THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN METACOGNITIVE STATEGY USE, GOOD LANGUAGE LEARNER, AND IRANIAN EFL LEARNER'S WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE

Gholam-Reza Abbasian (Ph.D.)
Corresponding Author
Imam Ali University, Tehran, Iran
IAU, South Tehran Branch, Tehran
gabbasian@gmail.com
Bahareh Hoodin Shad
Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch of Tehran
Hamishebahar.shad83@yahoo.com

Abstract:
Since communicative aspects of language get noticeable attention and learning strategy use is taken as one of the significant ways for second and foreign language learning and teaching, any attempts to investigate is relationship between metacognitive strategies, learner characteristics, and willingness to communicate seem warranted. To fulfill this goal, 95 EFL learners were asked to attempt, three questionnaires including MSQIT, GLLQ, and WTCQ. Also, an interview was run with 10 randomly selected participants. The Pearson Correlation Coefficients revealed that there is no relationship between metacognitive strategy use and WTC, but there is a significant relationship between metacognitive strategies and GLL. Furthermore, a significant relationship between GLL and WTC was found. The findings assert on the important role of learning strategies and communication in EFL education and bears implications on teaching and learning processes.
Key words: Good Language Learner, Metacognitive Strategies, and Willingness to Communicate.

1.Introduction
Gholam-Reza Abbasian, an assistant professor of TEFL at Islamic Azad University (IAU, South Tehran Branch), has been teaching English for more than 15 years at various levels. He has presented at a good number of both national and international conferences. He is also the author of five books and has translated at least ten others. Furthermore, he has published several scholarly articles in referred academic journals. It is for some years that he is offering courses like psycholinguistics, language testing, and syllabus design

at MA level, as his main areas of interests. He has supervised a number of MA theses. Meanwhile, he has been introduced as the top scholar for four consecutive years and identified as the most successful teacher in 2011 in his affiliated university.

Bio Data: Bahareh Hoodin Shad graduated from Azad Islamic University, Science and Research Branch of Tehran, Iran. She has experienced more than five years teaching of English language courses as the foreign language in institutes and university. Her area of interest is searching on learner`s oral proficiency, learning strategies use, and learners autonomy.

2.Learning Strategies

As strategy use is one of the significant ways for learning, second and foreign language learners resort to different types of strategies to ease and improve their language learning. According to O`Malley and Chamot (1990, p. 89), "learning strategies are procedures undertaken by learners to make their own language learning as effective as possible." These strategies are classified into three main categories: cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, social/affective strategies (O`Malley and Chamot, 1990).

3.Metacognitive Strategies

Anderson (2002) defining metacognition as thinking about thinking asserts that learners who are metacognitively aware know what to do; that is, they have strategies for finding out or figuring out what they need to do. Metacognitive strategies are classified into two components: metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive experiences or regulation. According to Schraw and Dennison (1994), knowledge of cognition sounds like what students know about themselves, strategies, and the conditions under which strategies are most beneficial. Metacognitive knowledge includes three types of metacognitive awareness: declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge. The other component of metacognitive strategies which is metacognitive regulation corresponds to knowledge about the ways that students plan, implement strategies, monitor, correct comprehension errors, and evaluate their learning (Schraw and Dennison ,1994).

According to Kuhn (2000), metacognition comes to notice early in life and it comes to operate increasingly under the individual's conscious control, as it follows a developmental course during which it becomes more explicit, more powerful, and hence more influential. Ridley, et al. (1992) describe metacognitive development as conscious development in one`s metacognitive abilities such as the move to higher knowledge, awareness and control of one`s learning, selecting strategies, monitoring the progress of learning, correcting errors, and changing learning behavior. Moreover, some

scholars such as Goh and Taib (2006) who emphasize on the teacher's role in metacognitive strategy development conclude that teachers can encourage greater metacognitive awareness by asking learners to report and discuss the thought processes they involve in during tasks.

4.Good Language Learner (GLL)

In order to communicate and use a foreign language, being a good language learner is also of significant role. As Chamot and Kupper (1989) reveal, the range of strategies use and the way in which those strategies were functioned make major differences between effective and ineffective students in the longitudinal study. Rubin (1975) mentions some strategies that good language learners use as; gathering and storing information in an effective manner, learning from a communication, looking for patterns in the language, monitoring their own and the speech of others, and attending to meaning. Different scholars specify some traits for good language learner. Moreover, Rubin (1975) states the good language learners may be good guessers; storing information in an efficient manner so that it can be easily retrieved. They have a strong drive to communicate, or to learn from a communication. They will seek out chances to use the language by looking for native speakers. Moreover, the good language learners monitor the speech of others and their own.

5.Willingness to Communicate (WTC)

On the other hand, communication which is an essential need engages active cognitive conversation processes of two basic types. To produce a message, the language user uses world knowledge and language knowledge to convert thoughts to language (Chastain, 1988). Dornyei (2005, p. 207) mentions: "There is a distance between having the ability to communicate and putting this ability into practice. Because this construct is the instant antecedent of the actual initiation of L2 communication, it must be highly placed in nature and it is likely to be made up of a combination of a number of psychological, linguistic, and contextual variables."

McCroskey and Richmond (1990) reveals that although messages are so regularl and habituate communication behaviors, they are subject to choice and are made by people. Furthermore, MacIntyre, et al. (2001) state that individual differences in communication tendencies will play a significant role in language-learning outcomes in a context where modern pedagogy puts a strong emphasis on authentic communication as a primary part of language learning.

There are some variables that lead to the differences in the degree of WTC among individuals, which are called "antecedents" by McCroskey and

Richmond (1990), such as: personality, self-perceived communicative competence, motivation, communication apprehension, context, gender, and age. In addition, MacIntyre et al. (1998) present a heuristic model which shows the range of potential influences on WTC in the L2. The expected interrelationships among the constructs are offered in a pyramid-shaped structure in which each layer introduces one or some variables which can affect the learners WTC.

Besides these theoretical statements, empirically there are some significant studies on these three variables. There are some studies on metacognitive strategies and its relationship with language proficiency, critical thinking, autonomy, and reading task performance (Abbasian, 2005; and Torkamani, 2010). Moreover, some scholars study the probable relationship between WTC and other variables such as; context, self-esteem, and communication apprehension (Simic and Tanaka, 2008; Fulmer, 2010; and Cetinkaya, 2005). Despite appreciating all previous studies, there is no study to undertake the relationship between variables of the current study. Furthermore, while the current trend of language teaching and learning emphasize more on communication and there are some situational and enduring factors that have been studiedby some scholars (Cetinkaya, 2005; and Hashimoto, 2002; Yashima, 2002), there is a gap on the relationship between metacognitive strategies, the good language learners, and willingness to communicate, especially in context of Iran where there are just few studies on WTC, and rarely are there instructions to aware learners of strategies and metacognitive strategies during their English language learning period. To this end, three specific research questions rendered respectively in the form of research hypotheses were raised.

6.Research Questions
The following questions were addressed, in order to accomplish the purpose of the study:

- Is there any significant relationship between metacognitive strategies and learner`s willingness to communicate?
- Is there any significant relationship between willingness to communicate and good language learners?
- Is there any significant relationship between metacognitive strategies and good language learners?

7.Methodology

7.1.Participants

The participants of this study were selected from 125 junior, senior, and post graduate EFL learners at South Tehran Branch of Azad Islamic University. Receiving the TOEFL, 95 learners whose score fell within -1 SD and +1SD of the mean score were selected as the main participants of the study. They were 18 males and 77 females whose age ranged from 18 to 30.

7.2.Instrumentations

In order to conduct this study, the researcher administrated (1) the TOEFL, that its reliability was estimated through K-R21 as .91, (2) the Metacognitive Strategies Questionnaire Item Type (MSQIT) already validated and used by Purpura (1999) with 92. Cronbach Alpha reliability, (3) the 20-items Good Language Learner Questionnaire (GLLQ) with Cronbach α = .82 (Wenden, 1991), (4) the Willingness to Communicate (WTCQ) retrieved from Macintyre and Charos (1996, cited in Hashimoto, 2002), with 90. Reliability, and finally a semi-structured interview was run by 10 randomly selected participants.

7.3.Procedures

The participants of the study were chosen among EFL university students (i.e. junior, senior, and post graduate) following administrating the TOEFL to 125 learners out of them 95 were selected. Then the Persian versions all three questionnaires were administrated in 45 minutes. Moreover, in order to motivate participants, they were ensured to be informed about the results, especially their TOEFL scores by e-mail. Finally, 10 participants were randomly selected for an interview to complete the qualitative analysis of the study.

7.4.Analysis

As a correlational research in design, this study was based on a mixed paradigm; qualitative and quantitative approaches. For quantitative analysis, the data of the questionnaires were fed to the SRSS. First of all, three assumptions about interval scale, test performance, and normal distribution were checked and analyzed. Then, the reliability of the TOEFL and questionnaires were estimated by K-R21 and Cronbach Alpha. Afterward, as the main objectives of the study; the null-hypotheses were tested by running the Pearson correlation to probe the relationship between three variables. Qualitatively, the key themes of the interview were explored, codified, and sorted for the purpose of frequency analysis.

8.Results

8.1.Testing Assumptions

Three assumptions should be met before one decides to run Pearson correlation; 1) the data should be measured on an interval scale; 2) the subjects should be independent that is to say their performance on the test should be independent from the performance of other subjects, 3) the data should enjoy normal distribution (Field, 2009). The present data were measured on an interval scale and none of the subjects had effect on the performance of other subjects. The assumption of normality was also met. As displayed in Table, 1 the values of skewness and kurtosis are within the ranges of +/- 2 (Bachman, 2005).

Table 1: Testing Normality Assumption.

	N	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
WTC TOTAL	95	-.134	.247	.090	.490
GLL TOTAL	95	-.684	.247	-.182	.490
MCS TOTAL	95	-.415	.247	-.409	.490
TOEFL	95	.224	.247	-.982	.490
GOAL SETTING	95	-.792	.247	.762	.490
PLANNING	95	-.384	.247	-.446	.490
ASSESSMENT	95	-.517	.247	-.383	.490
MONITORING	95	-.513	.247	-.256	.490
EVALUATION	95	-.693	.247	.005	.490

8.2.The TOEFL and the Questionnaires Statistics

Table 2 displays the Cronbach Alpha reliability indices for the good language learner, willingness to communicate and meta-cognitive strategies and its five components. The reliability indices range from a high .92 (total meat-cognitive strategies) to .68 for the planning components of meta-cognitive strategies. Moreover, the K-R21 reliability index for the TOEFL test was estimated as .91.

Table 2: Cronbach Alpha Reliability Indices

	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Good Language Learner	.824	20

Willingness to Communicate	.908	20
Meta-Cognitive Strategies	.922	40
Goal Setting	.749	6
Planning	.689	8
Assessment	.831	8
Monitoring	.760	9
Evaluation	.812	9

8.3. Testing the First Null Hypothesis

The Pearson correlation was run to probe the relationship between metacognitive strategies and learner`s willingness to communicate. Based on the results displayed in Table 3, it can be concluded that there is not any significant relationships between metacognitive strategies and learner`s WTC (r (93) = .19, P = .054 > .05). Based on these results, it can be concluded that the data failed to reject the first null-hypothesis as there is not any significant statistical relationship between metacognitive strategies and learner`s WTC.

Table 3: Pearson Correlation between WTC and Meta-Cognitive Strategies

		MCS TOTAL
WTC TOTAL	Pearson Correlation	.198
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.054
	N	95

Table 4 displays the Pearson correlation coefficients between the willingness to communicate and the five components of the meat-cognitive strategies, i.e. goal setting, planning, assessment, monitoring and evaluation. Based on these results, it can be concluded that;

A: There is not any significant relationship learner`s WTC and their goal setting strategy (r (93) = .17, P = .10 > .05).

B: There is not any significant relationship between learner`s WTC and their planning strategy (r (93) = .045, P = .66 > .05).

C: There is not any significant relationship between learner`s WTC and their assessment strategy (r (93) = .15, P = .14 > .05).

D: There is a significant relationship between learner`s WTC and their monitoring strategy (r (93) = .21, P = .03 < .05).

E: There is not any significant relationship between students' willingness to communicate and their evaluation strategy (r (93) = .14, P = .15 > .05).

Table 4: Pearson Correlation between Components of Meta-Cognitive Strategies with WTC

		WTC TOTAL
GOALSETTING	Pearson Correlation	.170
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.100
	N	95
PLANNING	Pearson Correlation	.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.664
	N	95
ASSESSMENT	Pearson Correlation	.151
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.143
	N	95
MONITORING	Pearson Correlation	.219[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.033
	N	95
EVALUATION	Pearson Correlation	.147
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.156
	N	95
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).		
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		

8.4. Testing the Second Null Hypothesis

The results of the Pearson correlation run to probe the relationship between WTC and GLL showed significant relationships between the two variables (r (93) = .29, P = .01 < .05). Based on these results, it can be concluded that the second null-hypothesis as there is not any significant statistical relationship between willingness to communicate and good language learners was rejected.

Table 5: Pearson Correlation between WTC and Good Language Learner

		WTC
GLL	Pearson Correlation	.262[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010
	N	95
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).		

8.5. Testing the Third Null Hypothesis

The results of the Pearson correlation run to probe the relationship between metacognitive strategy and GLL showed significant relationships between the two variables (r (93) = .64, P = .01 < .05). Based on these results, it can be concluded that the second null-hypothesis as there is not any significant statistical relationship between metacognitive strategy and good language learners was rejected.

Table 6: Pearson Correlation between Metacogntive Strategy and Good Language Learner

		MCSTO
GLL	Pearson Correlation	.647[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	95
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		

Unlike WTC, GLL inventory showed significant correlations with the five components of meat-cognitive strategies. Based on the results displayed in Table 13, it can be concluded that;

A: There is a significant relationship between GLL and the goal setting strategy (r (93) = .50, P = .000 < .05).

B: There is a significant relationship between GLL and the planning strategy (r (93) = .57, P = .000 < .05).

C: There is a significant relationship between GLL and the assessment strategy (r (93) = .34, P = .001 < .05).

A: There is a significant relationship between GLL and the monitoring strategy (r (93) = .53, P = .000 < .05).

A: There is a significant relationship between GLL and the evaluation strategy (r (93) = .54, P = .000 < .05).

Table 13: Pearson Correlation between Components of Meta-Cognitive Strategies with GLL

		GLL TOTAL
GOALSETTING	Pearson Correlation	.502[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	95
PLANNING	Pearson Correlation	.571[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	95
ASSESSMENT	Pearson Correlation	.340[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
	N	95

MONITORING	Pearson Correlation	.530[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	95
EVALUATION	Pearson Correlation	.545[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	95
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).		

8.6.Audio-Taped Interview Results

According to the key themes of the interview, majority of the participants were interested in learning English language and communicating in English, although they had rare opportunities to talk with natives. Moreover, they stated their communication apprehension depends on atmosphere, addressee, and their mood. And about metacognitive strategies phase of the interview, as they mentioned, they just prepared themselves by reviewing previous related points or setting a quiet place to study and then followed the guidelines and took notes while learning a new point. Mostly, they asserted they used gestures and paraphrasing if their addressees failed to understand them. In addition, for evaluation, most of them mentioned they check themselves by themselves or taking a proficiency test. Finally, when they made an error, they tried to correct themselves and continued their communication.

9.Discussion

As the results of descriptive analysis contrary to the expectations revealed the data failed to reject the first null-hypothesis. Based on the findings of previous studies (Torkamani, 2010; Coskun, 2010; Yang, 2009; and Tan and Tan, 2010), which confirmed a positive relationship between metacognitive strategy and reading, listening, and speaking performance, the researchers, hypothesized there would be a similar relationship between metacognitive strategy use and learner`s WTC, because skills performance may elevate perceived competence as is one of WTC`s antecedents. On the other hand, there are some studies that focus on the effect of context on WTC. According to other studies (Barraclongh, et al., 1988; Knutson et al., 2002; and Simic and Tanaka, 2008) learner`s WTC is more situational than trait-like, and it varies across different contexts and receivers. Chamot (2004) says that in a culture that prizes individual competition and has organized its educational system around competitive tasks, successful language learners may prefer strategies that allow them to work alone rather than social strategies that call

for collaboration with others. So, such a non-significant relationship in this study can be attributed to the Iranian contextual variables.

Moreover, the relationship between the components of metacognitive strategies and learner's willingness to communicate was analyzed. The results indicated that among the components of metacognitive strategies such as; goal setting, planning, assessment, monitoring, and evaluation, just there is significant relationship between just monitoring and learner`s WTC. Although according to O`Mally and Chamot (1990), which is in line with this study, self-monitoring is used in a variety of ways for both comprehension and production. The findings of Yang`s (2009) study revealed that successful listeners are better at all components of metacognitive strategies except monitoring.

In contrast to the first null-hypothesis, the second null-hypothesis was rejected. Since it was proven that there is a significant relationship between GLL and learner`s WTC. Thereby, the result is totally in line with Rubin`s (1975) statement who mentioned GLL have a strong drive to communicate or to learn from a communication. Moreover, they will seek out opportunities to use the language by looking for native speakers.

Similarly, the relationship between metacognitive strategies and good language learner was confirmed. This result is in line with the findings of Maftoon, et al (2011) and Abbasian`s (2005) studies which showed a GLL is autonomous and benefits from metacognitive strategies. It is also in accordane with Chamot and Kupper`s (1989, p. 250) statement: "major differences between effective and ineffective students in the longitudinal study were found in the range of strategies use and the way in which individual strategies were applied, the results showed that there is a significant relationship between good language learner and all components of metacognitive strategies."

10.Conclusion

To conclude learner's WTC requires two parameters; motivation and context, learners should be motivated and made aware of the communication values and ends instead of working alone for individual competitions. Moreover, if all learners get involved in group working and get familiar with the strategies, like GLL who look for patterns and use strategies appropriately, they will be more eager to communicate and search for communication opportunities to learn from them. Rationally, the monitoring component, strategic instruction, contextual considerations, and affective domain should be included in any EFL educational program seeking WTC and learners autonomy. Furthermore, because GLLs know and use strategies to a greater extent, they are more willing to communicate. The findings of this study bear

some implications for scholars, teachers, learners, syllabus designers, and even communicative course developers

References
Abbasian, Gh. R. (2005). Iranian EFL Learner's Metacognitive Strategy Use. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Science and Research Branch of Islamic **Azad University.Anderson, N. J. (2002)**. The Role of Metacognition in Second Language Teaching and Learning.
ERIC Clearinghouse on Language and Linguistics, 3-4.Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/resourses/digest/digest-pdf/0110anderson.pdf
Bachman, L. F. (2005). Statistical Analysis for Language Assessment.2nd ed. NY: Cambridge University Press.
Barraclough, R. A., Christophel, D. M., &McCroskey, J. C. (1988). Willingness to Communication: A Cross- cultural Investigation. Communication Research Reports, 5(2), 187-192. Retrieved from http://jamesmccroskey.com/publications/142.pdf
Cetinkaya, Y. B. (2005). Turkish College Students` Willingness to Communicate in English as a Foreign Language. Unpublished PhD thesis, school of the Ohio State University, U.S.A.
Chastain, K. (1988). Developing second- language skills: theory and practice. 3rd ed. U.S.A. :Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.P. 190.
Chamot, A. U. &Kupper, L. (1989). Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Instruction. Foreign Language Annals, 246-254.
Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in Language Strategy Research and Teaching. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 1(1), 14-26. Retrieved from http://www.e-flt.nus.edu.sg /vlnl2004/chamot.pdf
Coskun, A. (2010). The Effect of Metacognitive Strategy Training on the Listening Performance of Beginner Student. Novitas Royal, 4(1), 35-50.
Dornyei, z. (2005). Other Learner Characteristics. The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in 2nd Language Acquisition. Mahwah. New Jersey: Lawrence Erleaum Associates.
Field, A. (2009). Discovering Statistics Using SPSS.3rd ed. London: SAGE.
Fulmer, B. N. (2010). An Investigation of Willingness to Communicate, Communication Apprehension, and Self-esteem in the Workplace. Master`s Thesis. University of Tennessee. Retrieved from http://trace.Tennessee.edu/uk_gradthes/710
Goh, Ch. &Taib, Y. (2006). Metacognitive Instruction in Listening for Young Learner. ELT Journal, 60(3), 222-232. doi: 10.1093/elt/cd002
Hashimoto, Y. (2002). Motivation and Willingness to Communicate as Predictors of Reported L2 use: the Japanese ESL Context. Second Language Studies, 20(2), 29-70.

Knutson, T. S., Komolsevin, R., Chatiketn, P., & Smith, V. R. (2002). A Comparison of Thai and U.S. American Willingness to Communicate. Journal of International Communication Research, 31(1), 3-12.

Kuhn, D. (2000). Metacognitive Development. Association for Psychological Science, 9(5), 178-181. Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/term.jsp

Maftoon, P., Daftarifard, P., Lavasani, M. (2011). Good Language Learner: from Autonomy Perspective. Linguistics and Literary Board Research and Innovation, 2(1), 104-114.

MacIntyre, P. D., Clement, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing Willingness to Communicate in a L2: A Situational Model of L2 Confidence and Affiliation. The Modern Language Journal, 28(4), 545-562. doi: 10.2307/330224

MacIntyre, P. D., Clement, R., &Conrod, S. (2001). Willingness to Communicate, Social Support, and Language-learning Orientations of Immersion Students. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 23, 369-388.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1990). Willingness to Communicate: A Cognitive view. In M. Booth-Butterfield (Ed.). Communication, Cognition, and Anxiety, 5(2), 19-37.retrieved from http://www.jamescmccroskey.com/publications/150.pdf

O`Malley, J. M. &Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition.NY: Cambridge University Press.

PurPura, J. E. (1999).Studies in language testing. UK: Cambridge University Press, p.222-226.

Richard, J. C.& Schmidt, R. (2002). Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. UK: Pearson Education, p. 129-152.

Ridley, D. S., Schutz, P. A., Glanz, R. S., & Weinstein, C. E. (1992). Self-regulated Learning: the Interactive Influence of Metacognitive Awareness and Goal-setting. Journal of Experimental Education, 60(4), 293-306.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "Good Language Learner" Can Teach Us? TESOL Quarterly, 9(1), Retrieved from:http://www.jstor.org/stable/3586011

Schraw, G. & Dennison, R. S. (1994).Assessing Metacognitive Awareness. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 19, 460-475. doi:10.1006/ceps.1994.1033

Simic, M.,& Tanaka, T. (2008). Language Context in the Willingness to Communicate Research Works: A Review. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 26(1), 71-83. Retrieved from http://ousar.lib.okayama-u.ac.jp/metadata/14186

Torkamani, H. T. (2010). On the Use of Metacognitive Strategies by Iranian EFL Learners in Doing Various Reading Tasks Across Different Proficiency Level. International Journal of Language Studies, 4(1), 47-58.

Wenden, A. L. (1991). Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy. UK: Practice- Hall Int`l, p.21.

Yang, Ch. (2009). A Study of Metacognitive Strategies Employed by English Listeners in an EFL setting. International Education Studies, 2 (4), 134-139.

Yashima, T. (2002), Willingness to Communicate in Second Language: the Japanese EFL Context. The Modern Language Journal, 86, 54-66.

Appendix A
SILL Questionnaire of Metacognitive Strategy Questionnaire by Item Type (MSQIT) Version (English Version)

0   1   2   3   4   5
(0)Never   (2)Sometimes   (4)Usually
(1)Rarely   (3)Often   (5)Always

Goal Setting Processes(GS)

Process	Strategyy	Item
GS	GS43	When I begin studying English, I plan what I am doing to do so I can use my time well.
GS	GS53	I set goals for myself in language learning.
GS	GS54	I think about whether I am making progress in learning English.
GS	GS56	When I am learning a new language, I think about how well I want to learn it.
GS	GS80	When I am taking an English class, I think about my final goals.

Planing Processes(PL)

Process	Strategy	Item
PL	FPL48	I try to understand the purpose of activities in my English class.
PL	FPL59	When someone is speaking English, I try to concentrate on what the person is saying.
PL	FPL64	When I am taking an English test, I try to concentrate on what I am doing.
PL	FPL78	Before I begin an English assignment, I make sure I have a dictionary or other resources.
PL	FPL79	Before I write a composition in English, I plan my work.

LLRN	LLRN45	I think about how I learn languages best.
LLRN	LLRN70	I try to find out all I can about language learning by reading books or articles.
LLRN	LLRN77	I know what helps me remember new words in English.

Assessment Processes(ASS)

Process	Strategy	Item
ASS	ASIT41	Before I use my English, I think about whether my grammar is good enough to express my ideas.
ASS	ASIT42	Before I begin an English test, I try to see which parts will be easy and which parts will be difficult.
ASS	ASIT58	Before I begin an English test, I think about how the test will be scored.
ASS	ASIT63	Before I begin an English test, I think about which parts of the test are the most important.
ASS	ASIT65	Before I begin an English assignment, I think about whether I know enough English to do it.
ASS	ASIT66	Before I begin an English test, I decide how important it is for me to get a good grade on the test.
ASS	ASIT67	Before I use my English, I think about how I can ask for help if I an not express myself clearly or if I do not know a word.
ASS	ASIT72	Before I talk to someone in English, I think about how much the person knows about what I am going to say.
ASS	MON44	When I speak English, I know what I need to change so that people will understand me.
ASS	MON47	Before I hand in my English test, I check my work.
ASS	MON49	When I listen to English, I realise when I have not understood something.
ASS	MON52	When I am speaking English, I know when I have not pronounced something correctly.
ASS	MON55	When I am taking an English test, I know how much time has gone by.
ASS	MON57	When I speak English, I recognise when I have said something that sounds a native speaker.
ASS	MON60	When I speak English, I know when I make grammar mistakes.
ASS	MON68	When I listen to English, I recognise other people's grammar mistakes.
ASS	MON75	When I speak English, I know when someone does not

		understand something I said.
ASS	EVAL46	When I have learned a new word or phrase in English, I test myself to make sure I have memorised it.
ASS	EVAL51	I test my knowledge of English words by using them in new situations.
ASS	EVAL61	I test my knowledge of English grammar rule by applying them in new situations.
ASS	EVAL62	After I have taken a test in English, I think about how I can do better the next time.
ASS	EVAL69	I try to learn from the mistakes I make in English.
ASS	EVAL71	After I finish a conversation in English, I think about how I could say things better.
ASS	EVAL73	After I say something in English, I think about how I could say the thing better.
ASS	MON74	When someone dos not understand my English, I try to understand what I said wrong.
ASS	MON74	When I have learned a new English grammar rule, I test myself to make sure I know how to use it.
ASS	EVAL76	After I learn something in English, I test myself to make sure I have rally learned it.

Source: Adapted from James E. Purpura,1999,pp.224-6

Appendix B
Wenden`s Retrospective Self-Report Questionnaire of Good Language Learner` Strategies
(English Version)
Circle the answer that describes how you approach language learning.

A: Always   O: Often   R: Rarely   U: Usually   S: Sometimes   N: Never

The good language learner finds a style of learning that suits his/her

1. Itry to get something out of every learning situation even if I don't like.
A   O   S   R   N
2. I choose learning situations that are suited to my way of learning
A   O   S   R   N

Good language learners are actively involved in the language learning process.

3. Besides language class, I plan activities that give me a chance to use and learn language.

A   O   S   R   N

4. I choose activities because I am already familiar with the ideas.

A   O   S   R   N

5. I can figure out my special problems.

A   O   S   R   N

6. I try to do something about my special problems.

A   O   S   R   N

7. I do things I don't usually do toi gain more information about English.

A   O   S   R   N

Good language learner try to figure out how the language works.

8. I pay special attention to pronunciation.

A   O   S   R   N

9. I pay special attention to grammar.

A   O   S   R   N

10. I pay special attention to vocabulary.

A   O   S   R   N

Good language learners know that language is used to communicate.

11. I try to dwvelop good techniques to practice listening, speaking, reading, and witing.

A   O   S   R   N

12. I try to develop good techniques to improve my pronunciation, and vocabulary.

A   O   S   R   N

Good langue learners are like good detectives.

13. I am like a detective. I look for clues that will help me understands how language works.

A   O   S   R   N

14. When I don't know I guess.

A   O   S   R   N

15. I ask people to correct me if I make a mistake.

A   O   S   R   N

16. I compare what I say with what others say to see if I`m using correct
    English.
A   O   S   R   N
17. I think about I`ve learned .
A   O   S   R   N

Good language learners learn to think in the lsanguage.

18. I try to think in English.
A   O   S   R   N

Good language learners try to overcome their feelings of frustration and lack of confidence.

19. I overcome my feelings of frustration and lack of confidence.
A   O   S   R   N
20. I can laugh at my mistakes.
A   O   S   R   N

Adopted from Wenden, 1991 (who had adopted it from Naiman et al, 1978)

Appendix F
WTC QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

DIRECTIONS: Below are 20 situations in which a person might choose to communicate
or not to communicate. Please presume that you have completely free choice to initiate or
avoid communication. Please indicate in the space at the left the percentage of times you
would choose to communicate in English in each type of situation.

0 %= never, 100 %= always

_____**1.**Talk with an acquaintance in an elevator.
_____**2.**Talk with a stranger on the bus.
_____**3.**Speak in public to a group (about 30 people) 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 (about 10 people) of friends.
_____**7.**Talk with a janitor/resident manager.
_____**8.**Talk in a small group (about 5 people) 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 (about 10 people) of acquaintances.
_____**12.**Talk with a stranger while standing in line.
_____**13.**Talk with a shop clerk.
_____**14.**Speak in public to a group (about 30 people) of friends.
_____**15.**Talk in a small group (about 5 people) of acquaintances.
_____**16.**Talk with a garbage collector.
_____**17.**Talk in a large meeting (about 10 people) of strangers.
_____**18.**Talk with a librarian.
_____**19.**Talk in a small group (about 5 people) of friends.
_____**20.**Speak in public to a group (about 30 people) of acquaintances.

....

Source: adopted from Hashimoto (2002)