Teachers' Attitudes towards Teaching in Formal vs. Informal ELT Contexts

Farid Ghaemi, Farshid Mohammadbeigi

Ph.D. of TOFL, Department of Humanities, Faculty of Teaching English and Literature, Karaj Branch,

Islamic Azad University, Iran

Abstract

Up to now, many studies have been done to show the origin of attitudes and their relationships with behaviors or actions. Some of those works have focused on students' attitudes and some have introduced the various contexts of language teaching and learning. These studies were enough to give a new impetus for conducting the present investigation.

This paper investigated the teachers' attitudes towards teaching in high schools versus English institutions. For this reason 87 teachers (males and females) teaching English in both school and English institution asked to reply three sets of teacher questionnaires (TQ), i.e. their teaching course attitudes, teachers' attitudes towards their students, and teachers' practices. The main purpose of this investigation was to identify the teachers' attitudes when they encounter with different ELT contexts.

The results of this study revealed that teachers have different attitudes towards teaching in high schools versus English institutions. The statistical analyses of the data demonstrated that: (a) teachers had different attitudes towards their teaching courses (school versus English institution), (b) they showed different attitudes towards their students in high school and English institution, (c) the experience of teachers (low, medium, high), their degrees (MA, BA), and their background of education (Azad, State) had no influences on teachers' attitudes towards their teaching courses and towards the students attended those courses, (d) except for some cases, the experience of teachers, their degrees (MA,BA), and their background of education (Azad, State) had no influences on teachers' teaching activities done in high school and English institution, (e) teachers' attitudes contributed to their activities done in schools as well as English institutions. These results will expectantly help ELT teachers and course designers to step firmly in improving the language teaching and learning issues in Iran.

  Key terms: Attitude, Formal context, Informal context

Introduction

English is the world's most widely used language. Based on how language is learned, we can make a distinction between native language acquired when the speaker is a young child (generally in the home), and nonnative language acquired after the first language is learned. Even, there are differences in the use of the language: as a first language, the primary language of the speaker, and as a second or foreign language: EFL, ESL, EIL, and so on. In some countries, particularly of course where English is the dominant native language, people use English principally for internal purposes, as an intra-national language. There, speakers communicate with other speakers of the same country; in others, it serves chiefly as an international language, the medium of communication with speakers from other countries.

In countries where people consider English as international or foreign language, the demands of English learners as well as policy makers play a crucial role in creating the appropriate context of English language teaching (ELT). School context is the most familiar one in those areas, and the instructional demand is the priori force of learning English; in other words, English is assumed a subject of school to be studied for passing a course or getting marks.

Out of the school, there are large numbers of students in institutions of higher and further education that are learning English for a variety of purposes. They learn English for some reasons as the medium of the literature and culture of English-speaking countries; for access to scholarly and technological publications; to become English teachers, translators, or interpreters; to improve their chances of employment or promotion in their jobs.

English teaching contexts in Iran is EFL. In all formal educational places, English is the main school or university subject. In Iran, English course formally begins in second year of guidance school, and continues until the last year of high school. The average of English study in school is three hours per week. The dominant method, which teachers use in schools, is a combination of grammar-translation and audio-lingual method. At

the university level, reading skill is crucial, and the students focus on English for academic purposes (EAP). Of course, the university students have to pass a course in "General English" before taking specialized English courses. In high school, teachers have to apply the books prepared by curriculum developers of the Education ministry. They select and prepare the materials and even order the exam style and take the freedom of teachers in developing their own materials. If you compare schools with universities in textbook aspect, you will find out that at university levels, teachers have more freedom in preparing their own syllabuses than teachers in school. University teachers can introduce their favorite materials according to the subject of their teachings, but it is not the case in schools.

In spite of the fact that Education ministry prepares the textbooks, but there is no control over teaching methodologies which put in the classrooms by teachers. Teachers in Iran like to be the center; in other words, they follow teacher-centered procedure. The teachers oblige themselves with being honest implementers of the dictated materials.

Statement of the problem

Many studies have been done over recent decades all over the world to show how the ELT contexts are different, and how the methodology tends to be different due to these contexts. Although less attention has been paid to the subject in Iran, an informative study has been done by Talebinezhad and Aliakbari (2002). They found that Iranian ELT context is sensitive to EIL and EFL, but they left any other investigation on the problem of how teachers and students perceive those contexts. If there are two contexts in Iran, therefore, there should be different attitudes as well as needs in these different situations. Teachers' attitudes towards different teaching situations may affect their characteristics, and according to a study done in Turkey, teachers' characteristics, in its turn, may affect the students' attitudes and perceptions towards their teachers (Açikgöz, 2005). Therefore, if teachers' attitudes towards teaching in different contexts are so important, there have to be the necessity of considering the matter.

This was exactly what this study followed to reach. This study did the work because there were some factors in the two situations (high school and English institute), which caused the teachers had a remarkable impact on learning outcomes.

This study investigated the teachers' teaching attitudes towards high school and English institution contexts in which the learners attend with different types of needs. The present study assumed that there might be differences between these two contexts and teachers know the differences and fit themselves into these areas bases on their mental situational analyses, which just occur in the minds of teachers. These mental analyses put the basis of their attitudes, which this study aimed at reaching. This investigation searched for teachers' perceptions of their roles and practices in the mentioned contexts, as well as the different attitudes that they had towards the teaching courses in school and English institution as well as different attitudes towards their learners attending those classes. Up to now, most of the studies have been done on the issues such as, recognizing different contexts, students' attitudes towards their courses and teachers, attitudes and their relationship with behaviors and actions, but the most essential element has been neglected. If we depict the ELT context as a human body, teachers will certainly be the eyes. Therefore, the present study took into account the eyes of this huge body to find out how these sensitive parts of the body see the contexts.

This study investigated the expert and inexpert teachers' attitudes, in terms of their experiences, towards high school and English institution contexts. This study attempted to investigate whether teachers' degrees (MA or BA) and their background of graduation (Azad University vs. State University) have any contribution to their attitudes, and their activities or not. Therefore, based on the above problems, some questions raised that this study, more specifically, tried to find.

Literature Review

The history of attitude goes back to More than sixty-five years ago. In that time, Allport (1935) who was a psychologist at Harvard University asserted that attitudes are probably the most distinctive and indispensable concept of American social psychology. After Allport (1935) many social psychologists have been repeating his claim (e.g. Fishbein and Ajzen 1975; W. J. McGuire 1985). Attitude has been the key concept used by social psychologists to deal with three major sets of questions. These questions are (Fraser, 2001):

- To what extent our internal mental activities relate to our overt behavior. How do our views of the world connect to our actions in the world? Social psychology usually refers to that as, 'the attitude = behavior problem'.

- To what degree individuals have their views of the world internally organized. Are our positions on one set of concerns quite independent of our views on other topics or are they systematically related? How best can we change someone's views on one topic or another? These questions are related to attitude organization and attitude change.
- Why people have similar views on particular issues? This question was the first of the three sets of questions to be tackled by psychologists in the study of attitudes.

Fraser (2001) says that, like the early social psychologists who studied attitudes, many people believe as a rule of thumb that there are relations between attitudes and behavior. Furthermore, a commonsensical assumption seems to be that attitudes in some way determine or cause actions. Now let see how the term 'attitude' has been characterized by the scholars who worked on the issue. For many years, most of the researchers have been showing interest in focusing their attention on the learners and learning issues. First, there was an interest in study skills. Then, the interest changed towards learning strategies, and today there is a lot of interest in such issues as learning styles, learner autonomy and learner training (Palermo, 1999). As Palermo (1999) says, the way the people learn depends on how they think and feel. In another words, the people's beliefs affect their feeling and actions. For Palermo (1999), the belief is the informational attitudes, values, theories and assumptions about teaching and learning that teachers acquire through years and take them into the classrooms. He goes further and says that because human being is a social creature; his ideas will be shared with the other people around him. Palermo (1999) knows four selves in human being:

1. Open self
2. Secret self
3. Blind self
4. Hidden self

Therefore, it is somehow obvious that human is not a simple creature. Palermo (1999) says that the open self is the self that human himself, as well as the people around him, know about that self. He defines the secret self as the self that one knows about himself, but others do not know it. The third type is defined as facts, ideas, and beliefs that one is not aware of, but others can see them. Palermo (1999) knows this self as the blind self of human. The fourth self is the hidden one which Palermo (1999) defines it as the beliefs that not only the individuals but also the people around them are unable to know about those beliefs. Therefore, if we draw a line, there will be two levels, above and below the line. Above the line, the level of our awareness places and below the line is under our awareness. Palermo (1999) says that open self and secret self are above the line of our awareness and blind self as well as hidden one is below it.

Palermo (1999) depicted a pyramid and showed that there are four basic layers in it. These layers are:

1. Beliefs
2. Attitudes
3. Decisions
4. Actions

The way that we perceive and reinterpret the experiences is through the filter of belief system. These perceptions and interpretations evoke feelings, reactions, like, dislike, acceptance or rejection. These feelings shape our personal attitudes, and attitudes then affect our intentions and decisions and, ultimately, our actions. Therefore, what our students and we actually do in the classroom, are above the line of our awareness and below it our decisions that we make before and after our lessons lie. These decisions, in turn, are affected by our attitudes and beliefs (Palermo, 1999). The determinants of an action will be described more in the following parts. There are many definitions to attitudes, and I took some of them into account in the review of literature. In this part, the term has been defined operationally. Rokeach (1968) defined attitude as a learned orientation or disposition, toward an object or situation, which provides a tendency to respond favorably or unfavorably to the object or situation. Secord and Backman (1964) presented other definition for the term, which was more suitable to this study. They claimed that an attitude consists of three components:

- Cognitive component
- Affective component
- Behavioral component

The cognitive component refers to someone's knowledge, ideas, beliefs and opinions. The other part of an attitude is affective component, which is the person's feelings toward the attitude object, which based on Secord, and Backman (1964) terms, may be "favorable" or "unfavorable". They found that it is possible for

two individuals to have the same feelings, for example hold unfavorable attitudes towards something, but their personal feelings to be completely different. One may be afraid of thieves whereas the other is hostile and annoyed. The third component of an attitude, i.e. the behavioral component, is more sensible when the two other parts, the cognitive as well as affective component, are formed. The behavioral component is the tendency to act or react towards the attitude object. It refers to what an individual says about the action that he is going to do or what actually s/he does according to a particular attitude. In this investigation, these three components assumed to be dependent and influenced by each other. Therefore, in spite of the findings of some studies, which claimed there are differences between teachers' attitudes and actual classroom behaviors, the term attitude (or as the main purpose of the study suggested "teacher's attitude") may cause the teachers' actual behaviors, i.e. actions, in the classrooms.

Formal context
According to Farris (2001), formal context includes political speeches, homilies, lectures, which must be prepared in advance and presented in a serious tone. The present study focused on the teachers working in two familiar Iranian contexts (i.e. high school and English institutions). Because high schools are under the power of government and teachers have to work there based on designed curriculum, the study preferred to use the term formal, which covers school-bound contexts in Iran.

Informal context
Informal settings do not require a prior preparation of speeches or messages. It is more casual and relaxed as individuals engage in conversation. Because conversations often shift from topic to topic, speakers must be alert to all the interactions within a conversation. Speaking in informal settings is more rigorous because there are the demands of keeping up with the discussion while preparing additional comments (Farris, 2001). In English institutions, what is more obvious is the tendency of administrators to use global textbooks. Sometimes this endeavor is so vivid that each year the textbooks of an institution changes to show to the people and other institutions that they are up to date and move with the modern methods, and theories. Based on these evidences, it is clear that these institutions are not under the pressure of the government to use the imposed textbooks. The other obvious differences between high school and English institution are the duration of the courses as well as the rapport, which exist in the areas. Then, based on the above differences, this study took the English institution as the informal context, which is free from the limitations existing in the school-bound context. In another words, this investigation characterized informal context to be a non-school-bound area.

Research questions
The present study attempted to answer the questions raised about teachers' attitudes towards teaching in two well-known ELT contexts, i.e. high school vs. English institution, including their attitudes towards their teaching courses, their learners attending those courses, and their practices, in Iran. The objectives of the study could be expressed in the following questions:

1. Is there any significant difference between teachers' attitudes towards their courses in formal and informal ELT contexts?
2. Is there any significant difference between teachers' attitudes towards their students in formal and informal ELT contexts?
3. Do teachers' experiences, degrees (BA vs. MA), and background of graduation (Azad vs. state) contribute to their attitudes?
4. Is there any relationship between teachers' attitudes and their practices in these two context

Methodology:
The design of this study was described here. This investigation specifically described the subjects of the study, the instruments of data collection, the procedures used for administrating the procedures, the methods used for analyzing the data, and the statistics used.

Participants
A sample of eighty-seven ELT teachers (males and females) teaching both in high schools (private and public) and English institutions in Qazvin were randomly chosen. The most specific criterion of this study was the teaching contexts. The study limited its participants just to the teachers who had teaching experiences both in schools and English institutions.

Instruments

The data was collected by using three closed-ended questionnaires, which were based on Likert scale (1932), i.e. one=agree strongly, two=agree mildly, three=do not know, neither agree nor disagree, four=disagree mildly, five=disagree strongly. These questionnaires were:

(1) The questionnaire asking for teachers' attitudes towards their activities done in school versus English institution, which involve twenty-four questions (Appendix 1). (2) This questionnaire elicited the teachers' attitudes towards their students in their teaching contexts, i.e. school and English institution (Appendix 2). It was composed of eleven opposite terms extracted from Gardner (1985), and Osgood and Tannenbaum (1957). (3) The third questionnaire drew the teachers' attitudes towards their English courses and consisted of twenty-five sets of opposite terms (appendix 3).

All of these questionnaires were standardized as they had been used by other researchers in other studies.

Design and Procedures

In order to scrutinize the teaching attitudes of teachers towards high school and English institution, eighty-seven ELT teachers who worked both in schools and in English institutions, were selected by this study. After making sure that the subjects working in the mentioned contexts, the teacher questionnaires were administered. Eighty-seven ELT teachers answered the questionnaires individually. In another word, each subject had to answer the teacher's questionnaires alone to avoid any interference from the other teachers' views. The participants were asked to present their attitudes firstly towards teaching in high school and then, towards the second context, i.e., English institution. By doing that, their different attitudes towards those contexts would certainly emerge.

After the administration of the teacher's questionnaires, the statistical analyses were conducted. The first questionnaire was analyzed based on the frequency of answers. The second and third ones were scored for statistical reasons. All the participants were provided with complete recommendations of how to answer the questionnaires, and all of them knew that the study was for the research purpose.

The result of the analyses of the first part of the teacher's questionnaire showed us whether teachers have the same perceptions and practices in the two contexts or not. In addition, the other parts of the teacher's questionnaires depicted how teachers perceived the students and the English courses in the contexts under investigation. Finally, that is to say that teachers were requested to write their experiences based on the years of teaching, their sexes, their educational states or degree, and their graduation place, as they were crucial factors for the present study.

Results

To accept or reject the stated null hypotheses, the data obtained through three sets of questionnaires were analyzed by using SPSS 17.0 Software.

The first null hypothesis, which the present study tried to reject, was "An ELT teacher has no different attitudes towards his or her courses in formal classroom and informal one**.**"

The data was obtained through a teacher's questionnaire (Appendix 3) called 'Teacher Questionnaire Course' (TQC), and the participants gave their attitudes towards their teaching courses in two different contexts under the investigation of this study, i.e. school and English institution.

For rejecting the above hypothesis, an independent-sample t-test was conducted to compare the attitudes scores for teaching contexts, i.e. schools and institutions. As table (1) and (2) shows, there was a big significant difference in scores for school= ($\underline{M}$=66.78, $\underline{SD}$= 19.42) and [institution= $\underline{m}$= 37.13, $\underline{SD}$=8.28; $\underline{t}$ (58) = 9.297, $\underline{P}$< 0.0005]. According to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988), i.e. .01= small effect, .06= moderate effect, and .14= large effect, the magnitude of the differences in means was very big (eta squared= 0.3). Therefore, the first hypothesis could be strongly rejected.

Group Statistics

	Teachers' Teaching Context	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Teacher Questionnaire B	School	44	63.7190	18.52926	2.79339
	Institute	43	39.7040	13.71510	2.09153
Teacher Questionnaire C	School	44	66.7818	19.42465	2.92838
	Institute	43	37.1349	8.27569	1.26203

Table 1

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Teacher Questionnaire C	38.871	.000					
			9.297	58.394	.000	29.6469	3.18875

Table 2

The second null hypothesis which the present study tried to reject was," An ELT teacher has no different attitudes towards his or her students in formal and informal classrooms. "

As it is obvious in tables (3) and (1), one can reject the above null hypothesis. For rejecting this null hypothesis, an independent-sample t-test was conducted to compare the teachers' attitudes scores of their students for two different contexts, i.e. school and institution. There was a big significant difference in scores for teachers' attitudes towards their students in school (m= 63.72, SD=18.53) and their students in institution [m=39.70, SD=13.71; t (79) =6.882, P<0.0005]. The magnitude of the differences in means, according to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988), was very big (eta squared= 0.2). Therefore, the second null hypothesis can also be strongly rejected because the significant value is smaller than the alpha value (0.05).

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Teacher Questionnaire B	8.375	.005					
			6.882	79.233	.000	24.0150	3.48963

Table 3

The third null hypothesis, which the present study was to reject, was, "Teachers' experiences, degrees (BA vs. MA), and background of graduation (Azad vs. State) do not contribute to their attitudes towards teaching in formal and informal ELT contexts."

This null hypothesis consists of three parts and for rejecting or accepting it the result of each part has to be studied separately. Teacher's experience is the first part of the above hypothesis for that a one-way ANOVA, as it will be described below, was conducted.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to explore the impact of teachers' experience on their attitudes as measured by two sets of teacher's questionnaires (Appendix 2, 3). One of those questionnaires, as you see in Appendix 2, was about the attitudes that teachers had towards their courses in the contexts under investigation, and the other one was their attitudes towards their students in the contexts mentioned above. The subjects of this study were divided into three groups according to their experiences (low = less than 10, medium = 10 to 15, high = above 15). There was no statistically significant difference of teachers' attitudes towards their courses based on their experiences. As the tables (4) and (5) show, the mean scores of these three groups were Low = (M= 53.29, SD= 19.19), Medium= (M= 49.54, SD= 22.96), and High= (M=53.19, SD=21.41), (F (2, 84) = 0.275, P>0.05). Therefore, there was no significant difference here as the P value was bigger than 0.05.

The other attitudes of teachers were those towards their students in schools and institutions. Do teachers' experiences influence these attitudes? For answering this question, the result of a one-way ANOVA has to be considered. The values of teachers' attitudes (questionnaire C, Appendix 3) towards their students for the teachers' experiences, as the following tables (4) and (5) show, were:

Low= (M= 51.96, SD= 19.68), Medium= (M= 52.24, SD= 19.94), and High= (M=51.48, SD=21.40), [F (2, 84) = 0.011, P>0.05]. Therefore, there is no significant difference between teachers' attitudes towards their students caused by their experiences. Now by the above value, the present study cannot reject the first part of the above null hypothesis.

Descriptive

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Teacher Questionnaire B	low	26	51.9580	19.67789	3.85915	44.0100	59.9061	20.00	83.64
	medium	26	52.2378	19.94079	3.91071	44.1835	60.2920	23.64	89.09
	high	35	51.4805	21.40324	3.61781	44.1283	58.8328	20.00	98.18
	Total	87	51.8495	20.23286	2.16919	47.5373	56.1617	20.00	98.18
Teacher Questionnaire C	low	26	53.2923	19.19343	3.76414	45.5399	61.0447	24.80	84.00
	medium	26	49.5385	22.95643	4.50213	40.2662	58.8108	30.40	90.40
	high	35	53.1886	21.40775	3.61857	45.8348	60.5424	28.80	89.60
	Total	87	52.1287	21.08000	2.26001	47.6360	56.6215	24.80	90.40

Table 4

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Teacher Questionnaire B	Between Groups	8.991	2	4.495	.011	.989
	Within Groups	35196.709	84	419.008		
	Total	35205.700	86			
Teacher Questionnaire C	Between Groups	248.963	2	124.481	.275	.760
	Within Groups	37966.555	84	451.983		
	Total	38215.518	86			

Table 5

For the second and third parts of the above null hypothesis, i.e. teachers' degrees (BA vs. MA), and background of graduation (Azad vs. State) and their influences on teachers attitudes, two independent-sample t-test were conducted to compare the attitudes scores for teachers' degrees(MA, BA) as well as their background of education(Azad, State).

There was no significant difference in scores for MA (M= 50, 90, SD=22.78) and BA [M=52.03, SD= 19.88; t (85) = -0.189, P>0.05] in their attitudes towards their students and the same result achieved when their attitudes towards their courses were considered. In other words, Based on the tables (6) and (7) below, there was no significant difference in scores for MA (M=52.57, SD=22.32) and BA= [M=52.04, SD=20.99; t (85) = 0.085, P>0.05] when their course attitudes were considered. Consequently, the second part of the above null hypothesis is supported because the P values achieved were bigger than the alpha value (0.05).

Group Statistics

	Teachers' Last Academic Degree	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Teacher Questionnaire B	Master	14	50.9091	22.77617	6.08719
	Bachelor	73	52.0299	19.87710	2.32644
Teacher Questionnaire C	Master	14	52.5714	22.31948	5.96513
	Bachelor	73	52.0438	20.99477	2.45725

Table 6

Independent Sample Test

	Levene's Test for quality of Variance		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Teacher Questionnaire B	1.271	.263	-.189	85	.851	-1.1208	5.93663	2.92441	0.68282
Teacher Questionnaire C	.000	.987	.085	85	.932	.5276	6.18623	1.77229	2.82747

Table 7

The third part of the above null, i.e. background of graduation (Azad vs. State), cannot be rejected because the means and P values for the scores of teachers attitudes towards their courses and students showed no significant differences for Azad and State universities where the teachers had been graduated.

There was no significant difference in scores of teachers' attitudes towards their courses for Azad (M=53.27, SD=21.20) and State universities [M=48.77, SD= 20.83; t (85) = 0.865, P>0.05]. (See table 8 and 9)

As it is obvious from tables 8 and 9, the result of the T-test also revealed that there was no significant difference in scores of teachers' attitudes towards their students for Azad (M=53.31, SD=18.61) and State universities [M=47.52, SD=24.39; t (30) =1.018, P>0.05] where the teachers had been graduated.

Group Statistics

	Teachers' Place Of Graduation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Teacher Questionnaire B	Azad	65	53.3147	18.60615	2.30781
	State	22	47.5207	24.39538	5.20111
Teacher Questionnaire C	Azad	65	53.2677	21.20231	2.62982
	State	22	48.7636	20.82998	4.44097

Table 8

Independent Sample Test

	Levene's Test for quality of Variance		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Teacher Questionnaire B	3.704	.058							
			1.018	29.705	.317	5.7940	5.69013	5.83160	7.41965
Teacher Questionnaire C	.028	.867	.865	85	.389	4.5041	5.20714	5.84913	4.85724

Table 9

Therefore, like the parts one and second of the above null hypothesis, the third part also cannot be rejected. As a result, no parts of the above null hypothesis can be rejected; it means that the null hypothesis itself cannot be rejected by this study.

Beside the results stated above, some interesting results were also achieved by the present study. For example, T-test compared the participants' attitudes towards their students based on their sexes. It showed that there was no significant difference in scores of participants' attitudes towards their students for Male (M=55.09, SD=21.94) and Female [M=49.09, SD=18.45; t (85) =1.39, P>0.05]. (See table 10 and 11)

Group Statistics

	Teachers' Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Teacher Questionnaire B	male	40	55.0909	21.93906	3.46887
	female	47	49.0909	18.44864	2.69101
Teacher Questionnaire C	male	40	55.2200	23.51544	3.71812
	female	47	49.4979	18.61621	2.71545

Table 10

Independent Sample Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Teacher Questionnaire B	2.449	.121	1.386	85	.169	6.0000	4.32938	2.60797	4.60797
Teacher Questionnaire C	10.273	.002							
			1.243	73.879	.218	5.7221	4.60414	3.45207	4.89632

Table 11

Meanwhile, according to table 10 and 11 above, T-test compared the attitudes of participants towards their courses for males and females. It also showed no significant difference in scores for Male ($\underline{M}$= 55.22, $\underline{SD}$=29.51) and Female= [$\underline{M}$=49.49, $\underline{SD}$=18.61; $\underline{t}$ (74) = 1.24, $\underline{P}$>0.05].

The fourth null hypothesis, which this study aimed at rejecting, was "There is no significant relationship between the teachers' attitudes and their practices in the contexts under investigation, i.e. school and institution."

For rejecting this hypothesis the data obtained from the questionnaire A (TQA) administered to the participants to state their activities in the contexts under investigation (Appendix1), was manipulated by using two non-parametric techniques called 'Mann-Whitney U test' and 'Kruskal-Wallis test'. These two tests were conducted to compare the contexts attitudes of teachers and their practices in those contexts, i.e. school and institution. Because of the essence of questionnaire A that was about the activities done by teachers in formal and informal contexts (Appendix 1), the present study has separately analyzed each of those activities.

The first activity of questionnaire C was,' taking part in discussion' which after conducting the test, it showed that there is a big significant difference between the teachers activities in the contexts under investigation, ($\underline{Z}$ (87) = -6.630, $\underline{P}$<0.0005). There is a big significant difference for second activity as well ($\underline{Z}$ (87) =-6.878, $\underline{P}$<0.0005). Therefore, ' watching and listening to training videos' have been treated differently in schools and English institutions.

The third activity was ' taking part in language games' which the significant value which has achieved from the test shows a big significant difference for school and institution in performing this activity ($\underline{Z}$ (87)= -7.011, $\underline{P}$<0.0005).' Reading text for language analysis' seems to have no significant difference for these two contexts as its significant value is above the alpha value (0.05), [$\underline{Z}$ (87) = -1.034, $\underline{P}$>0.05]. Therefore, teachers are supposed to do this activity in both contexts. (See table 12)

Ranks

	Teachers'	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
taking part in discussion	School	44	60.84	2677.00
	Institute	43	26.77	1151.00
	Total	87		
Watching and listening to training video	School	44	61.67	2713.50
	Institute	43	25.92	1114.50
	Total	87		
Taking part in language games	School	44	62.18	2736.00
	Institute	43	25.40	1092.00
	Total	87		
Reading texts for language analysis, e.g., tenses, connectives	School	44	46.63	2051.50
	Institute	43	41.31	1776.50
	Total	87		
Studying grammatical rules	School	44	34.20	1505.00
	Institute	43	54.02	2323.00
	Total	87		
Working in small groups (maximum 5 students)	School	44	56.93	2505.00
	Institute	43	30.77	1323.00
	Total	87		

Table 12

Test statistics

	taking part in discussion	Watching and listening to training video	Taking part in language games	Reading texts for language analysis, e.g., tenses, connectives	Studying grammatical rules	Working in small groups (maximum 5 students)
Mann-Whitney U	205.000	168.500	146.000	830.500	515.000	377.000
Wilcoxon W	1151.000	1114.500	1092.000	1776.500	1505.000	1323.000
Z	-6.630	-6.878	-7.011	-1.034	-3.906	-5.049
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.301	.000	.000

a. Grouping Variable: Teachers' Teaching Context

Table 13

In 'studying grammatical rules', there is again a big significant difference $(Z (87) = -1.034, P<0.0005]$. 'Working in small groups' shows a big significant difference too $(Z (87) = -5.049, P<0.0005]$. (See tables 12 and 13)

This difference also exists in the next activity, which was' working in pairs'. This activity has a significant value, which was smaller than α (0.05). It revealed a significant different in doing this activity in schools and English institutions $(Z (87) = -5.575, P<0.0005)$. For the other activity, i.e. writing short passages, the result was $(Z (87) = -4.921, P<0.0005)$ which shows a big significant difference like what one can see for the ninth activity, i.e. Listening to others using English in class $(Z (87) = -6.112, P<0.0005)$.

'Planning exam answers, e.g., analyzing questions, and organizing answers' showed no significant difference due to its P value $[Z (87) = -0.767, P=0.4]$ which was bigger than the alpha value (0.05), but 'Talking to students in English in class' $(Z (87) = -7.569, P<0.0005)$, and 'Using the language laboratory', $(Z (87) = -4.587, P<0.0005)$ presented big differences. (See tables 14 and 15 below)

Ranks

	Teachers'	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Working in pairs	School	44	58.07	2555.00
	Institute	43	29.60	1273.00
	Total	87		
Writing short passages (< one page) in class	School	44	56.84	2501.00
	Institute	43	30.86	1327.00
	Total	87		
Listening to others using English in class	School	44	59.92	2636.50
	Institute	43	27.71	1191.50
	Total	87		
Planning exam answers, e.g., analyzing questions, and organizing answer	School	44	42.03	1849.50
	Institute	43	46.01	1978.50
	Total	87		
Talking to students in English in class	School	44	63.34	2787.00
	Institute	43	24.21	1041.00
	Total	87		
Using the language laboratory	School	44	55.97	2462.50
	Institute	43	31.76	1365.50
	Total	87		

Table 14

Test statistics

	Working in pairs	Writing short passages (< one page) in class	Listening to others using English in class	Planning exam answers, e.g., analyzing questions, and organizing answer	Talking to students in English in class	Using the language laboratory
Mann-Whitney U	327.000	381.000	245.500	859.500	95.000	419.500
Wilcoxon W	1273.000	1327.000	1191.500	1849.500	1041.000	1365.500
Z	-5.575	-4.921	-6.112	-.767	-7.569	-4.587
Asymp. Sig.(2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.443	.000	.000

a. Grouping Variable: Teachers' Teaching Context

Table 15

These big differences are not limited to above activities but for thirteenth activity, ($\underline{Z}$ (87) = -5.560, P<0.0005], of questionnaire A (appendix 1), as well as fourteenth (Z (87) = -5.537, P<0.0005), fifteenth (Z (87) = -7.686, P<0.0005), sixteenth (Z (87) = -4.156, P<0.0005), seventeenth (Z (87) = -3.132, P=0.002), eighteenth (Z (87) = -5.925, P<0.0005), nineteenth (Z (87) = -6.887, P<0.0005), and twentieth activities (Z (87) = -2.176, P<0.03) the same significant differences were seen. It is because their P values were smaller than the alpha value (0.05). Of course, in the case of seventeenth and twentieth activities their P values were a bit bigger than other activities stated above. However, these two activities were smaller

17

than alpha (0.05) and it implies the fact that there were significant differences in doing these two activities in the aforementioned contexts. For many years, most of the researchers have been showing interest in focusing their attention on the learners and learning issues. First, there was an interest in study skills. Then, the interest changed towards learning strategies, and today there is a lot of interest in such issues as learning styles, learner autonomy and learner training (Palermo, 1999). As Palermo (1999) says, the way the people learn depends on how they think and feel. In another words, the people's beliefs affect their feeling and actions. For Palermo (1999), the belief is the informational attitudes, values, theories and assumptions about teaching and learning that teachers acquire through years and take them into the classrooms. He goes further and says that because human being is a social creature; his ideas will be shared with the other people around him. Palermo (1999) knows four selves in human being:

1. Open self
2. Secret self
3. Blind self
4. Hidden self

Therefore, it is somehow obvious that human is not a simple creature. Palermo (1999) says that the open self is the self that human himself, as well as the people around him, know about that self. He defines the secret self as the self that one knows about himself, but others do not know it. The third type is defined as facts, ideas, and beliefs that one is not aware of, but others can see them. Palermo (1999) knows this self as the blind self of human. The fourth self is the hidden one which Palermo (1999) defines it as the beliefs that not only the individuals but also the people around them are unable to know about those beliefs. Therefore, if we draw a line, there will be two levels, above and below the line. Above the line, the level of our awareness places and below the line is under our awareness. Palermo (1999) says that open self and secret self are above the line of our awareness and blind self as well as hidden one is below it.

Palermo (1999) depicted a pyramid and showed that there are four basic layers in it. These layers are:

1. Beliefs
2. Attitudes
3. Decisions
4. Actions

The way that we perceive and reinterpret the experiences is through the filter of belief system. These perceptions and interpretations evoke feelings, reactions, like, dislike, acceptance or rejection. These feelings shape our personal attitudes, and attitudes then affect our intentions and decisions and, ultimately, our actions. Therefore, what our students and we actually do in the classroom, are above the line of our awareness and below it our decisions that we make before and after our lessons lie. These decisions, in turn, are affected by our attitudes and beliefs (Palermo, 1999). The determinants of an action will be described more in the following parts.

References

Açikgöz, F. (2005*)*. A study on teacher characteristics and their effects on student's attitudes.

Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior.

Ajzen, I. (1982). "On Behaving in Accordance with One's Attitudes."

Ajzen, Fishbein and M., I (1980). *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behaviour.*

Allen, L. (1996). The evaluation of a learner's beliefs about language learning. Allen, Patrick, Swain, Hadley, and Cummins (1990).

Allport, Gordon W. (1935). "Attitudes." *A Handbook of Social Pscychology.*

Alptekin, C., Alptekin, M. (1984).The question of culture.

Anderson, J. R. (1983). *The Architecture of Cognition.* Harvard University Press.

Arnold, J. (1999). *Affect in language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ashton, P., & Webb, R. (1986). *Making a difference.*

Ashton, P. T., Webb, R. B., and Doda, N. (1982.

Bagozzi, R. (1978). The construct validity of the affective, behavioral, and cognitive components

Barcelos, A. M. F. (2000). *Understanding teachers' and students' language*

Barcelos, A. M. F. (2003). Researching beliefs about SLA.

Baskerville, R.F. (2003). "Hofstede Never Studied Culture.

Benson, P. (2001). *Teach Teaching and research researching autonomy*

Benson, P. and Lor, W. (1999). Conceptions of language and language learning

Bentler P. M. and Speckart G. (1979) Models of attitude behavior relations.

Berliner, D. (1994). *'Teacher Expertise.'* In Moon, B & A. Sheldon Mayes.

Burnkrant, R. & Page, T. (1988). The structure and antecedents .

Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers' beliefs and knowledge.

Campbell, J. (1996). A comparison of teacher efficacy for pre and in-service teachers.

Campbell, D. et al. (1982). English in international settings.

Canagarajah, A. S. 1999. *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*.

Chaiken, S. & Baldwin, M. (1981).

Clark, C. (1988). Asking the right questions about teacher preparation.

Clermont, C. P., Borko, H., & Crack, J. S. (1994).

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Collin, M., and Civia, T. (1982). *Marva Collin's Way*, (Los Angeles: Jeremy P.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination inhuman behavior*.

Dörnyei, Z. (2000). *Teaching and researching motivation*. New York: Longman.

Eagly, A. H. and Chaiken, S. (1993) *The Psychology of Attitudes*. San Diego.

Edwards, C. (1996). 'Learning to Learn How to Teach.

Elbaz, F. (1983). *Teacher Thinking: A study of practical knowledge*.

Elliot, B & J. Calderhead. (1995). *'Mentoring for Teacher Development*.

Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching.

Felder, R. (1997). *Beating the numbers game: Effective teaching in large classes*.

Fenstermacher, G.D. (1994). The knower and the known.

Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior*

Flavell, J.H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring.

Flavell, J.H. (1981). Monitoring social cognitive enterprises.

Flavell, & L. Ross, (Eds.),   *Social cognitive development*

Flavell, J.H. (1987). Speculation about the nature and development of metacognition.

Weinert, & R.H. Kluwe, (Eds.), *Metacognition, motivation and understanding* (pp.1-29).

Fraser, C., (2001). *Introducing social psychology: Attitudes and Actions*

Freeman, D. and Richards, J. (eds.). (1996).

Freeman, D. (1989). 'Teacher Training, Development, and Decision-Making.

Gabrielatos, C. (2000). *The Shape of the Language Teacher*.

Gabrielatos, C. (1999). *Cooking and the Language Teacher*. Gabrielatos, C. (1996).

Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning*.

Hadley, A. O. (2003). *Teaching language in context*.

Haskel, J. F. (1978). 'An Eclectic Method.' *TESOL Newsletter* 12.

Johnson, H. (1992). 'Defossilizing'. *ELT Journal* 46/2.

Jenkins, J. (1998). Which pronunciation norms and models for English as an International Language?

Kalaja, P. (2003). Research on students' beliefs about SLA

Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). 'Using Attitude Scales to Investigate Teachers' Attitudes.

Kennedy, C. & Kennedy, J. (1996). Teacher attitudes and change implementation.

Klein, M. (1977). *Talking in the language arts classrooms*.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). Imported Theories/ Local Understandings.

Leinhardt, G., & Greeno, J. G. (1986). The cognitive skill of teaching.

Li, M. S. (1999). *Conflicts in teacher-student role beliefs and expectations:*

Lightbown, P. M. and Spada, N. (1993, 1999).

McArthur, T. (1983). *A Foundation Course for Language Teachers*.

McGuire, William J. (1985). Attitude and Attitude Change. In G. Lindzey & E.

Martin, E., & Ramsden, P. (1987). Learning skills, or skill in learning

Munby, H. (1982). The place of teachers' beliefs in research on teacher thinking and decision.

North, D.C. 1990. *Institutional Change and Economic Performance*.

Nunan, D. (1999/ 2000). Yes, but is English? *TESOL Matters*, 3.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G, J., and Tannenbaum, P.H. (1957).

Owen, N. (1999). *Teaching Excellence' in English Teaching Professional*

Palermo, (1999). *Probing the hidden curriculum*

Pennington, M. (1990). *A professional development focus for the language teaching.*

Phillipson, R. (1992). Linguistic Imperialism. Oxford University Press.

Pierre, F. (2005). Peer interaction in the Haitian public school context.

Quirk, R. (1978).Aspects of English as an International language.

Rajecki, D. J. (1990) *Attitudes.* 2nd ed. Sunderland, MA.

Rand, A. (1974). 'Philosophy: Who needs it?' In Rand, A. 1984. *Philosophy:*

Richards, J. and C. Lockhart. (1995). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms.*

Riley, P. (1980). *Mud and stars: Personal constructs sensitization and learning.*

Rivers, W. (1972). *Speaking in Many Tongues*. Newbury House.

Roberts, J. (1998). *Language Teacher Education*. London, Arnold.

Sabers, D. S., Cushing, K. S., & Berliner, D. C. (1991).

Sánchez, E., Rosaes, J., & Cañedo, I. (1999).

Schemp, P.G., Manross, D., Tan, S.K.S., & Fincher, M.D. (1998).

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). 'The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning.

Scrivener, J. (1996). 'ARC: A Descriptive Model for Classroom Work on Language.'

Sweet, H. (1899/1964). The Practical Study of Language. Oxford University Press.

Talebinezhad, M. R., Aliakbari, M. (2001)..

Talebinezhad, M. R., Aliakbari, M. (2002).

Thomas, L.F. and Harri-Augustein, E.S. (1983).

Triandis, H. (1971). *Attitude theory: In Attitude and Attitude Change*, 60-100.

Ulichny, P. (1996). 'What's in a Methodology?'

Unwin, T. (1990). The attitudes of final year geography undergraduates to teaching as a career.

van Els, T., T. Bongaerts, G. Extra, C.

Vassilakis, G. (1998). 'Qualification versus Development.

Victori, M. & Lockhart, W. (1995). Enhancing metacognition in self self-directed   language.

Von Glasersfeld, E. (1992). *A constructivist approach to teaching*.

Wenden, A. (1999). An introduction to metacognitive knowledge and beliefs.

Wenden, A. (2001). Metacognitive knowledge.