

Received date: 20/07/2008
Evaluated date: 30/10/2008
Accepted date: 15/03/2009

Journal of Education
(Education and Psychology Journal)
Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz
Faculty of Education and Psychology
No. 4, Vol. 4, Winter, 2009, pp: 89-114

ELT Educational Context, Teacher Intuition and Learner Hidden Agenda (A Study of Conflicting Maxims)

Gh. R. Abbasian *

Abstract

This study, first, attempted to explore the conflict or tension between EFL teacher intuition or concepts and the conception with a composite view assembled from learner's accounts of the distinctive features of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), and second to investigate the latter's "hidden agenda" (Nunan, 1998) of what ELT should be. On the other hand, role of educational context as an independent variable in determining such conflicting conceptions was also investigated. The study was carried out in the Iranian educational context conventionally categorized into three settings including; authoritarian, semi-democratic and democratic, given their varying existing educational policies and planning. Both the learner and teacher-participants (N=150, 45, respectively) answered three triangulating and already validated questionnaires (Brindly, 1984 and BALLI of Horwitz, 1987) attempting both the nature of language learning activities and their beliefs on CLT. Findings revealed that the learners hold variety of self-efficacy beliefs different from those of their teachers about learning language, many of which supported to be attributed to the educational context type and language planning and the pertinent administration policies. While both sides agreed in general on the virtues of CLT to language teaching, there were interesting differences in their perceptions mainly as to

* - Assistant Pro in Imam Ali University, Tehran, E-mail: gabbasian @ yahoo.com

lesson purposes, classroom activities, and learning outcomes. The implications of the study would revolve around the (I) dependency of reflective teaching and learning on teacher's awareness of learner's needs, capabilities, potentials and preferences or in Richard's (1996) term of learner's "maxims", (II) necessity of teacher-learner cooperation in syllabus design, (III) significance of narrowing the gap between their maxims of instruction and learning, and (IV) awareness of the possible imposition of negative impacts like tension, anxiety and dissatisfaction on the learner's side resulting from any cognitive and intuitive mismatch on the teacher's side.

Key Words: Teacher Intuition, Learner Hidden Agenda, Educational Context

Introduction

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in general research on the mental images, thoughts, and processes second or foreign language (L2/FL) learners and their teachers employ in their careers, respectively. Their mental processes provide "interpretative frames" used to understand and approach their own careers (Richards, 1996, p. 1). Both groups, in this process, develop their own personal principles functioning like rules for the best behavior or maxims. Out of the variables determining their interpretative frames, their beliefs or perspectives about learning in general and language learning in particular, referring to opinions they hold about various aspects of language learning have recently been the major focus of the attention (Horwitz, 1987a in Diab, 2006). It is also believed that such beliefs are linked with many effective variables and language teaching-learning strategies (Park, 1995; Wenden, 1986; Young, 1991).

Learners' beliefs about language learning deserve both special attention and further studies as according to Horwitz (ibid) they may influence their expectations for and commitment to their language learning and they are more susceptible than their cognitive and affective variables. On the other hand, teachers' beliefs about language teaching or better to say their intuition of what their learners think of and how they tackle the task of language learning require further investigations to explore the extent of either congruency or mismatch between the former's Hidden Agenda (Nunan, 1989) on language learning and that of the latter's Intuition of the issue at stake.

In spite of the growing number of studies investigating beliefs about language learning of different groups of EFL/ESL learners from various cultural backgrounds, few research studies have been reported in the literature to explore purposefully the intervention of educational context type in which language education is carried about, though Benson and Lor (1999) argue that beliefs about learning should not be viewed independently of the context and Sakin and Gaies (1999) outline the need for the development of “ context-sensitive” instruments for measuring beliefs.

Review of the Literature

The cognitive literature indicates that there are links among beliefs, motivation, and strategy use in the process of language learning. Second language researchers (e. g., Abraham & Vann, 1987; Horwitz, 1988; Wenden, 1986a, 1987a) have also suggested connections between learners’ metacognitive knowledge or beliefs about language learning and their choice of learning strategies as documented in Yang (1999) under three titles as (1) Learners’ beliefs about second language learning, (2) Beliefs and strategy use, and (3) Motivation, beliefs and strategy use.

Educational significance of beliefs has been tackled from various perspectives. In cognitive psychology, learner beliefs about the nature of knowledge and learning, or epistemological beliefs, have been investigated as part of the underlying mechanisms of metacognition (Flavell, 1987; Ryan, 1984 in Bernet & Gvozdenk, 2005), form the building blocks of epistemology (Goldman, 1986), and as a driving force in intellectual performance. The pervasive influence of personal and social epistemologies on academic learning, thinking, reasoning, problem solving, persistence and interpretation of information has been acknowledged by many psychologists (Schommer, 1990). From this perspective, beliefs about language learning are viewed as component of metacognitive knowledge (Flavell, 1987), which include all that individuals understand about themselves as learners and thinkers. Some others define beliefs as mini-theories, insights, culture of learning, learners assumption, implicit theories, self-constructed representational systems, conceptions of learning , and general assumptions one holds about himself, about factors affecting

language learning and about the nature of language learning and teaching (Bernet, 2005).

Interdisciplinary research also finds links between learners' beliefs about learning and factors such as self-concept and identity, self-efficacy, personality, and other individual differences (Epstein, 1990 in Bernet).

Evidently, learners bring to the language classroom a complex web of attitudes, experiences, expectations, beliefs and learning strategies. Then, their attitudes towards learning and the perceptions and beliefs may have a profound influence on learning behavior (Como, 1986, Cotterall, 1995) and on learning outcomes (Van Rossum & Schenk, 1984; Weinert & Klume, 1987). They are also linked with learners' overall experience and achievement (Saki & Gaies, 1990; Schommer, 1990). Furthermore, the issues have been investigated from different perspectives including normative, metacognitive, and contextual approaches. As to the last one, Chawhan & Oliver (2000), Cotterall (1995), Kim-Yoon (2000) extended their research into different contexts and their findings are context-specific. On the other hand, all of these studies, as Bernet (2005) put support the fundamental arguments raised by previous researchers that understanding of learner beliefs can enhance the language learning process. Therefore, it is concluded that "ESL teachers' consciousness of learners' expectations may contribute to a more conducive learning environment and to more effective learning" (Chawhan & Oliver, 2000, p. 25). Sakai & Gaies' (1999) study confirms dynamic and situationally conditioned nature of beliefs about language learning. It is strongly and widely believed that beliefs about learning and teaching affect learning behavior, overall experience and achievement, and they set learning and teaching processes as well as learning strategies.

Teacher-learner Congruency

Research on the differences between the views of language learners and teachers focus both on the conflicting perceptions they may hold on what helps or hinders language learning process and on how differently they may actually perceive what is happening in their shared classroom. To this end, Nunan (1989) has coined "hidden

agenda” which may lead learners to concentrate on specific language points or areas, e.g., formal language points rather than communicative purposes of a lesson, signifying some sort of conflicting conceptions of various language learning activities such as: error correction, learner self-discovery of errors, and pair work. He has found mismatch between learners’ and teachers’ responses on the majority of classroom activities. Therefore, the major problem is whether learners’ perceptions of the prominence of various classroom activities are the same as those of the teachers who are initiating them.

Huang Jing in his seminal article (2006) tried to prove that learners’ resistance in metacognitive resistance is partly due to a mismatch between the goals and expectations on the part of the teachers and learners’ beliefs. According to him, “learner resistance is a function of tension and conflicts in the learners and teachers’ agenda. They are manifested in their different perceptions, learning and instruction, lesson purposes, classroom activities and learning outcomes” (Jing, 2006, p. 99). Nunan (1995) tries to make association between such an agenda mismatch and mismatch of learning and instruction. Here agenda is concerned with goal-setting and action planning, conceptions of learning.

Conceptions of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

A well-known earlier study (Fronhlinch et al, 1985) looked at the differences between teachers in their orientations to communicative language instruction. This and similar studies indicated that teachers hold a variety of beliefs and understandings of this term, ranging from survival language to grammar, strategy use, sociolinguistic and discourse competence. Mangubhai et al (1998) put “teacher had understanding and beliefs about CLT that differed from those of CLT researchers and theorists.

Educational Setting

Nevertheless, any educational setting, and more specifically that of Iranian, usually resembles a continuum on which two extremes of educational management approaches are assumed: authoritarian and democratic (i.e., openness). Of course, some moderate versions lie in between somewhere on the continuum, which are, for the purpose of

this study, conventionally classified under three categories: Authoritarian, Democratic and Semi-democratic settings operationally defined as follows:

I. Authoritarian context (fitting the military settings), theoretically and operationally, means strict rules and harsh punishment (Brown, 1999). Here the teacher tries or is usually forced to "establish himself or herself as the absolute authority in the class ends to unjustly reward learners that fit the mould" (Harmer, 1983, pp. 209-210). It is then characterized by teacher-centeredness, less flexibility and relatively non-humanistic in psychological term.

II. Semi-democratic characterizes the situation (and a moderate state on the hypothesized educational continuum) of the Iranian well-established universities in which the relationship is reciprocal, non-repressive, non-discriminatory, and there are accountability, humanity, consistency, clarity, respect, and reasonable firmness.

III. Democratic setting in Iran characterises the situation of ever-growing non-profit higher education institutes under which (1) freedom is not associated with accountability in terms of either institutional formalities or expectations from the learners, (2) formalities are denigrated by both the institutes themselves and then by the learners, and (3) there are much more flexibilities and applications of conservative policies and considerations.

Given the nature of the problem and the educational settings under study, two main respective null hypotheses were raised:

Research Hypothesis

HA: Learners' agenda of learning and teachers' intuition of it do not match greatly in relation to ELT educational setting type.

HB: Learners' conceptions of language learning are not the functions of ELT educational setting types.

METHOD

Participants

Participants of the study were two groups including 150 Iranian learners doing their English conversation courses and 45 professional EFL teachers under the three already identified educational settings. A general proficiency test of the 1999 version of TOEFL was first

administered to about 210 subjects (70 from each setting) so as to homogenize them in terms of proficiency level. Based on the normal probability distribution curve, they, then, were divided into three distinct groups on the basis of their positions on the curve; under-1SD, between -1 and +1SD or over +1SD. Out of those who were standing between -1SD and +1SD 150 (50 from each setting) were selected. Then, 50 learners and 15 teachers from each setting (15 from each) took part in the study.

Instrumentation

Two different types of instruments were used in this study; first a 13-item Yes/No questionnaire, adopted from Brindly (1984) which is in two versions one designed to probe the beliefs of learners and the other one to those of the teachers. However, each item was composed of a number of sub-items to the extent that the learners' version consisted of 48 items altogether but that of the teachers included 45 sub-items. Apart from addressing and reference conventions, the two versions were originally expected they would measure the same trait. Each item along with its relevant sub-items explores a particular L2 topic and they can be categorized into three major classes including: Learning, Error correction, and Assessment or Evaluation. Second, Horwitz's (1987, 1988) five scale inventory called Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory (BALLI), which assesses learners' beliefs about language learning in five major areas of: FL aptitude, FLL difficulty, the nature of FLL, learning and commitment strategies, and expectations was employed. The BALLI includes 35 items and is reported to have content validity correlated with the Marlowe-Crowne Desirability scale and Cronbach alpha of 0.94 for internal-consistency reliability (Yang, 1999).

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

Given the complexities, varieties of the respective issues as well as practicality and manageability considerations, the study was confined to certain areas including agenda of and conceptualization of language learning from two perspectives; however, there are so many intact and

virgin areas as to education in general and language education in particular that necessitate further investigations that a few of them are suggested at the end of the article. Then, sound generalization of the findings rests upon replication, triangulation and extension of the scales of the all relevant issues. Furthermore, the study was confined to Iranian university and higher educational settings, but public school settings are so intact contexts for similar studies, bringing about much more tangible implications.

Results and Discussion (as to Ho A and Ho B)

Given the fact that both instruments do not yield a single composite score (Diab, 2006, p. 84); responses to the individual items were considered separately. Therefore, data were triangulated through conducting triple statistical measures including ANOVA, Post-hoc comparison, Chi-square and Principle Component analysis. As to Brindly's Questionnaire, two types of statistical results were obtained.

I. Hypothesis A

Tables 1 presents the ANOVA on whole group comparison in which teachers-learners and learners-learners in all of the triple settings are compared in terms of their intuition and hidden agenda of language learning, respectively collected through the YES-NO Questionnaire. Clearly, there are 33 items/cases out of 45 ones in which the differences are statistically meaningful on the areas such as learning process, attitude, leaning styles, learning strategies, error correction, etc., probed by the questionnaire. Such differences are taken as obvious indications sustaining the mismatch or discrepancy not only between the teachers and learners but also inter-learners from various educational settings. Then, it is conceivable to reject the null hypothesis A.

Table 1: ANOVA-Whole Group Comparison

ITEM (Teachers-Learners, Learners-Learners)	Between & Within Settings (Questionnaire items)	F Value	Significance
1	Achievement satisfaction	7.01	.000
2	Individual learning	4.80	.047
7	Time spent: preparation for next class	4.400	.001
9	Time spent: all in class	4.38	.000
11	Learning by listening	4.13	.001
12	Learning by reading	5.15	.000
14	Listening & note taking	3.33	.007
15	Reading & note taking	3.07	.001
16	Repetition	3.51	.005
17	Making summaries	4.41	.001
18	Contextualized vocabulary learning	7.25	.001
19	Old-new vocabulary connection in learning	6.56	.000
20	Vocabulary learning by writing over several times	5.27	.000
21	Avoiding verbatim translation	3.57	.004
22	Guessing meaning	2.40	..039
24	Welcome immediate correction in public	5.61	.000
25	Welcome later correction in public	3.27	.007
26	Welcome later correction in private	2.64	.026
27	Welcome peer correction	4.79	.000
29	Learning from visual aids	7.10	.000
30	Learning from tape	3.36	.006
31	Learning from written materials	7.69	.000
32	Learning from board	6.76	.000
33	Learning from pictorials	4.30	.001
34	Role play	5.19	.000
35	Conversing with classmates	11.43	.000
38	Memorizing dialogues	3.87	.002
39	Using guest speakers	3.85	.002
40	Planned visits	19.31	.000
41	Diary writing	3.10	.010
42	Learning about culture	21.45	.000
43	Finding out improvement	3.79	.003
44	The way one gets sense of satisfaction	10.08	.000

Table 2 presents the Post-hoc Test analysis of Teachers-Learners multiple comparisons of the beliefs affected by the educational setting type. According to the table, there are 28 items again out of 45 which indicate statistically significant differences when teachers were compared with their respective learners in the same setting. In 13 cases (i.e., items: 1, 2, 3, 6, 16, 17, 21, 22, 28, 31, 34, 35, and 39) the difference is within the same setting. However, there are 10 cases (i.e., items: 12, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 29, 32, 38, and 41) in which two settings share the meaningful difference. Furthermore, 5 cases (i.e., items: 9, 27, 33, 40, and 43) signify differences shared by all three settings. As a result, both findings revealed through the ANOVA and the Post hoc Test match in many cases and, then, collaboratively sustain the claim that not only learner-teacher beliefs on the concept of language learning as well as on CLT but also those of learner-learner are the functions of educational setting types.

The data presented in the Table 3 can be taken as an extra proof supporting the difference among the learners under the three different settings. However, the bulk of the difference lies on between the Authoritarian-Semi-democratic and Authoritarian-Democratic settings in 15 cases rather than the Democratic-Semi-democratic being varied just in two cases, i.e., items number 1 and 16. Meanwhile, in 7 cases (i.e., items 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, 18, and 21) both the Authoritarian-Semi-democratic and Authoritarian-Democratic share the difference in beliefs about language learning.

Table 2: Post hoc Test: Teachers-Learners Multiple Comparison

Item	Item stem	Between settings	Mean Difference	Significance
1	Achievement satisfaction	Lear-Teach-Autho	.66275	.000
2	Individual learning	Lear-Teach-Autho	.26392	.004
3	In pair learning	Lear-Teach-Autho	.36078	.014
6	Attitude toward homework	Lear-Teach-Demo	.30884	.030
9	Time spent : all in class	Lear-Teach-Autho	.38431	.006
		Lear-Teach-Semi	.31973	.021
		Lear-Teach-Demo	.37333	.007
12	Learning by reading	Lear-Teach-Autho	.29412	.033
		Lear-Teach-Demo	.32925	.018
16	Repetition	Lear-Teach-Demo	.42177	.046
17	Making summaries	Lear-Teach-Demo	.37143	.000
18	Contextualised vocabulary learning	Lear-Teach-Semi	.30884	.020
		Lear-Teach-Demo	.57333	.000
19	Old-new vocabulary connection	Lear-Teach-Semi	.62721	.000
		Lear-Teach-Demo	.38000	.006
20	Vocabulary learning by writing several times	Lear-Teach-Semi	.45306	.001
		Lear-Teach-Demo	.47333	.001
21	Avoiding verbatim translation	Lear-Teach-Autho	.36863	.005
22	Guessing meaning	Lear-Teach-Demo	.41224	.005
24	Immediate error correction in public	Lear-Teach-Autho	.34902	.009
		Lear-Teach-Demo	.36190	.007
25	Later error correction in public	Lear-Teach-Autho	.36078	.012
		Lear-Teach-Semi	.14275	.025
27	Peer error correction	Lear-Teach-Autho	.30588	.026
		Lear-Teach-Semi	.33469	.016
		Lear-Teach-Demo	.46000	.001
28	Error correction by teacher	Lear-Teach-Autho	.33725	.014
29	Learning from visual aids	Lear-Teach-Demo	.40000	.000
		Lear-Teach-Semi	.23333	.033
31	Learning from written materials	Lear-Teach-Autho	.30196	.029
32	Learning from board	Lear-Teach-Demo	.62721	.000
		Lear-Teach-Semi	.35333	.010
33	Pictorial learning	Lear-Teach-Autho	.31765	.021
		Lear-Teach-Semi	.51973	.000
		Lear-Teach-Demo	.44667	.001
34	Role play learning	Lear-Teach-Autho	.38824	.004
35	Conversing with classmates	Lear-Teach-Autho	.42353	.001
38	Dialogue memorization	Lear-Teach-Demo	.28299	.027
		Lear-Teach-Semi	.68000	.000
39	Using guest speakers	Lear-Teach-Autho	.29020	.026
40	Planned visits	Lear-Teach-Autho	.60392	.000
		Lear-Teach-Semi	.63673	.000
		Lear-Teach-Demo	.63333	.000
41	Diary writing	Lear-Teach-Autho	.40392	.002
		Lear-Teach-Demo	.28884	.028
42	Learning about culture	Lear-Teach-Autho	.88235	.000
		Lear-Teach-Semi	.45850	.000
		Lear-Teach-Demo	.60000	.000

Table 3: Post hoc test: Learners-Learners, Multiple Comparison

Item	Questionnaire Items	Autho-Semi	Autho-Demo	Demo-Semi
1	Achievement satisfaction		.000	.011
2	Individual learning	.004		
4	Small group learning		.026	
7	Time spent: preparation for next class	.001	.000	
9	Time spent: all in class	.005	.000	
11	Learning by reading	.001	.000	
12	Copying from the board	.011		
13	Listening & note taking		.001	
14	Reading & note making	.012	.000	
15	Repetition		.001	.047
16	Making summaries	.000	.001	
17	Contextualized vocabulary learning	.001	.012	
18	Old-new vocabulary connection		.010	
19	Vocabulary learning by writing several times		.003	
20	Avoiding verbatim translation	.000	.036	
21	Reading without dictionary	.000		.003
23	Immediate error correction in public		.004	
24	Later error correction in public	.005		
25	Peer error correction	.009	.000	
27	Error correction by teacher	.009	.000	
28	Learning from radio	.001	.001	
30	Learning from audio aids	.001	.001	
31	Learning from written materials		.032	
32	Learning from board	.004	.000	
33	Role play	.031		.006
35	Language games		.007	
36	Songs	.013	.029	
37	Conversing with classmates	.000	.000	
38	Dialogue memorization	.011		
39	Diary writing	.001	.000	
42	Learning about culture	.002	.000	

Table 4 presents the results of the factor analysis on YES-No Questionnaire. The factor analysis on the YES-No Questionnaire items identified four factors that constitute both the learners' beliefs about language learning under each of the educational settings. The table presents the items that constitute both the distribution and coefficient of factor loadings for each item. In this study only those items with factor loadings around and above 0.30 were considered, since according to Stevens (1986) items whose factor loading is around the given rate the variable shares at least 15% of its variance with factor and is thus considered to be practically significant.

Interestingly, not only does the type of the items under each factor but also their distribution and rate of loadings differ greatly inter-settings. For example, the underlying traits explored and attributed to the learners under the Authoritarian setting and under the factor 1 differ significantly from those of the two other settings as far as the same factor is concerned. The same trend holds true with regard to the other factors, items as traits and setting types. The result of the factor analysis to a large extent corresponds with these of the ANOVA and the Post-hoc Test.

II. Hypothesis B

Table 5 presents the ANOVA on the on whole group comparison in which learners-learners in all of the triple settings are compared in terms of their intuition and hidden agenda of teaching and learning language, respectively collected through the BALLI. According to the table there are 14 items/cases out of 35 in which the differences are statistically meaningful. Such differences are thus taken as an evidence for the fact that educational context type may play a crucial role in shaping and reshaping learners' conceptualisation on the phenomena including the nature of teaching and learning language as well as the CLT being studied in this study.

Table 4: Factor Analysis on YES/NO Questionnaire

Factor	Authoritarian Loadings	Semi-Democratic Loadings	Democratic Loadings
1	Time spent: next class prep %67 All time spent in class %50 Making summaries %30 Error correction later in public %67 Learning from visual aids %42 Learning from pictorials %61 Learning about culture %32 Ways of getting satisfaction %51	Individual learning %64 Attitudes towards homework %40 Learning by listening %30 Learning by reading %37 Peer correction %50 Learning from written materials %48 Songs %61 Planned visits %50 Ways of getting satisfaction %31	Welcome correction later in private %70 Planned visits %66 Using guest speakers %42 Learning about culture %63 Language games %63 Old-new vocabulary connection %56 Songs %50 Peer cooperation %47 Teacher correction %50 Conversing with classmates %40 Diary writing %36 Small group learning %31
2	Learning by reading %58 Repetition %36 Vocabulary learning by writing over several times %50 Avoid verbatim translation %31 Guessing meanings %60 Peer cooperation %32 Learning from written materials %52 Diary writing %30 Finding out improvement %33	Large group learning %35 Time spent: work review %41 Making summaries %34 Avoid verbatim translation %33 Guessing meanings %66 Reading without dictionary %54 Learning from visual aids %39 Learning from radio %31 Learning from tapes %31 Learning from pictorials %54 Using guest speakers %36	Sense of satisfaction %78 Realistic use as progress check %70 Making summaries %52 Guessing meaning %51 Error correction later in public %49 Learning from radio %49 Learning from tapes %48 Attitude towards homework %47 Learning from pictorials %37 Time spent: prep for next class %30 Learning from board %33
3	Small group learning %65 Attitude towards homework %50 Learning by listening %30 Copying from the board %40 Vocabulary in context %50	Small group learning %58 Time spent: next class prep. %32 Listening & note taking %31 Reading & note taking %58 Vocabulary learning by writing over several times %36 Memorizing dialogue %35 Diary writing %39 Confidence in previously threatening situations %38	Attitudes towards homework %33 Vocabulary learning by writing over several times %61 Learning by listening %60 Finding out improvement %60 Repetition %59 Learning from board %58 Reading & note making %47 Sense of satisfaction %46 Small group learning %33 Learning by reading %37 Being informed of progress %36
4	Teacher correction %47 Learning from radio %93 Role play %31 Language games %44 Find out improvement %30	Small group learning %67 Time spent: prep for next class %47 Listening & note taking %35 Reading & note making %33 Vocabulary learning by writing over several times %39 Memorizing dialogues %30 Diary writing %36 Confidence in previously threatening situations %60	Songs %49 Attitudes towards homework %45 Finding out improvement %33 Time spent: all in class %60 Satisfied from achievement %50 Using guest speakers %47 Learning by reading %45 Time spent: all in class %44 Being informed of progress %41

Table 5: ANOVA BALLI Whole Group Comparison (Learners-Learners)

Item	Stem: Between & Within Settings	F Value	Significance
9	Believe in successful FLL	4.607	.011
10	Iranians are good at FLL	4.772	.003
13	Accuracy as pre-requisite for use	21.039	.000
16	Significance of native context	6.629	.002
17	Enjoy talking with native speaker	5.204	.007
28	Significance of speaking FL well for Iranians	5.505	.005
29	Error avoidance from the start	14.128	.000
31	Grammar as a key for FLL	4.104	.018
33	Speaking is easier than comprehension	11.649	.000
35	FLL is different from other subjects	4.650	.011
36	Translation from TL to SL	25.670	.000
37	Translation from SL to TL	16.143	.000
39	Desire to learn FL well	10.070	.000
42	Written skills are easier than oral skills	4.756	.010

Table 6 presents the Post-hoc test of the learners' multiple comparisons of the setting-based beliefs probed by the BALLI. As the table shows, there are 21 items/cases again out of 35 on which the learners studying under different settings differ significantly.

Table 6: Post hoc test: BALLI Multiple Comparison (Learners-Learners)

Item	Stem	Between-Within Settings	Mean Difference	Significance
2	Special in-borne FLL ability	Autho-Semi	.51765	.027
3	Some languages easier to learn	Autho-Semi	.45804	.015
9	Believe in successful learning	Autho-Semi Autho-Demo	.40980 .50980	.005 .023
10	Iranians are good at learning FLs	Autho-Semi Demo-Semi	.60784 .38776	.001 .031
11	Excellency of pronunciation	Autho-Demo	.35574	.033
13	Accuracy as a pre-requisite of use	Autho-Demo Autho-Semi	1.14006 1.48803	.000 .000
14	Role of LL experience	Autho-Demo Autho-Semi	.44138 .45510	.045 .039
16	Importance of native context	Autho-Semi	.77490	.000
17	Enjoy talking with native speaker	Autho-Semi Autho-Demo	.41765 .52581	.016 .003
22	Fluency possible in 5-10 years	Demo-Semi	.50694	.050
25	Vocabulary learning as a key to FLL	Demo-Semi	.40000	.047
28	Significance of speaking well in FL for Iranians	Autho-Semi Demo-Semi	.40588 .50796	.028 .001
30	Error avoidance from the start	Autho-Semi Demo-Semi	1.18627 .92857	.000 .000
31	Grammar key for FLL	Demo-Semi	.62980	.005
33	Speaking is easier than comprehension	Auth-Semi Autho-Demo	.21300 .76627	.000 .000
35	FLL is different from other subjects	Autho-Semi	.62431	.003
36	Translation from TL to SL	Autho-Demo Autho-Semi Demo-Semi	.88796 1.26510 .37714	.000 .000 .041
37	Translation from SL to SL	Autho-Demo Autho-Semi Demo-Semi	.71829 1.20196 .48367	.001 .000 .026
39	Desire to learn FL well	Autho-Semi Autho-Demo	.67587 .48118	.000 .002
41	Fluency is possible for everyone	Autho-Semi	.50980	.030
42	Written skill is easier than other skills	Autho-Semi	.62314	.003

In order to define significance of dispersion of the BALLI choices ($P < 0.05$), a chi-square frequency analysis was also carried out. Results concerning each item in the BALLI will be presented in a tabular form. Table 7 presents total learners at different settings in which within group comparisons are made. Numerical values and percentages of each options are presented. According to the table,

there is a significant dispersion of choices among the learners with respect to the choices they made on the BALLI items. Meanwhile, the chi-square of 53.47 at 8 degree of freedom proves to be greater than the critical chi-square of 15.51 thereby rejecting the respective hypothesis.

Table 7: BALLI-Total Learners at different settings

CHOICES CROSS TABULATION								
			CHOICES					TOTAL
			1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	
SETTING	AUTHORITARIAN	COUNT	257	438	481	483	420	2349
		%With in Setting	10.9%	18.6%	16.2%	36.3%	17.9%	100.0%
	DEMOCRATIC	Count	356	402	400	751	441	2350
		%With in Setting	15.1%	17.1%	32.0%	32.0%	18.8%	100.0%
	SEMI-DEMOCRATIC	Count	373	490	404	699	384	2350
		%With in Setting	15.9%	20.9%	17.2%	29.7%	16.3%	100.0%
		Count	986	1330	1185	2303	1254	7049
		%Within Setting	14.0%	18.9%	16.8%	32.7%	17.7%	100.0%

The chi-square is 53.47 at 8 degree of freedom is greater than the critical chi-square, i.e. 15.51

On the other hand, inter-settings study of the dispersion of the BALLI choices are presented in tables 8, 9, 10 and shows that the chi-square is greater than the respective critical value in each setting (i.e., Authoritarian: 433.16 & 9.49, Democratic: 217.70 & 9.49, and Semi-democratic: 157.45 & 9.49, respectively).

Table 8: BALLI-Total learners at Authoritative Setting

CHOICES	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1.00	257	469.8	-212.8
2.00	438	469.8	-31.8
3.00	381	469.8	-88.8
4.00	853	469.8	383.2
5.00	420	469.8	-49.8
TOTAL	2349		

The chi-square is 433.16 at 4 degree of freedom is greater than the critical chi-square, i.e. 9.49

Table 9: BALLI-Total learners at Democratic Setting

CHOICES			
CHOICES	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1.00	356	470.0	-114.0
2.00	402	470.0	-68.8
3.00	400	470.0	-70.0
4.00	751	470.0	281.0
5.00	441	470.0	-29.0
TOTAL	2350		

The chi-square is 217.70 at 4 degree of freedom is greater than the critical chi-square, i.e. 9.49

Table 10: BALLI-Total learners at Semi-democratic Setting

CHOICES			
CHOICES	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1.00	373	470.0	-97.0
2.00	490	470.0	20.0
3.00	404	470.0	-66.0
4.00	699	470.0	229.0
5.00	384	470.0	-86.0
TOTAL	2350		

The chi-square is 157.45 at 4 degree of freedom is greater than the critical chi-square, i.e. 9.49

Table 11 presents the results of the factor analysis on the BALLI. The factor analysis on this Inventory items identified four factors that constitute the learners' beliefs about language learning under each of the educational settings. The table presents the items that constitute both the distribution and coefficient of factor loadings for each item. In this study only those items with factor loadings around and above 0.30 were considered, since according to Stevens (1986) items whose factor loading is around the given rate the variable shares at least 15% of its variance with factor and is thus considered to be practically significant.

Interestingly, not only does the type of the items under each factor but also their distribution and rate of loadings differ greatly inter-settings. For example, the underlying traits explored and attributed to the learners under the Authoritarian setting and under the factor 1 differ significantly from those of the two other settings as far as the same factor is concerned. The same trend holds true with regard to the other factors, items as traits and setting types. The result of the factor analysis to a large extent corresponds with these of the ANOVA and the Post-hoc Test.

Table 11: BALLI-Cross comparison Factor Analysis

Factor	Authoritarian Loadings	Semi-Democratic Loadings	Democratic Loadings
--------	------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
رتال جامع علوم انسانی

1	<p>Fluency time in 5-10 years %55 Can not learn in 1 hour/day %30 Women are better than men in FLL %51 Feeling shy when speaking %46 Grammar key for FLL %49 Translation from TL to SL %46 Translation from SL to TL %49 Learning English very easy %33 Correction as precondition for use %36 Good at other subjects no correlate-with being good at English %67 Enjoy talking with native speakers %61</p>	<p>Importance of well-speaking in FL for Iranian %50 FLL for understanding native like people %45 Practice with cassette/video %68 LE better for job opportunities %60 Desire to FLL well %73 Every one can learn English well %75 Special in-borne FLL ability %50 Learning English with medium difficulty %50 Belief in successful learning %58 Excellency of pronunciation %36 Interaction with native speaker a key %60 Enjoy talking with native speakers %56 Fluency time in less than a year %46</p>	<p>Learning English very difficult %62 Learning English difficult %56 Learning English with medium difficulty %59 Excellency of pronunciation %50 Positive role of LL experience %49 Guessing word meaning %55 Repetition & practice key in FLL %39 Importance of well-speaking in FL for Iranian %43 Grammar key for FLL %63 LE better for job opportunities %37 Desire to FLL well %48 FLL possible for everyone %33</p>
---	--	---	---

Table 11: BALLI-Cross comparison Factor Analysis

Factor	Authoritarian Loadings	Semi-Democratic Loadings	Democratic Loadings
2	<p>FLL easier for children than adults %48 Special in-borne FLL ability %39 Learning English very easy %57 Guessing word manning %45 Fluency time in 5-10 years %41 Importance of well-speaking in FL for Iranian %35 FLL for understanding native like people %46 Practice with cassette/video %63 LE better for job opportunities %40 Every one can learn English well %48 FLL possible for everyon %33</p>	<p>Some langs are easier to learn than Others %42 Excellency of pronunciation %41 Good at other subjects no correlate with being good at English %39 Vocab a key in FLL %70 Repetition & practice key in FLL %35 Feeling shy when speaking %55 Grammar key for FLL %63 Production easier than Comprehension %34 Practice with cassette/video %32 FLL different from learning other Subjects %39 Translation from TL to SL %57 Translation from SL to TL %56 FLL involves more memoisation %41 Interaction with native speaker</p>	<p>Special language learning a FLL possible for everyone %33 Practice with cassette/video %32 FLL for understanding native like people %45 Belief in successful learning %71</p>

		a key %33	
3	<p>Learning English is easy %46 Iranians are good at FLL %60 Can not learn in 1 hour/day %30 FLL involves more memorization %58</p>	<p>Some lngs are easier to learn than others %43 Positive role of cultural knowledge %59 Guessing word meaning %62 Fluency time less than 3-5 years %47 Fluency time in 5-10 years %47 Can not learn in 1 hour/day %35 FLL for understanding native like people %33</p>	<p>Some lngs are easier to learn than others %33 Special language learning Vocab a key in FLL %70 Repetition & practice key in FLL %46 Error avoidance from start %55 Enjoy talking with native Speakers %41</p>
4	<p>Enjoy talking with native speakers %39 Positive role of LL experience %30 Feeling shy when speaking %37 Grammar key for FLL %40 Production easier than comprehension %40 Every one can learn English well %44 FLL possible for everyone %33</p>	<p>Learning English easy %54 Learning English very easy %56 Correction as precondition for use %34 FLL possible for everyone %30 FLL possible for everyone %61</p>	<p>Guessing word meaning %32 FLL easier for children than adults %31 LE better for job opportunities %46 Desire to FLL well %50 Feeling shy when speaking %46 Cultural knowledge %33 Fluency time less than a year %40 Fluency time in 1-2 years %53</p>

Summary of findings

A. As to the YES/NO Questionnaire

Totally teacher-learner intuition and agenda and learner-learner agenda vary significantly mainly in terms of: achievement, time allocation for home work, learning strategies, error correction and

learning activities. Statistically similar meaningful picture is visualized in 23 variables as the result of the Post- hoc test. In terms of learner-setting comparison, the major difference is attributed to among the Autho-Semi and Autho-Demo settings rather than Demo-Semi one. Factor analyses reveal both varying factor loadings and distributions depending on the educational settings. Cross comparison of all three statistical analyses (ANOVA, Chi Square, and Factor Analysis) relatively match.

B. As to the BALLI

Totally learners vary meaningfully in certain key variables depending on the type of educational setting: Differences among the learners from the three settings in 14 and 21 variables achieved respectively through ANOVA and the Post hoc Test analysis along with the meaningful differences of Chi square supported in turn by the results of Factor Analysis in terms of factor loadings and distributions collectively and cooperatively support the fact that educational setting plays a crucial role in shaping one's frame of reference and conceptualization of language learning process and nature. Interestingly, these instruments and analyses share many variables out of the 35 items of the BALLI.

Conclusion and Implications

A triple conclusion can be drawn from the findings of this study: Teachers working under different educational setting hold different concepts and views towards teaching and learning language and they define the concept of CLT differently. Such an approach, then, affects objective setting, classroom activities, material preparation, and teaching methods and techniques by teachers. Teacher's and learner's agenda and intuition of teaching and learning language vary in many aspects due to contextual variables. Similarly, learners learning under different settings hold relatively different concepts and views from their counterparts under other setting. Such a difference in approach to the issues intuitively necessitates corresponding treatments from the respective teachers. Given the findings of the study and the major conclusions, educational implications of the study as to language teaching and learning can be summed up in the following way:

1. Teachers are expected to attend to the affective and cognitive components of learner's attitudes as well as develop defensible pedagogical techniques. The justification for this claim lies on the ground that successful language education greatly depends on the correspondence between teacher and learner since learner's perceived beliefs influence or even determine his attitudes or motivation on one hand and his epistemology on the other, which affectively and cognitively frame his concept of teaching and learning language. Any mismatch in beliefs might create tension in the classroom and entail conflicting views towards the whole processes of the issues at stake.

2. Given the key role of educational setting type in reshaping learners' cognitive and metacognitive strategies of language learning (Abbasian, 2005), the findings inform our teachers about the way to interpret L2 metacognitive strategy use with human information processing system, about curriculum development and more practically on classroom management processes.

3. Teachers are also expected to promote positive beliefs in the classroom and eliminate the negative ones. In other words, they need to try to tailor their instruction to each belief aspects of each learner.

4. Closer and more systematic planning and preparation of lessons for effective communicative teaching and learning across the language skills, avoiding lesson fragmentation or drift, unplanned but frequent changes of direction which are often caused by teachers' unease necessitate due attention from the teacher's side.

5. Teachers are expected to boast their knowledge of their learners since the more they know about what is perceived to be happening in the classroom, the better their chances of improving the quality of learning and use.

6. Teachers are expected to discover what characterizes successful language learning, which is possible through discovering what learners believe or know about their learning and provide activities that would allow learners to examine these beliefs and their possible impacts on how they approach learning. Furthermore, effective language teaching and learning can only be achieved when teachers are aware of the learners' needs, capabilities, potentials, expectations in meeting these needs.

7. The results obtained here call for a step forward towards teacher-learner cooperation in designing syllabuses, doing weekly course planning and classroom management.

Recommendations

Given the discussions made, a set of recommendations as areas of further research:

1. Teaching and learning styles from teacher-learner perspectives
2. Learning strategies from teacher-learner perspectives
3. Contrastive study of teacher and learner beliefs on error treatment
4. Comparative study of teacher and learner perspectives on learn ability and teachability theories
5. Structure of lesson and lesson planning from two sides of one coin: teacher-learner maxims

References

- Abbasian, Gh., R. (2005). *Iranian EFL learners' metacognitive strategy use*. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation in TEFL. IAU, Science & Research Campus: Tehran.
- Abraham, R. G. & Vann, R. J. (1987). Strategies of two language learners: A case study. In A. L., Wenden, & J., Rubin (Eds.). *Learners Strategies in Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N J, pp: 85-102.
- Bada, E. & Okan, Z. (2000). Students' language learning preferences. *TESL-E J*, 4 (3).
- Benson, P. & Lor, W. (1999). Conception of language and language learning. *System*, 27 (4), pp:459-479.
- Bernat, E. & Gvosdenko, I. (2005) (Eds.). Beliefs about language learning: Current knowledge, pedagogical implications, and new research directions, , *TESL-EJ*, 9 (1). p: 1-21

- Brindly, G. (1984). Needs analysis and objective setting in adult migrant educational program. Sydney: NSW Adult Migrant Educational Service.
- Brown, K. (1999). Sample article. *Discipline*, fili: //A:\IATEFL
- Chawhan, L. & Oliver, R. (2000). What beliefs do ESL students hold about language learning? p: 25, *TESOL in Context*, 10 (1), pp: 20-26.
- Como, L. (1986). The metacognitive control components of self-regulated learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 11, pp: 33-46.
- Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System*, 23 (2), pp: 195-206.
- Diab, L. Rula (2006). University students' beliefs about learning English and French in Lebanon. *System*, 34, pp: 80-96.
- Epstein, S. (1990). Cognitive- experiential self-theory. In: L. Pervin (Ed.). *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. NY: Guilford, p: 165-192.
- Flavell, J. H. (1987). Speculations about the nature and development of metacognition. In F. E., Weinert, & R. H. Kluwe, (Eds.). *Metacognition, motivation and understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp: 1-29.
- Frohlich, M. et al (1985). Differences in the communicative orientation of L2 classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, pp: 51-62.
- Goldman, A, L. (1986). *Epistemology and cognition*. Cambridge: Harward University Press.
- Harmer, J. (1983). *The practice of English language teaching*. New York: Longman, pp: 209-210.
- Hatch, E. & H. Farhady (1982). *Research design and statistics for applied linguistics*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, p: 26.
- Hawkey, R. (2006). Teacher and learner perceptions of language learning activity. *ELT Journal*, 60 (3). Pp242-252.

- Horwitz, E. K. (1987a). Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A. L., Wenden & J., Rubin (Eds.). *Learner strategies in language Learning*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., pp: 119-129. (1987b). Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory (BALLI, ESL/EFL Version). Unpublished manuscript.
- Jing, H. (2006). Learner research in metacognitive training? An example of mismatch between learner and teacher agenda. P. 99, Language *Teaching Research*, 10 (1), pp: 95-117.
- Kim-Yoon, M. (2000). Learner beliefs about language learning, motivation and their relationship: *A study of EFL learners in Korea*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 61 (08), 3041A. (UMI No. 998 3257).
- Mangubhai, F. ; Marland P. ; Dashwood, A and Son, J. (2005). Similarities and differences in teachers' and researchers' conception of CLT: does the use of an educational model cast a better light? *Language Learning Research*, 9 (1), pp: 31-66.
- Mangubhai, F. et al (1998). *Primary LOTE teachers' understandings and beliefs about CLT*: report on the first phase. Toowoomba, QLD: Centre for Research into Language Teaching Methodologies, The Natural languages and Literary Institute of Australia.
- Nunan, D. (1989). Hidden agenda: The role of the learner in programme implementation. In R. K., Johnson (Ed.). *The Second Language Curriculum OUP*, pp: 176-86.
- Nunan, D. (1995). Closing the gap between learning and instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29 (1), pp:133-88.
- Park, G. P. (1995). Language learning strategies and beliefs about language learning of university students learning English in Korea. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56 (06), 210A, (UMI No. 9534918).
- Richards, J. C. (1996). Teachers' maxims in language teaching, p: 1, *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (2), 281-296.

- Ryan, M. P. (1984). Monitoring text comprehension: Investigating differences in epistemological standards. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76 (2), pp: 248-258.
- Sakui, K. & Gaies, S. J. (1999). Investigating Japanese learners' beliefs about language learning. *System*, 27, pp: 473-492.
- Shommer, M. (1990). Effects of beliefs about the nature of knowledge on comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82 (3), pp: 498-504.
- Stevens, J. (1986). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, N. J.
- Vann Rossum, E. J. & Schenk, S. M. (1984). The relationship between learning conceptions, study strategy and learning outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 54, pp: 73-83.
- Wenden, A. L. (1987a). How to be a successful language learner: Insights and perceptions from L2 learners. In A. L., Wenden & J., Rubin (Eds.). *Learner strategies in language Learning*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., pp: 103-117.
- Yang, D., N. (1992). The learners' beliefs about language learning and their strategies: A study of college students of English in Taiwan. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*, the University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.
- Yang, N. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System*, 27, pp: 515-535.
- Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *MLJ* 75, pp: 426-439.