

- Murphey, T., Falout, J., Elwood, J., Hood, M.** "Inviting student voice". *Asian EFL Journal*, (2009), 1-35.
- Nation, I. S. P.** *Teaching Vocabulary: Strategies and Techniques*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 2008.
- Phipps, S., Borg, S.** "Exploring the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their classroom practice". *The Teacher Trainer*, Vol.21, Issue (3), (2007), 17-19.
- Rosenfeld, M., Rosenfeld, S.** "Developing effective teacher beliefs about learners: the role of sensitizing teachers to individual learning differences." *Educational Psychology*, Vol.28, Issue (3), (2007), 245-272.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410701528436>
- Simon, K.** "The development of pre-service English teacher beliefs about literacy, teaching, and students". *ProQuest LLC*, Ph.D., Santa Barbara, USA, University of California, 2012.
- Thornbury, S.** *How to Teach Vocabulary*. London: Longman, 2002.
- Wallace, M. J.** *Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approach*. Cambridge: CUP, 1991.
- Wan, S. W. Y.** "Differentiated instruction: Hong Kong prospective teachers, teaching efficacy and beliefs, Teachers and Teaching." *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 22, Issue (2), 148-176.

in revealing a number of key findings and that what we have shown is highly suggestive.

References

- Alenezi, S.** *The suitability of the EFL reading texts at the secondary and preparatory levels as a preparation for academic reading at first year university level in Saudi Arabia*. Ph.D., Colchester, UK, University of Essex, 2016.
- Alghamdi, A.** *Technical vocabulary instruction in a Saudi Arabian industrial college: An investigation of English language and content area practitioners' beliefs and practices*. Ph.D., Colchester, UK, University of Essex, 2013.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., Ellis, R.** "Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices". *Applied Linguistics*, Vol.25, Issue (2), (2004), 243-272.
- Birello, M.** "Teacher cognition and language teacher education: beliefs and practice. A conversation with Simon Borg". *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching and Learning Language and Literature*, Vol.5, Issue (2), (2012), 88-94.
- Borg, S.** "Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do". *Language Teaching*, Vol.36, Issue (2), (2003), 81-109.
- Borg, S., Al-Busaidi, S.** "Learner autonomy: English language teachers' beliefs and practices". *ELT Journal*, Vol. 12, Issue (7), (2012), 283-292.
- Cabaroglu, N., Roberts, J.** "Development in student teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-year PGCE programme". *System*, Vol. 28, Issue (3), (2000), 387-402.
- Çapan, S.** "Pre-service English as a foreign language teachers' belief development about grammar instruction". *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol.39, Issue (12), (2014), 131-152.
- Case, A.** "The big list of CPD for ELT". *TEFL.net*, <http://edition.tefl.net/articles/career/the-big-list-of-cpd-for-elt/>
- Dandy, S., Bendersky, K.** "Student and faculty beliefs about learning in higher education: Implications for teaching". *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Vol. 26, Issue (3), (2014), 358-380. <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>
- Deci, E. L., Flaste, R.** *Why We Do What We Do: Understanding Self-Motivation*. New York: Penguin Books, 1995.
- Degener, S.** "Making sense of critical pedagogy in adult literacy education". *The Annual Review of Adult Learning and Literacy*, Vol. 2, Issue (2), (2001), 26-62.
- Dinçer, A., Yesilyurt, S.** "Pre-Service English teachers' beliefs on speaking skill based on motivational orientations". *English Language Teaching*, Vol.6, Issue (7), (2013), 88-95.
- Ehrman, M., Leaverb, B., Oxford, R.** "A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning". *System*, Vol. 31, (2003), 313-330.
- Farrell, T. C.** "English language teacher socialisation during the practicum". *Prospect*, Vol. 16, Issue (1), 49-62.
- Gairns, R., Redman, S.** *Working with Words: A Guide to Teaching and Learning Vocabulary*. Cambridge: CUP, 1986.
- Gao, X., Ma, Q.** "Vocabulary learning and teaching beliefs of pre-service and in-service teachers in Hong Kong and mainland China". *Language Awareness*, Vol.20, Issue (4), (2011), 327-342. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09658416.2011.579977>
- Holec, H.** *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981.
- ."The learner as manager: managing learning or managing to learn?" In: A. Wenden and J. Rubin (eds.) *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1987.
- Hsu, J. Y.** "Reading without teachers: literature circles in an EFL classroom". Paper presented at the Cross-Strait Conference on English Education (2004).
- Hustler, D., McNamara, O., Jarvis, J., Londra, M., Campbell, A., Howson, J.** *Teachers' Perceptions of Continuing Professional Development*. London: DfES, 2003.
- Kagan, D.** "Professional growth among pre-service and beginning teachers". *Review of Educational Research*, Vol.62, Issue (2), (1992), 129-169.
- Kojour, M., Heirati, J.** "Teacher's and students' beliefs on English for general academic purposes: the case of Iranian university students". *ERIC*, (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n12p37>
- Life, J., Falout, J., Murphey, T.** "EFL students' educational preferences in Korea and Japan". In: A. M. Stoke (ed.) *JALT 2008 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT, 2009.
- Macalister, J.** "Pre-service teacher cognition and vocabulary teaching". *RELC Journal*, Vol.34, Issue (1), (2012), 99-111.
- ."Tracing it back: Identifying the impact of a transnational language teacher education programme on classroom practice". *RELC Journal*, Vol.47, Issue (1), (2016), 59-70.
- Moiseenko, V.** "Encouraging learners to create language-learning materials". *English Teaching Forum*, Vol.53, Issue (4), (2015), 14-23.

Discussion and Conclusion

In answer to our first research subquestion, clearly the teachers do between them show awareness of quite a range of possible factors underlying their students' beliefs. The categories we established are of types familiar in research on attitudes and individual differences, covering student's cognition and affect, motivation, attitudes, proficiency, strategies etc. (Ehrman, 2003). Socio-cultural factors were not mentioned, though perhaps this was due to the study being located in a very homogeneous one culture context. Teachers did not, however, for the most part evidence ability to deconstruct and explain their own beliefs: another time we would direct the interview to force more attention to this aspect. Certainly most of the teachers' beliefs are ones which would be endorsed by the vocabulary teaching literature as reasonable, so could readily be justified (Thornbury, 2002; Nation, 2008). With respect to the students' beliefs, it is noticeable, however, that some of the individual teachers showed deeper and more thoughtful awareness than others, referring to a wider range of explanations than others who tended to refer only to a limited range of the more negative types of explanation such as low proficiency, ease and laziness.

With respect to whether the teachers seem to treat learner belief challenges as coming essentially from below, or more from equals in a cooperative vocabulary teaching/learning enterprise, it seems clear that all the teachers take the former view, so do not appear welcoming to any stronger form of autonomy. There was indeed only one recognition of autonomy in the weaker sense discussed earlier. M11 Learners should be made aware of how many words they need to learn and where they can find lists of them. T-, S+. 'They want me to guide them and give them the sources all the time. But I sometimes need them to search themselves and choose what they think more suitable for them and their styles of learning. So the only thing that is seriously needed is my guidance.' Here the teacher responds to what the students want by explaining how he tries to instil into the students some personal autonomy and attention to their own learning styles.

However, even within the traditional teacher-centred stance which the teachers adopted, there did appear to be a further distinction between teachers like MS14 who showed signs of regarding the students as at least reasonable and teachable and those like FS12 who were somewhat dismissive of the students as incorrigibly lazy and so forth. This is not unrelated to a distinction among teacher attitudes to students found in the literature e.g. in Rosenfeld and Rosenfeld (2007, 245): 'Effective teacher beliefs about students are an integral part of effective teaching. Teachers with interventionist beliefs about students ('I can intervene to help a learner with difficulties') show more effective practice than teachers with pathognomonic beliefs ('I blame the learner for his difficulties').' Since, on many of the beliefs we covered, the teachers probably have the more appropriate belief than the students, the consequence we might often hope for is that the teachers would maintain their belief rather than change it, but, using heightened awareness of the student beliefs, make efforts to convince the students of its correctness or adapt their detailed practices. Many belief differences where the students were said not to understand the importance of something lend themselves

to this. This seems unlikely to happen if teachers adopt the pathognomonic position, however.

Concerning whether the teachers show signs of willingness to exploit information from their students for their own professional development as teachers, as the previous paragraphs show, this again seems unlikely. We cannot, however, rule out the possibility that some of the teachers (e.g. MS14) may, after the interviews, and as a consequence of them, in fact have been prompted to reflect and refine or alter their beliefs, or at least their practices. Certainly there were some instances where teacher experimentation with different practices could have been a beneficial outcome. Many of the belief clashes explained as a matter of ease, for example, can be resolved by how the teacher in practice executes his belief through classroom presentation. For instance, M110 Common phrases and sequences of words (e.g. *How are you?* and *put up with*) should be taught, not just isolated words. T+, S-/Sn. 'They may think that word by word is easier for them.' This could be the starting point for action research by a teacher to try out what means of handling multiword units works best for his class. Very likely however these teachers have not been trained in action research or the reflective type of continuing professional development which underlies it (Wallace, 1991), nor indeed the kinds of activities which can be used to stimulate it, such as self recording of classes, having a colleague observe, keeping a journal, as well as of course eliciting and exploiting feedback from students.

The main implication of all this for the context investigated, and maybe other similar ones around the world, is that further training of the teachers may be needed, but not of the traditional 'applied science' type in Wallace's (1991) terms. Rather, teachers need educating, e.g. through workshops in the style of Borg and Al-Busaidi (2012), in how to be more open to receiving challenges to their beliefs, whether from students or other sources: how to gather and welcome such input, reflect on it, and exploit it to improve teaching. Specifically, we might suggest that even where student beliefs are in fact rejected by the teacher, for maybe very good reasons, there are some positive things a teacher can do, such as:

- show recognition of the existence of a conflict between teacher and student belief,
- not decry the student's belief as of no value / treat students and their views as worthless,
- explain why the teacher does not want to change his/her beliefs,
- attempt to convince students of the ultimate benefit of following the teacher's belief and not their own,
- experiment with practices that implement the teacher belief in ways that deal with some of the factors leading to the student belief mismatch.

Finally, we must admit that this was a small scale, exploratory qualitative study of eight teachers only. Furthermore, it was limited in that there was no follow-up to see if any of the teachers in fact changed in any way. Clearly, more needs to be done in this and other contexts to more fully uncover the dynamics of these kinds of direct belief challenges and where they may lead, amid the plethora of other kinds of input available to the in-service teacher which has professional development potential. Nevertheless, we feel that our approach to illuminating such situations was successful

Student liking or disliking was often given as a reason for student difference of belief beyond being linked with learner style (above). Usually a person has a deeper reason for liking or hating something, and often the teachers conjoined a mention of liking with some other possible factor. E.g. '... she doesn't like technology....They don't have abilities to deal with or they are afraid of it.'

Student is motivated/lazy

Motivation, in the sense of effort expended on learning, was almost always referred to with the words *lazy* or *not bothered*. In addition, attribution of laziness was always conjoined with mentions either of ease/difficulty or liking/hating or both. E.g. FS12 The teacher is not supposed to just adhere to vocabulary which is in the textbook. T+, S-. 'They are lazy and they don't make an effort. They like to adhere to the book because they found it easier for them.'

Against 12 comments on those lines there were only two remarks which could be interpreted as attributing positive effort to students. E.g. M110 Teacher should have, as his/her main vocabulary objective, to get learners to learn the vocabulary which is in the textbook. T+, S-/Sn. 'The student can be excellent and special so he does not want to be limited to the textbook. He may want something better than the textbook.'

Student has an emotional response (other than liking or laziness) which guides their belief

Further emotive reasons given for student beliefs included shyness when repeating words, psychological pressure of weekly tests, and fear of difficulty of words beyond the textbook.

Student response not valid

Finally, some teacher comments indicated that they regarded the student response, and hence any implied student's belief, was not worth considering or attempting to understand. The student was dismissed as stupid, not understanding the point, 'not qualified enough to fill the questionnaire. they lack awareness and experience', or just not concentrating and answering randomly.

Teacher's stance

With respect to teacher stance towards student input, two points emerged very clearly. First, almost without exception the explanations offered were of the students' beliefs not the teachers'. That is, almost all explanations offered evidence either that the teachers have no awareness of the bases of their own beliefs, or, more likely, that they in effect tacitly assume that the teacher's belief requires no explanation and the difference between teacher and student's belief is entirely a matter of a departure of the student's belief from the teacher's (unquestionably correct) belief. Focus of the explanations is therefore on that departure as we saw throughout the previous section. One rare instance of a teacher focusing on justifying their own belief is FI2 The aim of the teaching should be for learners to understand and use vocabulary accurately: being able to handle the words speedily (i.e. fluency) is not so important. T+, Sn/S-. 'As for me, I disagree <with the students>. Because in their current level, it will be more appropriate to understand the meaning of vocabulary and how it could be used accurately. After that, they will use it more fluently in advanced levels.'

Second, a good proportion of the explanations of the students' beliefs were negative in tone, representing the students' beliefs as driven by ignorance or emotion rather than competent reason. Furthermore, even where a neutral explanation was offered, it was not uncommon for the teachers to combine it in multiple explanations with other more negative ones, thus giving it some negative tone by association. For instance, this example offers three explanations, the first of which is neutral, and could on its own form the basis for consideration of a rational change in practice, if not of belief, on the part of the teacher. The second and third, on the other hand, are progressively more negative, and suggest that, after all, the teacher is unlikely to reflect further on her belief, let alone change it or work on getting the students to change theirs. FS3 Show pronunciation of a new word by transcription using the International Phonetic Alphabet. T+, S-. 'Because they don't need more information. They don't have a desire for it. They are lazy.'

Taken together, these facts give little support to a view that these teachers are either going to reflect further on their beliefs, and maybe revise them, or their practices, as part of their continuing professional development, or indeed welcome or elicit continuing learner input to their English teaching, conceptualized as a collaborative teaching effort with autonomous learners.

However, there are some differences between the teachers. For instance, it is instructive to compare MS14 and FS12 on the same issue: In order to be ready for the Preliminary year, leading to a BA taught through the medium of English in KSA, learners should be taught more than 5000 words by the end of secondary school. For both teachers this was T+, S-, but the teacher explanations are quite different. MS14 says: 'They may find it so much and it is not necessary to have such a big number of vocabulary. In other words, they may think that less than 5000 is sufficient and could enable them join any college preparation year.' However, FS12 says: 'Yes I said that because the students' abilities are too narrow. They are lazy. They don't have a desire.' Both attribute the discrepancy to the students, but they present quite different attitudes to students. MS14 sees students as thinking entities making a rational decision. FS12, however, presents the students simply as deficient both in terms of ability and motivational effort. This type of difference shows up across many of the responses of each teacher.

Furthermore, one gets the feeling that MS14, while not changing his own belief, might accept the idea that the situation could be improved if the teacher at least adjusted his practices. E.g. MS14 Learners should be given short tests of vocabulary every week in class. T+, Sn. 'Because they hate exams... if we evaluate them through involving them in interesting activities or tasks, I think they will be satisfied.' This is the only instance in the entire data where there was a hint of a teacher considering a change either of belief or practice consequent upon the student belief they had heard about. FS12, on the same issue, is again characteristically dismissive, conveying the impression that she sees the students as a lost cause, which the teacher can do little about. 'They didn't like more information, more tests or even quizzes. They are lazy students.'

In the interests of obtaining genuine responses in a situation as free as possible of stress, embarrassment, cultural strangeness, and confrontation we interviewed the teachers separately rather than in focus groups with students. Neither did we boldly ask teachers if they might change their beliefs or not, or why, since this could be quite demanding to explain on the spot for teachers probably unused to thinking about such challenges. Rather, as a starting point we judged easier, we encouraged teachers to talk about why they thought the discrepancies we presented to them might occur, and looked in our qualitative analysis for explanations by the teachers of why such discrepancies might exist, demonstrating their awareness of reasons for their own and their students' positions, any indication of likelihood of belief change or some other way of handling the conflict, and the stance they adopted towards belief challenges from students. The interviewer voiced no opinions of his/her own and did not adjudicate between teacher and student as to who was 'right'.

Results

In fact, all the 38 vocabulary teaching issues we had asked about elicited at least one clash between a teacher and a student belief. Areas where there was almost unanimous agreement, however, concerned whether vocabulary could usefully be taught incidentally through reading and writing rather than separately, whether more needed to be taught about a word than just spelling, pronunciation and meaning, and whether learners should be trained in memory strategies.

Teacher explanations for the most prominent conflicts

In citing what the teachers said below we adopt a space-saving convention of first specifying the code for the teacher whose words are being cited followed by the belief at issue; next teacher prior endorsement or not of a belief is given as T+ or T-, or Tn for a neutral response; similarly, endorsement or not by students is reported as S+ or S- or Sn. The teacher's (translated) words follow in quotes. A fuller account of the results is available in a longer version of this paper available from the researcher.

Student has a learning benefit related reason for their belief

This type of reason for holding a belief in how something should be taught is perhaps the most legitimate one of all. However, there were only a few instances: e.g. M11 Learners should be made to repeat new words a lot in class (either aloud or silently). T-, S+. 'Because they think that using repetition will fix the vocabulary in their minds, so they would not forget it.' F12, by contrast, suggests a plausible 'lack of benefit' reason for her students not endorsing the same belief: T+, S-. 'Because they think that they are like a machine when they repeat the words. Or they may repeat them unconsciously so they gain no benefit from it.'

Student does not see the importance/usefulness/need of something

Far more commonly, student difference in belief was represented as student lack of knowledge/awareness about what is really important (with the assumption that the teacher's differing view is the correct one).

E.g. M110 Learners should be shown useful websites for learning and practicing vocabulary themselves. T+, S-. 'The students may consider anything outside the curriculum useless.' F12 Words should recur not only in the lesson where they are introduced, but from time to time in later lessons over weeks and months. T+, Sn. 'They may feel that it is just wasting time. They are unaware of the importance of this recurrence.'

Student has or does not have access to other sources of information

Another type of explanation that emerged concerned availability of other sources of information than the teacher.

Most mentioned was the dictionary and other people who could be asked. MS14 Learners should be trained in various ways of guessing the meaning of unknown words when they meet them in reading or listening. T+, S-. 'Because they have no motives for doing so as they can look up the new word from the dictionary or ask their teachers or colleagues about it.' Availability of private instruction was also mentioned. F14 'I think that some students have special teachers, thus they like to be free. With a special teacher, the circumstances are different. Maybe they need another source to learn from.'

Finally, one teacher mentioned watching films: F14 The teacher should pronounce a new word as a model for students. T+, S-. 'Maybe she has another model, for example movies. Maybe she thinks I make some mistakes.'

Student has their own individual learning style, habit or strategy

Another type of reason was based in recognition that learners might have individual learning styles or strategies which conflicted with the teaching method which the teacher believed in: M110 Learners should be made to repeat new words a lot in class (either aloud or silently) T+, S-. 'Some students keep the new word by heart by writing it once or twice while others prefer to repeat it orally to keep it by heart.'

Student level of English proficiency or possession of other prerequisite ability/knowledge/awareness

There were many references to the low ability of the students being a reason for their beliefs.

E.g. F14 Words should be explained in context like collocation and sentences. T+, S-. 'Because students don't understand separate English words, so how she can understand sentences?'

Student finds something easier versus difficult/confusing

Although often this was given as a reason linked to laziness (see later section), it was also quite often presented without that connection as a rational choice. M110 Vocabulary is not something that needs separate attention, but can be taught where necessary incidentally in connection with other activities (e.g. reading, writing). T+, S-. 'The students think that separately receiving a word and its meaning is easier for them.'

Student likes/does not like, prefers or hates something

above 2) came student's involvement in setting objectives and in assessment.

However, such studies are done in general and hypothetical terms. They ask teachers about how feasible or desirable they think it would be in principle to involve students in decisions about a general issue, such as, say, the English teaching methods used. This is a far cry from asking a specific teacher about how they themselves respond to a specific suggestion made by their actual students about how a particular aspect of vocabulary teaching like presenting word meaning should be done, where the student belief is clearly in conflict with the teacher belief. Would teachers be so welcoming in the latter case?

Furthermore, there is a scale of strength of how student beliefs might impact on teacher beliefs and so on what occurs in class. The strong version of student classroom autonomy (e.g. Degener, 2001) involves students in effect collaborating with the teacher in the actual decision making about what topics, activities, materials etc. are used, so does entail teacher beliefs being explicitly challenged by student beliefs. A weaker version is where the teacher takes into account the students' beliefs, but still makes all the decisions about how to accommodate them. Even weaker is where the students' beliefs are not even elicited, but the teacher unilaterally decides what best promotes learner classroom autonomy and acts accordingly: e.g. the teacher involves students in writing classroom materials (Moiseenko, 2015), or in selecting what reading texts to read and discuss in a literature circle (Hsu, 2004). In Borg (2012), it is noticeable that when participants were asked to give examples of where they encouraged autonomy in their own classes, the examples mentioned seemed to involve only some weaker version where the teacher encourages group work or computer work so as to enhance learnerself-reflection and self-learning, in or out of class, but does not face a full-on challenge to his/her beliefs about teaching.

Clearly it is in the stronger versions of classroom learner autonomy that direct challenges to the beliefs of the teacher about how teaching should be done from the beliefs of the learners may become apparent. Yet, there is a dearth of studies of how teachers handle such challenges in terms of heightened awareness and potential belief change. Will they exhibit 'autonomy-support' in the sense of 'being able to take the other person's perspective and work from there' (Deci and Flaste, 1995, 42), or be controlling?

It is for all these reasons that we feel it is timely to explore the responses of in-service teachers to explicitly conflicting learner beliefs in an individual way and in a particular context. The specific focus on vocabulary teaching was chosen for its relevance in the context of this study, where lack of success of learners to exit the state school system with a sufficient knowledge of English for onward study, or practical real world use, including especially vocabulary, is a continuing problem shared by other EFL contexts such as Taiwan and Thailand (Alenezi, 2016).

Research Questions

a. How do teachers respond when their beliefs about how vocabulary should be taught apparently are challenged by those of their students?

- b. Do teachers show awareness of their own and their students' beliefs, through being able to offer reasonable explanations for them?
- c. Do teachers seem to treat such challenges as coming essentially from below or more from autonomous equals in a cooperative vocabulary teaching/learning enterprise?
- d. Do teachers show signs of willingness to exploit information from their students for their own professional development (belief change) as teachers?

Method

Eight school teachers of EFL in KSA were selected, representing both genders. They taught at either intermediate (grades 7-9) or secondary (grades 10-12) level, and had a range of years of teaching experience. From the classes of each teacher, four representative students were randomly selected by the teacher. All participants came from the male and female sections of different regular state schools in Riyadh. All were Saudis and products of the Saudi state educational system, with a common Saudi cultural background. Although chosen on a convenience basis, the teachers and learners in these schools may be regarded as typical of school teachers and learners across KSA. Teachers are referred to later in code by gender, level and years of experience: e.g. FS12 means a female secondary level teacher with 12 years of experience.

The teacher interviews were conducted in Arabic and took place in school offices. They were recorded and took between 20 and 70 minutes depending on how forthcoming the teacher was. The researcher interviewed the male teachers and a trained female assistant with PhD in TESOL interviewed the females.

The teachers had previously responded to a questionnaire in Arabic, eliciting their beliefs on 38 issues concerning vocabulary teaching, and the learners had responded to an exactly parallel questionnaire. Beliefs were here operationalized as 'statements [the teachers] make ... about their ideas, thoughts, and knowledge that are expressed as evaluations of "what should be done", "should be the case", and "is preferable"' (Basturkmen et al., 2004, 244). The items chosen were based on lists obtained from qualitative studies of beliefs about vocabulary teaching (Gao and Ma, 2011; Alghamdi, 2013), and from the themes prominent in standard accounts of vocabulary teaching (Gairns and Redman, 1986; Thornbury, 2002; Nation, 2008). They covered six themes: overall factors in vocabulary teaching, selection of vocabulary items and information about them to teach, presentation of meaning and sound of new items, forms of vocabulary practice, training learners in learner vocabulary strategies, vocabulary testing and exams. The researcher went over teacher and student's questionnaire responses identifying prominent mismatches. In the interviews, the teachers were asked to elaborate particularly where there appeared to be a clash between how the teacher had responded and what their students had independently responded (four for each teacher) concerning the same issues. A typical interview prompt was then of the type:

You said that learners should be given short tests of vocabulary every week in class. But your students didn't agree. What do you think?

Introduction:

Teacher beliefs, awareness, and belief change

Teacher beliefs are often found to affect practices (e.g. Phipps and Borg, 2007; Macalister, 2012), though often some lack of effect or mismatch is found (e.g. Birello, 2012; Simon, 2012). Along with studying such effects, a growing area is consequently the study of changes in teacher beliefs, since if beliefs affect practices and one wants practices to improve, then teacher beliefs may need to change first (Holec, 1987). Thus, much of pre-service teacher training and in-service professional development could be interpreted as an exercise in promoting beneficial belief change (Macalister, 2016).

Cabaroglu and Roberts (2000) characterise belief change as starting with a participant's 'realization', or greater awareness of their belief and its consistency or lack of it with some other source of information, which may lead to any of ten further processes, such as reinforcement or change of that belief, many of which have been evidenced in other studies. What remains perhaps less understood, however, is that initial awareness/realization at the moment when a challenge to an existing belief is recognised (playing a role similar to that of 'noticing' in SLA), which may lead on to the change or maintenance of that belief. Hence, it is that area that this study focuses on.

Belief challenges and teacher professional development: pre-service and in-service

Along with the issue of belief change comes naturally the issue of what initiates this process. Most often research on change (or maintenance) of teacher belief has been conducted in the context of pre-service training (e.g. Kagan, 1992; Macalister, 2012; Çapan, 2014; Dinçer and Yesilyurt, 2013). This is perhaps the situation where one might most expect to find teacher awareness being raised and beliefs changing, and there have been numerous studies of this, finding variously less effect of such training. (Kagan, 1992; Çapan, 2014) or more (Simon, 2012; Farrell, 2001; Wai-Yan Wan, 2016).

Rather less attention has been paid to awareness and change in beliefs of in-service teachers and the factors affecting them, which is our focus of attention. This is despite considerable interest in teacher continuing professional development as a lifelong process, and the fact that there are many more factors that such teachers are exposed to, or may seek out, which might impact their beliefs (as listed in Case, 2012; Hustler et al., 2003). Among these are explicit sources of possible belief challenge not often found in the pre-service situation, and of interest because not associated with the same prestige as that of input from academic articles or trainers found in that situation, such as comments from parents at 'parent-teacher evenings', and direct comments from students themselves (e.g. in student satisfaction surveys: Murphey et al., 2009). Whether the impact of such sources is greater or less than that of those usually considered in the pre-service situation seems uncertain.

An associated issue that arises in the in-service situation rather more than the pre-service one is that of whether, following a belief challenge, awareness raising and reflection, a change of teacher belief is always desirable. By and large, belief studies tend either to document change or

lack of it in a non-judgmental way, or to tacitly make the assumption that teacher belief change is always desirable. In the context of pre-service trainee studies the latter is often the case, since teachers often arrive with erroneous beliefs based on their own experiences as learners (Borg, 2003). In the realm of in-service teachers, however, things may be less clear. Teachers with a lot of experience, exposure to explicit training, and a history of reflection on their experience may actually entertain more appropriate beliefs than, say, an in-service trainer unfamiliar with the local context, or the student in his/her class. In this case the appropriate response to a belief challenge could be not to change but instead self-justify, and persuade.

Despite the professional development advice to TEFL teachers of sources like Case (2012), saying "Get feedback from students", research on the impact on in-service teachers of belief challenge coming from their students seems to be sparse. Life et al. (2009), for example, gathered extensive data on the ELT-related beliefs of 373 students in Korea and Japan, but did not confront any practising teachers with those beliefs. There have also been studies of in-service teacher and student beliefs side by side and compared, but without considering how the one might be received by the other (e.g. Dandy and Bendersky, 2014). There have also been studies of student beliefs being changed by teachers, through the learners experiencing a different way the teacher teaches a course (e.g. Kojour and Heirati, 2015). However, we have failed to find studies of teacher beliefs being explicitly challenged by their students, and what the response was. If teachers can change the beliefs of students, can students also prompt teacher heightened awareness of their beliefs and even perhaps change them?

Learner classroom autonomy

The way in which teachers handle belief challenges from learners is also worth attention due to its centrality to the issue of learner classroom autonomy. Holec's (1981, 3) still influential definition of learner autonomy is 'the ability to take charge of one's learning ... to have, and to hold, the responsibility for all the decisions concerning all aspects of this learning', which in principle includes everything which in EFL classroom teaching is normally determined by the teacher or by educational entities above the teacher, such as school or university heads of department or the Ministry of Education which may set objectives and impose syllabi, textbooks and examinations. Hence, it is clearly central to this agenda that learner beliefs about teaching are regarded as having value and are given due attention.

A study of the idea that learners should be involved in decisions about how teaching is conducted close to our Saudi Arabian (KSA) context is that of Borg and Al-Busaidi (2012) in the language centre at Sultan Qaboos University in Oman. 61 multinational teachers from this centre who teach English to undergraduate students were surveyed and, for example, registered reasonably strong endorsement (around 3 on a 1-4 scale) of the feasibility and desirability of learner involvement in decision making about topics to be discussed, and kinds of tasks and activities used in the English classes. Student's involvement in classroom management, teaching methods, and materials used in class was rated a little lower around the middle of the feasibility and desirability scales. Lowest (slightly

استجابة معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية الذين على رأس العمل لتحديات تغير معتقداتهم التعليمية من وجهة نظر طلابهم: دراسة حالة

صلاح عائض الفروان

الأستاذ بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية العلوم والدراسات الإنسانية برماح،

جامعة المجمعة

(قدم للنشر في ١٠ / ١ / ١٤٣٨ هـ؛ وقبل في ٢٦ / ٧ / ١٤٣٨ هـ)

الكلمات المفتاحية: معتقدات المعلم، تدريس الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، تدريس الإنجليزية للناطقين بلغات أخرى، تعليم المفردات، والتطوير المهني، استقلالية المتعلم في الفصل الدراسي أو طريقة التعلم التي محورها الطالب، المعتقدات التوليدية غير السوية.

ملخص البحث: تهدف الدراسة إلى استكشاف موضوع محوري في البحوث الخاصة بمعتقدات المعلمين بشأن تدريس المفردات، والتنمية المهنية المستمرة للمعلم، ومدى استقلالية المتعلم في الصف. في هذه الدراسة جرت مقابلة شخصية لثمانية معلمين سعوديين يُدرّسون المرحلتين المتوسطة والثانوية، يتحدثون فيها عن بعض الأمثلة والمواقف التي تبين عدم التوافق بين معتقدات هؤلاء المعلمين بشأن ٣٨ جانبًا من جوانب الطرق المستخدمة في تدريس المفردات وبيان معتقدات طلابهم.

تُكِّن هذه المواقف المعلمين من إثبات مدى وعيهم بمعتقداتهم الشخصية ومعتقدات طلابهم إلى جانب تعزيز ذلك الوعي عبر تقديم شرح وافٍ لتلك المعتقدات. إضافة إلى ذلك، ربما تؤدي التحديات الصريحة لمعتقدات المعلمين إما إلى الاحتفاظ بتلك المعتقدات أو تغييرها؛ ومن ثمَّ يمكن اعتبارها بمثابة مصدر للتنمية المهنية المستمرة للمعلم، وكذلك وسيلة جيدة يمكن عن طريقها التأكد من مدى توافر قدر من الاستقلالية للمتعلم في الصف. وقد حدّد المعلمون المشاركون مجموعة من أسباب عدم التوافق وأظهروا درجات متفاوتة من الوعي بالعوامل ذات الصلة، ولكنهم جميعًا دون استثناء تقريبًا، تحدثوا بطريقة تدل على أنه من المستبعد أن يعدلوا معتقداتهم أو ممارساتهم، أو يستخدموا المعلومات الخاصة بمعتقدات طلابهم في تطوير أنفسهم مهنيًا، أو يتقبلوا منظور المتعلم بشأن ما يجري في الصفوف الخاصة بهؤلاء المعلمين. بل إنَّ بعض المعلمين عبروا عن نظرة سلبية تمامًا تجاه هؤلاء الطلاب.

In-service 'EFL Teachers' Response to Belief Challenge from their Students: A Case Study

D. Salah Al Farwan

*PhD in Applied Linguistics and TESOL; Vice Dean for Quality and Skills Development
Chairperson of English Department; College of Science and Humanities at Ramah
University of Majma'ah, K.S.A*

(Received 10/1/1438H; Accepted for publication 26/7/1438H)

Keywords: teacher belief, TEFL/TESOL, vocabulary teaching, professional development, learner classroom autonomy, pathognomonic belief.

Abstract: This study explores a topic that lies at the intersection of research on in-service teacher beliefs about vocabulary teaching, teacher continuing professional development, and learner classroom autonomy. Eight school teachers were invited to talk in interview about instances where their previously elicited beliefs about 38 aspects of vocabulary teaching did not appear to match those of their students. Such situations enable teachers to evidence and enhance awareness of their own and their students' beliefs, through providing explanations for them. Furthermore, such explicit challenges to teacher beliefs may lead either to maintenance or change of the teacher's beliefs, and can be seen both as a resource for continuing professional development of the teacher and as occasions where some degree of learner classroom autonomy may or may not be entertained. The reasons behind mismatches showed various degrees of awareness of relevant factors. Yet, all teachers, almost without exception, talked in a way that showed little sign that they might either modify their own beliefs or practices or use the information about their students' beliefs for their professional development or indeed welcome further the learner perspective on their classrooms. Indeed, some projected a quite negative view of their students. Teacher training in reflective professional development is recommended and suggestions are made for how teachers should handle such conflict.