

Relationship between language teachers' beliefs and their classroom practices

Lokesh Kumar Paliwal

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Education, Mohan Lal Sukhadiya University, Udaipur, Rajasthan, India

Abstract

The aim of this research study is to find out the beliefs of language teachers' about language and language pedagogy and its relationship with their actual classroom practices. For this, a sample of 240 language teachers of eighty government secondary schools of Udaipur and Rajsamand districts was selected. An Opinionnaire was administered to find out the beliefs of the above language teachers. The classroom practices of sixty teachers of the two hundred and forty were observed through video recordings and by an observation schedule. Both Normative and Descriptive Survey Method were used for the study. Purposive sampling was used for the data collection. The study revealed that there is no significant difference between language teachers' beliefs about language and language pedagogy. The study also revealed that there is no significant difference between the classroom practices of Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers. Further, no significant relationship was found between beliefs and classroom practices of Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers.

Keywords: substituted Li ferrite, magnetostatic and spin waves, microstrip array antenna, X-band frequency range

Introduction

Teaching is a process in which the teacher, the methodology and the curriculum are involved. The teacher teaches the prescribed books text by using a certain methodology. The methodology is generally influenced by certain beliefs of the teacher.

Some researchers have defined beliefs about language learning as mentioned below.

Beliefs are:

1. "Preconceptions, preconceived ideas, and preconceived notions". (Horwitz, 1985, 1987, 1988) [8, 9, 10]
2. "Attitude, values, judgements, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, explicit theories, personal theories, internal mental processes, action strategies, rules of practice, practical principles, perspectives, repertoires of understanding, and social strategy." Pajares (1992),
3. "Psychologically held understandings, premises, or propositions about the language that are felt to be true." Richardson (1996) [17],
4. "Preconceptions language teachers have about the task of teaching the target language." Huang (1997) [11],
5. "Opinions" and "ideas" or "views." Kunt (1997) [12],
6. "A set of conceptual representations which signify to its holder a reality." Cabaroglu and Roberts (2000) [5].
7. Instructional judgements.

As per to the National Policy on Education (1986, 2019), three languages are taught in the schools. In Rajasthan, the three languages are generally the mother tongue/Hindi, English as a second language and a third language which is Sanskrit or any other third language. It has been generally observed that language teachers focus on teaching prescriptive grammar which involves Meta, language irrespective of the status of the language whether it is the first, second and the third language. The teachers have got

certain beliefs about language, language teaching, its various aspects, etc.

It is generally assumed that our actions are determined by our ideas. Beliefs are also certain ideas which evidently guide our actions. Similarly teachers generally hold some beliefs about the subject they teach and also about the teaching techniques meant for teaching the specific subject. This study basically aims at finding out whether there is any significant difference between language teachers' beliefs about language and language pedagogy.

Study of Related Literature

The survey of related literature makes it crystal clear that no such study has been conducted in a multilingual context like India. However, a few studies conducted abroad are related to the present research work. The research studies conducted by Saydee, Farid (2016); Larenas, C'Landio Diaz (2015); Altan Mustapha X. (2006); Ozmen, Kemal Sinan (2012) and Karim, Hama Barzan Hadi (2015) were found useful in understanding the present research problem.

Although a lot of research work has been done in India in the field of language but no research work has been conducted in the area of language teachers' beliefs specific about language and language pedagogy and their relationship with teachers' actual classroom practices. Therefore, this research study was taken up.

Research Questions

On the basis of the study of related literature and the present context of language teaching in Rajasthan, the following research questions were framed:

1. What are language teachers' beliefs about language and language teaching?
2. What are the classroom practices being used for language pedagogy?
3. Is there any relationship between language teachers' beliefs and their classroom practices?

Objectives of the Study

On the basis of the above research questions, the following objectives were determined for the study:

1. To study language teachers’ beliefs about language and language teaching.
2. To study the classroom practices of language pedagogy (related to First Language, Second Language, Third Language).
3. To study the relationship between language teachers’ beliefs and their classroom practices of language pedagogy.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated for the study:

1. There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit (L1, L2 and L3) teachers’ beliefs about language and language pedagogy.
2. There is no significant difference between L1, L2 and L3 teachers’ classroom practices.
3. There is no significant relationship between beliefs and classroom practices of Hindi teachers.
4. There is no significant relationship between beliefs and classroom practices of English teachers.
5. There is no significant relationship between beliefs and classroom practices of Sanskrit teachers.

Methodology

Two hundred forty (240) language teachers from Udaipur and Rajsamand districts (80 teachers from each L1, L2 and L3) participated in the study. For this, language teachers were purposively selected. Percentage, Chi-Square and graphical presentation were used for the study. Both Normative and Descriptive Survey Methods were used for the study. An opinionnaire was administered to find out the beliefs of language teachers. The classroom practices of sixty teachers of the two hundred and forty, were observed through video recordings and by an observation schedule. The collected data were methodically analyzed and interpreted.

Data Analysis and Interpretation (Based on the Null Hypotheses)

Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers’ Beliefs about the Structure of Language

Table 1: Average Percentage and Chi-square Value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers’ Beliefs about the Structure of Language

Category (n=240)	Average % of Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of Significance
	Yes	No	Don't Know			
Hindi (n=80)	20	15	65	100	5.920	0.05
English (n=80)	35	13	52	100		
Sanskrit(n=80)	30	15	55	100		
n = 240	85	43	172	300		

df =4 Table Value (0.05:9.488), (0.01:13.277)

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.1) shows that the computed χ^2 (5.920) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the structure (phonological,

morphological, lexical, syntactic and semantic structure) of language) is accepted. Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers’ Beliefs about the Aims of Language Teaching

Table 2: Average Percentage and Chi-square Value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers’ Beliefs about the Aims of Language Teaching

Category (n=240)	Average % of Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of significance
	Yes	No	Don't Know			
Hindi (n=80)	63.6	21.6	14.8	100	0.28	N.S.
English (n=80)	65	19.7	15.3	100		
Sanskrit (n=80)	64.3	18.7	17	100		
n=240	192.9	60	47.1	300		

df =4 Table Value (0.05:9.488), (0.01:13.277)

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.2) shows that the computed χ^2 (0.28) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the aim of language teaching) is accepted.

Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers’ Beliefs about the Methods of Language Teaching

Table 3: Average Percentage and Chi-square Value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers’ Beliefs about the Methods of Language Teaching

Category (n=240)	Average % of Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of Significance
	Yes	No	Don't Know			
Hindi (n=80)	80.4	15.1	4.5	100	0.051	N.S.
English (n=80)	80	15.9	4.1	100		
Sanskrit(n=80)	81.1	15.2	3.7	100		
n = 240	241.5	46.2	12.3	300		

df =4 Table Value (0.05:9.488), (0.01:13.277)

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.3) shows that the computed χ^2 (0.051) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the Ho(There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Methods of Language Teaching) is accepted.

Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers’ Beliefs about the Teaching of Listening and Speaking Skills

Table 4: Average Percentage and Chi-square Value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers’ Beliefs about the Teaching of Listening and Speaking Skills

Category (n=240)	Average % of Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of Significance
	Yes	No	Don't Know			
Hindi (n=80)	84	9.7	6.3	100	4.47	N.S.
English (n=80)	89	8.4	2.6	100		
Sanskrit(n=80)	92.5	5.3	2.2	100		
n = 240	265.5	23.4	11.1	300		

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.4) shows that the computed χ^2 (4.47) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the teaching of Listening and Speaking skills.) is accepted.

Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers’ Beliefs about the Teaching of Reading and Writing Skills

Table 5: Average Percentage and Chi-square Value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers’ Beliefs about the Teaching of Reading and Writing Skills

Category (n=240)	Average % of Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of Significance
	Yes	No	Don’t Know			
Hindi (n=80)	63.2	30.3	6.5	100	0.35	0.05
English (n=80)	62.7	31	6.3	100		
Sanskrit(n=80)	61.2	30.8	8	100		
n = 240	187.1	92.1	20.8	300		

df =4 Table Value (0.05:9.488),(0.01:13.277)

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.5) shows that the computed χ^2 (0.35) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the Ho(There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Reading and Writing skills.) is accepted.

Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ Beliefs about the Teaching of Vocabulary

Table 6: Average Percentage and Chi-square Value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers’ Beliefs about the Teaching of Vocabulary

Category (n=240)	Average % of Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of Significance
	Yes	No	Don’t Know			
Hindi (n=80)	94	3.5	2.5	100	3.248	0.05
English (n=80)	87.5	9.5	3	100		
Sanskrit (n=80)	87.5	10	2.5	100		
n = 240	269	23	8	300		

df =4 Table Value (0.05:9.488),(0.01:13.277)

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.6) shows that the computed χ^2 (3.248) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Vocabulary.) is accepted.

Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Grammar

Table 7: Average percentage and Chi-square value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Grammar

Category (n=240)	Average % of Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of Significance
	Yes	No	Don’t Know			
Hindi (n=80)	45.2	52.8	2	100	0.265	0.05
English (n=80)	43.75	53	3.25	100		
Sanskrit(n=80)	44	53.25	2.75	100		
n = 240	132.95	159.05	8	300		

df =4 Table Value (0.05:9.488),(0.01:13.277)

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.7) shows that the computed χ^2 (0.265) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Grammar.) is accepted.

Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Poetry

Table 8: Average percentage and Chi-square value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Poetry

Category (n=240)	Average % of Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of Significance
	Yes	No	Don’t Know			
Hindi (n=80)	62	33	5	100	0.374	0.05
English (n=80)	58.6	36.2	5.2	100		
Sanskrit(n=80)	60.6	34	5.4	100		
n = 240	181.2	103.2	15.6	300		

df =4 Table Value (0.05:9.488),(0.01:13.277)

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.8) shows that the computed χ^2 (0.374) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Poetry.) is accepted. Therefore, it may be concluded that there is no difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the teaching of poetry.

Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Composition

Table 9: Average percentage and Chi-square value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Composition

Category (n=240)	Average % of Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of Significance
	Yes	No	Don’t Know			
Hindi (n=80)	52.5	40	7.5	100	0.580	0.05
English (n=80)	52.5	42.5	5	100		
Sanskrit (n=80)	53	39.5	7.5	100		
n = 273	158	122	20	300		

df =4 Table Value (0.05:9.488),(0.01:13.277)

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.9) shows that the computed χ^2 (0.580) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Composition.) is accepted.

Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Literature

Table 10: Average percentage and Chi-square value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers’ beliefs about the Teaching of Literature

Category (n=240)	Average % of Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of Significance
	Yes	No	Don’t Know			
Hindi (n=80)	60.3	33.7	6	100	2.024	0.05
English (n=80)	52.3	39.7	8	100		
Sanskrit (n=80)	57.7	33.3	9	100		
N = 240	170.3	106.7	23	300		

df =4 Table Value (0.05:9.488),(0.01:13.277)

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.10) shows that the computed χ^2 (2.024) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance.

Hence, the Ho (There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers' beliefs about the Teaching of Literature.) is accepted.

Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers' beliefs about the Evaluation in Language

Table 11: Average percentage and Chi-square value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers' beliefs about the Evaluation in Language

Category (n=240)	Average % of Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of Significance
	Yes	No	Don't Know			
Hindi (n=80)	67.3	23	9.7	100	4.289	0.05
English (n=80)	68.5	23.2	8.3	100		
Sanskrit(n=80)	78.5	17.3	4.2	100		
= 240	214.3	63.5	22.2	300		

df =4 Table Value (0.05:9.488),(0.01:13.277)

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.11) shows that the computed χ^2 (4.289) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers' beliefs about the Evaluation in Language) is accepted.

Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers' Classroom Practices

Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers' classroom practices.

Table 12: Average Percentage and Chi-square Value of the Hindi, English and Sanskrit Teachers' Classroom Practices Related to Language Teaching

Category (n=40)	Average % of Pedagogical Practices of Language Teachers			Total	χ^2	Level of Significance
	Always	Sometimes	Never			
Hindi (n=20)	27	11	62	100	0.249	0.05
English(n=20)	26	10	64	100		
Sanskrit(n=20)	26	12	62	100		
n = 60	79	33	188	300		

df: 4 Table Value (0.05:5.991), (0.01:9.21)

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.12) shows that the computed χ^2 (0.249) is less than the table/critical value (9.488) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers' Classroom Practices) is accepted.

Analysis and Interpration of Correlation between Beliefs and Classroom Practices of Hindi Teachers

Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between beliefs and classroom practices of Hindi teachers.

Table 13: Analysis and Inter pration of correlation between Beliefs and Classroom Practices of Hindi Teachers

Category of Teachers	N	r	Relationship
Hindi teachers	60	0.229	Low
df			58
Critical Value at.05			0.254
Critical Value at.01			0.330

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.13) shows that the computed 'r' value (0.229) is less than the table/critical

value (0.254) at 0.05 level of significance and the table value (0.330) at 0.01level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant relationship between beliefs and classroom practices of Hindi teachers.) is accepted. However, the correlation between beliefs and classroom practices of Hindi teachers is Low.

Analysis and Interpration of Correlation between Beliefs and Classroom Practices of English Teachers

Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between beliefs and classroom practices of English teachers.

Table 14: Analysis and interpration of correlation between Beliefs and Classroom Practices of English Teachers

Category of Teachers	N	r	Relationship
English teachers	60	0.126	Low
df			58
Critical Value at.05			0.254
Critical Value at.01			0.330

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.14) shows that the computed 'r' value (0.126) is less than the table/critical value (0.254) at 0.05 level of significance and the table value (0.330) at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant relationship between beliefs and classroom practices of English teachers.) is accepted. However, the correlation between beliefs and classroom practices of English teachers is Negligible.

Analysis and interpration of correlation between Beliefs and Classroom Practices of Sanskrit Teachers

Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between beliefs and classroom practices of Sanskrit teachers.

Table 15: Analysis and interpration of correlation between Beliefs and Classroom Practices of Sanskrit Teachers

Category of Teachers	N	r	Relationship
Sanskrit teachers	60	0.136	Low
df			58
Critical Value at.05			0.254
Critical Value at.01			0.330

Analysis and Interpretation: Table (7.15) shows that the computed 'r' value (0.136) is less than the table/critical value (0.254) at 0.05 level of significance and the table value (0.330) at 0.01level of significance. Hence, the Ho (There is no significant relationship between beliefs and classroom practices of Sanskrit teachers.) is accepted. However the correlation between beliefs and classroom practices of Sanskrit teachers is Negligible.

Conclusions

The above data analysis and interpretation clearly show that most of null hypotheses have been accepted. Thus, the study reveals that there is no significant difference between Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers' beliefs about language and language teaching. Further no significant relationship was found between beliefs and classroom practices of Hindi, English and Sanskrit teachers.

This leads us to conclude that the language teachers generally use the similar classroom practices. Therefore, in order to improve the teaching of a specific language, the teachers should be well acquainted with the objectives and pedagogy of the target language. Teachers need a better

orientation programme by keeping in view their pedagogical needs.

References

1. Aggarwal YP. Statistical Methods, Concepts, Applications and Computation. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt, 1990.
2. Altan MX. Beliefs about Language of Foreign Language-Major University Students. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 2006, 31(2).
3. Bailey KM. Learning about Language Assessment: Dilemmas, Decisions and Directions. Cambridge, MA: Heinke & Heinke, 1998.
4. Borg WR, Gall MD. Educational Research: An Introduction, 5th ed. White Plains, New York: Longman, 1989.
5. Cabaroglu N, Roberts J. Development in Student Teachers' Pre-existing Beliefs During a 1-year PGCE Program, 2000, 387-402.
6. Garrett Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans, Green and Co, 1958.
7. Hama Karim BH. The Impact of Teachers Beliefs and Perceptions about Formative Assessment in the University ESL Class. International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE). 2015; 2(3):108-115. ISSN 2349-0373.
8. Horwitz EK. Using Students Beliefs about Language Learning and Teaching in the Foreign Language Methods course. Foreign Language Annals. 1985; 18(4):333-40.
9. Horwitz EK. Surveying Students Beliefs about Language Learning. In A. Wenden & Rubin J. Learner strategies in language learning. Englewood cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1987.
10. Horwitz EK. The Beliefs about Language Learning of Beginning University Foreign Language Students. Modern Language Journal. 1988; 72(3):283-294.
11. Huang SC. Taiwanese Senior High School Students' EFL Learning: Focus on Learning Strategies and Learning Beliefs. Dissertation Abstracts International. 1997; 58(03):780A. (UMI No.9727936).
12. Kunt N. Anxiety and Beliefs about Language Learning: A Study of Turkish- Speaking University Students Learning English in North Cyprus. Dissertation Abstracts International. 1997; 59(01):111A. (UMI No.9822635).
13. Larenas CD, Hernandez PA, Navarrete MO. A Class Study of EFL Teachers' Beliefs about the Teaching and the Learning of English in Public, 2015.
14. Özmen KS. Exploring Students Teachers' Beliefs about Language and Teaching: A Longitudinal Study. Current Issues in Education. 2012; 15:1.
15. Peacock M. Pre-Service ESL Teachers' beliefs About Second Language Learning: A Longitudinal Study. System. 2001; 29(2):177-195.
16. Richards J, Rodgers T. Methods and Approaches in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
17. Richardson V. The Role of Attitudes and Beliefs in Learning to Teach. In J. Sikula, T.J. Buttery, & Guyton, E. (Eds.), Hand Book of Research in Teacher Education, Second Edition New York: Macmillan, 1996, 102-119.
18. Sadhu AN, Amarjit Singh. Research Methodology in Social Sciences. Bombay: Himalaya Publishing House, 1980.
19. Saydee F. Foreign Language Teaching: a Study of Teachers' Beliefs about Effective Teaching and Learning Methodologies. Journal of National Council of Less Commonly Taught Language. 2016; 18:63-91. DOI10.10120.
20. Voyakina EYu, Koroyova LYu. Language Learners' Beliefs and their Role in the Process of Teaching a Foreign Language (in English). 2014; 20(2):397.