

## Assessing Ideologies and Discursive Practices of Monolingual and Multilingual English Teachers in the EFL Classroom Context

Hema Vanita Kesevan

### Abstract

*This paper presents the findings from ethnographic research that assessed and evaluated teachers' classroom ideologies to actual classroom discursive practices in an EFL classroom context. The research focused on areas of teachers' classroom ideologies and their classroom questioning patterns. It investigates the factors that influenced convergence and divergences of the teachers' actual practice with ideologies. This study compared a set of multilingual and monolingual English teachers that are distinct in terms of their qualifications, experiences and language background. The findings indicate that both sets of teachers appear to have similar ideologies but do not apply these in the same way. The teachers' ideologies are not always applied in their classroom practices for a variety of reasons: some are related to the context of teaching while others are due to differences in experiences and personal backgrounds of the teachers.*

**Keywords** Assessment, teacher ideologies, discursive practice, EFL classroom.

### INTRODUCTION

Research in the field of second language education has shown that teachers no longer perceive teaching as a structured and pre-planned activity. Indeed, teaching is viewed as involving spontaneous decision-making that is based on the activities that arise during lessons (Borg, 2003). According to Farrell & Bennis (2013), teachers' decision-making in the classroom is heavily influenced by a set of ideologies that teachers hold about students and pedagogical practices. These ideologies have been shown to influence the instructional judgments and decisions made in classrooms. Fundamentally, the ideologies that teachers uphold reflect personal values and beliefs (Verloop et al., 2001). And thus, teacher ideologies are fundamentally derived from their individual philosophies of teaching. Past research has indicated that teachers have different and sometimes competing ideologies, Andrews (2003) suggests that research conducted in the area of teacher's ideologies and classroom practices demonstrates that teachers' ideologies do not always converge with their actual practices in the classroom. Although a considerable amount of research (Liu, 1999; Nayar, 1994; Paikeday, 1985; Tsui & Bunton, 2000; Widdowson, 1994) has been conducted in the area of teachers' ideologies in language classrooms, these studies are largely confined to investigating teachers' ideologies and have rarely explored teachers' actual classroom practices to determine the influence of teachers' ideologies in their actual discursive practices.

This paper aims to gain an understanding on three aspects of ideologies. It intends to assess two different sets of teachers' classroom ideologies; the monolingual and multilingual teachers, to evaluate the implementation of the teachers' ideologies in their classroom practices and to investigate the factors that influence the implementation of their classroom ideologies. First, it assesses teachers' classroom ideologies by using a set of interview questions. Second, it evaluates the execution of the teachers' ideologies in their classroom practices by observing their actual classroom teaching. Third, it investigates the factors that influence the convergence and divergence of the teachers' classroom ideologies with their actual teaching practices by comparing the interviews conducted with the teachers and their classroom teaching assessment. The findings indicated that both groups of teachers have similar classroom ideologies, slightly differentiating in the aspect of turn allocation following questioning. Although they share similar perspectives on classroom questioning practices and feedback, there is a huge difference among the monolingual and multilingual teachers on the implementation of ideologies in their classroom practices. This study identified several aspects that

lead to the difference among the two sets of teachers, such as teaching experience and the language backgrounds of the teachers.

## **TEACHERS' CLASSROOM IDEOLOGIES**

Ideology refers to belief systems. It is a form of belief or societal structure which influences our practices (Kroskrity, 2010). This system is shared by members of a group or society rather than being a feature of a single individual (ibid, 2010). This does not, however, mean that a certain ideology is necessarily shared by all members of a society or group. In fact, members of the same society may have competing sets of beliefs. For example, teachers in the same educational system may have different views about pedagogical practices. Ideology functions to organise and control other socially shared beliefs and associated actions (Eagleton, 1991). For instance, an educational ideology may shape and control beliefs about a teaching style, including student participation, types of activities, seating arrangements, and other classroom-related matters. These views in turn guide people's actions in these contexts. Ideologies are world views that an individual, group, or society holds to be important or true, these views are shared by a society and form the basis for how it should function (Schieffelin, 1998). Ideology underpins perspectives on issues, actions, and behaviours of a social group. It influences the ideas that a society or an individual holds towards a certain issue, such as language or teaching.

The term "ideology" has been "characterised in a variety of ways, in a confusing tangle of common-sense and semi-technical meaning" (Woolard, 2004:293). Despite its complex nature, ideology as a concept has been used across a variety of disciplines such as linguistics, where people have talked about language ideologies in general, and also in detail (ibid, 2004). Although the term ideology has been appearing in language studies, ideology as a concept has not been much theorised in education. In fact, the term ideology is simply referred to as beliefs about teaching and often overlaps with language attitudes in educational research (Tsui & Tollefson, 2007). Research on language attitudes in education tends to explore an individual's beliefs, but pays less attention to shared beliefs and politics of language as in the case of language ideologies. The term language ideologies in classroom studies tries to capture "the implicit, usually unconscious assumptions about language and language behaviour that fundamentally determine how human beings interpret events" (ibid., 2007:26). The concept of language ideologies in the classroom is not limited exclusively to language use, but also mediates between language and broad social structures and categories, such as speaker's gender, nationality, and socio-cultural background, as well as beliefs about language practices.

The study of language ideology has received much attention in sociolinguistics and anthropological research. Research on language ideologies, variously referred to as language ideology, linguistic ideologies, or ideologies of language, and investigates how speakers rationalise their language use, including linguistic forms and discursive practices (Kroskrity, 2010). However, over the years there has been little agreement as to "what exactly the concept of language ideologies should mean as a theoretically organising unit of investigation" (ibid.:84). The classic definition identifies 'language ideology' as a "set of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalisation or justification of perceived language structure and use" (Silverstein, 1979:193). Language ideologies are rooted in the social practices of people. It not only refers to people's ideas, notions, or representations of language, but also to the practices through which they are enacted (Kroskrity, 2010). That is, when people are engaged in language practices such as classroom instruction, they are simultaneously displaying their beliefs about the nature, function, and purpose of language use. Language ideology postulates that there is an inextricable link between language use and the broader historical and institutional practices, values, and interests (ibid., 2010).

To date, most studies of teachers' classroom beliefs practices have focused on exploring the classroom beliefs of the teachers' (Liu, 1999; Nayar, 1994; Paikeday, 1985; Tsui & Bunton, 2000; Widdowson, 1994). They show that only a limited number of studies have focused on the actual teaching practices of the teachers. Yet other studies that investigated teachers' teaching practice have

not explored the teachers' teaching ideologies. Essentially, there are no studies that have examined how teachers implement their teaching ideologies in actual teaching practice. Thus, the present study intends to fill the existing gap in the field of teachers' classroom ideologies and classroom practices in a concrete educational context in Dublin, Ireland. Language teaching in this context can be divided into two groups of teachers; native English speakers and non-native English speakers. In fact, this scenario is pertinent in majority of countries that teach English as a second or foreign language (Widdowson, 1994). Fundamentally, English language classrooms in Ireland are filled with non-native speakers of English that travel to acquire the language. These students are generally taught by the local Irish teachers that have little teaching training, these teachers are hired on the basis that they are the native speakers of the language. Meanwhile, a limited number of trained multilingual teachers from neighboring European countries such as Germany and Switzerland are also part of the teachers' force in this educational context.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The present study employs an ethnographic approach that emphasises observation and analysis of situated practice. The ethnographic fieldwork for this study involved classroom observations and semi-guided interview sessions. The ethnographic approach provided insights into classroom practice from both the teachers' and researcher's perspectives. The classroom observations made it possible to capture genuine classroom events, while the semi-guided interviews with teachers provided insights into participants' perspectives on their classroom practices.

Data collection took place for the duration of eight weeks. Several sources of data were collected for each teacher participant: a pre-observation background survey interview, six three-hour sessions of non-participant observations and a one-hour interview on post-observations. In total each teacher participated in one and a half hours of interview sessions and 18 hours of classroom observations (three hours each session).

The classroom observation served as a primary data source for this study, as it records teachers' actual practice in classroom. All the observed lessons were video-recorded and transcribed. The researcher also took field notes about the classroom interaction that made it possible to provide additional information from the researcher's perspective. Meanwhile, the semi-structured interviews probed teachers' ideologies and allowed researcher to access teachers' perspectives of classroom events. Two interview sessions were conducted with the teachers: the first session explored the teachers' ideologies in relation to their classroom discursive practices, and the second sought clarification from the teachers on the divergence of their ideologies and actual practice. The interviews provided a basis for the teachers to examine their ideologies, and reflect its implementation in their classroom practices. In addition, this interchange also allowed the teachers to share their perspective about the divergence of ideologies and practice. The interview aims also to ensure that the researcher does not simply impose her own interpretations of classroom practices.

Findings from the two different sources were validated through a data triangulation process (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Both classroom observation and interview transcriptions were checked more than once to ensure the accuracy and consistency of the transcription. This was to ensure that no important information was missed during the process of transcribing. The ideologies that were obtained from the interviews and teachers' actual practices in the observations were summarized in the form of charts; an assessment of the interview and observation data shows the convergence and divergence between the teachers' ideologies and actual classroom practices.

### **Context and Participants**

Four teachers participated in this study. All the teachers teach adult foreign learners that come to learn English as a foreign language in Dublin, Ireland. The learners come from various part of the world however, majority of them are from neighboring European countries such as Spain, Italy, Poland and Austria. The students' proficiency level ranges from lower intermediate to intermediate. That is, generally they are able to read and write but have limited fluency and communication ability.

I will refer to the teacher participants by the following pseudonyms: Sam, Chris, Eileen and Pinky. The monolingual (native) English speakers both do not have any teaching qualifications in the area of English language teaching. Chris hails from Northern Ireland and holds a degree in fashion design while Eileen comes from Britain and possesses a degree in English literature. Chris and Eileen had taught English in a number of Asian and European countries. The second group of teachers, Sam and Pinky, are multilingual (non-native) teachers and English is a second language for the teachers. Both of them are trained English teachers and hold a degree in Teaching English as other Language (TESOL). Teaching experience of all the teacher participants varied in between 2-8 years. The major difference between the teachers is that Sam and Pinky are trained multilingual teachers while Chris and Eileen are untrained monolingual speakers.

## **FINDINGS**

This section discusses the results of this study. It argues that different sets of teachers have slightly different sets of ideologies and the implementation of ideologies in the teachers' discursive practices varies due to several external factors. The discussion of the findings is organized in three sections. The first section explores teachers' ideologies in the interview data. The second section discusses the teachers' classroom practices and the final section assesses the teachers' ideologies and actual classroom teaching practices. It evaluates the implementation of the teachers' ideologies in their classroom practices.

### **Teachers' classroom ideologies**

The interview conducted with the teacher participants explored the following aspects of teachers' ideologies on classroom practices; questioning, and feedback/repair following questioning. Most of the literature on classroom discourse and ideologies indicates that questioning is an important aspect of classroom discourse. Questions have a dual function: they function to elicit information and to construct knowledge. Classroom questioning is one of the common ways to encourage participation from learners. Questioning in classroom is often categorized into two types; display and referential. Teachers ask referential questions to seek unknown information, while display questions elicit already known answers. Questions that begin with *how* and *why* are examples of referential questions, and usually these types of questions genuinely seek information from the students (Wragg, 1983). *Who*, *what*, *where* and *when* are the patterns of display questions. In a similar vein, there is a widely held assumption that a teacher's job is to reduce learners' errors and guide learners towards the ideal language form (Gass & Selinker, 1992). The error correction ideology postulates that accepting learner errors and failing to provide feedback are ultimately bad teaching practice (Tolleson, 2000), and thus feedback is perceived to be an important aspect of classroom practice.

Questioning is perceived as an important aspect of classroom teaching by all the teacher participants. All four teachers agree that questioning plays an important role in stimulating participation and it helps teachers to evaluate the progress and language development of the learners. Although they all agree on the effectiveness of questioning in advancing learners' language development, the teachers expressed a preference for different kinds of question practices to accomplish certain kinds of results. Both Pinky and Eileen stated that they prefer to use display questions to promote communication during lessons, while Chris and Sam prefer referential over display questions. They maintain that display questions inhibit students' language development, as it only tests their level of comprehension. By contrast, referential questions are believed to enhance student's language development and enhance the learning process (Miller, 2002). Although Pinky and Eileen also felt that referential questions are important, they generally do not use them, as they believe the students are not sufficiently proficient to handle referential questions. Sam and Chris argue that tasks, including questions, have to be commensurate with learners' language capabilities and proficiency, hence posing certain types of questions to learners is considered unfair. Thus, some teachers pick types of questions according to proficiency level while others according to cognitive

functions. In fact, they generally avoided asking students questions who had lower proficiency, because it might embarrass the students and undermine their confidence to participate in other classroom activities. By contrast, Pinky believes that every student in her classroom must contribute to the language learning and teaching process. She facilitates this by selecting questions according to students' strengths. She asks challenging questions, such as referential questions to students who have a better proficiency and easier ones to students with a weaker knowledge of English.

Despite the teachers' enthusiasm for implementing questioning sequences in their classroom in order to encourage student participation and further language learning, the teachers differed with regard to student selection in questioning. The teachers expressed different views about student selection for answering questions. Both Pinky and Sam stated that they prefer to nominate individual students for answering their questions rather than allowing students to self-select because it allows pitching questions to each student's ability. Pinky remarked that in a classroom with beginner learners, it is difficult to expect the learners to self-select. In order to ensure the functionality of the lesson, she thus calls upon individual students to answer the questions. In contrast, Chris and Eileen believe in student choice and typically practice 'open-floor questioning'. They maintained that calling on individual students' by name may lead to embarrassment if the particular student is not able to provide an answer. This preference for open-floor questioning appears to be due to a personal preference because Chris stated that "...if I am the student, I would definitely dislike for the teacher to call my name and ask me to provide an answer when I am not ready to do it". He further remarked it is important for a new language learner to build confidence in using the language, since as teachers we must accommodate to their pace and allow them to individually participate rather than forcing it upon them.

With regard to feedback and repair in classroom practice, all the teachers agree that effective language learning and teaching can only be achieved by providing feedback to students and correcting their mistakes in learning the language. All the teachers agree that both positive and negative feedbacks are equally important, since this helps students to become aware and address their mistakes. The teachers believe feedback tends to provide immediate response as the teachers are able to witness the students correcting their mistakes. Although all teacher participants agree that oral feedback tends to be more powerful, they expressed different views about how to effectively address students' incorrect responses in the classroom. Chris and Sam shared their concern about students if incorrect responses are corrected publicly in front of other learners. Both teachers believed that public discussion of individual learner's mistakes is shameful for the learners. Sam mentioned that it would be more appropriate to repair students' mistakes individually as students will pay attention to their mistakes and strive to improve. He further asserts that correcting students immediately and directly to their face might defeat the purpose of correcting, since the fear and embarrassment will cause the students to not fully understand the corrections made by the teacher. Both Sam and Chris prefer to implement an incidental corrective strategy in which only hints are given to the student, such as repetition of the learners' incorrect responses and then to subsequently discuss the error in private. Pinky and Eileen did not agree with their views. They argued that students' mistakes must be corrected immediately as it provides students with better opportunities for improvement. Both teachers insist that explicit and immediate repair is the most effective strategy. Eileen remarked, "...classroom is a place to learn your mistakes, if the students commit an error then it must be corrected immediately, moreover students can't get away from making errors so there should be embarrassment to the students". In addition, Pinky stated that covert and delayed repair will not lead to fruitful results.

Teachers also have different ways of delivering the message to the students. Chris argued in favour of a face-sensitive approach which he referred to as the 'sandwich technique'. It combines both positive and negative feedback to deliver the message. He explained that repair should not be delivered bold on record but should be layered in between positive remarks. The teacher should first highlight a student's strengths before pointing out any weaknesses. Sam concurred with Chris' point of view as he also felt that bold on-record repair strategies are likely to threaten the student's positive face. Alternatively, Pinky and Eileen remarked that positive and negative feedback should be handled separately. Both teachers asserted that students should be praised for positive efforts and their mistakes must be treated separately. They further maintain that, mixing positive remarks to deliver negative feedback may cause confusion among the students. Eileen noted that "...some concepts take

longer to acquire and praising and correcting the error is often not successful, especially in the case of fossilized errors". Both teachers stressed that positive and negative feedback should be clearly distinguished and it must be used solely to serve its purpose. For Pinky, accuracy is important in language learning and thus error correction will be beneficial only when it is addressed specifically to the mistakes in order to enhance accuracy. She further stated that if error correction is mixed with positive feedback it will undermine the entire repair process as it can lead to confusion for the learners. Eileen and Pinky believe that positive feedback is important for the students as it motivates and encourages language learning and development: "praise them for a correct answer but don't mix it up with error correction".

**Table 1** Teachers' Ideologies Statements

Theme	Ideologies	C	E	S	P
Questioning	It is important to ask questions	√	√	√	√
	What types of questions you prefer to use; Referential/ Open-ended questions				
	Display/ Closed questions	√	X	√	X
		√	√	√	√
	Do you give equal opportunity to all the students when you ask questions.				
		X	∅	X	√
Feedback	How you prefer the students to answer; Individual nomination				
	Open floor questioning				
		X	X	√	√
		√	√	X	X
	Is it necessary to provide feedback.				
	What types of feedback you use; Positive feedback	√	√	√	√
	Negative feedback				
		√	√	√	√
	Error correction is shameful.	√	√	√	√
	Error must be corrected immediately.				
	√	X	√	X	
What type of error correction is effective; Implicit	X	√	X	√	
Explicit					
Positive feedback must be given along with error correction.	√	X	√	X	
	X	√	X	√	
	√	X	√	X	

Key: √ = agrees; X = disagrees; ∅ = unsure

**Classroom Practice****Table 2** Teachers' Classroom Practice

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Practice</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>P</b>
Questioning	Frequent questions were asked during the lessons.	√	√	√	√
	Participation was encouraged by questioning.	√	√	√	√
	Types of questions used during lesson; Referential/ Open-ended questions	√	X	X	√
	Display/ Closed questions	√	√	√	√
	Equal opportunity was given to all the students during questioning.	√	X	X	√
	Students were nominated individually to provide answers.	√	√	√	√
	Open floor questioning was implemented.	√	X	X	X
Feedback	Feedback was provided throughout the lessons.				
	Both oral and written feedbacks were utilized.	√	X	√	√
	Error correction was made as whole class interaction.	√	√	√	√
	Error correction was done in isolation.	√	√	√	√
	Errors were corrected immediately.	X	X	X	X
	Hints were given to indicate an error.	√	X	√	√
	Errors were pointed out and explanations were given.	√	√	√	√
	Learners were praised for their correct answers.				
	Positive feedback was given when errors were corrected.	√	X	X	√
		√	X	√	√
	X	X	√	X	

---

Key: √ = agrees; X = disagrees; ø = unsure

As the table indicated, to a certain extent teacher participants' practices were not congruent with their held beliefs. There were both convergence and divergence of beliefs in their actual classroom practices, as will be discussed below.

### **Chris's ideologies and practices**

Overall, Chris's ideologies tend to diverge with his classroom practices, but there were also some instances where they converged as well. Although Chris stated that he assigns different types of questions to students according to their proficiency levels, in reality he seems to provide equal opportunity to all of his students. He frequently asks questions in a circle. He starts the first question with the student sitting in the front row and continues asking questions until he reaches the students on the last bench. Thus, in most of his lessons the majority of the students were given a chance to respond to the questions. Chris seems to depart more from his ideologies in feedback than in questioning. According to the interview, Chris's top priority was not to publicly embarrass students. For example, Chris said, "... high confidence level is very important for a learner, I try to be very cautious not to make any of my students shameful, and as for me learning comes along with pride". It is possible that Chris is a little bit over-concerned with students' freedom. Maum (2002) pointed out that native teachers tend to be more concerned about avoiding threatening students' face when making pedagogical decisions than with teaching aims and best practice. In actual practice, however, Chris was observed not to live up to his ideologies. In several instances, he immediately corrected student's mistakes, clearly pointed out their mistakes and provided an explanation, and he did not implement his 'sandwich' corrective strategy at all.

### **Eileen's ideologies and practices**

Eileen was observed to diverge from her ideologies in questioning and providing feedback/repair from several perspectives. Eileen stated that she uses both types of questions and focuses on using more referential questions as it challenges students' cognitive level. In actual practice, Eileen was observed not to use any referential questions, her questioning patterns were focused on closed questions and even with display questions and she tended not to probe further for the students to elaborate their answers, even though there were many opportunities to do so. Similarly, she diverged on the questioning techniques. She relied quite heavily on individual nomination rather than open-floor questioning. Eileen said she doesn't force a question on a student by naming students; however, she was not able to practice open-floor questioning in her lessons as she had expressed in the interview.

In a similar vein, Eileen's feedback/repair mechanism was also quite divergent, like her questioning approach. Eileen's ideologies and practices converged pertaining to whole class correction and in providing positive feedback. Eileen was clear to indicate students' errors directly and to ensure she did not confuse the students by providing positive feedback along with negative. As she expressed it: "...students have the rights to know how to fix their mistakes, so I will explicitly tell them when an error is committed and ensure I don't beat around the bush by saying things like you are good but so and so ...". However, she was observed to diverge in correcting errors from what she expressed during the interview. Eileen did not provide continuous feedback as there were several instances when errors were not corrected but only hints were given to indicate the errors. When errors were not corrected, Eileen only echoed the errors and left it as it was. This diverged from her belief that errors must be corrected immediately by providing an explanation. Additionally, Eileen rarely praises her students for positive responses, unlike what she claimed she does.

### **Sam's ideologies and practices**

Generally, Sam's ideologies tend to converge with his classroom practices but there are also a few instances where they diverged. With respect to Sam's ideologies about questioning, all his ideologies and practices converged. Sam stated that his preferred questioning structure was the 'teach-test'



approach and in line with the former, he implemented continuous questioning throughout the lessons and ensured that he choose the right student to test through individual nomination. Perhaps the most strongly divergent practices from Sam's ideologies are pertaining to error correction. He stated that he is a great proponent of students' comfort and that he makes sure not to point out errors directly or transforms it into a whole-class correction. However, in practice he was observed to pay attention to accuracy, since he corrected mistakes immediately and frequently echoed the mistakes and corrected these clearly and loudly. In these instances, he appears not to be congruent with his ideology that immediate and whole- class corrections are shameful and need to be avoided.

### **Pinky's ideologies and practices**

Overall, Pinky's ideologies and practices tended to converge in her classroom practices. A minor fraction of divergence was observed in Pinky's questioning and feedback patterns. With respect to questioning, Pinky was observed using a large quantity of referential questions along with display questions as her choice of questions. However, in the interview she was against using referential questions, especially among her students who have a low level of proficiency. Interestingly, many of her students were able to provide answers for the referential questions even though she held the ideological belief that her students are not capable of handling challenging questions.

Indicating errors explicitly was the top priority of Pinky, and she remarked: "...students are not capable to identify their own mistakes unless you point it out clearly to them, I don't see any usefulness of only giving hints rather than fixing it right away". In fact, departing from her ideologies on certain occasions appeared to be motivated by her desire to provide an opportunity to self-correct prior to being told the answer. During these instances, Pinky was observed challenging a particular group of students to self-correct by giving hints, but she did not practice the same with other students. Pinky's divergence in this particular aspect could be in order to test particular students who possess a better level of English than her average students. This is because she was observed using implicit corrective strategy only with selected students.

## **DISCUSSION**

Results from this ethnography study seems to strengthen the view that teachers' ideologies and actual practice are often not congruent during quite a number of instances in their actual classroom practices. According to Senior (2006), experienced and trained teachers are likely to have more expertise and experientially informed ideologies than teachers with no any pedagogical training. In a similar vein, Gatbonton posits that principles or ideologies of trained teachers are likely to converge from teaching practices, as training is paramount to pedagogical decisions (2008: 173). Similarly, this study corroborates the principle proposed in work by Senior (2006) and Gatbonton (2008). With regard to the former, Pinky and Sam, the multilingual trained teachers, tended to practice what they said they would to a greater extent, although there were a small number of divergences. The incidental divergence of their teaching practice, especially with regard to error correction, can be explained as due to issues arising in the classroom. Throughout the interview after the classroom observations, Pinky continuously stressed how teaching decisions were constrained by incidents that occur spontaneously during lessons. On numerous occasions, she stated that as a teacher, she needs to accommodate to the situation and adhere religiously to her plan in her decisions, since classroom events occur naturally. Since the students show different levels of participation for every lesson, she has to continuously change her question preference to test students' comprehension. She further mentioned that although the students were placed in the beginner's level, in actual fact the classroom comprised students of various levels of proficiency. She thus needs to challenge those students with better proficiency to keep them engaged with the lesson. In a similar vein, Sam's divergence in his error correction technique could be explained by time constraints within a lesson that refrain him from practicing his ideologies fully in his teaching practices. In fact, in the post-observation interview, Sam constantly expressed how time constraint s influenced his classroom decisions, especially in the beginner's classroom. Although he believes in individual and implicit error correction, he was not

able to implement his techniques, as he had to cover a large quantity of information in a lesson. If he chooses to implement his ideologies, he will not be able to cover the syllabus within the stipulated time. A study conducted by Farrell and Lim (2005) raised the similar concern of trained and experienced teachers pertaining to time constraints.

In the case of untrained monolingual teachers, although the results tended to be more divergent than convergent between the ideologies and actual classroom practices, this could not be determined clearly, since both teachers were observed experimenting with different feedback and questioning approaches throughout the lessons. That is, their classroom practices are not continuous and tend to change from lesson to lesson. The lack of expertise in making pedagogical decisions would suggest a lack of stability between their ideologies and classroom practices. Since both teachers were not trained in classroom teaching approaches and methodologies, the teachers were observed trying to test various techniques before forming stable and continuous patterns of classroom discourse. According to Gathbonton (2008), untrained and inexperienced teacher's ideologies tend to change to an exceptional degree, since they had fewer opportunities to revisit the pedagogical methodologies and approaches and draw a generalization, as the trained teachers were able to do. Although this might not appear to be true for all inexperience and untrained teachers, it tended to be possible in the case of Eileen, especially pertaining to the feedback/repair category. Eileen stated that error correction is not shameful and in fact it is an important part of classroom teaching.

However, Eileen was constantly monitored tending to neglect students' errors, she did not provide feedback or acknowledge that an error had been made; in fact, very minimal hints were given to the students to indicate the error. In the case of Chris, although he diverged from his ideologies in many instances, his divergence seems to be helpful in his actual practice in several ways. He stated that he does not provide equal opportunities to his students and only practices open-floor questioning. In actuality, he was in conflict with his professed ideologies, and his divergent practices were beneficial for the students, as he ensured that everyone was given an opportunity during all his lessons. Similarly, in the feedback/repair category, his divergence was beneficial for the students, since he clearly pointed out students' mistakes and provided an explicit explanation regarding the errors made, which enhanced students' understanding. According to Basturkmen (2012), it is possible for inexperienced teachers to be unsure of their ideologies, as they are still in the process of forming. From that perspective, it is possible that Chris's practices and ideologies varied to a certain extent due to his inexperience in verbalizing his ideologies. In addition, Chris has the fewest years of experiences, less than other teacher participants. Hence, his lack of experience may also have been a hindrance for him to verbalize his ideologies in the interview and cause him to be unaware of his actual practices.

This was the first interview and classroom observations for all the teacher participants pertaining to their ideologies and classroom practices. Despite several years of teaching practice, in general all the teachers were seem relatively unaware of their ideologies and practices, and this was evident in the interview; long hesitation and time was spent in conveying their ideologies. Farrell and Bennis (2013) mentioned that it is indeed a problem to examine teachers' ideologies as it always remains hidden for the teachers and efforts are needed to bring such beliefs to the level of awareness. Generally, when a chance is given to express ideologies on teaching and learning, teachers subsequently realize that their ideologies are far from simple. Thus, if teachers consciously think about their language teaching ideologies, they could actually form some awareness about their tacitly held ideologies and in addition be cautious if there is any gap between what they believe they are doing and what the students are receiving in actuality. Fundamentally, assessing the ideologies and actual classroom practices of trained and untrained teachers can help to shed light on how teachers can adjust their ideologies and further improvise their teaching techniques and approaches in order to enhance their practices.

## CONCLUSION

This study assessed the ideologies of teachers in regard to the degree they corresponded with or diverged from their classroom practices. It investigated the practices of two trained multilingual and two untrained monolingual teachers in an English academy in Ireland. The findings of this study indicated that there were divergence and convergence of ideologies and practices among all the teachers. However, the trained teachers seemed to be less divergent than the untrained teachers. Although the divergence can be seen as a reaction to the natural occurrences of classroom context where teachers need to accommodate to the needs of the classroom, the greater divergence of the untrained teachers suggests there is a distinctive empirical difference between trained and untrained teachers. Even though this study included a small sample of teachers, the ethnography approach and the length of this study suggests that this result can be generalized to teachers in similar contexts. The purpose of assessing the classroom ideologies and practices of monolingual and multilingual teachers is not to determine the best practice or to compare the teachers but to understand to what extent the training and experience of a teacher can influence their pedagogical decisions that further impact on the teaching and learning process. Hence it is clear that training is important for teachers of any background, whether monolingual or multilingual.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, S. (2003). 'Just like instant noodles': L2 teachers and their beliefs about teaching pedagogy. In *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* 9(4): 351-372.
- Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System* 40(2): 282-295.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81-109.
- Breen M P, Hird B., Milton M., Oliver, R. and Thwaite, A. (2001). Making sense of language teaching: Teacher's principle and classroom practices. In *Applied Linguistics* 11: 470-501.
- Calderhead, J. (1996). *Teachers: Beliefs and knowledge*. London: Prentice Hall International.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erkman, F., Caner, A., Sart, Z.H., Borkan, B., & Sahan, K. (2010). Influence of perceived teacher acceptance, self-concept and school attitude on the academic achievement of school-age children in Turkey. In *Cross-Cultural Research* 44(3): 295-309.
- Farrell, T.S.C., & Lim, P.C.P. (2005). Conceptions of grammar teaching: a case study of teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. *TESL-EJ* 9(2): 1-13.
- Farrell, T.S.C., & Bennis, K. (2013). Reflecting on ESL Teacher Beliefs and Classroom Practices: A Case Study. In *International Journal of Educational Research* 44 (2): 163-176.
- Gass, S. M. & Selinker, L. (1992). *Language transfer in language learning*. Rev. ed. London: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Gatbonton, E. (2008). Looking beyond teachers' classroom behaviour: inexperienced and experienced ESL teacher's pedagogical knowledge. *Language Teaching Research* 12(2): 161-182.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2010). Language ideologies in evolving perspectives. *Society and Language Use*, 7(3), 192-205.
- Liu, P. (1999). Teachers' beliefs about teaching English to elementary school children. *English Teaching & Learning*, 31(1), 43-76.
- Maum, R. (2002). Nonnative-English-Speaking Teachers in the English Teaching Profession. In *ERIC Digest*: 1-7.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Nayar, P. B. (1994). Whose English is it. *TESL English Journal*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Paikeday, T. M. & Chomsky, N. (1985). *The Native Speaker is Dead!: An Informal Discussion of a Linguistic Myth with Noam Chomsky and Other Linguists, Philosophers, Psychologists, and Lexicographers*. New York: Paikeday Pub Co.
- Richards, J. C. (1996). Teacher's maxims in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 30(2): 28—296.
- Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A. & Kroskrity, P. V. (1998). *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New

- York: Oxford University Press.
- Sendan, F., Robert, J. (1998). Orhan: a case study in a development of a student teacher's personal theories. In *Teachers and Teaching: Theories and Practices* 4(2): 229-244.
- Senior, R. (2006). *The Experience of Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge Press University.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks & C. L. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2000). Policy and ideology in the spread of English. In J. Kelly Hall & W. G. Egginton (Eds.), *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Tsui, A. & Bunton, D. (2000). The discourse and attitudes of English language teachers in Hong Kong. *World Englishes*, 19(3), 287-303.
- Tsui, A. B. & Tollefson, J. W. (2007). *Language Policy, Culture, and Identity in Asian contexts*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Verloop, N., Van Driel, J., and Meijer, P. (2001). Teacher knowledge and the knowledge of teaching. In *International Journal of Educational Research* 35: 441-61.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377-389.
- Woolard, K. A. (2004). Codeswitching. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. London: Wiley Blackwell.
- Wragg, E. C. (1983). *Classroom Teaching Skills: The Research Findings of the Teacher Education Project*. London: Psychology Press.
- Zeichner, K. (2003). The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit, prepare, and retain the best teachers for all students. In *The Teachers College Record* 105(4): 490-519.