

ELT Educational Context, Teacher Intuition and Learner Hidden Agenda

(a study of conflicting maxims)

Gholam-Reza Abbasian (PhD)

Imam Ali University, Tehran- IAU, South Tehran

Abstract

This study , first , attempted to explore the conflict between EFL teacher intuition or concepts and learner's accounts of the distinctive features of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), and second to investigate the latter's " hidden agenda" (Nunan, 1989) of favorable ELT in relation to educational context. The study was carried out in the Iranian educational context conventionally categorized into three settings including; authoritarian, semi-democratic and democratic. Two groups of participants including 150 EFL learners and 45 teachers answered three triangulating and already validated questionnaires (Brindly, 1984 and BALLI of Horwitz, 1987a) addressing both the nature of language learning activities and their beliefs on language learning and teaching. 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 policy. While both sides generally agree on the virtues of CLT to language teaching, there are many areas of mismatch in their perceptions as to ELT agenda including lesson purposes, classroom activities, and learning outcomes. The findings are persuasive in that: reflective teaching-learning rests on teacher's awareness of learner's 'maxims' (Richard,1996) , participatory syllabus design is a necessity, the gap between their opposing maxims should be narrowed, and the teachers are required to be aware of imposition of

negative psychological impacts on the learner's side; resulting from any cognitive and intuitive mismatch.

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

1. Introduction

Our recent history is characterized by a growing interest in general research on the mental images, thoughts, and processes second or foreign language (L2/FL) learners and teachers employ in their careers, given what their mental “interpretative frames” (Richards, 1996) assign them to do. Both groups develop their own personal principles which function as rules for the best behavior or maxims. Their belief systems or perspectives on learning in general and language learning in particular, supposed to determine their interpretative frames, have recently been the major focus of the attention (Horwitz, 1987a in Diab, 2006). It is also believed that their interpretative frames are linked with many affective variables and language teaching-learning strategies (Park, 1995; Wenden, 1987b; Young, 1991).

The interpretative frames of both groups deserve both special attention and further studies (Horwitz, *ibid*) to explore the extent of either congruency or mismatch between learners’ ‘hidden agenda’ (Nunan, 1989) and teachers’ ‘intuition’ on the nature and process of language education. Though the literature on the study of belief system seems rich enough, few research studies can be traced as to purposeful exploration of the intervention of educational context type in which language education is carried about, whereas Benson and Lor (1999) assert that beliefs about learning should not be viewed independently of the context.

2. Background to the study

The literature on cognitive studies 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, 1987a, and Yang, 1999) have also suggested connections between learners’ metacognitive

knowledge or beliefs about language learning and their choice of learning strategies.

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) and 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 (Schommer, 1990). From this perspective, beliefs about language learning are viewed as component of metacognitive knowledge (Flavell, 1987). Some others define beliefs as mini-theories 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, their various selves 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 which may have a profound influence on their both learning behaviors (Como, 1986, Cotterall, 1995) and learning outcomes (Van Rossum & Schenk, 1984).

Furthermore, language learning beliefs have been approached from three other perspectives including: the normative approach, the metacognitive approach, and the contextual approach out of which the last one has been the subject of context-specific investigations (Chawhan & Oliver (2000), Cotterall (1995), Kim-Yoon (2000). On the other hand, all of these studies support the fundamental arguments raised by previous researchers that understanding of learner beliefs can enhance the language learning process (Bernet, 2005). It seems convincing enough then to favor the claim 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.

2.1 Congruency of Teacher-learner Approaches

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*", by which it is meant goal-setting, action planning, conceptions of learning, and it includes what the learner thinks the objectives and processes of learning are. The notion of "hidden agenda" is traceable in the theory of critical pedagogy and postmodernism in education, but apparently it is used in a different sense in critical pedagogy. Contrary to Nunan's conception of the term, critical pedagogy approaches the term as something already defined and imposed social ideology looming ahead of any educational decisions.

Hidden agenda affected directly by learners' interpretative frames 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. Nunan has found mismatch between learners and teachers' responses on all but one of ten different classroom activities. That is why 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 (2006) tries to attribute learners' metacognitive resistance to a mismatch between the goals and expectations on the part of teachers and learners' beliefs. According to him, "learner resistance is a function of tension and conflicts in learners and teachers' agenda. Their conflicts are basically witnessed in

learners' and teachers' different perceptions, learning and instruction, lesson purposes, classroom activities and learning outcomes" (Jing, 2006, p.99). Nunan (1995) creates a sort of association between such an agenda mismatch and mismatch of learning and instruction.

2.2 Critical Pedagogy

Regardless of two distinctive conceptualizations, the both notions of 'hidden agenda' are associated with the theory of critical pedagogy and modernism. The modern times' schooling relies heavily on humanist assumptions such as objectivity, faith in the individual, absolute truth, and schools as places for transmission, rather than production of knowledge. On the contrary, the postmodernism approaches knowledge and subjectivity as closely related phenomena, individuals and meanings as socially determined and immersed in an endless process of signification, provisionally constituted, always mediated and not absolute or complete. Then meanings and knowledge are created in an infinite chain of relations between signifiers. That is why education has to be thought of in terms of its relation to other aspects of society. Teachers and students have the right to be aware of the process of meaning selection and beliefs and values, since it can help them not to impose their values on others, and understand that reality is not given or fixed.(Jordao, 1999). In the same vein, any attempts to resolve agenda conflict between learner and teacher are in line with the critical pedagogy. To be successful, such attempts are after breakthroughs as critical pedagogy is. In this line Giroux believes that

“in order to promote change, critical educators will have to get rid of the traditional parameters of educational theory and practice [so that] we can see schooling as inextricably linked to a wider web of political and socioeconomic arrangements. And when we analyze the nature of the relationship between schools and the dominant society in political and normative terms, we can oppose the

hidden agenda defined through the ideology of social processes. (1997:74).

The aims of critical pedagogy is to teach students to think critically through “conscientization” (Freire, 1972 in Hall) , relations education maintains with the “outside” world, the selection of certain types of knowledge to be privileged , the establishment and maintenance of specific classroom relations, and the structuring of schools (Giroux, 1997). Rationally, successful critical pedagogy rests upon a comprehensive communication between teacher and learner.

As for ELT, teachers are supposed to bear a responsibility to use a critical lens for English education, which could empower their students through reflective dialogue and a curriculum that mirrors the students’ goals and interests (Fredricks, 2007). It means that teachers should leave aside their own subjective intuition and try to understand their students’ agenda, offer them choices, involve them in decision-makings, avoiding pure knowledge transmission, and offer them “lesson ownership” (ibid). By lesson ownership, Fredricks means participation of learners in all decisions concerning planning of methodology, syllabus, materials selection and development and content. Decision-making should be an on-going process of exploration and review, negotiated by all participants within the lesson which ideally leads to “exploratory practice” of other’s interpretative frames (Hall, 1997).

2.3 Conceptualization of CLT

Studies on the differences between teachers’ orientations to communicative language instruction indicate that teachers hold a variety of beliefs and understandings of this term, ranging from survival language to grammar, strategy use, sociolinguistic and discourse competence (Frohlich et al, 1985). Mangubhai et al (1998) put “teacher had understanding and beliefs about CLT that differed from those of CLT researchers and theorists. Different perspectives to CLT can be studied from teacher-learner sides, too.

3. EFL Educational Setting

Any educational context/setting, and more specifically that of Iranian, usually resembles a continuum on which two conventional extremes of educational management approaches are assumed: authoritarian and democratic (i.e., openness). Of course, some moderate versions here called semi-democratic lie in between somewhere on the continuum.

3.1 Authoritarian context (fitting the military settings), theoretically and operationally, means strict rules and harsh punishment (Brown, 1999), where 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.

3.2 Semi-democratic characterizes the situation in which the relationship is reciprocal, non-repressive, non-discriminatory, and there are accountability, humanity, consistency, clarity, respect, and reasonable firmness.

3.3 Democratic setting in Iran characterises the situation of ever-growing non-profit higher education institutes under which (1) freedom is devoid of accountability, (2) formalities are denigrated by both the institutes themselves and then by the learners, and (3) there are extreme flexibilities in the exercise of requirements and policies.

4. The study

Given the discussion and review of the related literature, this study is an attempt to fill the gap in the literature. To this end, teacher-learner maxims of language teaching-learning supposed to be roughly opposing in many cases will be empirically investigated. However, role of language education context is considered as a determining variable in shaping the subjects general interpretative frames and the maxims. Therefore, this study is more specifically tires to explore the assumed mismatch of the maxims and role of

educational setting type in shaping them. To do so, two hypotheses stemming from their respective questions are to be tested.

4.1 Hypotheses of the study

Ho A: Learners' agenda of learning and teachers' intuition of it match greatly in relation to ELT educational setting type.

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

5. Method

5.1 Participants

Two groups of participants including 150 Iranian EFL learners and 45 professional EFL teachers representing the three already identified educational settings participated in the study. The 1999 version of TOEFL was first administered to about 210 learners (70 from each setting) so as to homogenize them in terms of proficiency level. They were divided into three distinct groups given their standing position on the normal probability distribution curve and the respective standard deviation estimate.

5.2 Instrumentation

Two different types of instruments were used in this study. First, Brindly's (1984) 'Learner-teacher 13-head Item Yes/No Questionnaire' designed to probe separately the beliefs of learners and teachers and composed of 48 sub-items as for the learners' beliefs but 45 sub-items as for those of the teachers was employed. Both versions have originally developed with the aim of measuring same trait/s. 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 (1987a, 1988) 35-item five scale inventory entitled '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 is reported to have content validity

correlated with the Marlowe-Crowne Desirability scale and Cronbach alpha of 0.94 for internal-consistency reliability (Yang, 1992).

6. Data Analysis

Given the fact that neither instruments yields 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.

7. Results and Discussion

7.1 Hypothesis A

7.1.1 Whole Group Comparison (Teachers-Learners and Learners-Learners)

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. Obviously, in 33 cases out of 45 ones the differences are statistically meaningful. 33 distinctive areas are presented in phrasal wordings and identified through 33 item numbers (see table 1). The most distinct areas of mismatch revolve around **learning process, attitude, leaning styles, learning strategies, error correction**, etc. Such differences are taken as obvious indications sustaining mismatch 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, since in many cases the participants' agenda and intuition vary.

Table 1: ANOVA-Whole Group Comparison

(Teachers-Learners, Learners-Learners)ITEM	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

7.1.2 Teachers-Learners Multiple Comparison

The Post-hoc Test analysis of Teachers-Learners multiple comparisons of setting-oriented belief system are presented in table 2. Similarly, in 28 cases out of 45 the differences are statistically significant 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 of intra-setting in nature. However, in 10 cases (i.e., items: 12, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 29, 32, 38, and 41) they are inter-setting. Furthermore, 5 cases (i.e., items: 9, 27, 33, 40, and 43) signify differences shared by all three settings. Phrasal references of all differentiating items are cited in front of each item for easy access, e.g., item 1 refers to "Achievement satisfaction" and item 33 refers to "Learning from pictorials". Both findings revealed through the ANOVA and the Post hoc Test thus 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 the learner-learner are the functions of educational setting types.

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

<i>Item</i>	<i>Item stem</i>	<i>Between settings</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Significance</i>
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
		Lear- Teach- Demo		
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-	.62721	.000
		Teach- Semi	.38000	.006
20	Vocabulary learning by writing several times	Lear- Teach- Demo	.45306	.001
		Lear- Teach- Semi	.47333	.001
		Lear- Teach- Demo		
		Lear- Teach- Demo		
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-	.34902	.009
		Autho Lear- Teach- Demo	.36190	.007
25	Later error correction in public	Lear- Teach-	.36078	.012
		Autho Lear- Teach- Semi	.14275	.025
		Lear- Teach- Semi		
		Lear- Teach- Demo		
27	Peer error correction	Lear- Teach- Autho	.30588	.026
		Lear- Teach- Semi	.33469	.016
		Lear- Teach- Semi	.46000	.001
		Lear- Teach- Demo		
28	Error correction by teacher	Lear- Teach- Autho	.33725	.014
29	Learning from visual aids	Lear- Teach-	.40000	.000
		Lear- Teach-	.23333	.033

			Demo		
			Lear-		
			Teach-		
			Semi		
31	Learning from		Lear-	.30196	.029
	written		Teach-		
	materials		Autho		
32	Learning from		Lear-	.62721	.000
	board		Teach-	.35333	.010
			Demo		
			Lear-		
			Teach-		
			Semi		
33	Pictorial		Lear-	.31765	.021
	learning		Teach-	.51973	.000
			Autho	.44667	.001
			Lear-		
			Teach-		
			Semi		
			Lear-		
			Teach-		
			Demo		
34	Role play		Lear-	.38824	.004
	learning		Teach-		
			Autho		
35	Conversing		Lear-	.42353	.001
	with		Teach-		
	classmates		Autho		
38	Dialogue		Lear-	.28299	.027
	memorization		Teach-	.68000	.000
			Demo		
			Lear-		
			Teach-		
			Semi		
39	Using	gust	Lear-	.29020	.026
	speakers		Teach-		
			Autho		
40	Planned visits		Lear-	.60392	.000
			Teach-	.63673	.000
			Autho	.63333	.000
			Lear-		
			Teach-		
			Semi		
			Lear-		
			Teach-		

41	Diary writing	Demo		
		Lear-	.40392	.002
		Teach-	.28884	.028
42	Learning about culture	Autho		
		Lear-	.88235	.000
		Teach-	.45850	.000
		Autho	.60000	.000
		Lear-		
		Teach-		
		Semi		
		Lear-		
		Teach-		
		Demo		

7.1.3 Intra-setting Comparison

The bulk of difference lies in inter the Authoritarian-Semi-democratic and Authoritarian-Democratic settings in 15 cases compared with those inter the Democratic-Semi-democratic settings 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 difference in beliefs about language learning.

7.1.4 Factor Analysis on YES/NO Questionnaire

Table 3 presents the results of the principle factor analysis on YES-No Questionnaire. To this end, four factor solutions was identified as an optimal criterion. Relying on Stevens' (1986) argumentation, items with factor loadings around and above 0.30 were considered since they shares at least 15% of its variance.

Not only does the type of the items under each factor but also their distribution and rate of loadings differ greatly inter-setting. The underlying traits explored and attributed to the learners under the Authoritarian setting and under the factor 1 differ in terms of title, case, nature of each case, quantity and quality from those of the two other settings as far as the same factor is concerned. Obviously, the traits under e.g., factor 1 in the Authoritarian setting load more on certain factors less common or rare in the remaining two other settings and vice versa. The same trend holds true with regard to the other factors. The result of the factor analysis to a large extent corresponds with these of the ANOVA and the Post-hoc Test.

Table 3: Factor Analysis on YES/NO Questionnaire

<i>Fac</i>	<i>Authoritarian Loadings</i>	<i>Semi-Democratic Loadings</i>	<i>Democratic Loadings</i>
	Time spent: next class prep %67	Individual learning %64	Welcome correction later in private %70
	All time spent in class %50	Attitudes towards homework %40	Planned visits %66
	.Making summaries %30	.Learning by listening %30	Using guest speakers %42
	.Error correction later in public %67	.Learning by reading %37	.Learning about culture %63
	.Learning from visual aids %42	.Peer correction %50	Language games %63
	.Learning from pictorials %61	.Learning from written materials %48	Old-new vocabulary connection %56
	.Learning about culture %32	.Songs %61	Songs %50
	Ways of getting satisfaction %51	.Planned visits %50	.Peer cooperation %47
		Ways of getting satisfaction %31	.Teacher correction %50
			Conversing with classmates %40
			Diary writing

Learning by reading %58	Large group learning %35	%36 Small group learning %31
Repetition %36	Time spent: work review %41	.Sense of satisfaction %78
Vocabulary learning by writing over several times %50	.Making summaries %34	Realistic use as progress check %70
Avoid verbatim translation %31	.Avoid verbatim translation %33	Making summaries %52
Guessing meanings %60	Guessing meanings %66	Guessing meaning %51
Peer cooperation %32	Reading without dictionary %54	Error correction later in public %49
Learning from written materials %52	Learning from visual aids %39	Learning from radio %49
Diary writing %30	Learning from radio %31	Learning from tapes %48
Finding out improvement %33	Learning from tapes %31	Attitude towards homework %47
	.Learning from pictorials %54	Learning from pictorials %37
	Using guest speakers %36	.Time spent: prep for next class%30
		Learning from board %33
Small group learning %65	Small group learning %58	.Attitudes towards homework % 33
Attitude towards homework %50	Time spent: next class prep. %32	Vocabulary learning by writing over several times %61
Learning by listening %30	Listening & note taking %31	Learning by listening %60
Copying from the board %40	Reading & note taking %58	Finding out improvement %60
Vocabulary in context %50	Vocabulary learning by writing over several times %36	Repetition %59
	Memorizing dialogue %35	Learning from board %58
	Diary writing	Reading & note

	%39	making	%47
	Confidence in	Sense of	
	previously	satisfaction	
	threatening	%46	
	situations	Small group	
	%38	learning	
		%33	
		Learning by reading	
		%37	
		Being informed of	
		progress	%36
Teacher correction	Small group	Songs	
%47	learning	%49	
Learning from radio	67	Attitudes towards	
%93	Time spent: prep for	homework	%45
Role play	next class% 47	Finding out	
%31	Listening & note	improvement	
Language games	taking	%33	
%44	Reading & note	Time spent: all in	
Find out improvement	making	class	%60
%30	.Vocabulary	Satisfied from	
	learning by writing	achievement	
	over several times	%50	
	%39	Using guest	
	Memorizing	speakers	%47
	dialogues	Learning by reading	
	%30	%45	
	Diary writing	.Time spent: all in	
	%36	class	%44
	Confidence in	Being informed of	
	previously	progress	%41
	threatening		
	situations		
	%60		

7.2 Hypothesis B

7.2.1 BALLI Whole Group Comparison (Learners-Learners)

Similar procedure as that of the hypothesis A was followed with regard to the data collected through the BALLI. As table 4 shows, in 14 cases out of 35 the differences are statistically meaningful justified. Again, phrasal references of all differentiating items are included in the table in front of each item for easy access. Such statistical differences are identified as evidence for the fact that

educational context type plays a crucial role in shaping and reshaping learners' conceptualisation of the phenomena of teaching and learning language as well as the CLT.

Table 4: ANOVA BALLI Whole Group Comparison (Learners-Learners)

<i>Item</i>	<i>Stem: Between & Within Settings</i>	<i>F Value</i>	<i>Significance</i>
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

7.2.2 Post hoc test: BALLI Multiple Comparison (Learners-Learners)

In the same vein, the Post-hoc test of the learners' multiple comparisons of the setting-based beliefs (table 5) shows in 21 cases out of 35 the learners under different settings differ significantly in terms of their CLT/ELT belief system with their counterparts representing the other settings. The findings then prove that EFL educational setting type affects both teachers and learners' cognitive make-up when compared with their counterpart teachers or learners representing the other EFL settings.

<i>Item</i>	<i>Stem</i>	<i>Between-Within Settings</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Significance</i>
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	.40980	.005
		Autho-Demo	.50980	.023
10	Iranians are good at learning FLs	Autho-Semi	.60784	.001
		Demo-Semi	.38776	.031
11	Excellency of pronunciation	Autho-Demo	.35574	.033
13	Accuracy as a pre-	Autho-Demo	1.14006	.000

	requisite of use	Autho-Semi	1.48803	.000
14	Role of LL experience	Autho-Demo	.44138	.045
		Autho-Semi	.45510	.039
16	Importance of native context	Autho-Semi	.77490	.000
17	Enjoy talking with native speaker	Autho-Semi	.41765	.016
		Autho-Demo	.52581	.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	.40588	.028
		Demo-Semi	.50796	.001
30	Error avoidance from the start	Autho-Semi	1.18627	.000
		Demo-Semi	.92857	.000
31	Grammar key for FLL	Demo-Semi	.62980	.005
33	Speaking is easier than comprehension	Auth-Semi	.21300	.000
		Autho-Demo	.76627	.000
35	FLL is different from other subjects	Autho-Semi	.62431	.003
36	Translation from TL to SL	Autho-Demo	.88796	.000
		Autho-Semi	1.26510	.000
		Demo-Semi	.37714	.041
37	Translation from SL to SL	Autho-Demo	.71829	.001
		Autho-Semi	1.20196	.000
		Demo-Semi	.48367	.026
39	Desire to learn FL well	Autho-Semi	.67587	.000
		Autho-Demo	.48118	.002
41	Fluency is possible for everyone	Autho-Semi	.50980	.030
42	Written skill is easier than other skills	Autho-Semi	.62314	.003

Table 5: Post hoc test: BALLI Multiple Comparison (Learners-Learners)**7.2.3 Chi-square Frequency Analysis**

A chi-square frequency analysis of within-setting at ($P < 05$) was also carried out to define significance of dispersion (table 6). Numerical values and percentages of each options show a significant dispersion of choices among the learners with respect to the choices selected from the BALLI items. The estimated chi-square of 53.47 at 8 degree of freedom being much greater than the critical chi-square of 15.51 strongly rejects the respective hypothesis.

Table 6: BALLI-Total Learners at different settings

CHOICES CROSS TABULATION								
Setting			CHOICES					TOT AL
			1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	
Setting	AUTHO	COUNT	257	438	481	483	420	2349
		%Within Setting	10.9	18.6	16.2	36.3	17.9	100.0%
	DEMOCR	Count	356	402	400	751	441	2350
		%Within Setting	15.1	17.1	32.0	32.0	18.8	100.0%
	SEMI-DEMO	Count	373	490	404	699	384	2350
		%Within 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**

Inter-settings study of the dispersion of the BALLI choices shows the pictures of the chi-square and critical values:

Authoritarian:***433.16 & 9.49******Democratic:******217.70 & 9.49******Semi-democratic:******157.45 & 9.49***

Clearly in all three settings, the respective chi-square value at four degree of freedom is greater than the respective critical value, evidence of rejecting the respective hypothesis.

7.2.4 Factor Analysis on the BALLI

Table 7 shows the results of the principle factor analysis on the BALLI. To this end, four factor solutions was identified as an optimal criterion. Similarly Stevens' (1986) argumentation is used as a criterion measure.

Analogous to the factor loadings and distributions manifested part 6.1.4 (i.e., table 3), 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. The result of the factor analysis to a large extent corresponds with these of the ANOVA and the Post-hoc Test.

Table 7: BALLI-Cross comparison Factor Analysis

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Authoritarian Loadings</i>	<i>Semi-Democratic Loadings</i>	<i>Democratic Loadings</i>
<i>I</i>	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-	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	Learning English very difficult %62 Learning English difficult %56 Learning English with medium difficulty %59 Excellenc y of pronun ciation %50

with being good at English %67	%58	Positive role of LL experience %49
Enjoy talking with native speakers %61	Excellency of pronunciation %36	Guessing word meaning %55
	Interaction with native speaker a key %60	Repetition & practice key in FLL %39
	Enjoy talking with native speakers %56	Importance of well- speaking in FL for Iranian %43
	Fluency time in less than a year %46	Grammar key for FLL %63
		LE better for job opportunitie s %37
		Desire to FLL well %48
		FLL possible for everyone %33
2 FLL easier for children than adults %48	Some langs are easier to learn than Others %42	Special language learning a FLL possible for everyone %33
Special in-borne FLL ability %39	Excellency of pronunciation %41	Practice with cassette/ video %32
Learning English very easy %57	Good at other subjects no correlate with being good at English %39	
Guessing word manning %45	Vocab a key in FLL %70	
Fluency time in 5-10 years %41	Repetition & practice key in FLL %35	
Importance of well-speaking in FL for Iranian %35	Feeling shy when speaking	

	FLL for understanding native like people %46	%55	FLL for understanding native like people % 45
	Practice with cassette/ video %63	Grammar key for FLL %63	Belief in successful learning %71
	LE better for job opportunities %40	Production easier than Comprehension %34	
	Every one can learn English well %48	Practice with cassette/ video %32	
	FLL possible for everyone %33	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 a key %33	
3	Learning English is easy %46	Some lngs are easier to learn than others %43	Some lngs are easier to learn than others %33
	Iranians are good at FLL %60	Positive role of cultural knowledge %59	Special language learning Vocab a key in FLL %70
	Can not learn in 1 hour/day %30	Guessing word meaning %62	Repetition & practice key in FLL %46
	FLL involves more memorization %58	Fluency time less than 3-5 years %47	Error avoidance from start %55
		Fluency time in 5-10 years %47	Enjoy talking with
		Can not learn in 1 hour/day %35	
		FLL for understanding native like people %33	

		native Speakers %41
4	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	Learning English easy %54 Learning English very easy %56 Correction as precondition for use %34 FLL possible for everyone Grammar key for FLL %30 FLL possible for everyone %61
		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

8. Conclusion and Implications

8.1 Conclusions

A triple conclusion is 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.

8.1.1 YES/NO Questionnaire data

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. In terms of learner-setting comparison, the major difference is attributed to among the Autho-Semi and Autho-Demo settings rather than to between 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.

8.1.2 The BALLI data

Totally, learners depending on the type of educational setting vary meaningfully in certain key variables. Differences among the learners from the three settings in 14 and 21 variables analyzed through ANOVA and the Post hoc Test and correspondence of multi-method analyses collectively and cooperatively support the crucial role of setting types in shaping one's interpretative frame

and revealing his hidden agenda on conceptualizing dimensions of language education in general.

8.2 Implications

Given the findings of the study and conclusion drawn, educational implications of the study as to language teaching and learning can be summed up as follows:

1. Teachers are expected to attend to the affective and cognitive components of learner's attitudes as well as develop defendable pedagogical techniques. The justification for this claim lies on the ground that successful language education greatly depends on the observation of the tenets of the postmodernism. Any mismatch in belief system, interpretative frames, frame of reference, and irrational reliance on one's intuition in educational decision-makings on one hand and overlooking learners' agenda of language education might create tension in the classroom and entail conflicting views towards the whole processes of the issues at stake.

2. In line with research findings in cognitive and metacognitive fields (Abbasian, 2005), the findings of this study are persuasive enough to inform our teachers on the way to interpret L2 metacognitive strategy use with human information processing system, on curriculum development and more practically on classroom management processes.

3. Following the tenets of humanist education 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. Teaching is no longer transmitter of knowledge and knowledge is no longer an objective phenomenon. Teachers' current responsibility is:

- empowerment through reflective dialogue and a curriculum that mirrors the students' goals and interests,
- leaving aside their own subjective intuition,
- trying to understand their students' agenda,

- offering them choices,
- involve them in decision-makings,
- offer them lesson ownership,
- participating them in decisions concerning planning of methodology, syllabus, materials selection and development and content, and .
- Moving in the direction of the exploratory practice of other's interpretative frames. Achievement of all of these objectives rests upon first teacher's awareness of his learners' interpretative frames and hidden agenda and second identifying one's own subjective and intuitive decision- makings and syllabus design outdated.

References

- Abbasian, Gh., R. (2005). *Iranian EFL learners' metacognitive strategy use*. Unpublished PhD 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, NJ, (pp.85-102).
- Benson, P. & Lor, W. (1999). Conception of language and language learning. *System*, 27 (4), 459-479.
- Bernat, E. & Gvosdenko, I. (2005) (Eds.). Beliefs about language learning: Current knowledge, pedagogical implications, and new research directions.p.4, *TESL-EJ*, 9 (1).
- 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), 20-26.
- Como, L. (1986). The metacognitive control components of self-regulated learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 11, 33-46.
- Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System*, 23 (2), 195-206.
- Diab, L. Rula (2006). University students' beliefs about learning English and French in Lebanon. *System*, 34, 80-96.
- Epstein, S. (1990). Cognitive- experiential self-theory. In: L. Pervin (Ed.). *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. NY: Guilford. pp.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.
- Fredricks, L. (2007). A rationale for critical pedagogy in EFL: the case of Tajikistan. *The Reading Matrix*, 7(2), pp.22-28
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London, Penguin
- Frohlich, M. et al (1985). Differences in the communicative orientation of L2 classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 51-62.
- Giroux, H. (1997). *Os professores como intelectuais*. Porto Alerge: Artes Medicas, p.74
- Hall, G. (?). *Local approaches to critical pedagogy: an investigation into the dilemmas raised by critical approaches to ELT*.
- 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).

- 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, NJ, (pp.119-129).
- Horwitz, E.K. (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), 95-117.
- Jordao, M. C. (1999). Critical pedagogy and the teaching of literature. *Acta Scientiarum*, 21 (1), 9-14
- 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. 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.
- Mangubhai, F. et al (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), 31-66.
- Nunan, D. (1989). Hidden agenda: The role of the learner in programme implementation. In R.K., Johnson (Ed.). *The Second Language Curriculum*. OUP. 176-86.
- Nunan, D. (1995). Closing the gap between learning and instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29 (1), 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), 248-258.
- Sakui, K., & Gaies, S.J. (1999). Investigating Japanese learners' beliefs about language learning. *System*, 27, 473-492.
- Shommer, M. (1990). Effects of beliefs about the nature of knowledge on comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82 (3), 498-504.
- Stevens, J. (1986). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Vann Rossum, E.J. & Schenk, S.M. (1984). The relationship between learning conceptions, study strategy and learning outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 54, 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, NJ, 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, D., N. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System*, 27, 515-535.
- Young, D.J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *MLJ* 75, 426-439.