Teachers Perceptions of their Knowledge and Skills in General and Specific Purposes English Courses at Distance and Regular Universities

Razieh Rabbani Yekta *

Abstract: The purpose of the this survey study was to explore if there were any differences between EGP and ESP teachers in terms of the way they perceived their pedagogical knowledge and teaching skills in teaching English when they were teaching in distance and regular education systems. To this aim, 84 teachers from a regular University and 50 teachers from the distance university were selected to participate in the survey. They were all novice teachers that had been working either in EGP and ESP courses for 1 to 4 years. The survey instrument used in this study was a questionnaire developed by [Choy, Lim, Chong, and Wong \(2012\)](#). It consists of 37 items, each with two Likert rating scales of 5 points which assess the self-perceived pedagogical knowledge and skills of the teachers. To compare the mean scores obtained from EGP and ESP teachers' perceptions of their knowledge and skills in distance and regular systems, MANOVA statistical technique was run on SPSS. The results showed that there was not any significant difference between distance and regular teachers of EGP in terms of their perceptions of their knowledge level and teaching skills. But, distance and regular teachers' perceptions of their pedagogical knowledge level in ESP courses were significantly different. A significant difference was also observed in the perceptions of pedagogical skills level between ESP teachers in two university systems with ESP teachers in the distance university perceiving their knowledge and skills at a higher level than their counterparts in regular education system. The results of this study have some implications for teacher training and professional development programs and pave the way for future studies on teachers' and learners' perceptions.

Keywords: Distance education, English for general purposes, English for specific purposes, teachers' professionalism, teachers' pedagogical knowledge, teaching skills.

Introduction

Along with rapid changes in technology and education, a kind of paradigm shift was also observed in both communications and the field of teacher training ([Hawkins, 2004](#)). Teaching was once considered as a kind of "technical enterprise", and teachers were encouraged to learn and apply certain skills and practices. Later, teaching was seen as a "cognitive process" which focused on analyzing teachers' mental processes. In recent years, the "critical teacher training programs" have been of a great concern in which teachers are "the agents of change", those who can develop appropriate attitudes and mentalities to reflect on not only "what they know." (knowledge), but also on "who they

---

* Assistant Professor in TEFL, Department of Literature and Humanities,

Faculty of Foreign Languages, Payam Noor University, Iran. Email: r.ryekta@yahoo.com.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: This article has been written based on the research project which was conducted with the financial support of Payam Noor University.

are" (their identities) (Hawkins, 2004).

Despite this paradigm shift which opens the eyes of the teachers to the critical era of change in teaching, it seems that some contexts, like the context of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), still suffer from a kind of chaos in pedagogy due to the incongruence between teachers of English for General Purposes (EGP) and teachers of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), on one hand, and between perceptions and practices, on the other hand. Because of these instabilities, the aim of the present study is to investigate teachers' perceptions of two aspects of knowledge and teaching skills. To this aim, the following research questions are answered in this study:

1. Is there any significant difference between regular and distance systems teachers' perceptions of their pedagogical knowledge and their teaching skills in General English courses?
2. Is there any significant difference between regular and distance systems teachers' perceptions of their pedagogical knowledge and their teaching skills in ESP courses?

Literature Review

In this part, the theoretical background and the related studies on the issue of teachers' perception and professionalism conducted so far have been presented.

Teachers' Pedagogical Knowledge

According to [Konig et al. \(2011\)](#), one of the important factors of teacher knowledge is General Pedagogical Knowledge (GPK). [L. S. Shulman \(1987\)](#); [Sothayapetch, Lavonen, and Juuti \(2013\)](#) define GPK as a set of "principles and strategies of classroom management and organization that appear to transcend subject matter"; it also includes knowledge about learners and learning, assessment, and educational contexts and purposes. GPK, as [Grossman and Richert \(1988\)](#) state, refers to the knowledge that teachers have of learning theories, instructional principles, educational philosophies, learners and classroom management techniques and, as a concept in research, is divided into three categories: instructional model (teaching method), classroom management, and classroom communication ([Morine-Dersheimer & Kent, 1999](#)).

Effective Teaching Skills

According to [Tikunoff \(1983\)](#); [Salmani-Nodoushan \(2006\)](#), effective teachers are those who can have a definite description of what instruction would entail, operationalize these specifications, and direct the student performance toward the achievement of desired results. The principles of effective teaching have been developed based on the research conducted on effective teachers' classroom practices and processes. [Blum \(1984\)](#); [Richards \(2001\)](#) has presented a list of 12 characteristics for effective teaching among them are: (1) giving clear and focused instruction, (2) monitoring students' progress, (3) using class time properly,

(4) having positive interpersonal skills with students and (5) using rewards to encourage students.

The Role of Teachers' Perceptions of their Knowledge and Skills in their Professional Development

[Eggen and Kauchak \(2001\)](#) see perception as a process in human growth which has a cognitive dimension; they believe that through perception, people are able to give meaning to their experiences ([Wong, Chong, Choy, Wong, & Goh, 2008](#)). Different factors may affect human's perceptions of his environment, including present and previous experiences, individual stance at a particular moment, the physical condition of the perceptual faculties, the person's interest, attention level, and the interpretation given to the perception. Due to the sensitivity of classroom events and the role of socio-affective and (Meta) cognitive factors in effective teaching and learning, the issue of teachers' perceptions and attitudes has frequently been studied so far ([Peerzada & Jabeen, 2014](#); [Atique & Khan, 2015](#)). In the study by [Wilson, Floden, and Ferrini-Mundy \(2001\)](#), a high correlation was found between what teachers perceived they know and what they teach. Thus, one of the main factors which enhances the teachers' ability for effective teaching is their perception of knowledge and skill which is, itself, highly flexible and subject to change during the process of professional development.

Effective Factors on Changing Teachers' Professionalism

In the literature on teacher education and professionalism, different models exist on teacher professional development. For example, [Berliner \(1995\)](#)'s of teacher professional development in which teachers start as novices and go through different successive levels to become advanced beginner, competent, proficient and expert teachers is one of the first models which, according to [Pířová et al. \(2011\)](#), has taken on a pedagogical-didactic approach to professional development and has ignored the impact of personal differences or contextual variables. There are some other frameworks which give more prominence to teachers' characteristics ([Pířová et al., 2011](#); [Maynard & Furlong, 1995](#)). Based on these models, in the first step in teachers' development process, the focus is on teacher's "survival" in the classroom; then, the emphasis shifts to teaching contexts and the final stress is on students' learning.

Another approach to teacher professional development is the socio-pedagogical one ([Pířová et al., 2011](#)). Under this approach, some of the models Huberman's model cited by ([Glatthorn, 1995](#)) focus on individual phases of teaching experience (1-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-18 years, 19-30 years, 31-40 years) as the stages of teachers' professional development; some deal with teacher preparation in reference to the research results ([Bevan, 2004](#)) or to the sense of environment ([Joyce & Shovers, 2002](#)). There are, also, [Day et al. \(2007\)](#); [Nias \(1989\)](#) models which put emphasis on the teachers' professional self-perception in connection with the impacts of outside elements. Teachers' reflection is, also, another factor which underpins some of the models of professional development ([Spilková, 2011](#); [Steffy, Wolfe, Pasch, & Enz, 2000](#)) .

From a third perspective, there are several models which view teacher professional development from a socio-pedagogical-didactic approach (Pířová et al., 2011). Fessler's model (Fessler & Ingram, 2003) considers three underlying systems in teacher professional cycle: the career cycle (educational subsystem), the individual surrounding (psychological subsystem) and the institutional context (social subsystem). According to Shulman and Shulman's framework (L. S. Shulman & Shulman, 2004) three layers of individual, community and policy evolve during the professional development of a teacher with teachers' reflection as the base of the changes.

Teachers' Professional Development in General vs. Specific Purposes English

One of the common trends in universities, all over the world, is to include both EGP and ESP courses in the language curriculum of their students to meet both their global needs and their future career needs (Bracaj, 2014). But, in most of the systems, ESP, has taken priority over EGP to the extends that some higher education stakeholders and practitioners claim that ESP should replace EGP, the long-standing practice of English language teaching in many universities, and thus become the common trend in college English education. They believe that EGP should be considered just as a prerequisite in language learning and should be studied before, but not during tertiary education level; English courses should be presented at more specialized levels commensurate with the students' subject specific fields. Furthermore, ESP is regarded as more effective than EGP in enhancing students' learning motivation because it relates to their fields of study and caters to their needs (Bracaj, 2014).

In Iran tertiary education system, ESP teachers are usually those who have some training in humanity with Master's or Doctoral degrees in Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, TESOL, or translation. There are rarely any teachers that have got their degree in ESP. The majority of ESP teachers, therefore, do not have enough knowledge and skills for handling the specialized issues in disciplines outside the realm of their expertise (Wilkins, 1976) cited by Abedeen (2015). This becomes more acute when no in-service ESP preparation course is offered at universities. This leads to an environment where beginning ESP teachers start their profession with only a couple of semesters teaching in General English courses. This is while General English course, according to Mallikarjun (1983) "aims at all language skills and develops a general competence in the learner to communicate in routine functional domains. The learner, however, will not be able to communicate in situations which are technical in nature and which are not common to all speakers of the language" (Abedeen, 2015). This shift in the focus of course from General to technical competence in English on the side of the learners, requires an ESP teacher education programs with special attention to the development of pedagogical content knowledge on the side of the teacher as one of the main elements of ESP teacher knowledge.

Distance vs. Regular Education Systems

One of the expectations of students in any educational setting is that such concerns as classroom organization, schedule and student tasks are clearly introduced to them just from the beginning of the course. The teacher, therefore, should organize the classroom procedure, grouping for tasks and demands for interactions and assignments (Simonson, Smaldino, & Zvacek, 2014). Moreover, as suggested by Sorensen and Baylen (2004), there is a set of instructional practice principles for engaging students in effective learning experiences which includes such items as: interaction with students, cooperation among students, active learning experiences, immediate feedback, high expectations, and appreciating diversity. In the distance education teaching and learning, however, there are some additional concerns that mostly engage the teachers and put them in the challenging situations for being a quality teacher. Below, some of the concerns mentioned for distance teachers have been presented:

- Providing required supports for not only delivery of content but for also the use of technologies involved in that process.
- Creating instructions for educational practice or experience necessary for effective teaching at a distance.
- Designing instruction with opportunities for giving feedback to the students and with due considerations of the background and the responsibilities of the students.
- Applying student-centered and interactive teaching methods which match the objectives of the distance learning (Herring & Smaldino, 2007; Miller, 2009; Simonson et al., 2014).
- Using strategies that engage learners in active rather than passive learning experiences (Conrad & Donaldson, 2012; Simonson et al., 2014).

Conducting research on teachers' professional knowledge and its influences on classroom decisions and performances is rather a new phenomenon in language teaching. A few studies have explored the relationship between teachers' perceptions and the way they work in EGP teaching (L. S. Shulman, 1987; L. Shulman, 1986; Cook, 1996; Andrews, 1999). However, in ESP teaching, this kind of study is rare or sporadic (Abdedeen, 2015). Moreover, investigating the impacts of teachers' knowledge on their classroom teaching, and studying the practical and professional needs of ESP teachers is not found among the research carried out earlier on ESP teaching and teacher development. When different education systems come into scene (in this case, regular vs. distance education systems), the paucity of research becomes more acute. This study aims to compare the EGP and ESP teachers' perceptions of their knowledge and skills across regular and distance university systems.

Methodology

This study was designed as an analytic survey using questionnaire to check the differences between self- perceived knowledge and skills of the novice teachers of English across different education systems and different types of the English courses. The survey was selected to be in an analytic type, here, because, in this study, the aim goes beyond just describing what is there; it attempts to find some answers to the research questions by analyzing the patterns observed in the participants' answers.

Participants

The population of the present study consisted of English teachers that were teaching at Isfahan University (as a regular education system) and Isfahan Payam Noor University (as a distance education system). Out of this population, a sample of 84 teachers was selected from Isfahan University and a sample of 50 teachers from Payam Noor University by a purposive sampling technique. The sampling is purposive because the participant teachers must have been selected from among the novice teachers with 1 to 5 years of experience in teaching English who have not yet passed any professional development program, and their perceptions and skills are, therefore, just subject to their preservice preparation programs and their limited experience in classrooms (Remmik, Karm, & Lepp, 2013; Palmer, Stough, Burdinski, & Gonzales, 2005). The composition of groups has been indicated in table 1 below:

Table1
Characteristics of the General English and ESP Teachers in the distance and Regular Education Systems

Education system	Type of the Course	N	Average Years of Experience in Teaching English
Regular	General English	63.0	4.0
	ESP	21.0	3.0
Distance	General English	33.0	3.5
	ESP	17.0	3.0

Instrument of Data Collection

The main instrument used in this study was a survey questionnaire developed by Choy et al. (2012). It consists of 37 items, each with two Likert rating scales of 5 points which assess the self-perceived pedagogical knowledge and skills of the teachers. The original version had 40 items, but, for the previous studies have showed that this questionnaire was both internally and externally valid (Choy et al., 2012; Chong, Wong, Choy, Wong, & Goh, 2010). But, to check the reliability of the instrument, a pilot study was done, based on its results, the Cronbach coefficient was calculated and reported to be 0.96. The questionnaire, therefore, was deemed reliable and could be used in this study. Table 2 shows the items:

As it has been indicated, in this questionnaire, teachers should mark their perceptions of the level of their knowledge on a scale with five points: 1 (No Knowledge At All), 2

Table 2
Questionnaire for the Self-perceived Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills of the Teachers

Perception of Knowledge					Items	Perception of Teaching Skills				
1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
					1. Selecting suitable teaching strategies for teaching particular topics.					
					2. Selecting teaching strategies that fit in students' different ability levels.					
					3. Asking students the right questions to make their learning easier.					
					4. Designing my own teaching materials.					
					5. Finding appropriate teaching materials for my lessons.					
					6. Integrating information and communication technology (ICT) effectively in the classroom.					
					7. Translating the syllabus into lessons for instruction.					
					8. Planning lessons that take into consideration the different abilities of students.					
					9. Determining appropriate teaching methods.					
					10. Planning student-centered lessons.					
					11. Using evaluative feedback to help students in their development.					
					12. Teaching according to students' pace.					
					13. Developing instruments for evaluation (e.g., written and oral tests, practical works or tasks, etc.).					
					14. Interpreting student performance based on the results of the test.					
					15. Diagnosing students' learning difficulties.					
					16. Using appropriate forms of assessment.					
					17. Arranging and controlling co-curricular activities.					
					18. Planning the time effectively.					
					19. Having coping skills.					
					20. Acquiring relevant subject matter content for instruction.					
					21. Managing stress.					
					22. Applying appropriate classroom management techniques.					
					23. Responding sensitively to diverse student needs.					
					24. Dealing with students with behavioral and learning problems.					
					25. Caring for the students' holistic development.					
					26. Managing student learning-groups effectively.					
					27. Managing individual students' learning effectively.					
					28. Using suitable strategies to control student behavior.					
					29. Monitoring students' learning and performance during lessons.					
					30. Managing student discipline.					
					31. Showing care and concern for students.					
					32. Motivating students to work hard.					
					33. Enhancing students' interest in learning.					
					34. Evoking students' interest in my subject area.					
					35. Instilling critical thinking appropriately in the lessons.					
					36. Promoting and inducing thinking among students.					
					37. Applying student-focused teaching and learning activities.					

(Not So Knowledgeable), 3 (Uncertain), 4 (Knowledgeable), and 5 (Highly Knowledgeable). They should also show their perceptions of the level of their skills in teaching in the areas determined by the items. In this scale, again, 1 points to “No Confidence At All”; 2 means “Not So Certain”; 3 is marked when teachers are “Uncertain”; 4 shows that they are “Confident”; and 5 indicates that they are “Extremely Confident”.

Data Collection Procedure

The data for the present study were collected at the end of 2015-2016 education year. At first, teachers were informed of the purpose of the study and the nature of the items to be responded, and they were invited to participate voluntarily. The survey questionnaires, then, were distributed among volunteer teachers either by email or in the face to face meetings and answers were collected.

Data Analysis and Results

Four different sets of data were collected from each university (four from distance and four from Isfahan University of which two sets were collected from General English teachers and two were from ESP teachers). Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics for each set of data.

Table 3
Means of Teachers' Perceptions of their Levels of Pedagogical Knowledge and Teaching Skills in General English and ESP Programs

	Distance		Regular	
	General Eng	ESP	General Eng	ESP
Perception of knowledge	3.29	4.60	3.37	3.70
Perception of skills	3.38	3.53	3.36	3.41

As it was indicated, there are some differences between distance and regular teachers' perceptions of their pedagogical knowledge at General English and ESP programs. At General English program, the distance education teachers' perceptions of their pedagogical knowledge level (3.29) are slightly lower than that for regular teachers of General English (3.37). At ESP program, there are also some differences in teachers' perception level. Distance teachers' overall perception level (4.60) is much higher than that of regular teachers (3.70). Similarly, if we compare the average scores across different programs within the same university system, again a difference is observed between General English and ESP teachers' perceptions of their level of knowledge, with ESP teachers showing a higher level of pedagogical knowledge.

As to perception of teaching skill, contrary results were obtained. Teachers' perceptions of their level of pedagogical knowledge were almost the same among General English teachers in different university systems (3.38 and 3.36). But, teachers' perceptions of their level of pedagogical skills showed some differences in ESP teachers, where the average score for ESP teachers in the distance education system (3.53) was higher than that for ESP teachers in regular system (3.41).

To answer the first research question, MANOVA was used to compare the mean scores obtained from General English teachers' perceptions of their knowledge and skills in distance and regular systems. At first, a test of equality of covariance was done and the result showed that there was no difference between two university systems ($F = 0.85$, $p=0.57$). MANOVA therefore, was suitable for the analysis with teachers' perceptions of knowledge and skills as dependent variables and type of the education system as the independent variable. The results of analysis showed that there was not any significant difference between distance and regular teachers of General English in terms of their perceptions of their knowledge level [Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.90$, $F(1, 134) = 1.99$, $p=0.07$]. Similar results were reported for teachers' perceptions of their teaching skills in General English courses with Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.90$, $F(1, 134) = 2.17$, $p = 0.04$ which showed that General English teachers in distance and regular education systems had similar perceptions of their teaching skills level.

To answer the second question, another MANOVA was run on SPSS to check any probable differences in perceptions of distance and regular systems ESP teachers. The results showed that there was a significant difference between distance and regular teachers' perceptions of their pedagogical knowledge level in ESP courses [Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.94$, $F(1, 134) = 5.56$, $p < 0.01$]. A significant difference was also observed in the perceptions of pedagogical skills level between ESP teachers in two university systems [Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.93$, $F(1, 134) = 6.1$, $p < 0.01$]. These differences have already been indicated in table 3 with ESP teachers in the distance university perceiving their knowledge and skills at a higher level than their counterparts in the regular education system.

Discussion

Contrary to EGP which takes a wide basis of knowledge and skills as its target, ESP, as said by [Far \(2008\)](#), is concentrated on specialized contexts in particular areas of skill or knowledge. According to [Harding \(2007\)](#), the main feature of ESP is its adjustment to students' specialized needs - while EGP focuses on all four language skills, in ESP the teacher should explore which of these skills is needed for the students' professions ([Fiorito, 2005](#)). The specialized content is another characteristic of ESP which according to [Hutchinson and Waters \(1987\)](#) comprises English for Science and Technology, English for Business and Economics, and English for Social Sciences.

The difference observed in this study between ESP teachers in the distance and regular education systems can be explained based on [F. Fuller and Brown \(1975\)](#)'s model of teachers' concerns during professional development. According to this model, beginning teachers are concerned with "self", or their "capability of teaching students and becoming a part of the educational environment". After this stage, teachers enter into a task stage, where they "expressed task concerns or fears about developing appropriate instructional materials". And, finally, in a late teaching stage, when self and task issues have been decided upon teachers become mostly concerned with the impact of their teaching on students which "encompass larger educational decisions and considerations of the impact of current trends and issues on students in the classroom". In regular education

system, where regular teacher-students interactions in classroom are the characteristic feature of the education system, it is reasonable that teachers enter the impact stage faster than teachers in the distance education where teacher-students interactions are limited. This impact stage is more acute in ESP contexts in which everything is determined based on students' needs.

On the other hand, in General English, where students' specific needs are not as much important as in ESP contexts, teachers' perceptions of their pedagogical knowledge and skills, are almost the same in the distance and regular education systems. It means that, novice teachers remain much longer in self and task stages and pass into the impact stage much later in their professional development period.

Conclusions

Based on the results of this study, something that makes EGP and ESP teachers' perceptions different in two education systems is their knowledge and skills in dealing with students. It means that in distance universities, where students are usually at distance, not in face-to-face interactions, ESP teachers have high perceptions of their knowledge and skills in teaching. Looking back at the questionnaires responses, this could be inferred from teachers' responses to items 23 - 30, where most of the ESP teachers in distance system have perceived themselves as highly knowledgeable and extremely confident in the areas like responding to different student needs, dealing with students with behavioral and learning problems, showing concern for the holistic development of students, dealing with student learning-groups, managing individual students' learning, using appropriate techniques to control student behavior, checking students' learning and actions during lessons, managing student discipline, whereas ESP teachers in the regular system who are frequently in contact with students in their regular classroom sessions have reported that they are mostly uncertain as to their knowledge and skills in the same areas.

Table 3, also, showed that EGP teachers in the distance university were a little more confident in their teaching skills than EGP teachers in the regular university; in contrast, EGP teachers, in the Regular system, perceived themselves a little more knowledgeable. These perceptions are observable in the responses obtained from the first ten items in the questionnaire, where EGP teachers in the distance university showed that they were confident of their skills in areas like: choosing appropriate teaching strategies, asking students the right questions, producing their own teaching materials, incorporating effective communication technology, designing and planning the lessons, determining appropriate teaching methods and etc. EGP teachers in the regular university, on the other hand, believed that they were highly knowledgeable in these areas.

In sum, the results of this study suggested that the self-perceived level of knowledge and skills was different in EGP and ESP beginning teachers in distance and regular education systems. In some areas of teaching (those which are directly related to teacher-student interactions), distance nature of university has affected positively on teachers' perceptions while in other areas (including those aspects which are related to teacher's planning and management of classroom events), it is the teachers in the regular system that see their

knowledge and skills at a higher level.

Implications

The results of this study show the importance of professional development programs that put more emphasis on understanding and practicing teaching skills for both distance and regular system teachers. According to [Johansson \(2006\)](#), teacher educators should apply the research findings on teacher knowledge for the improvement of training programs for prospective teachers. They should promote analytical thinking and help future teachers to “access experienced teachers’ practices and the cognition underpinning them ([Abdelhafez, 2010](#)).” This, in turn, helps the teachers in understanding their tacit theories and ideas, and developing knowledge of the effects of their perceptions on classroom procedures ([Borg, 1998](#)). On the other hand, focus should be on the development of accountability systems which make teachers and teacher training centers responsible for enhancing the pedagogical knowledge and teaching skills based on the standards set according to the research which is done on the profiles of professional competencies.

Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Studies

This study has only been conducted on novice teachers’ perceptions. Some further studies are needed to include both novice and experienced teachers and compare their knowledge and skills with each other. Such comparative studies will contribute to our understanding of the factors that affect language teachers’ knowledge of language teaching practices in different contexts and different systems.

The perceptions of knowledge and skills should also be compared between learners and teachers, on the one hand, and also, between teachers and other stakeholders in the field, on the other hand. This could give us more insights as to the nature of the problems that challenge our teaching and learning processes and suggest ways for handling these challenges.

And last, but not least, in this study, the ESP teachers were selected from different academic disciplines but because of the practical issues and the complexity of the research design, their fields of study could not be controlled or considered among the main variables under study. It’s, therefore, recommended that, in future studies, the probable differences in teachers’ perceptions of their knowledge and skills be explored across different subject specific fields.

References

- Abdelhafez, A. (2010). *An investigation into professional practical knowledge of EFL experienced teachers in Egypt: Implications for pre-service and in-service EFL teacher learning* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Abedeen, F. (2015). *Exploration of ESP teacher knowledge and practices at tertiary and applied colleges in Kuwait: Implications for pre-and in-service ESP teacher training* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Andrews, S. (1999). Why do L2 teachers need to 'know about language?' teacher metalinguistic awareness and input for learning. *Language and Education*, 13(3), 161–177.
- Atique, S., & Khan, I. (2015). The writing needs of business students: A teacher's perception in an EFL context. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, 3(2), 231–244.
- Berliner, D. C. (1995). *Teacher expertise*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Bevan, R. M. (2004). Filtering, fragmenting, and fiddling? Teachers' life cycles, and phases in their engagement with research. *Teacher Development*, 8(2), 325–339.
- Blum, R. (1984). *Effective schooling practices: A research synthesis*. Portland, ORE: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Borg, S. (1998). Data-based teacher development. *ELT Journal*, 52(4), 273–282.
- Bracaj, B. M. (2014). Teaching english for specific purposes and teacher training. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(2), 40–49.
- Chong, S., Wong, A. F. L., Choy, D., Wong, I. Y. F., & Goh, K. C. (2010). Perception changes in knowledge and skills of graduating student teachers: A Singapore study. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 19, 333–345.
- Choy, D., Lim, K. M., Chong, S., & Wong, A. F. (2012). A confirmatory factor analytic approach on perceptions of knowledge and skills in teaching PKST. *Psychological Reports*, 110(2), 589–597.
- Conrad, R., & Donaldson, J. A. (2012). *Continuing to engage the online learner: More activities and resources for creative instruction*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cook, V. J. (1996). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Edward Arnold.
- Dabbagh, N., & Bannan-Ritland, B. (2005). *Online learning: Concepts, strategies, and application*. Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Day, C., Sammons, P., Stobart, G., Kington, A., & Quing, G. (2007). *Teachers matter: Connecting work, lives and effectiveness*. Maidenhead: McGraw Hill (UK).
- Eggen, P., & Kauchak, D. (2001). *Educational psychology: Windows on classroom*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Far, M. M. (2008). On the relationship between ESP & EGP: A general perspective. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 7(1), 1–11.
- Fessler, R., & Ingram, R. (2003). *The teacher career cycle revisited: New realities, new responses*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.
- Fiorito, L. (2005). *Teaching english for specific purposes*. Available from <http://www.usingenglish.com/teachers/articles/teaching-english-for-specific-purposes-esp.html>.
- Fuller, F., & Brown, O. (1975). Becoming a teacher. *Teacher Education: Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*.

- Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 207–226.
- Glatthorn, A. (1995). *Teacher development*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Grossman, P. L., & Richert, A. E. (1988). Unacknowledged knowledge growth: A re-examination of the effects of teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4(1), 53–62.
- Harding, K. (2007). *English for specific purposes*. Oxford University Press.
- Hawkins, M. R. (2004). *Language learning and teacher education: A sociocultural approach*. Clevedon: The Cromwell Press.
- Herring, M., & Smaldino, S. (2007). *Planning for interactive distance education*. Bloomington, IN: AECT Publications.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Johansson, I. A. (2006). Concepts of teacher knowledge as social strategies. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 14(1), 19–34.
- Joyce, B., & Shovers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Alexandria, VA USA: ASCD.
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(2), 129–169.
- Konig, J., Blomek, S., Paine, L., Schmidt, H. L., Hsieh, & Feng-Jui. (2011). General pedagogical knowledge of future middle school teachers: On the complex ecology of teacher education in the United States, Germany, and Taiwan. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(2), 188–201.
- Mallikarjun, B. (1983). General and need based second language courses. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 21(3), 230–233.
- Maynard, T., & Furlong, J. (1995). *Learning to teach and models of mentoring*. London: Routledge.
- Miller, C. (2009). Enhancing web-based instruction using a person-centered model of instruction. *The Perfect Online Course: Best Practices for Designing and Teaching*, 297–309.
- Morine-Dersheimer, G., & Kent, T. (1999). *The complex nature and sources of teachers' pedagogical knowledge*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Nias, J. (1989). *Primary teachers talking: A study of teaching as work*. London: Routledge.
- Palloff, R., & Pratt, K. (2007). *Building learning communities in cyberspace: Effective strategies for the online classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Palmer, D. J., Stough, L. M., Burdenski, T. K., & Gonzales, M. (2005). Identifying teacher expertise: An examination of researchers' decision making. *Educational Psychologist*, 40(1), 13–25.
- Peerzada, M., & Jabeen, M. (2014). Impact of teachers' subject matter knowledge and behaviour on students' performance. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, 2(2), 154–162.
- Pířová, M., Najvar, P., Janík, T., Hanušová, S., Kostková, K., Janíková, V., & Zerková, J. (2011). *Theory and research of experts in teacher profession*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

- Remmik, M., Karm, M., & Lepp, L. (2013). Learning and developing as a university teacher: Narratives of early career academics in Estonia. *European Educational Research Journal*, 12(3), 330–341.
- Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Salmani-Nodoushan, M. A. (2006). Language teaching: State of the art. *The Reading Matrix*, 6(2), 125–140.
- Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–23.
- Shulman, L. S., & Shulman, J. H. (2004). How and what teachers learn: A shifting perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(2), 257–271.
- Šimoník, O. (1994). *Beginning teacher: Some pedagogical problems of beginning teachers* (Tech. Rep.). Brno: Masarykova Univerzita.
- Simonson, M., Smaldino, S., & Zvacek, S. (2014). *Teaching and learning at a distance: Foundations of distance education*. IAP.
- Sorensen, C. K., & Baylen, D. M. (2004). Learning online: Adapting the seven principles of good practice to a web-based instructional environment. *Distance Learning*, 1(1), 7–17.
- Sothayapetch, P., Lavonen, J., & Juuti, K. (2013). Primary school teachers' interviews regarding pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) and general pedagogical knowledge (GPK). *European Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 1(2), 84–105.
- Spilková, V. (2011). Development of student teachers' professional identity through constructivist approaches and self-reflective techniques. *Orbis Scholae*, 5(2), 117–138.
- Steffy, B. E., Wolfe, M. P., Pasch, S. H., & Enz, B. J. (2000). *Life cycle of the career teacher*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Tikunoff, W. J. (1983). *Utility of the SBIF features for the instruction of limited english proficiency students*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143–178.
- Wilkins, D. (1976). *Second-language learning and teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Wilson, S. M., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). *Teacher preparation research. Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations. a research report prepared for the U.S. Department of Education by the Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy in collaboration with Michigan State University*.
- Wong, A., Chong, S., Choy, D., Wong, I., & Goh, K. (2008). A comparison of perceptions of knowledge and skills held by primary and secondary teachers: From the entry to exit of their preservice programme. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(3), 77–93.