نقش معلم در دوره فرا متد

داود برزآبادی فراهانی
استادیار دانشکدهٔ زبان‌های خارجی دانشگاه تهران

مهرشاد احمدیان
کارشناس ارشد در آموزش زبان انگلیسی

تحقیق موجود بر آن است که با توجه به انتظارحاضر از معلم زبان مبنی بر داشتن دانش لازم جهت ایجاد تغییرات متناسب در تدریس مبتنی بر درک درست از شرایط مختلفی که در کلاسهای مختلف وجود دارد خصوصیاتی را که چنین معلمی باید دارا باشد تا به این مهم دست یابد را بررسی و ارائه نماید. به این منظورچنین خصوصیاتی که در این نوشته عمکردهای اصلی معلم نامیده می‌شود با نظر به مسائل مطروحه در رشتهٔ آموزش زبان انگلیسی تعیین و در معرض قضاوت زبان‌آموزان معلمین و مدیران مؤسسات آموزش زبان قرار داده شد و اطلاعات حاصله از این منابع و نیز بازیدهای کلاسی که توسط افراد واجد شرایط انجام شد تجزیه تحلیل اماری گردید. نتایج حاصله نشان داد که از هفت عملکرد اصلی تدریس که در این تحقیق مورد بررسی قرارگرفت یعنی (۱) کنترل رفتار زبان آموزان (۲) نحوه ارائه مطلب درسی (۳) نظارت بر روند تدریس (٤) گرفتن بازخورد آموزشی (٥) سعی در تسهیل روند آموزش و فراگیری (٦) ایجاد ارتباط با زبان‌آموزان و (۷) انجام فعالیت‌های آموزشی مرتبط در خارج محیط کلاسی عملکرد ششم و هفتم به ترتیب از نظر کلیه شرکت‌کنندگان در این تحقیق با عملکردهای دیگر تفاوت معنی‌داری داشت. باید خاطرنشان ساخت که نتایج حاصله در این تحقیق با روند موجود در بحث‌های مربوط به تربیت معلم که در آن‌ها اهمیت زیادی به ایجاد ارتباط با زبان‌آموزان و بالا بردن دانش تئوریک و درایت معلم داده می‌شود هماهنگ است.

واژه‌های کلیدی: عملکردهای معلمی، معلم با درایت، ارتباط با زبان‌آموزان، فعالیت‌های آموزشی مرتبط خارج از محیط کلاسی، پرسشنامه، فرم بازدید کلاسی.

Pazhuhesh-e Zabanha-ye Khareji, No. 32, Special Issue, English, 2007, pp 23-39

The Teacher Parameter in the Postmethod Era

Davood Borzabadi Farahani
University of Tehran, Faculty of Foreign Languages, English Department
e-mail: borzabad@ut.ac.ir

Mehrshad Ahmadian
M.A. in TEFL, University of Tehran

Abstract

Given the fact that teachers are now expected to be informed enough to be able to gear their teaching towards the varying requirements of different classroom settings, this study was designed to shed light on what it takes to be an effective teacher. To this end, the characteristics or major teaching functions of good language teachers often alluded to in the literature as those of effective language teaching practices were subjected to the judgment of English language learners, English language teachers, and language institute managers. The data so obtained through a questionnaire and several classroom observations was then statistically analyzed. The findings of the research carried out indicated that of the seven major teaching functions that language teachers are expected to perform, that is, (1) management of student behavior, (2) instructional presentation, (3) instructional monitoring, (4) instructional feedback, (5) facilitating instruction, (6) communicating within the educational environment, and (7) performing non-instructional duties, functions 6 and 7 were considered by all the three groups and the observers as well to be of more significance compared with the other five functions. This is ,of course, in step with today's trend in teacher development programs in which a high premium is placed on establishing rapport (function 6) and sharpening teachers' sensitivity to self development.

Key Words: Teaching Functions, Enlightened Teacher, Rapport, Non-instructional, Duties, Questionnaire, Observation Form, Self-development.

I. Introduction

Following the argument to the effect that the whole concepts of methods should be discarded in that they are all too prescriptive to meet the varying needs of different learning and teaching situations (Kumaravadivelu,1994, Kumaravadivelu, 2001; Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Pennycook, 1989; Prabhu, 1990: Prabhu, 1992: Stern 1985), teachers are often advised to develop an approach to teaching which could allow them to be themselves and do what they feel is best (Brown, 2001). Such an approach, unlike the concept of *method*, cannot be designed for use with regard to everybody, in all situations and at all times because as Nunan (1991, p.228) puts it:

> It has been realized that there never was and probably never will be a method for all, and the focus in recent years has been on the development of classroom tasks and activities which are consonant with what we know about second language acquisition, and which are also in keeping with the dynamics of the classroom itself.

It should be clear from the foregoing quotation that we can no longer rely on automated teachers who act upon the advice of some gurus. Rather, we now need , as suggested by Brown (2001), "enlightened teachers" familiar with research and theory in applied linguistics, to make informed decisions that well fit into the context in which they are implementing their job. This way, as stated by Brown (2001, p 54):

> You will be better to see why you have chosen to use a particular classroom technique (or a set of techniques), to carry it out with confidence, and to evaluate its utility after the fact.

In the light of the points mentioned above and given the fact that there are multifarious factors culminating in a satisfactory second or foreign language learning outcome, it is not surprising that these days much concern has been expressed in the literature regarding the content of teacher training and the processes and methodologies of training programs in order to render a good language teacher (Richards, 2001; Freeman, 1989; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992 as cited in Richards and Renandya, 2002). Teachers do not simply implement the curriculum. They define and refine the curriculum; in other words, it is what teachers think and do at the classroom level that eventually determines what learners learn in the classroom (Richards and Renandya, 2002).

Even though there is a considerable support for the vital role that a teacher plays in a classroom setting, there is a dearth of a unified piece of research on the characteristics of a good language teacher. On the other hand, if you ask some supervisors what it is that they evaluate when they go into a classroom, many would say that they would try to see whether the teacher is "good" or "competent". However, if you ask how they decide on the competency of the teacher, the likelihood of your encountering a multitude of divergent answers could be high. Hence, to carry out the study, we utilized the issues raised in the literature in discussions related to good teaching. To this end, use was specifically made of the discussions contained in Brown (2001), Richards (1990), Richards (2001) and Richards and Renandya (2002). Having reviewed the literature, the following seven teaching characteristics, which we refer to as teaching functions, were selected for the purposes of this study.

management of student behavior,

instructional presentation,

(3) instructional monitoring,

instructional feedback,

(5) facilitating instruction,

(6) communicating within the educational environment, and

(7) performing non-instructional duties.

Research Questions

In fact, the present study sought to find answers to the following questions:

1. What major functions do language learners look for in a good language teacher?

2. What major functions do language teachers themselves look for in a good language teacher?

3. What major functions do language institute managers look for in a good language teacher?

4. Is there any congruity among the viewpoints of managers, students, and teachers over the major functions of a good or successful language teacher?

5. Is there any congruity between the expectations of the three groups of people in the study with regard to their view of good teaching and what good language teachers do in the actual classroom settings?

All these five questions were changed into null hypotheses and tested at.05 level of significance.

II. Method

Participants

The following groups of subjects participated in this research study:

Group I included language teachers. This group contained twenty

language teachers, 12 males and 8 females, who were native Persian speakers teaching English at different English language institutes. All these teachers were B.A. holders in English, either in literature or translation. They aged between 22 and 40, and had 3 to 10 years of experience in language teaching.

Group II included fifty- six language learners, 35 females and 21 males. All of them were native speakers of Persian who were aged between 16 to 20. They were studying English at various levels at different institutes.

Group III involved ten institute managers. All of these male institute managers were native speakers of Persian, and seven of them had B.A.'s in English, either in literature, translation, or teaching. The remaining three ones had M.A.'s in TEFL. They aged between 35 and 50 and had some 5 to 15 years of experience in running language institutes.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study included:

(a) Teacher Performance Appraisal System's Observation Form :

The Observation Form used in this study was developed based on the concepts and models presented in the book titled *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching* (Chapter 7) by Richards (2001) . The observation form used included the seven teaching functions of effective teaching which were the main focus of this study.

(b) The Questionnaire :

It was developed to represent the same qualities and competencies of a good English teacher as reflected in the Observation Form used in this study

and was given to all the three groups, that is, the language learners, language teachers, and institute managers, for completion.

The questionnaire was translated into Persian to make sure that all the subjects could understand the items therein.

Hence, both the Observation Form and the Questionnaire involved the seven basic functions of good teaching as already mentioned in the introduction part of this paper.

Procedures

The questionnaire was given to the members of the three groups in this study (i.e. the learners, teachers, and institute managers) to complete. Next , some effective teachers were selected based on an opinion survey made of language institute learners and managers. The classes of those teachers dubbed effective by both parties were then observed through the Teacher Observation Form.

To ensure cooperation on the part of the teachers selected, each individual teacher was asked to attend a warm-up session prior to the actual data collection. The purpose of this warm-up was to familiarize them with the data collection procedures and to assure them of the confidentiality of the information in order to increase their willingness to cooperate. Each individual class was then observed four times to make sure that all the variables included in the Observation Form could be sufficiently examined and recorded.

III. Results

Language Learners (Question 1)

Having administered the Questionnaire to the language learners, the following data for each individual function, as shown in Table 1 below, was obtained:

Table 1: Descriptive Results for the Functions from Language Learners

Functions	Mean	SD	N
F 1= Management of Student Behavior	4.238	.457	56
F 2= Instructional Presentation	4.331	.369	56
F 3= Instructional Monitoring	4.196	.545	56
F4= Instructional Feedback	4.250	.505	56
F 5= Facilitating Instruction	4.181	.448	56
F 6= Communicating within the Educational Environment	4.593	.383	56
F 7= Performing Non-Instructional Duties	4.406	.480	56

Then, to find out whether there was any significant difference among the view points of language learners themselves over these major functions, a repeated measures ANOVA was run. The results of this analysis is presented in the following table.

Table 2: Repeated Measures ANOVA Results for Language Learners' Preference for the Different Functions

	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Function 7.	184	6	1.197	11.618	.000
Subjects	47.215	55	.858		
Function*Subjects	34.010	330	.103		

As Table 2 above indicates, there is a significant difference between functions based on the viewpoint of language learners themselves (F (6, 55) =11.618, p, <.05). The results of pair wise comparisons showed that the preference for function 6 (Communicating within the Educational Environment) was significantly better than preference for all other functions except for function 7 (Performing Non-Instructional Duties). The preference rates for functions 6 and 7 were both significant, with function 6 overriding even function 7 in terms of the means obtained.

B. Language Teachers (Question 2)

The descriptive information tabulated after the administration of the questionnaire to the language teachers in this study is represented in the following table.

Table 3: Descriptive Results for the Functions from Language Teachers

Function	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**
F 1= Management of Student Behavior	4.366	.506	20
F 2= Instructional Presentation	4.303	.429	20
F 3= Instructional Monitoring	4.112	.348	20
F 4= Instructional Feedback	4.166	.452	20
F 5= Facilitating Instruction	4.141	.443	20
F 6= Communicating within the			
Educational Environment	4.537	.446	20
F 7= Performing Non-Instructional Duties	4.375	.393	20

The data so obtained from the teachers was analyzed through ANOVA and pair comparisons. The results , as demonstrated in Table 4 below indicated that like language learners the teachers also preferred functions 6 and 7 to the other functions.

Table 4: Repeated Measures ANOVA Results for Language Teachers' Preference for the Different Functions

	Type III Sum of Squares	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Function	2.863	6	.477	6.143	.000
Subjects	16.165	19	.851		
Function*Subjects	8.856	114	.077		

C. Institute Managers (Question 3)

The descriptive data obtained from the questionnaire given to this group of participants in the study is included in the table below.

Table 5: Descriptive Results for the Functions from Institute Managers

Function	Mean	SD	N
F 1= Management of Student Behavior	4.366	.531	10
F 2= Instructional Presentation	4.333	.235	10
F 3= Instructional Monitoring	4.450	.283	10
F 4= Instructional Feedback	4.300	.531	10
F 5= Facilitating Instruction	4.350	.277	10
F 6= Communicating within the			
Educational Environment	4.65	.293	10
F 7= Performing Non-Instructional Duties	4.450	.307	10

The analysis of the data obtained from institute managers through the same questionnaire as used for the first two groups yielded the results encapsulated in the following table.

Table 6: Repeated Measures ANOVA Results for Institute Managers' Preference for the Different Functions

	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Function	845	6	141	1.208	.316
Subjects	2.329	9	.259		
Function*Subjects	6.299	54	117		

As Table 4 above demonstrates the managers attached equal importance to all the functions under investigation. Yet, it should be borne in mind that the mean score for every function is above 4.3., with functions 6 and 7 having the highest mean scores.

D. Comparison between the Three Groups in Terms of their Preference of the Teaching Functions (Question 4)

To find out whether there was any significant difference between the three groups involved in this study , i.e. language learners, language teachers and language institute managers, over their choice of the major functions of a good language teacher, seven one-way ANOVA's were conducted. The results obtained indicated that there was no significant difference between the three groups in relation to their preference of the language functions contained in this study. That is, all the seven teaching functions turned out to be equally important when inter-group comparisons were made.

E. Statistical Analysis of the Observation Form-Generated Data (Question 5)

Having administered the Questionnaire to the three groups of language learners, language teachers, and language institute managers, the researcher asked the learners and institute managers to name those teachers whom they thought were very effective teachers. Then, five teachers whom both group agreed upon as effective were selected for classroom observation.

Next, three people (the researcher and two language teachers) observed the five selected teachers' classes through the Observation Form selected for this study. Afterwards, the inter-rater reliability index was calculated through computing a coefficient alpha. The computed index was equal to .65 which showed a fair reliability index. The descriptive results of their observations which focused on the major teaching functions in the present study is presented in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Descriptive Results for the Functions of the Observation Form from Different Classroom Observers

Function	Mean	SD	N
F 1= Management of Student Behavior	4.07	.59	15
F 2= Instructional Presentation	4.27	.59	15
F 3= Instructional Monitoring	3.73	.80	15
F 4= Instructional Feedback	3.87	.74	15
F 5= Facilitating Instruction	3.93	.70	15
F 6= Communicating within the			
Educational Environment	4.53	.64	15
F 7= Performing Non-Instructional Duties	4.33	.49	15

N = The number of teachers (5) whose classes were observed (each teacher by three persons): 5.3=15

Mean = The mean of three raters for each language teacher

To find out if there was any significant difference between the three observers with regard to the teaching functions which they scrutinized in the five good teachers' classes, the statistical technique of ANOVA was applied, which indicated that there was a significant difference between the functions as evaluated by the three observers.

To determine where the difference was, paired wise comparisons were made. The results obtained showed that the same two functions pinpointed as the most important by the other groups in this study, i.e. Communicating within the Educational Environment and Performing Non-Instructional Duties were statistically significant in this phase too, with function 6 being superior to function 7, though it was not statistically more significant than function 7.

IV. Discussion

All in all, this study was carried out to:

1. to examine what major functions language learners, language teachers, and language institute managers look for in a good or successful language teachers, and

2. to find out whether there is any agreement and congruity among these three groups over the major functions of a good or successful language teacher.

As for the first part, we came to the conclusion that that out of the seven teaching functions included in the study, function 6 "Communicating within the Educational Environment" (i.e. establishing rapport) and function 7 "Performing Non-Instructional Duties" were regarded as the most important qualities that language learners, teachers and institute managers believed that a effective language teacher should enjoy. A conclusion that was further supported based on the analysis of the information gathered by the three observers in this study

As for question 2 , the results of the seven one-way ANOVA's run showed that these three groups had the same preference for individual functions and there was no significant difference among these three groups' preference for the major functions of a good language teacher.

Now the question is what is included in functions 6 and 7 that all the groups participating in this study rank- ordered them as the ones distinguished as the others. Function 6 is in fact nothing more than "rapport". That is, teachers' establishing a positive relationship with students, patience, courtesy, classroom presence and personality of a language teacher

have unrivalled position in the hierarchy of major functions of language teachers. This is congruent with McDonugh 's claim (2002) to the effect that sometimes the most effective teachers are not those whose proficiency is perfect. A claim favored by Medgyes (1996) and Cook (1999). That is, there are cases in which some teachers with a moderate command of the language being taught turn out to the best. This claim is also supported by a study carried out by Burstall (1975) where the most successful teachers tended to be experienced primary teachers with moderate French skills, and the less successful ones recent training-college graduates with very good French.

Therefore., it is very important for teachers to establish rapport with their students. To this end, they can act upon the advice offered made by brown (2001, p203):

How do you set up such a connection? By

- *showing interest in each student as a person,*
- *giving feedback on each person's progress,*
- *openly soliciting students' ideas and feelings,*
- *valuing and respecting what students think and say,*
- *laughing with them and not at them,*
- *working with them as a team, and not against them, and*
- *developing a genuine sense of vicarious joy when they learn something or otherwise succeed.*

Next comes performing non-instructional duties. To language learners' mind, language teachers should make their best efforts to seize opportunities to grow and develop professionally. Language teachers should be willing to cooperate with their colleagues and make full use of available professional support to raise the quality of English language teaching (ELT) programs.

More specifically, the student expects the teacher:

- to adhere to established laws, policies, rules, and regulations
- to follow a plan for professional development and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally
- be a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her decisions on students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community.

What the second teaching function boils down to is that teachers should have a logically developed plan for teaching inside the class that is rooted in the continuous reflection on their part outside the classroom setting. That is, teachers need to follow a self-development plan required to enable them to adjust their teaching to the varying teaching contexts in which they often find themselves.

To close the discussion, it should be noted that the focus on the two teaching functions above, that is, those that in all cases turned out to be more significant than the other functions from the viewpoint of learners, teachers, and observers, does not at all mean that the other teaching functions are unimportant. In fact, if we put together the ratings by the four groups of participants of those functions and work out the average rating for each, we would arrive at ratings that are all very high, i.e. each well above 4 out of five

When we calculate the average ratings for the functions as mentioned in the previous paragraph, the following list of functions arranged in their order of importance will emerge:

Table 9: The Remaining Teaching Functions Rank-ordered Based on Average Ratings by all Groups

Function	Point Average
1. Instructional Presentation	4.30
2. Management of Student Behavior	4.26
3. Facilitating instruction	4.15
4. Instructional Feedback	4.14
5. Instructional Monitoring	4.12

Two more things to consider. First, the ratings in Table 9 above are so close that we can safely say the representative teaching functions should actually be given the same weight in any teacher development program. Second, to enable the readers to gain more insight into the meaning of each of the functions above, the items which each of these functions covers as well as those covered by the those two functions that turned out to be statistically different from the five ones listed in table 9 are included in the only appendix of this paper.

References

Brown, H. D. (2001). ***Teaching by principles: An integrated approach to language pedagogy***. Second Edition. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Burstall, C. (1975). ***Primary French in the balance***. Windsor: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Cook, V.J. (1999). ***Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching***. Third Edition. London: Arnold.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. ***TESOL Quarterly, 28 (1), 27-48***.

——————— (2001). ***Toward a postmethod pedagogy. TESOL Quarterly, 35(4), 537-560***.

——————— (2003). ***Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching***. Retrieved from http://yalepress.yale.edu/yupbooks/pdf/0300095732.pdf

McDonough, S. (2002). ***Applied linguistics in language education***. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Medgyes,P. (1996). Native or non-native: who's worth more? In T. Hedge and N.,Whitney: ***Power, pedagogy and practice***. Oxford University Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers. Prentice Hall.

Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. ***TESOL Quarterly***, *23* (4) 589-618.

Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no best method - Why? ***TESOL Quarterly***, *24* (2) 161-176.

——————— (1992). The dynamics of the language lesson. TESOL Quarterly, 26 (2) 225-241.

Richards, J.C. (1990). The language teaching matrix. .Cambridge University Press.

——————— (2001). ***Curriculum development in language teaching***. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). ***Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stern, H. H. (1983). ***Fundamental concepts in language teaching***. Oxford: Oxford University Press.