

# RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE AND WRITING PROFICIENCY AMONG VISUALLY IMPAIRED COMPUTER-LITERATE PAKISTANI ESL LEARNERS

**Rida Farooq**

*MPhil Scholar, Department of Applied Linguistics, GC University, Faisalabad, Pakistan*

Email: [ridaf3416@gmail.com](mailto:ridaf3416@gmail.com)

**Aleem Shakir (Corresponding Author)**

*Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Linguistics, GC University, Faisalabad, Pakistan*

Email: [almsha@yahoo.com](mailto:almsha@yahoo.com)

## Abstract

*Aiming to explore the language learning process among the students with special needs, the current study endeavoured to examine the relationship between the willingness to write and writing proficiency among visually impaired computer-literate Pakistani ESL learners. The sample comprised 28 visually impaired students selected through purposive sampling. The data comprised scores from participants' argumentative essay compositions and their responses on the WTW questionnaire measuring willingness to write. Kendall's Tau, a nonparametric statistical test, was employed to examine the correlation between writing proficiency and WTW. The results revealed a very weak, negative, and nonsignificant correlation between WTW and writing proficiency (Kendall's Tau =  $-.122$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The study contributes to the existing body of knowledge by highlighting the limited role of willingness to write in predicting writing proficiency among visually impaired learners. These findings may inform curriculum developers and pedagogy specialists in designing materials and strategies that go beyond motivational aspects, focusing instead on practical support to enhance writing skills. The study may also serve as a reference point for future researchers exploring the language learning journey of differently abled students.*

**Keywords:** willingness to write, writing proficiency, visually impaired students, computer-literate, Pakistani ESL learners

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Communication is fundamental to the human interaction and cooperation within society. Language serves as the primary medium for this interaction, relying on agreed-upon signs, symbols, and sounds to create meaningful exchanges. These exchanges, both written and spoken, are dependent upon various factors for success. Numerous factors including psychological, social and environmental ones play their role in the smooth sailing of the conversations and interactions.

Among other variables, willingness to communicate is a salient factor that defines the communication occurring between two or more persons. Defined as a trait in L1 and a state in L2, Willingness to communicate refers to as an open choice opted by the speaker to initiate the communication or desisting it. It is of equal importance in both first and second language contexts in that it is one of the factors responsible for the sound communicative process. WTC and self-esteem hold special value in second language acquisition in that ESL and EFL learners need to practice communication after learning receptive and productive skills. Both spoken and written WTC are stated to be playing primary role in the communicative process and practice, required to master skills during second and foreign language learning according to Lilya (2022). This fundamental role of WTC is backed by different SLA theories such as Swain's output hypothesis (Swain, 1993), Long's interactional theory (Long, 1980), and socio-cultural theory (Vygotsky &

Cole, 1978). Lack of WTC hinders smooth communication process needed to practice fully what is learnt in that in case of lack of willingness to communicate, the practice needed for the sound acquisition of the learnt language is affected negatively.

Writing is one of the core productive skills taught to the ESL learners along with speaking. It is learnt distinctively compared to the other productive skill, which is speaking, mainly due to the difference in the processes of how both are used to convey the interlocutor's message. Its difference from the spoken skill instigated the investigation of willingness to write separately from the willingness to speak, which is usually considered as willingness to communicate.

Within ESL context, the question taken up for investigation in the current study is the relationship between willingness to write and the writing proficiency among visually impaired computer-literate language learners particularly due to the specialized language learning patterns followed by the students with special needs, and the challenges these learners face during their language learning journey as revealed by the research conducted by Tran and Pho in (2020), which states that these learners rely heavily upon listening skills and interaction with the peers and mentors to practice and improve their skills. It further adds that these students need to be more willing to communicate, and have flexible personality to adapt different ways of learning, which are not traditional, but are adopted for persons with visual disabilities in particular.

### Research Question

The review of existing literature indicated that there exists a gap in research regarding relationship between willingness to write and the writing proficiency among visually impaired, ESL learners in Pakistani context. This research aims to fill this gap by answering the following question: Is there any relationship between willingness to write and writing proficiency among visually impaired computer-literate Pakistani ESL learners?

To answer this question, the study intends to use a correlational design, and takes data from visually impaired students studying in the universities/colleges of Pakistan through WTW questionnaire and the essays. The findings of this study will be useful for researchers in the relevant area, SLA theorists, and the language pedagogy developers.

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

According to MacIntyre et al. (1998) willingness to communicate (WTC) is defined as the welcoming attitude or the willingness towards the initiation of communication within different (known/unknown) contexts, and with different (familiar/unfamiliar) persons. WTC is best described as the tendency to begin the conversation when given an open choice between initiation of communication and desisting it. In L1 it is viewed as a trait while in L2 it is looked at from the perspective of a situation-based variable.

McCroskey and Baer (1985) states that though some factors such as personal feelings, relationships, preferences of the interlocutors influence a person's willingness to communicate, the frequency with which a person begins a conversation stays static. This stability in the initiation of communication despite varied situations, contexts, and interlocutors is defined as WTC as a trait.

Within an L2 context, WTC is defined as a person's inclination to be involved in a conversation at a certain time and with particular people using second language. This view opposes WTC as a variable remaining stable across all types of contexts i.e., public, meetings, groups, and dyad, and receivers such as acquaintance, friends, and strangers. It argues that along with these contexts and receivers, various other variables impact a person's WTC within L2 context, and a person, despite having linguistic competence, may not show similar willingness to communicate

across different situations and contexts. The viewpoint was introduced by MacIntyre et al. (1998) with the advent of the heuristic model for WTC.

In literature, WTC in general refers to the spoken WTC. Written WTC, which is also known as WTW is defined as the willingness of an L2 learner to initiate the written task in different situations and with different readers. Like spoken WTC, written WTC is derived from different factors such as the L2 motivation, learners' autonomy and attitude, the knowledge of genre, self-confidence, and teacher/peer feedback (Rafiee & Abbasian-Naghneh, 2020).

Several factors have been highlighted playing their role behind WTC as suggested by the studies in different contexts. These factors include biological ones like sex, age, gender, psychological ones including motivation, anxiety, and identity, and instructional ones involving the attitude towards learning, self-confidence, and international community (Donovin & Macintyre, 2005; Baker & MacIntyre, 2000).

Similar to WTC, the factors impacting WTW in particular were reported to be the psychological, cognitive, contextual and the textual ones including the L2 learner's attitude, motivation, autonomy, the knowledge of genre, and the teacher/peer feedback as reported by Rafiee and Abbasian-Naghneh (2020).

Questionnaires have been utilised widely so far to collect the data regarding WTC, with most of the questionnaires intended to collect the data regarding spoken WTC. The first scale to measure trait-based oral WTC directly was developed by McCroskey and Baer in 1985. It took its basis from the UWTC, PVB, and PRCA scales. Willingness to communicate scale was a unidimensional measure of trait-based WTC, assessing spoken WTC within four contexts (public, meetings, small groups, and dyads), and three receiver types (strangers, acquaintances, and friends). It consisted of 20 items, out of which 12 were meant to assess WTC and the remaining 8 were dedicated to collect information about the general personality orientation McCroskey and Baer (1985).

The second most widely used WTC instrument for both inside and outside classroom use was developed by MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, and Conrod in 2001. It was developed to measure WTC of a second/foreign language learner within and outside the classroom, and across four skills. Similarly, different other questionnaires have been used so far to measure WTC, with most of the instruments focusing on spoken WTC, and a few for the written one. The WTW questionnaire developed by Kaivanpanah et al., (2019) is based on the data collection with regards to written WTC.

Out of all the questionnaires, a highly reliable L2WTC questionnaire was developed by Weaver (2005), dedicated both to spoken and written WTC. Its written sub-part was utilised in the current study due to its appropriate applicability in Pakistani context. The details about its reliability and validity will be discussed in the methodology section.

The data collection process for writing proficiency has been found to employ two primary approaches: the evaluation of pre-written exams (Hosseini et al., 2013) and the administration of writing tests, using either standardized assessments such as IELTS and TOEFL or self-developed prompts (Sattar et al., 2023). Among the various genres chosen for collecting data on writing proficiency, essays remain the most widely used.

The data evaluation process usually utilises two kinds of rubrics. Two primary types, holistic and analytical rubrics are used to assess the written data. In addition to the instruments used for the writing, the raters of writing compositions are selected carefully, considering reliability measures. The compositions are generally assessed by expert raters, researchers, or

students with a linguistics background. To maintain interrater reliability, the number of raters is often increased from one to two or three.

Along with WTC and WTW, numerous factors such as speaking, learners' autonomy, vocabulary mastery, writing anxiety, writing strategies, and content scores have been investigated recently in terms of their relationship with writing proficiency. Spoken skills have been reported to show a relationship with writing proficiency, ranging from negligible to moderate, in recent studies.

The research by Hadah et al. (2020) revealed moderately positive relationship between speaking and writing ability. Taking 32 students from the English education department of a senior high class, the researcher sought to look, at first, the performance of the seventh semester students on vocabulary, grammar, and the organization, and the relationship between speaking and writing. The research utilised a cross-sectional, quantitative research design, where the students chosen through simple random sampling were asked to attempt written test involving writing an essay on the essay prompt 'the ways to find out jobs in this modern era', and the spoken test for the spoken data involving describing a picture about marketing activities of people. Written essays were evaluated in view of different aspects as grammar, vocabulary, content, and coherence, and were marked via a scale ranging from one to five, while the spoken data was rated from the perspectives of fluency, pronunciation, content, and the organization. The gained scores were then used for the statistical analysis. SPSS was used to find out the answer to the relationship between speaking and writing proficiency. The results unfolded that there existed moderate relationship ( $r = .49$ ).

On the contrary, the study by Rahman and Suryanto (2022) indicated a very weak-negligible correlation between speaking and writing. The study was conducted with 49 fifth semester students of the English education programme at the Nurul Jadid University Probolinggo. Written and oral data were collected through written and oral tests, respectively. The data was analysed descriptively, and Pearson Product Moment Correlation was calculated later on, which revealed a very weak relationship ( $r = .07$ ).

Along with gender and semester, the relationship between learners' autonomy and writing proficiency was sought by Gultom and Purbani (2022) in Indonesian context. The participants for the study were 125 undergraduate students from the first and third semester of the faculty of teacher training and education in Indonesia. The data was collected using an autonomy questionnaire based on 22 items, which was confirmed in terms of its reliability and validity. An essay prompt was given for the composition of the essay for the collection of written data. The essay was scored using an essay rubric. The scores of the essay and the questionnaire were correlated using Pearson Product Moment correlation on SPSS 23 for windows, and the revealed value was  $r = .46$ , resulting in a positive significant correlation between writing proficiency and learners' autonomy.

Reading and writing skills are often considered complementary to each other due to the reading skill aiding in the improvement of writing skill as it provides input, and one of the form of outputs is the writing. Numerous researches have been conducted so far to look at the interplay between these two skills with varied results. The study by Noor et al. (2022) was also one such attempt as it aimed to measure the relationship between reading and writing proficiency. The participants for this correlational study included 50 randomly selected students from the 2018 batch of the English department of Mangkurat University, Indonesia. A self-developed questionnaire based on the indicators of reading frequency, motivation from academic and family environment, academic and non-academic reading, and the amount of books read was used to gather data about the reading habit (Noor et al., 2022). A written test, asking the students to describe their ideal figure provided the written data for the analysis.



The compositions from the tests were scored later on and were subjected to Pearson product moment correlation analysis along with the scores obtained through the questionnaire dedicated to evaluate the reading habit of the students. To ensure interrater reliability, normality and linearity assumptions, the data was subjected to statistical analysis. The  $r$  value ( $r = -.211$ ) unfolded a weak negative correlation between the reading and writing proficiency, which meant that the writing improves with the decrement in reading. The results differ from the study conducted by Anggeriyanti (2017) with an  $r$  value of .47, which showed two skills in moderate correlation.

An in-depth study about the interrelation between grammatical knowledge and the writing proficiency of IELTS test takers was conducted by Sattar et al. (2023) in Pakistani setting. In total 131 IELTS test takers from different IELTS institutes participated in the study, with 86 males and 45 females selected through convenient sampling. An argumentative essay prompt based on the topic about the agreement or disagreement with regards to the comparative competitiveness of men over women was used to collect written data, and the self-developed items for the evaluation of grammatical knowledge were utilised to collect the data about grammatical knowledge respectively. The essays were scored using IELTS argumentative essay rubric by a rater from British Counsel. Various calculations were performed to assess the appropriateness of the variables for Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The tests revealed that the variables were suitable for the correlation in that these were continuous in terms of their measurement, independent, free of outliers, normally distributed, and in a significant linear relationship. Pearson Product Moment correlation was calculated using SPSS, and the acquired value (.002) uncovered a very weak-negligible correlation between grammatical knowledge and the writing proficiency of IELTS test takers. This finding does not align with established L2 proficiency models (e.g., Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Hulstijn, 2015), thereby raising suspicion about the adequacy of the instrument employed in the study. A test validated within the Pakistani context, however, may yield more authentic and reliable results.

WTW in terms of its relationship with writing proficiency has been discussed within different theories, with most of them highlighting the role of other factors as well like environmental and behavioural ones towards improvement in one's writing proficiency. In this regards, the social cognitive theory developed by Albert Bandura (1986) signifies the role of other factors like instructional quality, technological aids, and support system shaping a learner's writing performance. Similarly, ecological system theory Urie Bronfenbrenner's (1979) and Self-determination theory by Deci and Ryan's (1985) also conclude that broader environmental factors like support system play crucial role besides WTW. On the contrary, the studies looking into the interconnection between these two variables have reported significant relationship, signifying the salience of WTW in improved writing proficiency.

The direct correlation between writing proficiency and WTC was investigated by Gholami and Barzegar in (2018). The population for the study were 51 EFL students from different private English institutes of Iran, with an exposure to English for 2.5 years minimum. A modified version of WTC questionnaire developed by MacIntyre et al. (2001) was utilised for the data collection with regards to the willingness to communicate. The time limit for filling the questionnaire was 10 minutes. For written data, the students were asked to write a paragraph on the topic suggested by the researcher. The time limit for this task was 30 minutes. The scores of the paragraph, and the questionnaire were then correlated applying Pearson Product Moment correlation formula. The results indicated a significant positive correlation between WTC and the writing proficiency of upper intermediate EFL students as the value was  $r = .93$ . This suggested that the students who were willing to communicate had good writing proficiency as well.

This study intends to look into the relationship between WTW and writing proficiency among visually impaired, computer-literate ESL learners in Pakistani context in specific. Although some studies have examined the writing skills of students with visual disabilities—for example, a case study on how visually impaired students acquire a second language (Tran & Pho, 2020), the challenges teachers face in teaching writing to visually challenged students (Febsiningteh & Wibowo, 2021), and the impact of JAWS screen reader and MELDICT dictionary on the writing proficiency of a visually impaired student (Marpaung et al., 2022)—these works consistently emphasize the significance of flexible personality and willingness to communicate in supporting language learning. However, no study has yet measured a direct relationship between language-related skills, particularly writing, and willingness to communicate among visually impaired ESL learners. This study intends to fill this gap by exploring the relationship between the willingness to write, and the writing proficiency among visually impaired computer-literate Pakistani ESL learners.

### 3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The current study was aimed at exploring the relationship between the willingness to communicate and writing proficiency among visually impaired students utilizing computers and laptops to produce written documents in their academics in particular. The study adopted quantitative approach. Within quantitative approach, the non-experimental, correlational research design was adopted to find out the answer to the question in terms of the relationship of two variables (Willingness to communicate and writing proficiency) with each other.

#### 3.1 Participants

The research included 30 students from the provinces Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) as the participants. Out of 30 students, 20 were from Punjab, and the rest ten belonged to the province KP. The population contained 20 males, and 10 females. All of the participants were acquiring education under 16 years of degree programmes and were exposed to English as a second language for 14 years minimum. Furthermore, these students have been learning English as a second language since the beginning of their academic journey. In their current degrees, they have been taught English as a compulsory subject.

A combination of purposive and snowball sampling was employed by the researcher to select the participants for this study. At first, out of all the visually challenged university students, such students were contacted who could write using a laptop in English. Those students were requested to ask their other visually impaired fellows fulfilling the research criteria afterwards. The challenge enforcing the utility of these nonrandom sampling techniques was the difficulty to find such students in abundance in the universities of Pakistan. In total 30 students participated in the study.

#### 3.2 Instruments

##### 3.2.1 L2 WTC questionnaire

A modified version of the written sub-section (WTW) of the 64-item L2WTC questionnaire developed by Cristopher Weaver in (2005) was used to measure the willingness to write of visually impaired ESL learners. The questionnaire included items on writing to four kinds of receivers that were Pakistani students of English (PSE), International students of English (ISE), Pakistani teachers of English (PTE) and foreign teachers of English (FTE).

As mentioned above, the written sub-part of the WTC questionnaire was modified to use it for the current study because the questionnaire was developed for the Japanese EFL context initially. In the altered version of the questionnaire, the activities were modified in terms of their wording for their appropriateness according to Pakistani context. As an instance, the item asking

for the details regarding Japanese cultural event was changed to Pakistani cultural event, the reason behind entering a Japanese university was altered to Pakistani university, and the translation of a sentence from Japanese native language was also modified to Pakistani native languages. Also, the receivers like Japanese student of English and Japanese teacher of English were altered to Pakistani student and teacher of English, respectively.

The rationale for selecting this particular questionnaire was that it preserved both the context and the variability among respondents. It effectively captured the types of activities conducted in EFL classrooms, which can also be traced in ESL settings. Its key characteristics—such as reflecting both situational and trait-like aspects of willingness to communicate (WTC), addressing willingness to write (WTW), and being highly specific to the circumstances of ESL/EFL learners—make it more suitable than other questionnaires for data collection in the present study. The alpha coefficients for the subscales were 0.88 for PSE, 0.94 for ISE, 0.93 for both PTE and FTE.

### **3.2.2 Written prompt**

An argumentative essay prompt was initially selected from the IELTS essay prompts. It was later subjected to a slight modification, suggested by teachers of visually impaired university students, to make it more relevant to the lives of students with visual impairments. Specifically, the statement that originally asked for viewpoints on technological advancements making life convenient for every individual was altered to focus on advancements facilitating and easing the lives of individuals with disabilities.

### **3.3 Data collection procedure**

The data was collected online over the period of two weeks. An online meeting with each student was scheduled according to their time of ease. During the meeting, each student was provided with the written essay prompt in accessible (Microsoft Word) format, and the questionnaire link. The time limit for the essay composition was 40 minutes, and the participants were asked to write at least 250 words.

After writing the essay, and submitting it back in the doc form, the respondents had to fill out L2WTC questionnaire to provide their stance with regards to their WTW. The allotted time for this activity was 20 minutes. Google form, being one of the most easily accessible platforms with screen readers, was utilised to place the questionnaire, and the respondents were provided with the link of the questionnaire on the Google form. The participants were guided verbally about the variable the questionnaire intends to collect data about.

### **3.4 Data analysis**

After collecting the essays for the writing proficiency, and the responses of the participants with regards to the WTW through questionnaire, the data analysis was carried out. The essays were marked by a trained rater holding an MPhil degree in Applied Linguistics. IELTS Task 2 band descriptor was used to mark the essay. It consists of nine bands and has four major elements constituting the marking criteria.

The responses from the questionnaires are usually coded for their numeric interpretation. The responses from WTW questionnaire needed no coding as Google forms provided a pre-coded Google sheet, which could easily be downloaded and exported to excel for the later use. Thus, the scores for each participant on WTW were calculated.

#### **3.4.1 Calculation of Overall Scores Obtained from Willingness to Write (WTW) Instrument**

Calculation of scores was done using simple summation method. The total score for the instrument (TTL\_WTW) was based on scores obtained from individual parts. Average scoring

method was not considered because the number of items in each part of the questionnaire was same (i.e., 16).

### 3.4.2 Assessment of Assumptions of Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient

The assumption of interval/ratio level measurement is obviously met because the data was obtained through a Likert scale questionnaire and a test of written proficiency (marked based on IELTS band descriptors).

The outliers were found in Overall Score of Willingness to Write Scale (Waterscape), and the three sub-scales - willingness to write to Pakistani students of English, international teachers of English, and the international students of English.

In each instance, the same two cases were found outliers and were thus removed before conducting correlation analysis. Thus, the sample was reduced to 28. A sample of 25 or larger is sufficient for running Pearson correlation (David, 1938), although some would recommend a higher number (Fraenkel, Hyun & Wallen, 2012).

To check normality assumption, the values of skewness and kurtosis were observed, and found within range for univariate normality (+/-2) (George & Mallery, 2010). The linearity assumption, however, was not met ( $p < .05$ ) in case of Essay Band and overall score of the scale (WTW\_ScaleScore).

Since the last important assumption was not met, a nonparametric option Kendal's Tau was used which does not require linearity assumption and is suitable for small sample size (Siegel & Castellan, 1998).

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Descriptive statistics

Presented in the table below is the descriptive statistics about total score of WTW (TTL\_WTW), the sub-scales, and Essay Band.

**Table 1**

*Descriptive Statistics for Essay Band, Overall WTW Scale Score, and Component Scores*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Essay Band	28	5.0	8.0	6.375	.8008	.208	.441	-.535	.858
TTL_PSE	28	40.0	64.0	51.250	6.5242	.141	.441	-.754	.858
TTL_ISE	28	30.0	64.0	52.679	8.5551	-.648	.441	.528	.858
TTL_PTE	28	37.0	64.0	51.821	8.8026	.057	.441	-1.315	.858
TTL_FTE	28	30.0	64.0	53.179	8.7010	-.627	.441	.336	.858
WTW_ScaleScore	28	157.0	256.0	208.929	27.2966	.057	.441	-.813	.858
Valid N (listwise)	28								

The data included 28 participants (originally 30, reduced to 28 after removing two significant outliers) of whom 19 were males while 9 were females.



The minimum value for Essay Band is 5 and the maximum value is 8, which means the lowest score on the essays was 5 while the maximum was 8. The skewness and kurtosis values are both under 1 (i.e.,  $>1$ ) indicate normal distribution of the variable. The standard deviation .8 suggests that most of the score are .8 above/below the mean (i.e., 6.37) (so between 5.57 and 7.17). The mean score of 6.37 in general suggests that participants as group had reasonable command of essay writing skill.

#### 4.2 Inferential Statistics

The primary research question sought to determine whether willingness to write (WTW) correlates with writing proficiency among visually impaired ESL learners. This section presents the inferential analysis addressing the research question by examining the correlations between writing proficiency and the overall Willingness to Write (WTW) scale, as well as its subcomponents.

The table below indicates the relationship between WTW and its sub-scales with writing proficiency.

**Table 2**

*Correlations of Essay Band Score with Overall WTW Scale and Subcomponents of WTW*

	WTW_ScaleScore	TTL_PSE	TTL_ISE	TTL_PTE	TTL_FTE
Correlation Coefficient	-.122	-.185	-.246	-.109	.012
Sig. (2-tailed)	.407	.213	.097	.467	.934
N	28	28	28	28	28

The correlation coefficient between the overall Willingness to Write Scale Score (WTW\_ScaleScore) and essay scores was found to be -.122, indicating a very weak negative correlation. However, this correlation was not statistically significant ( $p = 0.407$ ). Although negative, the correlation of  $r = -.122$  corresponds to a negligible effect size (Cohen, 1988). Thus, no significant relationship was observed between the overall willingness to write and essay scores, suggesting that other factors (e.g., instructional methods and learner support) may have a more substantial influence on writing proficiency. In addition to the overall WTW scale, the subcomponents also showed weak negative correlations with essay scores. The strongest negative correlation was observed with the willingness to write Pakistani students of English (PSE) subscale ( $r = -.185$ ,  $p = .213$ ), followed by the International students of English (ISE) subscale ( $r = -.246$ ,  $p = .097$ ), while the Pakistani teachers of English (PTE) subscale ( $r = -.109$ ,  $p = .467$ ) showed only a very weak negative relationship. In contrast, the willingness to write to Foreign teachers of English (FTE) subscale revealed a negligible positive correlation with essay scores ( $r = .012$ ,  $p = .934$ ). However, none of these correlations reached statistical significance, suggesting that the individual dimensions of willingness to write did not demonstrate a meaningful association with writing proficiency in this sample.

Although several well-established models of writing, such as the Hayes and Flower (1980) cognitive process model, Hayes' revised models (1996, 2012), Grabe and Kaplan's (1996) model, and Zimmerman and Risemberg's (1997) self-regulated model, explicitly include motivational constructs as integral components of the writing process, the present study found that willingness

to write—a motivational factor—did not show a significant relationship with writing proficiency among visually impaired Pakistani ESL learners. This outcome aligns with Graham's (2006) observation that, although motivation contributes to shaping writing development, its influence is often weaker than other forces such as writing-related knowledge, skills, and self-regulation. In this context, it is possible that factors like accessibility, instructional support, and the development of self-regulatory strategies played a more decisive role in learners' writing performance than motivation alone.

Our results contrast with the study by Gholami and Barzegar (2018), which found significant positive correlation between willingness to write and writing performance. These discrepancies may be due to differences in sampled populations, sample size, measurement instruments, or educational contexts. Further research is needed to explore these variables and to better understand the complex relationship between willingness to write and writing proficiency.

The findings in general support social cognitive theory that emphasises the influence of self-efficacy along with instructional methods and support provided on learning outcomes as well as the ecological systems theory that emphasise the role of environmental factors and support provided to learners. In other words, factors beyond willingness to write play a leading role in shaping learning outcomes.

An important aspect to take into consideration is that the current study has undertaken the writing proficiency and WTW of computer-literate visually impaired ESL learners only. Future replication of the study using alternative modes of writing may help explore the relationship in more depth. Also, the research about other factors possibly interacting with the writing proficiency such as the knowledge about spellings and grammar can be conducted to have the idea about the relationship between these factors with the writing proficiency of visually impaired ESL learners.

For practitioners, the results highlight that enhancing writing proficiency among visually impaired learners may require targeted instructional support rather than assuming that willingness to write alone can drive outcomes.

A notable strength of the present study lies in its unique focus on computer-literate visually impaired ESL learners, a population rarely investigated in L2 writing research. The use of adapted instruments further adds to its originality, as it ensured accessibility while retaining psychometric value. Moreover, situating the study within the Pakistani context enhances its contribution by providing insights from a setting where empirical evidence on visually impaired learners remains limited.

The findings of the present study should be interpreted in light of several limitations. First, the sample size was relatively small ( $N = 28$ ), which restricts the generalisability of the results to larger populations. Second, the study was conducted within a single context, focusing solely on visually impaired ESL learners in Pakistan; therefore, the outcomes may not reflect the experiences of learners in different cultural or educational settings. Third, the measurement of writing proficiency relied only on Essay Band, while willingness to write was assessed through a single questionnaire. This limited scope of measurement may not fully capture the multidimensional nature of both constructs. Finally, the cross-sectional design of the study does not allow for causal inferences about the relationship between willingness to write and writing proficiency.

Future research can expand on the present findings in several ways. First, larger and more diverse samples are needed to improve the generalisability of results and to capture variability across different groups of visually impaired learners. Second, longitudinal designs could be employed to trace the development of willingness to write and writing proficiency over time, allowing for a deeper understanding of causal relationships. Third, incorporating multiple

measures of writing proficiency—such as grammar and vocabulary tests, spelling assessments, and writing portfolios—alongside willingness-to-write scales may provide a more comprehensive view of the constructs. Finally, extending the investigation to other factors, including self-efficacy, motivation, and instructional support, may yield further insights into how social, cognitive, and environmental influences interact to shape the writing proficiency of visually impaired ESL learners.

#### 4.3 Conclusion

In sum, the study revealed no statistically significant relationship between willingness to write and writing proficiency among visually impaired ESL learners. This suggests that factors beyond willingness—such as instructional practices, environmental support, and learner self-efficacy—may play a more decisive role in shaping writing outcomes. While the results diverge from some previous studies, they underscore the complexity of the link between affective variables and language performance. By highlighting both the unique context of visually impaired learners in Pakistan and the methodological constraints of the present research, the study provides a foundation for future investigations that adopt broader samples, multiple measures, and longitudinal approaches. Ultimately, these findings contribute to a more nuanced understanding of how willingness to write interacts with other factors in influencing second language writing development.

#### REFERENCES

- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford University Press.
- 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.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00121>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum Press.
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Gholami, S., & Barzegar, R. (2018). The relationship between willingness to communicate and writing proficiency of Iranian EFL learners at the upper–intermediate and advanced levels. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Scientific Research*, 10(1), 69–81.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. Longman.
- Graham, S. (2006). Writing. In P. Alexander & P. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 457–477). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gultom, U. A., & Purbani, A. T. W. (2022). The relationship between learner autonomy and students' writing skills. *Journal of Hunan University*.
- Hadah, L. M., Maghfiroh, S., Humaira, N. Z., & Akhada, W. N. (2020). The relationship between speaking and writing performance in an Indonesian senior high English foreign

- language (EFL) classroom. *Alsuna: Journal of Arabic and English Language*, 3(2), 162–178.
- Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 1–27). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hayes, J. R. (2012). Modeling and remodeling writing. *Written Communication*, 29(3), 369–388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088312451260>
- Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 3–30). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hosseini, M., Taghizadeh, M. E., Abedin, M. J. Z., & Naseri, E. (2013). The importance of EFL learners' writing skill: Is there any relation between writing skill and content score of English essay test. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 6(1), 1–12.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2015). *Language proficiency in native and non-native speakers: Theory and research*. John Benjamins.
- Lilya, C. (2022). *Examining the willingness to communicate (WTC) scale with advanced foreign language learners* (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University).
- Long, M. H. (1980). *Input, interaction, and second language acquisition*. University of California, Los Angeles.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., & Conrod, S. (2001). Willingness to communicate, social support, and language-learning orientations of immersion students. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 23(3), 369–388. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263101003035>
- MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545–562.
- Marpaung, S. D. C., Rangkuti, R., & Tarigan, B. (2022). Assistive technology in English learning by a visually impaired student at inclusive school. *Asian TESOL Journal*, 2(1), 1–14.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Baer, J. E. (1985, November). Willingness to communicate: The construct and its measurement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, CO.
- Noor, G. R., Arini, D. N., & Arapah, E. (2022). Correlation of English students' reading habits and their writing ability.
- Rafiee, M., & Abbasian-Naghneh, S. (2020). Willingness to write (WTW): Development of a model in EFL writing classrooms. *Cogent Education*, 7(1), 1847710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1847710>
- Rahman, F. F., & Suryanto, B. T. (2022). The correlation between students' writing skills and speaking skills. *International Journal of English Education and Linguistics (IJoEEL)*, 4(1), 31–39.
- Sattar, A., Shakir, A., & Amjad, H. (2023). The relationship between grammatical knowledge and argumentative essay writing proficiency among IELTS test takers in Pakistan. *Linguistic Forum: A Journal of Linguistics*, 5(1), 1–7.
- Siegel, S., & Castellan, N. J., Jr. (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.



- Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50(1), 158–164.
- Tran, T. M. P., & Pho, P. D. (2020). A case study of how visually impaired learners acquire language. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 7(1), 1–10.
- Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Weaver, C. (2005). Using the Rasch model to develop a measure of second language learners' willingness to communicate within a language classroom. *Journal of Applied Measurement*, 6(4), 396–415.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Risemberg, R. (1997). Becoming a self-regulated writer: A social cognitive perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22(1), 73–101.  
<https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1997.0919>