Research Article 10.30495/JAL.2019.671932

EFL Teachers' Pedagogic Strategies and Students' Willingness to Communicate: Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions

Nahid Zarei [1], Mahnaz Saeidi[2*], Saeideh Ahangari[3]

1,2,3. Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran
*Corresponding author: m_saeidi@iaut.ac.ir; mnsaeidi@yahoo.ca
(Received: 2019/4/13; Accepted: 2019/8/25)

Online publication: 2020/3/18

Abstract

This study explored both teachers' and learners' perceptions of teachers' pedagogic strategies which may engender willingness to communicate (WTC) in an English as a foreign language class and the difference between their perceptions to detect how convergent or possibly how divergent these are. The project used a convenience sample of 300 students taking an intermediate English course and their teachers (N=60) in several English Language Institutes in Tabriz, Iran. The instruments included a Likert scale questionnaire on teachers' pedagogic strategies and learners' WTC completed by both teachers and learners. Based on the data collected from the questionnaires, it was revealed that the teachers and learners agreed on the role of teachers' wait time in learners' WTC but not on the other strategies such as motivating strategies, error correction strategies, and teachers' congruence. The findings of the study have important implications for teachers in terms of reconsidering their pedagogic strategies to play their facilitating roles in engendering students' WTC in the class. The results also have the implications for EFL teacher education in the new era of communication.

Keywords: willingness to communicate, pedagogic strategies, perception

Introduction

Enhancing learners' ability to communicate in L2 has been underscored by the recent approaches to second language learning because it is believed that performance promotes competence (Long, 1996; Swain, 2000). This emphasis has highlighted the importance of willingness to communicate (WTC).

WTC, as one of the learner characteristics, was developed in the early 1990s in L1 studies (McCroskey & Baer, 1985) as a fairly stable personality trait; however, it was adapted by MacIntyre (1994) for L2 studies as a situated construct including both state and linguistic characteristics. MacIntyre, Dornyei, Clement and Noles (1998) defined the construct as the individual's "readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2" (p. 547). WTC has played a determining role in second language acquisition because it may provide a chance of interaction not only in an EFL class but also in real life situations. As MacIntyre et al. (1998) argue, learners' competence does not guarantee their actual use of the language. As a result, they suggest that "the main goal of second language should be to produce students who are willing to use the language for authentic communication" (p. 589). In fact, "WTC is a means and end at the same time" (Dornyei, 2005, p. 210). However, many language learners choose reticence over communication in EFL classrooms in spite of being extroverted and competent. Therefore, besides learner internal factors, temporal or situational factors may also affect learners' decision to talk or keep reticent (Batstone, 2010; Joe, Hiver, & Al-Hoorie, 2017; Kramsch, 2008; Larsen-Freeman, 2015). The goal of this study, then, is to delve into the factors residing in the immediate classroom situation on top of which lie teachers' pedagogic strategies. Pedagogic strategies are procedures that help a teacher behave and act in the classroom in a certain way to present the material efficiently (Feinman-Nemser & Flodden, 1986; Shulman, 1986, 1987 as cited in Gatbonton, 2000). In this study, pedagogic strategies refer to those strategies that aid teachers in imparting materials, including the knowledge of managing specific language items to facilitate learning and the knowledge about techniques. Some of these strategis are teachers' error correction, wait time, and their cognitive congruence or ability of adaptation.

Error correction is a common strategy used by teachers in different ways. Although some SLA theories (Krashen, 1982; 1985) maintained that corrective feedback (CF) does not facilitate L2 learning, others found it as a determinig factor in second language acquisition (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Ellis, 2010; Erlam, 2008; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Another point of controversy is over the type of CF especially in oral commuincation that whether it should be provided right away or be put off for a later time. In some studies, (e.g., Kaivanpanah, Alavi, & Sepehrinia, 2015; Katayama, 2007; Rahimi & Zhang, 2016; Yoshida, 2008) it was discovered that Iranian and Japanese EFL learners preferred metalinguistic and recasts types of CF. Kaivanpanah et al.'s (2015) findings did not reveal any difference between immediate and delayed CF in oral commuincation; however, the results of Rahimi and Zang's (2016) study revealed that both high- and low- anxiety Iranian EFL learners found immediate corrective feedback as the most effective. In fact, Rahimi and Zang's study is in line with Mackey's (2007) view that effective CF is provided as soon as the learner makes error.

Another teaching strategy which may affect students' performance in the classroom is teachers' wait time. Tobin (1987) defined wait time as the silent pause during a teacher's and student's verbal interaction. Rowe (1986) stated that teachers wait approximately 0.9 seconds for a student to react after beginnig a question. If the student does not respond during this time, the teacher may answer the question or address it to another student. Research findings show a positive correlation between teachers' wait time and students' voluntary responses, self-confidence, the number of student questions, and a weak chance of failure to react (Rowe, 1986).

Congnitive congruence refers to an instructor's ability to convey the message for learners in a comprehensible language, and presenting the material in a language used by students (Schmidt & Moust, 1995). Proposing the input hypothesis, Krashen (1985) also claimed that for second language acquisition the presence of comprehensible input is both enough and determining. He believed that if learners are at stage "i" in their language development, they can understand input containing i+1. Of course, several ways in which input could be comprehensible to the learner were proposed and investigated such as clarification requests and comprehension

checks (Long, 1983). In discussing teachers' pedagogic knowledge, Gatbonton (2000) also noted that providing input does not sufficie. It must be accentuated, adapted, written on the board and modeled. It also has to be made available to all, and illustrated with examples.

Teachers are also expected to be motivating and encouraging enuogh to further their pupils interest in the subject matter and their active participation. Lewin (1951) put forward two types of forces to describe motivational issues in Field Theory: (a) driving forces (what motivates people froward toward their goal) and (b) restraining forces (what restrains people from achieving a goal). Lewin observed that decreasing the restraining forces modifies a person's actions more easily than increasing the driving forces. Both these observations and the pyramid model for L2 communication, underscore the dynamism which underlies WTC, and help us understand the nature of the constraints imposed on action in situ.

There is a large volume of published studies describing the role of situational variables in WTC. Cao and Philip (2006) found several factors perceived to influence WTC in classroom context. These factors were group size, self-confidence, familiarity with the interlocutor, interlocutor participation, degree of topic preparation, cultural backgrounds, and medium of communication. Their research results are in line with the notion of willingness to communicate in other research (Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; Kang, 2005). In the same vein, based on the interview and journal entry data, Cao (2012) found that the prevalent factors reported by learners can be categorized into three environmental, individual, and linguistic dimensions some of which had already been confirmed in a research conducted by de Saint Léger and Storch (2009) too. Similarly, applying Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecosystem model, Peng (2012) studied classroom environment at the microsystem level. His findings indicated that classroom atmosphere i.e., moods, emotions or climate influenced the learners' WTC. He reported teacher factors such as methods, teaching styles, classroom procedures, teacher's humor, support and immediacy contribute to WTC in addition to other factors like learning tasks and contextual factors. González and McDonough (2015) investigated the relationship between the instructors' elicitation techniques, evaluative or non-evaluative, and students' talk in the classroom. Their findings, through conversation group discussions, showed

that non-evaluative elicitation techniques affected the language production of the speakers more than evaluative techniques. Bernales (2016) conducted a mixed method design study to investigate L2 use and classroom participation practices of German-as-foreign language learners, their predictions and expectations regarding their own participation during the foreign language class and the reasons behind their own actions according to their own accounts. His results of the study revealed that a combination of factors involved in the learners' WTC such as alignment with the classroom norms, the teachers' expectations, students' speaking goals and motivation among others. Joe et al. (2017), using structural equation modeling, studied the relation between three theoretical frameworks- classroom social climate, self-determination theory, and L2 WTC in a formal secondary school in Korea. Their findings highlighted the impact the classroom environment exerted on WTC and learning outcomes. Applying correlation analyses followed by multiple regression analyses, Dewaele and Dewaele (2018) studied learner-internal and learner external factors as predictors of WTC in FL classroom. Their results showed that the strongest predictors of WTC were FL classroom anxiety, frequent FL use by the teacher, a positive attitude towards the FL (a neglected macro intergroup dimension in recent research), followed by high levels of social FL Enjoyment and age.

Although, previous studies have examined EFL teachers' role as one of the determining factors of classroom context in encouraging learners' WTC, they have mostly investigated it among other factors; besides, most of them have taken merely learners' points of view into consideration and teachers' points of view have been neglected. Therefore, studying both the learners' and teachers' views on teachers' strategies which encourage WTC in the classroom at the same time can show us how convergent or possibly how divergent these are. Consequently, the least that can be done would be briefing the teachers and providing the necessary information which in the long run may lead to training more active learners who seek an opportunity to use L2.

As a result, this study set out to answer the following question:

Is there a significant difference between the EFL teachers' and learners' perception regarding teachers' pedagogic strategies which engender WTC?

Method

Participants

In the present study, the participants included both English teachers and learners. As the study consisted of two phases, pilot and main, two groups of participants participated in the study. The sampling in both the pilot and main was non-probability convenience sampling (Dornyei, 2007).

Participants of the pilot study

Teachers: Twenty Iranian female EFL teachers teaching at an intermediate level were selected from three English Institutes in Tabriz, Iran. They had 5-12 years of teaching experience within the age range of 28- 35 (M=31.95). Their native language was Turkish and their second language was Persian. Eight of them had a B.A and the other twelve held a Master in TESOL.

Learners: Sixty Iranian female EFL learners taking general English courses were selected from the above mentioned teachers' classes (three students from each class). They were within the age range of 16-21 (M=17.16). Fifty one of them were junior and senior high school students and the rest were college students. All of them spoke Turkish as their native language except three whose language was Persian. They came from middle and high social classes.

Participants of the main study

Teachers: Sixty Iranian female EFL teachers teaching at intermediate level were selected from six English institutes in Tabriz, Iran. They had 10-22 years of teaching experience within the age range of 32-44 (M=35.98). The researchers preferred experienced over novice teachers believing that they would be more competent and experienced and better contribute to the research.

Learners: Five Iranian female students, totally 300 learners, were selected from each teachers' class to respond to the questionnaire. The students spoke Turkish and Persian and were mostly high school (N= 211) or university students (N=52) and the rest were graduate students or homemakers. They came from high or middle-class social background with the age range of 15-24 (M=18.06). They were taking a general English course at the intermediate level in English Institutes. The researchers selected the students from intermediate levels so that they would be proficient enough to participate in class activities. Furthermore, learners in

intermediate level have developed enough skills; therefore, teachers can select activities that release control to the learner (Murray & Christison, 2011) and give them chance to participate in the classroom.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was used to be completed by both the teachers and learners to obtain the data needed.

Questionnaires

As there were no questionnaires available addressing teachers' pedagogic strategies, items from different previously made and validated questionnaires (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008; Saeidi & Jabbarpour, 2011) and previous studies (Korthagen, Attema-Noordewier, & Zwart, 2014; Meijer, Korthagen, & Vasalos, 2009; O'Connor, 2008; Rotgans & Schmidt, 2011; Schmidt & Moust, 1995; Zarrinabadi, 2014) were used. In addition, Dornyei (2005) was consulted regarding construction and organization. They were also modified by the researcher to better attain the aim of the present research. Modifications were not only based on the research goal and questions but also the review of the literature concerning teachers' pedagogic strategies. The questionnaires administered to students were translated to Persian as recommended by Dörnyei and Csizér (2012) believing that "the quality of obtained data improves if the questionnaire is presented in the respondents' own mother tongue" (p.79) because it would eliminate the probability of any erroneous responses due to miscomprehension or lack of comprehension of the questions on the part of the students. To ensure the equivalence of the two versions a bilingual external reviewer (a colleague whose major was translation) was consulted (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012).

The following questionnaires were utilized to collect data from teachers and students:

1. Teachers' questionnaire: A multi-scale questionnaire, entitled Teachers' ideas about pedagogic strategies which engender WTC in intermediate learners in the classroom, was utilized to be completed by teachers regarding pedagogic strategies that engender WTC in learners. Teachers' pedagogic strategies comprised motivating students to become involved, teachers' congruence (adaptability), teachers' error correction strategies and

wait time. Furthermore, some negatively worded questions (see Appendix) were included to prevent a "response set in which the respondents mark only one side of a rating scale, and reduce the harmful effects of the acquiescence bias" (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009, p. 44). The questionnaire was piloted for validation purposes.

2. Students' questionnaire: The translated and modified form of the above mentioned questionnaire, with the change of point of view, entitled Learners' ideas about pedagogic strategies which engender WTC in intermediate learners in the classroom, was used to explore learners' perceptions of factors contributing to learners' WTC. The questionnaire was piloted for validation purposes.

Procedure

As the study consisted of two phases, pilot and main, each of them will be explained and discussed consecutively.

Pilot study

To improve reliability in the present study, the instruments and data collection procedures were completely tested in a pilot study with students and teachers, who were comparable to the sample population of the actual study in an effort to detect any problems, to try to eradicate them before the main study (A Mackey & Gass, 2005), and to adapt the procedure on the basis of new information (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). This early step in the research process is "an important means of assessing the feasibility and usefulness of the data collection methods and making any necessary revisions before they are used with the research participants" (A Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 43). In this section, the steps taken in piloting the instruments, the 25-item teachers' questionnaire and 25- item students' questionnaire and their results will be explicated.

Piloting teachers' questionnaire

To ensure the reliability of the questionnaire, teachers' questionnaire was piloted to detect whether the questions were relevant and clear, the instructions were comprehensible, and the time required to respond to the questions was sufficient (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989).

The 25-item questionnaire was administered to 20 teachers in four different English Institutes. Before administering the questionnaire, the researcher secured the consent of the principals and teachers a week ago.

The teachers answered the questionnaire at the presence of the researcher in 15min. The presence of the researcher is recommended to address any ambiguity relating to the design of the questionnaire. In addition, it increases the rate of responses provided; it also guarantees completion and filling of the questions correctly (Cohen et al., 2000). After the questionnaires were completed, it was found that the wording of some items was confusing, so they were reworded. No problem was detected with the time of administration and answering the questionnaire.

Piloting students' questionnaires

A 25-item translated questionnaire was given to 60 intermediate EFL learners in the above mentioned teachers' classes. Permission from the principle and teachers to administer the questionnaire was obtained. The questionnaire was given in the middle of the term to allow adequate time for students to gain familiarity with their teachers' pedagogic strategies. Needing three students for the questionnaire in each class, we asked volunteers to fill in the questionnaire. It was administered at the end of the class by the researcher herself and it took 25min for students to complete it. The participant students were guided through the questions if they had any problems.

Main Study

Having piloted the instruments and removing the problematic points, the researcher conducted the main study.

Teachers' questionnaire

Some of the questions in the teachers' questionnaire were reworded and the format was modified slightly to facilitate understanding and responding. The questionnare was administered to 60 teachers teaching at intermediate level in six English institutes. The same procedure as the pilot study was adopted to administer the questionnaire.

Students' questionnaire

There were no changes in students' questionnaire in the main study. The questionnaire was administered to 300 students in six institutes in the above mentioned teachers' classes. The same procedures were followed to distribute the questionnaire. It took 25min for the students to complete it.

Results

In this study, an unpaired (independent) t-test was conducted to answer the research question which was addressing the difference between teachers' and learners' perception regarding teachers' pedagogic strategies and students' WTC. Cronbach Alpha, regarded to be a measure of scale of reliability, was used to measure the internal consistency in both teachers' and students'questionnaires in the pilot study. Although Nunnaly (1977) has indicated 0.7 to be an acceptable reliability coefficient, lower thresholds are sometimes used in the literature.

Reliability and Validity

The items were checked with the second and third author for content validity; in addition, the literature was consulted to make sure the instrument was measuring what it had been designed for. Furthermore, the translated form was back translated by the second author and checked by the third author. As the questionnaire was a "made-to-measure" research instrument that was developed for our specific purpose, and there were no resources and opportunities for elaborate validation exercises, we endeavored to measure its internal consistency as recommended by (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009). Therefore, Cronbach's Alpha was run to detect the reliability of questionnaires (i.e., the internal consistency across individual items on a data collection instruments) (see Table 1).

Table 1

Examination of Reliability in Teachers' Questionnaire: Teachers' Ideas about Pedagogic Strategies which Engender WTC in Intermediate Learners in the Classroom

		Item	Case	Cronbach's Alpha
Teachers' Pedagogic Strategies	Motivating students to get involved	8	20	0.796
	Teacher's congruence	2	20	0.608
	Teacher's error correction	3	20	0.766
	Teacher's wait time	3	20	0.862
Total		16	20	.762

The results of the analysis revealed that Cronbach Alpha exceeded .7 in all variables except teachers' adaptability, which indicate that the items were reliable to question teachers' ideas about what pedagogic strategies engendered WTC at their intermediate EFL learners. The total score for the reliability of this questionnaire is .76.

To assess teachers' motivating strategies, eight items from previous research (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008) were measured (e.g., I use innovative strategies to teach). The Cronbach's α for teachers' motivating strategies was .86. To assess teachers' congruence, twelve items from Rotgans and Schmidt (2011) were measured (e.g., I try to tune in to students and discuss issues in a way they understand). The Cronbach's α for teachers' congruence was .79. To assess teachers' error correction strategies, three items from previous studies (Rahimi & Zhang, 2016; Zarrinabadi, 2014) were measured (e.g., I correct the mistakes as whole without addressing individuals' mistakes). The Cronbach's α for teachers' error correction strategies was .72. To assess teachers' wait time, three items from previous studies (Zarrinabadi, 2014) were measured (e.g., I give enough time to students to think and speak). The Cronbach's α for teachers' wait time was .81.

The same procedure was taken to analyze the answers in the students' questionnaire (see Table 2).

Table 2

Examination of Reliability in the Students' Questionnaire: Students' Ideas about Socio-Affective and Pedagogic Strategies Which Engender WTC at Intermediate Learners in the Classroom

		Item	Case	Cronbach's Alpha
Teachers' Pedagogic Strategies	Motivating students to get involved	8	60	0.869
	Teacher's congruence	2	60	0.793
	Teacher's error correction	3	60	0.727
	Teacher's wait time	3	60	0.817
Total		16	60	.785

The results of the analysis revealed that Alpha Cronbach was higher than .7. In all variables, which indicates that the items in the questionnaire properly evaluate the intermediate EFL learners' ideas about the teachers' strategies that stimulate WTC in them. The total score for reliability is .78.

The null hypothesis aimed to determine whether there is a difference between the teachers' and learners' perception regarding pedagogic strategies which engender WTC. The hypothesis claimed that:

H01. There is no difference between the teachers and learners' perception regarding pedagogic strategies which engender WTC?

To test this hypothesis, an independent sample t-test was conducted.

Table 3

The Difference between Teachers' and Learners' Perception Regarding Teachers' Motivating Strategies and Learners' WTC

	N	Mean	SD	SEM	p-value	t-statistic	df	95% CI
Teacher	60	32.25	2.36	0.30	0.0002	3.77	358	[1.89-3.64]
Learners	300	29.48	5.58	0.32				

An independent samples t-test found there was a significant statistical difference between groups, t (358) =3.77, $p \leq 0.0002$. There are therefore good reasons to think teachers (M =32.2, SD =2.3) and learners (M=29.4, SD =5.58) perceive teachers' motivating behavior and learners' WTC differently.

Table 4

The Difference Between Teachers and Learners' Perception Regarding Teachers' Congruence and Learners' WTC

	N	Mean	SD	SEM	p-value	t-statistic	df	95% CI
Teachers	60	7.80	1.05	0.16	0.0025	3.09	358	[-0.89-0.17]
Learners	300	8.30	1.53					

An independent samples t-test found there was a significant statistical difference between groups, t (358) =3.09, p= 0.0161. There are therefore good reasons to think teachers (M =7.80, SD =1.05) and learners (M=8.30, SD =1.53) perceive teachers' congruence and learners' WTC differently. In other words, learners consider teachers' congruence more effective in WTC.

Table 5
The Difference Between Teachers and Learners' Perception Regarding Teachers' Error Correction Strategies and Learners' WTC

	N	Mean	SD	SEM	p-value	t-statistic	df	95% CI
Teachers	60	9.16	1.31	0.16	0.0038	2.91	358	[0.2765-1.4235]
Learners	300	8.13	2.18	0.12				

An independent samples t-test found there was a statistical difference between groups, t (358) = 2.91, p =0.0038. It is, therefore, reasonable to think teachers (M =9.16, SD =1.31) and learners (M=8.13, SD =2.18) do not perceive teachers' error correction strategies equally important in learners' WTC. In other words, teachers consider the role of error correction strategies more effective in learners' WTC.

Table 6
The Difference Between Teachers and learners' perception regarding teachers' wait time and learners' WTC

	N	Mean	SD	SEM	p-value	t-statistic	df	95% CI
Teachers	60	9.13	2.61	0.33	0.07	1.81	358	[-0.0529-1.2929]
Learners	300	8.51	2.38	0.13				

An independent samples t-test found there was no statistical difference between groups, t (358) = 1.81, p =0.07, and the Cohen's d effect size (d = 0.2) was small too. It is, therefore, reasonable to think teachers (M =9.13, SD =2.61) and learners (M=8.51, SD =2.38) perceive teachers' wait time equally important in learners' WTC.

Discussion

This study set out to compare EFL teachers' and learners' perceptions with regard to teachers' pedagogic strategies which may engender learners' WTC in the classroom. As Brown (2009) puts it, "Perceptions do influence reality." Besides, perceptions are changeable, as new experiences and new

insights can affect them. Students' positive perception of what is happening in the class can result in better learning in most cases (Brown, 2009; Kalaja & Barcelos, 2003) and teachers' beliefs and perceptions guide their actions. Therefore, knowing about perceptions of both parties can contribute to forming a more desirable class climate, which may lead to active involvement and better achievement.

Consequently, an independent t-test was conducted to compare these perceptions regarding teachers' pedagogic strategies and learners' WTC. The strategies under study were teachers' motivating strategies, teachers' congruence, teachers' wait time and error correction strategies. The result of the research revealed that the teachers rated motivating strategies higher than the learners believing that teachers' motivating strategies in comparison to other strategies have a more determining role in engendering WTC. These results, considering teachers' beliefs, are in accord with previous studies that there is a relationship between teachers' motivating strategies and learners' WTC and second language acquisition (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008; Joe et al., 2017; Khajavy, MacIntyre, & Barabadi, 2018; Maeng & Lee, 2015). It means, considering the motivating strategies, when teachers encourage class activity involvement, ask open ended questions, evaluate students positively, and use innovative strategies, learners are more willing to participate. When teachers ask referential or open ended questions, students' responses are longer and syntactically more complex (Farooq, 2007; Shomoosi, 2004). In spite of the fact that some studies show language learners do not always answer referential questions (Heaton, Chantrupanth, & Rorex, 2003), teachers can use some techniques to encourage talk. For example, Farooq (2007) observed in his study that teachers modified their questions in the following ways to trigger talk: a) repeating questions; b) offering questions at lower speed of speech; and c) providing students with longer wait time to respond. Furthermore, teachers' stance also plays a determining role in learners' WTC; "When discussing topics in the conversation group settings, the instructors may need to set aside their evaluator role in order to create space for students to express their own opinions and critically engage with each other's ideas" (González & McDonough, 2015, p. 27). In addition, classroom activities should be creative enough to foster talk. As Dewaele (2015) argued if classroom

activities are too rigid and excessively predictable, they may prevent interesting challenges including risk-taking.

Considering teachers' congruence, the learners valued it as more determining. This finding is in agreement with Zarei, Saeidi, and Ahangari's (2019) findings which showed that when the presented lesson is not within the students' comprehension level, learners choose reticence over talk. Therefore, it is suggested that teachers adopt specific adaptation strategies to cater to the learners' needs and encourage WTC. Another finding was that there was a difference between teachers' and learners' perceptions regarding error correction strategies, which means they did not have a consensus on the importance of these strategies in learners' WTC. In fact, the teachers regarded the role of error correction strategies more important in WTC. Therefore, the results pertaining to teachers, unlike learners, are in line with previous studies (Kang, 2005; MacIntyre & Legatto, 2010; Zarrinabadi, 2014). Kang believed that there is a close relationship between learners' feeling of security and teachers' strategies to create a non-threatening environment in case they make a mistake (Kang, 2005). MacIntyre and Legatto (2010) also believed that feedback from the teacher might exert effect on students' WTC. Zarrinabadi (2014), based on a focused essay study, found that when error correction happens in the moment and the teachers' feedback immediately follows the individuals' error, it tends to reduce students' WTC (p. 293).

When it comes to teachers' wait time, there was no difference between the teachers' and learners' perceptions. In other words, the learners and teachers perceived the role of teachers' wait time equally important. These results are consistent with that of Zarrinabadi (2014) in which the students mentioned teachers' wait time as a reason for being communicative and active. Although some teachers may find silence threatening, a sign of weakness or an indication that they are simply 'not doing their job', it, in fact, increases oral fluency and the number of learner responses and results in more complex answers (Walsh, 2002).

In general, on the question of the difference between teachers' and learners' perceptions of teachers' pedagogic strategies and learners' WTC, it was found that except for teachers' wait time, the teachers and the learners

disagreed on the role of motivating strategies, teachers' congruence and error correction strategies. Although it is not feasible to attribute the differences to particular reasons, one possible reason regarding the differences may be that some of the strategies may not be practiced by teachers in the classes; as a result, learners may not feel the effect on their WTC. Also, teachers may not be aware of the strategies which are perceived as facilitating for learners. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers assess their students' perceptions of the strategies they employ in their classes in order to engender WTC among students who usually choose reticence over talk in the class.

In spite of reaching its goal, this research has its own limitations. The participants of the present study were merely female students and teachers; therefore, doing research with male students may render different results because males and females have different learning and communication styles (Tannen, 1992). Besides, this study was undertaken in English Institutes, which usually have more informal atmosphere compared to formal education system in the country. This might affect the pattern of interaction between the teacher and the student and, consequently, students' WTC. Therefore, in terms of directions for future research, further work could be carried out in junior and senior high schools and at universities to get a comprehensive picture of teacher-student interaction and students' WTC in the educational context of Iran. Furthermore, the study can be conducted at other levels other than the intermediate level to make generalization possible for other levels of proficiency. This study was carried out about FL teachers in Iran. Though some teacher characteristics may be true for almost all disciplines, various disciplines within the teaching profession may require discipline dependent characteristics that distinguish teachers from their counterparts in different disciplines. Therefore, a comparative study of FL teachers and other subjects in Iran may also be enlightening. Additionally, to reflect reality of the classroom behavior, a self-reported method of collecting data used in this study does not suffice; therefore, future studies need to adopt additional methods, like videotaping, stimulated recalls and observations of the classroom behavior in collecting data to find whether or not what teachers really practice in the classroom match their perceptions.

References

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.

Batstone, R. (2010). *Sociocognitive perspectives on language use and language learning*: Oxford University Press Oxford.

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

Bernaus, M., & Gardner, R. C. (2008). Teacher motivation strategies, student perceptions, student motivation, and English achievement. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*(3), 387-401.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*: Harvard university press.

Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal, 93*(1), 46-60.

Cao, Y. (2012). Willingness to communicate and communication quality in ESL classrooms. *TESL Reporter, 45*(1), 17-36.

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

Cohen, L., Monion, L., & Morris, K. (2000). *Research methods in education (5th edn)*. London UK and New York: USA. Routeledge Falmer.

de Saint Léger, D., & Storch, N. (2009). Learners' perceptions and attitudes: Implications for willingness to communicate in an L2 classroom. *System, 37*(2), 269-285.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2015). On emotions in foreign language learning and use. *The Language Teacher, 39*(3), 13-15.

Dewaele, J.-M., & Dewaele, L. (2018). Learner-internal and learner-external predictors of Willingness to Communicate in the FL Classroom. *Journal of the European Second Language Association*.

Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learners*. Mahwah, New Jorzy: Laurence Ulbanm Associates.

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

Dornyei, Z., & Csizer, K. (2012). How to design and analyze surveys in second language acquisition research. In Mackey A. & Gass, S. M.

(Eds). *Research methods in second language aquisition*. (pp. 74-94). Uk: Blackwell.

Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Routledge.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114–138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 335-349.

Erlam, R. (2008). What do you researchers know about language teaching? Bridging the gap between SLA research and language pedagogy. *International Journal of Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 2*(3), 253-267.

Farooq, M. (2007). Exploring the effectiveness of spoken English classes of Japanese EFL learners. *The Journal of Liberal Arts, 3*, 35-57.

Gatbonton, E. (2000). Investigating experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 56*(4), 585-616.

González, T. H., & McDonough, K. (2015). The effect of instructor stance on ESL speakers' language production in a conversation group setting. *System, 55*, 21-29.

Heaton, S. L., Chantrupanth, D., & Rorex, P. D. (2003). Thai Uuniversity EFL learners' oral responses to various spoken question types. *Second Language Learning and Teaching, 12*, 19-31.

Joe, H.-K., Hiver, P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2017). Classroom social climate, self-determined motivation, willingness to communicate, and achievement: A study of structural relationships in instructed second language settings. *Learning and Individual Differences, 53*, 133-144.

Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: differences between learners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal, 43*(1), 74-93.

Kalaja, P., & Barcelos, A. M. F. (2003). Conclusion: Exploring possibilities for future research on beliefs about SLA. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA* (pp. 231-238): Springer.

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

Katayama, A. (2007). Japanese EFL students' preferences toward correction of classroom oral errors. *Asian EFL journal, 9*(4), 289-305.

Khajavy, G. H., MacIntyre, P. D., & Barabadi, E. (2018). Role of the emotions and classroom environment in willingness to communicate: Applying doubly latent multilevel analysis in second language acquisition research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 40*(3), 605-624.

Korthagen, F. A., Attema-Noordewier, S., & Zwart, R. C. (2014). Teacher–student contact: Exploring a basic but complicated concept. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 40*, 22-32.

Kramsch, C. (2008). Ecological perspectives on foreign language education. *Language Teaching, 41*(3), 389-408.

Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*: Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015). Saying what we mean: Making a case for 'language acquisition'to become 'language development'. *Language Teaching, 48*(4), 491-505.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science: selected theoretical papers (edited by dorwin cartwright.).

Long, M. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In Ritchie, W., Bhatia, T. (Eds.). *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press.

Long, M. H. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 5*(2), 177-193.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 37-66.

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.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Legatto, J. J. (2010). A dynamic system approach to willingness to communicate: Developing an idiodynamic method to capture rapidly changing affect. *Applied Linguistics, 32*(2), 149-171.

Mackey, A. (2007). *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies*: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawerence Erlbawn Associates: Inc.

Maeng, U., & Lee, S.-M. (2015). EFL teachers' behavior of using motivational strategies: The case of teaching in the Korean context. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 46,* 25-36.

McCroskey, J. C., & Baer, J. E. (1985). Willingness to communicate: The construct and its measurement. In paper presented at the annual convention speech communication association: Denver.

Meijer, P. C., Korthagen, F. A., & Vasalos, A. (2009). Supporting presence in teacher education: The connection between the personal and professional aspects of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(2), 297-308.

Murray, D. E., & Christison, M. (2011). *What English language teachers need to know volume II: Facilitating learning*: Taylor & Francis.

O'Connor, K. E. (2008). "You choose to care": Teachers, emotions and professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(1), 117-126.

Peng, J.-E. (2012). Towards an ecological understanding of willingness to communicate in EFL classrooms in China. *System, 40*(2), 203-213.

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2016). The role of incidental unfocused prompts and recasts in improving English as a foreign language learners' accuracy. *The Language Learning Journal, 44*(2), 257-268.

Rotgans, J. I., & Schmidt, H. G. (2011). The role of teachers in facilitating situational interest in an active-learning classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(1), 37-42.

Rowe, M. B. (1986). Wait time: slowing down may be a way of speeding up! *Journal of teacher education, 37*(1), 43-50.

Saeidi, M., & Jabbarpour, N. (2011). EFL teachers' socio-affective startegy use in relation to studnets' academic achievement. *International Journal of Academic Research, 3*(3).

Schmidt, H. G., & Rotgans, J. I. (2011). The role of teachers in facilitating situational interest in an active-learning classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27,* 37-42.

Seliger, H. W., & Shohamy, E. G. (1989). *Second language research methods*: Oxford University Press.

Shomoosi, N. (2004). The effect of teachers' questioning behavior on EFL classroom interaction: a classroom research study. *The Reading Matrix, 4*(2), 96-104.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: mediating acquisition through collaborative dialoge. In J. Lantolf (Ed,). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp.97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1992). *You just don't understand: Women and men in Conversation*. London: Virago Press.

Tobin, K. (1987). The role of wait time in higher cognitive level learning. *Review of educational research, 57*(1), 69-95.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 6*(1), 3-23.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language awareness, 17*(1), 78-93.

Zarei, N., Saeidi, M., & Ahangari, S. (2019). Exploring EFL Teachers' Socioaffective and Pedagogic Strategies and Students' Willingness to Communicate with a Focus on Iranian Culture. *Education Research International, 2019.*

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

Appendix A

Teachers' ideas about socio-affective and pedagogic strategies which engender willingness to communicate in intermediate learners in the classroom

Dear colleague, we would like to ask you to help us by answering the following questions concerning *teachers' ideas about socio-affective and pedagogic strategies which engender willingness to communicate in learners in the classroom*. This is not a test so there are no "right" or "wrong" answers and you don't even have to write your name on it. We are interested in your personal opinion. Please give your answers sincerely as only this will guarantee the success of the investigation. **Thank you very much for your help.**

	My **intermediate** students are more willing to communicate when…..	**Strongly agree**	Agree	**Neither agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly disagre**
	Motivating Strategies					
1.	I speak English in class.					
2.	I ask yes/no questions.*					

3.	I ask open-ended questions to encourage talk.					
4.	I make an exception for some students about class rules.*					
5.	I do warm-up for the new lesson.					
6.	I avoid being the only speaker.					
7.	I involve all students in class activities by addressing them.					
8.	I evaluate the students positively.					
9.	I ignore the students' ideas about the points raised in the class.*					
10.	I award the students' right answer.					
11.	I use innovative strategies to teach.					
12.	I evaluate the students negatively.*					
13.	I teach in the first language.*					
	Teachers' Congruence					
14.	I speak eloquently and simply enough for the students to understand.					
15.	I present the material without adapting it to the students' level.*					
16.	I try to tune in to students and discuss issues in a way they understand.					
	Error Correction Strategies					
17.	I do not blame the students for making a mistake.					
18.	I correct them in the middle of the communication activity.*					
19.	I correct them after the activity.					

20.	I correct the mistakes as a whole without addressing individuals' mistakes.					
	Teachers' Wait Time					
21.	I listen to the students attentively and patiently.					
22.	I expect a quick answer.*					
23.	I give enough time to the students to think and speak.					
24.	I wait some minutes so that the students can prepare their answers.					
25.	I wait for the response as soon as a topic is introduced.*					

*Presumed to be a negatively worded item.

Biodata

Mahnaz Saeidi, an Associate professor of Applied Linguistics at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Tabriz, Iran, is the editor-in-chief of the Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice. She has published many books and articles and presented papers in national and international conferences. Her research interests are teacher education and intercultural competence.

Saeideh Ahangari is an assistant professor of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch. Her main interests are task-based language teaching and language testing. She has published and presented a number of papers in different international journals and conferences.

Nahid Zarei is a Lecturer at Islamic Azad University, Maragheh Branch and Ph.D in TESOL. She has presented a number of papers in international conferences. Her main interests are classroom strategies and teacher education.