

«نشریه علمی-پژوهشی آموزش و ارزشیابی»

سال نهم - شماره ۳۵ - پاییز ۱۳۹۵

ص.ص. ۱۷۷-۱۹۴

The Effects of Authoritative vs. Facilitative Interventions on EFL Learners' Willingness to Communicate

Mohammad Ali Yaghchi¹
Nasser Ghafoori^{2*}
Nesa Nabifar³

Date of receipt: 2016.04.09

Date of acceptance: 2016.09.21

Abstract

The present study sought to investigate the effects of employing the intervention provision framework put forward by John Heron, entitled Six-Category Intervention Analysis, on EFL learners' willingness to communicate. This model of intervention provision, having its genesis in clinical supervision, can regulate the verbal behavior and actual sentences used by teachers to intervene in language learning contexts. The Preliminary English Test (PET) as an English language proficiency test was administered to 60 participants. Based on the results obtained, 36 participants were selected and assigned to two groups of 18. The first group was authoritative intervention group in which the teacher suggested what had to be done, provided information, or confronted the learners. The second group was facilitative intervention, in which the teacher drew out ideas, solutions, or self-confidence. The participants in both groups completed Willingness to communicate questionnaire before and after the treatment, as well as in the follow-up period. The findings indicated that the application of Six-Category Intervention Analysis brought about significant changes in the performance of the facilitative group that outperformed the authoritative intervention group. This research could carry some important implications for all stakeholders in the realm of foreign language teaching.

Keywords: Authoritative Intervention, EFL learners, Facilitative Intervention, Willingness to Communicate

1-2 & 3 Department of English, Tabriz branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

* (ghafoori@iaut.ac.ir)

اثرات عملکردی نفوذ استاد و عدم نفوذ استاد بر تمایل زبان آموزان به برقراری ارتباط

محمدعلی یاغچی^۱

ناصر غفوری^{*۲}

نساء نبی فر^۳

تاریخ دریافت مقاله: ۱۳۹۵/۰۱/۲۱

تاریخ پذیرش نهایی مقاله: ۱۳۹۵/۰۶/۳۱

چکیده

تحقیق حاضر سعی دارد تا تأثیرات به کارگیری چارچوب نظری نفوذ استاد را در کلاس‌های آموزش زبان انگلیسی در دانشگاه فرهنگیان تبریز مورد بررسی قرار دهد، چهارچوبی که جان هرون تحت عنوان «بررسی شش اصل نفوذ استاد بر تمایل زبان آموز به برقراری ارتباط» مطرح کرده است. این مدل که ریشه در نظارت بالینی دارد، می‌تواند رفتار کلامی و جمله‌های حقیقی که استاد در بافت یادگیری زبان بکار می‌برد را جهت دهد. ۶۰ دانشجو در آزمون مهارت‌های عمومی زبان PET شرکت کردند که بر اساس نتایج حاصله، ۳۶ نفر از آنها به دو گروه ۱۸ نفری برای این پژوهش انتخاب شدند. گروه اول، گروه تحت نفوذ استاد بود که در آن استاد تعیین می‌کرد چه اقداماتی باید صورت پذیرد، این استاد بود که اطلاعات را ارائه می‌داد و یا با دانشجویها تعامل داشت. گروه دوم، گروه عاری از نفوذ استاد بود که در آن استاد صرفاً ایده دهنده، حلال مشکلات و اعتماد به نفس دهنده بود. این دو گروه پرسشنامه‌های مربوط به تمایل به برقراری ارتباط، هم قبل، هم بعد و هم در دوره پیگیری مجدد آموزشی را کامل کردند. نتایج حاصل از بکارگیری شش اصل نفوذ استاد حاکی از تغییرات چشمگیر در عملکرد دانشجویانی داشت که تحت نفوذ استاد نبودند و به عملکرد بهتر این گروه از گروه تحت نفوذ استاد منجر گردید. امید است که این تحقیق افق‌های روشن جدیدی را به روی متخصصان، اساتید و نیز دانشجویان در حیطه آموزش زبان انگلیسی ایجاد نماید.

واژگان کلیدی: گروه تحت نفوذ استاد، زبان آموزان، گروه آزاد از نفوذ استاد، تمایل به برقراری ارتباط

۱-۲-۳- گروه زبان انگلیسی، واحد تبریز، دانشگاه آزاد اسلامی، تبریز، ایران

* - نویسنده مسئول ghafoori@iaut.ac.ir

1. Introduction

There has been a strong movement in the field of foreign language learning and pedagogy towards increasing emphasis on meaningful communication. As a consequence of this development, the concept of willingness to communicate (WTC) has become progressively more significant in second language learning studies and, therefore, an increasing number of studies have been conducted on the different variables that might affect second and foreign language learners' willingness to communicate (e.g. Alemi et al. 2013, Cao & Philip 2006, MacIntyre et al. 2011, Wen and Clement 2003). Despite the growing interest in WTC, teachers' influence on learners' WTC is a variable that needs to be scrutinized thoroughly. Most of the studies that have looked into teachers' effect on learners' WTC regarded it as one of several variables and therefore have not given the matter a central attention in order to provide substantial information. Furthermore, there have been few studies on this issue in an Iranian EFL context. Hence, additional research is needed to determine whether teachers actually have an effect on their learners' WTC in the classroom and if so, what the pedagogical consequences of their interventions are.

The classroom language, teachers' verbal behavior and interaction within the class are key components that contribute to success of language learning. Despite their importance, it is not known why, to date, no structured oral/verbal framework has been put forward to provide learners with intervention and classroom language conducive to learning. Language learning and teaching contexts tend to be replete with intervention and mediation. Ellis (2008) believes that language teaching is comprised of direct intervention referring to "attempts to actually teach learners specific linguistic properties" (2), and indirect intervention referring to the conditions built to facilitate language learning. Additionally, research has shown that being exposed to linguistic input is not, per se, sufficient to develop language proficiency (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Swain 2000). Hence, provision of valid pedagogical and non-pedagogical intervention is a pressing need for nurturing the process of learning (Lai, 2012; Negueruela & Lantolf, 2006; van Compernelle, 2012). Furthermore, classroom climate is believed to be markedly determined by the dynamics of the learning group and its development over time (Dornyei & Murphey, 2003; Hadfield, 1992, as quoted in Galadja, 2012). In line with this, Widdowson (1990, p. 182) states "The classroom provides the context for the enactment of these roles: but the classroom should not just be perceived as physical surroundings but also conceived as social space. The difference is important and can be marked by a terminological distinction: setting for the physical context, scene for socio-psychological one". Farrell (2002) notes that communication in the classroom influences learners' perception and willingness to take part in classroom activities. To consolidate this, and within the scope of classroom interaction, Edwards & Westgate (1987, p. 6) maintain "all normal human beings are expert in the practical interpretation of talk. Most of our everyday life depends on skills in talking and making sense of the talk of others, as we work or trade or simply pass the time of day".

Six-Category Intervention Analysis (SCIA) has been put forward by Heron (1976). This conceptual framework, being originally based on counseling and clinical supervision studies, has been employed to educate and train professionals in health-related arenas. Recently, however, it has been used in various fields including management, medical education and counselling to promote interpersonal skills. (Chambers & Long, 1995; Cutcliffe & Epling, 1997; Fowler, 1996;). Intervention in its both direct and indirect forms constitutes a major portion of the process of education. In language learning and teaching arenas, intervention has been attended to mostly in its former form. Indirect intervention, however, has not been considered in detail and with the necessary heed it deserves. The

present study discusses intervention from Heron's (1976) point of view and tries to elaborate on its two major categories, and their respective six types.

1.1 Intervention

Intervention is "an identifiable piece of verbal and/or non-verbal behavior that is a part of the practitioner's service to the client" (Heron, 2001, p. 3). Despite the significance of non-verbal aspects of intervention, Heron (1976) refers to intervention as a practitioner's verbal behavior. SCIA is proposed as a conceptual framework to understand interpersonal relationships and to analyze interactions between a client and a helper.

Whereas there exist a number of intervention models (Sloan & Watson, 2002), SCIA has been frequently used in fields that need to promote interpersonal skills (Ashmore, 1999; Chambers & Long 1995; Cutcliffe & Epling, 1997; Fowler, 1996; Sloan & Watson, 2001). For practitioners, it can be used to improve the effectiveness of their communication skills in mentoring relationships. The two main categories of SCIA include authoritative and facilitative interventions which are briefly introduced here.

1.1.1 Authoritative Interventions

In this category, the practitioner suggests what should be done, provides information, or confronts the other person. This category includes three types: 1) *Prescriptive*: "...seeks to direct the behavior of the patient/colleague, client" (Heron, 2001, p. 5). For example, *I would like you to discuss this issue with your classmates*. In this intervention, the teacher or practitioner directly advises, proposes, recommends, or suggests the client what to do due to a gap in their knowledge or skill when they are badly needed (Maggioli, 2012), 2) *Informative*: "...seeks to impart knowledge, information and meaning to the other person" (Heron, 2001, p. 5). For example, *It would be useful for you to know that...* Maggioli (2012, p. 112) notes that "these interventions present relevant information, provide personal interpretations, feedback or self-disclosure with the aim of helping the aspiring teacher cope with a specific situation, and 3) *Confronting*: "...to raise the awareness of the patient/colleague/person about some limiting attitude or behavior of which he/she is relatively unaware" (Heron, 2001, p. 5). For example, *I notice this is the third time we have talked about this—and you have still not been able to act—I wonder what is going on*. These are employed in cases where the clients "need to be pushed to reassess their actions, beliefs or attitudes because they are acting against the benefits of themselves, or the learners, and they are unable to see it" (Maggioli, 2012, p. 112).

1.1.2 Facilitative Interventions

In these, the mediator or the helper draws out ideas, solutions, self-confidence, and so on, from the other person, helping him or her to reach his or her own solutions or decisions (Heron, 2001). They include: 1) *Cathartic*: "... to enable the other person to discharge and express painful emotion, usually grief, anger or fear". For example, *I notice that whenever you speak about your research, you look rather anxious, why don't you tell us your problem?* 2) *Catalytic*: "...to elicit self-discovery, self-directed learning, and problem solving". For example, *What would you do in this situation?* 3) *Supportive*: "...to affirm the worth and value of the other person, their qualities, attitudes and actions". For example, *It sounds like you handled that in a very mature and confident way, well done!* (Heron, 2001, p. 6).

Regarding intervention efficiency, Heron (2001) suggests that a valid intervention is "one that is appropriate to the client's current state and stage of development, and to the developing practitioner-client interaction" (Heron, 2001, p. 10). Heron further continues that "...to say that it is appropriate, is to say that: (a) it is in the right category; (b) it is the

right sort of intervention within that category; (c) its content and use of language are fitting; (d) it is delivered in the right manner; and (e) it is delivered with good timing.

A degenerate intervention is one that “fails in one, and usually several, of these respects, because the practitioner lacks personal development, or training, or experience, or awareness or some combination of these” (Heron, 2001, p. 10). On the other hand, “a perverted intervention is one that deliberately malicious, that intentionally seeks to do harm to another person”.

Within a helping paradigm, Heron (1976) proposed a framework for delivering interventions. Whereas the SCIA, mainly based upon studies on counseling and clinical supervision, has been employed to train health education professionals, it has also been utilized by managers, supervisors, coaches, consultants, and educators to promote intervention within interpersonal relationship frameworks recently (e.g., Chambers & Long, 1995; Cutcliffe & Epling, 1997; Fowler, 1996; Johns & Butcher, 1993). Keeping in mind the vast usage scope of this framework including education, the researchers utilized it in the language instruction contexts to promote the interpersonal relationships so as to make language learning a more successful experience through provision of valid interventions. Employing such interventions as facilitative ones tend to enable teachers to create authentic dialogues between teachers on the one hand and the learners on the other throughout the interaction processes. The rationale behind employing such interventions in the educational psychology is that teachers adopting facilitative interventions are expected to provide learners with an opportunity to actively participate in these interactions which could lead to their higher willingness to communicate in the classroom setting.

Given the importance and the dearth of research on the effect of teachers' intervention on learners' WTC, the present study attempted to explore the effect of authoritative and facilitative interventions on the promotion of Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate (WTC) in the short and long runs. To this end, the following research questions were posed:

1. Is there any statistically significant difference in Iranian EFL learners receiving authoritative and facilitative interventions in terms of WTC level in the short run?
2. Is there any statistically significant difference in Iranian EFL learners receiving authoritative and facilitative interventions in terms of WTC level in the long run?

To answer the above - mentioned research questions, two null hypotheses were formulated as follows:

Hypothesis one: There is not any significant difference between immediate posttest of willingness to communicate for the authoritative intervention group and facilitative intervention group.

Hypothesis two: There is not any significant difference between delayed posttest of willingness to communicate for the authoritative intervention group and facilitative intervention group.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

The participants of this study were selected from a sample of 60 male and female EFL learners aged 20 to 45 at Farhangian University. Sixty subjects took the Preliminary English Test (PET) at the beginning of the study. Based on the results of the PET, those participants whose scores were within one standard deviation below and above the mean were selected as a homogenous sample for further data collection. The selected participants

were randomly divided into two groups categorized as authoritative intervention group and facilitative intervention group.

2.2 Instrumentation

The researcher utilized the Preliminary English Test (PET) to assess the language proficiency level of 60 sophomores at Farhangian University. It is a Cambridge ESOL exam for the intermediate level learners. The test consists of four sections. Section one is composed of 35 reading test items. Section two is made up of 5 writing test items. Section three includes 25 listening test items, and section four is a speaking test during which a picture is given to each participant and he or she is required to reflect and explain about it.

The WTC Questionnaire developed by MacIntyre et al. (2001) was employed to examine the participants' willingness to communicate (see Appendix one). It contains a total of 27 items, all of which refer to the learners' willingness to engage in communication tasks focusing on four skills of speaking, writing, reading, and listening. The learners were required to indicate on a scale from 1 to 5 how willing they would be to communicate (where 1 = almost never willing, 2 = sometimes willing, 3 = willing half of the time, 4 = usually willing, and 5 = almost always willing). It should be noted that the questionnaire was piloted before the experiment and its reliability was 0.81. The textbook they were studying was American English File (OUP) level 2.

2.3 Procedures

The PET was administered to 60 subjects. Based on the results of the test, those participants who scored within one standard deviation above and below the mean were selected as a homogeneous sample, and then divided into two groups, each consisting of 18 learners. The researcher himself first made it explicit to the participants about the major objective of the course. Prior to the treatment, WTC questionnaire was administered to measure the participants' level of willingness to communicate. The results were later compared and contrasted with the results and possible gains from the application of Heron's authoritative and facilitative interventions on WTC.

The application of the intervention, based on Heron's six-category model, comprised the most important stage of this research, i.e., the treatment. According to Heron's (2001) model, there were two main categories of intervention including authoritative and facilitative types. The authoritative domain would include 3 main sub-categories including prescriptive, informative and confronting interventions. The other major category, facilitative interventions, included cathartic, catalytic, and supportive intervention types. While many examples of each of these two main categories and their subsequent six categories could be mentioned, Heron (2001) notes that "...there is not just one way of stating an intervention: it can have many verbal forms." (p.4). He intended not to confuse an intervention with a verbal formula or a particular set of words. The reason is that an intervention is a person to person intention that can have many variations of verbal form, and the right variation depends on who those persons are and what is going on between them. However, some examples of different types of verbal interventions are as follows:

Authoritative:**- Prescriptive:**

- I suppose we (you) need to make more sentences with this structure to completely master it.
- I want you to review this part one more time
- You must follow the grammar in the book
- Don't you think we need to work on this for one more session?

- Informative

- 'Which' is not used to refer to humans. 'Who' is the right choice.
- I think you should have used *simple present tense* for talking about plane schedules.
- It is best to use *simple present tense* when we are talking about train, plane, or subway schedules.
- When you have a prior decision, use *I am going to*

- Confronting

- Did you notice you talked about this matter three times?
- How many times have I told you not to forget the 3rd person 's' ?!
- Pay attention! One more mistake in using the tenses and you will lose two points!
- This is ridiculous! I have talked about this structure 4 times!

Facilitative:**- Cathartic:**

- You don't look Ok today. What is the problem?
- Would you like to share your problem with us?
- Don't worry. Many other learners have this problem. This is quite normal.
- Your lecture seems very nice, so why are you so anxious?

- Catalytic:

- What would you do to solve the problem?
- Tell me about the last time you had to work with a classmate whom you found particularly difficult. How did you deal with him?
- My friend David has some problems with..... How would you act if you were him?
- Let's see how you try to solve this problem.

- Supportive:

- Well done! I am really proud of you.
- It sounds like you handled that in a mature and confident way.
- I have noticed you are making good progress. Good job!
- Wow! That was a perfect sentence. Thanks!

Having mentioned some sample sentences used in each type of interventions, the researchers need to mention that the treatment lasted for eight sessions in each class. Since the experiment was intended to be conducted on speaking skill, the feedback delivery would be primarily focused on the Heron's interventions. The feedbacks were provided during speaking practices or lectures. Teaching the course book, *The American File Two*, was done based on the standards of the course while feedback were being delivered based on Heron's (2001) intervention analysis.

Based on the types of the feedback which were supposed to be provided by the researchers, a specific lesson plan was carefully designed for each session according to

which some steps were taken in all sessions (see Appendix Two). The steps taken in one specific session are provided in details as an Example here:

1. A number of thought-provoking warm-up questions will be asked regarding the topic of unit entitled "last weekend" in order to both introduce the topic and make the participants actively involved.
2. A short lecture will delivered to introduce the topic.
3. The students will required to discuss the topic in pairs.
4. The students were asked to put forward their own ideas and viewpoints about different aspects of a topic.
5. Some appropriate feedbacks (verbal behaviors) on the part of the researchers was provided in accordance with the type of the mistakes made by the students or the utterances produced by them.
6. In order to encourage the students to discuss the topic more deeply, they were required to work on diverse topic-related exercises and discuss them in the classroom.
7. Whereas a friendly atmosphere was created by the researcher for the facilitative group to eradicate the psychological barriers between the teacher and the students, the atmosphere of the class for the authoritative group was not as friendly due to the nature of the interventions.
8. While prescriptive, informative, and confronting interventions were made for the authoritative group, cathartic, catalytic, and supportive interventions were made for the facilitative group.

In this session the students were talking about their last weekends, the relative pronoun "whose" was mistakenly used by one of the students in the following dialogue:

Student: Last weekend I bought a car which name was Ford.

Teacher: "Which" is not used to show possessions. "Whose" is the right choice here?

Teacher's feedback in the above-mentioned dialogue was used as an informative intervention which is one of the authoritative interventions

As another example the researcher likes to mention another dialogue below in which he used cathartic intervention as a feedback to a mistake made by one of the students in the facilitative group.

Student: I can speak English Fluently with a native speaker in the museum last weekend.

Teacher: Don't worry. Many other learners have this problem. I know that you forgot to change the tense of "can" to "could".

3. Results

This section puts forward the statistical analyses of the data along with the discussions to the findings of the study based on the research questions mentioned in the introduction part

3.1. Results of the PET with the Initial Participants

The sixty participants who had initially accepted to take part in the study were given the PET as the standard English language proficiency test appropriate for their level. The purpose of the test was to select a homogeneous group in terms of English language proficiency. Table 3.1 shows the descriptive statistics for the PET scores.

Table 3.1

Descriptive Statistics; PET General Language Proficiency Test

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
PET	60	59.27	14.376	206.673

As it is indicate in Table 3.1, the mean score of the test was 59.27 and the SD was 14.376. The decision was to select the participants whose scores were within the range of one SD above and below the mean. Therefore, the participants whose scores were between 45 and 73 were selected as the homogenous sample for further data collection. The selected group included 36 participants who were randomly divided into two experimental groups to receive two treatments during the study.

3.2. Comparison of WTC scores between two groups on the pretest

To compare the participants in two groups in terms of WTC before the treatment, the researchers gave the WTC questionnaire to 36 participants at the beginning of the study. Table 3.2 shows the results of descriptive statistics for the WTC pre-test scores.

Table 3.2

Descriptive Statistics for the Pre-test WTC Scores

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
4.1 Pre WTC	Authoritative	18	75.94	15.46
	Facilitative	18	81.39	8.09

According to Table 3.2, the mean score of the authoritative group was 75.94 with the SD of 15.46, but the mean score of the facilitative group was 81.39 with the SD of 8.09. Before comparing the two means through the Independent samples t-test which is a method of parametric inferential statistics, it was prerequisite to check the normality of the scores distribution. For this purpose, the researcher used One-sample Kolmogorove-Smirnov test. Table 3.3 shows the results of this test.

Table 3.3

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for the Participants' Pre-test WTC Scores

	PreWTC	
N	36	
Normal Parameters ^{a, b}	Mean	78.67
	Std. Deviation	12.472
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.103
	Positive	.089
	Negative	-.103
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	.615	
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.843	

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

The results in Table 3.3 indicate that the p-value observed was .843 and higher than the alpha level of .05. It means that the p-value was above the alpha level. Therefore, the normality assumption could be confirmed. After the normality assumption was met, the Independent samples t-test was used to check whether there was a significant difference in the participants' pretest willingness to communicate scores between the authoritative and facilitative groups or not. The results of the independent samples t-test are shown in Table 3.4

Table 3.4
Independent Samples T-test for the Participants' Pretest WTC Scores

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means							95% Interval of the Difference Lower	Confidence of the Upper		
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference			F	
PreWTC	Equal variances assumed		4.092	.051	-	1.324	.34	.194	-5.44	4.11	-13.80	2.91
	Equal variances not assumed				-	1.324	25.655	.197	-5.44	4.11	-13.90	3.02

As Table 3.4 indicates, the p-value observed was .197 and was higher than the alpha level of .05. Thus the null hypothesis that stated there was no difference between the two means was affirmed. That is, there was not a significant difference between the means obtained from the two groups. In other words, the participants in two groups were almost equal in terms of WTC at the beginning of the study.

3.3 Examining the First Null Hypothesis

The first null hypothesis stated that there was no significant difference between the two experimental groups, in terms of WTC, on the immediate posttest.

After the treatment, the researcher administered the same WTC questionnaire to 36 participants as the post-test again to see whether there was a significant difference between the two groups after treatment. For this purpose, the researcher computed the descriptive statistics for the immediate posttest of WTC. The results are shown in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5
Descriptive Statistics for the immediate Post-test WTC Scores

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Immediate WTC	Authoritative	18	72.89	13.30
	Facilitative	18	90.44	7.30

As it is illustrated in Table 3.5, the mean score and SD of the participants' immediate post-test scores in the authoritative group were 72.89 and 13.30 respectively, whereas the mean score and SD of the scores in the facilitative group were 90.44 and 7.30 respectively. It was revealed that the participants' WTC scores in the facilitative group were higher than the WTC scores obtained by the authoritative group. Before running the Independent samples t-test to compare the significance of the difference between the two means, we needed to check the normality of the scores distribution. For this purpose, we ran the One-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Table 4.6 shows the results of the analysis.

Table 3.6

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for the Participants' Immediate post-test WTC Scores

		Immediate WTC
N		36
Normal Parameters ^{a, b}	Mean	81.67
	Std. Deviation	13.823
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.121
	Positive	.105
	Negative	-.121
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.726
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.667

As it is seen in Table 3.6, the p-value was .667 and higher than the alpha level of .05 showing that the participants' immediate post-test WTC scores had normal distribution. After the normality assumption was satisfied, Independent samples t-test was applied to see whether there was a significant difference between the two means. The results are demonstrated in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7

Independent Samples T-test for the Participants' Immediate Post-test WTC Scores

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						95% Interval Difference Lower	Confidence of the Upper
	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	F		
ImmediateWTC	Equal variances assumed	4.363	.044	-4.909	34	.000	-17.56	3.58	-24.82	-10.29
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.909	26.393	.000	-17.56	3.58	-24.90	-10.21

As Table 3.7 demonstrates, the p-value observed was zero and lower than the alpha level of .05 ($p < .05$), thus the null hypothesis that stated there was no difference between the two means was rejected. That is, there was a significant difference between the participants' immediate post-test WTC scores in the authoritative and facilitative groups. The answer to the first research question was affirmative. That is, the facilitative intervention had a significant gain in the facilitative group scores regarding to WTC immediately after the treatment.

3.4. Examining the Second Null Hypothesis

The second null hypothesis proposed that there was no significant difference between the two experimental groups, in terms of WTC, on the delayed posttest.

After one month interval of the immediate post-test, the researcher gave the same WTC questionnaire to 36 participants once more as to see whether the participants' WTC scores have changed or not. To this end, the researcher computed the descriptive statistics. Table 3.8 indicates the results of the descriptive statistics.

Table 3.8
Descriptive Statistics for the Participants' Delayed Post-test WTC Scores

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Delayed WTC	Aut	18	75.06	11.85
	Fac	18	85.61	6.09

With regard to the results depicted in Table 3.8, the mean score of the participants' delayed post-test scores in the authoritative group was 75.06 with the SD of 11.85, while the mean score of the participants in the facilitative group was 85.61 with the SD of 6.09. It was revealed that that the participants' WTC scores in the facilitative group were higher than the WTC scores obtained by the authoritative group in the follow-up period. Before running the Independent samples t-test to compare the significance of the difference between the two means, it was necessary to check the normality of the scores distribution. To this end, we ran the One-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Table 3.9 indicates the results of this test.

Table 3.9
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for the Participants' Delayed Post-test WTC Scores

		DelayedWTC
N		36
Normal Parameters ^{a, b}	Mean	80.33
	Std. Deviation	10.717
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.113
	Positive	.063
	Negative	-.113
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.677
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.749

As is clear from Table 3.9, the p-value was .749 and higher than alpha level of .05 indicating that the participants' delayed post-test WTC scores had normal distribution. After the normality assumption was met, the Independent samples t-test was employed so as to see whether there was a significant difference between the participants' delayed post-test WTC scores or not. The results of this test are indicated in Table 3.10.

Table 3.10
Independent Samples T-test for the Participants' Delayed Post-test Willingness to Communicate Scores

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means							95% Interval Difference Lower	Confidence of the Difference Upper
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference		
Delayed WTC	Equal variances assumed	4.314	.045	-3.362	34	.002	-10.56	3.14	-16.94	-4.17
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.362	25.393	.002	-10.56	3.14	-17.02	-4.09

As it is indicated in Table 3.10, the p-value obtained was .002 and lower than the alpha level of .05, thus the second null hypothesis that proposed there was no difference between two means was rejected. It was revealed that there was a significant difference between the

participants' delayed posttest WTC scores in two experimental groups. The answer to the second research question was affirmative. That is, facilitative intervention had a significant gain in the facilitative group scores in terms of WTC after one month of interval.

4. Discussion and Conclusion:

The present study aimed at exploring the effect of authoritative and facilitative interventions on the enhancement of Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate (WTC) in the short and long runs. The findings indicated that the application of Six-Category Intervention Analysis resulted in significant changes in the performance of the facilitative group which led this group to outperform the authoritative intervention group. This implies that the learners' unwillingness to communicate is due to the kind of intervention employed by the teachers in the classroom. The findings of this research can be in line with those of the study conducted by Wen and Clement (2003). They also discovered that support on the part of the teacher is a determining and significant factor which could highly influence learners' WTC.

The results of this study can be discussed in the light of sociocultural theory. Ellis (1999) notes that within sociocultural approach towards second language acquisition, "interaction is the actual site of learning" (p. 21). The role of environment has been frequently highlighted in the Second Language Acquisition theories as Chaos Complexity theory (Larsen-Freeman, 1997; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008), Dynamic system (de Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor, 2005), and Dynamic assessment (Vygotsky, 1986). In addition, meticulous catering for the nature and quality of the intervention and interaction in the classroom, i.e., the actual words and the classroom language which teachers decide to employ while managing such interactions, can be facilitated through conscious and proper use of six category Intervention Analysis (SCIA) model.

Provision of a learning atmosphere conducive to learning is a great step; language teachers can take steps to aid language learners to overcome the affective obstacles in the learning process. To achieve this end, it is recommended that teachers attempt to raise their awareness of various indirect interventions while communicating with language learners. In addition, gearing these valid interventions to the learners' individual differences can help teachers achieve long-term success in their profession.

The results of the current study might be beneficial for practicing teachers, ELT researchers, teacher trainers, and teacher developers. The familiarity gained in this preferred manner or through the desired type of intervention can be one of the important contributions of this research. In addition, appropriate recognition of the restraining factors which impede the learners' attempts to communicate would be of great assistance to the language learners and teacher trainers inclined to successfully tackle those problems.

In developing effective mentoring relationships, it is usual for teachers to rely more on facilitative interventions rather than on authoritative ones – to enable the mentee to develop their own solutions and autonomy. Considering WTC as a dynamic system, language teachers and teacher trainers can earn a proper recognition of momentary influences and changes which occur within an individual. In addition, familiarity with learners' preferences of the type of intervention they would like to receive could help recognize Iranian learners' attitudes towards a proper intervention, hence, enhance their willingness to improve their communication competence.

It can be concluded that, both teachers' behavior and their selected intervention could have a remarkable impact on the learners' self-reported willingness to communicate in English in their EFL classrooms. Moreover, teachers can increase learners' WTC by

adopting a supportive and facilitative manner and also through being genuinely interested in their learners and their learning processes.

A number of limitations can be considered for this study. First, the number of the participants could have been larger. However, the researchers had to limit themselves to this number due to practical restrictions and the lengthy process of training. A second limitation of the present study concerns the level of the participants. This study included merely Intermediate students. Other level students were not incorporated into the study.

References

- Alemi, M., Tajeddin, Z. & Mesbah Z. (2013). Willingness to communicate in L2 English: Impact of Learner Variables. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 4 (1), 42-61.
- Ashmore, R. (1999). Heron's intervention framework: An introduction and critique. *Mental Health Nursing*, 19(1), 24-27.
- Cao, Y., & Philip J. (2006). Interactional context and willingness to communicate: a comparison of behavior in whole class, group and dyadic interaction. *System*, 34 (2006), 480-493.
- Chambers, M., & Long, A. (1995). Supportive clinical supervision: A crucible for personal and professional change. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 2(5), 311-316. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2850.1995.tb00097.x>
- Cutcliffe, J., & Epling, M. (1997). An exploration of the use of John Heron's confronting interventions in clinical supervision: Case studies from practice. *Psychiatric Care*, 4(4), 174-180.
- de Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2005). *Second language acquisition: An advanced resource book*. USA: Routledge.
- Dornyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667138>
- Edwards, A. D., & Westgate, D. P. G. (1987). *Investigating classroom talk*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Ellis, R. (1999). (Ed.). *Learning a second language through interaction*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: OUP.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2002). *Classroom discourse: An introduction*. Singapore: National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University.
- Fowler, J. (1996). Clinical supervision: What do you do after you say hello? *British Journal of Nursing*, 5(6), 382-385. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12968/bjon.1996.5.6.382>
- Galadja, D. (2012). Teacher's zone of action in facilitating group dynamics. *LINGVARM ARENA*, 3, 89-101.
- Heron, J. (1976). A six-category intervention analysis. *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 4(2), 143-155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03069887608256308>
- Heron, J. (2001). *Helping the client: A creative practical guide* (5th ed.). London: Sage Publication.

- Lai, W. (2012). Concept-based foreign language pedagogy: Teaching the Chinese temporal system (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA).
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. (2006). Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development. Oxford: Oxford University Press. www.ccsenet.org/ijel *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(1), 2016-98.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). Chaos/complexity science and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(2), 141-165.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lengeling, M. M. (2011). Past, present, and future of second language acquisition: An interview with Rod Ellis. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 35(1), 1-7.
- MacIntyre, P.D., Burns, C., & Jessome, A. (2011). Ambivalence about communicating in a second language: a qualitative study of French immersion learners' willingness to communicate. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95 (1) (2011), 81-96.
- Maggioli, G. E. (2012). *Teaching language teachers: Scaffolding professional learning*. UK: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Negueruela, E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2006). Concept-based pedagogy and the acquisition of L2 Spanish. In R. M. Salaberry & B. A. Lafford (Eds.), *The art of teaching Spanish: Second language acquisition from research to praxis* (pp. 79-102). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Sloan, G., & Watson, H. (2001). John Heron's Six Category Intervention Analysis: Towards understanding interpersonal relations and progressing the delivery of clinical supervision for mental health nursing in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 36(2), 206-214. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2001.01961.x>
- Sloan, G., & Watson, H. (2002). Clinical supervision models for nursing: Structure, research and limitations. *Nursing Standard*, 17(4), 41-46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7748/ns2002.10.17.4.41.c3279>
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Socio-cultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Compernelle, R. A. (2011). Developing second language sociopragmatic knowledge through concept-based instruction: A microgenetic case study. *Journal of pragmatics*, 43, 3268-3283. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2011.06.009
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wen, W.P. and Clement, R. (2003) A Chinese conceptualization of willingness to communicate in ESL. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 16 (1) (2003), 18-38.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix A: Willingness to Communicate Scale (MacIntyre, et al., 2001)

		Almost never willing	Sometimes willing	Willing half of the time	Usually willing	Almost always willing
1	Speaking in a group about your summer vacation					
2	Speaking to your teacher about 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 rules of your favorite game.					
8	Play a game in English					
9	Read a novel					
10	Read an article in a paper					
11	Read letters from a pen pal written in English					
12	Read personal letters or notes written to you in in which the writer has deliberately used simple words and constructions					
13	Read an advertisement in the paper to find something you can buy					
14	Read reviews for popular movies					
15	Write an advertisement to sell an old bike					
16	Write down the instructions for your favorite hobby					
17	Write a report on your favorite animal and its habits					
18	Write a story					
19	Write a letter to a friend					
20	Write a newspaper article					
21	Write the answers to a fun quiz from a magazine					
22	Write down a list of things you must do tomorrow					
23	Listen to instructions and complete a task.					
24	Bake a cake if instructions were in English.					
25	Fill out an application form.					
26	Take directions from a English speaker.					
27	Understand a English movie.					

Appendix two: Lesson plan

Lesson plan	
Subject/ course	Conversation class
Lesson title	Last weekend
Level	Sophomore university students
Teacher's name	Mohammad Ali Yaghchi
Lesson objectives	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The students are supposed to develop their speaking accuracy. 2. The students will master the new words related to topic under discussion. 3. The students will become highly involved in conversational activities. 4. The students will be able to use the new words in new contexts. 5. The students will be able to answer the follow-up questions. 	
	Materials <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. American English File (Unit four: Last Weekend) 2. Oxford Learner's Dictionary
Time Allocated	Activities
5 minutes	Warm- up Small talks about the students' academic and social lives
10 minutes	Review <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will be encouraged to use what they have been taught in the previous lesson. 2. The students' attention will be focused on the objectives of the new lesson. 3. The students will be motivated to focus on the lesson.
35 minutes	Presentation A lecture including the following sections will be delivered. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pre – lecture activities such as topic introduction, warm –up questions, etc. 2. The lecture itself focusing on the topic of the unit. 3. Post – lecture activities including motivating students to become actively involved in the follow-up tasks pertaining to the unit.
5 minutes	Break
15 minutes	Follow- up tasks <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In pairs, the students will be required to discuss the topic of the lesson once more. 2. The students will be asked to make use of the vocabulary presented in the lecture.
15 minutes	Evaluation At the end of the session, the students' performances will be evaluated based on the accuracy of their utterances.
5 Minutes	Homework <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The information included in the lesson will be reviewed again. 2. Some tasks will be assigned to be done at home as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. The students will be required to go through the unit again. B. The students will be asked to listen to topic- related audiobooks

