Taiwan Journal of TESOL
Vol. 16.2, 101-150, 2019 DOI: 10.30397/TJTESOL.201910_16(2).0004

THE EFFECTS OF COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES ON INTERMEDIATE EFL LOW- AND MID- WILLING LEARNERS' WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE: PERSONALITY TYPES AND LEARNERS' CHOICE

Hosein Vafadar
Thomas Chow Voon Foo
Afsar Rouhi

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effects of communication strategies (CSs) on Intermediate Iranian EFL Low- and Mid-Willing Learners' Willingness to Communicate (LWTC and MWTC). Sixty-five intermediate EFL learners were placed in LWTC (n = 32) and MWTC (n = 33) group. All learners attended two discussion sessions as the pretest and two discussion sessions as the posttest. All sessions were audio/video recorded and observed. The learners received a direct instruction of CSs for five sessions. The results revealed that the LWTC learners' WTC significantly increased as a result of CSs use compared to that of the MWTC learners. The indirect types of CSs were identified as the most frequent strategies applied by all learners. The personality type was not identified as a contributing factor to the learners' CSs choice. A set of interrelated factors enhancing or reducing learners' WTC including contextual, individual, and communicative competence factors were identified through stimulated-recall interviews.

Key words: communication strategies, low-willing and mid-willing, willingness to communicate

INTRODUCTION

It is too frequently observed that learners in EFL classes although motivated to learn a language remain silent and they are unwilling to initiate or engage in communication when they are free to do so. This status, as established by research into L2 communication, has generally

been referred to as Willingness to Communicate (WTC) and explains that learners with high levels of linguistic competence remain unwilling to communicate, while others with limited competence actively engage in communication (Bernales, 2016; Cao & Philp, 2006; Kang, 2005; MacIntyre, Dörnyei, Clément, & Noels, 1998; Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015; Peng, Zhang, & Cheng, 2016; Zarrinabadi, 2014). Generally, English teachers explain that this unwillingness happens because learners do not take a risk to use what they have learnt; they only attempt to respond to their teachers when they are questioned. Furthermore, learners' unwillingness to communicate is also attributed to their few linguistic resources and inadequacy of interaction skills to continue conversation and convey meanings which results in communication breakdowns or unwillingness to communicate. MacIntyre (2004) defined WTC as "the probability of initiating communication, [and] given the opportunity, WTC integrates motivational process with communication competencies and perceived self-confidence" (p. 2).

Communication is an inevitable part of L2 learning. As noted by Skehan (1989), one must talk in order to learn L2. As a result, speaking has been considered to mean more language use and practice which in turn leads to higher levels of communicative competence and success. Accordingly, WTC has been taken to mean the main predictor of production and language use (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Similarly, MacIntyre and Charos (1996) posited that one must be able to use language to communicate. Thus, an essential purpose of L2 teaching should be to produce learners who are willing to use the language for authentic communication (MacIntyre et al., 1998). However, despite possessing knowledge of forms, meanings and functions, some learners are yet reticent or unwilling to communicate, which is seen as the inability of learners to use that knowledge and acquire strategies to keep the communication channel open and convey the intended meanings appropriately.

Considering the WTC definition as the percentage of times that one would choose to communicate if given opportunities in each type of situation may put aside the role of CSs which is intended to facilitate the communication by providing interlocutors with necessary interaction skills. Moreover, one may only utter one word in conversation, for example, by using the word "yes" to confirm to the interlocutor many times. If we only consider the percentage of times that would be chosen

to communicate, the one using "yes" for many times would show a high WTC, but this is very different from the other one who sustains communication and attempts to convey the intended meanings and who is equal in terms of taking turns with the one uttering only one word, which may not reflect the actual amount of speaking and communication behavior. Therefore, in the present study, WTC is not only taken to mean initiating communication (i.e., taking turns), but also sustaining communication (i.e., amount of speaking) (Cao, 2009).

Communication strategies (CSs), which are considered strategic competence enhancers, can help solve communication breakdowns, increase interaction and language use in the target language, and deal with reticence (e.g., Dörnyei & Scott, 1997; Lafford, 2004; Nakatani, 2010). Dörnyei and Scott (1997) defined CSs as "a conscious technique used to achieve a goal" (1997, pp. 184–185).

Despite much research on the antecedents of WTC around the globe, research into improving learners' WTC behavior, to date, has not been given much consideration. Therefore, the present study aims to fill that gap in the literature by investigating the effects of CSs on Intermediate Iranian EFL Low-WTC (LWTC) and Mid-WTC (MWTC) learners, the most frequent CSs used, and learners' personality type.

Willingness to Communicate (WTC)

WTC is a particular area of investigation in the field of L2 acquisition which started from the L1 communication focusing on trait-like variables and extended to a broad scope of L2 with a focus on situational, linguistic, and social variables (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Related literature on WTC reveals a distinction between personality trait level and situational level WTC. The personality trait for WTC refers to learners' stable behavior and personality or what MacIntyre et al. (1998) referred to as enduring influences that continue across contexts with no fluctuations. For example, Cetinkaya (2005) concluded that extroverted learners perceived themselves more proficient in communication which resulted in increased WTC compared to introverted ones. The situational WTC, however, is a transient influence and dynamic and which depends on specific contexts that change over time and across situations (MacIntyre et al., 1998). For example, Pawlak et al. (2015) examined the dynamic situational nature of WTC and found some situational level factors influencing learners' WTC such as the topic, planning time,

cooperation and familiarity with the interlocutor, the opportunity to express one's ideas, the mastery of requisite lexis, the presence of the researcher, and a host of individual variables.

Exploring related literature on WTC indicates that WTC is closely related to motivation, attitudes, and L2 confidence (Ghonsooly, Khajavi, & Asadpour, 2012), international posture (Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004), learner beliefs (Peng & Woodrow, 2010), personality (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996), gender and age (MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, & Donovan, 2002), classroom environment (Khajavi, Ghonsooly, Fatemi, & Choi, 2016), emotional intelligence level (Alavinia & Agha Alikhani, 2014), and context (Baker & MacIntyre, 2000). The qualitative studies on WTC show that some other factors in conversational and contextual factors are also related to WTC such as interlocutors, topics, and tasks (Cao & Philp, 2006), and teaching styles and the teacher's support and immediacy behavior (Peng, 2014). The present study also investigates the trait and situational level of learners' WTC by employing a mixed-method design and discusses the reasons for fluctuations in learners' WTC.

Communication Strategies (CSs)

CSs are not only employed to overcome the communication difficulties because of linguistic deficiency or other resources, but also to enhance communication efficacy, fluency, and despite negotiating meaning, CSs keep the communication channel open (Dobao & Martínez, 2007). Swain (1995) asserted that the available literature on CSs indicate that learners do notice the breakdowns as they speak, and they attempt to do something about them. She compared this to her "output hypothesis" particularly its "noticing" function. In other words, Swain (1995) believes that output leads to noticing and thus learners need to be informed about problems in their output. The related literature also indicates that L2 using and receiving certain L2 input do foster learners' strategic competence; for example, Tarone's (1981) investigation among Russian learners indicated that learners exposed to some extracurricular activities revealed better performance in applying strategies effectively than their learners who were not exposed.

According to CSs instruction, the intra-individual approach considers CSs as problem-solving behavior of learners and explores the mental processes involved in that behavior. It is argued that those

processes are not influenced by teaching (Bongaerts & Poulisse, 1989). Additionally, the opposing view of CSs teachability is grounded in the argument that learners are already familiar with them from their L1 which is mainly based on the limited belief of teaching as transferring new information. However, the supporters of inter-individual approach highlight the interactional function of CSs and advocate the significance of teaching these strategies (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997).

Dörnyei and Scott (1997) suggested the notion of CSs as a conscious strategy applied to achieve a goal and a direct approach to CSs teaching with a focus on awareness-raising tasks. They identified different kinds of problems: a) recourse deficits–refers to the knowledge shortcomings that render speakers unable to express meanings; b) own performance problems–the speaker realizes that his utterance is not correct, such as the self-repair strategy; c) other performance problems–the speaker perceives that something is incomplete or highly unexpected or he is unable to understand a message completely in the interlocutor's speech, such as the strategy of negotiating meaning; and d) processing time pressure–when the speaker needs time for thinking and planning his message; such as the self-repetition strategy. They suggested an extended classification of CSs. They placed their classification under three broad categorizations: direct strategies, interactional strategies, and indirect strategies.

According to Dörnyei and Scott (1997), direct CSs are self-reliant, optional, and easy-to-use strategies that speakers use to communicate meaning, such as circumlocution CSs. In interactional CSs, speakers utilize troubleshooting exchanges in achieving mutual understanding with their interlocutor (e.g., asking for clarification). Accordingly, both direct and interactional CS categories are oriented with "Resource deficit-related strategies: L1- or L2-based; Own-performance problem-related strategies: L1- or L2-based; and Other-performance problem-related strategies: L1- or L2-based". Indirect strategies, though not strictly considered problem-solving strategies and not viewed as a means of providing alternative meaning structures, help to convey the meaning indirectly by mutual understanding and keeping the communication channel open. The indirect CSs categories are oriented with "Processing time pressure-related strategies, Own-performance problem-related strategies, and Other-performance problem-related strategies". Therefore, Dörnyei and Scott's (1997) CSs categories (see Appendix A) are of much interest in the present study.

Some investigations were carried out to study the potential efficiency of CSs teachability. For example, Nakatani (2005) examined the effect of explicit teaching of CSs and strategy use on oral communication ability. The results revealed that learners exposed to strategy training demonstrated significant improvements on their speaking proficiency over the control group. Nakatani further explained that the training group's better performance was partly justified with the reason that learners' awareness of using specific CSs was raised.

CSs have been scarcely investigated from the viewpoint of teaching and their effects on WTC but have focused on the other areas such as learners' oral production (Saeidi & Ebrahimi Farshchi, 2015), language learning (Maleki, 2007), speaking ability (Alibakhshi & Padiz, 2011), the correlation between proficiency levels and CSs use (Al Alawi, 2016), effects of task type on the CSs use (Shih, 2014), and learners' perceptions towards explicit teaching of CSs (Abdi & Varzandeh, 2014).

The learners' personality plays an important role in communication (Tarone, 1977). Extroverted learners seem to be more successful in conversations because they may be more sociable and willing to communicate than introverted ones, and they will show greater interaction and apply more interactive strategies in communication (Zhang, 2008). The personality of the learners may also influence the choice of CSs (e.g., Lin & Li, 2009; Wang, 2005; Wannaruk; 2003). For example, Lin and Li (2009) found that the extroverted learners who were more sociable and willing to exchange their opinions employed more cooperative strategies and imitation strategies, and the introverted ones who were too shy and conservative to ask for help used more reduction strategies. Wang (2005) investigated the effect of Chinese ESL learners' language proficiency on their CSs use. The data from the questionnaire survey and interview from 40 second-year non-English majors indicated that personality traits affect learners' choice of specific CSs aside from L2 proficiency levels and that the higher-proficiency learners, especially extroverts, employed more L2-based strategies in an effective and flexible way, while introverts with lower-proficiency resorted to more L1-based strategies and even more reduction strategies. McCroskey et al. explained that WTC is a personality-oriented concept that illustrates such regularity in a person's tendency toward oral communication (1985, as cited in Peng, 2007). Thus, it appears that learners who are not involved in second language interaction are usually regarded as being passive and unmotivated. McCroskey and Richmond (1990) reflected on verbal

communication as a free will act focusing on the necessity of cognitive characteristics of communication behavior which is influenced by the individual's personality. As noted by MacIntyre et al. (1998), personality is believed to have an indirect effect on intergroup environment and individuals' communication behavior. Kim's (2014) study, a relationship between the learners' WTC in L2 and attitudes was reported. It indicated that the introverted or extroverted personality factors of learners were indirectly correlated with their WTC through linguistic self-confidence.

The Study

As evidenced in the literature, much of the previous WTC studies have focused on identifying the trait and situational factors influencing learners' WTC. Empirical investigations on finding a tool to improve learners' WTC are still rare. Therefore, the paucity of available studies in this area requires further investigations on different aspects of CSs and their effects on learners' WTC, learners' personality type, and CSs choice. Therefore, the present study is an attempt to address these gaps. It is assumed that this study would give more practical insights into the WTC field. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to examine the effects of CSs on intermediate EFL LWTC and MWTC learners. The study also attempts to gather data on the most frequent types of CSs used by learners, and learners' personality types in CSs choice. Accordingly, the present study addresses the following research questions.

1. Does communication strategies instruction increase the willingness to communicate of Intermediate EFL Low-WTC learners?
2. Does communication strategies instruction increase the willingness to communicate of Intermediate EFL Mid-WTC learners?
3. What are the learners' personality types and their most frequently used communication strategies?
4. What are the factors influencing learners' WTC reported during stimulated-recall interviews?

METHOD

Learners

Sixty-five intermediate EFL learners (male and female aged between 13-24) from an English Language School in Iran participated in this study. They were selected through a purposive sampling procedure. That is, the intermediate learners were chosen through a placement test, the Solutions Placement Test (Edwards, 2007). This well-established and valid test published by Oxford publications was used to assess learners' general knowledge of language and indicate their appropriate level, i.e. to choose the intermediate level of learners or classes for the current study. Accordingly, only the intermediate EFL learners were included in this study in order to have a homogeneous group of learners in terms of language proficiency level because learners' WTC is contingent upon level of proficiency (MacIntyre et al., 1998) and CSs use is in correlation with learners' proficiency level. The learners were given some of the CSs descriptions in handouts to check if they were familiar with them. As reported by all learners, they had not been taught to use those CSs systematically by their teachers, but a few learners (three learners from the control group and two learners from the experimental group) reported that they were familiar with a few CSs by learning through their books such as "Use of all-purpose words", "circumlocution", "Repetition", and "Code switching". Furthermore, their teachers also stated that they had not taught CSs to the learners systematically, but sometimes they generally explained how to deal with their speaking breakdowns by describing the properties of the target word that they do not know (or to use words such as "thing, stuff…) where specific words are lacking (Use of all-purpose words). Learners' first language was Azeri/Turk and their second language was Persian. They had approximately two to seven years of experience studying English in language schools and in other places such as secondary school or university. At the time of the data-collection procedures, the learners had attended a regular EFL curriculum meeting for three two-hour classes per week for almost a four-week semester of instruction. The learners were placed in LWTC (n = 32) and MWTC (n = 33) groups.

Materials

WTC questionnaire (Appendix C)

This questionnaire was adapted (McCroskey, 1992) to assess learners' level of WTC. It includes 20 items showing four types of communication contexts (i.e., group discussion, meetings, interpersonal,

public speaking), three types of receivers (i.e., stranger, acquaintance, friend), and eight distracting items. Through a pilot study, the experts, aged between 37-45, were university lecturers specializing in English language teaching and were experienced in the present subject; they only suggested some modifications in filler item 18 because of cultural differences between eastern and western countries in order to make them appropriate for Iranian culture. That is, the item "Talk with a spouse or girl/boyfriend" was changed into "talk with brother or sister". The learners indicated the percentage of times they would choose to communicate in each type of situation, from 0 (never) to 100 (always). According to the cutting scores, a learner who scored 82 and above was determined as HWTC and one who scored 52 and below was identified as LWTC learner. The WTC total score falling between 52 and 82 indicated as MWTC. The internal reliability analysis for this questionnaire yielded the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of .86.

Systematic observation scheme (Appendix D)

Cao and Philp's (2006) scheme was adapted to observe learners' behaviors relevant to WTC in the class. As a result of the pilot study and the experts' suggestions, the observation scheme for EFL learners was validated. Only one subcategory "(b) Learner-responding" was excluded from the Teacher/interaction section of the scheme. One subcategory "(b) Learner-responding" was not considered since it refers to a question addressed to the learner him/herself in particular because he/she is obliged to answer without having much choice, which was contrary to the WTC definition. Simply stated, when a question is raised by a teacher to a learner, he/she is obliged to answer without having much choice.

Big five personality test (Appendix E)

This test, developed by Goldberg (1992), was adopted to determine learners' personality type. It contains fifty items rated on a five-point scale. The Big Five traits are Openness, Conscientiousness, Extroversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. Openness refers to people who like new experiences and things and like being insightful and imaginative. Conscientiousness refers to people who are honest, hardworking, and organized. Extroversion refers to people who like interacting with others and includes traits such as energetic, talkative, and assertive.

Agreeableness refers to people who adjust their behavior to suit others and includes traits such as friendly, cooperative, compassionate, sympathetic, and polite. Neuroticism refers to emotional people and being moody and tense.

Stimulated-recall interview (Appendix F)

An interview that is conducted in the classroom which normally involves video/audio recording of the learners' conversations playing back the recording to a learner, stopping at any moment when their speaking and WTC were influenced or changed by certain factors, and asking what s/he had been thinking at that particular point in time (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Therefore, in the present study, it was conducted through which learners' perceptions of CSs on their WTC and the interacting factors contributing to their WTC behavior, and their dynamic changes of WTC behaviors were elicited by individually listening to excerpts of the recordings of their performance in the class.

Placement test

An Oxford placement test called Solutions Placement Test (Edwards, 2007), was used to assess learners' general knowledge of language and indicate their appropriate level, i.e. to choose the intermediate level of learners or classes for the current study. It was administered before the main study in a sampling procedure. The test includes 50 multiple-choice items which are used for the purpose of assessing learners' knowledge of grammar and vocabulary from elementary to intermediate levels, a reading text with 10 graded comprehension questions, and a writing task that assesses learners' ability to produce the language. The 50 multiple-choice items and the reading task are designed to be done together in 45 minutes. The writing can be done in approximately 20 minutes. Learners whose scores fall on the borderlines of 0-20, 21-30, 30+ should be placed in elementary, pre-intermediate, and intermediate groups, respectively.

Procedures

This study followed the design of a pretest, five treatment sessions, and a posttest with LWTC (n = 32) and MWTC (n = 33) group. The learners received CSs instruction and the data were collected over 11

sessions by employing a mixed-method design using questionnaires, observation and recording, and stimulated-recall interviews. In session 1, learners completed the WTC and Big Five Personality Test questionnaires. The learners suggested and also chose their favorite discussion topics through a topic familiarity and interest list questionnaire, which included a list of 30 topics which had been specified by consulting their teachers and course books. The learners attended session 2 as a preparatory session to get used to the presence of the observer, recorder, and the classroom environment by discussing one of their favorite topics for 50 minutes. In sessions 3 and 4, learners discussed one of their favorite topics as a pretest. Their communication and behaviors relevant to WTC were recorded and observed by the observer. Session 4 was held with the same procedures in session 3. A transcribed excerpt of the discussion in session 3 is presented in Appendix B. In sessions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 40, CSs (eight CSs each session) were taught from Dörnyei and Scott's (1997) Inventory of Strategic Language Devices (Appendix A) to the learners (five sessions, 60 minutes each). A Persian translation of each CS definition was also provided in the handouts so earners could learn and understand CSs functions, for example:

Use of all-purpose words

Description: Extending a general, "empty" lexical item to contexts where specific words are lacking.

ا گر نتوانم در صحبت کردن واژه مورد نظرم را پیدا کنم به جای آن از کلماتی مثل *thing, stuff, make, do* استفاده می کنم .

Example: The overuse of thing, stuff, make, do, as well as words like thingie, what-do-you-call-it; e.g.: I can't can't work until you repair my ... thing.

In teaching CSs, six interrelated procedures proposed by Dörnyei (1995) and adapted activities developed by Dörnyei and Thurrell (1992) were employed. The teaching procedures were as follows: a) introducing learners to the definition and concept of CSs and increasing their awareness of the potential of CSs that could actually be effective, b) encouraging learners to take risks and use strategies, c) providing

learners with models of applying special CSs, d) describing the cross-cultural differences in the use of strategies, e) providing learners with linguistic devices to make use of CSs orally, and f) providing learners with opportunities to practice strategy use. In sessions 10 and 11, the discussions were conducted for the group similar to the procedures in sessions 3 and 4 as a posttest. At the end of session 11, which took two more hours because of the interview, learners attended the next class for a one-on-one stimulated-recall interview. Their responses were audio-recorded for later analysis.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Not only the amount of speaking time as a measure of learners' WTC level by recording their performance was taken into consideration in this study, but also learners' behaviors as an indicator of their WTC in the class were considered using the Systematic Observation Scheme (Cao & Philp, 2006). Therefore, the observers identified the learners' turns demonstrating WTC behaviors in classroom interactions and matched them to the categories by putting a tick on a separate lined blank sheet by the observers. The frequency of learners' WTC behavior or turns, i.e. each time that a learner initiated a conversation was considered a turn, was then counted and their sums for each observed session were calculated for both groups involved in the study.

It is noteworthy to mention that WTC behavior was considered not only the initiating communication in this study, but also maintaining communication in the same turn. Therefore, learners' speaking time in each turn was also recorded in each session and calculated for each learner.

The conducted stimulated-recall interview in this study was analyzed applying content tape analysis which involves taking notes while listening to recordings several times and coding data, discovering categories, sub-themes and themes, and making interpretations, and building theory (Dörnyei, 2007, Mackey & Gass, 2012). The coding was conducted by employing NVivo 11 Plus Software which is used for qualitative analysis to help organize and manage the codes and frequency and store them for later analysis by other coders. Since the language of the interview was in the learners' L1, Azeri/Turkic, the developed codes and their translations into English were discussed, revised, and validated by two EFL teachers to avoid the possible

mistakes of vague code interpretations and language errors. Then, in order to avoid bias and establish uniformity in data coding, a qualified co-coder who had background about the present study was invited to code eight learners' interview accounts. To check the inter-rater reliability, Cohen's kappa was run to determine if there was agreement between coder 1 and coder 2 in assigning codes for the stimulated-recall interview data. The analysis revealed a .93% degree of agreement showing perfect agreement between the two coders.

Audacity 2.3.1 software was also employed to reduce background noise, to truncate each learner's silent time (more than 1 second), the amount of time spent by them using succesive pause fillers (e.g., Well, Um, Uh, actually, you know, let's see, I mean), and the pushed time by the teacher, i.e, the time that the teacher made learner speak by asking extra questions.

Results for Research Quesion 1

LWTC learners

The LWTC learners, as presented in Table 1, indicated improvements from pretest (M = 226.43, SD = 48.45) to the posttest (M = 310.87, SD = 60.45) for their WTC or amount of speaking time. The results of paired-samples t-test, as shown in Table 1, revealed a statistically significant difference between pretest and posttest scores, $t(15) = -.37$, $p < .05$. The eta squared statistic (.97) indicated a large effect size.

Table 1

Results of Paired-samples T-test for LWTC Learners' WTC Amount of Speaking

	n	*t*	*df*	*p (2-tailed)*	η^2
Pretest & Posttest	32	-.37	15	.04	.97

As presented in Table 2, comparing means for LWTC learners' number of speaking turns through the observation scheme indicated that the learners took more turns from pretest (M = 20.31) to posttest (M =

51.75). The results obtained from Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test, as displayed in Table 2, indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between pretest and posttest scores on LWTC learners' number of speaking turns, z = -1.58, p < .05, with a large effect size (r = .19). The median score increased from pretest (Mdn = 20) to posttest (Mdn = 30.50).

Table 2

Results of Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test for LWTC Learners' Speaking Turns

	n	*Mdn*	*z*	*p (2-tailed)*
Pretest	32	20		
Posttest	32	30.50		
Pretest & Posttest			-1.58	.04

Results for Research Question 2

MWTC learners

The results of paired-samples t-test, as shown in Table 3, performed on MWTC learners' amount of speaking showed that there was a decrease in means from pretest (M = 220.76) to posttest (M = 234.70) but this mean difference was not statistically significant, t (16) = .95, p = .355. The eta squared statistic (η 2 = .02) indicated a small effect size.

Table 3

Results of Paired-samples T-test for MWTC Learners' WTC Amount of Speaking

	n	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p (2-tailed)*
Pretest & Posttest	33	14.05	60.88	.95	16	.355

MWTC learners' number of speaking turns through the observation scheme showed very small gains from pretest (M = 19.94) to posttest (M = 21.58). As demonstrated in Table 4, the paired-samples t-test analysis indicated that the mean difference (-1.64) was not statistically significant,

t (16) = -1.87, p = .079, with a small eta squared effect size (η 2 = .02).

Table 4

Results of Paired-samples T-test for MWTC Learners' Speaking Turns

	n	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p (2-tailed)*
Pretest & Posttest	33	-1.64	3.62	-1.87	16	.079

Table 5 summarizes the means of learners' amount of speaking and number of speaking turns in the pretest and posttest for all LWTC and MWTC learners.

Table 5

Means Summary of Pretest and Posttest Scores for Amount of Speaking and Number of Speaking Turns

		Amount of Speaking		Number of Turns	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
	n	*M*	*M*	*M*	*M*
LWTC	32	226.43	310.87	20.31	51.75
MWTC	33	220.76	234.70	19.94	21.58

Results for Research Question 3

As demonstrated in Table 6, seventeen CSs were identified as the frequent strategies applied by LWTC learners. Among the most frequent CSs (largest number), 12 LWTC learners used the "Use of fillers" (75.0%) strategy, seven LWTC learners used "Response (repair)" (43.8%), and six LWTC learners used the "Self-repair" (37.5%) strategy. The most frequent CSs (the largest of all) used by LWTC learners in their speaking belonged to the "Indirect" classification of CSs, based on Dörnyei and Scott's (1997) classification, as displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

Frequency of CSs Used by LWTC Learners in Their Speaking (Recordings)

	CSs Classification	*f*	Percent
Use of fillers	Indirect	12	75
Response (repair)	Interactional	7	43.8
Self-repair	Direct	6	37.5
Self-repetition	Indirect	5	31.3
Approximation	Direct	5	31.3
Message abandonment	Direct	5	31.3
Code switching	Direct	2	12.5
Retrieval	Direct	2	12.5
Word-coinage	Direct	2	12.5
Mumbling	Direct	2	12.5
Circumlocution	Direct	1	6.3
Mime (nonlinguistic/paralinguistic)	Direct	1	6.3
Literal translation (Transfer)	Direct	1	6.3
Response (repeat)	Interactional	1	6.3
Foreignizing	Direct	1	6.3
Message reduction (topic avoidance)	Direct	1	6.3
Direct help	Interactional	1	6.3

As shown in Table 7, 17 CSs were identified as frequent strategies used by MWTC learners. The top most frequent CSs (largest number) used by MWTC learners were almost the same as those used by LWTC learners as 13 MWTC learners used the "Use of fillers" strategy, 11 MWTC learners used the "Self-repetition" strategy, eight MWTC learners used the "Approximation" strategy, and seven MWTC learners used the "Response (repair)" strategy. Similar to LWTC learners' use of

CSs, the most frequent CSs use (the largest of all) belonged to the "Indirect" classification of CSs, based on Dörnyei and Scott's (1997) classification.

Table 7

Frequency of CSs Used by MWTC Learners in Their Speaking (Recordings)

	CSs Classification	*f*	Percent
Use of fillers	Indirect	13	76.5
Self-repetition	Indirect	11	64.7
Approximation	Direct	8	47.1
Response (repair)	Interactional	7	41.2
Self-repair	Direct	7	41.2
Code switching	Direct	3	17.6
Message abandonment	Direct	2	11.8
Retrieval	Direct	2	11.8
Direct help	Interactional	2	11.8
Restructuring	Direct	2	11.8
Use of all-purpose words	Direct	1	5.9
Literal translation (Transfer)	Direct	1	5.9
Response (repeat)	Interactional	1	5.9
Foreignizing	Direct	1	5.9
Message reduction (topic avoidance)	Direct	1	5.9
Use of similar sounding words	Direct	1	5.9
Self-rephrasing	Direct	1	5.9

Table 8 presents the personality type of LWTC and MWTC learners and the number of learners in each category. All five personality traits were found in both LWTC and MWTC learners. Since the most frequent CSs used (the largest of all) by LWTC and MWTC learners were roughly the same and belonged to the "Indirect" classification of CSs,

the learners' personality was not a determinant of their CSs choice.

Table 8

Personality Types of LWTC and MWTC Learners

Learners	n	Extroversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness
LWTC	32	8	6	5	8	5
MWTC	33	9	7	4	6	7

Results for Research Quesion 4

The learners reported the factors influencing their WTC were both facilitative and inhibitive factors. They were coded under three dimensions including contextual, individual, and communicative competence. According to the conceptualized framework of this study and learners' accounts through a stimulated-recall interview as well as previous studies (e.g., Cao, 2009), the factors influencing their dynamic-situational WTC, their perception of CSs were clustered and coded into three core-categories or themes: contextual, individual, and communicative competence themes containing relevant categories and sub-categories.

Contextual Factors Influencing WTC Behavior

It was supported by a few learners' attitudes reported during the interview in the present study that the topic (topical knowledge and familiarity with the topic) contributed to their WTC behaviors and participation in the class. For example, one of the interviewees mentioned in her comment that:

> "when the topic is interesting and open-ended question I'd like to talk more and I have a lot to say about it. For example, one of the topic discussion was about technology that I was interested in and it was sort of topic everybody touches it regularly and can talk about it from different aspects."

"Desire to communicate with a specific person" refers to a person's tendency to speak with a specific person because of the interlocutor's

familiarity or attractiveness in some ways. This variable was determined as one of the antecedents of WTC behavior. The contextual factors such as interlocutor familiarity influences learners' WTC in a way that the learners feel more comfortable to speak with a more familiar interlocutor. This was cited during the interview:

> "I'd like to talk to a person I know and I am familiar with especially my friends with whom I socialize outside of class because I feel more confident and I am willing to talk much and it is comfortable to share opinions and talk whatever I like"

Additionally, the interlocutor's personality was also mentioned as a factor which could inhibit or promote learners' WTC. As mentioned by learners in the interview if the person they talk to was sociable and friendly or attractive in terms of personality traits they could be more willing to talk.

Being evaluated negatively by peers was mentioned by learners as a big concern because they felt hesitant to express their ideas to the whole class. As evident in this study and reported in the interview:

> "If I feel that my oral skill is being evaluated negatively by my friends, it discourages me and I feel less confident as I was interrupted by one my classmates in one of the sessions because of the inappropriate use of vocabulary which led me to avoid talking to her"

Moreover, it was mentioned during the interview that peer influence contributed positively to learners' WTC in that their classmates speaking English better encouraged them to follow their peers and to conform to that of the influencing individual.

The role of teacher immediacy behaviors in a language classroom cannot be avoided as it was mentioned by the majority of the interviewees that teacher's both verbal and non-verbal behaviors were an affective factor that encouraged them to communicate and motivate them to engage in discussions. As it was remarked during interviews:

> "I think the teacher's role is very important in our talking, for example, when I receive positive attitudes or feedback from teacher such as praising, nodding her head, and calling my first name,

> saying …good… all right… very good and so on… I feel more encouraged and interested. But, I feel unwilling to speak if the teacher pays little attention to what I say"

The learners also reported that teaching style, teacher involvement, and personality are the factors that could exercise effects on their WTC and engagement in the class discussions. Referring to their teachers' CSs instruction and teaching style in general, the learners commented that the teacher explicitly explained and trained them with CSs usage in both English and Persian language by presenting examples, needed expressions and applying interactive style, and this could motivate them and encourage them in class activities. The learners acknowledged their teacher involvement by expressing that they liked their teacher's personality of being friendly and that they could discuss and raise their questions in the class and actively participate in the classroom discussions.

The class communication pattern including whole-class situation or teacher-fronted communication, group work, small groups, and pair work were also nominated by learners as influencing factors on WTC behavior. The learners favored different communication patterns as some prefer to talk in small groups or in pairs, whereas some others prefer large group work or teacher-fronted communication. The learners of the present study generally favored pair work or small groups. They did not prefer the whole-class communicational pattern because they felt their WTC was inhibited due to peer pressure and dominance of more proficient learners in the discussions. They reported that they felt anxious and uneasy about making mistakes in front of their classmates. However, the majority of learners preferred small group or teacher-fronted communicational patterns since they perceived it as an opportunity to talk comfortably and informally and with less competitive turn-taking. Additionally, they expressed that they are more willing to talk to the teacher who provides a safer context and can give feedback and correct their mistakes, which was identified in this study as the most preferable communicational pattern regarding learners' WTC.

Class situated pattern (recording and observer effect) was another factor within contextual variables cited by the learners that affect their WTC behavior. According to the dynamic situational view, the interdependence between internal and external factors is highlighted in WTC antecedents such as mood and environmental conditions (e.g., the

presence of recording equipment and observer). As explained by the learners of the present study, they felt nervous about being recorded or observed in the class which affected their performance and WTC, but all mentioned that this especially happened in the earlier sessions and was reduced in proceeding sessions.

Individual Factors Influencing WTC Behavior

The individual factors including feelings, self-perceived communication competence (SPCC), and perceived opportunity to communicate were reported by the learners that either inhibit or promote their WTC behavior. In the present study, a number of feelings were mentioned by the learners as influencing factors of their WTC including positive and negative feelings such as relaxed mood, apprehension, anxiety, embarrassment, self-evaluation, face-protection, and boredom. Some learners commented that their mood, which seemed to be dependent on learning context or socially-dependent variables such as friendly learning environment, feelings of tiredness or boredom contributed to their WTC. As it was noted by a few learners during interviews:

> "sometimes I feel tired and think that I can't talk well in English as in one of the sessions I was too tired because I had been in school classes until my English class time in the afternoon so I wasn't more willing to participate in discussions"

The apprehension factor was also noted by some learners of this study as a factor affecting their participation in class discussions, expressing that they were anxious or afraid of their failure in conversation which at times could make them unwilling to talk in the class.

As some learners remarked in the present study, anxiety was provoked largely because of the recording presence in the class and partly because of negative self-evaluation of their actual oral skill or making mistakes in front of their classmates. Additionally, it was mentioned by a few learners that being afraid of losing face if they cannot speak effectively and feeling embarrassed to volunteer to answer questions because of low self-confidence are also factors which could affect learners' involvement in class discussions.

In the present study, learners' WTC turned out to be influenced by their SPCC which could be promoted by CSs instruction. As this is also evident by the majority of the learners during interviews expressed that:

> "after our teacher tought us CSs, I felt that my self-confidence increased thinking that there is always another way to overcome any shortcomings of my communication resources. It would help me to have confidence and courage to get involved in discussions more"

Of the factors contributing to learners' WTC behavior within the individual dimension noted by the learners of this study was perceived opportunity to communicate. The given opportunity is the prerequisite condition for initiating communication. The learners were eager to talk if the opportunity was appropriate for them. In the present study, opportunities available for learners to talk were varied but it largely depended on how the learners perceived those opportunities such as willing to talk to a familiar interlocutor in small groups. However, what was mainly pointed out by some interviewees in this respect was that they felt at times responsible to engage in breaking the ice in the class when observing that others in class were too quiet, which would influence learners' WTC behaviors.

Communicative Competence Factors Influencing WTC Behavior

The last dimension identified as an influencing factor on learners' dynamic-situational WTC includes two categories, namely, language ability and CSs. As reflected by a few learners during interviews, language ability regarding comprehension and production was reported as a factor which could at times inhibit their communication. Particularly, it was mentioned that when they did not understand some key words from their interlocutor or they faced difficulty in terms of listening comprehension, their WTC and engagement in the discussion would be reduced. As reported during interviews:

> "it happened sometimes I did not quite understand what my friend said or I did not understand a keyword and I did not ask my friend to clarify because I felt that if I ask her, she would judge my English negatively. So, it made me not to talk much"

It was reported that difficulty in applying appropriate lexical resources and sentence structures appear to inhibit learners' WTC and interaction or lead learners to feel less confident to express their opinions as a result of their reticence in class. The learners facing difficulty in finding proper vocabulary or structures to express their opinions in oral expressions led to their suspension or retreat from communication. This is reflected by a few learners in the present study during interviews that inability to find appropriate words or structures at times made them pause while speaking or impeded their communication:

> "sometimes, I couldn't find right words or structures to express my ideas. It also happened sometimes I did not apply right words, so my classmates did not understand what I said, I don't know it's maybe because of my English. You know, this makes me feel less confident to move on"

However, it was reported by nearly all learners that CSs were like an emergency tool for their communication breakdowns, which could boost their interaction and WTC. They expressed that they would apply CSs whenever they were faced with difficulty of finding the right words, which could give them confidence thinking that there was always another way to cope with communication breakdowns regarding poor lexical resources. The learners applied the CSs when they felt that they had a smaller size of vocabulary at their disposal.

In the present study, despite learners' positive perception of CSs effects on their WTC and communication breakdowns, a few of the learners also criticized the practicality of some types of CSs, especially in a context other than an Iranian context. For instance, a few of them disapproved of applying "Literal translation (Transfer)", "Foreignizing", "Code switching" strategies in the belief that the class is the only place they could speak and practice English; therefore, they were not interested in switching into their L1. In addition, they did not show an interest in switching into their L1 in a context other than their L1 context, claiming that outsiders or non-speakers of their L1 would face difficulty in understanding their L1 switching and intended message as well.

The learners of the present study also believed that their grammar and pronunciation were not considered problematic areas in their WTC behavior. Only two of the interviewees cited that it happened at times they paused their speaking because of difficulty in pronouncing some

words.

DISCUSSION

The WTC of the LWTC learners significantly increased from pretest to the posttest. This finding is well supported by the belief that CSs improve learners' WTC, enhance communication efficacy (e.g., Dobao & Martínez, 2007) and despite negotiating meaning, CSs keep the communication channel open (Saeidi & Ebrahimi Farshchi, 2015). As mentioned above, MacIntyre (2004) states WTC is "the probability of initiating communication, [and] given the opportunity, WTC integrates motivational process with communication competencies and perceived self-confidence" (p. 2). Thus, strategic competence as an awareness of CSs and a main component of individuals' communicative competence solving communication breakdowns (Canale & Swain, 1980) seems to have a significant effect on learners' WTC behaviors. Awareness-raising is emphasized through explicit CSs instruction, which was applied in this study, by many researchers (e.g., Alibakhshi, 2011; Cervantes, Carmen, & Rodriguez, 2012; Nakatani, 2005; Sukirlan, 2014) who support the opinion that it results in developing strategic competence and using CSs to solve communication breakdowns.

The results related to the LWTC learners' increase in WTC in the present study are also consistent with the results from some empirical studies such as a study conducted by Nakatani (2005) who found that learners receiving CSs instruction revealed significantly more improvements on their speaking proficiency than the control group as it turned out that learners' awareness of using specific CSs was raised. Rossiter (2003) also in his study concluded that CSs training results in an increased amount of speaking, successful communication, and also CS use. The studies conducted in the Iranian context also supported learners' communication improvements and speaking ability (Alibakhshi & Padiz, 2011; Maleki, 2007; Saeidi & Ebrahimi Farshchi, 2015) as a result of CSs instruction.

This result is also consistent and supported by the majority of LWTC learners own explanations during their interviews. They explained that peer influence contributed positively to their WTC in that by observing their classmates speaking English better encouraged them to follow their peers and to conform to that of the influencing individual and their surroundings.

The majority of LWTC learners explained during interviews that by observing learners who were talkative and outgoing and who would come up with a lot of ideas, they could attempt to keep up with them in class participation and as a result this affected their WTC behavior and amount of speaking time. This is also evident in previous studies (e.g., Cao & Philp, 2006; Kang, 2005). The LWTC learners also pointed out that they could not neglect the role of CSs in helping them in this case, which could give them confidence and courage to participate in discussions more. Consequently, LWTC learners' taking speaking turns were also fostered after intervention.

The MWTC learners' amount of speaking or WTC showed a small decrease in means from pretest to posttest without a significant difference. Nevertheless, it was observed that MWTC learners who applied CSs in their speaking and their turn taking in speaking also increased in the posttest, though small improvements, which shows the effectiveness of CSs. Besides increasing turn taking, the LWTC learners also showed a significant increase in their amount of speaking time or WTC according to the WTC definition referred to in the present study. WTC, in this study, was taken as not only initiating communication but also sustaining communication. This indicates that LWTC learners were more willing to exploit CSs and sustain communication more than MWTC learners.

The "Use of fillers" strategy was the most frequent CSs (the largest of all) used by LWTC and MWTC learners in their speaking which belongs to the "Indirect" classification of CSs. Furthermore, examining the top most frequent CSs (largest number) used by both LWTC and MWTC learners reveals a general similarity of employing self-solving (such as "Use of fillers", "Self-repair", "Approximation", and "Self-repetition") and other-initiated self-repair ("Response (repair)") strategies among them. Indirect strategies are not strictly considered problem-solving strategies; they do not provide a choice for meaning structures, rather they help to convey the intended message by creating mutual understanding and keeping the communication channel open (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997). For example, the "Use of fillers" strategy is taken as "processing time pressure" to buy time and plan speech when faced with difficulty (e.g., well, you know, actually, okay). In the present study, the learners frequently used this strategy to gain more time and plan their speech or to fill pauses at the time of difficulty in their speaking. This shows that the CSs teaching gave learners the confidence

to not only depend on teacher-dependency strategies but also employ the indirect types of CSs as well. The "Use of fillers" strategy was also identified as one of the eight effective strategies in Abdi and Varzandeh's (2014) study.

The results of the present study also show that the learners' personality was not a contributing factor to their CSs choice as the most frequent CSs applied (the largest of all) by LWTC and MWTC learners was roughly the same and belonged to the "Indirect" classification of CSs. This result is contrary to the results of rare studies in the literature which claimed a relationship between personality and the choice of CSs by learners (e.g., Lin & Li, 2009; Wang, 2005; Wannaruk; 2003). The reason for this conflicting result is that this kind of CSs, the "Use of fillers" strategy in particular, may be a common type of strategy among all learners with different personality types, who applied this strategy to gain more time and plan their speech or to fill pauses at the time of difficulty in their speaking. This would also be a further research area to examine the CSs based on personality type and their detailed traits.

CONCLUSIONS

This study provides more empirical evidence that CSs teaching is an effective tool to increase WTC of LWTC learners. Although there are still some areas of uncertainty due to the paucity of studies or lack of investigations in WTC and CSs literature concerning the effects of CSs on learners' WTC, this study suggests that CSs instruction can pedagogically be implemented by teachers in the classroom to foster learners' WTC, particularly LWTC learners. It needs to be mentioned that the recommendations are offered in accordance with the Iranian EFL context; however, it can be considered in other EFL contexts with similar characteristics. It is also convincing to suggest the indirect types of CSs to be effectively implemented in the classroom activities for EFL learners, for LWTC learners in particular, to improve their WTC. The language material developers can include strategies particularly indirect types of CSs as fundamentals in textbooks for teaching oral communication skills in order to promote learners' strategic competence.

This study suggests that variables influencing WTC behavior were found to be not by a single factor but by joint effects and interrelationships between contextual, individual, and communicative competence factors which could either enhance or reduce learners' WTC

behavior. These interdependency characteristics indicate that the factors influencing WTC have an unequal strength of effects on different occasions. This means that the influence of one factor or another on learner's WTC is contingent on the other factor, and this influence can also be perceived in a different manner by another learner. Therefore, teachers should listen to learners' needs and preferences and consider various factors influencing their WTC. Any CSs training that can improve the learners' WTC behavior is particularly required so EFL learners can get engaged in communication and language use.

Based on the practical nature of CSs, and the observations of their effect on solving communication breakdowns in learners' WTC behavior, there is a strong hope that EFL teachers and learners will rapidly see the value of teaching and learning CSs. In the end, the theory of CSs should be applied in practice.

The findings of the present study were generated from 65 intermediate EFL learners; the sample size was relatively small basically because of time, cost, and practicality constraints, because of which the generalizability of the findings in other wider contexts should be approached with caution. The CSs instruction was taught to the learners over a relatively short period time of five sessions. If more time had been devoted to CSs instruction, it could reveal more aspects of CSs teaching and its efficacy. Additionally, even though the direct approach applied in teaching CSs was effective, the other approaches and methods of teaching could reveal more aspects and effects of teaching methods as well. Further research is still required to examine EFL learners' WTC with different proficiency levels and samples, to extend the treatment sessions to a larger period of time, and to investigate different teaching approaches.

REFERENCES

Abdi, G., & Varzandeh, O. (2014). EFL learners' attitudes towards communication strategies: A qualitative investigation. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 5*(3), 167–175.

Al Alawi, R. A. (2016). Communication strategies used by Omani ELF learners. *Pyrex Journal of English and Literature, 2*(1), 1–11.

Alavinia, P., & Agha Alikhani, M. (2014). Willingness to communicate reappraised in the light of emotional intelligence and gender differences. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*, 143–152.

Alibakhshi, G., & Padiz, D. (2011). The effect of teaching strategic competence on speaking performance of EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(4), 941–947.

Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2000). The role of gender and immersion in communication and second language orientations. *Language Learning, 50*(2), 311–341.

Bernales, C. (2016). Towards a comprehensive concept of willingness to communicate: Learners' predicted and self-reported participation in the foreign language classroom. *System, 56*, 1–12.

Bongaerts, T., & Poulisse, N. (1989). Communication strategies in L1 and L2: Same or different? *Applied Linguistics, 10*(3), 253–268.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1–47.

Cao, Y. (2009). An ecological view of situational willingness to communicate in a second language classroom. In H. Chen & K. Cruickshank (Eds.), *Making a difference: Challenges for applied linguistics* (pp. 199–218). Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.

Cao, Y., & Philp, J. (2006). Interactional context and willingness to communicate: A comparison of behavior in whole class, group and dyadic interaction. *System, 34*(4), 480–493.

Cervantes, R., Carmen, A., & Rodriguez, R. R. (2012). The use of communication strategies in the beginner EFL classroom. *GIST Education and Learning Research Journal, 6*, 111–128.

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

Dobao A. M. F., & Martínez I. M. P. (2007). Negotiating meaning in interaction between English and Spanish speakers via communicative strategies. *Atlantis, 29*(1), 87–105.

Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 55–85.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning, 47*, 173–210.

Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1992). *Conversation and dialogues in action*. Hemel Hemstead, England: Prentice Hall.

Edwards, L. (2007). *Solutions placement test*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ghonsooly, B., Khajavi, G., & Asadpour, S. F. (2012). Willingness to communicate in English among Iranian non–English major university learners. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 31*(2), 197–211.

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment, 4*(1), 26–42.

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.

Lafford, B. A. (2004). The effect of the context of learning on the use of communication strategies by learners of Spanish as a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*(2), 201–225.

Kang, S. J. (2005). Dynamic emergence of situational willingness to communicate in a second language. *System, 33*(2), 277–292.

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

MacIntyre, P. D. (2004). Volition and personality: Bringing motivational tendencies to life. *Paper presented at the 9th International Congress of Language and Social Psychology.* State College PA, July 1, 2004. Retrieved from http://faculty.cbu.ca/pmacintyre/research_pages/presentations.htm

MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clement, 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 learners. *Language Learning, 52*(3), 537–564.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Charos, C. (1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 15*(1), 3–26.

MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R. Z., & Noels. K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal, 82*(4), 545–562.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design.*

Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide.* London: Wiley Blackwell.

Maleki, A. (2007). Teachability of communication strategies: An Iranian experience. *System, 35*(4), 583–594.

McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly, 40*(1), 16–25.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1990). Willingness to communicate: A cognitive view. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *5*(2), 19–37.

Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *Modern Language Journal, 89*(1), 76–91.

Nakatani, Y. (2010). Identifying strategies that facilitate EFL learners' oral communication: A classroom study using multiple data collection procedures. *The Modern Language Journal*, *94*(1), 116–136.

Pawlak, M., & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A. (2015). Investigating the dynamic nature of L2 willingness to communicate. *System, 50,* 1–9.

Peng, J. E. (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. E. (2014). *Willingness to communicate in the Chinese EFL university classroom: An ecological perspective*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Peng, J. E., & Woodrow, L. (2010). Willingness to communicate in English: A model in the Chinese EFL classroom context. *Language Learning, 60*(4), 834–876.

Peng, J., Zhang, L., & Chen, Y. (2017). The mediation of multimodal affordances on willingness to communicate in the English as a foreign language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 51*(2), 302-331.

Rossiter, M. J. (2003). "It's like chicken but bigger": Effects of communication strategy in the ESL classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 60*(2), 105–121.

Saeidi, M., & Ebrahimi Farshchi, E. (2015). The effect of communication strategy teaching on EFL learners' oral production in content-based courses. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5*(1), 71–78.

Shih, Y. C. (2014). Communication strategies in a multimodal virtual communication context. *System, 42*, 34–47.

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

Sukirlan, M. (2014). Teaching communication strategies in an EFL class of tertiary level. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 4*(10), 2033–2041.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input*

in second language acquisition (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage. In H. D. Brown, C. A. Yorio., & R. C. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '77: Teaching and learning English as a second language* (pp.194–203). Washington D.C: TESOL.

Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. *TESOL Quarterly*, *15*(3), 285–295.

Wang, Y. (2005). The effect of L2 formal proficiency and personality traits on the use of communication strategies among Chinese ESL learners. *Foreign Languages in Fujian*, *4*, 249–253.

Wannaruk, A. (2003). Communication strategies employed by EST learners. *SLLT*, *12*, 1–18.

Yashima, T., Zenuk-Nishide, L., & Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language communication. *Language Learning*, *54*(1), 119–152.

Zarrinabadi, N. (2014). Communicating in a second language: Investigating the effect of teacher on learners' willingness to communicate. *System*, *42*, 288–295.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of the *Taiwan Journal of TESOL* for their constructive comments to help improve earlier versions of this paper. The author's sincere gratitude also goes to Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), the School of Languages, Literacies, and Translation, Malaysia for their continuous support throughout this project.

CORRESPONDENCE

Hosein Vafadar, School of Languages, Literacies, and Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Penang, Malaysia
Email address: vafadar82@gmail.com

Thomas Chow Voon Foo, School of Languages, Literacies, and Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Penang, Malaysia
Email address: tomichow@usm.my

Afsar Rouhi, Department of Linguistics and Foreign Languages, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

PUBLISHING RECORD

Manuscript received: December 24, 2018; Revision received: June 22, 2019; Manuscript accepted: August 26, 2019

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Inventory of strategic language devices

(Adopted from Dörnyei & Scott's, 1995a, 1995b, as Cited in Dörnyei & Scott, 1997)

DIRECT STRATEGIES

Resource deficit-related strategies

Message abandonment

Description: Leaving a message unfinished because of some language difficulty.

Example: It is a person er... who is responsible for a a house, for the block of house... I don't know... [laughter]

Message reduction (topic avoidance)

Description: Reducing the message by avoiding certain language structures or topics considered problematic language wise or by leaving out some intended elements for a lack of linguistic resources.

Example: [Retrospective comment by the speaker:] I was looking for "satisfied with a good job, pleasantly tired," and so on, but instead I accepted less.

Message replacement

Description: Substituting the original message with a new one because of not feeling capable of executing it.

Example: [Retrospective comment after saying that the pipe was broken in the middle instead of "the screw thread was broken":] I didn't know "screw thread" and well, I had to say something.

Circumlocution

Description: Exemplifying, illustrating or describing the properties of the target object or action.

Example: It becomes water instead of "melt".

Approximation
Description: Using a single alternative lexical item, such as a superordinate or a related term, which shares semantic features with the target word or structure.
Example: plate instead of "bowl"

Use of all-purpose words
Description: Extending a general, "empty" lexical item to contexts where specific words are lacking.
Example: The overuse of thing, stuff, make, do, as well as words like thingie, what-do-you-call-it; e.g.: I can't can't work until you repair my ... thing.

Word-coinage
Description: Creating a non-existing L2 word by applying a supposed L2 rule to an existing L2 word.
Example: [Retrospective comment after using dejunktion and unjunktion for "street clearing":] I think I approached it in a very scientific way: from 'junk' I formed a noun and I tried to add the negative prefix "de-"; to "unjunk" is to 'clear the junk' and "unjunktion" is 'street clearing'.

Restructuring
Description: Abandoning the execution of a verbal plan because of language difficulties, leaving the utterance unfinished, and communicating the intended message according to an alternative plan.
Example: On Mickey's face we can see the... so he's he's he's wondering.

Literal translation (Transfer)
Description: Translating literally a lexical item, an idiom, a compound word or structure from L1/L3 to L2.

Example: I'd made a big fault [translated from French]

Foreignizing

Description: Using a L1/L3 word by adjusting it to L2 phonology (i.e., with a L2 pronunciation) and/or morphology.

Example: reparate for "repair" [adjusting the German word 'reparieren']

Code switching

Description: Including L1/L3 words with L1/L3 pronunciation in L2 speech; this may involve stretches of discourse ranging from single words to whole chunks and even complete turns.

Example: Using the Latin ferrum for "iron".

Use of similar sounding words

Description: Compensating for a lexical item whose form the speaker is unsure of with a word (either existing or non-existing) which sounds more or less like the target item.

Example: [Retrospective comment explaining why the speaker used cap instead of "pan":] Because it was similar to the word which I wanted to say: "pan".

Mumbling

Description: Swallowing or muttering inaudibly a word (or part of a word) whose correct form the speaker is uncertain about.

Example: And uh well Mickey Mouse looks surprise or sort of XXX [the 'sort of' marker indicates that the unintelligible part is not just a mere recording failure but a strategy].

Omission

Description: Leaving a gap when not knowing a word and carrying on as if it had been said.

Example: then... er... the sun is is... hm sun is... and the Mickey Mouse.... [Retrospective comment: I didn't know what 'shine' was.]

Retrieval

Description: In an attempt to retrieve a lexical item saying a series of incomplete or wrong forms or structures before reaching the optimal form.
Example: It's brake er... it's broken broked broke.

Mime (nonlinguistic/paralinguistic strategies)
Description: Describing whole concepts nonverbally, or accompanying a verbal strategy with a visual illustration.
Example: [Retrospective comment:] I was miming here, to put it out in front of the house, because I couldn't remember the word.

Own-performance problem-related strategies

Self-rephrasing
Description: Repeating a term, but not quite as it is, but by adding something or using paraphrase.
Example: I don't know the material...what it's made of...

Self-repair
Description: Making self-initiated corrections in one's own speech.
Example: then the sun shines and the weather get be... gets better.

Other-performance problem-related strategies

Other-repair
Description: Correcting something in the interlocutor's speech.
Example: Speaker:... because our tip went wrong... [...] Interlocutor: Oh, you mean the tap.
S: Tap, tap...

INTERACTIONAL STRATEGIES

Resource deficit-related strategies

Appeals for help

Description: Direct help: Turning to the interlocutor for assistance by asking an explicit question concerning a gap in one's L2 knowledge.

Example: it's a kind of old clock so when it strucks er... I don't know, one, two, or three 'clock then a bird is coming out. What's the name?

Description: Indirect help: Trying to elicit help from the interlocutor indirectly by expressing lack of a needed L2 item either verbally or nonverbally.

Example: I don't know the name... [rising intonation, pause, eye contact]

Own-performance problem-related strategies

Comprehension check

Description: Asking questions to check that the interlocutor can follow you.

Example: And what is the diameter of the pipe? The diameter. Do you know what the diameter is?

Own-accuracy check

Description: Checking that what you said was correct by asking a concrete question or repeating a word with a question intonation.

Example: I can see a huge snow... snowman? snowman in the garden.

Other-performance problem-related strategies

Asking for repetition

Description: Requesting repetition when not hearing or understanding something properly.

Example: Pardon? What?

Asking for clarification
Description: Requesting explanation of an unfamiliar meaning structure.
Example: What do you mean?, You saw what? Also 'question repeats,' that is, echoing a word or a structure with a question intonation.

Asking for confirmation
Description: Requesting confirmation that one heard or understood something correctly.
Example: Repeating the trigger in a 'question repeat' or asking a full question, such as You said...?, You mean...?, Do you mean...?

Guessing
Description: Guessing is similar to a confirmation request but the latter implies a greater degree of certainty regarding the key word, whereas guessing involves real indecision.
Example: E.g.: Oh. It is then not the washing machine. Is it a sink?

Expressing non-understanding
Description: Expressing that one did not understand something properly either verbally or nonverbally.
Example: Interlocutor: What is the diameter of the pipe? Speaker: The diameter? I: The diameter. S: I don't know this thing. I: How wide is the pipe? Also, puzzled facial expressions, frowns and various types of mime and gestures.

Interpretive summary
Description: Extended paraphrase of the interlocutor's message to check that the speaker has understood correctly.
Example: So the pipe is broken, basically, and you don't know what to do with it, right?

Responses
Description: Response (repeat): Repeating the original trigger or the suggested corrected form (after another-repair).

Example: See the example of other-repair.
Description: Response (repair): Providing other-initiated self-repair.
Example: Speaker: The water was not able to get up and I... Interlocutor: Get up? Where? S: Get down.

Description: Response (rephrase): Rephrasing the trigger. Interlocutor: And do you happen to know if you have the rubber washer?
Example: Speaker: Pardon? I: The rubber washer... it's the thing which is in the pipe.

Description: Response (expand): Putting the problem word/issue into a larger context.
Example: Interlocutor: Do you know maybe er what the diameter of the pipe is? Speaker: Pardon? I: Diameter, this is er maybe you learnt mathematics and you sign er with th this part of things.

Description: Response (confirm): Confirming what the interlocutor has said or suggested.
Example: Interlocutor: Uh, you mean under the sink, the pipe? For the... Speaker: Yes. Yes.

Description: Response (reject): Rejecting what the interlocutor has said or suggested without offering an alternative solution.
Example: Interlocutor: Is it plastic? Speaker: No.

INDIRECT STRATEGIES

Processing time pressure-related strategies

Use of fillers

Description: Using gambits to fill pauses, to stall, and to gain time in order to keep the communication channel open and maintain discourse at times of difficulty.

Example: Examples range from very short structures such as well; you know; actually; okay, to longer phrases such as this is rather difficult to explain; well, actually, it's a good question.

Repetitions

Description: Self-repetition: Repeating a word or a string of words immediately after they were said.

Example: [Retrospective comment:] I wanted to say that it was made of concrete but I didn't know 'concrete' and this is why "which was made, which was made" was said twice.

Description: Other-repetition: Repeating something the interlocutor said to gain time.

Example: Interlocutor: And could you tell me the diameter of the pipe? The diameter. Speaker: The diameter? It's about er...

Own-performance problem-related strategies

Verbal strategy markers

Description: Using verbal marking phrases before or after a strategy to signal that the word or structure does not carry the intended meaning perfectly in the L2 code.

Example: (strategy markers in italic): (a) marking a circumlocution: On the next picture... *I don't really know what's it called in English*... it's uh this kind of bird that... that can be found in a clock that strikes out or [laughs] comes out when the clock strikes; (b) marking approximations:

it's some er... it's *some kind of* er... paper; (c) marking foreignizing: ... a panel [with an English accent], *I don't know whether there's a name in English or not* [laughter] just it's a panel flat; (d) marking literal translation: it's er... a smaller medium flat and in, we call them blockhouse, but it's not it's not made of blocks; (e) marking code switching: the bird from the clocks come out and say "kakukk" *or I don't know what*; see also the example for message abandonment.

Other-performance problem-related strategies

Feigning understanding

Description: Carry on the conversation in spite of not understanding something by pretending to understand.

Example: Interlocutor: Do you have the rubber washer? Speaker: The rubber washer? ... No I don't. [Retrospective comment: I didn't know the meaning of the word, and finally I managed to say I had no such thing.]

Appendix B. A transcribed excerpt of discussion in session 3

Teacher: Who wants to talk about her best wishes in her life.
Learner A: May I talk…
Teacher: Yes, please.
Learner A: From my perspective, if you want know …
Teacher: You wanttt….
Learner A: You want to know one person at first level, you should ask people about their wishes …Uh-huh… always my mother says any wishes of people actually…Mmm… this …Mmm… is their formation of their progress and their purpose of living. If two years ago, you asked to me what's your wishes and what's your plan for your future…. Mmm… Actually I say I want study mathmatics …er… I want to be فضانورد(astronaut)
Learner B: Astronaut
Learner A: Oh…yes… astronaut or English teacher. But my brain changed. And …. Mmm… I believe that …Mmm… if you are effective for all of the people in all over the world….er… Actually you be a successful. For example, if I help to people I feel so good myself. Actually my friends say I'm so liberal person. I am agree with them
Teacher: You agree with…
Learner A: Yes, I agree with them because I want a freedom for all over the world specially for my own country because I know that our people need a lot of help specially in education part specially for girls. I don't want to …Mmm… say just girls because being equal is the most important purpose of mine. In conclusion, being free is one of my best wishes.

Teacher: What and who are you thankful for in your life? Why?
Learner A: I'm thankful in my life for one person….er… actually …Mmm… there is a lot of important and effective person in my social and educational life but one of the most important person is Stephen Hawking. He has a lot of effects on my life… er…actually his…er… his theory is really special and helpful for all of the…Mmm… for all of the science, community, specially astronomy, physics, and mathematics. And I have…er…I... every day I download a lot of videos about Stephen Hawking. And I always …Uh-huh… I always watch documents about …er… his family life.
Teacher: If you were to choose any of these, which one do you choose to have? Beauty, power, money, knowledge, and nice friends? Why?
Learner B: You choose money…huhhuh…
Learner A: …huhhuh…If I want to choose one…er… one of these…Uh-huh…actually I choose knowledge because knowledge can solve a lot of problems, and specially …er…specially my own problems. For example, you know that these days, teenagers have a lot of mental problems. Knowledge could be effective for them.

Appendix C. Willingness to communicate questionnaire (WTC)

Name: ……
Age:……

Directions: Below are 20 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate. Presume you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of times you would choose to communicate in each type of situation. Indicate in the space at the left of the item what percent of the time you would choose to communicate.

****You can choose any percentage from %0 to %100**

Total WTC >82 = High WTC, Total WTC <52 = Low WTC, 52 to 82 = Mid WTC

_____1. Talk with a service station attendant.
_____2. Talk with a physician.
_____3. Present a talk to a group of strangers.
_____4. Talk with an acquaintance while standing in line.
_____5. Talk with a salesperson in a store.
_____6. Talk in a large meeting of friends.
_____7. Talk with a police officer.
_____8. Talk in a small group of strangers.
_____9. Talk with a friend while standing in line.
_____10. Talk with a waiter/waitress in a restaurant.
_____11. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.
_____12. Talk with a stranger while standing in line.
_____13. Talk with a secretary.
_____14. Present a talk to a group of friends.
_____15. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.
_____16. Talk with a garbage collector.
_____17. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.

_____18. Talk with brother or sister.
_____19. Talk in a small group of friends.
_____20. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.

Appendix D. Systematic observation scheme

Teacher/learner Interaction	1. Volunteer an answer (including raising a hand)
	2. Give an answer to the teacher's question (a) Provide information – general solicit (b) Learner-responding (c) Non-public response
	3. Ask the teacher a question
	4. Guess the meaning of an unknown word
	5. Try out a difficult form in the target language (lexical/morphosyntactic)
	6. Present own opinions in class
	7. Volunteer to participate in class activities
Pair/group Interaction	1. Guess the meaning of an unknown word
	2. Ask group member/partner a question
	3. Give an answer to the question
	4. Try out a difficult form in the target language (lexical/grammatical/syntactical)
	5. Present own opinions in pair/group

Note. Adopted from Cao and Philp, 2006.

Appendix E. Big five personality test

Instructions

In the table below, for each statement 1-50 mark how much you agree with on the scale 1-5, where 1=disagree, 2=slightly disagree, 3=neutral, 4=slightly agree and 5=agree, in the box to the left of it.

Rating	I…	Rating	I…
	1. am a lively person.		26. have little to say.
	2. feel little concern for others.		27. have a soft heart.
	3. am always prepared.		28. often forget to put things back in their proper place.
	4. get stressed out easily.		29. get upset easily.
	5. have a rich vocabulary.		30. do not have a good imagination.
	6. don't talk a lot.		31. talk to a lot of different people at parties.
	7. am interested in people.		32. am not really interested in others.
	8. leave my belongings around.		33. like order.
	9. am relaxed most of the time.		34. change my mood a lot.
	10. have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.		35. am quick to understand things.
	11. feel comfortable around people.		36. don't like to draw attention to myself.

(continued)

	12. insult people.		37. take time out for others.
	13. pay attention to details.		38. shirk my duties.
	14. worry about things.		39. have frequent mood swings.
	15. have a vivid imagination.		40. use difficult words.
	16. keep in the background.		41. don't mind being the center of attention.
	17. sympathize with others' feelings.		42. feel others' emotions.
	18. make a mess of things.		43. follow a schedule.
	19. seldom feel blue.		44. get irritated easily.
	20. am not interested in abstract ideas.		45. spend time reflecting on things.
	21. start conversations.		46. am quiet around strangers.
	22. am not interested in other people's problems.		47. make people feel at ease.
	23. get chores done right away.		48. am exacting in my work.
	24. am easily disturbed.		49. often feel blue.
	25. have excellent ideas.		50. am full of ideas.

Appendix F. Stimulated-recall interview

Stimulated-recall questions:

1. What were you thinking right then/at this point?
2. I saw you were laughing/looking confused/saying something there, what were you thinking then?
3. Can you remember what you were thinking when she/he said that/those words?
4. Can you tell me what you thought when she said that?

Probing questions

I was wondering if I could ask you something. I'm just curious. I noticed when you were talking about the recording you mentioned …quite a lot. Is that what you are most concerned about when you are speaking? Can you say a bit more about this?

5. Did you feel very sure and relaxed in this class?
6. Did you feel confident when you were speaking English in class?
7. Did it embarrass you to volunteer answers in class?
8. Did you feel that the other learners speak English better than you did?
9. Were you afraid that other learners would laugh at you when you were speaking English?
10. In what situation did you feel most comfortable (most willing) to communicate: in pairs, in small groups, with the teacher in a whole class? Why?
11. How did you feel about the presence of the observer? Were you anxious? Afraid?
12. How did you feel about the presence of the recording tape? Were you anxious?

Strategies

Can you tell me how you felt about the teaching of CSs? Were they useful, and in what ways?

What was your perception of your own use of CSs?
What did you dislike about the instruction of CSs?
Have you encountered any problems with regard to understanding CSs?
Do you think that the use of these strategies help you to be a better English speaker and be more willing to speak?

Do you have any additional thought that you would like to add?