Stroke Effect of English Teachers on the Learners' L2 Motivational Self-System

Samaneh Naderi

PhD. Student, TEFL, English Department, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran Email: samane.naderi61@gmail.com

Muhammad Ajmal

Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature,

University of Lahore, Pakistan

ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1085-7046

Email: muhammad.ajmal2@ell.uol.edu.pk

Dr. Muhammed Salim Keezhatta

Assistant Professor, Department of English, College of Science and Humanities in Al Kharj,

Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

Email: m.keezhatta@psau.edu.sa

Dr. Sohaib Alam

Assistant Professor, Department of English, College of Science and Humanities in Al Kharj,
Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia
Email: s.alam@psau.edu.sa

ORCHID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9972-9357

Correspondence: Dr. Muhammed Salim Keezhatta, m.keezhatta@psau.edu.sa

Bio-profiles:

First Author, Samane Naderi is PhD student in TEFL in Yazd University, Iran. She is lecturer at Applied Science and Technology University. Her main interests are new technologies in language teaching and learning, teacher education and education psychology.

Second author, Muhammad Ajmal is perusing his PhD in English Language and Literature from International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan. He has been teaching at various universities for the last 10 years and currently working as an Assistant Professor at the University of Lahore. He has secured Indigenous and International scholarships from Higher Education Commission of Pakistan and visited Universitat Heidelberg Germany. He presented his research paper at James Joyce Conference in Universitat Roma Tre, Italy. He is also member of Poetics and Linguistic Association (PALA), UK. His research interests include ELT, Applied Linguistics, Corpus Stylistics, Literary Stylistics, Text Linguistics and Narratology.

Third Author, Dr. Muhammed Salim Keezhatta is presently working as an Assistant Professor of English at Department of English, College of Science and Humanities in Al-Kharj, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia. His multifaceted research focuses mainly on Applied Linguistics, English Language Education, Neurolinguistics, Discourse Analysis, British literature and English for academic purposes. He has published several articles in various international journals and presented papers in many national and international conferences. He has been teaching English for over 12 years.

Fourth Author, Dr. Sohaib Alam is currently working as an Assistant Professor of English at Department of English, College of Science and Humanities, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia. He holds a Ph.D. in English Language Teaching (ELT) from Aligarh Muslim University, India. His areas of interest are Applied Linguistics, Pragmatics, Teaching Methods, Blended Learning, and Pedagogic Theory. He has presented papers at both national and international conferences, published research articles and papers in various journals.

Abstract

This study investigated the effect of English teachers' stroking behaviors including positive verbal conditional (PVC), negative verbal conditional (NVC) and no stroke (NS) on the learners' motivation within Dörnyei's Theory of L2 Motivational Self-System. Sixty intermediate EFL learners were chosen as the participants. They were randomly divided into three groups each consisting 20 learners. The motivation questionnaire was administered for three groups to evaluate their level of motivation before treatment implementation. The same content was instructed by one teacher for all three groups. Each group received one type of determined three strokes. At the end

of the term, the very motivation questionnaire was applied again for three groups. In addition to the questionnaire, the researcher had interviews with 24 members of participants about their attitude towards the effect of the kind of stroke which they experienced. Analysis of variance (ANOVA), multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), and qualitative content analysis were used. The results showed that the teacher's stroking behaviors had significant effects on the learners' language learning motivation. Moreover, there were significant differences among the three types of strokes on three subcategories of L2 Motivational Self-System. The results of the interviews confirmed the quantitative data analysis findings.

Keywords: Stroke; L2 Motivational Self-System theory (Ought-to self, Ideal L2 self, and L2 Learning experience); transactional analysis (TA)

Introduction

The interaction between teacher and learner can be considered as a fundamental element in the educational contexts. Hall and Walsh (2002) asserted that the quality of teacher-learner interaction in the language learning contexts is a major factor to have an effective and efficient learning and teaching process. Moreover, this kind of interaction has an essential role in progressing a positive learners' academic development and a social enhancement as well. In fact, the promoted interaction between teacher and learners provides a safe and suitable environment for both learners and teacher. To clarify the essence and effect of teacher-learner interaction in pedagogical contexts, it is needed to scrutinize the psychological dimension of this interaction. Different aspects of human interactions have been examined through Transactional Analysis (TA) which was introduced originally by Eric Berne (1958). Transactional analysis is a theory within the psychology and psychotherapy domain; according to Stewart and Joines (1987), it is the personality's theory and a kind of psychotherapy for personal improvement.

The TA theory is applicable in different domains including education, psychotherapy, management, counseling and totally in any domain that requires individual and communication comprehension (Stewart and Joines, 1987). The TA theory comprises the following concepts: transactions, ego-states, games, life-script, and strokes (Berne, 1988; Stewart and Joines, 1987). One of the principal components within TA domain which is directly allied to the teacher-learner interactions is stroke. Based on Shirai's (2006) definition, stroke can be any action pertaining to

confirmation of other's existence. It refers to being seen by others through which some human's affective needs can be met. There are various kinds of strokes: positive and negative, verbal and non-verbal, conditional and unconditional. Verbal stroke is using words in both forms of oral and written, non-verbal stroke are the actions such as smiling and frowning, positive stroke is the actions that result in pleasant feelings in receiver of stroke; athwart, negative stroke results in unpleasant experiences. Conditional stroke betokens what a person does, while unconditional stroke refers to what a person is (Stewart & Joines, 1987). Francis and Woodcock (1996) believe that stroke is a related term to motivation and different kinds of strokes can be used to motivate or demotivate people.

Strokes are units of recognition. When we communicate, we recognize one another; we transmit energy through words and non-verbal language. Some transactions provide less of these strokes (like "Hello – Hello") and some provide more (like "I love you – I love you too"). People need strokes in their lives in the same way as they need food or water. That's why we structure our time so that we get the amount of strokes that we need, from isolation to intimacy (Gheorghe, 2007).

Study about motivation started with Gardner and Lambert (1972), which underlined the concept of integrativeness, then in the 1990s it tended to the cognitive aspect, attribution theories and the self-determination. Dörnyei (2009) proposed L2 Motivational Self System theory which extended the existing L2 motivation conceptualizations by the use of psychological aspects of the self and consists of three components: the Ought-to self, the Ideal L2 self, and L2 Learning experience. The Ought-to L2 self "concerns the attributes that one believes one ought to possess to meet expectations and to avoid possible negative outcomes", the Ideal L2 self refers to the "L2-specific facet of one's 'ideal self', the L2 Learning experience refers to "situated, executive motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience" (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 29). This theory is according to some theories in the psychosocial domain whose focuses are on the individuals' identities and the selves as an L2 learners, and based on the fact that it is not possible for all L2 leaners to be always in close contact with target language situations and groups; therefore, the traditional concept of integrativeness changed into selves and individual identity. Based on this perspective, a learner can embody his future self and considers it as a motivational force to

decrease the differences between future and present selves. Thus, the L2 learner's motivation results from the positive attitude towards the learning process itself (Dörnyei, 2009).

Statement of the problems

As it was previously mentioned, teacher-learner interaction is an irrefutable effective factor in learning and teaching process and because of this utmost importance, it has been taken into account by many researchers in the realm of education (Roorda, Koomen, Spilt and Oort, 2011; Kato, Tscholl and Kunnen, 2018; Hamre and Pianta, 2001; Thijs and Koomen, 2008; Keezhatta, 2020; Aldridge and Fraser, 2016; and Henderson and Fisher, 2008).

Pishghadam, Zabihi, and Shayesteh (2015) postulated that the main purpose of education within psychological and humanistic framework is to make a learner become a good decision maker in his life and to promote his psychological aspects consisting of critical thinking, autonomy, emotional abilities and self-determination. Pishghadam, Zabihi, and Kermanshahi (2012) contended that a language teacher should be trained in other allied disciplines in order to recognize learners' affective, mental, psychological, social and ethical needs for improving the overall quality of their lives. Indeed, Pishghadam et al. have taken into account the underlined assumptions of TA in the education domain. Considering these assumptions, a language teacher should heighten motivational features for learning by optimal application of different types of strokes in the respective situations.

Recent attention to the psychological aspects of teacher-learner interaction including the use of strokes to ameliorate learners' motivation made the researcher interested in investigating the effect of English teachers' stroking behaviors on the learners' motivation within Dörnyei's theory of L2 Motivational Self-System. For this purpose, the researchers investigated the effect of positive verbal conditional stroke (PVC), negative verbal conditional strokes (NVC) and no stroke (NS) in this study.

Research question

For this study the following research questions were posed:

1. Does the English teacher's application of positive verbal conditional stroke and negative verbal conditional strokes and lack of stroke have any significance effect on the learners' motivation for learning a language within Dörnyei's theory of L2 Motivational Self-System?

- 2. Is there any significant difference among the effect of using positive verbal conditional stroke and negative verbal conditional stroke and lack of stroke on three subcategories of Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self-System theory (the Ought-to self, Ideal L2 self, and L2 Learning experience)?
- 3. What is the EFL learners' attitudes towards the effect of the English teacher's application of positive verbal conditional stroke and negative verbal conditional strokes and lack of stroke on their motivation for learning a language within Dörnyei's theory of L2 Motivational Self-System?

Methodology

Subjects

To accomplish the aim of the study, the researchers picked three groups each including 20 female EFL learners in the intermediate level via convenience sampling because of some limitation in sampling process and to control the gender variable just female learners were selected. Total number of participants were sixty Iranian EFL learners from a language institution. Their age varied from 16 to 47 and they have different socio-economic backgrounds. Their levels of education ranged from high school to MA degree.

Instrumentation

In this investigation, a motivation questionnaire which was adopted from a designed questionnaire by Taguchi et al. (2009), was employed. It was prepared to measure three subcomponents of Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self-System theory (Ought-to self, Ideal L2 self, and L2 Learning experience). It includes 30 items in the five-interval Likert scale. An example of each follows:

- 1. Ideal L2 Self: 10 items, example: "I imagine myself as someone who is able to speak English".
- 2. Ought-to 12 Self: 10 items, example: "I study English because close friends of mine think it is important".
- 3. L2 learning experience: 10 items, example: "I find learning English really interesting". The questionnaire was piloted among 30 EFL learners at the intermediate level and its reliability was achieved through Cronbach's alpha (0.787).

Study Design

The design was utilized for this investigation is quasi-experimental because it is an empirical study to investigate the causal effect of using positive verbal conditional stroke and negative verbal

conditional stroke and lack of stroke on three subcategories of L2 Motivational Self-System theory without random assignment.

Procedure

First of all, 73 Iranian EFL learners were selected for this study. To see that the subjects were at almost same English proficiency level, the researcher administered the 'Interchange/Passages Objective Placement Test' (Lesley, Hasen & Zukowski, 2005) at the first session. Based on the test results, the appropriate subjects were picked for the study. Then, the selected subjects were assigned randomly to three groups. Each group was consisted of 20 female EFL learners at the intermediate level. Before starting the course, the motivation questionnaire was administered for three groups to evaluate their level of motivation before treatment implementation. The same content was instructed by one teacher for all three groups during almost two months in the preappointed three sessions in a week each one took about one and a half hours. For the content of the course the book of American English File 2 was chosen whose four lessons were taught to the EFL learners. For the group in which positive verbal conditional strokes were applied, the teacher frequently tried to use some before-planned words and expressions implying positive conditional stroke such as "you did well or excellent" and "I am satisfied with your assignments" in each session and she usually ignored the negative aspects of learners' learning process it means that she concentrated on the positive aspects for providing stroke. For the group in which negative verbal conditional strokes were used, the teacher frequently included some before-planned words and expressions implying negative conditional stroke in her feedbacks such as "you did not well" and "I am not satisfied with your assignments"; she did not consider the learners' positive aspects in their learning process and mostly gave stroke to their negative aspects. Finally, for the group in which no strokes were applied, the teacher usually gave the learners feedbacks bearing no emotional concepts and themes such as "it is not correct, pay more attention" or "it is correct think about the other one". In the final session, the very motivation questionnaire was applied again for three groups to investigate the effect of using two strokes and lack of stroke on the EFL learners' motivation after treatment implementation. In addition to the questionnaire, the researcher had interviews with 24 members of participants, eight ones randomly from each group, about their attitude towards the effect of the kind of stroke which they experienced during the course through some open-ended questions such as: "what kind of stroke are you more comfortable with?"; "what

is your idea about these types of strokes"; "what type of stroke would you apply for your students if you were in your teacher's shoes?"

Results

Both kinds of quantitative and qualitative data were gathered for the present study. For analyzing the quantitative data in this investigation, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 19, was employed. First, descriptive statistics were applied for the three components of Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System (Ought-to self, Ideal L2 self, and L2 Learning experience) among three groups at the pretest which are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of the three components of Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System between the three groups at the Pre-Test.

						95% Con Interval fo			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Pretest of ideal	PVC	20	36.0000	6.85181	1.53211	32.7933	39.2067	21.00	47.00
L2 self	NVC	20	36.0000	5.95598	1.33180	33.2125	38.7875	20.00	44.00
	NS	20	34.0000	6.89011	1.54068	30.7753	37.2247	19.00	42.00
	Total	60	35.3333	6.53716	.84394	33.6446	37.0221	19.00	47.00
Pretest of ought	PVC	20	24.0000	9.64638	2.15700	19.4854	28.5146	9.00	41.00
to self	NVC	20	25.0000	5.63822	1.26074	22.3612	27.6388	17.00	38.00
	NS	20	26.0000	6.44001	1.44003	22.9860	29.0140	19.00	42.00
	Total	60	25.0000	7.36460	.95077	23.0975	26.9025	9.00	42.00
Pretest of L2	PVC	20	29.0000	9.14215	2.04425	24.7213	33.2787	12.00	42.00
learning	NVC	20	29.0000	6.12158	1.36883	26.1350	31.8650	19.00	41.00
experience	NS	20	28.0000	7.34130	1.64157	24.5642	31.4358	19.00	48.00
	Total	60	28.6667	7.52097	.97095	26.7238	30.6095	12.00	48.00
Pretest of whole	PVC	20	89.0000	14.41856	3.22409	82.2519	95.7481	58.00	117.00
motivation	NVC	20	90.0000	9.18809	2.05452	85.6998	94.3002	78.00	107.00
	NS	20	88.0000	18.22376	4.07496	79.4710	96.5290	67.00	126.00
	Total	60	89.0000	14.20432	1.83377	85.3306	92.6694	58.00	126.00

To check whether there are any significant differences in learners' L2 Motivational Self System and its three components in three groups and whether they are appropriate for the study, three groups' mean scores were analyzed at the pre-test by the use of a one-way ANOVA. The *F*-

observed values were .616, .361, .114 and .096 respectively for L2 Motivational Self System components and itself as a whole. Also, p-value for them were .544, .699, .892 and .909 in order. The amount of *F*-values was lower than the critical value of F and p-values were higher than the significance level of .05 (see Table 2).

Table 2
One-Way ANOVA on the Three Groups at Pretest

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Pretest of ideal L2 self	Between Groups	53.333	2	26.667	.616	.544
	Within Groups	2468.000	57	43.298		
	Total	2521.333	59			
Pretest of ought to	Between Groups	40.000	2	20.000	.361	.699
self	Within Groups	3160.000	57	55.439		
	Total	3200.000	59			
Pretest of L2	Between Groups	13.333	2	6.667	.114	.892
learning experience	Within Groups	3324.000	57	58.316		
	Total	3337.333	59			
Pretest of whole motivation	Between Groups	40.000	2	20.000	.096	.909
	Within Groups	11864.000	57	208.140		·
	Total	11904.000	59			

Thus, based on the Table 2, there were no significant differences among three groups' mean scores at the pre-test (F (2, 57) = .616, p> .05), (F (2, 57) = .361, p> .05), (F (2, 57) = .114, p> .05), and (F (2, 57) = .096, p> .05) and these groups are acceptable ones for this study. In Table 3 the groups' homogeneity of variances was indicated.

Table 3
Test of the three groups' Variances Homogeneity at the pretest

	Levene's Statisti	c df1	df2	Sig.
Pretest of ideal L2 self	.673	2	57	.514
Pretest of ought to self	1.797	2	57	.281
Pretest of L2 learning experience	1.111	2	57	.336
Pretest of whole motivation	1.975	2	57	.133

Regarding the results of the Levene's test of homogeneity of variances it was found that all groups possess homogenous variances; namely, no significant differences were found among three groups' variances. Therefore, one-way ANOVA's results were reliable (see Table 3). The descriptive statistics for the three groups at the post-test are displayed in the Table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of the three components of L2 Motivational Self System between the three groups at the Post-Test.

						95% Con Interval fo			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Posttest of ideal	PVC	20	41.0000	6.84413	1.53039	37.7968	44.2032	30.00	58.00
L2 self	NVC	20	22.0000	3.79751	.84915	20.2227	23.7773	18.00	32.00
	NS	20	20.0000	4.75727	1.06376	17.7735	22.2265	12.00	32.00
	Total	60	27.6667	10.86694	1.40292	24.8594	30.4739	12.00	58.00
Posttest of ought	PVC	20	30.0000	6.19847	1.38602	27.0990	32.9010	20.00	41.00
to self	NVC	20	24.0000	6.19847	1.38602	21.0990	26.9010	16.00	39.00
	NS	20	21.0000	4.07818	.91191	19.0914	22.9086	14.00	30.00
	Total	60	25.0000	6.65875	.85964	23.2799	26.7201	14.00	41.00
Posttest of L2	PVC	20	43.0000	5.47723	1.22474	40.4366	45.5634	32.00	50.00
learning	NVC	20	16.0000	4.65663	1.04125	13.8206	18.1794	11.00	29.00
experience	NS	20	17.0000	3.21182	.71818	15.4968	18.5032	12.00	23.00
	Total	60	25.3333	13.37296	1.72644	21.8787	28.7879	11.00	50.00
Posttest of whole	PVC	20	1.1400E2	11.53941	2.58029	108.5994	119.4006	97.00	138.00
motivation	NVC	20	62.0000	7.13037	1.59440	58.6629	65.3371	51.00	87.00
	NS	20	58.0000	6.70428	1.49912	54.8623	61.1377	40.00	67.00
	Total	60	78.0000	27.11870	3.50101	70.9945	85.0055	40.00	138.00

To see whether the use of three kinds of strokes caused any differences in the three groups' mean scores at the post-test, MANCOVA was applied. The Wilk's $\Delta = .041$, F (8, 108) = 52.88, p < .05, the partial eta squared = .797. (see Table 5).

Table 5
Multivariate Tests on the Three Groups at Post-Test.

				Hypothesis	Error		Partial Eta
	Effect	Value	F	df	df	Sig.	Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.992	1.770E3 ^a	4.000	54.000	.000	.992
	Wilks' Lambda	.008	1.770E3 ^a	4.000	54.000	.000	.992
	Hotelling's Trace	131.116	1.770E3 ^a	4.000	54.000	.000	.992
	Roy's Largest Root	131.116	1.770E3 ^a	4.000	54.000	.000	.992
group	Pillai's Trace	1.040	14.898	8.000	110.000	.000	.520
	Wilks' Lambda	.041	52.889 ^a	8.000	108.000	.000	.797
	Hotelling's Trace	21.215	140.546	8.000	106.000	.000	.914
	Roy's Largest Root	21.121	2.904E2 ^b	4.000	55.000	.000	.955

a. Exact statistic

b. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

c. Design: Intercept + group

According to Table 5, there are significant differences among the mean scores of the three groups on post-test. The partial eta squared, was found to be .797. This figure shows the degree of association between the dependent (post-test scores) and independent (three types of strokes) variables, which is almost a large size (Cohen, 1988; Richardson, 2011).

The Leven's test of homogeneity of variances reveals that the three groups had homogenous variances F(8, 108) = 52.88, p < .05; therefore, results of the MANCOVA were reliable, namely, there was not any significant difference between the variances of the three groups at the post test.

Table 6
Test of the three groups' Homogeneity of Variances at the posttest

	Levene's Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Posttest of ideal L2 self	2.358	2	57	.104
Posttest of ought to self	3.039	2	57	.056
Posttest of L2 learning experience	2.509	2	57	.090
Posttest of whole motivation	3.220	2	57	.052

The result of MANCOVA revealed that there are differences among the means, but its precise place was not specified. To demonstrate the exact place of differences, a post hoc comparison of the means was conducted. Thus, an analysis of Bonferroni confidence intervals was applied as a follow up test (see Tables 7). The results of the post hoc comparison show that L2 Motivational Self System as a whole and its three subscales (Ideal L2 self, the Ought-to self, and L2 Learning experience) differed significantly between the three groups.

Table 7
Post hoc comparison for subscales of L2 Motivational Self System as a whole and its three subscales (Ideal L2 self, the Ought-to self, and L2 Learning experience)

Variable group group on the procession of the	Dependent	(I)	(J)				95% Confidence Interval		
NS 21.00000* 1.67227 .000 16.8750 25.1250 NVC PVC -19.00000* 1.67227 .000 -23.1250 -14.8750 NS 2.00000 1.67227 .710 -2.1250 6.1250 NS PVC -21.00000* 1.67227 .710 -2.1250 6.1250 NVC -2.00000 1.67227 .710 -6.1250 2.1250 NVC -2.00000 1.67227 .710 -6.1250 2.1250 NVC -2.00000 1.67227 .710 -6.1250 2.1250 NS 9.00000* 1.76516 .004 1.6459 10.3541 NS 9.00000* 1.76516 .000 4.6459 13.3541 NVC PVC -6.00000* 1.76516 .000 4.6459 13.3541 NS 3.00000 1.76516 .284 -1.3541 7.3541 NS PVC -9.00000* 1.76516 .284 -7.3541 1.3541 NS PVC -3.00000 1.76516 .284 -7.3541 1.3541 Posttest of ought to self NVC 27.00000* 1.43759 .000 23.4539 30.5461 NS 26.00000* 1.43759 .000 22.4539 29.5461 NS -1.00000 1.43759 .000 -30.5461 -23.4539 NS -1.00000 1.43759 .000 -29.5461 -22.4539 NVC 1.00000 1.43759 .000 -25.461 4.5461 NS PVC -52.00000* 2.76253 .000 49.1857 62.8143 NVC PVC -52.00000* 2.76253 .000 -58.8143 -45.1857 NS 4.00000 2.76253 .459 -2.8143 10.8143 NS PVC -56.00000* 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1857 NS 4.00000 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1857 NS 4.00000 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1857 NS -76.00000* 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1	Variable	. ,	. ,	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Posttest of ideal L2 self		PVC	NVC	19.00000*	1.67227	.000	14.8750	23.1250	
Posttest of ideal NS 2.00000			NS	21.00000*	1.67227	.000	16.8750	25.1250	
NS		NVC	PVC	-19.00000*	1.67227	.000	-23.1250	-14.8750	
NVC -2.00000 1.67227 .710 -6.1250 2.1250	Posttest of ideal		NS	2.00000	1.67227	.710	-2.1250	6.1250	
Posttest of L2 learning experience PVC	L2 self	NS	PVC	-21.00000*	1.67227	.000	-25.1250	-16.8750	
Posttest of L2 learning experience NS 9.00000* 1.76516 .000 4.6459 13.3541 1.6459 NS 3.00000 1.76516 .004 -10.3541 -1.6459 NS 3.00000 1.76516 .284 -1.3541 7.3541 NS PVC -9.00000* 1.76516 .000 -13.3541 -4.6459 NVC -3.00000 1.76516 .284 -7.3541 1.3541 1.3541 NVC -3.00000 1.76516 .284 -7.3541 1.3541 1.3541 NS 26.00000* 1.43759 .000 23.4539 30.5461 NS 26.00000* 1.43759 .000 22.4539 29.5461 NVC PVC -27.00000* 1.43759 .000 -30.5461 -23.4539 NS -1.00000 1.43759 1.000 -4.5461 2.5461 NS PVC -26.00000* 1.43759 1.000 -2.5461 -22.4539 NVC 1.00000 1.43759 1.000 -2.5461 4.5461 -22.4539 NVC 1.00000 1.43759 1.000 -2.5461 4.5461 NS 56.00000* 2.76253 .000 49.1857 58.8143 NS PVC -52.00000* 2.76253 .000 -58.8143 -45.1857 NS 4.00000 2.76253 .000 -58.8143 -45.1857 NS 4.00000 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1857 NS .0000 -62.8143 -49.1857 .0000 .00000 .00000 .000000 .0000000 .00000000			NVC	-2.00000	1.67227	.710	-6.1250	2.1250	
Posttest of L2 learning experience NVC		PVC	NVC	6.00000*	1.76516	.004	1.6459	10.3541	
NVC	D		NS	9.00000*	1.76516	.000	4.6459	13.3541	
experience NS 3.00000 1.76516 .284 -1.3541 7.3541 NS PVC -9.00000* 1.76516 .000 -13.3541 -4.6459 NVC -3.00000 1.76516 .284 -7.3541 1.3541 PVC NVC 27.00000* 1.43759 .000 23.4539 30.5461 NS 26.00000* 1.43759 .000 22.4539 29.5461 NVC PVC -27.00000* 1.43759 .000 -30.5461 -23.4539 NS -1.00000 1.43759 .000 -30.5461 -23.4539 NS -1.00000 1.43759 1.000 -4.5461 2.5461 NS PVC -26.00000* 1.43759 .000 -29.5461 -22.4539 NVC 1.00000 1.43759 .000 -29.5461 -22.4539 NVC 52.00000* 2.76253 .000 45.1857 58.8143 NS 56.00000* 2.76253 .000 49.1857	learning	NVC	PVC	-6.00000*	1.76516	.004	-10.3541	-1.6459	
NVC -3.00000 1.76516 .284 -7.3541 1.3541			NS	3.00000	1.76516	.284	-1.3541	7.3541	
Posttest of ought to self PVC NVC 27.00000* 1.43759 .000 23.4539 29.5461 NS 26.00000* 1.43759 .000 22.4539 29.5461 NVC PVC -27.00000* 1.43759 .000 -30.5461 -23.4539 NS -1.00000 1.43759 1.000 -4.5461 2.5461 NS PVC -26.00000* 1.43759 .000 -29.5461 -22.4539 NVC 1.00000 1.43759 1.000 -29.5461 -22.4539 NVC 1.00000 1.43759 1.000 -2.5461 4.5461 PVC NVC 52.00000* 2.76253 .000 45.1857 58.8143 NS 56.00000* 2.76253 .000 49.1857 62.8143 NVC PVC -52.00000* 2.76253 .000 -58.8143 -45.1857 NS 4.00000 2.76253 .459 -2.8143 10.8143 NS PVC -56.00000* 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1857	-	NS	PVC	-9.00000*	1.76516	.000	-13.3541	-4.6459	
Posttest of ought to self NS 26.00000* 1.43759 .000 22.4539 29.5461 NVC PVC -27.00000* 1.43759 .000 -30.5461 -23.4539 NS -1.00000 1.43759 1.000 -4.5461 2.5461 NS PVC -26.00000* 1.43759 1.000 -29.5461 -22.4539 NVC 1.00000 1.43759 1.000 -2.5461 4.5461 PVC NVC 52.00000* 2.76253 .000 45.1857 58.8143 NS 56.00000* 2.76253 .000 49.1857 62.8143 NVC PVC -52.00000* 2.76253 .000 -58.8143 -45.1857 NS 4.00000 2.76253 .459 -2.8143 10.8143 NS PVC -56.00000* 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1857 NS PVC -56.00000* -56.0000* -56.0000* -62.8143 -49.1857 NS PVC -56.00000* -56.0000* -56.0000* -62.8143 -49.1857 NS PVC -56.00000* -56.0000* -56.0000* -62.8143 -49.1857 -60.0000* -62.8143 -49.1857 -60.0000* -62.8143 -49.1857 -60.0000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -60.000* -6			NVC	-3.00000	1.76516	.284	-7.3541	1.3541	
Posttest of ought to self NVC		PVC	NVC	27.00000*	1.43759	.000	23.4539	30.5461	
to self NVC	D C . 1.		NS	26.00000*	1.43759	.000	22.4539	29.5461	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	_	NVC	PVC	-27.00000*	1.43759	.000	-30.5461	-23.4539	
NVC 1.00000 1.43759 1.000 -2.5461 4.5461 Posttest of whole motivation NVC 52.00000* 2.76253 .000 45.1857 58.8143 NS 56.00000* 2.76253 .000 49.1857 62.8143 NVC PVC -52.00000* 2.76253 .000 -58.8143 -45.1857 NS 4.00000 2.76253 .459 -2.8143 10.8143 NS PVC -56.00000* 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1857	10 3011		NS	-1.00000	1.43759	1.000	-4.5461	2.5461	
Posttest of whole motivation PVC NVC 52.00000* 2.76253 .000 45.1857 58.8143 NS 56.00000* 2.76253 .000 49.1857 62.8143 NVC PVC -52.00000* 2.76253 .000 -58.8143 -45.1857 NS 4.00000 2.76253 .459 -2.8143 10.8143 NS PVC -56.00000* 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1857		NS	PVC	-26.00000*	1.43759	.000	-29.5461	-22.4539	
Posttest of whole motivation NS			NVC	1.00000	1.43759	1.000	-2.5461	4.5461	
Posttest of whole motivation NVC PVC -52.00000* 2.76253 .000 -58.8143 -45.1857 NS 4.00000 2.76253 .459 -2.8143 10.8143 NS PVC -56.00000* 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1857		PVC	NVC	52.00000*	2.76253	.000	45.1857	58.8143	
MVC PVC -52.00000° 2.76253 .000 -58.8143 -45.1857 NS 4.00000 2.76253 .459 -2.8143 10.8143 NS PVC -56.00000* 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1857	Posttest of whole motivation		NS	56.00000*	2.76253	.000	49.1857	62.8143	
NS 4.00000 2.76253 .459 -2.8143 10.8143 NS PVC -56.00000* 2.76253 .000 -62.8143 -49.1857		NVC	PVC	-52.00000*	2.76253	.000	-58.8143	-45.1857	
			NS	4.00000	2.76253	.459	-2.8143	10.8143	
NVC -4.00000 2.76253 .459 -10.8143 2.8143		NS	PVC	-56.00000*	2.76253	.000	-62.8143	-49.1857	
			NVC	-4.00000	2.76253	.459	-10.8143	2.8143	

^{*.} The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

According to Table 7 and also comparison of the pretest's and posttest's mean scores in the Tables 1 and 4, the positive verbal conditional strokes (PVC) have had positive effect on the L2 Motivational Self System as a whole and its three subscales (Ideal L2 self, the Ought-to self, and L2 Learning experience), it caused the development of L2 Motivational Self System as a whole and its three subscales in EFL learners. Negative verbal conditional strokes (NVC) and no strokes (NS) affected the L2 Motivational Self System as a whole and its three subscales in negative way and decreased them among learners. Between negative verbal conditional strokes and no strokes, no strokes had more negative effects on the L2 Motivational Self System as a whole and its three subscales and caused more decline in them. On the other hand, positive verbal conditional strokes (PVC) had the most positive effect on the Ideal L2 self-component in comparison with the other two ones. In addition, negative verbal conditional strokes (NVC) and no strokes (NS) also had the most negative effect on the Ideal L2 self as well.

The results of the interviews confirmed the quantitative data analysis based on which L2 Motivational Self System as a whole and its three subscales in EFL learners can be developed through positive verbal conditional strokes and between negative verbal conditional strokes and no strokes the learners prefer negative verbal conditional ones rather than no strokes. In their opinions, without any strokes from teacher they feel that they have been ignored by teacher.

Discussion and Conclusion

The significance of the teacher-learner interaction as an effective factor in education process has attracted many researchers' attention to investigate its related effects (Roorda, Koomen, Spilt and Oort, 2011; Kato, Tscholl and Kunnen, 2018; Hamre and Pianta, 2001; Thijs and Koomen, 2008; Henderson and Fisher, 2008).

The findings of Pishghadam, Zabihi, and Shayesteh's study (2015) indicated that the objective of education by the special regarding to psychological and humanistic framework is to change a learner to a good decision maker in his life and to augments his psychological dimensions including critical thinking, autonomy, emotional abilities and self-determination. According to Pishghadam, Zabihi, and Kermanshahi (2012), a language teacher should be trained in other related disciplines to enhance the whole quality of the learners' life by considering his affective, mental, psychological, social and ethical aspects. Therefore, Pishghadam et al (2015) have considered the underlined assumptions of TA in the education process and believe that a language

teacher should promote the learners' motivational feature by appropriately using different kinds of strokes in educational settings. Another study was carried out by Pishghadam and Khajavy (2014) where they revealed that stroke was positively related to extrinsic and intrinsic motivation; thus, it can be considered as a significant factor in the motivational aspects of learning a language.

Regarding the afore-mentioned significance of teacher-learner interaction and its contribution to learners' motivation, this study aims to investigate the effect of English teachers' stroking behaviors on the learners' motivation within L2 Motivational Self-System. The researchers investigated the effect of positive verbal conditional stroke (PVC), negative verbal conditional strokes (NVC) and no stroke (NS) in this investigation.

The results of the study displayed that the English teacher's application of positive verbal conditional stroke and negative verbal conditional strokes and lack of stroke have significant effects on the learners' motivation of language learning within L2 Motivational Self-System. Moreover, based on the findings, there were the significant differences among the effect of using positive verbal conditional stroke and negative verbal conditional stroke and lack of stroke on three subcategories of L2 Motivational Self-System theory (Ought-to self, Ideal L2 self, and L2 Learning experience). On the other hand, the results of the interviews backed up the quantitative data analysis findings regarding the effect of the English teacher's application of positive verbal conditional stroke and negative verbal conditional strokes and lack of stroke on the language learning motivation within L2 Motivational Self-System. According to them, L2 Motivational Self System as a whole and its three subscales in EFL learners can be developed through positive verbal conditional strokes and between negative verbal conditional strokes and no strokes the learners prefer negative verbal conditional ones rather than no strokes. In their opinions, without any strokes from teacher they feel that they have been ignored by teacher.

The present study's results can provide new horizons for the scholars, teacher educators and teachers in this domain by considering the affective aspects and using different types of strokes in educational settings. Consequently, much more study is still needed to investigate the effect of other types of stroke (such as: positive non-verbal conditional stroke (PNC); negative non-verbal conditional strokes (NNC); positive verbal unconditional stroke (PVU), negative verbal unconditional strokes (NVU); etc.) on learners' motivation or other psychological components.

References

- Aldridge, J. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2016). Teachers' views of their school climate and its relationship with teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Learning Environments Research*, 19(2), 291-307.
- Berne, E. (1958). Transactional analysis: a new and effective method of group therapy. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 12(4), 735.
- Berne, E. (1988). Games People Play, New York. Deutsch: Spiele der Erwachsenen, Reinbek.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System. In: Dörnyei, Z., Ushioda, E. (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 9-42). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Francis, D., & Woodcock, M. (1996). *The new unblocked manager: A practical guide to self-development*. Farnham: Gower Publishing.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury house.
- Gheorghe, R. (2007). [Review of the book: *TA today: A new introduction to transactional analysis*, by I. Stewart & V. Joines]. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v3i1.390
- Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22(3), 186-203.
- Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher–child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child development*, 72(2), 625-638.
- Henderson, D. G., & Fisher, D. L. (2008). Interpersonal behaviour and student outcomes in vocational education classes. Learning Environments Research, 11, 19e 29. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10984-007-9034-z.
- Kato, Y., Tscholl, M., Kunnen, S. (2018). Detecting Patterns of Dynamic Teacher-Learner Interactions in Online Adult Learning through a Dynamic Systems Approach, in Proceedings of the International Conference of the Learning Sciences, London, UK.
- Keezhatta, M.S. Exploring nascent trends and developments emanating in the domain of learning and assessment of English as a Foreign Language at undergraduate English majors of Saudi Arabia. *Asian EFL Journal*. 27.4.2 (2020): 41-62.

- Lesley, T., Hansen, C., & Zukowski-Faust, J. (2005). *Interchange passages: Placement and evaluation package*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pishghadam, R., & Khajavy, G. H. (2014). Development and validation of the student stroke scale and examining its relation with academic motivation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 43(2), 109-114.
- Pishghadam, R., Zabihi, R., & Kermanshahi, N. P. (2012). Educational language teaching: A new movement beyond reflective/critical teaching. *Life Science Journal*, *9*(1), 892-899.
- Pishghadam, R., Zabihi, R., & Shayesteh, S. (2015). *Applied ELT: A movement beyond applied linguistics*. Iran: KhateSefid.
- Richardson, J. T. E. (2011). Eta squared and partial eta squared as measures of effect size in educational research. *Educational Research Review*, *6*, 135–147. doi:10.1016 j. edurev.2010.12.001
- Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher—student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A metaanalytic approach. *Review of educational research*, 81(4), 493-529.
- Shirai, S. (2006). How transactional analysis can be used in terminal care. *International Congress Series*, 1287, 179–184.
- Siddig, B., E., & AlKhoudary, Y., A., (2018). Investigating Classroom Interaction: Teacher and Learner Participation. *English Language Teaching*, *11* (12), 86-92.
- Stewart, I., & Joines, V. (1987). *TA today: A new introduction to transactional analysis*. Nottingham: Lifespace.
- Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self-system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 66-97). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Thijs, J. T., & Koomen, H. M. (2008). Task-related interactions between kindergarten children and their teachers: the role of emotional security. *Infant and child development, 17(2)*, 181-197.