

American University of Armenia
Department of English Programs

A thesis submitted in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in
Teaching English as a Foreign Languages (TEFL)

***Transitioning from Teacher-Centered to Learner-
Centered Approach: Teacher Behavior***

Thesis supervisor: Robert Agajeenian, Ph.D.

Thesis reader: Liliana Edilian

By:

Lusine Nuryan

Yerevan, Armenia

2010

American University of Armenia

We hereby approve that this thesis

By

Lusine Nuryan

Transitioning from Teacher-centered to Learner-centered Approach:

Teacher Behavior

be accepted in partial fulfillment for the requirements of the degree of

M.A. in TEFL

Committee on the Thesis

Robert Agajeenian: Chair

.....

Liliana Edilian: Reader

.....

Hossein Farhady: Associate Dean of DEP

.....

**Yerevan, Armenia
2010**

Dedication

To the memory of my mother

Acknowledgments

Completing a Master's degree is truly an important event, and I would not have been able to complete this journey without the aid and support of countless people. The following thesis benefited from the insights and direction of several people. First, I would like to express my gratitude towards the Associate Dean of the Department of English Programs (DEP), Dr. Hossein Farhady for his support, attention to detail work and his belief in me. It was through his persistence, understanding, kindness and encouragement, that I completed my thesis. He provided insights that guided and challenged my thinking, substantially improving the completed project.

Next, I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Robert Agajeenian for his guidance, support, and comments. His advice and directions helped me a lot while writing my thesis.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my third reader Mrs. Lilianna Edilian for her motivation, support, and the time she devoted to me.

In addition to the instrumental assistance above I received important assistance from family and friends. My husband and my son provided an on-going support throughout the thesis process. I want to thank them for their understanding, patience and love. I would like to thank all my friends who were with me these two years of studies, especially Karine Karapetyan, Naira Stepanyan and Arevik Aboyan for their support and encouraging words.

Finally, I wish to thank all the respondents of my study (who remain anonymous for confidentiality purposes). Their responses created an informative and interesting project with opportunities for future work.

Table of Contents

Dedication	i
Acknowledgments	ii
List of Tables	vi
Abstract.....	vii
Chapter 1: Background and Purpose	1
1.1 Significance of the Study	2
Chapter Two: Review of the Related Literature	3
2.1 Introduction to Literature Review.....	3
2.2 Learner-centered vs. Teacher-centered Approach	3
2.3 Why Learner-Centered Teaching?	10
2.4 Key characteristics of a learner-centered approach	13
2.5 Self-determination Theory and Learner-centered Psychological Principles	14
2.6 Learner-Centered Psychological Principles.....	18
2.6.1 Cognitive and Metacognitive Factors	19
2.6.2 Motivational and Affective Factors	20
2.6.3 Developmental and Social Factors.....	20
2.6.4 Individual Differences Factors.....	21
2.7 Teacher Behavior	21
2.8 Types of Teacher Behavior.....	22
2.8.1 Autonomy Enhancing Behavior.....	22
2.8.2 Autonomy Suppressing Behavior	23

2.8 Students Perception of Teacher Behavior.....	25
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	27
3.1 Introduction.....	27
3.2 Participants and Setting.....	27
3.3 Instrumentation	27
3.3.1 Questionnaire	28
3.3.2 Interview	29
3.4 Procedure	30
3.5 Analysis.....	32
Chapter 4: Results and Discussions	34
4.1 Introduction.....	34
4.2 Analysis of the quantitative data (<i>Students' Questionnaire for Akhuryan High School</i>) ...	34
4.3 Students' Questionnaire (Anania Shirakatsi University).....	38
4.4 Students' Questionnaire (American University of Armenia)	42
4.5 Analysis of the Qualitative Data (<i>Semi-structured Interview</i>).....	45
Chapter 5: Conclusions, Implications, and Suggestions for Further Research	48
5.1 Summary of the Findings.....	48
5.2 Applications and Implications	49
5.3 Limitations and Delimitations.....	50
5.4 Suggestions for Further Research	50
References.....	53
APPENDICES.....	55
Appendix A: Attitudinal Questionnaire for Students (<i>English Version</i>)	55

Appendix B: Attitudinal Questionnaire for Students (<i>Armenian Version</i>).....	57
Appendix C: Final grades of the students (<i>American University of Armenia</i>)	60
Appendix D: Final Grades of the Students (Imastaser Anania Shirakatsi University).....	63
Appendix E: Final Grades of the Students (<i>Akhuryan School</i>).....	65
Appendix F: Questions for Interview (<i>English Version</i>)	67
Appendix G: Questions for Interview (<i>Armenian Version</i>).....	68
Appendix H: Samples of Interview Transcripts.....	70

List of Tables

Table 4-2-1 <i>Pearson’s Correlations between the final grades and the mean scores of seven clusters (Akhuryan High School)</i>	35
Table 4-2-2 <i>Mann - Whitney Tests on comparison of average grades of “agree” and “disagree” student categories defined by different clusters (Akhuryan High School)</i>	36
Table 4-3-1 <i>Pearson’s Correlations between the final grades and the mean scores of seven clusters (Imastaser Anania Shirakatsi University)</i>	39
Table 4-3-2 <i>Mann-Whitney Tests on comparison of average grades of “agree” and “disagree” student categories defined by different clusters (Imastaser Anania Shirakatsi University)</i>	39
Table 4.4.1 <i>Pearson’s Correlations between the final grades and the mean scores of seven clusters (American University of Armenia)</i>	42
Table 4-4-2 <i>Mann - Whitney Tests on comparison of average grades of “agree” and “disagree” student categories defined by different clusters (American University of Armenia)</i>	43

Abstract

Teacher behavior is considered to be an important factor for teaching and learning process. Teacher behavior determines the type of the classroom whether it is teacher-centered or learner-centered. This study was designed to investigate if the students' attitude towards teacher behavior affects their learning achievement in the Armenian EFL classrooms, in order to see if there was a need to shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered classrooms.

The data was collected through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, which served as the basis of the study. The aim of the questionnaire was to reveal the relationship between students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement. The interview was conducted to find out if students' needs are being met in Armenian EFL classrooms.

The findings of the research reveal that students' achievement is positively related to their attitude towards the following types of teacher behavior: *clarity of the explanation of concepts, enthusiasm, encouraging students' participation in class, fostering understanding and interest and providing choice*. Therefore, it can be suggested that there is a need to shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered classrooms in the Armenian EFL setting, particularly emphasizing the above mentioned types of teacher behavior.

Chapter 1: Background and Purpose

In recent decades there has been a noticeable tendency in the field of foreign language teaching to bring about a shift from teacher-centered to the learner-centered approach. Much literature emerged on learner-centered approach and a number of teacher training courses developed as a result, aimed to train and encourage teachers to use learner-centered approach. An examination of the literature on teacher-centered and learner-centered approaches makes it obvious that this tendency of shift brings about considerable changes in the ways of foreign language teaching and learning.

The aim of this research is to reveal the main characteristics of teacher behavior in the teacher-centered classroom and to find out if those characteristics influence students' achievement or not. The questionnaire is used to find out the relationship between students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement. The items included in the questionnaire, are related to teacher's autonomy-enhancing behavior.

Assor (2002) distinguishes three categories of autonomy-enhancing teacher behavior: fostering relevance, providing choice, and allowing criticism and encouraging independent thinking. These three categories (thoroughly discussed in the review of literature), are closely related to learner-centered approach. As described by Tudor (1996):

“Learner-centeredness allocates a central place to learner autonomy, which recognizes the essential role that learners can play in language learning and become full and active participants in the development of pedagogical procedures rather than passive recipients of language teaching. Learner autonomy refers to various forms of independent or self-directed learning. It involves learner awareness of learning goals, participation in decision making, and personal assumption of responsibility”.

1.1. Significance of the Study

The current study can be considered significant for the following reasons: in Armenian educational context, most of the classrooms are teacher-centered; therefore it is important to conduct a research in order to see if there is a need for the shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered approach. The study also tries to show that students will have the opportunity to become more autonomous and self directed learners in a more learner-centered classroom.

The research is directed by the following two research questions:

1. Do teachers' expectations of their own behavior and students' perceptions of the teacher behavior affect student achievement?
2. What is the relationship between students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement?

Chapter Two: Review of the Related Literature

2.1 Introduction to Literature Review

Chapter 2 begins with a general description of the learner-centered and teacher-centered approaches. The essential differences between learner-centered and teacher-centered approaches, suggested by different authors, are presented. Then, the characteristics and the psychological principles of the learner-centered approach are described. Through a detailed discussion of the learner-centered approach the reasons for the transition from the teacher-centered to learner-centered approach are being considered. The chapter ends up with taxonomy of teacher behavior student perceptions of teacher behavior.

2.2 Learner-centered vs. Teacher-centered Approach

Language education has experienced significant changes over the past thirty years. One of the most essential changes is the shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered approach. Altan and Trombly (2001, cited in Brown), offer learner-centeredness as a model, which counters classroom challenges by means of which we can meet the different needs of the learners.

Jones (2007), points out the significant differences between teacher-centered and learner-centered classrooms. According to him, students in the learner-centered classrooms almost do not depend on their teacher, they do not wait for the teacher to give instructions, to correct, to advise or praise as it is done in the teacher-centered classroom. In the learner-centered classroom, students help each other, communicate with each other and cooperate; as

a result they learn from each other. Jones further states that in the learner-centered approach the importance is given to working together, in pairs, and in groups. The teacher is considered to be a facilitator and an assistant for the students in helping them do their activities, and give directions for their learning. The role of the teacher is to help learners to develop their language skills. (Jones, 2007:26).

Jones (2007) also makes a clarification by stating “a learner-centered classroom isn’t a place where the students decide what they want to learn and what they want to do. It’s a place where teachers consider the needs of the students, as a group and as individuals, and encourage them to participate in the learning process all the time” (Jones, 2007:27).

“Being a teacher means helping people to learn” – and, in a learner-centered classroom, Jones compares teacher with a member of the class as a participant in the learning process. At the same time, he accepts that in a learner-centered classroom, students may be teacher-led: when students want to work together, their teacher may help them prepare to work together by giving explanations and pronunciation practice (Jones, 2007:25-27).

Unlike learner-centered approach teacher-centered approach has been criticized by many researchers. Harden and Crosby (2000), consider the teacher-centered learning strategies as the ways which help the specialists to transmit knowledge to the learners. In contrast, they believe that learner-centered approach is the one which concentrates on the students’ learning.

McDonald (2002) also associates teacher-centered approach with the transmission of knowledge. In her article Brown (2003) refers to McDonald’s definition of a teacher-centered approach:

“The work of teachers depends upon the abilities, skills and efforts of their students. Student achievement is at the forefront of teacher-centered curriculum, but teachers are driven to meet accountability standards and often sacrifice the needs of the students to ensure exposure to the standards. Teachers in a teacher-centered environment focus on making relationships with students that are anchored in intellectual explorations of selected materials. The focus is more on content than on student processing” (McDonald, 2002 cited in Brown, 2003:51).

According to McDonald (2002), in the teacher-centered classroom students learn from the hands of the teacher. The teacher uses her abilities in content knowledge to help learners make connections. The teachers do not make any effort to know the learner and to learn how he/she processes the given information. Whereas, in the learner-centered approach the first thing is to know the learner’s abilities and create an environment where the learners are able to make connections themselves. In a teacher-centered classroom thinking is the responsibility of a teacher and the students’ responsibility is only to memorize the information provided by teacher (McDonald, 2002 cited in Brown, 2003).

Winograd (2002) offers to break down the old hierarchical roles of university professor, classroom teacher and help them get together and do what they do best: explore experiment, create, implement and assess and all these will lead to students’ success (Winograd, 2002 cited in Brown 2003:53).

Breen and Littlejohn (2000), state that the learners who depend on a teacher and always want her to tell them what to do or how to learn, have difficulties to learn on their own. At the same time, the learners who learn on their own and know how they can learn well are considered independent learners (Breen and Littlejohn, 2000 cited in Liang 2007:11).

As a student, I can assert from my own experience that at the beginning some of us may be dependent on teachers expecting them to help us in learning and correcting our mistakes. There are ways that teachers can help such students to overcome dependency. One of those ways is suggested by Jones (2007). In order to avoid a dependency on teachers, Jones offers to put those students into groups where fewer teacher-dependent students are, and not pair them up with the students who are shy and dependent like them. It may take some time before they become more independent. According to Jones, as students become more independent and resourceful, they'll stop thinking "I don't know the right word, so I can't say what I want to say" but rather "I don't know exactly the right words, but I'll try to find other words to say what I mean" (Jones, 2007:25).

Eventually, learners become independent and if they have any questions, they'll ask one another before asking the teacher. They might also ask questions directed to the whole class which gives an opportunity to other students to learn from hearing the answers.

From my own experience, as a former student in the BA level (where the education system was teacher-centered), I can state that I was dependent on the teachers and expected them to tell me how to learn, I always needed their help in learning. The picture was quite different when I studied in the American University of Armenia, where the education system is learner-centered. At first, this environment seemed strange and difficult for me to adapt to. The first thing that I noticed was the arrangement of the desks and chairs. They were arranged U-shaped and all the students were able to see each other.

The most important factor that I consider worth writing about is the teacher's awareness of the students' needs and expectations. The teachers were aware of the students

needs and met their needs as much as possible, which was done by means of questionnaires or reflective essays, something I had never experienced in the past. In that environment I became an independent learner, I learnt how to plan my time, how to learn best.

Weatherholtz (2003) holds the viewpoint that the students in the learner-centered classroom become self-directed and life-long learners as they are allowed to access their own work and that of their classmates. This statement is familiar to me, as a graduate student for MA degree. By assessing my own work and that of my classmates I became not only a self-directed learner but also a responsible individual both in learning and in real life. This kind of education raises the significance of responsibility in every individual. As we were assessing one another's work we had to be very attentive as we took the responsibility of giving corrective feedback on us because our mistakes might influence our classmates' learning in different ways. And as a matter of fact, we learned a lot from it. As stated by Liang:

“Learner-centered classroom would help shift the responsibilities from teachers to learners, and the focus from teaching to learning. As education has moved from a traditional transmission model of learning to a more collaborative, learner-centered model, the role played by students and teachers have changed (Liang, 2007:11).

By extending the learner-centered definition Milambiling (2001) characterizes learner-centered education as “context-sensitive”. She puts the importance on the culture of the learning by considering it as important as the methods used (Milambiling, 2001 cited in Brown 2003:50).

Both, teacher-centered and learner-centered approaches differ not only in the methods and teaching styles used in the classroom but also in the classroom arrangement As has been mentioned above, the first thing that I noticed in the American University of Armenia was

the arrangement of desks and table. They were arranged U-shaped. All the students had the opportunity to see each other and work in pairs and in groups, while in Armenian educational institutions almost all of the classrooms are arranged in neat rows, with all the students facing the teachers.



Learner-centered Classroom

This is similar to the type of the teacher-centered classroom arrangement described by Çinar:

“In the teacher-centered arrangement style, students sit in two or three lines of desk groups, one behind the other so that they can see the nape of the one sitting ahead” Çinar (2006:1).



Teacher-centered classroom

In Armenian setting, in a teacher-centered classroom, the teacher is considered to be an “authority”. It is the teacher who decides what to teach and how to teach, especially in the schools. The teacher almost never asks students what activities they want to do or in what way they want to be taught. During the class there is no movement in the classroom: it is only the teacher who moves. The students rarely do group work. They sit and listen to the teacher’s instructions, write, read or retell a certain story. The interaction takes place only between the students and the teacher. If the student has questions he/she can ask only the teacher.

2.3 Why Learner-Centered Teaching?

Nowadays, the learner-centered approach is more preferable in the world view. According to Tomlinson (2000), “with the learner-centered approach, teachers bring command of content knowledge but design flexibility for learners to construct their learning. Learner needs and characteristics take precedence over knowledge of facts and skills; the emphasis is on engaging learners in learning for understanding and thinking, to help them build their own interpretations. Teacher narratives and the emphasis on learner characteristics make the learner-centered approach a possible alternative for matching teaching practices with learner needs”.(Tomlinson 2000 cited in Brown 2003:52).

McCombs and Whistler (1979) explain that the focus in the learner-centered approach is on individual learners’ heredity, experiences, perspectives, talents, interests, capacities and needs. They define learner-centeredness from a research-based perspective, “as a foundation for clarifying what is needed to create positive learning contexts to increase chances that more students will experience success. This dual focus informs and drives educational decision-making”. In other words, teachers are responsible for getting to know their students and the ways those students learn best. In order to do that they must know students needs and expectations. They also must integrate cognitive theories such as motivational and affective factors, development and social attributes and individual differences into their instructional decision making process (McCombs and Whistler, 1979 cited in Brown 2003:55).

In Reilly’s viewpoint, in the learner-centered classroom the teacher should develop instructional methods, which involve students in the learning process (Reilly, 2000).

Taking into consideration the above mentioned differences of both approaches, the following can be stated: “in a learner-centered classroom, teaching should not be the focus in classroom instruction instead students learning should be in the first place so that teaching would be able to facilitate more and better learning for students in respect to language learning” (Liang 2007:11).

According to Liang (2007), when students get involved in the learning process, they become successful learners and not the followers of the teacher. From his point of view learner-centeredness gives importance to the issue that the “learners develop the interest toward knowledge through a process of self-exploration and consider the language learning as an inner needs, therefore, learner’s role changes from acceptor to explorer and analyzer”(Liang 2007:11).

Weatherholtz (2003) points out the advantages of learner-centered classroom; one of the advantages presented by him is that through the learner-centered classroom learners can:

- become aware of themselves as learners,
- recognize and understand their strengths and weaknesses,
- become confident in learning skills,
- become self-directed learners, to result in life-long learning,
- become an autonomous learner.

(Weatherholtz (2003) cited in Liang 2007:11)

Both approaches consider the student to be the key factor in improving student achievement. But for the learner-centered approach, the first priority is to know individual learner abilities and create an environment which will be motivating enough for the learners

to be able to make learning connections. In the same way, the responsibility for gaining achievement in learning is transferred to the student. Teachers only offer different instructional methods and techniques for helping learners to plan their learning and develop a system for applying knowledge and theory (Brown, 2003:49-54).

As mentioned by Pillay (2009), learner-centeredness is not only meeting learners' needs by providing choices, but also a degree of universality in learners' needs which encourage the construction of personal meaning. "Learners are now required to take responsibility for their own learning and develop deep and personal understanding. It is also argued that from such understanding learners will be able to continuously learn and adapt their knowledge as their life circumstances change. However, we know that the only universality in learners' needs is variations, which at a fundamental level may be affected by their conception of learning and beliefs about the nature of knowledge (p. 94)".

According to O'Sullivan (2004), the aim of learner-centered education is to create helpful conditions and environments in order to accomplish educational goals such as equity, quality and democracy.

Schuh (2003) believes that in the learner-centered classroom, teachers' responsibilities are to understand their learners' views, needs and also to support abilities which the learners already have. By taking their responsibilities to understand students' needs and the ways they want to be taught, the teachers can have desired learning outcomes (Schuh, 2003 in Hung 2008, retrieved from <http://www.vnu.edu.vn/en>).

As stated by Meece (2003):

“...teachers are encouraged to take their students' individual and developmental characteristics into account when planning lessons. Learning activities help promote the development of conceptual understanding and higher order thinking skills. Opportunities for authentic learning are evident, and learning activities are adapted to differences in students' linguistic, cultural, and social backgrounds. Additionally, the learner-centered framework emphasizes the importance of supportive classroom environments that foster positive, caring relationships. When teachers apply learner-centered practices it helps them create a learning environment that is matched with the needs of learners” (J.Meece, 2003:112).

For Hodson (2002), it is important that teachers first find out who their students are, what their needs and expectations are, to listen to their viewpoints in order to then direct them into a place where their perceptions make up the center. (Hodson 2002:13). The last point is considered to be the most important. When the teachers and students perceptions do not match in that case the classroom will not be a student-centered but a teacher-centered.

2.4 Key characteristics of a learner-centered approach

In her article Meece (2003) refers to the key characteristics of the learner-centered approach described by McComb and Whistler (1997). The characteristics, which can be used to create learner-centered classrooms, are suggested to teachers and educators. One of those characteristics is to organize learning activities around the themes that are meaningful to students. McComb and Whisler also suggest providing opportunities for students to choose their own projects and work at their own pace and help them to develop and refine their understanding through critical thinking. In order to create a learner-centered classroom, teachers should use a variety of instructional strategies and methods to match student needs, and include learning activities that are personally and culturally relevant to the students. At the same time, they can listen to and respect students' points of view and encourage shared

decision making and student autonomy by giving students increasing responsibility for their learning.

In general, learner-centered practices involve a movement toward a constructivist and authentic approach to teaching, a focus on conceptual understanding and problem solving. Learner-centered practices put an emphasis on students' improvement and learning for its own sake and a classroom environment that honors and respects students' needs (McCombs & Whistler 1997 cited in J. Meece, 2003:113).

2.5 Self-determination Theory and Learner-centered Psychological Principles

Daniels (2001) presents two prominent theories in education which are consistent with the learner-centered approach: Learner-Centered Psychological Principles and Self-determination theory.

Taking into consideration the findings from several recent studies Daniels (2001) supports the idea that it is important for children to know that the teacher meets their needs. He states that in the classrooms where the teacher uses activities that meets their needs students were more motivated and they place a higher value on learning (Daniels, 2001:101). One of the needs of the learners mentioned by Daniels (2001) is "to be known as a unique person". According to Daniels, students want their teachers to know and care for them as unique persons. The learners who have close relationship to their teachers feel more successful academically. Learners are quite enthusiastic in expressing their needs and interests in the classroom learning.

When the learners feel that their needs are met by their teacher they become more involved in the learning process. On the other hand, if the learners do not trust that their teachers know them and their needs well enough to give them appropriate care and chances for presenting their abilities they may begin to disengage from learning in school (Daniels, 2001).

Daniels (2001) also suggests that the learners should have a chance to make their own choices. In the learner-centered classroom learners have more opportunities to make choices about their learning activities than in the teacher-centered classroom.

“Let me work with my classmates” this is considered to be one of the various needs of learners. According to Pelligrini and Baltchford (2000), the learners in a learner-centered classroom have more chance to work with classmates than do in teacher-centered classroom. They believe that “learners’ needs to work together are not accepted in teacher-centered classroom; even it is considered to be cheating. (Pelligrini and Baltchford, 2000 in Daniels, 2001: 106).

According to McCombs (2001), while teaching teachers should not focus on the text in the chapter they cover. Instead of focusing on the text, they should first take into consideration learners’ needs, prior knowledge, interests, social orientations, linguistic abilities, and cultures. She explained that when the teachers take into account all the above mentioned factors they understand what they should teach (McComb, 2001 cited in Brown 2003:100). As a future teacher I also consider students’ needs, interests, culture and also religion to be important factors in teaching.

Manning and Bucher (2000), discuss the importance of respecting the students. “Teachers should respect every student and remember that all are unique, having different strengths and capabilities. Teachers must not expect all of their students to be working on a grade level, realizing that some will be performing below, some on, and some above grade level. On the other hand, teachers must have high expectations for all their students, setting the goal of helping all achieve to the best of their abilities. They must be ever mindful that they are responsible not only for their students’ intellectual growth but also for their physical, social and emotional growth. In the learner-centered classroom, the teachers should expect their students to learn and then should to try hard to ensure that all develop in all growth areas” (Manning and Bucher, 2000 cited in Brown, 2003:100).

Dinchak (1999) believes that in learner-centered classrooms, teachers should provide students with choices regarding their assignments and the ways the students want to do them. As students possess different types of intelligence and learning styles, teachers should not have them to do the same assignments in the same ways. Instead, teacher can provide students with a variety of ways to study concepts. There are students who may prefer to read extensively on their own and write papers and other students who may prefer to study pictures and create their own models as summative projects. Providing choice to students is considered to be one of the subcategories of autonomy-enhancing teacher behavior described by Assor (2002).

McCombs (2001), states that in a learner-centered classroom, students should be actively involved. In addition, Stroh and Sink (2002) suggest allowing students to act on their environments and construct their own knowledge. (Stroh and Sink, 2002 in Brown, 2003:101).

Brown (2003) also discusses this issue. According to him, learners must learn by doing and not by sitting passively and listening. In our everyday life we also learn things by doing: we learn to swim by swimming, to cook by cooking, etc. He criticizes the use of lectures: “Teachers in a learner-centered classroom must avoid using the lecture as their primary means of teaching. Lectures can be dull and boring and for students to tune out teachers”. He offers to put students in situations where they are allowed to move around the classroom and do activities which enable them to see, hear, feel, smell and even taste concepts. Taking into consideration what have been discussed above, the following can be stated: teachers must be facilitators of learning not just presenters of content (Brown, 2003:101).

Stroh and Sink (2002) also share this idea. According to them, teachers should create learning environments and learning opportunities for their students rather than to lecture. “As facilitators, they should help students find out the meaning of the concepts they study (Stroh and Sink, 2002 in Brown, 2003:101).”

McCombs and Whisler (1997) value learner-centered approaches as they believe that when topics and activities are appropriate to the students’ interests and educational needs learning becomes more meaningful. This is also true when students are actively connected to the creation and comprehension of knowledge. Eventually, the students are treated as co-creators within the learning process and as individuals with appropriate ideas about how learning takes place.

Brown (2008) gives another description of the learner-centered classroom. According to her description, “in the learner-centered classrooms, students also create strategies that

teachers can use. Often no one knows better how students learn than the students themselves. Learner-centered teachers encourage them to come up with new ways of doing things”(p. 33). She offers ways that this can be done: a written reflection done in or outside of class time, or by simply engaging in dialogue in or out of the classroom environment.

Sometimes we ask: what are the benefits of learner-centered approach? This question can perhaps be best answered by realizing that through learner-centered learning, students become self-sufficient, creative thinkers and people who appreciate and value the subject being taught (Brown, 2008:33).

2.6 Learner-Centered Psychological Principles

Learner-centered psychological principles (LCP) are developed in a collaborative partnership between the American Psychological Association (APA) and Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory. The developers of learner-centered psychological principles believe that LCP and system perspectives for incorporating them are necessary components of a new design of schooling.

Learner-centered psychological principles provide a framework for developing and incorporating the components of new designs for schooling. These principles emphasize the active and reflective nature of learning and learners. From this perspective, educational practice will be most likely to improve when the educational system is redesigned with the primary focus on the learner. These learner-centered psychological principles are aimed to provide a framework that can contribute to current educational reform and school redesign efforts.

The fourteen psychological principles relate to the learner and the learning process. They focus on psychological factors that are primarily internal to and under the control of the learner rather than conditioned habits or physiological factors. However, the principles also attempt to acknowledge external environment or contextual factors that interact with these internal factors. The principles are intended to deal holistically with learners in the context of real-world learning situations. Thus, they are best understood as an organized set of principles; no principle should be viewed in isolation. The fourteen principles are arranged into four categories: cognitive and metacognitive, motivational and affective, developmental and social, and individual difference factors influencing learners and learning.

2.6.1 Cognitive and Metacognitive Factors

1. Nature of the learning process - *the learning of complex subject matter is most effective when it is an intentional process of constructing meaning from information and experience.*

2. Goals of the learning process - *the successful learner, over time and with support and instructional guidance, can create meaningful, coherent representations of knowledge.*

3. Construction of knowledge - *the successful learner can link new information with existing knowledge in meaningful ways.*

4. Strategic thinking - *the successful learner can create and use a repertoire of thinking and reasoning strategies to achieve complex learning goals.*

5. Thinking about thinking - *higher order strategies for selecting and monitoring mental operations facilitate creative and critical thinking.*

6. Context of learning - *learning is influenced by environmental factors, including culture, technology, and instructional practices.*

2.6.2 Motivational and Affective Factors

7. Motivational and emotional influences on learning - *What and how much are learned is influenced by the motivation. Motivation to learn, in turn, is influenced by the individual's emotional states, beliefs, interests and goals, and habits of thinking.*

8. Intrinsic motivation to learn - *the learner's creativity, higher order thinking, and natural curiosity all contribute to motivation to learn. Intrinsic motivation is stimulated by tasks of optimal novelty and difficulty, relevant to personal interests, and providing for personal choice and control.*

9. Effects of motivation on effort - *Acquisition of complex knowledge and skills require extended learner effort and guided practice. Without learners' motivation to learn, the willingness to exert this effort is unlikely without coercion.*

2.6.3 Developmental and Social Factors

10. Developmental influences on learning - *As individuals develop, there are different opportunities and constraints for learning. Learning is most effective when differential development within and across physical, intellectual, emotional, and social domains is taken into account.*

11. Social influences on learning - *learning is influenced by social interactions, interpersonal relations, and communication with others.*

2.6.4 Individual Differences Factors

12. Individual differences in learning - *Learners have different strategies, approaches, and capabilities for learning that are a function of prior experience and heredity.*

13. Learning and diversity - *Learning is most effective when differences in learners' linguistic, cultural, and social backgrounds are taken into account.*

14. Standards and assessment - *Setting appropriately high and challenging standards and assessing the learner as well as learning progress -- including diagnostic, process, and outcome assessment -- are integral parts of the learning process.*

APA presidential task force (revised in 1997).

2.7 Teacher Behavior

Teacher behavior is one of the most important factors that influence teaching and learning processes. As a future teacher, I have already created my own image about the word “teacher”. While thinking about the teacher and teacher’s behavior, another word is coming to my mind: the word “sculptor”. I find a lot of “similarities” in the concepts of these two words. The stones that are not yet carved like learners have many secrets, hopes and capabilities in them. They are like those stones full of secrets, hopes and abilities. Those “stones” are waiting for their sculptors to investigate all the hidden beauty by the gentle but strong strokes of hammer. When the sculptor looks at the stone he already decides what he

should find in it. The teachers are like “sculptors” and the learners are the “stones” with unlimited abilities. The teachers with their right behavior as the sculptor with his soft and safe strokes should remove all the factors which interrupt learners’ development. This seems to be nice. But when the teachers do not see prospects in their students, those “stones” will have no value or will be sculptures without quality. In other words, the teachers should look inside every learner as an individual, to find out his/her abilities and move forward.

Baloğlu also finds teacher’s good behavior to be an important factor for teaching and learning process:

“Teachers’ main responsibility is to help students learn in the classroom. It is difficult for learning to take place in chaotic environments. Subsequently, we are challenged daily to create and maintain a positive, productive classroom atmosphere conducive to learning” (Baloğlu, 2009:1).

2.8 Types of Teacher Behavior

According to Assor (2002), there are two kinds of teacher behavior: autonomy enhancing and autonomy suppressing teachers’ behaviors. He gives the following explanations of these two behaviors: “ teacher’s behavior is experienced as highly autonomy-supportive if that behavior helps children to develop and realize their personal goals and interests, or to understand the contribution of the teacher’s or the child’s present actions to the realization of the child’s personal goals and interests. In contrast, a teacher’s behavior is experienced as autonomy suppressing if it is perceived as interfering with the realization of the child’s personal goals and interests” (Assor, Kaplan and Roth, 2002, p263).

2.8.1 Autonomy Enhancing Behavior

Taking into consideration the interviews with students and the results of studies on the inter-generational transmission of values, Assor (1999) suggests three categories of the autonomy enhancing behavior: *fostering relevance, providing choice, allowing criticism and encouraging independent thinking*.

According to him, “the *fostering relevance* involves direct attempts by teachers to help students to experience the learning process as relevant to and supportive of their self determined interests, goals and values. To facilitate such a positive perception of learning, teachers may explain the contribution of the learning task to students’ personal goals and attempt to understand students’ feelings and thoughts concerning the learning task”.

Another type of behavior suggested by Assor is *providing choice* which enables students “to choose tasks that they perceive as consistent with their goals and interests. The opportunity to work on tasks that allow students to realize their goals or interests contributes to students’ experience of autonomy in learning”.

The last type of autonomy enhancing behavior is *allowing criticism and encouraging independent thinking*, which creates feelings of interest: when students express their feelings or dissatisfaction it helps teachers to make learning tasks more interesting. In cases in which the teacher is not able to make the learning task more interesting, student criticism may still cause the teacher to provide a more convincing rationale for the learning task, thus helping the student to form a more positive evaluation of the learning task (Assor, 2002:264).

2.8.2 Autonomy Suppressing Behavior

Assor (2002) also describes the categories of autonomy suppressing behavior: the first category is *suppressing criticism & independent opinions*, where “the students are not

allowed to inform teachers about aspects of the task and the learning context that interfere with the realization of their interests and goals, and therefore are rather frustrating. In addition, it is likely that the suppression of independent opinions directly undermines students' need for self-direction and self-expression, particularly in adolescence.

The second category is *intervening in ongoing behavioral sequences*, in other words, *disrupting natural rhythm*: Teachers continually interfere with students' natural rhythm as they perform various tasks; students are likely to feel angry that they are not allowed to realize their action plans.

The third category of autonomy suppressing behavior, presented by Assor is *forcing meaningless & uninteresting activities*: the teacher make students do things that they find boring or meaningless and this kind of behavior can be assumed to be rather aversive.

Autonomy suppressive behavior is quite typical to the behavior of teacher in Armenian EFL settings, where they are making students do the activities in the textbooks which are sometimes boring and they never try to create and provide interesting activities to students. Students are not allowed to make choices or suggestions about learning tasks and activities.

Assor (2002), states that in order to foster the relevance of schoolwork for children, teachers need to take an empathic-active role in relation to their students. This role requires the teacher first to understand students' goals, interests and needs, and then to link school tasks to those goals, interests and needs (Assor, 2002:262). Whereas, in Armenian EFL settings, teachers even do not try to be aware of the needs and interests of the students.

2.8 Students Perception of Teacher Behavior

Adediwura and Toya (2007), suggest that perception may be defined from physical and psychological perspectives.

Taking into consideration, what have been discussed above, it can be stated that learning ‘is not a passive, knowledge consuming and externally directed process, but an active, constructive and self-directed process in which learners build up internal knowledge representations that are personal interpretations of their learning experiences. However, whether students will engage in and successfully complete the activities as teachers expect may partially depend on the students’ perceptions of the quality of their teachers’ control behaviors (Brok, 2001:425). “If constructivist ideas (such as, students construct their own knowledge and perceptions of every learning situation) are taken seriously, then far more attention must be paid to students’ perceptions of their teachers’ behaviors within the context of classroom activities and expectations. We assume that students’ perceptions of teacher behavior do act as one set of important mediators between the actual regulating behaviors of teachers and the actual performance of learning activities by each student”. Two crucial variables that are assumed to determine the quality of teacher regulation are interpersonal teaching skills and clarity of instruction (Brok, 2001). For instance, when teachers send vague nonverbal messages to students while giving instructions, are perceived as lacking sufficient authority or respect in the classroom, or provide unclear assignments or lesson structure, students are not likely to engage in or much less successfully complete the intended learning activities. This failure is likely because they do not comprehend what is expected

from them or because they anticipate acceptable consequences even when they do not complete the activities at the criterion level.

“Given the constructivist claim that individuals construct their own personal knowledge and views of reality, then each learner’s perceptions relative to learning situations should be very important to teachers. Research using teacher or external observer perceptions to study teachers’ regulation of students’ learning is rather common, while student perceptions are infrequently used” (Brok, 2001:428).

“Besides, student perceptions have several additional advantages over teacher perceptions and classroom observations. First, student perceptions are cheaper and more efficient to gather than observational data. Second, the experience of students with the behavior of a certain teacher is often based on a large amount of lessons, while the experience of observers is often limited to a few lessons (Brok, 2001:428).

Ahmad (2009) refers to the viewpoint given by Eken(1999) and Sidhu (2003) who state that students’ perception and observation can work in practice and become a part of exploratory studies (p.19). Their perception is highlighted by challenging and interesting experiences that allow them to observe learning and teaching behaviors more intimately; thereby raising their own awareness of the whole process of teaching as well as their own learning. Teachers can use the information or comments gathered from the students to polish their methodology and style of teaching and look for ways of improvement (Ahmad 2009:19).

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The present study was designed to find out the relationship between students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement and investigate whether students' needs are being met in Armenian educational institutions.

The chapter consists of three sections: *participants, setting, instrumentation, procedure, and analysis.*

3.2 Participants and Setting

Participants of this study were 180 students. All of them were native speakers of Armenian. The ages of the participants ranged between 14-35 years of age. Those 180 participants were divided into 3 groups. The first group included sixty students studying in the 7th, 8th and 9th grades. They were studying in the Akhuryan High School in Gyumri. The second group consisted of sixty students studying at the BA level at the "Imastaser Anania Shirakatasi" University in Gyumri. In the third group, there were sixty students studying at the MA level. The students at the MA level were from the American University of Armenia.

3.3 Instrumentation

The instrumentations used for data collection were questionnaire and semi-structured interview.

3.3.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire that was modified and applied for the data collection was developed by Harry, G. Murray (1993) cited in Journal of Educational Psychology. At the beginning, I thought that through that questionnaire I could get the data that I needed, but I decided to modify it, since some of the questions were not appropriate for my context. For modifying the questionnaire I used articles about teacher behavior. Generally, I concentrated on two types of teacher behavior: autonomy enhancing and autonomy suppressing, as they are somehow connected with learner-centered and teacher-centered approaches.

The questionnaire consists of 60 items which are grouped 7 clusters: *clarity of the explanation of concepts, enthusiasm, and encouraging students' participation in class, providing choice, fostering understanding and interest, allowing criticism and interfering.*

The first cluster includes 11 items:

1. *Teacher uses concrete everyday examples to explain concepts and principles.*
2. *Teacher uses graphs or diagrams to facilitate explanation.*

The second cluster also consists of 11 items describing the enthusiasm of teacher:

1. *Teacher exhibits facial gestures or expressions.*
2. *Teacher speaks in a dramatic or expressive way.*

The third cluster contains 9 items concerning encouraging students' participation in class:

1. *Teacher encourages students to ask questions or make comments during lectures.*
2. *Teacher presents challenging, thought-provoking ideas.*

Seven items are included in the fourth cluster which is "providing choice":

1. *Teacher asks which topics we would like to study more and which we prefer to study less.*

The fifth cluster which is “fostering understanding and interest” includes 6 items:

1. *It is important for teacher that I would learn things that interest me.*
2. *Teacher talks about the connection between what we study in school and what happens in real life.*

The sixth cluster consists of 7 items concerning criticism and independent thinking:

1. *Teacher tells us if we do not agree with her-it is important to express our disagreement.*

The last cluster which is “interfering” contains 9 items:

1. *Teacher is strict about me doing everything in her/his way.*
2. *When I choose a topic for a paper, teacher tries to influence my choice too much.*

The questionnaire was in English (Appendix A) but for the students at the school it was translated into Armenian (Appendix B) as there were terms in the questionnaire that were not appropriate for their level of English.

3.3.2 Interview

The semi-structured face-to-face interview was conducted with 30 participants from three levels. The interview consisted of 22 questions (Appendix F). The questions of the interview were developed by me. While developing the questions for interview, I took into consideration the participants responses to the questionnaire items. I concentrated on the questions where students disagreed with certain teacher behavior, and by developing questions for interview I tried to reveal the reasons of their disagreements.

The interviewees were free to choose the language used for the interviews. All of them selected Armenian. Thus the interview was conducted in Armenian (Appendix G) with all levels of students. First, the interviews were recorded (not a special recording device but

with the help of Smart Phone (HTC). That is why the quality of the recordings was not good. Then the recordings were translated into English. I also considered the fact that most of class instructors were not native speakers of Armenian. I found a special program (Audio Book Recorder), which was able to read the written text from the word file. Thus, after putting all the translated transcripts in the word file, I had all of them read in English by the help of that program. And after all these processes, saved and transferred the recordings to the CD ROM.

The last instrumentation used for the data collection was the final grades of the students, signed and stamped by the headmasters and deans of educational institutions where I conducted my research. The final grades of the students were needed to do a correlation between students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement (students' achievement was determined by their final grades) which was used to reveal if the students' attitude towards teacher behavior influences students' achievement.

3.4 Procedure

Students completed the questionnaire that intended to reveal their attitude towards their teacher behavior. They used 5-point scale to respond to each item. The scale ranged from "*strongly disagree*" to "*strongly agree*". The first institution that I conducted the survey was Akhuryan School in Gyumri. The reason for choosing both the school and the university in Gyumri is that I wanted to include educational institutions from regions in my study. When I entered the school and tried to explain to teacher what I wanted to do, she first asked for a copy of the questionnaire and without reading it took it to the headmaster of the school. I thought that they would refuse me. Fortunately, the headmaster (who had

participated in teacher-training program in US), understood what I wanted and allowed me to conduct my survey.

The teachers were not present in the classrooms when the students completed the questionnaire, and the students' identities were protected with a coding procedure. While completing the questionnaire, the children in the elementary school could not hide their enthusiasm. One of the pupils said: "it is the first time that we are given a chance to assess our teacher behavior and we are glad that now we can express what we feel about our teacher behavior". All of them were enthusiastic and motivated.

At the university, I had another reaction to my request. The Dean, who did not know English, asked one of the English instructors to read the questionnaire and tell him if it is confidential. After reading the questionnaire, the instructor said that she wanted to have one copy with her. She thought that the questionnaire would help her to see her drawbacks in teaching and removing them.

The third institution where I conducted the survey was American University of Armenia. My request for conducting the survey was accepted by AUA students, as they used to complete questionnaires and assess teacher behavior.

The questionnaire was designed to reveal the relationship between students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement. It also investigates whether or not the teachers meet students' needs and expectations in Armenian educational context.

The picture was quite different while conducting semi-structured face to face interview. From students face expression, it was vivid that at first they wanted to share everything about his/her teacher behavior. But when I told them that the interview would be recorded but at the same time would be confidential, they were not as enthusiastic as they

were during completing the questionnaire. The interview was conducted in their classroom: a small-size room with a teacher-centered arrangement (two neat rows of desks and in front of them was teacher's desk). The room had one small window. There were some graphs concerning different subjects on the walls. The environment was not motivating for learning as there was nothing concerning English teaching such as colorful vocabulary sheets for the beginners or important expressions for the intermediate level.

At the university, the room where the interview was conducted was in a worse condition than that of in school. It was too small. There were six desks; five were for students and the other for the instructor. There was no place to move. There was only one blackboard and nothing else. The atmosphere was depressing.

At the American University of Armenia, the interview was conducted in a large room with learner-centered arrangement. The room had wide windows, two blackboards. The students were more active than the students in Gyumri. I think one of the reasons was the learning environment that existed in those three educational institutions. The most difficult part of data collection was asking for the final grades of the participants which lasted one month. As the final grades needed to be signed and stamped, I had to wait until they were ready. All data collection process took almost three months.

3.5 Analysis

For the data collection of this study, quantitative and qualitative researches were used. Two instruments were used: questionnaires, assessing teacher behavior and interview. I also used the final grades of the participants. The quantitative data was analyzed through the SPSS statistical package. As mentioned above the questionnaire included seven clusters. The

first step was to find the mean of each cluster score. Then I did the Pearson's correlation between the means of cluster scores and participants' final grades. It helped me to find out the relationship between students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement. Then sixty participants' responses of each cluster were divided into three categories: agree, uncertain and disagree. I recoded them in the following way: 1=disagree (below 2.99), 2=uncertain (3.00) and 3=agree (above 3.01). After recoding them, Independent Sample T-Test was implemented, in order to find out the relationship between the final grades of students who agree and who disagree. While applying T-Test I did not apply the responses of the participants whose answers were 3(uncertain). If I moved 3(uncertain) in 1(disagree) or 3(agree), the findings of the study would show different results, therefore I had to take out them while implementing T-Test.

The qualitative data which was the semi-structured interview, was recorded, translated in English and transcribed. Then by the help of the Audiobook Recorder Program it was read, saved and transferred to CD ROM. The interview was conducted to reveal if the students like their teacher behavior and if the teacher meets their needs.

Chapter 4: Results and Discussions

4.1 Introduction

This chapter covers the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the study followed by the findings of research. The aim of the current study was to investigate whether or not students' needs are being met in Armenian EFL classrooms and the relationship between students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement. Data was collected by means of the questionnaire (Appendix A) and interview (Appendix F) for the students. The research was conducted in three educational institutions of Armenia: Akhuryan High School (Gyumri), Imastaser Anania Shirakatsi University (Gyumri) and American University of Armenia (Yerevan).

4.2 Analysis of the quantitative data (*Students' Questionnaire for Akhuryan High School*)

The questionnaire was analyzed using SPSS statistical package. As the aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between the mean of the cluster scores and final grades of the students (Appendix C, D, E), Pearson's correlation (Table 4.2.1.) and Mann Whitney Test were implemented (4.2.2.).

The questionnaire consisted of 60 items which are grouped into 7 clusters: *(A) clarity of the explanation of concepts, (B) enthusiasm, (C) encouraging students' participation in class, (D) providing choice, (E) fostering understanding and interest, (F) allowing criticism and (G) interfering.*

The results of the Pearson's correlation showed significant positive correlation between the final grades of the students and the clusters A (.359**), B (.438**) and C (.430**) at the 0.01 level. In other words, for Akhuryan High School students' achievement is positively related to their attitude towards teacher's behavior described in clusters *A (clarity of the explanation of concepts)*, *(B) enthusiasm*, and *(C) encouraging students' participation in class*. Among seven clusters, clusters A, B and C were the important factors contributing to students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement. Thus, we can state that students' attitude towards teacher's clarity of the explanations of concepts, enthusiasm and encouraging students' participation in class influence students' achievement. The picture was different for clusters D, E, F and G. The correlation between final grades of the students and cluster D and G was slight non-significant according to observed significance level values; $r = .054$ and $r = .067$, the correlation between final grades and cluster E and F was small, $r = .118$ and $r = .199$. Therefore, it can be stated that students' achievement does not depend on their attitude towards teacher behavior described in clusters *(D) providing choice*, *(E) fostering understanding and interest*, *(F) allowing criticism and (G) interfering*.

Table 4-2-1
Pearson's Correlations between the final grades and the mean scores of seven clusters (Akhuryan High School)

		cluster A	cluster B	cluster C	cluster D	cluster E	cluster F	cluster G
GRADE	Pearson Correlation	.359**	.438**	.430**	.053	.118	.199	.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.000	.001	.689	.369	.127	.609
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60

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

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4-2-2

Mann - Whitney Tests on comparison of average grades of “agree” and “disagree” student categories defined by different clusters (Akhuryan High School)

Students’ Category defined by cluster A

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	5	25.80	114	.522
	agree	55	30.93		
	Total	60			

Students’ category defined by cluster B

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	33	23.30	208	.002
	agree	24	36.83		
	Total	57			

Students’ category defined by cluster C

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	2	6.25	9.5	.043
	agree	56	30.33		
	Total	58			

Students’ category defined by cluster D

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	4	29.13	101.5	.935
	agree	52	28.45		
	Total	56			

Students' category defined by cluster E

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Assmp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	6	19.75	97.5	.156
	agree	50	29.55		
	Total	56			

Students' category defined by cluster F

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	9	26.22	191	.711
	agree	46	28.35		
	Total	55			

Students' category defined by cluster G

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	2	44.50	26	.192
	agree	56	28.96		
	Total	58			

If the level of significance is less than 0.05, the difference between the two scores is statistically significant. Table 4.2.2 shows that cluster B '*Enthusiasm*' with p-value 0.002, cluster C '*encouraging students' participation in class*' having p-value of .043 and average grade of the students is significantly different. Moreover, the average grade of "agree" category of students is significantly higher. (Table 4.2.2 *students' category defined by cluster B and C*)

Table 4.2.2 revealed that there is no significant difference between the average grades of “agree” and “disagree” category of students and cluster A *‘clarity of explanations of concept’* with p-value .522, cluster D *‘providing choice’* having P value of .935.

Cluster E *‘fostering understanding and interest’* having P-value of .156, cluster F *‘allowing criticism and independent thinking’* with p-value .711, and cluster G *‘interfering’* having p-value of .192 and average grades of “agree” and “disagree” category of students are not significantly different. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the students’ attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement. According to this statistical analysis, from viewpoint of clusters A, D, E, F G, there is no relationship between students’ attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement. Only taking into consideration clusters B and C it can be stated that there is a relationship between students’ attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement.

4.3 Students’ Questionnaire (*Imastaser Anania Shirakatsi University*)

The results of the Pearson’s correlation, for the students of Anania Shirakatsi University, showed significant positive correlation only between the final grades of the students and the clusters D (.283*), at the 0.05 level. (Table 4.3.1) Therefore, it can be stated that students’ achievement in Anania Shirakatsi University, depends on their attitude towards teacher’s behavior described in cluster D *‘providing choice’*. The correlation between final grades of the students and the clusters A *‘clarity of the explanation of concepts,’* and F *‘allowing criticism’* was negative. The correlation was small between the final grades of the students and clusters B *‘enthusiasm’*, C *‘encouraging students’ participation in class’*, E *‘fostering understanding and interest,’* and G *‘interfering’*. Accordingly, we can state that

students' achievement depends only on their attitude towards teacher behavior described in cluster D 'providing choice'.

Table 4-3-1
Pearson's Correlations between the final grades and the mean scores of seven clusters (Anania Shirakatsi University)

		cluster A	cluster B	cluster C	cluster D	cluster E	cluster F	cluster G
GRADE	Pearson Correlation	-.031	.187	.117	.283*	.127	-.022	.158
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.213	.152	.375	.029	.333	.870	.229
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60

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

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4-3-2 *Mann-Whitney Tests on comparison of average grades of "agree" and "disagree" student categories defined by different clusters (Imastaser Anania Shirakatsi University)*

Students' Category defined by cluster A

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	1	25.80	4	.105
	agree	58	30.93		
	Total	59			

Students' category defined by cluster B

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	46	25.80	185,5	.130
	agree	11	30.93		
	Total	57			

Students' category defined by cluster C

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	13	25.80	224.5	.242
	agree	43	30.93		
	Total	56			

Students' category defined by cluster D

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	13	25.80	205	.047
	agree	47	30.93		
	Total	60			

Students' category defined by cluster E

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Assymp. Sig.(2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	5	25.80	136	.292
	agree	55	30.93		
	Total	60			

Students' category defined by cluster F

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	7	25.80	145	.264
	agree	50	30.93		
	Total	57			

Students' category defined by cluster G

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	6	25.80	180.5	.177
	agree	49	30.93		
	Total	55			

The results of the Mann Whitney Test (*Table 4.3.2*) showed that cluster D '*providing choice*' having p value of .047 and the average grades of "agree" and "disagree" category of students of Ananaia Shirakatsi University, is significantly different. The average grade of "agree" category of students was significantly higher. (*Table 4.3.2 students' category defined by cluster D 'providing choice'*)

The significant difference is missing between the average grades of "agree" and "disagree" category of students and clusters A '*clarity of the explanation of concepts*' and B '*enthusiasm*' with p-values of .105 and .130, clusters C '*encouraging students' participation in class*', and E '*fostering understanding and interest*' having p-values of .242 and .292. The significant difference also did not exist between the average grades of "agree" and "disagree" category of students and clusters F '*allowing criticism*' and G '*interfering*' with p-values .264 and .177.

According to this statistical analysis, only from the point of view of cluster D '*providing choice*' we can state that there is a relationship between students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement. Taking into consideration the results of the clusters A '*clarity of the explanation of concepts*', B '*enthusiasm*', C '*encouraging students' participation in class*', E '*fostering understanding and interest*', F '*allowing criticism*' and G

'interfering' there is no relationship between students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement.

4.4 Students' Questionnaire (*American University of Armenia*)

The results of the Pearson's correlation revealed quite different picture for the students of American University of Armenia. The correlation between the final grades of the students and the clusters A (-.323*), F (-.275*) and G (-.330) was strong negative at the 0.05 level (*Table 4.4.1*). Therefore, it can be stated that students' achievement in American University of Armenia, depends on their attitude towards teacher's behavior described in clusters *A 'clarity of the explanation of concepts', F 'allowing criticism' and G 'interfering'*.

The correlation between the final grades of the students and the clusters *C 'encouraging students' participation in class', D 'providing choice' and E 'fostering understanding and interest'*, was weak negative. The correlation was small between the final grades of the students and clusters *B 'enthusiasm'*. Accordingly, we can state that students' achievement does not depend on their attitude towards teacher behavior described in clusters *C 'encouraging students' participation in class', D 'providing choice' and E 'fostering understanding and interest'*.

Table 4-4-1
Pearson's Correlations between the final grades and the mean scores of seven clusters (American University of Armenia)

		cluster A	cluster B	cluster C	cluster D	cluster E	cluster F	cluster G
GRADE	Pearson Correlation	-.323*	.221	-.183	-.137	-.186	-.275*	-.330*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.089	.163	.298	.155	.034	.010

N 60 60 60 60 60 60

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

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4-4-2

Mann - Whitney Tests on comparison of average grades of “agree” and “disagree” student categories defined by different clusters (American University of Armenia)

Students’ Category Defined by Cluster A

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	11	33.91	210	.324
	agree	47	28.47		
	Total	58			

Students’ Category Defined by Cluster B

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	7	13.57	102	.069
	agree	50	30.46		
	Total	57			

Students’ Category Defined by Cluster C

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	15	32.23	281.5	.455
	agree	43	28.55		
	Total	58			

Students' Category Defined by Cluster D

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	18	27.64	326.5	.780
	agree	38	28.91		
	Total	56			

Students' category defined by cluster E

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	24	33.27	221.5	.013
	agree	30	22.88		
	Total	54			

Students' category defined by cluster F

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	16	34.50	256	.154
	agree	42	27.60		
	Total	58			

Students' category defined by cluster G

	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test statistic	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
GRADE	disagree	11	39.95	198.5	.192
	agree	48	28.64		
	Total	59			

The Mann Whitney Test results presented in Table 4.4.2 showed that there is no significant difference between the average grades of “agree” and “disagree” category of students of American University of Armenia and seven cluster of the questionnaire: *cluster A*

“clarity of the explanation of concepts”, B enthusiasm, and C ‘encouraging students’ participation in class’, with p-values .324, .069, .455, D ‘providing choice’, E ‘fostering understanding and interest’, F ‘allowing criticism and independent thinking’ and G ‘interfering’ consequently having p-values of .780; .013; .154; 192.

Taking into consideration this statistical analysis, it can be stated that there is no relationship between students’ attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement.

4.5 Analysis of the Qualitative Data (*Semi-structured Interview*)

The second instrumentation for data collection was semi-structured interview. The data was analyzed qualitatively. The interpretation of the data was given through personal understanding of the respondents’ answers. The process of conducting the interview was more difficult than that of the questionnaire. Some of the students refused to be interviewed when they learnt that they were going to be recorded. They felt uneasy and nervous. The role of the interviewer was also new for the researcher. However, all above mentioned factors did not influence the value of the qualitative data.

To the questions of the “the teacher’ teaching styles” category “Do you like the way your teacher teaches?” almost all the respondents gave positive answers: “Yes”, “Yes a lot.” They also answered positively to the question “Do you like those activities that you do in class?” at the same time, to the question “Do you want to have extra activities?” only one respondent gave negative response: “the activities from textbook are enough”. The answers to the question “Does your teacher ask what kind of activities you want to have in class?” were also negative from the point of view of the respondents from Akhuryan High School and “Imastaser Anania Shirakatsi” University. They answered: “we are doing the activities

from our textbook, there are not any activity provided by the teacher”, “the teacher decide what kind of activities we should do in class.”Then, all the respondents gave positive answers to the question “Do you want your teacher to ask what kind of activities you want to have in class?”

The answers to the questions concerning class discussions and group works varied from student to student according to their level (high school students, students studying at BA /Bachelor/ and MA /Master/ levels). Based on the students’ answers studying in the Akhuryan High School they did not have class discussions or group works. If they wanted to discuss the topic concerning the lesson they do it before or after the class. To the question “Do you work in groups in class?” the interviews gave similar answers “when the teacher gave us reading materials to translate from English into Armenian we work in pairs”. To the same question the students studying at BA level answered: “we do group works when we are assigned to do some project or to write a paper” this was one of the most frequent answers concerning group works. The answers to the same questions were different for MA level students studying in the American University of Armenia. According to their answers they had class discussions and do group works in class. Their answers also were positive for the questions: “Do you have chance to talk when you disagree with teacher’s ideas?” “Do you use only English in class?” The answers of the high school and BA level students to those questions differed from that of MA level students; especially to the question “Do you use only English in class?” The most common answers were: “No, we usually use Armenian in class as there are students who do not understand English well and the teacher has to explain the topic in Armenian. “No, sometimes if we don’t know the meaning of the certain words we ask teacher and she explains it in Armenian.” At the same time in responses to the

question: “Would you like to communicate only in English during the class? Why?” one of the students answered: “Yes, I want to use only English in class: when teacher talks in English we will be motivated to know what is she talking about and in that way we will learn English well.”

Concerning the question “Does she/he criticize you when you are making mistakes?” all the students’ responses were negative: “No, she just explains us our mistakes.” “No, she only corrects us.” No, and even if we make mistake he corrects us in a gentle way. And I am happy that he corrects us even if he criticizes me I would also accept that.

Taking into consideration the fact that the students studying at three different levels gave different responses to the same category questions, it can be stated that the level of the students influenced their responses. The respondents’ answers especially were different in the following questions: “Does your teacher ask what kind of activities you want to have in class?” “Do you use only English in class?”, “Do you work in groups in class?”, and “Do you have class discussions?”. According to their responses of above mentioned questions it can be stated that in Akhuryan High School and Imastaser Anania Shirakatsi University, students’ needs somehow are not being met, especially while taking into consideration the responses to the question: “Does your teacher ask what kind of activities you want to have in class?” Almost all the students’ responses from Akhuryan High School and Imastaser Anania Shirakatsi University were negative.

Though the quantitative data showed that there was no significant difference between the students’ attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement, the researcher’s personal understanding was that the teachers in some Armenian EFL settings do not meet

students' needs and as a result students' achievement are affected negatively. In other words, students' achievement may be influenced by their attitude towards teacher behavior.

Chapter 5: Conclusions, Implications, and Suggestions for Further Research

In this chapter the research findings will be summarized in accordance with research questions. Then, the implications and applications of the study will be discussed followed by limitations and delimitations of the study. Finally, the chapter will be brought to the end with suggestions for further research.

5.1 Summary of the Findings

The analysis first focused especially on students' achievement taking into consideration their attitude towards teacher behavior. Second, it tried to find out whether students' needs are being met in the Armenian EFL settings.

Taking into consideration the quantitative and qualitative results obtained from the study the interpretation of the quantitative data differs from that of qualitative data. The analysis and the results of the quantitative data showed different results for all three level students "High School, BA Level and MA level". The results of the MA level students studying in the American University of Armenia revealed that there was no significant difference between the average grades of "agree" and "disagree" category of students and their responses concerning the attitude towards teacher behavior. Based on these results it can

be suggested that there is no relationship between students' attitude towards teacher behavior and their achievement.

The results of finding of the High School and BA level students, revealed that students' achievement depends on their attitude towards teacher's certain types of behavior: *enthusiasm, encouraging students' participation in class, and providing choice*. Thus, I may assume that there is statistically significant difference between the average grades of "agree" and "disagree" category of students (High School and BA level) and their responses concerning their attitude towards teacher behavior.

The results obtained from a qualitative data also differ according to the students' level. The respondents' answers to the questions: "Does your teacher ask what kind of activities you want to have in class?" "Do you use only English in class?", "Do you work in groups in class?", and "Do you have class discussions" revealed that in High school and BA level students' needs were not being met, whereas the MA level students' responses were positive.

5.2 Applications and Implications

In Armenian educational setting, classrooms are traditional and teacher-centered. The findings of the present study revealed that students' achievement depends on their attitude towards teacher's specific types of behavior (*Enthusiasm, Providing Choice and Encouraging Students' Participation in Class*). The study suggest that Armenian educational setting should shift from teacher-centered to learner centered approach focusing on the above mentioned types of teacher behavior, thus making the learning process more effective. The characteristics of a learner-centered approach suggested by McComb and Whisler (1997)

also can be useful for teachers and educators to create learner-centered classrooms. Some of those characteristics are: to organize learning activities around the themes that are meaningful to students, to provide opportunities for students to choose their own projects and work at their own pace and help them to develop and refine their understanding through critical thinking.

Teachers should try to change their classroom behavior in the above mentioned characteristics and implement them in their teaching process.

5.3 Limitations and Delimitations

One of the limitations of the study that might have influenced the results obtained from the study is the number of the interviewers. First, the number of the interviewers was intended to be twenty students from each level. But the fact of being recorded bothered majority of the students and I had to choose ten interviewers from each level. The results from semi-structured interviews would have been more detailed with variety of responses if the number of the interviewers was twenty from each level. The delimitation of the study referred to the choice of the level of the participants. For the High School students I didn't choose the students below 7th, 8th and 9th grades as I consider their level not appropriate to be able to answer the questions.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

Taking into consideration the findings of the study, several areas can be suggested for the future research. As a continuation of this study it can be suggested to conduct a larger scale research with the aim to find out the learners needs in the Armenian EFL classrooms

and focusing to those needs reveal ways of creating learner-centered classrooms in Armenian educational setting.

References

- Adediwura, A & Tayo, B. (2007). Perception of teachers' knowledge, attitude and teaching skills as predictor of academic performance in Nigerian secondary schools. *Educational Research and Review Vol. 2 (7), pp. 165-171, July 2007. ISSN1990-3839*
- Altan, M. Trombly, C. (2001) in Brown, K. (2003). From Teacher-Centered to Learner-Centered Classrooms. Improving Learning in Divers Classrooms. *Education Vol. 124 No 1 pp. 49-54 Fall 2003*
- Assor, A. Kaplan, H. Roth, G (2002). Choice is good, but relevance is excellent: Autonomy-enhancing and suppressing teacher behaviors predicting students' engagement in schoolwork. *British Journal of Educational Psychology Vol.72 pp. 261-278, 2002*
- Baloğlu, N (2009), Negative Behavior of Teachers With Regard to High School Students in Classroom Settings. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 00941956, March 2009, Vol. 36, Issue 1*
- Brok, P. (2004). *Students' perceptions of teacher control behaviors*. Learning and Instruction 14 (2004) www.elsevier.com/locate/learninstruc
- Brown, J. (2008). *Learner-centered Instruction: Involving Students in Their Own Education*. Music Educators Journal 2008; 94; 30
- Brown, K. (2003). From Teacher-Centered to Learner-Centered Classrooms. Improving Learning in Divers Classrooms. *Education Vol. 124 No 1 pp. 49-54 Fall 2003*

- Çinar, K (2006). *The Scale for Student Arrangement in Traditional Classrooms. Validity and Reliability Study (SSATC)*. Humanity & Social Sciences Journal 1 (1). IDOSI Publications. Istanbul.
- Daniels, D. Perry, K (2002). “Learner-centered” according to Children. *Theory into Practice*. Vol. 42, No. 2, pp.102-107, Spring 2003
- Jones, L. (2007). *The Student-Centered Classroom*. USA. Cambridge University Press
- Liang C. (2007). *Workshop on how to create a learner-centered classroom*. Dec. 2007, Volume 4, No.12 (Serial No.48). Sino-US English Teaching, ISSN1539-8072, USA
- McCombs, B. & Whisler, J. (1997) in Brown, K. (2003). From Teacher-Centered to Learner-Centered Classrooms. Improving Learning in Diverse Classrooms. *Education Vol. 124 No 1 pp. 49-54*. Fall 2003
- McDonald, J. (2003). *Teachers studying student work: Why and how?* Phi Delta Kappan. 84(2), 121-127
- Pillay, H. (2002). *Understanding Learner-centeredness: does it consider the diverse needs of individuals?* Studies in Continuing Education, Vol. 24, No. 1, 2002.
- Tutkun, F. (2002). *Seating Arrangement in Classroom in Çinar, K (2006). The Scale for Student Arrangement in Traditional Classrooms. Validity and Reliability Study (SSATC)*. Humanity & Social Sciences Journal 1 (1). IDOSI Publications. Istanbul.
- Weatherholtz, D. (2003). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice-book review theory into practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Attitudinal Questionnaire for Students (*English Version*)

Age -----
 Gender-----
 Instructor -----

In this inventory you are asked to assess your instructor's specific classroom behaviors. Please, try to assess each behavior independently rather than letting your overall impression of the instructor determine each individual rating.

Please use the following rating scale in making your judgments:

- 1 = strongly disagree
- 2 = disagree
- 3 = uncertain
- 4 = agree
- 5 = strongly agree

T = Teacher

A. CLARITY OF EXPLANATIONS OF CONCEPTS

1. Gives several examples of each concept	1	2	3	4	5
2. Uses concrete everyday examples to explain concepts and principles	1	2	3	4	5
3. Fails to define new or unfamiliar terms	1	2	3	4	5
4. Repeats difficult ideas several times	1	2	3	4	5
5. Stresses most important points by pausing, speaking slowly, raising voice and so on	1	2	3	4	5
6. Uses graphs or diagrams to facilitate explanation	1	2	3	4	5
7. Points out practical applications of concepts	1	2	3	4	5
8. Answers students' questions thoroughly	1	2	3	4	5
9. Suggests ways of memorizing complicated ideas	1	2	3	4	5
10. Writes key terms on blackboard or overhead screen	1	2	3	4	5
11. Explains subject matter in familiar colloquial language	1	2	3	4	5

B. ENTHUSIASM

12. Speaks in a dramatic or expressive way	1	2	3	4	5
13. Moves about while lecturing	1	2	3	4	5
14. Gestures with hands or arms	1	2	3	4	5
15. Exhibits facial gestures or expressions	1	2	3	4	5
16. Avoids eye contact with students	1	2	3	4	5
17. Walks up aisles beside students	1	2	3	4	5
18. Gestures with head or body	1	2	3	4	5
19. Tells jokes or humorous anecdotes	1	2	3	4	5
20. Reads lecture verbatim from prepared notes or text	1	2	3	4	5
21. Smiles or laughs while teaching	1	2	3	4	5
22. Shows distracting mannerisms	1	2	3	4	5

C. ENCOURAGING STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN CLASS

23. Encourages students to ask questions or make comments during lectures	1	2	3	4	5
24. Criticizes students when they make errors	1	2	3	4	5

25. Praises students for good ideas	1	2	3	4	5
26. Asks questions of individual students	1	2	3	4	5
27. Asks questions of class as a whole	1	2	3	4	5
28. Incorporates students' ideas into lecture	1	2	3	4	5
29. Presents challenging, thought-provoking ideas	1	2	3	4	5
30. Uses a variety of media and activities in class	1	2	3	4	5
31. Asks rhetorical questions	1	2	3	4	5

D. PROVIDING CHOICE

32. When I am doing something that interests me – T gives me enough time to finish it	1	2	3	4	5
33. T allows me to choose how to do my work in the classroom	1	2	3	4	5
34. T asks us which topics we would like to study more and which we prefer to study less	1	2	3	4	5
35. T asks us if there are things we would like to change in the way we study	1	2	3	4	5
36. T allows me to choose to study topics that interest me	1	2	3	4	5
37. When T gives us an assignment she allows us to choose which questions to answer.	1	2	3	4	5
38. T encourages me to work in my own ways	1	2	3	4	5

E. FOSTERING UNDERSTANDING AND INTEREST

39. T talks about the connection between what we study in school and what happens in real life	1	2	3	4	5
40. It is important for T that I would learn things that interest me	1	2	3	4	5
41. T explains why it is important to study certain subjects in school	1	2	3	4	5
42. T talks to us about how we feel concerning the subjects we study	1	2	3	4	5
43. T announces availability for consultation outside of class	1	2	3	4	5
44. T offers to help students with problems	1	2	3	4	5

F. ALLOWING CRITICISM AND INDEPENDENT THINKING

45. T listens to my opinions and ideas	1	2	3	4	5
46. T tells us that if we do not agree with her – it is important that we would express our disagreement	1	2	3	4	5
47. T is willing to listen to students' complaints regarding her	1	2	3	4	5
48. T respects students who tell her what they really think and are not ingratiating	1	2	3	4	5
49. T allows me to decide about things by myself	1	2	3	4	5
50. T allows us to talk about things that we find unacceptable in school	1	2	3	4	5
51. T shows me how to solve my problems by myself	1	2	3	4	5

G. INTERFERING

52. T tells me what to do all the time	1	2	3	4	5
53. T does not allow me to work in my own pace	1	2	3	4	5
54. T interrupts me in the middle of activities that interest me	1	2	3	4	5
55. T is strict about me doing everything in her way	1	2	3	4	5
56. T stops me in the middle when I write or read interesting things	1	2	3	4	5
57. T stops me in the middle before I finish to say what I wanted	1	2	3	4	5
58. Sometimes I want to work on one topic, and T forces me to move to another topic	1	2	3	4	5
59. Sometimes I want to move to a new topic and T forces me to keep dealing with the 'old' topic	1	2	3	4	5
60. When I choose a topic for a paper, T tries to influence my choice too much	1	2	3	4	5

Thank You!

Appendix C: Final grades of the students (*American University of Armenia*)

American University of Armenia

Final Grades

1.Abovyan	Armineh	B	B	3.00
2.Abovyan	Tina	B	B	3.00
3. Avagyan	Manik	B+	B plus	3.30
4.Baibourtian	Ani	B	B	3.00
5. Gabrielyan	Gayane	B	B	3.00
6.Grigoryan	Luiza	A-	A minus	3.70
7.Grigoryan	Luiza	B	B	3.00
8.Harutyunyan	Lilit	B	B	3.00
9.Hovhannisyan	Hermine	B-	B minus	2.70
10.Hovhannisyan	Syuzi	B	B	3.00
11.Jeladyan	Roza	B	B	3.00
12.Khachaturyan	Adelina	B	B	3.00
13.Mazmanyanyan	Anushik	B	B	3.00
14.Mkhitaryan	Tatevik	B+	B plus	3.30
15.Movsisyan	Marine	B	B	3.00
16.Torikyan	Maria	B	B	3.00
17.Vardazaryan	Karine	A-	A minus	3.70
18.Zakaryan	Ani	INC	Incomplete	
19.Adamyan	Anush	B+	B plus	3.30
20.Avagyan	Arpine	A-	A minus	3.70
21.Baghdasaryan	Karine	B+	B plus	3.30
22.Bayburdyan	Anna	B+	B plus	3.30
23.Harutyunyan	Irina	B	B	3.00
24.Hovassapian	Addeh	A-	A minus	3.70
25.Hovsepyan	Susanna	B	B	3.00
26.Mezhlumyan	Marianna	B	B	3.00
27.Miskaryan	Marine	B	B	3.00
28.Movsesyan	Anna	B	B	3.00
29.Nersisyan	Arevik	B	B	3.00
30.Sahakyan	Nune	B+	B plus	3.30
31.Sargsyan	Astghik	B	B	3.00
32.Shabunts	Gayane	B+	B plus	3.30
33.Shabunts	Hripsime	A-	A minus	3.70
34.Tarverdyan	Tereza	INC	Incomplete	
35.Torosyan	Suzanna	A-	A minus	3.70
36.Zargaryan	Tatevik	B+	B plus	3.30

37.	Balasyan	Angela	C+	C plus	2.30
38.	Dilbandyan	Armine	B-	B minus	2.70
39.	Ghazaryan	Anna	C-	C minus	1.70
40.	Ghazaryan	Armine	INC	Incomplete	0.00
41.	Hakobyan	Hasmik	C	C exact	2.00
42.	Iskenderian	Deena	C	C exact	2.00
43.	Khachatryan	Lilit	B+	B plus	3.30
44.	Malkhasyan	Diana	C+	C plus	2.30
45.	Nikoghosian	Niery	C+	C plus	2.30
46.	Paskevichyan	Tatevos	B-	B minus	2.70
47.	Vrshikyan	Hasmik	A-	A minus	3.70
48.	Aboyan	Arevik	B+	B plus	3.30
49.	Aleksanyan	Rima	A-	A minus	3.70
50.	Gasparyan	Stuzanna	C+	C plus	2.30
51.	Grigoryan	Jenny	C	C exact	2.00
52.	Karapetyan	Karine	B+	B plus	3.30
53.	Karapetyan	Mariam	A-	A minus	3.70
54.	Manukyan	Gayane	A-	A minus	3.70
55.	Nuryan	Lusine	C+	C plus	2.30
56.	Poghosyan	Serine	B-	B minus	2.70
57.	Simonyan	Lena	B-	B minus	2.70
58.	Stepanyan	Naira	B	B	3.00
59.	Varosyan	Narine	C	C exact	2.00
60.	Martirosyan	Sona	B-	B minus	2.70




Appendix D: Final Grades of the Students (Imastaser Anania Shirakatsi University)

IMASTASER ANANIA SHIRAKATSI UNIVERSITY

STUDENT`S NAME	GRADE
1. VOSKANYAN HEGHINE	<u>4</u>
2. MKHITARYAN ANNA	<u>5</u>
3. MARGARYAN NARINE	<u>4</u>
4. HOVHANNISYAN ARINA	<u>4</u>
5. DAVTYAN QARMEN	<u>5</u>
6. ARAQELIAN SHUSHANIK	<u>4</u>
7. MINASYAN MANIK	<u>5</u>
8. QOCHARYAN ARMINE	<u>5</u>
9. PETROSYAN HAMESTUHI	<u>4</u>
10. KARAPETYAN ANAHIT	<u>4</u>
11. TAGMAZYAN ROSA	<u>4</u>
12. MKHITARYAN HRIPSIME	<u>4</u>
13. MANUKYAN LARISA	<u>4</u>
14. GASPARYAN MARY	<u>4</u>
15. MANUKYAN VARSENİK	<u>4</u>
16. MARTIROSYAN SVETLANA	<u>4</u>
17. QOCHARYAN ARPINE	<u>5</u>
18. ALEQSANYAN SUSANNA	<u>5</u>
19. MURADYAN SYUZANNA	<u>5</u>
20. KHACHATRYAN ANTHARAM	<u>4</u>
21. KHACHATRYAN SUSANNA	<u>5</u>
22. HARUTYUNYAN ANUSHIK	<u>5</u>
23. ABGARYAN ANAN	<u>5</u>
24. BAHARYAN VARDUHI	<u>5</u>
25. GRIGORYAN ARMINE	<u>5</u>
26. GASPARYAN LUSINE	<u>5</u>
27. ADAMYAN HASMIK	<u>4</u>
28. SHABAZYAN LILYA	<u>4</u>
29. MARTIROSYAN MARGARIT	<u>4</u>
30. SAROYAN ANI	<u>4</u>
31. GRIGORYAN ANI	<u>3</u>
32. PALYAN ANI	<u>3</u>
33. BAGHDASARYAN LIANA	<u>3</u>
34. MARZPETUNI MANUSHAK	<u>4</u>
35. MUGHDUSYAN MERY	<u>4</u>
36. AGHAJANYAN ANETA	<u>4</u>
37. TSARUKYAN KARINE	<u>4</u>
38. HOVHANNISYAN SOFYA	<u>3</u>
39. ZIROYAN NARINE	<u>4</u>
40. HOVHANNISYAN ETERY	<u>5</u>
41. HOVHANNISYAN NUSHIK	<u>5</u>
42. GHARAGYOSYAN HRANUSH	<u>5</u>
43. AVETISYAN SIRANUSH	<u>4</u>
44. GRIGORYAN LIANA	<u>4</u>

45. PETROSYAN QRISTINE	<u>5</u>
46. ALEQYAN KAREN	<u>4</u>
47. DAVOYAN INESSA	<u>4</u>
48. SARGSYAN ARTHUR	<u>3</u>
49. BARSEXYAN LEVON	<u>3</u>
50. NAZARYAN MERY	<u>4</u>
51. ABRAHAMYAN ARTAVAZD	<u>4</u>
52. MKRTCHYAN HRIPSIME	<u>5</u>
53. KARAPETYAN SALVINAZ	<u>5</u>
54. MACAKYAN ANI	<u>4</u>
55. KHACHATRYAN NAIRA	<u>4</u>
56. THARZYAN SARGIS	<u>3</u>
57. HAKOBYAN ZAVEN	<u>4</u>
58. AVOYAN ARMEN	<u>3</u>
59. HOVHANNISYAN HAYARPHY	<u>5</u>
60. DAVTYAN MESROP	<u>3</u>

Georgyan Hakob 



Appendix E: Final Grades of the Students (*Akhuryan School*)

Student Name	Grade
1. Gasparyan Ani	7
2. Serobyan Ani	8
3. Petrosyan Sona	5
4. Hovakimyan Armen	8
5. Mosoyan Artak	6
6. Abgaryan Diana	8
7. Nikolyan Vanya	6
8. Mosoyan Alexan	8
9. Mosoyan Lusine	8
10.Safaryan Ararat	8
11.Matosyan Sargis	8
12.Hakobyan Kajik	5
13.Saghatelyan Henrik	9
14.Muradyan Levon	7
15.Bdeyan Sinor	6
16.Mkoyan Henrik	8
17.Galoyan Astghik	7
18.Darbinyan Anahit	8
19.Nikolyan Artyom	7
20.Karaprtyan Armen	6
21.Barseghyan Levon	5
22.Gasparyan Astghik	9
23.Torosyan Artyom	7
24.Barseghayn Hovhannes	8
25.Hosepyan Anna	7
26.Arzumanyan Lidia	8
27.Shabazyan Perchanush	5
28.Zhamkochyan Vahan	6
29.Barseghyan Anjela	7
30.Safaryan Gagik	6
31.Grogoryan Ani	8
32.Hakobyan Hovhannes	9
33.Babujyan Syuzanna	6
34.Vardevanyan Seda	6
35.Elbakyan Janna	7
36.Barseghyan Karine	7
37.Kasemyan Edgar	7
38.Malkhasyan Mane	8

39. Poghosyan Robert	9
40. Sargsyan Anahit	9
41. Hambaryan Gor	7
42. Kerobyan Gor	9
43. Igityan Samvel	5
44. Harutunyan Haykanush	5
45. Sargsyan Vachagan	2
46. Shahbazyan Vachagan	6
47. Khachatryan Sona	9
48. Asatryan Arsen	5
49. Aloyan Nora	5
50. Shakhbazyan Lilia	5
51. Hakobyan Knarik	5
52. Manukyan Hovhannes	5
53. Mardoyan David	5
54. Virabyan Aghabek	3
55. Atoyan Albert	7
56. Grigoryan Marine	3
57. Harutunyan Marzpet	7
58. Karapetyan Hovhannes	2
59. Pilosyan Lianna	8
60. Khachatryan Hovhannes	5

Akhuryan #1 Secondary School

A. Yengoyan



Appendix F: Questions for Interview (*English Version*)

1. Do you like the way your teacher teaches?
 - + What kind of activities does she want you do in class?
 - + Do you like those activities? Why?
 - + Do you want to have more (extra) activities? Why?
 - + Do those activities help you practice English in class? How? Please, give me an example.
 - + Does your teacher ask what kind of activities you want to have in class?
 - + If no, do you want your teacher to ask? Why?

2. Do you have discussions with your classmates concerning the topics of the day?
 - + If no, would you like to have and why?
 - + If yes, how do you think it can be helpful for improving your English?

3. Do you work in groups in class?
 - + If no, would you like to have an opportunity to work in group? Why?
 - + If yes, do you like working in groups? Why?

4. Do you have a chance to talk when you disagree with the teacher's ideas?
 - + If no, does it influence your learning achievement? How?

5. Do you use only English in class?
 - + If no, would you like to communicate only in English during the class? Why?
 - + If yes, do you find it effective for improving your English? How?
 - + Do you talk more than your teacher does during the class?
 - + Does your teacher encourage you to talk in English?
 - + Does she/he criticize you when you make errors?
 - + If yes, how does it influence your learning?

5. □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□:

✚ □□□ □□, □□□□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□
□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□:

✚ □□□ □□□, □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□ □□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□
□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□: □□□□□□:

✚ □□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□
□□□□□□□□□:

✚ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □ □□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□:

✚ □□ □□□□□□□□□□ □ □□□ □□□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□:

✚ □□□ □□□, □□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□ □ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□:

Appendix H: Samples of Interview Transcripts

Student 1 (MA Level)

Interviewer: Do you like the way your teacher teaches?

Student: Yes, a lot.

Interviewer: Why?

Student: Because he explains everything in a very comprehensive way. Even very difficult ideas he explains very clearly.

Interviewer: What kind of activities does she have you do in class?

Student: The activities suggested by our instructor make us think and find answers and we became inspired while finding the answers. Usually, in class we have that kind of activities.

Interviewer: Do you like those activities? Why?

Student: Yes, I like those activities because they make me think.

Interviewer: Do you want to have more (extra) activities? Why?

Student: yes, but mostly I would like to have more practicum activities in real life situations.

Interviewer: Do those activities help you practice English in class? How? Please, give me an example

Student: Of course, when we are being asked questions we have to answer them only in English and talk in English always.

Interviewer: Does your teacher ask what kind of activities you want to have in class?

Student: No

Interviewer: Do you want your teacher to ask? Why?

Student: I would like him to suggest alternatives. For example: Do you like to do this or that?

Interviewer: Do you have discussions with your classmates concerning the topics the day?

Student: Yes, we have discussions with group before the class, especially difficult points of the certain topics. And we also have group discussions in class. Our instructor tries to involve us in discussions

Interviewer: how do you think it can be helpful for improving your English?

Student: I think that it is helpful when we have discussions in class where we have to talk only in English: but before or after the class it is not helpful as we talk mainly in Armenian.

Interviewer: Do you work in groups in class?

Student: No not always, usually we do pair works.

Interviewer: would you like to have an opportunity to work in group? Why?

Student: No, I feel myself more comfortable while doing pair works.

Interviewer: Do you have chance to talk when you disagree with teacher's ideas?

Student: Of course, we have.

Interviewer: Do you use only English in class?

Student: Yes, only English

Interviewer: do you find it effective for improving your English? How

Student: Yes, it's very effective, as we are using and practicing English in class

Interviewer: Do you talk more than your teacher does during the class?

Student: Both of us are talking may be half-half.

Interviewer: Does your teacher encourage you to talk in English?

Student: Yes, as he is a foreigner, he does not know Armenian, and we have to talk in English. If we talk Armenian with classmates in class, he can get angry, and even set limitations for talking Armenian.

Interviewer: Does she/he criticize you when you are making errors?

Student: No, and even if we make mistake he corrects us in a gentle way. And I am happy that he corrects us even if he criticizes me I would also accept that.

Student 2 (High School)

Interviewer: Do you like the way your teacher teaches?

Student: Yes

Interviewer: Why?

Student: Because she uses different methods.

Interviewer: What kind of activities does she have you do in class?

Student: Usually we do activities from our book.

Interviewer: Do you like those activities? Why?

Student: Yes, but I like to have other interesting activities.

Interviewer: Does your teacher ask what kind of activities you want to have in class?

Student: No

Interviewer: Do you have discussions with your classmates concerning the topics the day?

Student: Yes, we have discussions with group so we can understand the topic better.

Interviewer: How do you think it can be helpful for improving your English?

Student: I think that it is helpful when we have discussions in class where we try to speak English but there are weak students and we have to speak Armenian which is not helpful.

Interviewer: Do you work in groups in class?

Student: Yes, sometimes. When we have a new reading material, we can work in groups and translate it in Armenian.

Interviewer: Do you like to work in group? Why?

Student: Yes, as there are some passive (weak) students who also can work during group work.

Interviewer: Do you have chance to talk when you disagree with teacher's ideas?

Student: Yes, sometimes we have an open lesson and in that lesson we are given a chance to ask questions.

Interviewer: Do you use only English in class?

Student: No, we usually use Armenian in class as there are students who do not understand English well and the teacher must explain the topic in Armenian.

Interviewer: Would you like to use only English in class?

Student: Yes, I want to use only English in class: when teacher talks in English we will be motivated to know what is she talking about and in that way we will learn English well.

Interviewer: Do you find it effective for improving your English? How?

Student: Yes, it's very effective, as we are using and practicing English in class

Interviewer: Do you talk more than your teacher does during the class?

Student: When teacher explains the new topic she talks much, but for the next lesson we talk much as we have to retell the topic.

Interviewer: Does your teacher encourage you to talk in English?

Student: She helps us to understand our mistakes and learn from our mistakes.

Interviewer: Does she/he criticize you when you are making mistakes?

Student: No, she just explains us our mistakes.

Student 3 (Bachelor Level)

Interviewer: Do you like the way your teacher teaches?

Student: Yes, a lot.

Interviewer: Why?

Student: It is interesting, sometimes tell jokes as well.

Interviewer: What kind of activities does she have you do in class?

Student: She has everyday lesson plan with activities from textbook and we usually do those activities.

Interviewer: Do you like those activities? Why?

Student: Yes, they are interesting.

Interviewer: Do you want to have more (extra) activities? Why?

Student: Yes, depending on the day.

Interviewer: Do those activities help you practice English in class? How? Please, give me an example

Student: Of course, as those activities sometimes make us think in English and it improves our English

Interviewer: Does your teacher ask what kind of activities you want to have in class?

Student: No

Interviewer: Do you want your teacher to ask? Why?

Student: No, I think that she knows better what we need

Interviewer: Do you have class discussions?

Student: Yes, we have

Interviewer: How do you think it can be helpful for improving your English?

Student: I think that it is helpful, as during those discussions we try to find and use more difficult words

Interviewer: Do you work in groups in class?

Student: Yes

Interviewer: Do you like group works?

Student: Yes, I do; generally, they are the most interesting activities for me

Interviewer: Do you have chance to talk when you disagree with teacher's ideas?

Student: Yes, I have.

Interviewer: Do you use only English in class?

Student: Sometimes

Interviewer: Do you find it effective for improving your English? How?

Student: Yes, somehow

Interviewer: Do you talk more than your teacher does during the class?

Student: Teacher talks more than we.

Interviewer: Does your teacher encourage you to talk in English?

Student: Yes, she tells us that we can improve our English by talking English in the class.

Interviewer: Does she/he criticize you when you are making mistakes?

Student: No, but sometimes she does and then corrects my mistakes.