



© 2027 the authors. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

1. Fatemeh. Ansari Cholcheh^{ID}: Department of English, Shk.C., Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran
2. Parisa. Riahipour^{ID}: Department of English, Shk.C., Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran (Email: priahipour@iau.ac.ir)
3. Fariba. Rahimi Esfahani^{ID}: Department of English, Shk.C., Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

Article type:
Original Research

Article history:
Received 16 June 2026
Revised 16 September 2026
Accepted 26 September 2026
Initial Publish 24 October 2026
Published online 01 March 2027

How to cite this article:

Ansari Cholcheh, F., Riahipour, P., & Rahimi Esfahani, F. (2027). When Words Keep Flowing: How Altruistic Teaching Shapes Writing Fluency and Boredom in the Iranian EFL Classroom. *Assessment and Practice in Educational Sciences*, 5(3), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.61838/japes.328>

When Words Keep Flowing: How Altruistic Teaching Shapes Writing Fluency and Boredom in the Iranian EFL Classroom

ABSTRACT

Drawing on positive psychology and, specifically, Fredrickson's (2001) Broaden-and-Build Theory, this mixed-methods study examined the effects of an altruistic teaching intervention on the writing fluency and foreign language boredom of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. Fifty female intermediate learners (ages 14–17) at a private language institute in Shahrekord were assigned to two intact classes. Over twelve 90-minute sessions, the experimental group received writing instruction infused with altruistic teaching practices—learners writing for and responding to authentic audiences—while the comparison group received conventional instruction. Writing fluency was operationalized as words per T-unit and measured through parallel argumentative pre- and post-tests; boredom was assessed with the Boredom in Practical English Language Classes Questionnaire (BPELC; Kruk & Zawodniak, 2017), and semi-structured interviews with 10–15 learners supplied qualitative data. ANCOVA results showed that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group in writing fluency, $F(1, 47) = 10.003$, $p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .175$, and reported significantly lower L2 boredom, $F(1, 47) = 13.346$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .221$. Thematic analysis attributed these gains to interactive activities, learner autonomy, meaningful tasks, and emotional support. The findings suggest that altruistic teaching functions as a positive-psychology intervention that simultaneously builds writing fluency and reduces L2 boredom.

Keywords: altruistic teaching, writing fluency, L2 boredom, positive psychology, EFL writing

Introduction

Writing in a foreign language is a multidimensional cognitive, linguistic, and affective activity that requires learners to coordinate lexical retrieval, grammatical encoding, idea generation, organization, monitoring, and revision while simultaneously maintaining sufficient motivation to remain engaged with the task. In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, this process can be particularly demanding because learners often compose texts with limited opportunities for authentic interaction in English and may experience writing primarily as an academic requirement rather than as a meaningful

form of communication. Consequently, learners' development as writers cannot be explained solely by linguistic knowledge or formal instruction; it is also shaped by the emotional and motivational conditions under which writing takes place. Among the various dimensions of L2 writing performance, fluency has received sustained attention because it represents learners' capacity to produce language efficiently and continuously without excessive disruption caused by planning, monitoring, or lexical and grammatical difficulties. At the same time, increasing attention to learners' emotions has revealed that negative achievement emotions, particularly boredom, may interfere with the cognitive engagement required for successful language production. These developments suggest that approaches to writing instruction should address not only the mechanics of written production but also the quality of learners' emotional and interpersonal classroom experiences.

Writing fluency is commonly conceptualized as the ease, speed, and quantity with which learners generate written language. It represents an important component of L2 writing proficiency alongside accuracy and complexity and is sensitive to the conditions under which composing occurs. Research has shown that task design and planning conditions can influence how learners allocate attentional resources during writing. Ellis and Yuan demonstrated that planning can substantially affect second-language narrative writing, with different planning conditions producing changes in fluency, complexity, and accuracy (1). Such findings are important because they demonstrate that writing fluency is not a fixed attribute of the learner but is responsive to instructional and task-related conditions. When learners are provided with conditions that facilitate idea generation, reduce cognitive overload, and allow them to organize language more efficiently, their written production may become more fluent. Nevertheless, much of the traditional research on fluency has approached writing primarily from a cognitive or task-based perspective, leaving the emotional climate and relational qualities of instruction comparatively underexplored.

Research in Iranian EFL contexts similarly indicates that writing fluency can be strengthened through pedagogical interventions that modify the learning process. For example, Zeraatpishe and colleagues investigated multiple-intelligence-oriented writing tasks and found that instructional tasks designed around learners' diverse abilities could positively influence the accuracy, fluency, and organization of English language teaching students' writing (2). Their findings suggest that instructional variation and responsiveness to learner characteristics may facilitate more effective written performance than routine, undifferentiated writing practice. In another Iranian study, Kaveh and Rassaei compared mobile-mediated and face-to-face dynamic assessment and examined their effects on EFL learners' writing fluency and strategy awareness. Their findings emphasized the value of mediated interaction, strategic support, and socioculturally informed assistance in facilitating writing development (3). Collectively, these studies show that writing fluency is sensitive not only to practice frequency but also to the structure of learner support, mediation, task meaningfulness, and the nature of instructional interaction.

Contemporary writing pedagogy has therefore increasingly moved away from viewing writing as an isolated individual activity and toward recognizing it as a socially situated process in which teacher behavior, interaction, feedback, audience, and communicative purpose shape learners' performance. This shift is also visible in the changing professional identity of L2 writing teachers. Yu's analysis of published discourse on second-language writing teachers showed that writing teachers perform multifaceted roles that extend beyond error correction and the transmission of formal writing conventions, including roles related to facilitation, feedback, pedagogical decision-making, and the creation of supportive learning environments (4). These expanded roles are particularly relevant in EFL settings, where learners may rely heavily on the teacher for linguistic input, affective encouragement, and opportunities to perceive writing as purposeful communication. Accordingly, the relational and emotional qualities of teaching may constitute important but insufficiently examined variables in explaining how learners develop writing fluency.

The affective dimension of language learning has become increasingly prominent in recent years, partly because research has demonstrated that learners' emotions influence attention, persistence, engagement, willingness to communicate, and academic performance. While anxiety has traditionally dominated affective research in second-language acquisition, boredom has emerged as an equally important but distinct emotional experience. Boredom typically involves low arousal, lack of interest, reduced concentration, and an aversive perception that a learning activity is monotonous, meaningless, overly easy, overly difficult, or disconnected from learners' goals. In a writing classroom, these characteristics may be particularly problematic because successful composing requires sustained attention and repeated investment of cognitive effort. A learner who experiences persistent boredom may disengage from planning, minimize effort, avoid revision, and produce shorter or less elaborated texts. Thus, boredom is not merely an unpleasant classroom feeling; it may have direct implications for the quality and quantity of language learners produce.

Research across educational settings supports the association between boredom and diminished engagement. Wang and colleagues examined teacher autonomy support and mathematics engagement and demonstrated that boredom operated alongside self-efficacy and intrinsic value as an important psychological mechanism linking classroom experience with student engagement (5). Their findings illustrate that boredom is closely embedded in the motivational architecture of learning and may mediate the effects of instructional practices on students' participation. Although conducted outside the EFL writing domain, this evidence is highly relevant because it suggests that supportive instructional environments can influence engagement partly through their effects on students' emotional experiences. In other words, pedagogical practices that enhance value, autonomy, and personal relevance may simultaneously reduce boredom and strengthen learners' willingness to invest effort in demanding academic tasks.

Teacher behavior appears to be especially important in this process. Borgonovi and colleagues examined relations among academic boredom, achievement, information and communication technology use, and teacher enthusiasm among adolescents and found meaningful associations between teacher enthusiasm and students' academic experiences (6). Their work contributes to a growing body of evidence suggesting that teachers' visible interest, energy, and commitment can shape how learners interpret classroom activities. Similarly, Cui and colleagues found that perceived teacher enthusiasm could dampen class-related boredom among university students and that perceived task value played an important longitudinal mediating role in this relationship (7). These findings are particularly significant for writing instruction because writing tasks are often perceived by learners as repetitive or evaluative. A teacher who presents writing as personally relevant, socially useful, and intellectually worthwhile may increase perceived task value and thereby reduce the likelihood that students experience the activity as monotonous or meaningless.

Evidence from EFL classrooms further strengthens this argument. Dewaele and Li examined teacher enthusiasm, learners' enjoyment and boredom, and social-behavioral learning engagement in Chinese EFL classes. Their findings indicated that teacher enthusiasm was associated with higher engagement and that learner enjoyment and boredom played mediating roles in this relationship (8). This work demonstrates that teacher affect and learner affect should not be viewed as separate domains. Teachers' interpersonal and instructional behaviors can contribute to emotional climates that either facilitate or impede student engagement. Within writing instruction, therefore, a teacher who communicates enthusiasm, care, encouragement, and genuine interest in learners' progress may create conditions that reduce boredom and allow greater cognitive involvement in composing tasks. Such an approach may be particularly valuable for learners who have come to associate EFL writing with correction, examination, and repetitive classroom routines.

The relevance of motivational and affective processes is also supported by research outside second-language education. Rezayi and Noorouzi examined motivational beliefs in relation to job boredom among physical education teachers and showed

that motivational factors were meaningfully connected with the reduction of boredom (9). Although occupational boredom differs from academic boredom, the study reinforces the broader proposition that boredom is responsive to motivational beliefs and perceived meaning rather than simply being caused by task duration. Similarly, Vahedinia and colleagues examined psychological and interpersonal variables in relation to marital boredom among teachers, highlighting the role of cognitive and relational processes in experiences of disengagement and monotony (10). Taken together, such studies indicate that boredom across contexts is shaped by how individuals interpret activities, relationships, expectations, and personal investment. In education, this implies that modifying the interpersonal meaning of classroom tasks may represent an important route for reducing boredom.

One pedagogical orientation that may address these affective and relational dimensions is altruistic teaching. In the context of language education, altruistic teaching can be understood as an instructional orientation in which teachers intentionally structure learning around care, contribution, mutual support, authentic benefit to others, and meaningful social purposes. Rather than presenting writing solely as an exercise to satisfy curricular requirements or receive a grade, an altruistically oriented classroom can position learners as individuals whose writing can inform, assist, encourage, persuade, or otherwise contribute to other people. This approach may involve writing for authentic audiences, peer-support activities, collaborative response, socially meaningful topics, and explicit teacher behaviors that communicate concern for learners' wellbeing and progress. Such practices could increase the perceived purpose of writing tasks and transform learners from passive recipients of instruction into active contributors within a social learning community.

This orientation is particularly compatible with contemporary educational perspectives emphasizing reflective, purposeful, and learner-centered writing. Tola Chala examined the effects of reflective writing on EFL student-teachers' critical thinking and showed that structured reflective writing can function as more than language practice by encouraging learners to examine experiences, articulate reasoning, and develop higher-order thought (11). When learners perceive writing as a vehicle for reflection and meaningful expression, the activity may acquire value beyond grammatical practice. Altruistic teaching may extend this logic by giving writing an explicitly interpersonal purpose: learners write not simply to demonstrate competence but to communicate something useful or meaningful to another person. Such task framing may be particularly conducive to reducing boredom because it increases authenticity, personal involvement, and communicative consequence.

Recent technological developments also reinforce the importance of meaningful, adaptive, and supportive writing environments. Syukran and colleagues explored teachers' experiences with SAMR-based adaptive technology in primary English reading-writing instruction and highlighted the potential of technology integration to reshape literacy activities when digital tools are used to modify or redefine learning rather than merely reproduce conventional exercises (12). Such evidence suggests that innovation in writing pedagogy is most valuable when it changes the nature of learner participation and task meaning. Technology, therefore, is not inherently motivating; its impact depends on whether it promotes interaction, responsiveness, creativity, authenticity, and learner agency. These principles overlap with altruistic teaching, which similarly depends less on a specific tool than on the purposeful redesign of classroom relationships and activities.

Artificial intelligence represents an even more recent development in EFL writing pedagogy. Sadigova and colleagues investigated teachers' perspectives on integrating artificial intelligence into the assessment of and feedback on EFL academic writing in Azerbaijan, illustrating the growing importance of AI-mediated support in regional language education (13). AI tools can potentially provide rapid feedback, language suggestions, and individualized assistance, but their educational value still depends on how teachers integrate them into pedagogically meaningful relationships and tasks. If technologically mediated writing becomes overly automated, impersonal, or product-focused, it may not address learners' emotional disengagement. Conversely, when technology is used within a caring and socially meaningful instructional framework, it may complement

rather than replace teacher support. This distinction is particularly relevant to the present investigation because altruistic teaching foregrounds the human, relational, and prosocial dimensions of learning at a time when writing instruction is becoming increasingly technology-mediated.

The growing interest in adaptive and digitally supported instruction also raises questions about what remains uniquely important in the teacher–learner relationship. Technological affordances can increase access to feedback and diversify writing activities, yet learners’ emotional experiences continue to be shaped by their perceptions of teacher interest, responsiveness, fairness, enthusiasm, and care. As research on teacher enthusiasm suggests, learners are more likely to experience classroom activities as valuable and engaging when teachers visibly communicate commitment to the learning process (7, 8). From this perspective, altruistic teaching may offer a particularly useful framework because it conceptualizes caring behavior not as an incidental personality characteristic but as something that can be intentionally embedded in instructional design.

The possible relationship between altruistic teaching, boredom, and writing fluency can also be understood through the allocation of cognitive resources. Writing fluency requires learners to sustain idea generation and linguistic encoding while minimizing disruptive pauses and excessive self-monitoring. Boredom, by contrast, is associated with attentional drift and withdrawal from the task. If an instructional environment reduces boredom by enhancing interpersonal relevance, task value, autonomy, and authentic communication, learners may be able to allocate a greater proportion of their available attentional resources to composing. This reasoning is consistent with earlier evidence that writing performance changes under different task and planning conditions (1) and with Iranian findings demonstrating that mediated support and diversified task design can enhance fluency (2, 3). Altruistic teaching may therefore influence writing fluency indirectly by altering the emotional and motivational conditions within which cognitive writing processes occur.

Despite the growing literature on writing fluency, teacher enthusiasm, boredom, adaptive instruction, reflective writing, and technology-supported literacy, important gaps remain. First, writing fluency studies have predominantly emphasized planning, task structure, feedback, strategy use, and instructional technique, whereas the potential role of explicitly prosocial and altruistic classroom practices remains underexplored. Second, research on boredom has demonstrated its relationships with task value, teacher enthusiasm, autonomy support, and engagement (5-7), but relatively few studies have treated boredom as an outcome that can be deliberately reduced through a structured pedagogical intervention in L2 writing. Third, research highlighting the expanded role of writing teachers suggests that effective instruction requires attention to social and emotional dimensions in addition to linguistic knowledge (4), yet empirical work has not sufficiently investigated how a consciously caring and contribution-oriented teaching approach may influence measurable writing outcomes.

A further gap concerns the integration of quantitative and qualitative evidence. Changes in fluency and boredom can be statistically measured, but quantitative differences alone provide limited insight into why an instructional intervention works. Learners may respond to interactive tasks, teacher behavior, authentic audiences, autonomy, peer relationships, or a heightened sense of purpose in different ways. Understanding these mechanisms requires learners’ own accounts of the classroom experience. A mixed-methods perspective is therefore particularly appropriate because it can establish whether meaningful changes occur while also identifying the experiential processes that learners associate with those changes. Such triangulation is valuable in affective language research, where constructs such as boredom are subjective, dynamic, and closely intertwined with classroom context.

The Iranian EFL context provides a particularly relevant setting for examining these issues. Iranian learners frequently study English in institutionally structured environments where writing instruction may be influenced by examinations, formal language accuracy, textbook progression, and teacher-led classroom routines. Although previous Iranian research has demonstrated the effectiveness of dynamic assessment and differentiated writing tasks for promoting fluency (2, 3), less is

known about whether deliberately restructuring the emotional and prosocial meaning of writing activities can produce similar or complementary benefits. Investigating altruistic teaching in this context can therefore extend the literature by connecting writing pedagogy with emerging research on positive classroom emotions, teacher enthusiasm, meaningful engagement, and socially oriented learning.

Moreover, recent developments in EFL pedagogy emphasize that learners' engagement is increasingly shaped by a combination of human and technological factors. Reflective writing can deepen cognitive engagement (11), adaptive technologies can redesign literacy tasks (12), and AI-assisted assessment and feedback are becoming increasingly relevant to EFL writing instruction (13). Yet these innovations do not eliminate the need for learners to perceive writing as emotionally meaningful and socially valuable. Indeed, as writing instruction becomes more digitally mediated, the intentional cultivation of care, interpersonal connection, authenticity, and contribution may become even more important. Altruistic teaching thus represents a theoretically and pedagogically timely approach for examining whether the humanization of writing instruction can simultaneously support linguistic performance and emotional engagement.

Taken together, previous research suggests several complementary propositions: writing fluency is responsive to instructional conditions; boredom can interfere with engagement and is influenced by motivational and relational factors; teacher enthusiasm and support can reduce boredom and promote participation; and meaningful, reflective, adaptive, and socially relevant writing activities may strengthen learners' cognitive involvement. Nevertheless, these strands of research have largely developed separately. There remains limited empirical evidence concerning whether an explicitly altruistic instructional orientation can bring them together by creating a classroom environment in which learners experience writing as both linguistically productive and socially meaningful. Examining this possibility may contribute to a more integrated understanding of L2 writing development in which affective wellbeing, interpersonal pedagogy, and observable language performance are considered mutually influential rather than independent domains.

Accordingly, the aim of the present study was to investigate the effect of altruistic teaching on the writing fluency and L2 boredom of Iranian intermediate EFL learners and to explore the learner-perceived factors underlying these effects.

Methods and Materials

Participants were 50 Iranian female intermediate EFL learners (ages 14–17) enrolled in two intact classes at a private language institute in Shahrekord. Following Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) screening (60 multiple-choice items; learners scoring 40–47 were classified as intermediate), 25 learners per class formed the control and experimental groups. Intact classes were retained for ecological validity; the homogeneity analyses reported below confirmed baseline equivalence.

Placement and screening. The OQPT (60 items) served to select intermediate-level learners. Writing pretest and posttest. Two parallel researcher-developed argumentative essay prompts (250–300 words in 40 minutes) were administered before and after the intervention and scored for fluency. Writing fluency measure. Fluency was computed as words per T-unit (W/T), with T-units identified according to standard segmentation procedures, supported by a multi-dimensional analytic rubric adapted from Wolfe-Quintero et al. (1998) and Storch (2009). L2 boredom questionnaire. The Boredom in Practical English Language Classes Questionnaire (BPELC; Kruk & Zawodniak, 2017) measured boredom on a Likert scale, administered as pretest and posttest in both groups. Interviews. Semi-structured interviews with 10–15 learners across both groups probed experiences of boredom, engagement, and the perceived effects of classroom activities; an interview protocol guided the sessions.

A quasi-experimental pretest–posttest design with a non-equivalent (intact) control group was employed. The intervention spanned 12 sessions of 90 minutes. The experimental group's writing instruction was infused with altruistic teaching: learners wrote for authentic audiences, produced texts intended to help or inform others, engaged in peer-response exchanges framed

as mutual support, and received explicit teacher behaviors conveying care and investment in learners' progress. The control group covered the same writing syllabus with conventional instruction. Pretests (OQPT, essay, BPELC) preceded the intervention; posttests and interviews followed it.

Independent-samples *t* tests on pretest scores established homogeneity. ANCOVA with pretest scores as covariates compared posttest fluency and boredom across groups. Qualitative interview data were transcribed and subjected to thematic analysis, with two coders working independently; disagreements were resolved through discussion until inter-coder agreement was reached. Ethical safeguards included informed consent, voluntary participation, anonymity of interview data, and institutional permission from the language institute.

Findings and Results

Before the intervention, independent-samples *t* tests confirmed that the two groups did not differ significantly in writing fluency, $F(1, 48) = 0.847$, $p = .362$, or in L2 boredom, $F(1, 48) = 0.521$, $p = .474$. The groups were therefore treated as statistically equivalent at baseline.

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics. The experimental group improved by 0.78 words per T-unit on average, whereas the control group improved by only 0.25 words per T-unit.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Writing Fluency (Words per T-unit)

Group	N	Pre-test M (SD)	Post-test M (SD)	Mean Difference
Control	25	12.20 (0.72)	12.45 (0.68)	+0.25
Experimental	25	12.34 (0.76)	13.12 (0.64)	+0.78

The ANCOVA in Table 2 shows that, after controlling for pre-test fluency, the between-group difference in post-test fluency was significant, $F(1, 47) = 10.003$, $p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .175$, a moderate effect. Pre-test fluency itself was a significant covariate, $F(1, 47) = 19.024$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .288$.

Table 2. ANCOVA Results for Writing Fluency Post-test

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial η^2
Pre-test (covariate)	7.845	1	7.845	19.024	< .001	.288
Group	4.125	1	4.125	10.003	.003	.175
Error	19.384	47	0.412			

Adjusted means and confidence intervals appear in Table 3; the non-overlapping intervals indicate a reliable group difference favoring the experimental group.

Table 3. Adjusted Means for Writing Fluency

Group	Adjusted Mean	SE	95% CI
Control	12.45	0.128	[12.20, 12.71]
Experimental	13.12	0.128	[12.86, 13.38]

Table 4 reports the boredom descriptives. The two groups moved in opposite directions: the experimental group's boredom decreased by 0.57 points while the control group's rose by 0.87 points.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for L2 Boredom by Group

Group	N	Pre-test M (SD)	Post-test M (SD)	Mean Difference
Control	25	2.88 (0.31)	3.75 (1.19)	+0.87
Experimental	25	2.78 (0.27)	2.21 (1.9)	-0.57

As shown in Table 5, the ANCOVA on post-test boredom yielded a significant between-group effect, $F(1, 47) = 13.346$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .221$, again a moderate effect. The pre-test covariate was also significant, $F(1, 47) = 4.872$, $p = .032$, partial $\eta^2 = .094$.

Table 5. ANCOVA Results for L2 Boredom Post-test

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial η^2
Pre-test (covariate)	2.145	1	2.145	4.872	.032	.094
Group	5.876	1	5.876	13.346	< .001	.221
Error	20.692	47	0.440			

Table 6 presents adjusted means; the confidence intervals do not overlap, confirming that the experimental group experienced significantly less boredom at post-test.

Table 6. Adjusted Means for L2 Boredom

Group	Adjusted Mean	SE	95% CI
Control	3.75	0.133	[3.48, 4.02]
Experimental	2.21	0.133	[1.94, 2.48]

Thematic analysis of the interviews identified five boredom-related factors whose distribution differed across groups, as summarized in Table 7. Themes 1, 2, and 5 surfaced in both groups, although the experimental participants reported them as reduced or past experiences after the intervention. Themes 3 and 4—interactive activities and teacher behavior—were reported exclusively by the experimental group.

Table 7. Thematic Distribution of Boredom-Related Factors by Group

Theme	Control Group	Experimental Group	Example from Participants
1. Repetitive classroom activities increase boredom	Present	Present (as past experience)	"I feel bored when the class is slow and the activities are the same for a long time."
2. Boredom reduces attention and classroom participation	Present	Present (but reduced after intervention)	"I lose my concentration and sometimes think about other things."
3. Interactive activities reduce boredom	Absent	Present	"Group work and discussions make the class more interesting for me."
4. Teacher behavior shapes learner interest	Absent	Present (reported under altruistic teaching)	"If the teacher is active, I feel less bored."
5. Boredom weakens learning and writing performance	Present	Present (but reported improvement after intervention)	"When I feel bored, I cannot focus well."

Taken together, the quantitative and qualitative results converge: the intervention produced measurable gains in fluency and reductions in boredom, and learners attributed both changes to the interactive, meaningful, and emotionally supportive character of the altruistic classroom.

Discussion and Conclusion

The present study investigated the effects of altruistic teaching on the writing fluency and L2 boredom of Iranian intermediate EFL learners and explored the factors through which learners perceived the intervention to influence their classroom experiences. The quantitative findings demonstrated that the altruistic teaching intervention was effective in improving writing fluency. Although the experimental and control groups were statistically comparable at the pretest stage, learners exposed to altruistic teaching showed substantially greater improvement in writing fluency than those receiving conventional instruction. The experimental group increased from a mean of 12.34 to 13.12 words per T-unit, representing a mean gain of 0.78, whereas the control group increased only from 12.20 to 12.45, a gain of 0.25. After controlling for pretest performance, ANCOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of group on posttest writing fluency, $F(1, 47) = 10.003$, $p =$

.003, partial $\eta^2 = .175$. This effect size indicates that the intervention accounted for a meaningful proportion of the variance in post-intervention fluency. The findings therefore suggest that integrating authentic audiences, peer-supportive exchanges, socially meaningful writing purposes, and explicit teacher care into ordinary writing instruction can facilitate learners' capacity to generate written language more fluently.

This finding is consistent with previous research demonstrating that writing fluency is sensitive to instructional and task conditions. Ellis and Yuan found that planning conditions can influence fluency, complexity, and accuracy in second-language narrative writing, illustrating that learners' written production changes when the cognitive conditions surrounding task performance are modified (1). The present findings extend this line of research by indicating that fluency may also be shaped by the affective and interpersonal framing of writing tasks. Whereas planning reduces processing demands by enabling learners to prepare ideas and linguistic resources, altruistic teaching may enhance fluency by increasing engagement with the communicative purpose of writing and reducing psychological disengagement. When learners write for audiences whom they perceive as authentic and when the purpose of writing involves helping, informing, or supporting others, the task can become more meaningful and may stimulate sustained idea generation. This increased investment may help learners maintain a more continuous flow of written language and reduce interruptions associated with lack of interest or low task involvement.

The result also corresponds with Zeraatpishe and colleagues' findings that multiple intelligence-oriented writing tasks improved dimensions of learners' writing, including fluency (2). Both studies suggest that writing development benefits when instruction moves beyond uniform, repetitive task formats and provides learners with more varied and personally meaningful ways of engaging with written language. Multiple intelligence-oriented tasks can diversify participation by allowing learners to approach writing through different cognitive strengths, whereas altruistic teaching can diversify the social and emotional meaning of the task. In both cases, learners are provided with reasons to become more actively involved in writing rather than merely completing an exercise. This similarity suggests that writing fluency may be facilitated when classroom tasks are designed in ways that increase learner involvement, relevance, and perceived purpose.

The findings are likewise compatible with Kaveh and Rassaei's investigation of mobile-mediated and face-to-face dynamic assessment, which demonstrated that mediated instructional support can contribute to EFL learners' writing fluency and strategy awareness (3). Dynamic assessment emphasizes responsive support and interaction between teacher and learner, and altruistic teaching similarly foregrounds the interpersonal dimension of learning. The present results therefore reinforce the view that writing fluency is not developed solely through repeated independent production. Rather, supportive interaction, responsive teacher behavior, and strategically structured learning conditions may create environments in which learners can mobilize their linguistic resources more efficiently. The altruistic teacher's explicit investment in learners' progress may also have reduced concerns about evaluation and shifted attention toward communication and contribution, thereby enabling learners to produce written language with greater continuity.

The second major quantitative finding concerned L2 boredom. The results showed a significant reduction in boredom among learners in the experimental group, whereas boredom increased among learners receiving conventional instruction. The experimental group's mean boredom score decreased from 2.78 at pretest to 2.21 at posttest, while the control group's mean increased from 2.88 to 3.75. After controlling for baseline boredom, ANCOVA indicated a significant group effect, $F(1, 47) = 13.346$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .221$. The magnitude of this effect suggests that altruistic teaching had a substantial influence on learners' emotional experience of the writing classroom. More importantly, the opposite trajectories observed in the two groups indicate that boredom was not simply stable across the instructional period. Instead, classroom design appears to have played an important role in determining whether learners became increasingly disengaged or experienced a reduction in boredom.

This result is strongly supported by studies examining teacher enthusiasm and classroom boredom. Cui and colleagues found that perceived teacher enthusiasm dampened class-related boredom among college students and that perceived task value mediated this relationship over time (7). The present findings can be interpreted through a similar mechanism. Altruistic teaching may have increased learners' perceptions that classroom writing was valuable because tasks were connected with authentic audiences, mutual assistance, and meaningful communication rather than functioning only as formal exercises. When students believe that a task has purpose and relevance, they may be less likely to experience the low activation and lack of meaning characteristic of boredom. Thus, the decline in boredom in the experimental group may have resulted partly from changes in how learners appraised the value of writing activities.

The findings also align closely with Dewaele and Li's evidence that teacher enthusiasm is associated with students' social-behavioral engagement and that enjoyment and boredom serve as important mediating emotional processes in EFL classrooms (8). In the present study, the qualitative findings specifically identified teacher behavior as one of the themes explaining reduced boredom. Learners in the experimental group described the teacher's active and supportive behavior as contributing to greater interest in classroom activities. This convergence between quantitative and qualitative results reinforces the argument that teacher behavior can shape the emotional quality of language learning. Altruistic teaching may have communicated enthusiasm not only through energetic instruction but also through visible care, responsiveness, and investment in students' progress. Such behaviors can signal to learners that their participation matters, thereby enhancing emotional involvement and reducing detachment.

Borgonovi and colleagues similarly demonstrated meaningful relationships among teacher enthusiasm, academic boredom, achievement, and ICT use among adolescents (6). Their findings support the present interpretation that boredom is closely connected to the quality of the learning environment rather than being merely an individual learner characteristic. In the current study, learners exposed to conventional instruction experienced an increase in boredom across the instructional period, whereas learners exposed to altruistic practices experienced the reverse pattern. This contrast suggests that repeated exposure to ordinary classroom routines may contribute to emotional disengagement when tasks offer insufficient novelty, interpersonal meaning, or opportunities for active participation. Altruistic practices appear to have interrupted this process by introducing more meaningful forms of engagement.

The qualitative results provided further evidence regarding the mechanisms underlying the reduction in boredom. Five boredom-related themes emerged from learner interviews: repetitive classroom activities, reduced attention and participation, interactive activities, teacher behavior, and the perceived negative influence of boredom on learning and writing performance. Repetitive activities were identified as a source of boredom across participants, but learners in the experimental condition described this issue largely as a prior experience that had diminished during the intervention. Interactive activities, in contrast, emerged as a distinctive feature of the experimental group. Learners reported that group work and discussions made the classroom more interesting, suggesting that increased interpersonal interaction was central to the emotional impact of altruistic teaching.

This finding can be understood in relation to Wang and colleagues' study of teacher autonomy support and student engagement. Their results showed that boredom, intrinsic value, and self-efficacy functioned as mediating mechanisms through which teacher autonomy support influenced engagement (5). In the present study, altruistic teaching provided learners with opportunities to participate actively, respond to peers, and contribute through meaningful written communication. Such activities may have enhanced perceptions of autonomy and intrinsic value because learners were not simply responding to decontextualized teacher demands. Instead, they had recognizable communicative purposes and social roles within classroom

tasks. Greater participation and autonomy may therefore have weakened the disengagement associated with boredom while simultaneously creating favorable conditions for writing production.

The qualitative findings regarding attention are particularly important in explaining the relationship between boredom reduction and increased writing fluency. Learners reported that boredom interfered with concentration and participation and that they found it difficult to focus effectively when bored. After the altruistic teaching intervention, experimental-group participants described these effects as less prominent. This pattern offers a plausible explanation for the simultaneous improvement in writing fluency. Writing requires sustained concentration, lexical retrieval, idea generation, and linguistic encoding. If boredom diverts attention away from the task, fewer cognitive resources may remain available for fluent production. Conversely, reducing boredom through interactive, meaningful, and socially purposeful tasks may allow learners to sustain attention and generate language more continuously. The results therefore suggest that improved fluency and reduced boredom may not represent independent outcomes but rather interconnected consequences of the same instructional environment.

The relationship between motivation and boredom identified in the present study also corresponds with findings reported by Rezayi and Noorouzi, who showed that motivational beliefs were related to reductions in job boredom among physical education teachers (9). Although occupational and academic boredom differ in context, both involve perceptions of meaning, involvement, and motivational investment. The present findings similarly imply that boredom may be reduced when individuals perceive greater purpose and personal value in what they are doing. Altruistic writing tasks may have increased motivational significance by positioning learners' written products as potentially useful to others rather than as products created solely for evaluation. This socially meaningful orientation may therefore have functioned as an important motivational resource.

The importance of relational dimensions is also compatible, at a broader conceptual level, with Vahedinia and colleagues' examination of irrational thoughts and communication beliefs in relation to marital boredom among teachers (10). Although the setting differs substantially from language education, their work highlights the broader association between boredom and the quality of interpersonal and cognitive engagement. The present findings similarly indicate that emotional disengagement can be affected by relational conditions. When learners experienced teacher care, peer support, and meaningful communication, boredom declined. This reinforces the idea that boredom is not solely produced by the objective characteristics of a task; it is also influenced by the interpersonal meaning attached to participation.

Another notable finding was the learners' emphasis on interactive and meaningful classroom activities. This observation is compatible with recent work on technology-supported and adaptive instruction. Syukran and colleagues' investigation of SAMR-based adaptive technology in English reading-writing instruction highlighted teachers' experiences of using technology to transform rather than merely reproduce conventional learning activities (12). The present study similarly suggests that instructional innovation is most effective when it changes the learner's role in the task. Simply altering the delivery medium may be insufficient if learners remain passive. Altruistic teaching transformed writing into an interactive activity with social consequences, which may explain why learners described the classroom as more engaging and less repetitive.

The findings can also be related to Tola Chala's study showing that reflective writing enhanced critical thinking among EFL student-teachers (11). Reflective writing becomes educationally powerful when learners use written language to process experience, formulate perspectives, and communicate meaning rather than merely practice formal structures. Similarly, the current intervention encouraged learners to perceive writing as purposeful communication. This orientation may have supported both deeper cognitive involvement and greater persistence. The overlap between these findings suggests that when writing is embedded in meaningful cognitive or social purposes, it is more likely to generate active engagement than when it functions mainly as a language exercise.

The present findings are also relevant to changing conceptions of the L2 writing teacher. Yu's review of discourses surrounding second-language writing teachers showed that teachers occupy multiple roles extending beyond the correction of linguistic forms (4). The current findings provide empirical support for the significance of such expanded roles. Learners appeared to benefit when the teacher functioned not only as an evaluator but also as a facilitator of meaningful interaction, a source of emotional support, and an organizer of opportunities for contribution. The significant improvement in fluency and reduction in boredom therefore suggest that the interpersonal and affective roles of writing teachers may have measurable consequences for both performance and classroom emotions.

The findings also have implications in the context of emerging artificial intelligence in language writing education. Sadigova and colleagues documented teachers' perspectives regarding the integration of artificial intelligence into assessment and feedback on EFL academic writing (13). Although AI-based tools can enhance the speed, accessibility, and personalization of feedback, the current findings emphasize the continuing importance of distinctly human dimensions of instruction. Learners responded positively to teacher care, interpersonal interaction, meaningful audiences, and peer support. Therefore, technological innovation in writing instruction may be most effective when it complements rather than replaces relational pedagogy. AI can potentially support linguistic feedback and revision, while altruistically oriented teaching can address the social and emotional dimensions that technology alone may not provide.

Taken together, the findings demonstrate convergence across quantitative and qualitative evidence. The statistically significant improvement in writing fluency was accompanied by a statistically significant reduction in L2 boredom, while interview data indicated that learners associated these changes with interactive activities, meaningful tasks, reduced repetition, enhanced participation, and supportive teacher behavior. This pattern supports an integrated interpretation in which altruistic teaching alters both the emotional climate and the cognitive conditions of writing. By increasing perceived purpose, social interaction, autonomy, and teacher support, the intervention may have reduced attentional disengagement and encouraged learners to invest more cognitive and linguistic resources in written production. The findings therefore extend previous work on planning, differentiated writing tasks, dynamic assessment, teacher enthusiasm, autonomy support, reflective writing, adaptive technology, and teacher roles by demonstrating that these strands can converge within an explicitly altruistic pedagogical framework (1-3, 5, 7, 8). Overall, altruistic teaching appears to constitute a promising instructional approach for simultaneously addressing the linguistic and affective dimensions of EFL writing.

The findings should be interpreted in light of several limitations. First, the study involved only 50 female intermediate EFL learners from a single private language institute in Shahrekord, which restricts the generalizability of the findings to male learners, different age groups, other proficiency levels, public educational institutions, university settings, and learners from other sociocultural contexts. Second, intact classes were used rather than individual random assignment, meaning that unmeasured classroom characteristics may have influenced the outcomes despite the statistical equivalence of the groups at pretest. Third, the intervention lasted only twelve sessions, and no delayed posttest was administered; consequently, it remains unclear whether improvements in writing fluency and reductions in boredom would persist after the intervention ended. Fourth, boredom was measured partly through self-report, which may be influenced by social desirability, response tendencies, or learners' awareness of the intervention. Finally, writing fluency was operationalized primarily through words per T-unit, which captures an important aspect of fluency but does not encompass all dimensions of writing performance, such as accuracy, syntactic complexity, lexical sophistication, organization, and overall quality.

Future research should replicate the study with larger and more diverse samples that include male and female learners, different age groups, multiple proficiency levels, and participants from schools, universities, and language institutes in different geographical regions. Randomized controlled designs would strengthen causal inference, while longitudinal studies with

delayed posttests could determine whether the effects of altruistic teaching on writing fluency and boredom are sustained over time. Researchers should also examine additional writing outcomes, including accuracy, lexical and syntactic complexity, organization, coherence, revision quality, and overall writing achievement, in order to determine whether the benefits extend beyond fluency. Future studies could experimentally separate different components of altruistic teaching, such as authentic audience writing, peer-helping activities, service-oriented writing projects, teacher-care behaviors, and collaborative feedback, to identify which components have the strongest effects. Additional mediating variables, including enjoyment, task value, self-efficacy, autonomy, willingness to communicate, and writing motivation, should also be investigated to provide a more detailed explanation of how altruistic teaching influences language learning outcomes.

EFL teachers are encouraged to incorporate altruistic principles into ordinary writing instruction by designing tasks that give learners authentic and socially meaningful reasons to write. Instead of limiting writing activities to decontextualized essays completed only for teacher evaluation, instructors can invite learners to produce informative texts for classmates, supportive messages for peers, advice-oriented writing, community-focused texts, collaborative projects, and materials intended to help or inform identifiable audiences. Teachers should also create opportunities for peer response that emphasize constructive assistance rather than simple error identification and should communicate active interest in learners' progress through supportive feedback, responsiveness, and encouragement. Classroom routines should be varied to prevent excessive repetition, and learners should be offered meaningful choices in topics, audiences, and forms of participation where feasible. Digital and AI-assisted writing tools may also be incorporated, but they should serve the larger goals of interaction, autonomy, meaningful communication, and human support rather than reducing writing to automated correction. In this way, altruistic teaching can be embedded into existing curricula without requiring additional instructional time while potentially improving both learners' written performance and their emotional engagement with language learning.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to all those who helped us carrying out this study.

Authors' Contributions

All authors equally contributed to this study.

Declaration of Interest

The authors of this article declared no conflict of interest.

Ethical Considerations

All ethical principles were adhered in conducting and writing this article.

Transparency of Data

In accordance with the principles of transparency and open research, we declare that all data and materials used in this study are available upon request.

Funding

This research was carried out independently with personal funding and without the financial support of any governmental or private institution or organization.

References

1. Ellis R, Yuan F. The effects of planning on fluency, complexity, and accuracy in second language narrative writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 2004;26(1):59-84. doi: 10.1017/S0272263104261034.
2. Zeraatpishe M, Seifoori Z, Hadidi Tamjid N. The impact of multiple intelligence-oriented writing tasks on the accuracy, fluency, and organization of ELT students' writing. *The Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*. 2020;12(25):1-31.
3. Kaveh A, Rassaei E. Mobile-Mediated Versus Face-to-Face Dynamic Assessment, EFL Learners' Writing Fluency, and Strategy Awareness: A Sociocultural Perspective. *Language and Sociocultural Theory*. 2022;9(1):34-68. doi: 10.1558/lst.20288.
4. Yu S. Profiling Second Language Writing Teachers: Discourses From the Published Literature. *Future in Educational Research*. 2025;3(2):207-23. doi: 10.1002/fer.370000.
5. Wang J, Liu RD, Ding Y, Xu L, Liu Y, Zhen R. Teacher's Autonomy Support and Engagement in Math: Multiple Mediating Roles of Self-Efficacy, Intrinsic Value, and Boredom. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2017;8. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01006.
6. Borgonovi F, Pokropek M, Pokropek A. Relations between Academic Boredom, Academic Achievement, ICT Use, and Teacher Enthusiasm among Adolescents. *Computers & Education*. 2023;200(1):104807-12. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104807.
7. Cui G, Chen J, Wang C, Zhang C, Zhang X, Hu Y. Dampening Effects of Perceived Teacher Enthusiasm on Class-Related Boredom in College Students: Longitudinal Mediation Effects of Perceived Task Value. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2021;12. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.712441.
8. Dewaele JM, Li C. Teacher enthusiasm and students' social-behavioral learning engagement: The mediating role of student enjoyment and boredom in Chinese EFL classes. *Language Teaching Research*. 2021;25(6):922-45. doi: 10.1177/13621688211014538.
9. Rezayi M, Noorouzi P. The Role of Motivational Beliefs in Reducing Job Boredom Among Physical Education Teachers. *Quarterly Journal of Social Psychology*. 2020;7(2):142-59.
10. Vahedinia M, Akbari Daghi H, Gharib H. The relationship between irrational thoughts and communication beliefs with marital boredom among teacher (Master's Married teachers in Gonbad County, Master's thesis, Gonbad, Iran. 2019.
11. Tola Chala G. The Effects of Reflective Writing on EFL Student-Teachers' Critical Thinking: A Quasi-Experimental Study. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*. 2025. doi: 10.1057/s41599-025-05643-9.
12. Syukran R, Adriansyah A, Alimir IJ, Syafitri W, Sesmiarni Z, Bayu EPS. Exploring Teachers' Experiences in Integrating SAMR-Based Adaptive Technology in Primary English Reading-Writing Instruction. *El-Rusyd*. 2025;10(2):330-8. doi: 10.58485/elrusyd.v10i2.535.
13. Sadigova SI, Aliyeva DKR, Ahmadova VS, Rzayeva DG, Aliyeva KM, Huseynova DF. Teachers' Views on the Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Assessing and Providing Feedback on EFL Academic Writing in Azerbaijan. 2026. doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-9514620/v1.