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Abstract—Self-monitoring as a means of observation gives teachers proper respect and appropriate understanding of what they do when teaching. There is also a shift from an outsider to an insider as far as observation is concerned. It definitely gives teachers a great insight into their teaching and at the same time proves effective in improving their teaching. The purpose of this paper is two-fold. It first investigated the barriers that Iranian high school students face while speaking. This investigation was made by interviewing both students (language institutes and schools) and teachers. Teachers’ comments on the students’ answers and teachers’ separate answers on the causes of speaking problems were elicited. It then made a comparison between the willingness to communicate (WTC) of high school and language institute students after the reflection (self-monitoring) of the teacher. To achieve this purpose 32 high school and 32 language institute students spent 10 sessions with a teacher who had previously reflected upon the speaking barriers collected from participants comments through oral interviews. The results of the study, using an independent t-test, clearly showed that language institute students were much more willing to communicate. Several reasons were also found to be highly important regarding students, teachers, and course materials. Both high-stake and low-stake holders can avail from the results of the study.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The world of ELT is quite amazing. It undergoes many changes and experiences with new methods and approaches coming into existence every day. Knowledge is not bound to sets of fixed ideas and principles born out of our old generation’s mentality. Moreover, a sort of relativism is dominant. Things seem to be context dependent and are subject to change due to place and time. This is where the challenge lies. ELT is in the realm of humanities, further complicating things. In humanities we deal with something which we call the human mind; a highly complicated issue to discuss. There are different sides to this: linguistic, psychological, social, etc. Having all this in mind, in fact, makes us much more concerned with consciousness about the issue of context. We have to accept the changes around us and behave accordingly. Whether we like it or not, the context of language teaching has changed and it will definitely experience more changes in the near future as well. In fact, the concept of language teaching and consequently language teacher as the one who makes it happen is much different today from that of twenty or thirty years ago. Widdowson (1990) mentions that not long ago, teachers tend to be referred to as if they were factory workers to be provided with minimal practical skills and were required to pick up on the job whatever expertise is necessary to keep the pedagogic production line going. In this case, the result is that teachers’ morale declines with their status. Many leave a profession officially treated with such disdain. Furthermore, expedient stop-gap attempts to provide for the lack of qualified teachers only make matters worse. Widdowson (1990) adds that twenty-five percent of teaching in British secondary schools is being carried out by teachers with an inadequate knowledge of the subject. Those in authority seem not to be particularly troubled by this situation. So long as there are people available to stand in front of classes it does not seem to matter much about their competence as teachers.

There are a couple of points to ponder here. In the light of such attitudes, nothing positive can be done. It is important to assert that teaching needs commitment to standards of professionalism. These standards depend on our open-mindedness and tolerance of new approaches and ideas. In other words, in the limits if principled pragmatism (the dominant approach of the 1990s), we should experience new paths and views, one of which is the new picture of a language teacher as researcher. In this approach, teachers are given important roles. They are not merely consumers of
the truth produced by out-of-the-classroom researchers. They are teaching practitioners who feel that their own
experience as pedagogic providers is given sufficient recognition.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Self-monitoring

Many people are interested in knowing whether teaching has been fruitful or not. Among those administrators, course
supervisors, and students taking the course can be named. However, the teacher himself is the first who wants to know
what type of teacher he is, what he is doing and how well he is teaching. So, having the ideas from principled
pragmatism on his mind, he should do his best to become a critical teacher who can properly take the steps of self
monitoring himself. Today, self-monitoring as a recently used term in ELT is given special attention. The term comes
from the new trends in ELT where teachers have central roles as researchers. According to Richards, Plat and Plat (1992,
p.327), self-monitoring or self-observation is 'observing and recording information about one's own behavior for the
purpose of achieving a better understanding of a control over one's behavior and its impact on students' growth. In fact,
teachers, almost always overwhelmed with a sense of responsibility gain specific rights through this approach. They,
themselves, achieve the role of an observer or supervisor and show the confidence in themselves by using more
responsible attitude towards the system they are working for. The confidence in teachers is formed when recruiting and
training them. Moreover, this approach in English language classes i.e. the experience of self-monitoring helps teachers
feel at ease to become more autonomous in their teaching activities.

According to Richards & Nunan (1990), improvement of teaching maybe achieved through reflection. Asking 'what'
questions gives us a certain power over our teaching and the degree of autonomy and responsibility we have in our
work as teachers is determined by the level of control that we can exercise over our actions. If teachers want to gain
such control, they should be good self-monitors. Nunan & Lamb (1996, p.121) introduce three parts as central in any
reflective teaching: planning, implementation, and evaluation. It is right in the third part where 'ability to evaluate the
effectiveness of teaching takes a key function. Richards (1990, p.119) summarizes the good reasons for the use of self-
monitoring as the following:

- Teachers need feedback to improve their performance and self-monitoring is a good way to gain such feedback.
- It creates a good means of critical reflection on teacher's own teaching.
- It can help narrow the gap between teachers' imagined view of their own teaching
- It changes the responsibility of checking one's improvement in teaching from an outsider, such as supervisor, to the
teachers themselves.

Emphasizing the role of observation techniques, Millrood (1998) believes that there is a need for handy and time-
saving observation techniques which can be used to reflect on the lesson that is being observed. He continues stating
that observation activities may have different features: focusing on developing linguistic competence, pragmatic
abilities, thought processes, background knowledge, etc. Richards & Nunan (1990, p. 207) reinforces the need to
consider a number of principles and self-monitoring.

1. The issue upon which the teacher reflects must occur in the social context where teaching occurs.
2. The teacher must be interested in the problem to be solved.
3. The issue must be 'owned' by the teacher—that is, derived from his or her practice.
4. Reflection on the issue involves problem solving from the teaching situation in which the teacher is located.
5. Ownership of the identified issue and its solution is vested in the teacher.
6. Systematic procedures are necessary.
7. Information (observations) about the issue must be derived from the teacher's experience of teaching.
8. The teacher's ideas need to be tested through the practice of teaching.
9. Ideas about teaching, once tested through practice, must lead to some course of action.
10. Hence, reflexive action may be transformed into new understandings and refined practice in teaching.

Richards (1990) introduces three major approaches to self-monitoring in teaching: personal reflection, self-reporting,
and recording lessons.

1. Personal reflection:
   It is the simplest approach through the use of a diary or journal in which the teacher prepares an open extensive
   report of what happened in teaching. Among many others, one advantage of using diaries is that it allows teachers to
   explore information that might not be accessible in other ways. It serves to initiate insights into the teaching experience.

2. Self-reporting:
   This efficient approach involves completing an inventory or checklist in which the teacher indicates which teaching
   practices were used within a lesson. Teachers can check up to what extent their assumptions about their own teaching
   are reflected in their actual teaching practices. A teacher, for instance, can use self-reporting to find out about the kinds
   of teaching activities he has used regularly, the extent to which primary learning goals for a lesson are being met, and
   the kinds of activities that work well or do not work at all.

3. Recording lessons:
   Audio or video recording of lessons provide a very reliable moment-to-moment record of what actually happened in
   the class, though it is not possible for every teacher to use.
Many aspects can be examined when teachers self-monitor through diaries, self-reports, or recordings of lessons. The following are some issues:

1. Classroom management and discipline
2. Teacher-student interaction
3. Grouping
4. Structuring
5. Tasks
6. Classroom interactions
7. Opportunities for speaking
8. Quality of input
9. Communicativeness
10. Questions
11. Feedback
12. Use of time
13. Use of teaching aids
14. Teaching pace
15. Establishing rapport

B. Importance of Communication and Speaking Ability

Emphasis on communication and concern for fluency and accuracy has been a matter of great concern for teachers/learners in the field of English language teaching. In line with this trend, some theories such as Monitor Theory of SLA by Krashen (1982) put emphasis on the output which is performance. Doughty and Williams (1998) back up focus on fluency and communication rather than focus on form and accuracy. According to Chastain (1988), speaking plays several roles in language learning and in language classes. Being aware of these roles will enable teachers to attend to them all and to see speaking as one important element in developing each language skill and conveying culture knowledge. Fluency and accuracy are both important but at times fluency may have to take on more importance than accuracy in order to keep learners meaningfully engaged in language use (Brown, 2000). This seems to be one of the major concerns of Communicative Language Teaching where students have to use the language productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Fluency is the ability of the speaker of a foreign language to communicate with the language in a way that makes him understood by his interlocutors whether they are native-speakers or not (Harmer, 2001). On the importance of speaking, Nunan (2001) believes that if listening is the Cinderella skill in second language learning, then speaking is the overbearing elder sister. More important than that, Rivers (1981) warns teachers to be aware of inhibiting factors which may impede students' speaking and expression of ideas.

C. Willingness to Communicate

The term “willingness to communicate” (WTC) was first introduced by McCrosky and Richmond in 1987 in the context of first language acquisition. Nonetheless, it is now being widely used in the context of second and foreign language learning.

Since the late 90s attempts have been made to conceptualize willingness to communicate to explain an individual’s degree of readiness to participate in discourse in an L2 (MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei & Noels, 1998). MacIntyre et al. (1998) recognizes the difference between L1 and L2 WTC and mentions it’s probably being due to the uncertainty inherent in L2 use that interacts in a more complex manner with the variables influencing L1 WTC, i.e. individual differences. WTC was originally introduced with reference to L1 communication, and it was considered to be a fixed personality trait that is stable across situations, but when WTC was extended to L2 communication situations, it was proposed that it is not necessary to limit WTC to a trait-like variable, since the use of an L2 introduces the potential for significant situational differences based on wide variations in competence and inter-group relations (MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998).

Yashima, Nishide and Shimizu (2004) hold that WTC is a conceptual model in which L2 proficiency is not considered as a goal to be achieved through L2 learning, but rather is considered as a means to gain ‘interpersonal/intercultural’ goals. According to Leger and Storch (2009), early models of WTC included two main variables: perceived communication, and communicative anxiety. Based on this model it is predicted that high levels of perceived competence together with low levels of anxiety results in higher WTC and a higher probability of communicative interactions in L2. MacIntyre et al. (1998) conceptualized WTC in an L2 in a theoretical model in which social and individual context, affective cognitive context, motivational propensities, situated antecedents, and behavioral intention are interrelated in influencing WTC in an L2 and in L2 use. Some researchers have argued that a fundamental goal of second language education should be the creation of WTC in the language learning process. It is also suggested that higher WTC among learners leads to increased opportunity for practice in an L2 and authentic L2 usage (MacIntyre et al., 2003). As Chapelle (2001) states in the communicative classroom, conscientious language teachers want motivated students who demonstrate a willingness to communicate in the L2. A lack of willingness...
inhibits effective interaction and language production. Recent technological advances have changed the classroom so that interaction has come to mean not only spoken interaction but electronic interaction as well.

As was mentioned earlier, learners’ willingness to communicate in an L2 has been a matter of great concern for some researchers within the scope of second language investigation. Here, some of the important studies conducted so far are pointed out. MacIntyre et al. (1999) investigated the effect of anxiety variable and found that this factor influenced L2 communication and confirmed the findings of the previous studies related to the effect of anxiety variable. MacIntyre et al. (2001) found that among their early adolescent learners (Grades 7-9), the strongest correlate of L2 WTC in all three grade levels was perceived confidence in the L2. Clément and Kruidendier (1985) examined factors related to self-concept including perceived confidence and found that this variable is correlated with WTC. Other researchers like Gardner, Tremblay and Masgoret (1997) further conducted researches on the potential role of self-perceptions in an L2 learner’s desire to communicate and came to the same results as found in the previous studies. Daly and Stafford (1984) found that communication apprehension is significantly related to a person’s willingness to communicate. Communication apprehension is “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (McCroskey, 1984). Their research findings indicated that people who experience high levels of fear or anxiety regarding communication often avoid and withdraw from communication.

D. Statement of the Problem

Although there has been many studies related to the effect of self-monitoring on the improvement of different language skills, there seems to be scarce studies (if any) on the effect of teacher’s self-monitoring on the learner’s willingness to communicate in Iranian EFL context at high school level. Therefore, this study is aimed at finding an answer to the following research question:

E. Research Question and Null Hypothesis

For the research question of “Is there any relationship between teacher’s self-monitoring and student’s willingness to communicate?” a null hypothesis is made:

There is no relationship between teacher’s self-monitoring and student’s willingness to communicate.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

Participants of this study are 32 Iranian upper-intermediate EFL students, males and females from Simin Language Institute. They have just started studying the New Interchange, book 3. They are of two separate classes but the teacher is the same. The next group was 32 high school students, grade 3 to pre-university, all under the supervision of one English language teacher.

B. Instruments

In this study, the Willingness to Communicate (WTC) questionnaire developed by MacIntyre et al. (2001) was used in order to collect the necessary data. This questionnaire is designed in two parts of 27 items which tests communication inside the classroom and outside the classroom context. It is a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire (See Appendix A) consisting of four skill areas of speaking (8 items), reading (6 items), writing (8 items) and listening comprehension (5 items). Concerning the reliability of the questionnaire, previous internal (alpha) reliability estimates have been reported (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988; McCroskey, 1992) at .91 and .95 respectively.

C. Procedure

Since this study was a qual/quant research, for the first step, students of both language institutes and schools were interviewed in order to find out the possible barriers they face in trying to communicate or making themselves understood. Teachers were also interviewed in order to figure out their answers and comments on the students’ responses regarding the causes of their speaking problems. The teacher (the one used for the reflection) had to consider these items and reflect upon them or change his way of teaching in order to meet the needs of his students for language institute participants only and worked on the high school students conventionally (without any change in spite of the problems these participants showed regarding their speaking). As a matter of fact, language institute participants were regarded as experimental group while high school students were regarded as control group. The focus of this study was on the possible change in willingness to communicate between these two groups when the teacher reflects upon the problems and changes his way of reaching or not. For instance, all the students complained about not being provided with enough time to express themselves or simply talk. But the teacher tried to give more time during the class for the experimental group participants. He also tried to motivate the participants to take part in discussions with providing more free chat opportunities, asking them to talk about their personal life, etc. The teacher also tried not to threaten students with marks focusing on grammar and vocabulary section and let them be freer on the speaking sections and so on. Since the answers and comments varied a lot, only those common responses and comments are shown here. Tables 1 and 2 show the answers.
After 10 sessions, a willingness to communicate (WTC) questionnaire based on MacIntyre et al. (2001) was given to 32 upper-intermediate EFL students from Simin Language Institute and 32 high school and pre-university students in order to determine the level of their WTC and possible difference between the two groups after the reflection for the experimental group. The focus of this research was both on the possible difference between two groups of students and common barriers to their speaking ability.

### IV. DATA ANALYSIS

Investigating some speaking difficulties of Iranian high school students, the researcher faced some answers highly worthy of mention. The classes observed were of different levels, from grade 3 in high school and pre-university. The data for the ten high school classes observed appears below. This chapter is devoted to the description of the statistical analyses which were performed to answer the question formulated for the purpose of this research. All the data were processed using version 18.0 SPSS software.

When the teacher reflected upon the comments of the students, he tried to concentrate more both on students’ answers and the items available in the WTC questionnaire (8 from in class, and 8 from out of the class willingness to communicate). After 10 sessions of working with both groups, the WTC questionnaire, scaled 1 to 5, was given to the students in order to evaluate the possible difference. The results are as follow:

Table 1 shows the number of each group (32), mean of school students (38.75) and mean of the language institute students (56).

### TABLE 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers’ and students’ answers on the causes of speaking problems of the students in general</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S: One student said he had no motivation to talk in English. T: most of the students are not motivated to talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S: Another student said he did not feel the need to talk in English. T: Students are not required or obliged to talk, so they are careless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S: One other student said he studied English in order to pass the university entrance not for anything else. T: Yes, that’s true. Nearly all the students are exam-centered. Rarely do they prepare themselves for listening or speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S: One student said our teacher could not speak well (he meant fluently and accurately), let alone the students. T: teachers do not usually have problems in speaking; they are fluent and accurate normally, but there are some who are off-track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S: Another student said he was not given any opportunity to talk (in fact no one had this chance to express himself in the class). T: we are overwhelmed with different materials to cover. The syllabus is not time-appropriate. We have a lot to do, so much less time remains for the speaking session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S: yet another student said his teacher had just drill and practice in the class, and unlike institutional classes they rarely had time to make a free discussion class. T: drill and practice is something necessary for the class. In fact practice makes perfect. Students are not at the level of free discussion, they are so weak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S: teachers teach differently when they are in language institutes than when they are at schools. There’s no concentration on speaking at schools. T: the syllabus, books cause and managers expect us to teach differently. Besides, we are better paid here than schools, so we are much more motivated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers’ separate answers on the causes of students’ problem in speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students are not motivated to speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students are afraid of speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>They don’t practice enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>They just want to memorize words and learn grammar in order to be able to pass university entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>They spend very little time on listening, that’s why they are not good at speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If they want to learn to express themselves in English, they should register in institutional classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>They just have English course one session a week, so their amount of exposure to English language is barely enough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 4.2:
**FREQUENCY TABLE FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Missing | 32 | 50.0 | 100.0 |

| Total | 64 | 100.0 |

### TABLE 4.3:
**FREQUENCY TABLE FOR INSTITUTE STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTE</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Missing | 32 | 50.0 | 100.0 |

| Total | 64 | 100.0 |

The above table shows frequency of the numbers for institute students.
The above chart shows bar chart for school students who attempted the 16-item WTC questionnaire.

The above chart shows bar chart for institute students who attempted the 16-item WTC questionnaire.

The above chart shows histogram with minimal curve for school students.
The above figure shows the histogram with minimal curve for school students who attempted the 16-item WTC questionnaire.

![Histogram with minimal curve for school students](image)

The above figure shows the histogram with minimal curve for institute students who attempted the 16-item WTC questionnaire.

### Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics for the Two Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>7.55624</td>
<td>57.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>9.81769</td>
<td>96.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.6: Group Statistics and Independent T Test for Both Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WTC</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>7.5624</td>
<td>1.33577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>9.81769</td>
<td>1.73554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>4.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-7.876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent t test was conducted in order to decide whether this mean difference (17.25) is meaningful for the t value of 7.87 or not. As you notice: F= 4.074 and \( P< 0.05 \). So in this way the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that the research hypothesis is accepted, meaning there in fact is a difference between willingness to communicate of Iranian high school and language institute students.

### V. Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations

Self-monitoring as a means of observation gives teachers proper respect and appropriate understanding of what they do when teaching. There is also a shift from an outsider to an insider as far as observation is concerned. It definitely gives teachers a great insight into their teaching and at the same time proves effective in improving their teaching. Many people are interested in knowing whether teaching has been fruitful or not. Among those administrators, course supervisors, and students taking the course can be named. However, the teacher himself is the first who wants to know...
what type of teacher he is, what he is doing and how well he is teaching. So, having the ideas from principled pragmatism on his mind, he should do his best to become a critical teacher who can properly self-monitor. Today, self-monitoring as a recently used term in ELT is given special attention. The term comes from the new trends in ELT where teachers have central roles as researchers. According to Richards, et al. (1992, p.327), self-monitoring or self-observation is ‘observing and recording information about one's own behavior for the purpose of achieving a better understanding of a control over one's behavior’. In fact, teachers, almost always obsessed with a sense of responsibility gain specific rights through this approach. They, themselves, achieve the role of an observer or supervisor but show the confidence in the teachers and, by giving them such respect, make them even more responsible towards the system they are working for.

Out of the four language skills, speaking plays a quite crucial role in communication, i.e. oral communication. Iranian high school students have been learning English for about 5 years, yet they have problem in speaking or making themselves understood while talking in a foreign language. One of the major problems regarding the investigation of the speaking difficulty is that there might not exist a fixed source or a defined rule based on which speaking could be measured. However, in this research students’ motivation to speak was measured by Willingness to Communicate questionnaire (WTC). The findings of this research showed that there actually was a difference between the willingness to communicate of the language institute participants (experimental group) and high school participants (control group). It was quite interesting that what students of school said to a great extent the problems of the language institute students too. But that latter group could find a way to compensate for the weaknesses, i.e. by finding more time in a more relaxed atmosphere and more practice. The t-test result showed the difference between the mean scores of the two groups, resulting in the better performance of the language institute participants, suggesting when teachers self-monitor themselves, consider and reflect upon their teaching ways and problems of their students, they become better educators resulting in the better performance of the students (in this particular aspect willingness to communicate).

Interpretations of the findings of this research also led to several suggestions for further research.
1. It is recommended that this study be replicated with a larger sample or number of participants from the same background.
2. The present study may be replicated having native speakers as the participants.
3. It is recommended that a research be carried out to investigate whether teacher's self-monitoring has any role on the students’ motivation or not.
4. It would be interesting to compare the results across levels of proficiency.

**APPENDIX A: MACINTYRE ET AL. (2001) WTC QUESTIONNAIRE**

**WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE INSIDE THE CLASSROOM**

**Directions**: This questionnaire is composed of statements concerning your feelings about communication with other people, in English. Please indicate in the space provided the frequency of time you choose to speak English in each classroom situation.

If you are almost never willing to speak English, write 1. If you are willing sometimes, write 2 or 3. If you are willing most of the time, write 4 or 5.

1 = Almost never willing  
2 = Sometimes willing  
3 = Willing half of the time  
4 = Usually willing  
5 = Almost always willing

**Speaking in class, in English**

1. Speaking in a group about your summer vacation.
2. Speaking to your teacher about your homework assignment.
3. A stranger enters the room you are in, how willing would you be to have a conversation if he talked to you first?
4. You are confused about a task you must complete, how willing are you to ask for instructions/clarification?
5. Talking to a friend while waiting in line.
6. How willing would you be to be an actor in a play?
7. Describe the rules of your favorite game.
8. Play a game in English, for example Monopoly.

**Reading in class (to yourself, not out loud)**

1. Read a novel.
2. Read an article in a paper.
3. Read letters from a pen pal written in native English.
4. Read personal letters or notes written to you in which the writer has deliberately used simple words and constructions.
5. Read an advertisement in the paper to find a good bicycle you can buy.
Writing in class, in English
1. Write an advertisement to sell an old bike.
2. Write down the instructions for your favorite hobby.
3. Write a report on your favorite animal and its habits.
4. Write a story.
5. Write a letter to a friend.
6. Write a newspaper article.
7. Write the answers to a “fun” quiz from a magazine.
8. Write down a list of things you must do tomorrow.

Comprehension in class
1. Listen to instructions and complete a task.
2. Bake a cake if instructions were not in Persian.
3. Fill out an application form.
4. Take directions from an English speaker.
5. Understand an English movie.

WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

Directions: Sometimes people differ a lot in their speaking, reading, and so forth in class and outside class. Now we would like you to consider your use of English outside the classroom. Again, please tell us the frequency that you use English in the following situations.

Remember, you are telling us about your experiences outside of the classroom this time. There are no right or wrong answers.
1 = Almost never willing
2 = Sometimes willing
3 = Willing half of the time
4 = Usually willing
5 = Almost always willing

Speaking outside class, in English
1. Speaking in a group about your summer vacation.
2. Speaking to your teacher about your homework assignment.
3. A stranger enters the room you are in, how willing would you be to have a conversation if he talked to you first?
4. You are confused about a task you must complete, how willing are you to ask for instructions/clarification?
5. Talking to a friend while waiting in line.
6. How willing would you be to be an actor in a play?
7. Describe the rules of your favorite game.
8. Play a game in English, for example Monopoly.

Reading outside class, in English
1. Read a novel.
2. Read an article in a paper.
3. Read letters from a pen pal written in native English.
4. Read personal letters or notes written to you in which the writer has deliberately used simple words and constructions.
5. Read an advertisement in the paper to find a good bicycle you can buy.
6. Read reviews for popular movies.

Writing outside class, in English
1. Write an advertisement to sell an old bike.
2. Write down the instructions for your favorite hobby.
3. Write a report on your favorite animal and its habits.
4. Write a story.
5. Write a letter to a friend.
6. Write a newspaper article.
7. Write the answers to a “fun” quiz from a magazine.
8. Write down a list of things you must do tomorrow.

Comprehension outside class
1. Listen to instructions and complete a task.
2. Bake a cake if instructions were not in Persian.
3. Fill out an application form.
4. Take directions from an English speaker.
...5. Understand an English movie.
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