International Journal of Language Studies
Volume 12, Number 2, April 2018, pp. 17-50

Exploring novice and experienced Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs representations: A more vivid picture

Saeed MEHRPOUR, Shiraz University, Iran[1]
Meisam MOGHADDAM, Shiraz University, Iran

As part of a larger scale research on teachers' beliefs and practices, the present study examined the categories of pedagogical beliefs of novice and experienced EFL teachers (gleaned from the administration of 'Importance of Pedagogical Knowledge Scale' (IPKS)) and their verbal reports through semi structured interviews and stimulated recall, and compared these categories to their practices which were examined through classroom observation. The goal was to explore the possible mismatches between novice and experienced teachers' beliefs (TB) and practices in relation to classroom management and organization, language assessment, motivation, and teachers' knowledge including, content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge. Within the domain of the qualitative research, a multi-case study design was utilized, involving eight novice and experienced teachers who were selected through purposive sampling. The data were analyzed using the constant comparative method around common themes and categories, which were identified as distinctive features of teachers' beliefs; the same categories were then compared with teachers' practices. To ensure the validity of the results, multiple data sources were used to triangulate the data. The results of the study showed that the pedagogical beliefs of novice and experienced teachers were represented differently in their practices, and except for teachers' content knowledge there were mismatches between their beliefs and practices considering the other major categories.

Keywords: Experienced Teachers' Knowledge; Novice Teachers' Knowledge; Teachers' Pedagogical Beliefs; Teachers' Practices

1. Introduction

In educational contexts, teachers are guided by their beliefs about teaching competence. As mentioned recurrently in the literature, teachers' beliefs are

[1] Corresponding Author (Email: smehrpur@rose.shirazu.ac.ir)

ISSN: 2157-4898; EISSN: 2157-4901

assumed to be highly influential on their practices (e.g., Davis & Wilson, 1999; Gebel & Schrier, 2002; Johnson, 1992; Richardson, Anders, Tidwell, & Lloyd, 1991; Woods, 1996). Such beliefs may lead them, as Pajares (1992) noted, "to question the value of information presented, make epistemic assumptions about the nature of teaching knowledge, question the validity of knowledge content, and support their views on teaching and the need for teacher education" (p. 324).

Accepting the nature and the role of these beliefs is necessary to the examination of the choices and decisions teachers will make. Teachers' pedagogical beliefs have a fundamental role in their teaching practices (e.g., Handal & Herrington, 2003; Salmon & MacCyvers, 2001) where these beliefs, as Borg (2003) has explained, are manifested in the decisions teachers make in choosing methods, subjects, activities, and evaluation in their classrooms.

The significance of this study comes from several sources. Firstly, the present study can help teachers to understand how their beliefs influence their classroom practices, and this may encourage them to have interest in their professional development and enhance their knowledge, which may make them cognizant of the effect of those beliefs on their pedagogical decisions. Secondly, according to Gabillon (2013) and Khader (2012), by identifying the matches or mismatches among teachers' beliefs and practices, teacher trainers, in-service teachers, and prospective teachers could better understand each other's perspectives and consequently work together to converge teachers' beliefs and practices. Thirdly, as Borg (2003, 2006) stated, studies investigating teachers' cognition in foreign language contexts have been limited. Due to the scarcity of studies in this filed in Iran, it is hoped that this study will pave the way and inspire other researchers to work on different dimensions of teachers' beliefs and practices in foreign language contexts. Fourthly, the focus of the present study is on the beliefs of both novice and expert teachers. This will offer a chance to examine the changes that might happen to teachers' beliefs and practices as a result of training and experience. Finally, as the present study is the first phase of a larger scale research on teachers' beliefs development, the distinctiveness of the present study lies in its design and tools used to collect data for identifying the elements that comprise teachers' belief systems. For one thing, following a multi-case study design, four novice and four experienced teachers were employed to obtain more comprehensive data sets. Moreover, to prevent any inconsistencies between teachers' beliefs and practices due to the shortcomings of using a single tool measurement, multiple sources of data—including, a questionnaire, classroom observations, field notes, semi structured interviews on teachers' personal practical theories and peer checking—were employed to triangulate the data. Furthermore, data collection and analysis were done through several iterations.

This study tries to investigate the beliefs and practices of novice and expert teachers based on their own pedagogical beliefs components. Based on these objectives, the following research questions are posed.

1. How do (novice/expert) Iranian EFL teachers' pedagogical beliefs about, and practices of, classroom management and organization compare?
2. How do (novice/expert) Iranian EFL teachers' pedagogical beliefs about, and practices of, language assessment compare?
3. How do (novice/expert) Iranian EFL teachers' pedagogical beliefs about, and practices of, employing motivational strategies compare?
4. How is (novice/expert) Iranian EFL teachers' knowledge (including content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge) represented in practice?

2. Background

Researches on teachers' beliefs have been categorized by Gabillon (2013) under five main rubrics. These categories include those which take into account the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices. The second domain comprises the studies which "investigated L2 TB as a source for teacher awareness and professional growth" (p. 6). The other three main groups of studies consider teachers' beliefs about educational innovation, the nature of teachers' beliefs, and those on the incongruity between teachers' and learners' beliefs.

With regard to the first category, Clark and Peterson (1986) saw that teachers' beliefs are a rich store of knowledge that may affect teaching plans and thoughts. Brophy and Good (1986) have found consistency between teachers' beliefs and their practices. Also, Pajares (1992) summarized the results of research on teachers' beliefs by indicating that there is a strong relationship between the pedagogical beliefs of teachers, their planning for teaching, teaching decisions, and classroom practices. Johnson (1994) tried to elaborate on the possible links between teachers' beliefs and their classroom practices. Likewise, Borg (1999), Ernest (1998), Farrow (1999), Trigwell and Prosser (1996), and Varella (1997) explicated the ways that teachers' theoretical considerations are converted into their classroom practices. King (2002) and Wallace and Kang (2004) believed that what teachers actually perform in the classroom is representative of their beliefs. Similarly, Basturkmen, Loewen, and Ellis (2004) regarded teachers' beliefs as the antecedent of teachers' practices. For instance, Zhang, X. (2017) analyzed a novice Chinese EFL teacher's writing beliefs and practices and concluded that the teacher's writing practices firstly arose from his/her beliefs. However, in some cases the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their practices are not

straightforward. Thompson (1992) believed that the relationship between beliefs and practices is not "a simple one-way relationship from belief to practice, but a dynamic two-way relationship in which beliefs are also influenced by practical experience" (p. 73). Similarly, according to Reynolds and Muijs (2002), belief systems are "dynamic and permeable mental structures, susceptible to change in light of experience" (p. 5). On the other hand, some researchers such as Galton and Simon (1980) indicated that the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their practices was not very strong. Furthermore, some researchers such as Nespar (1987), Parmelee (1992), Tobin, Tippins, and Gallard (1994), and Van Zoest (1994) justified the inconsistencies between teachers' beliefs and practices. Fang (1996) related the inconsistencies to the complexities of classroom life. Also, Khader (2012) assumed teachers' beliefs as a set of complex belief systems that are sometimes not reflected in their classroom practices for various reasons.

With respect to expert and novice teachers' beliefs and practices, Berko and Livingston (1989) concluded that expert teachers are more autonomous in decision making while novice teachers tend to believe in procedures, rules and curriculum guidelines. Moreover, they concluded that expert teachers show more flexibility to contextual variations such as student responses, disruptions, and available resources. In contrast, novice teachers are less able to anticipate class events and therefore are less flexible. Kagan and Tippins (1992) argued that novice teachers spend much energy and time on planning lessons which are more detailed and elaborate.

In the present study teachers' beliefs and practices were examined with regard to four teaching components including classroom management, language testing, motivation, and teachers' knowledge. To this end, teachers' knowledge is defined based on the organizational framework described by Shulman (1986). Shulman argued that the competency of effective teachers must be explained in three domains: (A) content knowledge, (B) pedagogical content knowledge, and (C) pedagogical knowledge.

Content knowledge or subject matter knowledge is one of the several components of knowledge. Shulman (1986) and Wilson, Shulman, and Richert (1987) defined content knowledge as the teacher's proficiency in the target language, the degree of knowledge the teacher has about the formal properties of the language such as its grammar, the culture of the L2 community as well as an understanding of applied linguistics and curriculum development.

The second component of teachers' knowledge is pedagogical content knowledge (PCK). PCK is defined by Hogan and Rabinowitz (2003) as the ability to employ multiple models of teaching to transfer one's knowledge of the content knowledge for student understanding, comprehension and

achievement. Shulman (1987) considered PCK as the "blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction" (p. 8). Akbari and Dadvand (2014), Gatbonton (1999), and Shulman (1986, 1987) noted that teachers' PCK has to be used as the main yardstick in determining their expertise.

As a component of PCK, Shulman (1987) included a substantial and essential category namely knowledge of learners, that is, a specific understanding of the learners' characteristics and how these characteristics can be used to specialize and adjust instruction. Likewise, Rahman, Scaife, Yahya, and Jalil (2010) categorized knowledge of the learners into empirical and cognitive categories.

In addition to content knowledge and PCK, Shulman (1986) included pedagogical knowledge as the third criterion characterizing effective teachers. Pedagogical knowledge is used here in its broadest definition (Shulman, 1986, 1987) to refer to any knowledge, theory, and belief about the act of teaching and the process of learning that informs teachers' behavior in the classroom. In the present study, this category entails subcomponents such as the variety of teaching techniques, adjusting teaching methods to a variety of learners, having knowledge of instructional practices, structuring a lesson to promote learning, matching approaches to learners' needs, presenting information in multiple ways, and knowledge of how learners learn. All of these points were contrasted both in novice and experienced teachers' beliefs and practices.

Besides theoretical issues, some researchers examined the relationship between teachers' beliefs and different aspects of their instructional activities empirically. Some of these studies revealed consistencies between teachers' beliefs and practices (e.g., Chou, 2008; Richardson, Anders, Tidwell & Lloyd, 1991; Wang, 2006), while some others indicated inconsistencies (e.g. Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver, and Thwaite, 2001; Kennedy and Kennedy 1996), and some focused on teachers' beliefs and practices among novice and expert teachers (e.g. Gatbonton, 2008; Khalaj, 2010; Mehrpour & Mirsanjari, 2016).

3. Method

3.1. Participants

This research is a case study employing 8 language teachers, both female and male. Since it was thought that this sample of participants can provide the relevant information to gain sufficient insights into, and understanding of, the topic, they were purposively chosen based on the ease of access to hold training workshops, interviews, and observation sessions. All of the participants were teachers of English who had graduated from English

language majors, including English Translation, TEFL, and English Literature, and had completed training courses; therefore, their proficiency level in English was at least upper intermediate or above. Their teaching experience varied from 1 to more than 20 years. Some of them taught English at university level, public schools, and institutes while some solely taught in language institutes. They worked in Fasa University Language Center under the supervision of the lead researcher. Their native language was Persian, and they ranged in age from 28 to 45. The summary of the participants' demographic information appears in Table 1 below. To observe confidentiality, the teachers' names are written in codes.

Table 1
Participants' Demographic Information

Teachers	Age	Experience (years)	Context of teaching	Education	Level	Major
PA	36	12	Ins.	MA	Expert	TEFL
SH	33	10	Ins./uni.	MA	Expert	Literature
BAZ	45	21	Ins./uni.	MA	Expert	TEFL
GH	40	14	Ins.	BA	Expert	Translation
TA	30	2	Ins.	MA	Novice	TEFL
DI	34	4	Ins.	BA	Novice	Literature
BA	28	2	Ins.	MA	Novice	TEFL
IZ	28	1	Ins.	BA	Novice	Literature

To categorize the participants as novice and expert, Yazdanmehr, Akbari, Kiani, and Ghafar Samar's (2016) model was implemented. In fact, a number of models on teaching expertise have been suggested such as: Dryfus Brothers' model proposed in 1986, Glaser and Chi's introduced in 1988, and finally Bereiter and Scardamalia's model in 1993; nevertheless, each has its own shortcomings. To avoid such flaws, Yazdanmehr et al. presented a framework of teaching expertise in ELT which defines both the "informational and behavioral features of expertise and [*sic*] explores interrelationship [*sic*] between and among [*sic*] these features and [*sic*] how [*sic*] they directly or indirectly contribute to the latent variable, expertise" (p. 632). Yazdanmehr et al. (2016) described the merits of the proposed model. This model refuted the "intuition based characteristics' [*sic*] of expert teachers noted in the [*sic*] previous models" (p. 632). Furthermore, the model unlike the previous ones which showed up some static features, illustrates the mutual interactions between the features. The other feature of this model is its focus on teaching in general, not on language teaching. In spite of the fact that the previously known models were totally based on the comparison between novices and experts, the proposed model by Yazdanmehr et al. (2016) revealed how an

expert becomes what he/she is through revealing the underlying relationship between the factors. The 8 factors which were taken from the recent studies and what the interviewees' stated include: "teacher's language proficiency, pedagogical content knowledge, social recognition, cognitive skills, experience, professional development, contextual knowledge, and learner-centered teaching" (p. 631). These factors are regarded as the main components of teaching expertise in language teaching.

Based on the scant literature review, the subcomponents of each of these constituents are enumerated by Yazdanmehr et al. and the specifications are mentioned in detail. Based on these subcomponents, a checklist of teachers' expertise was made by the present researchers and used in classroom observations to determine the participants' level of expertise and categorize them into the novice and expert groups.

3.2. The site of the study

To investigate teachers' beliefs, Fasa University Language Center (FULC) was purposively chosen as the site of the study. FULC was established in 2014 as a language learning institute, teaching English, Arabic, French and German. Adult language learning applicants, above 18 years old, and of both genders, can register in different levels of the language learning classes based on the oral placement tests given at the beginning of each term. The thirteen teachers working in this institute have mostly completed their studies in language majors. Classes are held three sessions a week, and each session lasts one hour and a half. The American English File series is taught in English classes.

The purpose of choosing this context as the site of research is twofold. Firstly, the lead researcher was the administrator of the institute and was able to hold workshops, seminars, interview sessions, and class observations whenever needed. Secondly, he was familiar with the teaching behavior of teachers and their socioeconomic statuses. Moreover, the teachers in this institute passed their training course with him, and their classes were observed several times by him. All in all, the research was carried out in a natural setting, and there was no attempt by the investigators to control extraneous influences. In fact, the phenomenon under study was observed and described as it occurred.

3.3. Role of the researcher

The researcher as an observer has an important role in the phenomenon being studied because, in order to understand the personal meanings and subjective experiences, he/she has to be involved with the teachers and the kind of practices they perform. The researcher attempts to learn the insiders' view of the teachers teaching in the target context.

The role of the researcher was that of a participant as the observer in the first phase of the study which was characterized by a period of intense social interaction between the researchers and the participants. During this period of interaction data were collected in the form of field notes, questionnaire items, and the verbatim transcription of the interviews recorded with the participants. In the second phase of the research, when the researcher was involved with overt observation of the teachers' actual practices, the researcher's role was that of the observer as the participant.

3.4. Data collection

Describing the shifting approaches on teacher education, Kanakri (2017) emphasized the qualitatively oriented approach to the study of teachers' beliefs because of its focus on the in-depth understanding of the participants' perspectives and experiences. Based on the qualitative research methodology, the methods which were utilized in the current study to collect data are enumerated and the detailed explanations are given below.

- Questionnaire administration
- Classroom observation
- Verbal reports through stimulated recall and self-reports
- Follow-up semi-structured interviews

In the first phase of the study, data on teachers' pedagogical beliefs were collected through the administration of the Importance of Pedagogical Knowledge Scale (IPKS) developed by Fives and Buehl (2005). The IPKS implemented in the present study includes a total of 53 items (i.e., Classroom Management and Organization: 9 items; Pedagogy-Assessment: 5 items; Pedagogy-Motivation: 3 items; Pedagogy-Methods and Practices: 7 items; Content Knowledge: 5 items; Pedagogical Content Knowledge: 4 items; Knowledge of Children-Psychology and Development: 5 items; Knowledge of Children-Own Students: 5 items; Importance of Theoretical Knowledge: 5 items; and Importance of Strategies Compared to theory: 5 items).

Based on the categories extracted from the administration of the questionnaire, an observation check list was prepared by the researchers, the teachers' classroom practices were observed, and the related practices were explicated. Classroom observation was done in three sessions for each teacher to ensure the quality of the data collected, as recommended by Bailey and Nunan (2008).

Semi structured in-depth interviews were used to elicit data on teachers' belief categories extracted from the questionnaire. Connelly and Clandinin (1988) and Elbaz (1981) noted that the semi structured interview technique

is frequently used in teacher thinking research and acknowledges the voice of teachers. According to Elbaz (1981) semi structured interview "ensures fidelity of accounts of practice and their rationales" (p. 13). Moreover, in the interview sessions, an attempt was made so that the teachers would have sufficient time and opportunity to think and respond to the questions in detail fully and freely. Interview sessions were held with the teachers to discuss the content of their beliefs and to get beyond their practice by clarifying the areas of discrepancy between their beliefs and practices. This way the researchers could get beyond their viewpoints and elicit their typical practices.

In addition, the extensive notes taken during class observation, the data obtained from the checklist, and the recorded videos were used to stimulate teachers' recall of the classroom events and explain their related beliefs. This was used to help cross-check the in-depth interview data and to remind the teachers of the different aspects of their beliefs and practices. To check the validity of the data and to prevent any possible inconsistencies between teachers' beliefs and practices because of the shortcomings of measurement through using a single tool, triangulation of the data was employed using multiple sources of data.

3.5. Data analysis

The first phase of data analysis dealt with scoring the Importance of Pedagogical Knowledge Scale (IPKS). According to Fives and Buehl (2005), due to concerns with respect to ceiling effects and variability within the data, we decided to use a nine-point Likert scale with anchor points at the ends (i.e., 1: not important and 9: very important) and in the middle (i.e., somewhat important spanning 4, 5, and 6). Firstly, the items related to each category were detected, the teachers' responses to these items were scored based on the Likert scale, and the mean was assumed as the degree the teachers regarded the related category as "not important" or "very important".

After determining the teachers' beliefs on each category based on the self-reported questionnaire, the teachers' practices were observed in three sessions to see whether the reflection of the beliefs was represented in the teachers' practices. For more scrutiny, some sessions were video recorded. Two observation checklists were also filled out during the class observation, namely the teachers' expertise checklist designed on the basis of Yazdanmehr et al.'s (2016) model and the beliefs representation checklist designed on the basis of the questionnaires' main categories.

The content of the interview sessions was recorded and transcribed for further analysis. The transcriptions were analyzed though a six-phased thematic analysis. According to Braun, Virginia and Clarke (2006), these phases are: familiarization with data, generating initial codes, searching for

themes among codes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report. The generated themes were corresponded to the main categories extracted from the questionnaire items and explained under those categories.

The data obtained from the interviews and classroom observations were coded and condensed into categories through several iterations, as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994). The process of data analysis began from the very first interview session between the lead researcher and the participants. Data generated in each phase, through interviews, observations, or notes taken during the discussion sessions resulted in tentative findings, caused some minor changes for the subsequent observations and data generation. Therefore, the obtained data were adjusted as new data were generated and tested against the emerging themes.

The study used the constant comparative technique which is described by Charmaz (2000) in the following way. The constant comparative technique means (a) comparing different people (such as their views, situations, actions, accounts, and experiences); (b) comparing data from the same individuals with themselves at different points in time; (c) comparing incident with incident; (d) comparing data with category; and (e) comparing a category with other categories (p. 515). Following Charmaz, in each interview session, the focus was on one participant at a time, comparing data taken from the questionnaire with the participants' statements in the interview, and their observed practices in the classroom. The participants' beliefs and practices were compared around the emerging themes and also between the expert and novice teachers. Finally, the emerging themes were compared to the final categories which comprised classroom management and organization, motivation, assessment, and teachers' knowledge.

4. Results and discussion

In this part, first, teachers' practices are described under the rubrics of the categories obtained based on the observation checklist and the questionnaire's principle factors mentioned in the previous section. Next, to report on the mismatches between the teachers' espoused theories and theories in action, their stated beliefs which were extracted based on the responses given to the questionnaire items in addition to the follow up interviews are compared with their classroom practices. Finally, a comparison is made between the beliefs representations of novice and expert teachers and the details are discussed.

Besides qualitative descriptions, to clarify the probable mismatches between teachers' beliefs and practices, the teachers' responses to the questionnaire items are quantified and the percentage of their beliefs is presented. The

percentage is obtained from the mean of the scores teachers assigned to all items related to each category in the questionnaire multiplied by 100. Based on the Likert scale in the questionnaire, up to 33% was regarded as 'not important', between 33% and 66% was assumed as 'somewhat important' and more than 66% was marked as 'very important'. Moreover, teachers' practices were checked based on the observation checklist and the percentage in the table revealed the number of checked cells related to each practice divided by the total number of cells multiplied by 100. For example, based on the questionnaire items related to classroom management and organization, the teachers' practices were observed based on their 'knowledge of how to organize a classroom, matching teaching approaches to students' needs, establishing a classroom management system, maintaining order and control, organizing homework and paper work, managing class time, having a variety of management techniques, and having administrative skills and abilities' in the checklist. When each of these components were observed, they are checked in the checklist.

4.1. Classroom management and organization

In response to the first research question, the discussion begins with novice and experienced teachers' beliefs and practices about the classroom management and organization.

Observing the classroom practices of novice teachers, it was revealed that they believed in classroom management and organization and showed disciplined and organized teaching practices. This point was mostly evident in following the text book task sequence step by step without any change in task designs and sequence. The other commonality among them was that they had established a management system for their learners to check their assignments and presence in the classroom. However, there seemed to be no variety in classroom management system and approach. Therefore, all of the novice teachers paid attention to classroom management and organization in the form of engaging the learners through frequent questioning and doing the text book exercises. With regard to time management, they showed different practices; the common point was that they were not adroit in adjusting the task design to class time. For example, IZ was very hasty in doing the task, which led to much misunderstanding on the part of the learners, while TA was so slow that he could not cover all the activities and the paper works. Based on their self-reported beliefs extracted from the questionnaire items, these novice teachers valued classroom management and organization as a very important factor (79%); however, it was not in line with their management practices.

With regard to the experienced teachers, it can be concluded that they were

all flexible in following the text book procedure and adjusted the activities based on what was done and the learners' characteristics and reactions. The learning tasks they employed were both aimed for learners' engagement and class management and also for their proficiency improvements. One of the signs of flexibility was evident in class atmosphere. As it was seen in the teaching practices of SH, BAZ and PAK, students were free to discuss their ideas, commented on the topics discussed, and used their personal experiences to elaborate on their ideas, while the teachers used learners' performances to inform their own instructions. The pace of teaching practice and class time was adjusted based on the learners' understanding of the teaching points. As it can be seen in table 2, for the expert teachers, there seems to be no discrepancy between their beliefs and practices. Their beliefs in classroom management were 90 percent and 85 percent of their beliefs is actualized in practice.

Table 2
The Percentages of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices on Classroom Management and Organization

	Novice					Expert				
	TA	IZ	BA	DI	Mean	PA	BAZ	GH	SH	Mean
Beliefs	52	77	89	98	79	93	90	92	88	90.75
Practices	22	44	77	44	46.75	89	85	90	77	85.25

Classroom management has been referred to as one of the problematic areas for novice teachers by many authors (Bruneau, Niles, Slanina & Dunlap, 1993; Daloğlu, 2002; Freiberg, 2002; Martin & Baldwin, 1996; Mastrilli & Sardo-Brown, 2002). In line with what Freiberg (2002) and Sekulić (2014) claimed, one of the main features of novice teachers' classroom management as was seen in this study is their inability to employ multiple management techniques in the classroom.

The other sharp distinction between novices' and experts' classroom management skills in this study was the experts' flexibility in managing the learners and making use of the classroom events to boost teaching effectiveness. As Tsui (2003) noted, the experts are capable enough in changing the plan and the general direction of the classroom to achieve their goals and are more prepared to respond to classroom events. As Tsui (2003) stated, expert teachers are "more responsive to contextual cues, and much more ready to make changes to their plans accordingly" (p. 29). Tsui enumerated four characteristics of expert and novice teachers in preactive teaching: autonomy, automaticity and effortlessness, flexibility, and selectivity. Based on what was inferred from the interviews and discussion sessions with the teachers, the expert teachers in this study had more autonomy and

confidence in their own planning and did not follow the text book procedure exactly, while the novices followed the text book task sequence and did not adjust the task sequence to learners' characteristics and classroom events. Along the same lines, Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) point out that, novice teachers do not take into account the contextual factors which affect their lesson planning. The experts' autonomy and confidence in classroom management can be also related to the second characteristic, i.e., automaticity and effortlessness. According to Tsui (2003), since expert teachers can "rely on routinized behavior and what normally works, especially if they are planning for something that they have taught before" (p. 29), they could manage the class differently from the novices. Moreover, because of being selective, the experts can attend to more important events. Attending to irrelevant and less important issues was evident in TA's teaching practice with a very slow pace of teaching.

The other difference regarding classroom management and organization lies in the way the novice and the expert teachers defined management. During the follow-up interview and discussion sessions, it was revealed that novices referred to classroom management as maintaining discipline. By discipline they meant 'observing order and keeping everything under control' as mentioned by BA and IZ. Likewise, Burden (1995) defined discipline as the teachers' ability in establishing order in class when students' misbehaviors are seen, and their actions deter others' learning whereby causing insecure conditions. However, classroom management conveys a broader concept than maintaining discipline. As Martin (1995) puts it, classroom management covers all the attempts made by the teacher to supervise students' learning, interaction, behavior, and discipline in the classroom.

In contrast, for the experienced teachers, classroom management was conceptualized differently. According to Brophy (1988), Doyle (1990), and Woolfolk-Hoy and Weinstein (2006), classroom management includes, but is not defined by, discipline. For them the qualities of learners' engagement, the way they respond to the teachers' prompts which improve their learning were of utmost importance. This justified what was concluded by Copeland, Birmingham, DeMeulle, D'Emidio-Caston, and Natal (1994) and Wolff, van den Bogert, Jarodzka, and Boshuizen (2015). Likewise, Nunan (1990, as cited in Borg, 2011) suggested that in contrast to novice teachers who were more concerned with classroom management, experienced teachers had automatized their management routines and thus paid more attention to language issues in class. For example, PA believed that in her classroom management was observed in terms of the learners' engagement in the learning task. Moreover, BAZ and GH designed the tasks in such a way as to prompt the learners to participate in the discussions and consequently being involved in the learning process.

4.2. Pedagogy-assessment

The second research question dealt with the teachers' beliefs and knowledge about language assessment and their practices in creating classroom assessments, using these assessments to inform instruction, and their understanding of standardized testing. Through their responses to the questionnaire items, it was inferred that knowledge of assessment was perceived as a very important requisite for language teachers, although in the interview sessions it was detected that none of the teachers had the technical knowledge of language testing in terms of theories and practices. As it is shown in Table 3, although the novice teachers highly believed in language assessment (77%), they could actualize a small amount of their beliefs (25%). However, for the expert teachers, there seems to be no discrepancy between their beliefs and practices.

Table 3
Percentages of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices on Language Assessment

	Novice					Expert				
	TA	IZ	BA	DI	Mean	PA	BAZ	GH	SH	Mean
Beliefs	58	75	78	97	77	88	80	66	86	80
Practices	40	20	20	20	25	60	85	90	100	83.75

In novice teachers' practice, it was seen that much of the learners' evaluation was done through their responses to the grammatical exercises, the typical questioning used about the topics, and final examinations. In fact, no variety was seen in their assessment practices and they evaluated the learners' language skills discretely. For instance, TA and DI focused more on speaking skills and ignored learners' performance on other skills. Similarly, BA and IZ judged the learners' progress based on their final examination scores.

However, the experts' assessment practices were varied and geared to learners' educational level. Although they did not have exact knowledge of recent approaches to language testing such as dynamic assessment, they were familiar with the practical side of creating and designing language tests because of their experience as teachers and educational managers in language institutes. BAZ and SH had experience of selecting an appropriate test for the learners from the test banks available in language institutes, and of designing general language proficiency tests in the context of university. They regarded learners' language proficiency in a holistic way and tried to evaluate their students based on their classroom performance and through the interactions they had with other students. They assessed learners' comprehension and progress through various techniques.

Along the same lines, Hogan and Rabinowitz (2003) noted that the expert

teachers are better equipped than novices at selecting and diversifying strategies to assess learners' knowledge of a given topic. Also the results of the present study highlighted the findings of Housner and Griffey (1985) according to which the experts are more adroit in assessing the learners to inform the type of instruction they want to perform. Likewise, Schempp, Tan, Manross and Fincher (1998) investigated the knowledge differences between competent and novice teachers and concluded that competent teachers are more able to assess students' knowledge and learning difficulties.

4.3. Pedagogy-motivation

The third research question considered novice and expert teachers' pedagogical beliefs and practices on employing motivational strategies. Although the close relationship between teachers' beliefs in motivating the learners and their actual use of motivational strategies in their practice has been mentioned frequently in the literature (Brown, 2001; Chambers, 1999; Dörnyei, 2001; Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998), in this study it was noticed that for most participants, especially the novices, there was no relationship between teachers' beliefs in motivating the learners and their practices. All of the teachers regarded employing motivational strategies as a very important component of their teaching beliefs and mentioned that they had known the different motivational strategies and practices to engage and motivate the learners, but it was totally different in practice. This can be seen in Table 4 (below), where it is shown that both the novice and expert teachers highly believed in motivation, while the novices could put 33% of their beliefs into practice. However, the expert teachers, except for PA, could put their beliefs into practice to a great extent.

Table 4
Percentages of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices on Motivational Strategies

	Novice					Expert				
	TA	IZ	BA	DI	Mean	PA	BAZ	GH	SH	Mean
Beliefs	92	77	78	96	85.7	100	98	85	92	93.75
Practices	33	00	33	66	33	33	90	80	85	72

Observing the teachers' practices, it was seen that there was no common pattern of practice in the novice or the experienced teachers. Considering the novices, IZ and BA were very tough and rigid in maintaining order and doing the tasks. They did not praise the learners' progress, and no encouraging feedback was detected. However, it was frequently seen that DI and TA motivated the learners explicitly by admiring their progress, comparing them with learners in other classes, and promising them awards in response to their improvements. Moreover, they created a warm atmosphere in the

classroom, and the learners felt comfortable enough to talk about their personal experiences. Likewise, the experienced teachers did not represent a unified type of practice in terms of motivational strategies. When PA was interrogated about the lack of motivational strategies in the interview session, she acknowledged her lack of knowledge in this specific domain although she thought that "[her] specific way of teaching absorbs the learners and may motivate them." On the other hand, in SH, GH, and BAZ classes motivational strategies were abundantly seen. In addition to creating a relaxed atmosphere in the classroom, giving encouraging feedback, and praising the learners' progress, the experienced teachers tried to foster learners' autonomy, and personalized the learning processes by putting much of the burden on the learners' shoulders. As reported earlier, much of the designed instructional tasks focused on familiarizing the learners with the target language culture.

In addition, it can be concluded that the ways the two mentioned novice teachers and the three experienced ones motivated the learners were different. Novices focused on motivating the learners explicitly and verbally while the experienced teachers tried to do that through learning tasks by creating a learning environment, promoting autonomy in the learners, and adjusting the motivational strategies to learners' characteristics. This supports the findings by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) and Hsu (2009). Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) suggested that "language teachers' motivational practice is linked to increased levels of the learners' motivated learning behaviors as well as their motivational state" (p. 55). Also, Hsu (2009) concluded that experienced teachers knew better which strategies were more suitable for their students because they could easily understand students' abilities and needs based on their experiences. Moreover, all the strategies employed by both groups of teachers were included in the motivational macro strategies formulated by Dörnyei and Csizér (1998).

Moreover, the findings of the present study supported the results of the study done by Solak and Bayar (2014) who explored the main variables influencing the motivational strategies used by non-native English teachers in Turkish context. They concluded that English teachers used each motivational strategy more than average, and that there was no significant difference between motivational strategy use, gender, and years of experience.

The results presented here partially question what Sekulić (2014) concluded. Sekulić focused on the belief patterns of a novice and an experienced EFL teacher about employing motivational strategies. The results of the study indicated that the novice teacher used all four types of motivational strategies which include "creating the basic motivational conditions, generating initial motivation, maintaining and protecting motivation and encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation" (p.1) more than the experienced teacher.

4.4. Teachers' knowledge

4.4.1. Content knowledge

In this study the teachers' content knowledge was examined based on their expertise in the subject matters. In the questionnaire, the teachers were asked about their mastery over the content areas they covered in the classroom, and their knowledge of the overall structure and make-up of the subject area was observed in practice.

Table 5
Percentages of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices on Content Knowledge

	Novice					Expert				
	TA	IZ	BA	DI	Mean	PA	BAZ	GH	SH	Mean
Beliefs	65	73	67	93	74.5	88	90	88	92	89.5
Practices	80	80	100	60	80	100	90	95	100	96.25

All the novice and expert teachers believed in the importance of content knowledge for a language teacher, and it was seen through observation that all of the teachers presented their expertise in the content they taught. As it can be seen in Table 5, considering content knowledge, there was not much discrepancy between novice and expert teachers' beliefs and practices. Through classroom observation, it was determined that both novice and expert teachers possessed the necessary content knowledge and had the required mastery over the contents they taught. The findings of the current study are in line with that of Aubrey's (1999) which concluded that the development of teachers' subject matter knowledge does not occur in the teaching process, and teachers' experience does not lead to higher knowledge of content. Similarly, Ibrahim, Surif, Abdullah, and Sabtu (2014) concluded that both expert and novice science lecturers possess knowledge of the content they present in the classroom.

Considering the differences between expert and novice teachers' content knowledge gleaned from the literature, Borg (2003) enumerated teachers' experience as influential in teachers' content knowledge. Moreover, Glaser and Chi (1988) maintained that the experts know more things about a particular topic than non-experts, and the experts' knowledge is structured in sophisticated, complex hierarchies that lead to easy and economical recall and application. However, the novices' knowledge structures are described by Glaser and Chi (1988) as fragmented and incomplete, usually lacking the linkages between various concepts and elements.

4.4.2. Pedagogical content knowledge (PCK)

In our study, based on the literature and the model presented by

Yazdanemehr et al. (2016), different topics were regarded as the components of PCK, both in the questionnaire and the observation check list. The teachers' PCK was checked and evaluated based on their knowledge of instructional methods for the specific content area and their awareness of the teaching techniques that are unique to each subject as well as their knowledge of psychology and theoretical knowledge.

Table 6
Quantification of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices on Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Its Subcomponents

	Novice					Expert				
	TA	IZ	BA	DI	Mean	PA	BAZ	GH	SH	Mean
Beliefs	56	78	70	94	74.5	83	91	97	95	91
Practices	20	25	75	25	36.25	87	80	85	90	85.5

Considering the participants of the present study, all of the teachers marked the questionnaire items on pedagogical content knowledge as a very important type of knowledge for language teachers. As it can be seen in Table 6, the novice and expert teachers highly believed in PCK (novices=74%, experts=91%). In the interview session, they referred to their competency in adopting various instructional methodologies in relation to the specific content areas. However, it was found through several classroom observations that in practice there seemed to be a difference between the performance of novice and expert teachers. Moreover, it was revealed practically that there was a discrepancy between the novice teachers' beliefs and practices. The novice teachers could actualize 36% of their beliefs; for the expert teachers, there seemed to be no discrepancy between their beliefs and practices.

The classroom practice of expert and novice teachers, considering the instructional strategies they employed, was quite different. The expert teachers were able to implement practical instructional strategies in accordance with specific content areas. Their teaching practices were different in teaching the reading section compared to the grammar section or the vocabulary part. Their practices were also observed when they had to teach the same content to different learners in different classes. There, based on the learners' characteristics and proficiency levels, different ways of content presentation were observed. This was mostly evident in the practice of PA, BAZ and GH. The expert teachers were aware of the difficulty level of each content area and the complexity of each topic and adopted the suitable teaching techniques. They were aware of the merits and demerits of different teaching methodologies regarding different contents and learners. This was due to their experience of teaching in different institutional contexts. For example, BAZ, SH and PA had the experience of teaching in two institutes with

different teaching approaches, and also that of the university context. GH also stated that he had taught in four different institutional contexts since the beginning of his teaching profession.

On the other hand, it was observed that novice teachers made use of the same teaching methodology all over their class time. The same teacher-fronted and lecture-based explanations were applied in teaching new words, grammatical points, reading passages, and listening sections. They did not consider the features of any content, and the same routines were followed. This was due to the fact that they were not aware of the existence of different methodological strategies; this was detected in the interview sessions with IZ, DI, and TA. It should be noted that BA presented a teaching practice similar to that of experts considering the components of PCK.

The findings of the present study support Wolff, Jarodzka, and Boshuizen (2017) who believe that experts use their elaborate knowledge of classroom events and situations to interpret the complexities of the events and choose suitable instructional strategies. In contrast, the novices possess "limited, less elaborate knowledge, and attend to classroom events with less interconnectedness and coherency" (p. 295). Likewise, Bromme (2001), Doyle (1990) and Eraut (2007) considered teachers' classroom experience as the main factor in teachers' PCK to determine the instructional methods appropriate to the course content and classroom events. Moreover, Boshuizen and Schmidt (2008) and Carter (1994) declared that expert teachers are more aware of problematic classroom situations and are more capable than novices to tailor appropriate teaching techniques to each problem.

In contrast to the obtained results, Khalaj (2010) concluded that, in the context of teacher education in Iran, novice and experienced teachers were to a large extent similar to each other in terms of major PK categories; however, there were differences both in the number and particularly the order of the precepts experienced and novice teachers believed in.

4.4.2.1. Teachers' knowledge of psychology

All the teachers including the novice and the experts believed that the knowledge of psychology with regard to learners' typical development is very important for a language teacher. Throughout the interview sessions, they insisted that they know how to take the individual characteristics of the learners into consideration while teaching them, and claimed that they were aware of the psychological development each person may be going through. However, when their practices were observed, and when they were interviewed about their learners' learning characteristics and styles, different results were obtained.

In the interview sessions, the novices were found not to have any information about typical and atypical psychological development and learners' typical learning styles although they had claimed to be aware of learning psychology. Their classroom teaching was confined to the presentation of the content, and to practice over the learners' production; internalization and consolidation of the content did not receive sufficient attention. The learners' characteristics were not taken into account in DI and IZ classes since they did not pay attention to slow learners and those who were not attentive or motivated to participate in class discussions. Lastly, the classroom teaching practices in all of the novices' classes were designed in a formulaic way without considering the learners' understanding, special characteristics, psychological development, and learning styles. In fact, their teaching practices to different learners in different classes were similar.

However, the experts were different in their awareness of affective factors, psychological traits, and learners' learning styles. For instance, because of her interest in psychology, SH was aware of the typical and atypical development of each individual and stated that she had studied numerous articles on educational psychology. GH was curious about learners' learning styles and tried to boost his awareness of multiple learners' styles, and to implement them in his practice. The classroom practice of PA and BAZ showed that they paid attention to learners' characteristics and tried to engage all of the learners' including the slow or the reserved ones. Many learners referred to them for consultation on learning tips and asked about their problems in learning. In accordance with this, Ellis (1985) posited that learners have general factors which are social, cognitive, and affective in nature. He mentioned that the teacher has to evaluate the extent to which these factors are present in learners, and examined the way these are represented in teachers' classroom practices. Likewise, Allami, Jalilifar, Hashemian and Gooniband Shooshtari (2009) believed that effective teachers should prepare learners for their future academic experience and recognize the importance of affective, personal, and social expectations of learning.

Moreover, Gay (2003) asserted that teachers are to be aware of the demographic trends of learners and be aware of the characteristics of diverse learners. The results of this study echo Berliner (1987) who stated that expert teachers do know the cognitive abilities of their students. Diaz, (1997) noted that, to be effective, teachers must master a variety of perspectives and strategies, and be flexible to meet learners' individual variation.

As stated earlier, Knowledge of one's own students deals with teachers' understanding of the cultural background, likes and dislikes, personal experiences, and potentials of the students. All of the teachers believed that it is very important for a language teacher to be familiar with their learners'

socio-cultural, economic and personal background; in practice, however, the novices and the experts did not perform a unified type of practice.

Two of the novice teachers, IZ and BA, did not elicit the learners' background information throughout the tasks, and there was no room for the learners to discuss their personal experiences. On the other hand, three expert teachers, SH, BAZ, and GH, through the discussions they held, became familiar with the learners' background information. Both in the warm up activities in the pre-task phase and in post-task activities, they elicited learners' background information and gave them appropriate prompts to talk about their own memories and ideas. They designed the tasks in accordance with their likes and dislikes, and for the discussion parts they posed the topics relevant to the learners' cultural and social background. For example, in doing grammar exercises, GH asked the learners to make real sentences about themselves. Likewise, considering the learners' background information, BAZ declared that "I took all these details into consideration even when asking general questions, for instance when I know [*sic*] that a learner's father had died I would never talk [*sic*] about the fathers' day [*sic*]."

However, PA who was regarded as an expert did not take into account the learners' background information, and she had not been inclined to know about the learners' socio-economic background. Also, TA and DI who were regarded as novice teachers revealed a teaching practice similar to that of the expert teachers.

The results of the present study support those of Berliner (1987; 1994a; 1994b) who found that expert teachers were more sensitive to task demands and social situations, and that due to their experience, they were more opportunistic and flexible in their teaching and did know how to match their teaching practice to their learners' personal background—while novices did not. Similarly, Wiseman, Cooner and Knight (1999) characterize effective teachers as those recognizing differences among their learners and having the capacity and willingness to understand the impact of dissimilar backgrounds and abilities on learning. Richards and Farrell (2005), too, mentioned that expert teachers have a deeper understanding of students' needs and learning and a greater awareness of the learning context. According to Miller (2009) and Rukanuddin, Hafiz, Asfia (2016), expert teachers have much familiarity with the cultural and socio-economic background of learners.

4.4.2.2. Teachers' theoretical knowledge

This category encompasses teachers' knowledge of the theoretical foundations and implications of their teaching practice, their understanding of the theory behind the tricks and strategies they use in the classroom as well as the understanding of why a teaching technique works. Because of the

tacit nature of this type of knowledge, in addition to the questionnaire items, the details of this type of teachers' knowledge were also interrogated in the interview sessions.

Based on the results of the study, all of the novice teachers claimed familiarity with the differences between teaching methodologies and educational theories; however, they were only familiar with the topics, and no deep theoretical knowledge was detected. On the other hand, PA and SH, as the expert teachers, were familiar with the theoretical issues and educational theories because of their interests in the field and the experience they had as the educational managers of the institutes which necessitated designing curriculum and course contents. BA and GH indicated that they were familiar with the theories although it was detected that their knowledge and understanding were gleaned from their experience of teaching different learners in different contexts.

The practical side of teachers' theoretical knowledge was examined based on the observation of the teachers' abilities to teach the learning strategies and their ability to focus on the practical applications of educational theories. Based on the classroom observations, it was noticed that the novice teachers did not teach the learning strategies explicitly. However, the expert teachers were aware of teaching and learning strategies based on their experience and the contents they had studied. PA was very skilled in using the strategies in a scenario to present the new topics which made the learners internalize the learning strategies. Moreover, observation showed that SH was able to teach by fostering learners' autonomy through teaching the learning strategies explicitly, specifically the reading comprehension strategies.

What was discussed lends support to Housner and Griffey's (1985) claim that experts plan more strategies to teach a specific skill than novices. Shulman (1987) mentioned that teachers must have knowledge of specific strategies that can be used to address learners' needs in particular classroom circumstances. It was emphasized that the PCK cannot be reduced to sets of facts or isolated propositions but reflects the contexts of applicability. Also it was added that, teachers' expertise resides in the interaction between disciplinary knowledge and general pedagogical knowledge.

4.4.3. Pedagogical Knowledge

All the teachers, both novices and experts, believed in the importance of pedagogical knowledge. In their responses to the questionnaire items, they regarded the items related to this category as very important, as it is displayed in Table 7. Moreover, in the follow-up interview they unanimously considered mastery over these domains as a necessity for a language teacher. In practice, however, it was observed that they did not have the necessary

capability and experience for putting their beliefs into practice. The novices could actualize 52% of their beliefs while the experts were able to put almost all of their beliefs into practice and actualized 96% of their beliefs.

Table 7
Percentages of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices on Pedagogical Knowledge

	Novice					Expert				
	TA	IZ	BA	DI	Mean	PA	BAZ	GH	SH	Mean
Beliefs	65	73	67	93	74.5	88	90	88	92	89.5
Practices	35	40	75	60	52.5	100	90	95	100	96.25

Considering instructional practices and methodological issues, the novice teachers were somehow different from the expert teachers, and they were also different from each other in specific points. Although they passed the training courses and attended the workshops and seminars presented in FULC, in which a large number of teaching techniques was taught, no variety was seen in the presentation phase of the lesson. In teaching the new words, mere explanation of the meanings and sometimes direct translation into the learners' mother tongue were seen. The materials were presented in a lecture-based and teacher-fronted way and therefore no multiple ways of teaching was detected. In teaching grammar, they taught the grammatical points deductively, and the interactions were mostly teacher to students and teacher initiated. This was mostly evident in IZ, DI, and TA's classroom practices. Therefore, they could not adjust their teaching approaches to learners' needs. This point was justified when the teaching practices of the same teacher were compared in two classes of the same level with different learners (TA and IZ's classroom practices). They could not activate the learners' background knowledge, and therefore they merely presented the materials and made the learners practice the exercises. The structure of the lessons was fixed in their practice, and the recommended sequences of the text book were followed. In spite of these points, BA showed a markedly different way of presenting the materials, and his teaching practice was similar to that of experts.

On the other hand, experts used prompts, clarification, explanations, contextual clues, modeling, realia, drawings, gestures, synonyms, and antonyms to teach the new words and tried to teach grammatical points inductively in meaningful contexts and through communicative tasks. The tasks were done in the form of pair and group work, and the responsibilities were given based on the learners' characteristics. Monitoring, giving feedback, and error correction were done in due time, and learners' autonomy was encouraged. Most activities were done by the learners, and the interactions were mostly between the learners. For example, in BAZ and SH's class

practices, the learners who were asked to prepare the information made an Internet search about the reading topic. BA, SH, and PA made use of supplementary materials such as story books, audios, text books, and extra reading passages. They changed the text book tasks, omitted some or focused on some others to tailor the learning goals to the learners' needs and potentials. These activities showed that they had mastery over the text book structure and had the knowledge of the instructional strategies.

With respect to adjusting the teaching approaches to the variety of learners and matching them to learners' needs in novice and experienced teachers, Housner and Griffey (1985) contended that in planning the instructional strategies, novices regard the class as a whole as did the participants of this study; they do not take into account the individuality of the learners. On the contrary, experts perceive the classroom as comprised of unique individuals. Moreover, some researchers (e.g., Borko & Livingston, 1989; Borko & Putnum, 1996; Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner, 1988; Leinhardt & Greeno, 1986; Peterson & Comeaux, 1987) have emphasized that experts are more able to help 'individual student learning' occur in the classroom, and to adjust instructional strategies accordingly. Likewise, as AL-Magableh (2010) noted an effective teacher must take into account the social and cultural backgrounds and individual differences of the learners to promote their knowledge. Moreover, the findings of this study confirm the conclusions reached by Sekulić (2014) who differentiates between the practices of novices and experts in adjusting the teaching approaches. Sekulić (2014) maintained that experts are more sensitive to monitoring learners' understanding and noticing their difficulties in the process of learning.

The second point which was overtly distinctive in novice and experts' practices was the variety in the instructional strategies, with the experts being much more adroit at applying various instructional strategies. The results of the present study provide evidence in support of Hogan and Rabinowitz (2003) who contended that expert teachers used different strategies to communicate with their students. Also Erkmen (2014) concluded that the novice teachers focused more on speaking skills and therefore made use of a specified set of tasks which is attributed to the novices' smaller knowledge of instructional strategies in comparison to the experts. Accordingly, Baltus and Belhiah (2013) recommended the explicit instruction of learning strategies to ESL learners which can give them a tool for future learning.

The third point which differentiated the experts from the novices in this study was their different practices in structuring the lessons to promote learning. As discussed, the experts were more capable of adjusting the teaching tasks to learners' needs. Earlier in 1989, Borko and Livingston, exploring the

differences in mathematics instruction in novice and expert teachers, had concluded that the expert teachers were quicker and more efficient in planning the lessons. In the present study, the expert teachers were seen frequently to notice the events happening in the class and to make use of these events to stimulate learners to talk.

In contrast, as stated earlier, the novice teachers followed the text book task sequence closely and did not alter the structure of the lessons based on the classroom events. Borko and Livingston (1989) and Kagan and Tippins (1992) noted that novice teachers are less able to anticipate problems in the classroom and the difficulties that students have in the process of learning, and they are mostly unwilling to change their plans in response to students' cues. As Tsui (2003) mentioned, the reason can be attributed to the fact that novice teachers are usually required to do so in their professional training courses; however, the experts, as Carter, Sabers, Cushing, Pinnegar, and Berliner (1987) argued, are more concerned with the flow of the activities over a period of time, or how to get the classroom to work. In addition, Housner and Griffey (1985) and Borko and Livingston (1989) believed that expert teachers are able to anticipate possible situations in lessons and can alter the plan to deal with these unpredictable situations. In the same line, Carter et al. (1987) believed that the experts have mastery over a host of routines to cope with learners' cues. This can also be explained through the expert teachers' flexibility discussed earlier under the rubric of classroom management (See section 4.1 above).

5. Conclusion

As it was discussed, the categories of pedagogical beliefs of novice and expert teachers were not of a unified pattern and there were mismatches between their pedagogical beliefs and their actual teaching practices. As it is illustrated in table 8, there were mismatches between novice and experienced teachers' beliefs and their teaching practices in classroom management and organization, language assessment, employing motivational strategies, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge. However, there was almost no discrepancy between teachers' beliefs and practices considering their content knowledge.

The findings of this study can be integrated into the structure of teacher preparation programs. These programs should provide suitable chances for pre-service and in-service teachers to examine their beliefs as they related to their practices. Engaging teacher candidates and in-service teachers in sharing their beliefs may be a useful tool for developing reflective practice, learning to teach different groups of learners, and developing commitment to lifelong learning. The results of the present study further imply that teachers

may professionally develop when they become aware of the mismatches between their belief system and their actual classroom practices; being made aware of their potentials, teachers can improve their practices and align them to their own beliefs system to become effective teachers. The identification of mismatches between teachers' beliefs and practices may also help teachers gain awareness of other teachers' beliefs and attitudes and consequently use this knowledge to make progress in their professional growth which can also be beneficial for their students.

Table 8
The Summary of the Mismatches Between Teachers' Beliefs and Practices

		teachers' beliefs	Practice
Management	Novice	79	46.7
	Expert	90.7	85.2
Assessment	Novice	77	25
	Expert	80	83.7
Motivation	Novice	85.5	33
	Expert	93.7	72
Content knowledge	Novice	74	80
	Expert	89.5	96.2
PCK	Novice	74.5	36.2
	Expert	91.5	85.5
Pedagogical knowledge	Novice	83.5	46.2
	Expert	93.7	94.2

Acknowledgments

We, hereby, acknowledge the role of Shiraz University for providing us with the educational and research means to support this project as a part of a PhD dissertation.

The Authors

Saeed Mehrpour (Email: smehrpur@rose.shirazu.ac.ir) is Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics/TESOL at the Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

Meisam Moghaddam (Email: moghaddam.m@fasau.ac.ir) is a PhD candidate in Applied Linguistics/TESOL at the Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

References

Akbari, R., & Dadvand B. (2014). Pedagogical knowledge base: A conceptual framework for teacher admission. *System, 42,* 12-22.

Allami, H., Jalilifar, A. R., Hashemian, M., & Gooniband Shooshtari, Z. (2009). Are Iranian school students' language needs taken into consideration? *Iranian Journal of Language Studies, 3*(1), 125-142.

AL-Magableh, A. M. F. (2010). An evaluation of English practicum at Yarmouk university from cooperative teachers and student-teachers' perspectives. *International Journal of Language Studies, 4*(4), 19-56.

Baltus, R., & Belhiah, H. (2013). Teaching practices of ESL teachers in Ontario. *International Journal of Language Studies, 7*(3), 109-138.

Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics, 25,* 243-272.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1993). *Surpassing ourselves: An inquiry into the nature and implications of expertise.* Chicago, IL: Open Court.

Berliner, D. C. (1987). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. *Educational Researcher, 15*, 5-13.

Berliner, D. C. (1994a). Expertise: The wonders of exemplary Performance. In C. Collins Block, J. N. Mangieri & H. Barnes (Eds.), *Creating powerful thinking in teachers and students* (pp. 141-186). Ft. Worth, TX. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Berliner, D. C. (1994b). Teacher expertise. In T. Husèn & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of education* (2nd ed.) (vol. 10, pp. 6020- 6026). London. Pergamon.

Borg, S. (1999). Teachers' theories in grammar teaching. *English Language Teaching Journal, 53,* 157-167.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe and do. *Language Teaching, 36*, 81-109.

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education*: *Research and practice*. London: Continuum.

Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System, 39*, 370-380.

Borko, H., & Linvingstone, C. (1989). Cognition and improvisation: Differences in mathematics instruction by expert and novice teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 26*(4), 473-498.

Borko, H., & Putnum, R. T. (1996). Learning to teach. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 673-707). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Boshuizen, H. P. A., & Schmidt, H. G. (2008). The development of clinical reasoning expertise: Implications for teaching. In J. Higgs, M. Jones, S. Loftus & N. Christensen (Eds.), *Clinical reasoning in the health professions* (3rd ed., pp. 113-121). Amsterdam: Butterworth Heinemann.

Breen, M. P., Hird, B., Milton, M., Oliver, R., & Thwaite, A. (2001). Making sense of language teaching: Teachers' principles and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics, 22*, 470-501.

Bromme, R. (2001). Teacher expertise. In N. Smelser & P. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the behavioral sciences* (pp. 15459–15465). London: Pergamon.

Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*(1), 1-18.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1986). Teacher behaviors and student achievement. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 328-375). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bruneau, B., Niles, K., Slanina, A., & Dunlap, K. (1993). Exploring preservice students' perceptions of literacy instruction: Listening to students [electronic version]. Paper presented at *The Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference*, Charleston, SC.

Burden, P. R. (1995). *Classroom management and discipline: Methods to facilitate cooperation and instruction.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Carter, K. (1994). Preservice teachers' well-remembered events and the acquisition of event-structured knowledge. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 26*(3), 235-252.

Carter, K., Cushing, K., Sabers, D. S., Stein, P., & Berliner, D. (1988). Expert-novice differences in perceiving and processing visual stimuli. *Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 25-31.

Carter, K., Sabers, D. S., Cushing, K. S., Pinnegar, S., & Berliner, D. C. (1987). Processing and using information about students: A study of expert, novice and postulant teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 3*, 147-157.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Constructivist and objectivist grounded theory. In N. K. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 509–535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cheng, H. F., & Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 1*(1), 153-174.

Chou, Y. (2008). Exploring the reflection of teachers' beliefs about reading theories and strategies on their classroom practices. *Fengchia Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 16,* 183-216.

Clark, C., & Peterson, P. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook on research in teaching* (pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Copeland, W. D., Birmingham, C., DeMeulle, L., D'Emidio-Caston, M., & Natal, D. (1994). Making meaning in classrooms: An investigation of cognitive processes in aspiring teachers, experienced teachers, and their peers. *American Educational Research Journal, 31*(1), 166-196.

Daloğlu, E. M. (2002). *Teacher perceptions on classroom management in teaching English as a foreign language* (Unpublished master's thesis). Uludağ Üniversitesi, Bursa, Türkiye.

Davis, M., & Wilson, E. (1999). A little teachers' beliefs, decision-making, and instruction at the third and seventh grade levels. *Reading Research and Instruction, 38*(4), 290-299.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research, 2,* 203-229.

Doyle, W. (1990). Classroom knowledge as a foundation of teaching. *Teachers College Record, 91*(3), 347–360.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Dreyfus, S. E. (1986). *Mind over machine*. New York: Free Press.

Elbaz, F. (1981). The teacher's "practical knowledge": Report of a case study. *Curriculum Inquiry, 11*, 43-71.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eraut, M. (2007). Learning from other people in the workplace. *Oxford Review of Education, 33*(4), 403-422.

Erkmen, B. (2014). Novice EFL teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning and their classroom practices. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 29*(1), 99-113.

Ernest, P. (1988). The impact of beliefs on the teaching of mathematics. Paper presented at *6th International Congress of Mathematical Education*, Budapest, Hungary.

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Pedagogical Research, 38*(1), 47-65.

Farrow, K. (1999). *The relationship of science teachers' beliefs to their classroom strategies* (Unpublished Master Thesis). Queen's University at Kingston, Canada.

Freiberg, H. J. (2002). Essential skills for new teachers. *Educational Leadership, 59*, 56-61.

Gabillon, Z. (2013). A synopsis of L2 teacher beliefs research. Paper presented at *Belgrade International conference on education*, Belgrade, Serbia.

Galton, M., & Simon, P. (1980). *Inside the primary classroom*. London: Routledge and Kagan Paul.

Gatbonton, E. (1999). Investigating experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *The Modern Language Journal, 83*, 35-50.

Gatbonton, E. (2008). Looking beyond teachers' classroom behavior: Novice and experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(2), 161-182.

Glaser, R., & Chi, M. (1988). Overview. In: M. Chi, R. Glaser & M. Farr (Eds.), *The nature of expertise* (pp. 311–342). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Guilloteaux, M. J. (2007). *Motivating language learners: A classroom oriented investigation of teachers' motivational practice and students' motivation* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Nottingham, UK.

Handal, B., & Herrington, A. (2003). Mathematics teachers' beliefs and curriculum reform. *Mathematics Education Research Journal, 15*(1), 59-69.

Hogan, T., & Rabinowitz, M. (2003). Problem representation in teaching: Inferences from research of expert and novice teachers. *Educational Psychologist, 38*(4), 235-247.

Housner, L. D., & Griffey, D. C. (1985). Teacher cognition: Differences in planning and interactive decision-making between experienced and inexperienced teachers. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 56*, 45-53.

Hsu, R. J. (2009). *Investigating novice and experienced teachers' motivational strategies use in secondary EFL setting in Taiwan* (Master's thesis). Ming Chuan University, Taiwan.

Huberman, M. (1993). *The lives of teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ibrahim, N., Abdullah, A., Surif, J., & Sabtu, N. (2014). Comparison of pedagogical content knowledge between expert and novice lecturers in teaching and learning process. *International Conference on Teaching and Learning in Computing and Engineering*, *53*. Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Johnson, K. E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 24*(1), 83-108.

Kagan, D., & Tippins, T. (1992). Implications of research on teacher beliefs. *Educational Psychologist, 27*(1), 65-90.

Kanakri, A. (2017). Second language teacher education: Preparing teachers for the needs of second language learners. *International Journal of Language Studies, 11*(1), 63-94.

Kennedy, C., & Kennedy, J. (1996). Teacher attitude and change implementation. *System, 24*, 351-360.

Khader, F. R. (2012). Pedagogical beliefs and actual classroom practices in social studies instruction. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 2*(1), 73-92.

Khalaj, S. (2010). *A comparison of novice and experienced EFL teachers' pedagogical knowledge in Iran* (MA Thesis). Mazandaran University, Sari, Iran.

King, E. (2002). Science teachers' belief about teaching and reform: Case studies from a restructured high school (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Georgia State University, USA.

Leinhardt, G. (1988). Situated knowledge and expertise in teaching. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Teachers' professional learning* (pp. 146–168). London: Falmer Press.

Martin, N. (1995). Beliefs regarding classroom management style: Relationships to particular teacher personality characteristics. Paper presented at the *Annual Conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association*, San Antonio, TX: USA.

Martin, N. K., & Baldwin, B. (1996). Helping beginning teachers foster healthy classroom management: Implications for elementary school counselors. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 31*, 106-114.

Mastrilli, T., & Sardo-Brown, D. (2002). Novice teachers' cases: A vehicle for reflective practice. *Education, 123*, 56-63.

Mehrpour, S., & Mirsanjari, Z. (2016). Investigating the manifestation of teaching expertise feature among novice and experienced EFL teachers. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 18*, 168-197.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mullock, B. (2006). The pedagogical knowledge base of four TESOL teachers. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*, 48-66.

Nunan, D., & Bailey, K. M. (2008). *Exploring second language classroom research: A comprehensive guide.* Boston, MA: Heinle.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Journal of Educational Research, 62*, 307-332.

Peterson, P. L., & Comeaux, M. A. (1987). Teachers' schemata for classroom events: The mental scaffolding of teachers' thinking during classroom instruction. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 3,* 319-331.

Rahman, F., Scaife, J., Yahya, N., & Jalil, H. (2010). Knowledge of diverse learners: Implications for the practice of teaching. *International Journal of Instruction, 3*(2), 83-96.

Reynolds, D., & Muijs, D. (2001). Being or doing: The role of teacher behaviors and beliefs in school and teacher effectiveness in mathematics, a SEM analysis. Presented at *The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, Seattle, WA.

Richardson, V., Andres, P., Tidwell, D., & Lloyd, C. (1991). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in reading comprehension instruction. *American Educational Research Journal, 28*, 559-586.

Rukanuddin, M., Hafiz, K., & Asfia, R. (2016). Knowledge of individual differences of the learners of second language enriches second language teaching. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics, 19*, 11-15.

Schempp, P., Tan, S., Manross, D., & Fincher, M. (1998). Differences in novice and competent teachers' knowledge. *Teachers and Teaching, 4*(1), 9-20.

Sekulić, M. (2014). Motivational strategies of novice and experienced EFL teachers (Unpublished PhD dissertation). University of Zagreb, Croatia.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*, 1-22.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher, 15*, 4-14.

Solak, E., & Bayar, B. (2014). The factors influencing the motivational strategy use of nonnative English teachers. *International journal of education and research, 2,* 1-12.

Thompson, A. G. (1992). Teacher's beliefs and conceptions: A synthesis of research. In D. A. Grows (Ed.), *Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 127-146). New York: Macmillan.

Tobin, K., Tippins, D. J., & Gallard, A. J. (1994). Research on instructional strategies for teaching science. In D. L. Gabel (Ed.), *Handbook of research on science teaching and learning* (pp. 45-93). New York: Macmillan.

Trigwell, K., & Prosser, M. (1996). Congruence between intention and strategy in university science teachers' approaches to teaching. *Higher Education, 32*, 77-87.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783-805.

Tsui, A. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of ESL teachers.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tsui, A. B. M. (2005). Expertise in teaching: Perspectives and issues. In K. Johnson (Ed.), *Expertise in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 167-189). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Varella, G. (1997). The relationship of science teachers' beliefs and practices (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). The University of Iowa, USA.

Wallace, C., & Kang, N.-H. (2004). An investigation of experienced secondary science teachers' beliefs about inquiry: An examination of competing belief sets. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41*(9), 936–960.

Wang, W. (2006). Exploring teacher beliefs and practice in the implementation of a new English language curriculum in China: Case studies. Presented at the *APERA Conference*, University of Hong Kong.

Wilson, S. M., Shulman, L. S., & Richert, A. E. (1987). 150 different ways of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teaching. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring teacher's thinking* (pp. 104-124) London: Cassell Education.

Wolff, C. E., Jarodzka, H., & Boshuizen, H. P. A. (2017). See and tell: Differences between expert and novice teachers' interpretations of problematic classroom management events. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 66*, 295-308.

Wolff, C. E., van den Bogert, N., Jarodzka, H., & Boshuizen, H. P. A. (2015). Keeping an eye on learning: Differences between expert and novice teachers' representations of classroom management events. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(1), 68-85.

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woolfolk-Hoy, A., & Weinstein, C. (2006). Student and teacher perspectives on classroom management. In C. Evertson & C. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary issues* (pp. 181-219). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Yazdanmehr, E., Akbari, R., Kiani, G., & Ghafar Samar, R. (2016). Proposing a conceptual model for teacher expertise in ELT. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6*(3), 631-641.

Zhang, X. (2017). Exploring a novice Chinese EFL teacher's writing beliefs and practices: A systemic functional perspective. *International Journal of Language Studies, 11*(1), 95-118.