Research Paper

Comparative Effect of Authoritative vs. Facilitative Virtual Intervention Models on the Development of SL Speaking Components of Iranian EFL Learners

Zohreh Darabi[1], Nasim Shangarffam[2*], Ahmad Mohseni[3]

[1]Department of English, Tehran Central Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
[2]Department of English, Tehran Central Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran. Iran
[3]Department of English, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to explore the relative effects of authoritative and facilitative virtual intervention models on the development of speaking skills in second languages among Iranian EFL learners. Participants in the study were 60 male and female intermediate EFL learners from Imam Reza University in Mashhad. These students were selected from a larger pool of 80 participants who completed a standard Preliminary English Test (PET) as a language competency test. The PET is a standard language competence test. After that, the participants were given a general speaking pre-test and then were randomly divided into two groups that would participate in the experiment. After that, an authoritative intervention was given to one of the experimental groups, whereas a facilitative intervention was given to the other group. Following ten sessions of treatment, the individuals were given the post-tests, which consisted of the speaking portion of a different version of the PET. At last, the students took part in an interview that was only partially structured. The quantitative data were analyzed through the utilization of SPSS, and the results were analyzed by a number of t-tests and MANOVA procedures. The results of quantitative studies showed that the Facilitative Intervention (FI) model was more effective than the Authoritative Intervention (AI) model for the development of L2 speaking skills among Iranian students of English as a foreign language. One such factor that contributed to the variability was the emphasis placed on grammatical correctness when evaluating L2 speech. The AI group placed a greater emphasis on grammatical errors and pronunciation. In contrast, the FI group placed a greater emphasis on lexical resources and pronunciation, followed by discourse management and interactive communication.

Keywords: Authoritative Intervention; Facilitative Intervention; Iranian EFL Learners; L2 Speaking Components

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is without a doubt one of the most important language skills that are required for both language acquisition and teaching. Learners of a language, on the other hand, frequently express their frustration at the difficulty and demand posed by appropriate speech. Since the beginning of time, one of the most difficult challenges that educators have is helping pupils

*Corresponding Author's Email:
nshangarf@yahoo.com

improve their oral communication skills and fostering their growth as active, engaged participants in the process of language acquisition (Baker, 2015). As a result of this, a number of studies have been conducted on the strategies that can assist EFL students in gaining mastery of speaking skill and their components (Astituk, 2019; Manan & Ezmir, 2020; Mirahmadi & Alavi, 2016; Riberio & Jiang, 2020). However, as Kumaravadivelu (2003) correctly stated, there

is no single strategy that can be considered the best. Approaches to the teaching of speaking in ELT have been more strongly influenced by innovative teaching methods such as desuggestopedia, counseling learning, and cognitive code models than approaches to the teaching of other L2 skills (Ivashkevych & Antyukhova, 2021; Poss, 2021), and the notion of intervention, which is contained within the counseling learning theory (Heron, 1976), has been proposed as one of the methods which can improve L2 speaking skill among EFL learners (Ell Chambers and Long (1995), Cutcliffe and Epling (1997), Fowler (1996), and Yaghchi et al. (2016) all take a specific position with regard to the attention that the 6-category intervention model presented by Heron (1976), which was revised in Heron (2001), pays to interpersonal skills and their promotion. This model is one of the approaches to teaching L2 speaking. Heron (1976) and Heron (2001) both presented revisions of this model. The influence of Heron's 6-category intervention model on EFL learners' speaking performance is a novel study issue in the Iranian setting; despite this, the model has been around for a while.

Heron's intervention model, being initially grounded on counseling and clinical supervision studies, has been used to educate and train experts in health-related fields, and progressively, it has found its way to the ELT context (Asaei & Rahimi, 2021; Hamid & Azman, 1992; Ivashkevych & Antyukhova, 2021; Yaghchi et al., 2016; Yurekli, 2013). It is presumed that the groundwork for increasing counseling learning is laid by the two major types of authoritative (including confronting, instructive, and prescriptive) intervention models and facilitative (including cathartic, catalytic, and supportive) intervention models.

Many studies have reported on the success of internet-based education and virtual training of learners during the time of the COVID-19 pandemic (Shah et al., 2021; Thomas 2020). On the other hand, with the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic, a lot of educational systems all over the world made use of internet-based education and virtual training of learners. In addition, a number of research have reported the success of utilizing facilitative and authoritative virtual intervention models in the clinical studies (Anderson, Perlman, McCarrick & McClintock, 2020 Chambers & Long, 1995; Papageorgiou, 2015; Sloan & Watson 2001, 2002) and educational (Clift, 2021) domains. These studies were conducted in clinical settings.

As a consequence of this, the purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of authoritative versus facilitative virtual intervention models on EFL learners' ability in speaking components and speaking skill. This was done in an effort to associate the concept of virtual learning with an LMS (learning management system). The following research questions were prepared after taking into consideration the issues discussed before as well as the objective of the study.

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between the impacts of the virtual authoritative intervention model and the facilitative intervention model on the growth of the speaking abilities of Iranian EFL students?

2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the effects of virtual authoritative versus facilitative intervention models on the development of speaking components (grammatical resource, lexical resource, discourse management, pronunciation, and interactive communication) of Iranian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Learners?

3. What are the perspectives of Iranian EFL learners regarding the impact of authoritative versus facilitative intervention strategies on the speaking components of their second language?

The importance of carrying out this research and locating responses to these issues can be seen from a variety of vantage points. To begin, the implementation of Heron's facilitative and authoritative intervention models in teaching as a kind of supervisory feedback has been found to be effective in the promotion of learners' interpersonal skills in the clinical setting. Second, when it comes to English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL),

the most crucial of the four linguistic abilities is speaking. In conclusion, those involved in the production of instructional materials, teaching foreign languages, and students of English as a foreign language (EFL) stand to gain from the findings of the current research and stand to benefit from the incorporation of facilitative and authoritative intervention types into ELT environments.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Speaking is widely regarded as one of the most important skills for students of foreign languages to develop. This is due to the fact that the majority of students choose to study a foreign language in order to improve their comprehension and spoken communication skills with native speakers. According to Albino (2017), the act of speaking requires multiple degrees of linguistic complexity, including phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and discourse levels. Learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) need to be able to both comprehend and produce appropriate language because failure to do so can leave both the speaker and the listener feeling irritated or confused (Rabab'ah & Rumman, 2015).

It would be difficult for students to build their speaking abilities in a foreign language setting when they require more opportunities for authentic communication in the language they are learning (Toro, Camacho-Minuche, Pinza-Tapia, & Paredes, 2019). As a result, numerous intervention programs have been established to assist students in the development of their speaking abilities. One of them is an intervention that is both authoritative and facilitative.

The majority of intervention studies that are considered authoritative and helpful focus on clinical principles (Chambers & Kantaris, 2017; Papageorgiou, 2015; Suikkala et al., 2020, 2021). However, educationists also used supervisory models of teaching and learning in their research. This was done in order to better understand education. For instance, Mitchell and Butler (2021) discovered that multicultural integrated supervision models have the potential to improve intersectional identity in supervision. In addition

to this, Parlamis and Dibble (2019) discovered that supervisory teaming and increasing communication through supervisory and counseling models can have a considerable impact on learners' performance in the management domain. Additionally, face-to-face teams reported excellent marketing achievements while their supervisory models were in effect. In addition, Flood and Romm (2018) discovered that facilitative intervention can strengthen the staff and learners' commitment to the educational centers' ideals, which in turn fosters responsible decision-making and social transformation in their research of power relations in schools and educational centers.

Rakhshan and Yazdani Moghaddam (2015) showed that Heron's counseling perspectives can be applied in intervention analysis as an innovative approach of teaching reading comprehension. Their research was conducted in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT). In addition to this, they reported that the facilitative teaching paradigm had a beneficial influence on the enhancement of dynamic assessment.

In the meanwhile, researchers looked into how learners of English as a foreign language reacted to authoritative and facilitative interventions designed to increase their readiness to speak. According to the findings, the performance of the facilitative group changed significantly, and the group's overall performance was superior to that of the authoritative intervention group (Yaghchi et al., 2016).

In a manner analogous to this, Smith and Lewis (2017) improved the standard of TEFL instructors' professional growth through the utilization of facilitative mentorship. In a similar vein, Nekoda (2020) was able to find that supervisory conferences held between students and teachers after classroom sessions had a favorable influence on their reflections when they were participating in teacher training workshops. In addition, Ivashkevich and Antyukhova (2021) used innovative ideas of facilitative intervention and teaching in order to increase the speaking capacity of young students of English as a foreign language in Russia. The author came to the conclusion that the majority of the investigations

that were presented were of a descriptive and limited nature based on the data acquired from a variety of articles. Literacy, clinical concerns, nursing, mathematics, and science are highlighted more prominently in the more significant parts of these investigations.

In addition, it was recognized that despite the fact that a number of investigations have been conducted to investigate the role of Heron's (1976, 2001) intervention types in the teacher education and ELT domain (Ashmore, 1999; Chambers & Long, 1995; Cutcliffe & Epling, 1997; Fowler, 1996; Hamid & Azman, 1992; Melissa et al., 2015; Yaghchi et al., 2016; Yurekli, 2013), only The current research is an attempt to fill in some of these knowledge gaps.

METHODOLOGY
Design
This study is a mixed-method one. In the quantitative phase, there were pre-tests, interventions and post-tests, while in the qualitative part, some questions were asked to find the feelings and reactions of learners to these two types of intervention.

Participants
The participants of the study were 60 intermediate-level male and female students in the age range of 18 to 25 at Imam Reza University in Mashhad. These participants were chosen out of 80 intermediate students according to their performance on a Preliminary English Test (PET) sample. Notably, the participant selection in the present study followed Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) sample selection table, which specifies that out of a population of 80, the researcher should select 66 homogeneous individuals. However, only 60 individuals could meet the criterion, gaining scores within one standard deviation above and below the mean.

Instrumentation
Preliminary English Test (PET) A standardized version of the PET was used to homogenize learners at the intermediate level. This test has four parts containing writing (7 items), reading

(35 items), listening (25 items), and speaking. The four test parts have the same value- 25% each.

The total score is computed by adding all the results together. The administration of the whole test took 120 minutes.

Speaking Pre-test and Post-test
The second instrument in the pre-treatment level was a standard pre-test of speaking extracted from a PET presented in the interview mode. Hence, before the treatments, all participants of the two groups were invited to an oral performance test. The questions and topics aimed at this purpose focused on grammatical resources (accuracy), lexical resources (vocabulary), discourse management, pronunciation, and interactive communication (fluency) of the students as the sub-categories of speaking. This test was given to the participants selected after the pre-test of language proficiency. The results showed how well they were able to speak before the treatment began.

Interview
The third instrument used in the study was a semi-structured interview in order to collect the data related to the EFL participants' views about the effect of authoritative and facilitative intervention types on EFL learners' L2 speaking development. It was developed based on the review of the related literature and consulting with five educational experts who were prominent TEFL Ph.D. holders familiar with learning psychology in order to collect the data related to the EFL participants' views about the effect of authoritative and facilitative intervention types on EFL learners' L2 speaking development. The interview questions were put to the scrutiny of three experts who were Ph.D. holders of TEFL.

They requested to check the content validity of the items in the interview guide, and then, based on their views, some modifications were implemented, and the interview guide was used to collect the data from 10 participants of each experimental group.

The interview questions were as follows:

1. How well did the feedback provided by the teacher help you to improve your speaking?

2. Do you think you can assess your own speaking in terms of grammatical resource, lexical resource, discourse management, pronunciation, and interactive communication in speaking English?

3. What do you think about the method your teacher used in the classroom in the semester just finished?

Materials
The course book used in the present study was the intermediate-level book of *the Touchstone Series*. Units 1 to 4 of book 2 of the series were used in the present study; however, the speaking sections were more emphasized during the treatment sessions.

Data collection procedure
Right after the proficiency test results were finalized and the speaking test was given to the learners in both experimental groups, the intervention process started in the second session. The treatment period was started and continued for ten sessions using the university LMS, a virtually supported system widely used by the university during the COVID-19 pandemic. The students could participate in the classroom discussions, take turns, deliver their mini-lectures, leave comments, and ask questions orally and in writing. The whole semester included 16 weeks, and the learners attended the virtual class once a week, each session lasting for 90 minutes in both groups. Because the syllabus of the course taught at the university had to be covered during this semester, ten sessions of 30 minutes were allocated to the experiment in the experimental groups. The students in the two experimental groups actively participated in the classroom sessions held through the university's Learning Management System (LMS), practicing speaking, covering materials, and receiving online peer and teacher feedback. The application of intervention and its categorization and characterizations based on John Heron's six-category intervention model comprises the most important stage of this research, the treatment.

According to Heron's (2001) model, there were two main intervention categories: authoritative and facilitative.

It is worth mentioning that the classes of both experimental groups received the same hours of instruction and practice. The researcher herself taught both groups. In experimental group I, the Authoritative Intervention Group (AIG), the teacher/researcher continuously checked the learners' understanding and provided timely support based on student responses. Peer and teacher feedback was introduced to increase the amount of supervisory feedback. As AI includes prescriptive, informative, and confronting techniques, these three intervention subcategories and techniques were used to direct EFL learners' behavior by telling them what to follow, like looking up the meaning of the new words in the dictionary, making new sentences, presenting short talks, developing new conversations, informing them about L2 notions in speaking, and helping them widen their views while speaking in English and try to be more informed L2 learners, improve their pronunciation, speak more grammatically, use more meaningful lexicons, and speak more coherent. The experimental group II, the Facilitative Intervention Group (FIG), received supervisory feedback in the cathartic, which intends to "enable the other person to discharge and express painful emotion, usually grief, anger or fear" (p. 6), catalytic which aims to "elicit self-discovery, self-directed learning, and problem-solving" (p. 6, and supportive forms technique aims to "affirm the worth and value of the other person, their qualities, attitudes, and actions" (p.6).

RESULTS
The preliminary research showed that the individuals had similar characteristics before the intervention was carried out. After that, a number of t-tests and MANOVA were carried out in order to locate the solutions to the problems posed by the research.

Investigating the Primary Research Question
In order to investigate the first study question, a comparison of the methods of post-test speaking

used by the facilitative intervention group and the authoritative intervention group was carried out using an independent samples t-test.

Does the growth of Iranian EFL Learners' speaking demonstrate a statistically significant distinction between the effects of virtual authoritative versus facilitative intervention models?

The findings of the descriptive statistics relating to the two groups' performances on the speaking post-test are presented in Table 1. On the post-test of speaking, the results showed that the facilitative group had a higher mean (M = 4.66, SD =.583) than the authoritative group (M = 3.03, SD = 1.18)

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics; Post-test of Speaking by Groups

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post-test of Speaking	FIG	30	4.66	.583	.107
	AIG	30	3.03	1.181	.216

Table 2 displays the results of the independent-sample t-test. Before discussing the results, it should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not retained on the post-test of speaking.

The results of the independent samples t-test; (t (42) = 6.75, p < .05, r = .705 representing a

large effect size) indicated that the facilitative intervention group significantly outperformed the authoritative group on the post-test of speaking. Thus, it can be concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between the effects of authoritative vs. facilitative intervention models on the second language speaking of Iranian EFL Learners".

Table 2

Independent-Samples t-test; Post-test of Speaking by Groups

	Levene's Test for Equality Variances		oft-test for Equality of Means						
								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	14.602	.000	6.75	158	.000	1.623	.240	1.142	2.105
Equal variances not assumed			6.75	142.368	.000	1.623	.240	1.138	2.108

Exploring Second Research Question

A multivariate ANOVA (MANOVA) was run to compare the facilitative and authoritative groups' means on post-tests of speaking components; grammatical resources, lexical resources, discourse management, pronunciation, and

interactive communication to probe the second research question.

Is there a statistically significant difference between the effects of virtual authoritative vs. facilitative intervention models on the development of speaking components (grammatical resource, lexical resource,

discourse management, pronunciation, and interactive communication) of Iranian EFL Learners?

Table 3

Multivariate Tests; Post-tests of Components of Speaking by Groups

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.957	242.077	5	54	.000	.957
	Wilks' Lambda	.043	242.077	5	54	.000	.957
	Hotelling's Trace	22.415	242.077	5	54	.000	.957
	Roy's Largest Root	22.415	242.077	5	54	.000	.957
Group	Pillai's Trace	.640	19.167	5	54	.000	.640
	Wilks' Lambda	.360	19.167	5	54	.000	.640
	Hotelling's Trace	1.775	19.167	5	54	.000	.640
	Roy's Largest Root	1.775	19.167	5	54	.000	.640

Table 4 compares the two groups' means on each of the components of the post-test of speaking. The results indicated that;

A: The facilitative group (M = 4.55) significantly outperformed the authoritative group (M = 3.51) on the post-test of grammatical resources (F (1, 58) = 17.39, p < .05, partial η2 = .231 representing a large effect size.

Table 4

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects; Post-tests of Components of Speaking by Groups

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Group	PostGrammatical	16.017	1	16.017	17.391	.000	.231
	PostLexical	24.704	1	24.704	22.741	.000	.282
	PostDiscourse	70.417	1	70.417	70.701	.000	.549
	PostPronunciation	68.267	1	68.267	51.950	.000	.472
	PostInteractive	32.267	1	32.267	41.696	.000	.418
Error	PostGrammatical	53.417	58	.921			
	PostLexical	63.008	58	1.086			
	PostDiscourse	57.767	58	.996			
	PostPronunciation	76.217	58	1.314			
	PostInteractive	44.883	58	.774			
Total	PostGrammatical	1045.500	60				
	PostLexical	1158.750	60				
	PostDiscourse	913.000	60				
	PostPronunciation	886.500	60				
	PostInteractive	966.500	60				

B: The facilitative group (M = 4.86) significantly outperformed the authoritative group (M = 3.58) on the post-test of lexical resources (F (1, 58) = 22.74, p < .05, partial η2 = .282 representing a large effect size. C: The facilitative group (M = 4.70) significantly

outperformed the authoritative group (M = 2.53) on the post-test of discourse management (F (1, 58) = 70.70, p < .05, partial η2 = .549 representing a large effect size.

D: The facilitative group (M = 4.58) significantly outperformed the authoritative group (M = 2.45) on the post-test of pronunciation (F (1, 58) = 51.95, p < .05, partial η2 = .472 representing a large effect size.

E: The facilitative group (M = 4.58) significantly outperformed the authoritative group (M = 3.11) on the post-test of interactive communication (F (1, 58) = 41.69, p < .05, partial η2 = .418 representing a large effect size.

Exploring the third research question
The third research question was an attempt to delve into the EFL learners' perceptions about the impact of authoritative vs. facilitative intervention models on the L2 speaking components of Iranian EFL Learners. The students of the two interviewed groups mentioned some significant points concerning the positive points of previous methods and techniques they experienced in their respective instructional types in the current study. They are presented in Table 10 below.

Table 5

Students' Views about Positive / Negative Points of the Methods Just Received

No.	Views	Frequency (*f*)		Percentage	
1		FIG.	AIG.	FIG.	AIG.
2	The class was very friendly	10	6	100%	60%
	Motivating students to go on	10	5	100%	50%
3	Using films, clips, and teaching aids	10	4	100%	40%
	Emphasizing L2 speaking	10	7	100%	70%
4	Making students work hard	10	7	100%	70%

The learners in the facilitative intervention model group expressed that the classroom was undeniably pleasant compared to the previous classes and methods. Also, they mentioned that the information and materials they could obtain during the semester was more than what they had gained in the earlier semesters. In addition, they felt highly interested in the classroom and could join the classroom learning to their supplementary accomplishments and training. Nevertheless, the non-proficient students in the facilitative and authoritative intervention model reported getting exhausted as the class activities were beyond their capability.

A significant concern worth stating is that in the negotiated syllabus, highlighted in the facilitative intervention model; a crucial point is the matter of shared decision-making, which asks all learners to add and have their part in persuading the decisions. Nevertheless, the opinions of the most vocal appear to be received,

not of those who remained quiet and did not share their ideas. In the present study, the less active learners were in the latter group.

DISCUSSION
The first finding of the study was that the facilitative intervention model had a higher statistically significant influence on the development of English language-speaking abilities among Iranian EFL students when compared to the authoritative intervention technique. The second finding indicated that the speaking skills of the students who had been exposed to the model of facilitative intervention had improved more than the speaking skills of the students who had experienced authoritative intervention. Therefore, the data indicate that the facilitative intervention model, which primarily relies on psychology and counseling, has been successful in the ELT domain. This is the case despite the fact that the facilitative intervention

model is relatively new in the speaking domain and that this teaching strategy does not have a theoretical linguistic grounding.

These findings also correlate with Nakatani's (2010) study on employing Heron's intervention model, which highlights the relevance of self-discovery and self-directed learning as facilitating elements in the development of oral communication for EFL learners within the context of the learning environment. Problem-solving is just one of the many approaches that are utilized in the Catalytic techniques that are proposed by Heron in the facilitative intervention model. Other techniques include self-discovery and self-directed learning.

In the meanwhile, it is possible to draw the conclusion that various components of the EFL classroom can be improved by the use of facilitative intervention. This is because facilitative intervention creates the way for the growth of self-directed learning, self-assessment, and self-discovery (Schein, 2006). Likewise, in line with some other previous studies, such as AlRamadhan (2020) on L2 vocabulary learning, Casan (2020) on L2 listening comprehension, and teaching English to kids (Ivashkevych & Antyukhova, 2021), it can be concluded that facilitative intervention and its related techniques such as cathartic, catalytic, and supportive techniques can be used as an effective method in the EFL classroom helping learners improve their learning abilities.

The qualitative findings supported the hypothesis that the facilitative intervention model could be more useful than the authoritative intervention for the L2 speaking development of Iranian EFL learners. These findings were in line with the quantitative data, which also supported the idea. However, in terms of factors such as creating a friendly atmosphere in the classroom, motivating students to continue their L2 development, using films, clips, and teaching aids, emphasizing L2 speaking, and making students work hard, almost the two groups of study were in agreement with one another. The concordance between the learners who were exposed to the facilitative intervention model was greater. When evaluating second language

speaking ability, another point of disagreement could be placing more emphasis on grammatical correctness. The authoritative intervention group focused the majority of their attention on the grammatical faults, whereas the facilitative intervention group placed a greater emphasis on the student's pronunciation and lexical resources. Discourse management and fluency came in a close second.

CONCLUSION

There were significant differences between the means of the facilitative and authoritative groups' post-tests of speaking components, such as grammatical resources, lexical resources, discourse management, pronunciation, and interactive communication, according to the findings of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) that was conducted to compare the means of the facilitative and authoritative groups' post-tests of speaking components. This comparison was carried out in order to determine whether or not there was a difference between the two types of groups. The findings revealed that the group that focused on facilitating learning had significantly higher means than the group that focused on authoritative knowledge on post-tests measuring components of speaking.

According to these two sets of findings, the facilitative intervention model is more effective than the authoritative intervention model when it comes to assisting EFL learners in improving their L2 speaking and the speaking components of their language. The findings from the qualitative data analysis of the interviews also provided support for the same concept. The only point of divergence that was revealed in the qualitative data analysis was that learners who were exposed to the AI model only preferred grammatical errors that showed accuracy, whereas learners who were exposed to the FI model paid more attention to other features of L2 speaking such as lexical resource, discourse management, and interactive communication. This could be due to the fact that learners in the authoritative intervention paradigm (Heron, 1976, 2001) are exposed to strategies that are similar to those that are supported by behaviorism

and structuralism (Huang, Olsen, Cohen, and Coombs, 2021). These techniques include prescriptive, informative, and confronting instruction. As a consequence of this, the presumption was made that the accuracy of the utterances produced by learners while speaking should take precedence over other characteristics of their production. Another reason could be that the nature of the teacher feedback that is offered in the authoritative intervention may be to blame. This type of feedback from the instructor focuses mostly on errors and asks the learner to remedy the problem using the methods that she or he recognizes within the context of teacher-learner agreements. It appears to the learners that grammatical faults are more obvious than other forms of errors (Mar 2021).

Finally, it is worth mentioning that, the present study findings in terms of the positive and significant effect of facilitative intervention in developing L2 speaking of FL learners can take support from different studies conducted in the ELT domain (AlRamadhan, 2020; Casan, 2020; Colcher, 2021; Ge, 2017; Melissa et al., 2015; Nakata, 2015; Nakatani, 2010; Rakhshan &Yazdani Moghaddam, 2015; Rassaei, 2015; Schein, 2006; Smith & Lewis, 2017; Yürekli, 2013). Even though none of these studies have directly focused on the speaking components, they still represent that facilitative intervention is more successful than authoritative intervention in helping FL learners realize their learning problems, design problem-solving strategies, and improve their abilities through self-directed learning, self-assessment, and recognizing personal and situational values. This is the case even though none of these studies have directly focused on the speaking components.

As a result, one may get the following conclusion: the Facilitative Intervention (FI) model has the potential to considerably and favorably affect the participants' performance in their second language speaking ability. For the purpose of providing an expressive explanation of the language and metalinguistic challenges faced by their students, English instructors could use a facilitative intervention paradigm. The

findings of the current study and those of similar studies could be used by content developers working in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) to create activities that raise students' levels of awareness regarding English as a Foreign Language (EFL) speaking. This kind of exercise may assist learners' development toward meaningful learning, self-correction, and autonomy and align with helpful strategies provided in Heron (2001)'s facilitative intervention.

References

Albino, G. (2017). Improving speaking fluency in a task-based language teaching approach: The case of EFL learners at PUNIV-Cazenga. *Sage open, 7*(2), 1-11.

AlRamadhan, M. H. (2020). L1 textual glosses and word repetition: facilitative interventions for incidental vocabulary acquisition. *International Journal of Instruction*, *13*(4), 815-832.

Anderson, T., Perlman, M. R., McCarrick, S. M., & McClintock, A. S. (2020). Modeling therapist responses with structured practice enhances facilitative interpersonal skills. *Journal of clinical psychology*, *76*(4), 659-675.

Asaei, S. M., & Rahimi, R. (2021). Appropriation-based syllabus and speaking ability: Evidence from Iranian EFL context. *Biannual Journal of Education Experiences*, *4*(1), 1-20.

Ashmore, R. (1999). Heron's intervention framework: An introduction and critique. *Mental Health Nursing, 19*(1), 24-27.

Astutik, I. (2019). Inter-correlation among speaking components of the fourth semester students' speaking ability of English education program. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 3*(2), 19-30.

Baker, F. S. (2015). Emerging realities of text-to-speech software for nonnative-English-speaking community college students in the freshman year. *Community College*

Journal of Research and Practice, *39*(5), 423-441.

Casan, H. B. (2020). The effects of facilitative e-tools on listening comprehension and attitudes towards English language. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *3*(8), 93-105.

Chambers, M., & Kantaris, X. (2017). Enhancing the therapeutic interaction skills of staff working in acute adult inpatient psychiatric wards: Outcomes of a brief intervention education programme. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, *7*(11), 123.

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

Colcher, D. (2021). Corrective feedback and the ideological co-construction of expertise. In L. Czerwionka, R. Showstack, & J. Liskin-Gasparro (Eds.), *Contexts of co-constructed discourse* (pp. 68-89). Routledge.

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

Ellis, R.W. (2008). *Principles of instructed second language acquisition.* Washington, DC. Pergamon.

Flood, R. L., & Romm, N. R. (2018). A systemic approach to processes of power in learning organizations: Part II–triple loop learning and a facilitative intervention in the "500 schools project". *The Learning Organization*. https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-11-2017-0106

Fowler, J. (1996). Clinical supervision: What do you do after you say hello? *British Journal of Nursing, 5*(6), 382-385.

Ge, X. (2017). Restudying oral corrective feedbacks in EFL classes of Jinan university- a statistical analysis of discrepancies via SAS software. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 7*(6), 473-482.

Hamid, B. A., & Azman, H. (1992). Adapting the six category intervention analysis to promote facilitative type supervisory feedback in teaching practice. In S. Eugenius (Ed.), *Language teacher education in a fast-changing world; Anthology series, 29* (pp. 88-99). ERIC, ED 369-280.

Heron, J. (1976). A six-category intervention analysis. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 4* (2), 143-55.

Heron, J. (2001). *Helping the client: A creative practical guide* (5th ed.). London: Sage Publication.

Huang, F. L., Olsen, A. A., Cohen, D., & Coombs, N. (2021). Authoritative school climate and out-of-school suspensions: Results from a nationally-representative survey of 10th grade students. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, *65*(2), 114-123.

Ivashkevych, E., & Antyukhova, N. (2021). Innovative principles of facilitative teaching using modern approaches in teaching English in primary schoolchildren. *Інноватика у вихованні*, *2021*(Вип. 13), 81-94.

Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(1), 607-610.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2016). *Second language research: Methodology and design* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Manan, N. A., & Emzir, A. R. (2020). Moodle-based speaking learning model. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 4*(17), 42-59.

Melissa**,** K., Smith, M. K., & Lewis, M. (2015). Toward facilitative mentoring and

ljT

catalytic interventions. *ELT Journal*, *69*(2), 140-150

Mirahmadi, S. H., & Alavi, S. M. (2016). The role of traditional and virtual scaffolding in developing speaking ability of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *6*(2), 43-56.

Mitchell, M. D., & Butler, S. K. (2021). Acknowledging intersectional identity in supervision: The multicultural integrated supervision model. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *49*(2), 101-115.

Nakata, T. (2015). Are learners aware of effective ways to learn second language vocabulary from retrieval? Perceived effects of relative spacing, absolute spacing, and feedback timing on vocabulary learning. *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, *4*(1), 66-73.

Nakatani, Y. (2010). Identifying strategies that facilitate EFL learners' oral communication: A classroom study using multiple data collection procedures. *The Modern Language Journal*, *94*(1), 116-136.

Nekoda, K. (2020). Promoting student teachers' reflections in an English teaching practicum: An analysis of after-class supervisory conferences in the Netherlands. *Casele Journal*, *50*, 37-49.

Papageorgiou, A. (2015). Models of the doctor-patient consultation. *Clinical Communication in Medicine, 1*(2), 21-29.

Parlamis, J., & Dibble, R. (2019). Teaming: Are two communication modes better than one?. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 25(5/6), 318-333. https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-10-2018-0065

Possú, M. C. F. (2021). *Implementing English speaking skills with EFL large groups: Challenges and useful strategies*. Doctoral dissertation, Greensboro College. North Carolina, The USA.

Rabab'ah, G., & Rumman, R. A. (2015). Hedging in Political Discourse: Evidence from the Speeches of King Abdullah II of Jordan. *Prague Journal of English Studies*, *4*(1), 157-185.

Rakhshan, A., & Yazdani Moghaddam, M. (2015). Intervention analysis in teaching reading comprehension through dynamic assessment: Heron's perspective. *Journal of Language and Translation*, *5*(2), 23-41.

Rassaei, E. (2015). Oral corrective feedback, foreign language anxiety and L2 development. *System*, *49*(2), 98-109.

Ribeiro, A., & Jiang, W. (2020). Enhancing ELLS' second language acquisition with interactions. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *56*(2), 77-81.

Richards, J. C. (2005). Materials development and research: Making the connection. *Paper presented at a colloquium on research and materials development, at the TESOL Convention, San Antonio, March, 2005.*

Schein, E. H. (2006). Facilitative process interventions. *Organizational Development: A Jossey-Bass Reader, 1*(2), 286-308.

Shah, R. K. (2020). Concepts of learner-centred teaching. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, *8*(3), 45-60.

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), 206-14.

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

Smith, M. K., & Lewis, M. (2017). *Supporting the professional development of English language teachers: Facilitative mentoring*. Routledge.

Suikkala, A., Koskinen, S., Katajisto, J., & Leino-Kilpi, H. (2021). Congruence between nursing students' and patients' views of

student–patient relationships. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, *26*(1), 79-115.

Suikkala, A., Leino-Kilpi, H., Katajisto, J., & Koskinen, S. (2020). Nursing student–patient relationship and related factors—A self-assessment by nursing students. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *29*(21-22), 4030-4044.

Toro, V., Camacho-Minuche, G., Pinza-Tapia, E., & Paredes, F. (2019). The Use of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach to Improve Students' Oral Skills. *English Language Teaching, 12*(1), 110-118.

Yaghchi, M. A., Ghafoori, N., & Nabifar, N. (2016). The effects of authoritative vs. facilitative interventions on EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *Nashriyeh Elmi Pazhouheshiyeh Amoozaeh va arzyabi, 9*(5), 177-194.

Yürekli, A. (2013). The six-category intervention analysis: A classroom observation reference. *ELT Journal*, *67*(3), 302-312.