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Abstract
This study investigates L2 teachers’ and L2 students’ perceptions of effective foreign language teaching in Iran by evaluating adjustments and maladjustments among each group’s perception of what they think an effective L2 teacher should recognize and perform in the classroom. The main aims of this study were triple: First, the recognition and contrast of post-secondary L2 students’ and L2 teachers’ perceptions of effective teaching conducts on a Likert-scale questionnaire; second, the contrast of students’ and teachers’ perceptions of how often particular teaching conducts are implemented; third, the contrast of students’ assessments of teaching to their teachers’ self-assessments on a similar questionnaire. Fifty teachers and their one hundred and fifty students from eight classes in some universities in Golestan province, Iran willingly joined the study in fall semester, 2014. In two visits, the students and teachers completed questionnaires concerning perceptions of 1) what effective FL teachers should be performing in the classroom, 2) how often definite target conducts are implemented, and 3) how effective teachers do them. An extra section of the study included the contrast of the students’ evaluations on the language-teaching questionnaire with certain questions related to teaching taken from the standard Teacher-Course Evaluation Questions. Statistical analyses indicated that teachers and students, generally and by teacher, do have very various perceptions of what should be performed in the FL classroom, what is at this time being performed, and how effectively it is being performed. Questions that indicated statistically important distinctions among teachers and students generally concealed matters such as direct error modification, task-based teaching, and students’ utilization of FL early, use of pair and small-group work, and grammar teaching. Teachers’ and students’ answers to the utilization of English in testing reading and listening skills, the need for the teacher to have native-like command of the target language, the explanation of the FL by the teacher to help students’ comprehension, and the need of positioning grammar into real-world backgrounds were alike. Students and teachers look to have different views concerning grammar teaching and the worth of communicative language
teaching strategies with students preferring a more common grammar-based method and teachers preferring a communicative FL classroom.
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### INTRODUCTION

In the area of adult second language acquisition the question of what truly consists of effective teaching maintains to confuse students and teachers who are involved in language teaching and learning. This condition is not separated in the area of language teaching such as how to be able to recognize particular teaching behaviours needed for learning in which it will not be achieved in other areas (Brown, 2006). Regardless of the difficulty in indicating particular learning attainments to bind teaching behaviours specified common rules of effective teaching and social variables become visible to practice some efficacy on all types of teaching and learning in spite of training (Murray, 1991). In investigating the research studies reporting teacher manners to students consequences, Rosenshine and Frust (1971) mention eleven variables presuming to symbolize effective teaching and eventually leading to effective learning: 1) Clarity (pp. 44-45), 2) Variability (pp. 45-46), 3) Enthusiasm (pp. 46-47), 4) Task-Oriented and/or Businesslike Behaviors (pp. 47-48), 5) Student Opportunity to Learn Criterion Material (pp. 48-49), 6) Use of Student Ideas and General Indirectness (pp. 49-50), 7) Criticism (pp. 50-51), 8) Use of Structuring Comments (pp. 51-52), 9) Types of Questions (pp. 52-53), 10) Probing (pp. 53-54), 11) Level of Difficulty of Instruction (p. 54).

Travers (1981) claims a holistic approach in asserting convincingly that variables within the teachers’ power represent just one feature of the many questions to be noticed while evaluating student learning. He mentions social variables such as efficacy of the home conditions and the extent of family members’ association in and help of learning: The extent to which a pupil learns in the school as a function of many different conditions, of which the teachers’ mode of operation is only one. Achievement is also a function of such conditions as the extent to which the home encourages learning, the extent to which the parents participate in the learning and development of the child, perhaps genetic endowment, and the kinds of material available for study (p.18)

In evaluating college teaching, Murray (1991) studied on effective teaching manners, concentrating on the effect of passion and clarity on student learning and motivation. Murray admits that most of the study he examined was directed in lecture style classes, but makes the bold claim that “classroom teaching behaviors, at least in the enthusiasm and clarity domains appear to be casual antecedents (rather than mere correlates) of various in instructional outcome measures” (p. 161). These writers assert that teacher conducts are just one of the principles having impact on student learning make the enhancement of teaching that is much more important. In fact, there are many elements behind teachers’ control that are influencing student success and learning, it becomes essential that teachers try to maximize the effect of those things they can control. Teachers can control their own real educational intents and manners that directly affect
students and their learning, but they cannot control students’ private lives outdoor of the classroom.

The common teaching rules noted above supply some tips to teachers of all orders at an abstract level but lack the requirement to perform a real lesson plan that will successfully develop students’ efficient learning. As stated by writers noted above, it can be guessed that teachers require to be eager in their teaching, oblivious in their behavior, and tolerant in their integration of student opinions (Brown, 2006). At first, teachers should know what students describe as effective teaching, so they are responsible for students’ requirements and try to make better the efficacy of students’ output. Although away from favoring the teachers use date about students’ opinion based on unacceptable desire, the data will be applied for their reaction and recognizing particular areas in which their attitude are required to change among students (Barnes & Lock, 2010).

In fact, there exist many factors over teachers’ control that impact students’ success and understanding. So, it seems essential for teachers to increase the effect of those factors. Teachers are not able to control the way of students’ lives, though they are able to control the way of their own real teaching intents and behaviors in which immediately affect their understanding (Brown, 2006). There exist common interests to learn a language on the area of students’ opinion that will be able to affect the process of language learning whereas teachers provide the context for students to learn a language in a good way (Boakye, 2007).

Researching on students’ perceptions of effective foreign language teachers is essential. While a teacher and his students have different opinions about what should they do in the class and they may miss assurance in the teachers ability, teachers must get how to deal with and their methodology for education (Brown, 2006). It has been identified that thought about language learning are context-specific and students with various ways of life may have various trends, methods and ideas about language learning (Nikitina & Furuoka, 2006). Students’ opinions affect their awareness, trend about language learning, strategies and policies of learning. Also, teachers’ opinions widely affect the way of their teaching, methods of teaching, behaviors and students’ progression. Specification of students’ and teachers’ opinion in the process of language teaching and learning will be a useful way to create effective methods for teaching and learning (Büyükazi, 2010).

Knowledge of differences is essential. It is essential to survey students’ perceptions of effective foreign language teaching, therefore, teachers who are teaching and trainers are able to get how to amend their work, however, students may miss their assurance about teachers’ ability. Thus, in spite of developing and expressing an atmosphere of confidence and reinforcement which are essential for effective learning, teachers want to find areas of differences between what they do and what the students think, and therefore say these differences. Teachers should not just get students’ ideas and apply them such as determining factor in class. In some occasions, teachers will discover that
they want to reconsider their teaching methodologies, however, in other occasions, teachers will achieve to improve the thoughts of their students (Barnes & Lock, 2013).

**Students’ and Teachers’ Perceptions**

As Richardson (1996) maintains, teachers’ trends obtained much consideration in literature during the early 1950’s and early 1970’s, and more lately, they have covered as clue to get what motives teachers’ actions. In addition to different terms, Richardson (1996) categorizes trends, opinions, and perceptions as a set of intellectual constructs, that “name, define and describe the structure and content of mental states thought to derive a person’s actions” (p.102). She also mentions the beliefs as psychological propositions, and other comprehensions about the world that are perceived true which are offered by other anthropologists, social psychologists, and philosophers.

Instead of replacement among different words and to simplify discussion on the topic, the word ‘belief’ will be used in reviewing literature in the field of teachers’ and students’ opinions about ideal drills. ‘Perception’ will be used in discussing the features of this study, which contains beliefs as described above as well as students’ intellectual assessments of their teachers’ manners. Therefore, for the aims of this study ‘perception’ will be operationalized to intend participants’ psychologically received, intellectual opinions on ideal teaching exercises, their observations of the repetition of particular teaching exercises, and their evaluations of those exercises.

Put simply, ‘perception’ in frame of this study’s investigation plan mentions students’ and teachers’ private, intellectual opinions, on three various levels: 1) which teaching exercises students and teachers commonly assume that are efficient in foreign language teaching, 2) how often they realize specified behaviors to be happening in their classrooms, and 3) how efficiently they assume their teachers do specified behaviors. These three levels closely parallel a three-part definition explained by Pajares (1992) where beliefs may be prescriptive, expressive, and appraising severely. The compilation of words should not be made as an effort to reduce the significance of the exact meaningful differences among beliefs, trends, intentions, perceptions, and perspectives; however, given the aim and extent of the current study, ‘perceptions’ often describes the independent, intellectual nature of this study’s objective concept.

Arguing in a social constructivist approach to language learning, Williams and Burden (1997) bring the relation among beliefs and acts on the role of both teachers and students. They suggest that teachers’ acts are extremely impressed by their beliefs and state that, “one of the plenty of aspects that teachers bring to the teaching-learning procedure is an opinion of what education is all about, and this belief, whether implied or definitive, will impress their acts in the classroom” (pp. 48-49). The researchers suggest that a necessary step in the social constructivist approach is for teachers to notice what their beliefs are. However, students’ and teachers’ private beliefs about teaching may not be confirmed by experimental or scientific proof or be absolutely foreseeable. There seems to be a strong relation among prior experience and the expansion of concepts relevant to teaching and learning. In studying teachers in
educating and their beliefs about teaching. Richardson (1996) notices the following three kinds of experience as effective: private experience, experience with training and guidance, and experience with official knowledge. Personal experience has reference to one’s view, worth, mental confidence, moralist trends, and familial and cultural context. Experience with training and guidance refers specially to teachers’ prior experiences when they were students in traditional classrooms. These first two kinds of experience cause extremely based opinions about teaching and learning that may be hard to modify. Experience with official knowledge contains experience with comprehension that has been agreed upon as reliable and valid by a group of researchers. Students occupy with official knowledge via different instruments containing information stated via the mass media in the form of news and documentaries or articles in magazines or journals.

In his revision of the belief literature, Pajares (1992) corroborates Richardson’s assertion that (1) beliefs about teaching are regulated via many years of official training and, (2) that they may be hard to modify. He mentions Lortie (1975) who used the phrase “apprenticeship of observation” in referring to the effect on prior experience in the formatting of educational beliefs. Pajares discusses that teachers’ trend to enter the profession with predetermined concepts of what teaching should involve comparisons with other professions such as medicine and law. Pre-service teachers can investigate insiders and as such do not feel the requirement to redefine their status. These aspirant teachers’ fact and beliefs stays mainly unchanged by courses in higher education. He maintains that beginning medical and law students, unlike teachers, enter their relative fields and places of recruitment, e.g., the operating room or the courtroom, with little to no presentation or experience. Specially, Pajares claims that for medical and law students the operating room and the courtroom are “new to students, what goes on in them is alien, and understandings must be constructed nearly from scratch” (p. 323). Beliefs, as stated by Pajares (1992), can be so established that often they are claimed even after having been shown to be empirically wrong and unrepresentative of fact.

Although teachers’ belief structures may be very persistent to alter, Richardson (1996) discusses that conversion can really happen. In her review of the research on studies in belief conversion, the writer mentions that in-service teachers prefer to be more open to alter than pre-service teachers. Another catalyst for belief conversion occupies in a constructivist approach where teachers are cheered to occupy in reflective experiment of their exercises and beliefs (Richardson, 1996). Evenly significant in improving teaching, student learning and student success is a consistent understanding of students’ beliefs and perceptions. Williams and Burden (1997) state that “learners’ perceptions and interpretations ... have been found to have the greatest influence on achievement” (p. 98). Not surprisingly, they claim that in some cases students’ perceptions of teacher treatments do not correlate with teachers’ intents (Williams & Burden, 1997).

Students and teachers may have very same or different concepts of efficient teaching and the intersection of the two has consequences for students’ language learning and
the effectiveness of teachers’ instruction. Horwitz (1990), one of the prominent researchers on the affective area in the foreign language classroom – especially subjects of anxiety – claims that maladjustments among students’ and teachers’ expectations of teaching “can lead to a lack of student confidence in and satisfaction with the language class” (p. 25). In addition, Kern (1995) sums up the aim of research into students’ and teachers’ beliefs about language teaching by expressing that the important purpose is “to predict expectational conflicts that may contribute to student frustration, anxiety, lack of motivation, and in some cases, ending of foreign language study” (p. 71). It is remarkable that the previously mentioned assertions about student disappointment and lack of motivation were made without reference to any type of real, quantifiable learning gains or improvement in success, i.e., scores. The writers mentioned above explicit concerns related to more far-reaching outcomes, namely, frustration with learning and disillusionment with official training, their teachers, and the institutions they represent.

**Students’ and Teachers’ Evaluations**

According to this researcher’s comprehension, very little research is within L2 language teaching that has exactly contrasted L2 teachers’ self-evaluations with the evaluations of their own students using a homogeneous evaluation instrument (Beaudrie, Brown, & Thompson, 2004). Feldman (1989) reconsidered research administered across various areas where numerous sources of teaching evaluation were contained. Regrettably, his analysis did not divide by area nor was much data afforded on the resemblance of instruments used by each evaluation group. As part of her thesis that directed experienced teachers’ perceptions of effective L2 teaching, Reber (2001) creates commendations for future research in the area of teachers’ and students’ perceptions of effective teaching. In one such commendation, she expresses, “a similar study that would be valuable to the profession would be one comparing and matching teacher and student belief systems” (p. 173).

What this study will show is that it is helpful to know not only what students’ sense about abstract L2 learning principles, but also what students’ perceptions are of real pedagogical drills in the L2 classroom. In fact, teachers might employ their students in short discussions about L2 learning by first explaining the reason beyond definite activities. After notifying them, group and pair work will be practical mostly in the classroom, the teacher might help students get the emphasis of input, output, and discussion of meaning, being specified to do so by modifying the discussion and new words to the students’ level of understanding. In spite of the significance of awareness about students’ perceptions for effective teaching, there exists a deficiency of studies in the area of English Language teaching, particularly in the Iranian context. Indeed, little research exists regarding students’ and teachers’ perceptions of effective foreign language teaching, thus the present study attempted to do it. Especially, it notices the trends of effective foreign language teaching in Iranian universities’ students. It surveys students’ attitudes to be performed and why these trends are selected. The results of this survey will supply new conceptions for students and teachers about effective
foreign language teaching and they will be instructive for teachers and students of foreign language in Iranian universities.

The present study explains the main part of present knowledge by surveying how the results will be used for FL students in Iranian universities context. Moreover, this study helps to make clear the constraint of literature in the FL area about students’ perceptions of a broad area of teachers’ trends. Also, in contrast with previous studies of FL students’ perceptions of effective teachers, which include questionnaire instruments with items based on trends applied by previous studies in other situations, the questionnaire instrument items of the this study were informed by the trends produced by a qualitative study of the same student population (Barnes & Lock, 2010). This has not only authorized particular testing of trends to the context, but also notices domains of interest of FL students that may be used in other contexts and may not have been involved in lists based on the literature. The present study investigates Reber’s (2001) offers by considering foreign language teachers’ and students’ perceptions of effective FL teaching by analyzing matches and mismatches among each group’s perception of effective teaching conducts. The real development of these perceptions of effective teaching in the FL classroom will also be directed versus teaching evaluations. The relationship among L2 students’ evaluations of their teachers’ teaching and those similar teachers’ self-evaluations will be investigated. It is with these aims that the following research questions have been formulated.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

RQ1: Is there any statistically significant relationship between students’ and teachers’ views about the effective foreign language teaching?

RQ2: Is there any statistically significant relationship between students’ and teachers’ views about the language teaching observation and evaluation?

RQ3: What are the students’ ratings of teacher course evaluation?

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The participants for this study were fifty teachers (13 males, 37 females) mainly among the ages of 27 and 35 and one hundred and fifty students among the age of 18 and 34 enrolled on a volunteer basis from eight intact 2nd-year and 3rd-year foreign language classes in some universities in Golestan Province. Teachers were enrolled by way of their basic language program administrators or separately with the department’s permission. Students were contained as intact classes attached to a special teacher in order to permit for explained contrasts of opinions, perceptions, and evaluations. As the major research goal was to contrast students’ and teachers’ perceptions of effective teaching and their real evaluations of it, a specific attempt was made to enroll L2 teachers who taught more than one part of the language to gain student-teacher contrasts, though no teacher was prevented for only teaching one class or for low
enrollment. A relevant part of the current study plan is the capability to make contrasts among students’ and teachers’ perceptions and assessments, therefore, just those students whose teachers participated in the study were contained, and no students were enrolled individually from their teachers. A majority of the students were female with a large relation among the ages of 18-34 with two-thirds being sophomore.

**Instrumentation**

The researcher used seven instruments in this study, one of them was Oxford Placement Test for homogenizing the students, the Effective Foreign Language Teacher to expect what a teacher should do during his class, and Language Teaching Observation and Evaluation in two versions, one for students and another for teachers, to assess the teachers, Teacher-Course Evaluation Questions in which students evaluate their teacher and course. The researcher also used two questionnaires which were related to teachers’ and students’ information.

**Instrumentation Development and Content**

Primary drafts of the instrumentation paralleled Reber’s (2001) 80-item instrument used in her dissertation. Reber’s instrument derived from complete and comprehensive study into current investigations concerning effective L2 teaching and supplied a point of determination for the development of the evaluation instrument relevant to the present study. She puts nine overarching categories in her 80-item instrument: 1) standards for foreign language learning, 2) corrective feedback, 3) teachers and teacher behaviors related to communicative approaches, 4) focus on form in the classroom, 5) individual learner differences in foreign language learning, 6) strategies for foreign language learning, theories about SLA, 8) teacher qualifications, and 9) assessment in foreign language teaching. The breadth and depth of Reber’s instrument return her target population – experienced ACTFL-related foreign language teachers. Likely, most of these teachers would know the technical jargon in the area of foreign and second language pedagogy. Given the background of the current study, Reber’s instrument demonstrated much too lengthy, technical, and theoretical to be used for the aims of this study that contained students’ perspectives. Unlike Reber’s study, the driving force behind the present study was to directly contrast both teachers’ and students’ perspectives on foreign language teaching drills. Key to this contrast is the capability to indicate both groups with similarly worded instruments. So, the following limitations on the instrumentation were enforced by this study’s research plan: 1) in order to make an instrument whose choices would be comprehensible to all participants, i.e., beginning level students and experienced teachers, extra attempt was made to decrease the amount of discipline-specific jargon that would not be available to those with little to no disposal to the area of second language pedagogy; in addition, some choices contained a short example to help disambiguate the target method or technique; 2) as this research efforts to recognize teachers’ and students’ perspectives on real teaching drills within the teacher’s control, choices depending on theoretical subjects in SLA and second language pedagogy were eliminated; 3) many participating departments make evaluation instruments for multi-section classes and for this reason testing and
evaluation choices were limited on the Evaluation Questionnaire to those that would occupy within each teacher’s authority.

In order to supply the reader with an explained description of the instrumentation, each questionnaire and its choices will be summarized in this section. The first questionnaire for both teachers and students named “The Effective Foreign Language Teacher,” – afterward entitled “Effective Teacher” – supplied a general stem for all 24 Likert-scale descriptions with a 4-point scale ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.” The stem, “Effective foreign language teachers should ...”, was followed by 24 numbered descriptions that complemented the sentence. The instructions at the top of the page motivated students to “reflect on your personal beliefs regarding what characterizes effective foreign language teaching.” Moreover, within the instruction paragraph students were persuaded that “There are no rights or wrong answers, just those that are right for you.”

From a logical, content-based standpoint, seven general category groups seem to explain the nature of the items: Grammar Teaching, Error Correction, Target Language Use, Culture, Computer-Based Technology, Communicative Language Teaching Strategies, and Assessment. The first factor included choices related to the use of both the target language and English by both students and teachers. Factor 2 seemed to indicate student-to-student reaction as it contained items concerning group and pair work and information gap activities. Factor 3 did not result in an obvious, general variable as it contained items from a wide range of topics such as task-based teaching (11), TPR (12), inductive grammar (20), and use of real-life materials instead of textbooks (21). Factor 4 described a much clearer picture of the fundamental hidden variable, culture, after filling unambiguously on Items 3 and 9, both of which relate directly to culture. Factor 5 indicates the firm fit with the logistic categories determined by the researcher in that all three items recognized by the factor analysis were the same three determined to the category “Error Correction.” Factors 6 and 7 did not result in easily recognizable hidden variables. Factor 6 contained Items 18 and 19; the former relating to the use of grammar in real-world backgrounds, the latter having to do with native-like control of the FL by the teacher. In addition, Factor 7 contained apparently separate items, one relative to computer-based technology (1), and the other having to do with concentrating on grammar instead of information change.

Data Collection Procedures

One of the researchers went into eight classes and students during the second week of fall semester. To homogenize the students, Oxford Placement Test related to the grammar was used. It contained 50 questions. More than two hundred students participated, then one hundred and fifty students were selected as homogenous members in this study. Within the first four to six weeks of fall semester in 2014, the researchers went into eight classes and the students and teachers completed two questionnaires in the following order: 1) a 24-item, Likert-scale questionnaire concerning perceptions of effective foreign language teachers, i.e., Effective Teacher
Questionnaire, and 2) a demographic questionnaire for Teacher Information Questionnaire and Student Information Questionnaire.

The rationale behind the administration of the questionnaire within weeks 4-6 was to minimize the trend of students to consider their current teachers’ drills when responding the effectiveness questionnaire as well as to decrease the effect of students who were still adding, dropping, and changing classes before the deadline for allowed drops. Teachers who taught more than one section or level of a language were only needed to complete one Effective Teacher questionnaire as the questions were universal and not appropriate to one individual class per session. Among weeks nine and twelve in the semester, students completed the questionnaire asking for perceptions of the frequency of target teaching manners and their assessments of their teachers’ performance of those manners. Students also answered six questions taken from the university’s Teacher-Course Evaluation (TCE), contrast of students’ answers on chosen TCE questions and the evaluation column of the Evaluation Questionnaire, an analysis of the relation among students’ answers on all questionnaires and students’ TCE answers. During the same visit teachers filled out the same questionnaire worded in the first person asking for their perceptions of the frequency of definite teaching manners and their self-evaluations of those drills. The timing for this second visit considered the requirement for both groups to have experienced an adequate amount of instruction to make a valid observation of the frequency of teaching manners and a reliable evaluation of teaching all over the semester. Students who were absent during the administration of the two questionnaires during the first classroom visit were given the chance to complete questionnaires during the second visit. Students who missed the first class visit were asked to also complete a demographic questionnaire during the second visit so their unique demographics would be known. As the contrasts were among teachers and whole classes, or all teachers and all classes, data from students who were present at the first class and were absent for the second visit were contained.

Data Analysis

Students’ and teachers’ responses on the Effective Teacher questionnaire and the Evaluation Questionnaires were represented to mathematical analyses that made descriptive statistics, Oxford Placement Test, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, and Spearman’s Rank Order correlation of class level on students’ and teachers’ answers to each questionnaire. All teachers’ and all students’ answers on the Effective Teacher instrument were investigated distinctly for Research Question 1 and Research Question 2 using descriptive statistics. Research Questions 2 contrasted each teacher’s answers to those of his classes on all three features of both questionnaires, i.e., ideals of effective foreign language teachers, frequency of incidence of their teachers’ manners, and the effectiveness of their teachers’ presentation of those drills – all of which needed Pearson product-moment correlations as well as descriptive statistics. An extra reason for the impracticality of directly contrasting separate teacher’s answers to students’ was the point that the reorganizing of the stem to match teachers’ and students’ perceptions makes two dependent elements rather than one. Though students
and teachers were asked to replicate on the same separate’s teaching manners, the modification in perception indicated by various prompts, i.e., “My teacher . . .” v. “I . . .” creates, two different, dependent actions. Hence, in contrasting all students’ and all teachers’ perceptions generally of frequency of incidence of definite manners and perceived effectiveness of teachers’ presentation, a Pearson product-moment correlation was run. For separate teacher contrasts, descriptive statistics were used to classify common tendencies as well as notable outliers. These descriptive statistics were designed by taking the modification among each separate teacher’s answer worth on each item and deducting it directly from his students’ mean answer on the same item. Then, an average was taken across all answering teachers and their separate teacher-student variance each item to give an overall averaged teacher-student variance for each item. Research Question 3 contrasts students’ answers on certain TCE questions to their answers on the Evaluation Questionnaire. In order to perform this contrast it was essential to use descriptive statistics.

RESULTS

Result of the OPT Used as Homogeneity Test

In order to have homogenized participants in terms of their general English language proficiency on the part of the learners, the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was administered. The descriptive analysis for the OPT test is displayed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of the OPT Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the two hundred participants, one hundred and fifty were considered as homogenous members based on one standard deviation above and below the mean (24.12+_ 6.04).

Analysis of the First Research Question

With regards to the first research question, “Is there any statistically significant relationship between students’ and teachers’ views about the effective foreign language teacher?”, the test of normality was used to determine the appropriate test of correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Test of Normality for Effective Foreign Language Teacher Marked by Students and Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFLT-Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFLT-Teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Lilliefors Significance Correction * This is a lower bound of the true significance.
As it can be seen in table 2 above, the sig value of the Shapiro-Wilk Test is higher than 0.05 for both sets of scores meaning that the two sets of scores are normally distributed. Therefore, the best test for finding the relationship would be the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. Table 3 below shows the result of the correlation test.

**Table 3. Result of the Correlation Test between EFLT Marked by Students and Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EFLT-Students</th>
<th>EFLT-Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.731**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was run to determine the relationship between Iranian EFL students’ and teachers’ views about EFLT. There was a strong positive correlation between Iranian EFL students’ and teachers’ views about EFLT, which was statistically significant ($r = .731, p = .000$). Thus, there is a statistically significant relationship between students’ and teachers’ views about the effective foreign language teacher.

**Analysis of the Second Research Question**

With regards to the second research questions, “Is there any statistically significant relationship between students’ and teachers’ views about the language teaching observation and evaluation?”, the test of normality was used to determine the appropriate test of correlation.

**Table 4. Test of Normality for Language Teaching Observation Marked by Students and Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTO-Students</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTO-Teachers</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

As it can be seen in table 4 above, the sig value of the Shapiro-Wilk Test is lower than 0.05 for both sets of scores, meaning that the two sets of scores are not normally distributed. Therefore, the best test for finding the relationship would be the Spearman Rank-Order correlation. Table 5 below shows the result of the correlation test.

**Table 5. Result of the Correlation Test between LTO Marked by Students and Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LTO-Students</th>
<th>LTO-Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | LTO-Teachers | Correlation Coefficient | .537** | 1.000 |

Spearman's rho
The Spearman’s Rank Order correlation was run to determine the relationship between Iranian EFL learners’ and teachers’ language teaching observation. There was a moderate positive correlation between Iranian EFL learners’ and teachers’ language teaching observation ($r_s=.537$, $p=.000$). Thus, there was statistically significant difference between students’ and teachers’ views about the language teaching observation and evaluation.

**Analysis of the Third Research Question**

With regards to the third research question, “What are the students’ ratings of teacher course evaluation?”, descriptive statistics was used to answer this research question. Table 6 below shows the students’ marking of a 5-item Likert-scale questionnaire about teacher course evaluation (TCE), eliciting students’ views about the effectiveness of the course of study.

**Table 6. Students’ Views about Teacher Course Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Course Evaluation</th>
<th>N Valid</th>
<th>150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>21.3067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>4.01832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>16.147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen in table 6 above, the mean and standard deviation of TCE questionnaire was 21.30 and 4.01 respectively. The questionnaire has six items, each having five points at most. Therefore, the lowest mark would be six and the highest mark would be thirty. To clarify the students’ responses, the mark was divided by 3 in which 0 to 10 shows low consideration, 10 to 20 shows medium consideration, and 20 to 30 shows students’ high consideration of the TCE. As already shown in table 6 above, the mean of the total scores was 21.30, falling between 20 to 30 range. Hence, it can be concluded that students in general had high consideration towards their teaching course evaluation in this particular study.

**Table 7. Frequency and Percentage of Students’ Responses on TCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As table 7 above shows, the score 18 had the highest frequency (24 times) which equals to 16% of total responses, and the score 26 had the lowest frequency (1 time) which equals to .7 % of total responses (less than 1 percent).

DISCUSSION

The teachers in this study seem to worth communicative approaches to foreign language pedagogy where information substitute proceeds priority over mechanical grammar drill. Teachers also felt that grammar teaching is required to be set in real-world backgrounds. What makes this result value citing is not that these teachers worth significant information substitute over grammar, but that their separate students do not, or at least seem to not, worth it nearly as much. This result may help to arrange teachers to face a population of students who, for the most part, select to have grammar teaching proceed priority over communicative substitutes in the FL classroom. This result confirms the outcomes from Schulz's (1996, 2001) studies which gained that students' ideas of grammar teaching seemed more satisfactory than teachers'. Teachers may require to help students comprehend several rules of second language acquisition, e.g., interface hypothesis, arbitration of meaning, output hypothesis, by providing descriptions and explanations for practices without a grammar concentration or tasks not graded mainly for accuracy, but rather effectiveness of communication. Another possible description for students' perceived interest in grammar teaching might be the disconnection among teaching and testing.

The results of the Moradi and Sabeti's (2014) study recommended that language experts and teacher instructors should realize learners' views of effective teaching as well as recognition of good teachers' features so as to prepare language teachers with those features in order to help less successful language learners to be successful. The significant differences among teacher and student views in several related domains point to the need for FL teachers to look for their students' perspectives actively.

Based on Reber's study about second language acquisition (SLA), on pedagogical theories underlying current teaching methodologies, and about teaching conducts and views found to be effective in the field of general education, various teaching conducts and views of effective FL teachers were recognized for inclusion on the questionnaire. Reber's (2001) study contributed to the knowledge of what satisfactory classroom teaching conduct was. The more that was known about successful FL teaching and learning, the more likely FL teachers, administrators, and curriculum developers will be
able to make models for FL teacher preparation and assessment that reflect effective conducts and views for FL teaching.

Teachers’ and students’ answers connected more when reflecting on how often definite teaching conducts happened than how effective teachers were in participating them. Though teachers and students realized similar frequencies, they varied in realizing teacher effectiveness. With admiration to teacher-student answer forms, the norm was variance and the exception was agreement. In analyzing teacher-student variances with descriptive statistics generally, it seemed that teachers’ answers approached more of what the area at large might investigate suitable for communicative classrooms. Similarly, teachers agreed more powerfully that having students’ comprehensive tasks in the language was useful. Teachers appeared more eager about having students use the foreign language more frequently and former on than did their students. Students felt that effective foreign language teachers should refine oral mistakes directly and teachers were not nearly as persuaded. Teachers also stated that they used indirect error correction more than direct error correction in their classrooms while students did not coincide. Similar to Reber (2001) who found disagreement between participants on controversial matters such as grammar teaching, evaluation drills, and target language use, this study represented there is no statistically significant relationship between students’ and teachers’ views about the effective foreign language teacher.

Both the frequency with which teachers perceived themselves to be integrating definite skills and their effectiveness in doing so paralleled what is currently termed ‘communicative’ in the pedagogical literature. In other words, teachers’ beliefs of what should be happening in the classroom advanced an ‘ideal’ communicative classroom, where students connect about significant topics, complete real-world drills, use computer-based technologies, involve with the language outside of class, get acquaintance to the culture in class, and work in groups or pairs. Regrettably, in many cases participating teachers’ perceptions of this ‘ideal’ communicative classroom did not parallel their students’. However teachers’ and students’ perceptions of what was actually happening in the classroom concurred a little more than they did when replicating on ideal drills, variances abounded. Teachers’ comprehend themselves as participating the target conducts more than students and self-evaluated their presentation on these same drills as more effective than did students. Seemingly, students either have not been formally represented to present tendencies in FL pedagogy, or, if they have been represented, they do not agree with many of its essential principles. In fact, teacher perceptions may be more closely connected to what they think they should do based on their teaching than what they really do in the classroom.

Analysis of the relationship between teacher demographics and the degree of teacher-student variances appeared to favor experienced, well-trained teachers in expecting which teachers’ perceptions might be more in sync with students’. Many of the teachers in this sample whose answers associated meaningfully with their students’ across questionnaires had language teaching experience and formal, pedagogical teaching.
The match, or mismatch, of L2 teachers’ and students’ perceptions of effective teaching in general, joined with a contrast of their course-specific grades can make greater thoughtful of each group’s perspective on effective teaching in the L2 classroom. Not only can teachers and students profit from this increased awareness, so too can rudimentary language directors, administrators, and teacher trainers. When a teaching supervisor or director is faced with discontent between teachers or students, it may be beneficial to look at each group’s expectations and perceptions of what goes on in the classroom. In addition, the outcomes of this study will add to and complement former research from which SLA researchers may continue to join their real, empirical results with perceptions of those most directly included with L2 learning: teachers and students. If students feel their teachers better comprehend their perspectives and, similarly, if teachers feel that students better comprehend theirs, an increase in inspiration and satisfaction may outcome for both groups. Teachers who take the time to evaluate their students’ perspectives on FL teaching, either through questionnaires or in-class discussion, will confirm their students’ views while creating students who feel that their perceptions are an important thought in making classroom actions.

CONCLUSION

Even though a difficult and apparently unending assignment, investigators require to continue evaluating teachers’ and students’ perceptions of FL teaching, as the area will most certainly replace over time and particular perceptions of FL teaching between teachers and students will most absolutely stay a fact of the FL classroom. The most applied and far-reaching effect of future study in this field will occur in separate FL classrooms where teachers will be investigators who want to better comprehend their own perceptions on FL teaching, their students’ perceptions, and how to adapt the two.

The small numeral of statistically important relationships with common averaged teacher-student variances conducts to the clearest implication for classroom teaching: Some given group of FL students will most certainly have various ideas from their teachers on some significant issue in FL pedagogy. Teachers must not suppose that students entering their FL classes divide the same perceptions as they do on what it signifies to learn a language, how to go about it, and which are the most efficient instruments of performing so. Furthermore, teachers must not suppose that students will perfectly recognize how or how often determined methods are performed. Teachers may believe that they are performing something regularly when their students may believe that it is performed pretty irregularly. The same belief utilizes to a teacher’s realized efficiency and how that observation correlates with students’ perceptions. A teacher may discover that after expending a whole four-month semester applying a favorite grammar drill, that students state dislike and disappointment on end-of-semester assessments.

At its fundamental, the consequences of this study involve that teachers must connect more with their students concerning their thoughts of FL pedagogy and the real teaching occurring in the classroom. This study gets to the front defective assumptions some teachers may create about their students, such as, 1) students expect that their
teacher will select those actions that will most encourage language learning and are most suitable, 2) students accept the teacher's pedagogical choices in the classroom and will not ask them, 3) students do not have adequate capability to comprehend fundamental SLA theory and how that can translate into practice.

Short of creating each basic language class a techniques course, beginning-level teachers would do well to take Horwitz’s (1988) recommendation to evaluate their students’ perceptions on language learning primary in the semester. Taking her suggestion a phase added, it might evidence valuable to not only question about students’ thoughts regarding language learning, but to show for students the kinds of real pedagogical actions that they will incorporate in the classroom. What this study has presented is that it is not only valuable to recognize what students sense about unreal SLA rules as Horwitz (1988) and Kern (1995) have shown, but also what students’ perceptions are of real pedagogical drills in the FL classroom. Indeed, teachers might occupy students in short discussions of SLA by first describing their reasons behind definite actions. After notifying students that group work will be applied regularly in the classroom, the teacher might boost students comprehend the significance of input, output, and discussion of meaning, convincing to adjust the argument and terms to students’ level of comprehending.

Three particular domains of FL teaching that teachers must show are error modification, grammar teaching, and group/pair work. Teacher-student maladjustment on these three matters may replicate essential, theoretic variances among teachers and students in recognizing the complete procedure of second language acquisition as well as the nature of accessible aims for FL learning. Students who worth an assertion on grammar teaching and obvious error modification may think that second language acquisition is firmly concerning gaining indicative knowledge concerning a language’s grammar. This perception will most probably cause to disappointment when students fight to apply the language naturally in either oral or written circumstances. Teachers who worth accuracy in creation but select to accept less obvious or annoying strategies in teaching grammar may result in disappointed students whose unreal beliefs are not seen.

Additionally, teachers seem to discover more worth in group/pair work than their students and think that they apply it more efficiently than their students feel they do. Teacher-student difference with group/pair work, such an important and regularly applied pedagogic tool in these FL classes and many others, insures discussion in the classroom so that teachers can explain its use and so that students can have their worries showed.

Teachers certainly do not have the time nor energy to supply a complete theoretic explanation for each and every action they have students complement. Likewise, teachers require not sense obliged to refine all of their students’ misunderstandings concerning SLA and language teaching generally. However, students’ perceptions of effective teaching exercises and teacher efficiency might be changed were teachers to supply a short reason for chosen actions. Such as, when participating students in group
work, it may extend student stimulant if teachers basically asked students why the action is being behaved in groups or pairs rather than as a whole class. Some students may collect on the need to enlarge learners' chances for creation via small group work but others may not. To sum up, this study creates obvious the requirement for teachers to 1) evaluate students' perceptions on real pedagogic drills in the classroom and 2) optionally divide their reason and explanations for participating definite actions so as to additional apprise and encourage their students.
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