ISSN 1798-4769
Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 323-331, March 2011

doi:10.4304/jltr.2.2.323-331

Mismatches between Learner's Style and Teacher's Style in L2: A Concern for Communication, a Case of Iranian Adult

Minoo Alemi
Sharif University of Technology, Iran, Tehran
Email: alemi@sharif.ir

Parisa Daftarifard
Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Iran
Email: pdaftarifard@yahoo.com

Iolanda Tobolcea
Educational Sciences University, Romania
Email: itobolcea@yahoo.com

***Abstract*—It is quite axiomatic that no two foreign language learners are the same. Also, these differences frequently are considered to be responsible for the learners' success or failure. Although individuals do not usually show variations in their first language learning, they are different in "rate, speed, and ultimate level" as far as their second language acquisition/learning is concerned (Ellis, 1997). Such differences are due to the cognitive, affective, and social factors underlying second language acquisition. This paper is a case study of an Iranian adult who had language deficiency. The subject has been studying at an institute for more than a year and a half; however, he could not make good progress in his English proficiency in comparison to his other classmates. Several instruments were used in this study to probe his probable disabilities in learning. The results show that there are some discrepancies between the teaching method and his learning ability techniques. Moreover, he is not familiar with metacognitive strategies and cannot plan for himself.**

***Index Terms*—communication, mismatch factors, foreign language learners, cognitive factors, affective factors, social factors**

I. Introduction

It is quite axiomatic that no two foreign language learners are the same. Also, these differences frequently are considered to be responsible for the learners' success or failure. Although individuals do not usually show variations in their first language learning, they are different in "rate, speed, and ultimate level" as far as their second language acquisition/learning is concerned (Ellis, 1997) [6]. Such differences are due to the cognitive, affective, and social factors underlying second language acquisition.

Some people learn language more easily and at a higher rate than others (Lightbown & Spada, 2006 [12]; Ellis, 1994 [5]). This variation among learners might be due to the differences in their aptitude (Robinson, 2005 [15]; Dornyei & Skehan, 2003 [8]), attitude and motivation (Arnold & Brown, 1999 [1]; Brown, 2007 [2]; Ehrman, 2005[4]), intelligence (Gardner, 1993 cited in Lightbown & Spada, 2006) [12], belief (Lightbown & Spada, 2006), [12] and strategies (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990) [13]. Ellis and Sinclair (1989 cited in Halbach, 2000) [9] present a list of the characteristics of good language learners and comment that good language learners ‘‘are aware of and understand the reasons for their attitudes and feelings towards language learning and themselves as language learners’’(p. 6).

Researchers have been trying to investigate how different cognitive and personality variables are related and how they interact with learners' experiences so that they can gain a better understanding of human learning. The importance of such studies is that researchers hope to find a way to increase the possibility of learners' success in language learning. Stevick (1989 cited in Ellis, 1994) [5], in a study of seven successful language learners, noted that they "differ markedly with regard to what … they prefer to do and not to do". Ellis (1994) [5] has identified five major aspects of successful language learning in literature as (a) a concern for language form, (b) a concern for communication, (c) an active task approach, (d) an awareness of the learning process, and (e) a capacity to use strategies flexibly in accordance with task requirements. Rubin (1975 as well as Naiman et al., 1978 cited in Ellis, 1994) [5] found that good language learners treat language as a system by making effective cross-lingual comparisons, analyzing the target language, and using reference books. Such learners also monitor their L2 performance and try to learn from their errors by asking for corrections when they think these are needed.

Good language learners also attend to meaning. As Ellis (1994) [5] found from eight studies he reviewed, all reported

that good learners use this strategy. Good language learners search for meaning in input they are exposed to. The ability to switch back and forth in attending to meaning and form may be a crucial feature of successful language learning. Moreover, good language learners are actively involved in language learning. They are autonomous although they appreciate teachers who are systematic, logical, and clear. They like to be responsible for their own learning by identifying goals and by introducing new topics into a conversation, although they may not engage in language production. As O'Malley and Chamot (1990) [13] mentions, good learners follow metalingual strategies.

Also they list several features for an effective learner. They believe that effective language learners learn to perceive recurring patterns in a problem and to link their solution to these patterns. They also learn to represent the problem in terms of abstract features. This may be predictive of the problem solution as contrasted with surface features of the problem. Moreover, experts reorganize their approach to the problem in terms of the features of the domain and develop better memories for information that is involved in the problem solution. Also, experts are domain-specific in regard to the knowledge they possess.

More effective learners also understand language tasks in terms of the meaning-based intent of the communication rather than in terms of the linguistic elements or surface language features of the text. They recognize their approach to the problem and apply a variety of strategies, depending on the task demands. Experts have better-organized long-term memory structures for their area of expertise. Elsewhere, Ehrman (1996) [3] proposed a taxonomy in which different types of learners are shown and differentiated.

II. What is Learning Disability?

Learning disability refers to a "dysfunction in one of the components of learning that takes place in the brain" Ehrman (1996, p. 262) [3]. It covers a variety of problems such as input, output, integration, and memory (Silver, n.d. cited in Ehrman, 1996) [3]. Input is related to all abilities which receive input like visual and auditory perceptual abilities. Visual perceptual disabilities have a spatial aspect such as eye coordination, orientation of self in space, and judging distance. A messy desk might cause trouble for such a person when he or she has to focus on a single task. Auditory perceptual disabilities often cause difficulty with distinguishing difference among sounds. Minimal pairs such as boil and bowl may be confused.

The next learning disability is integration. When information reaches the brain through perception, it must be ordered (sequenced) and understood (abstraction) (Ehrman, 1996) [3]. Sometimes three types of disability occur: sequencing disabilities, simultaneous processing disabilities, and abstraction disabilities. Sequencing disabilities appear in difficulties with narratives, particularly managing sequences of ideas or events. Beginning, middle, and end may be mixed up. Spelling errors will show up as re-orderings of the letters, all of which may be present, or material may be copied in the wrong order.

Simultaneous processing disabilities are not mentioned in Silver's taxonomy, but they would seem to belong here. They may manifest as the severe inability to do even the kinds of everyday multitasking called on by taking notes while listening to a lecture, for example. And finally, abstraction disabilities may show up as difficulties with making inferences, appropriate categorizing, seeing interrelations, or going from the specific to the general. Problems are likely to show up in making subtle semantic distinctions.

Another disability is related to memory. Short-term memory disabilities occur when an unusual number of repetitions are needed to put material into memory. Long-term memory, on the other hand, refers to disability in retrieving information from memory and disability in transferring the original learning context to a new one. The last type of category is output disabilities which cover dyslexia, motor disabilities, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder.

Other famous learning problems are general functioning. Sometimes, in some cases general abilities and language skills are inconsistent with each other. Level of work varies from day to day. These people might have negative self-image, and may need to be given information more than once.

While it has long been recognized in the learning disabilities field that foreign language study would be a terrific challenge to learning-disabled students, somehow this fact has been widely ignored in the field of foreign language instruction and in schools in general until very recently. Teachers of ESL students also have recognized that there are students who have great difficulty mastering English because of learning disabilities. This fact has added some urgency to the need for recognition of this problem. As more research is being done and more teachers are recognizing the problem, more solutions are being created for the student facing the challenge of learning a foreign or second language and the teachers who teach them (Schwarz, 1997) [16]. This study examines one of the cases who has a language learning problem.

III. Method

As mentioned above, the purpose of this paper is to study an Iranian adult with language deficiency to locate his probable disabilities. Therefore, the design of this research is a case study which is done through observation and constructed interview.

A. The Case

The participant in this study was a 20-year-old boy (his pseudonym is Al hereafter) who has studied English at Marefat institute for about 23 months. He began English at the starter level. He has studied the "Let's Go" series of books. He passed semesters CAC3, CAC4 (yellow "Let's Go" book), CAC5 (He studied this term twice: the first time he failed), CAC6 and CAC7 (the green "Let's Go" book), CAC8 and CAC9 (the red "Let's Go" book), and CAC10 (the orange book). However, he could not make any good progress. He has failed the last semester and now he has taken CAC10 again. Although he is highly motivated, as he frequently repeated this to the interviewer, he could not get a good mark for each term he passed. Mainly his score was near the cut off score of 70 – the conditional case for acceptance – and he has barely gotten 75 or above, which is the unconditional passing score (CAC3=74; CAC4=70; CAC5/1= 66; CAC5/2= 72; CAC6=70; CAC7= 75; CAC8=70; CAC9=70; CAC10= 54). Nevertheless, he enrolled in CAC10 again, although he told me that he might have to quit if he could not pass.

Al has not been a successful learner at high school either. He is studying on his own at home because he is behind his classmates. However, he is a symbol of self-confidence. When this researcher asked him, "Who do you think is the best in your class?" he responded, "I think I am the best because I try very much more than anyone else." He said he had never encountered any problem for which he could not find a solution.

From the very beginning, he stated that he wanted to learn English so he could travel and visit his brother who is studying in Canada. So he seems to enjoy highly extrinsic motivation. Also, he said that he loved English so he enjoys highly intrinsic motivation.

B. Instrument

In this study three instruments were used: 1) an environmental questionnaire developed by Joy Reid (1987) [14], 2) a motivation and strategies questionnaire by Ehrman (1996) [4], and 3) an instrument to test sequential and random processing (Ehrman, 1996) [4]. It took the researcher (the author) 10 sessions, twice a week to interview the respondent and complete the questionnaire. Each session took 30 to 45 minutes. All sessions were videotaped. However, since the interview was structured and was based on the questionnaires available, no part of the interview was transcribed. It only was referenced to the extent it could help the researcher interpret the questionnaire results. For example, the respondent's handwriting, both in Farsi (mother tongue) and English (learner language) was recorded. Also, the way he was writing was recorded. The researcher noted instances in which he answered questions with difficulty. Sometimes, the researcher had to repeat a sentence several times so that he could process the sentence and answer the question.

C. Procedure

During the first session, the researcher introduced herself and explained the purpose of her research. She asked about Al's academic background, but she was cautious not to create any bad feeling in the respondent and embarrass him. Because the respondent was the weakest student in the class, the researcher decided to start the research with two individuals – Al and D – to save Al from embarrassment. They were told that the purpose of the research was to see what might affect language learning development in different students. Later, because of lack of time, this researcher did not continue with D. Therefore, only Al was interviewed for the remaining eight sessions.

Al explained that he had studied English before in another institute in Esphahan, and he thought the Marefat institute was better than his previous institute. He seemed to be very tidy and he had all information on the previous institute in his notebooks. As the researcher asked the other respondent – D, Al prepared his answer to the same question in advance. This showed that he paid attention to every detail of the research and questions. As the researcher asked D to talk about her teachers, Al also was writing the name of his teachers so that in his turn he could talk about them.

D. Environmental Writing Inventory

The first questionnaire was the Environmental Writing Inventory Questionnaire, the responses to which are shown below and discussed in detail. The first question was related to location for studying. Al mentioned that he is used to studying in an informal but clean place. He does not care if he studies at a specific time. Also he is used to using a pencil instead of other instrument such as a computer, pen, highlighter, etc. He also mentioned that he is used to wearing casual clothing when studying and he likes to study in a bright environment. To him it is not important whether it is hot or cold or cool; however, he likes to study in a quiet environment. He also does not like to eat or drink when studying. The result shows that he likes to do everything step-by-step and he is not an integrator.

IV. MSQ Part I: Aptitude and Motivation

The second instrument was MSQ, which has three parts. In this part, different respondent's features such as overall attitude, nature of motivation, reason for learning motivation, thin or thick ego boundary, and anxiety are explored. The questions are discussed and the results are interpreted here. The first question was, "How do you rate your own ability to learn foreign languages relative to others in general?" Al considered himself average.

The second question was, "How well do you think you will do in this language course?" He answered "superior" to this question. The third question is, "How motivated are you to learn this language?" This question measures the respondent's motivation for learning English. The answer was "highly motivated." The fourth and fifth questions – "Why are you taking this language?" and "How much do you want to do what you described in item 4 above?" – are

related to the reason for learning and the importance of the reason for learning. To answer this question, Al mentions that he is learning English because he wants to go abroad, watch films, and use the computer. As a whole, he thinks learning English is useful for him. He weighted this importance as a 5, i.e., really looking forward to it. The next questions indicate that his motivation is intrinsic motivation not extrinsic, although he thinks that it is important to be at the top of his class (of course he is not). To him, (a) language learning is fun, (b) he likes the country where English is used, (c) he does not think language learning is a challenge, (d) he enjoys talking with English-speaking people, and (e) he loves to learn something new.

The next questions in this questionnaire were related to anxiety. Anxiety, as mentioned by Ellis (1994) [5] as well as Foss and Reitzel (1988) [7], can be either debilitative or facilitative. Facilitative anxiety helps the learner try harder while debilitative anxiety prevents him from trying. Al seems to have no anxiety at all! Although he is a low achiever, he answered "not at all" to two questions: (7) "I would say my anxiety about learning language is" and (8) "My anxiety about speaking in class (answering questions, giving reports, asking questions, etc.) is about this level". This is really surprising about Al. According to Ehrman (1996) [4], the two questions have a negative correlation with different parts of questionnaires of End of training proficiency in speaking and interactive listening, and reading, as well as Hartmann Boundary Questionnaire (thin ego boundary, sensitive, and abstractions), Meyers-Briggs-Type Indicator. Therefore, he has no anxiety about language learning experience in spite of being well behind the class, nor does he have anxiety about speaking in class although he is not fluent in speaking. One point should be worth mentioning about Al is that he even insists on using the English pronunciation when pronouncing a word in Persian. This researcher has to use his native language for asking questions and talking to him, and whenever she uses an English word he was familiar with perfunctorily in Persian pronunciation, surprisingly he corrected the researcher.

In sum, Al is a very motivated student with intrinsic motivation. According to Dornyei and Skehan (2003) [8] intrinsic motivation is a positive motivation and is more permanent than extrinsic motivation, which is temporary and situational. This is why he persists in learning English, although he faces many difficulties and is gaining low scores and mostly near-cutoff scores rather than excellent scores. What has been observed was that in one of his quizzes he was allowed more time in answering test questions than his classmates.

A. MSQ Part IIa: Learning and Teaching Techniques

This questionnaire is a 5 option Likert scale with 1 equals waste of time, 2 equals not very helpful, 3 equals neither/nor, 4 equals helpful, and 5 equals nearly indispensable. Al strongly endorsed systematic ways of instruction and language learning. In responding to the first question of this questionnaire, "The instructor systematically follows a textbook or syllabus" he answered "helpful".

Moreover, he rated himself as an analytic processor, which is associated with MBTI (Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator) of thinking and judging; however, he cannot be considered neat in HBQ's sense. In answering the question of "A written in-class exercise in which students fill in the correct form of verbs in sentences" he answered "nearly indispensable". To answer the question according to Ehrman (1996) [4], judging tends "to like to learn sequentially and control one thing before going on to another" (p. 106). This was obvious because he did everything one by one. One time he brought a notebook to show some names in it to this researcher and when she asked him to put the notebook aside and get back to the interview, he put it inside his bag instead of aside. To a judging type person, unpredictability is a source of discomfort. Judging types tend to get their work done in an orderly way, and they are often natural time-managers. Judging is correlated with sensing, and perceiving is correlated with intuition. Their downside is sometimes intolerance of ambiguity and a need to control the uncontrollable. This might be true for him because he always asked for repetition of those sentences which seemed obscure to him. Specially, in this section of this questionnaire, this researcher had to ask first whether he agreed with the statement or not, then go to options. For example, she asked "Do you think you agree with this statement or not?" and in the case he said that he did not agree, then the question would be so how much you disagree – "is it a waste of time, not very helpful, or neither/nor". Otherwise, he could not concentrate on the differences and would ask for more repetition.

Also, Al is characterized by thinking, which means that thinking learners "gravitate to analytical processing and like to take part and recombine ideas, if they prefer intuition, or things, if they prefer sensing" (Ehrman, 1996, p. 105) [4]. These people tend to trust reasoning above all other ways of knowing. Thinking people are less vulnerable to distress and anxiety. As noted earlier, Al did not feel anxious at all, although he had not developed English properly. This feeling of course may create problems for them, because as Ehrman said, "native interlocutors may not be as patient with them" (p. 105). Moreover, he rated himself as thick ego boundaries or neat, which in HBQ's sense means to be relatively meticulous and orderly. These people are not very receptive to new information.

Al is also rated himself to highly enjoy lessons when the class breaks up into smaller groups to talk. He works with his classmate whose name is Mohammad Reza. He interprets small group as pair work, of course. Also, Al likes to ask questions in pairs. However, he does not think that he can learn English through interviews with a native speaker specifically grammar, Instead he thinks that English grammar should be explained through examples and handout. This shows that he is field-dependent. Other evidence for his judging and sequential-based learning character, is that he rated himself highly on question number 7; that is, teacher "reads new material in the textbook aloud, followed by students reading it aloud one by one". This shows that he can be characterized as sensing in that he needs to practice everything in an order to learn, not go through intuition. In fact, he is a deductive learner rather than an inductive one.

One contradiction is that he answered quite highly positive to question number 8, that he thinks it would be very helpful if each student finds and reports on an interesting news or magazine article in language x. This might suggest that he also is an open-ended learner which is in contrast with sensing. This is again indicated in questions 19, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 28 but is rejected by his low weighting of question number 21.

Moreover, he strongly rejected using word list and translation, saying that English should be learned through English, not translation and Farsi. This suggests that he is low in tolerance of ambiguity. This is also supported by question 15, which states that the teacher calls on each student in turn to make a change in a target sentence in some specified way. Questions 22 and 23 support his low tolerance of ambiguity; however, his answers to questions 24, 27, 28, 29, and 30 indicate high tolerance of ambiguity. This might suggest that he has an average tolerance of ambiguity.

Also, Al seems to rely on highly external structure, as he answered "highly positive" to questions 22, 30, and 32 and "highly negative" to questions 21; however, his surprising answers to questions 23, 26, 29, and 33 indicates he is not highly dependent on external structure, especially in pronunciation. Maybe we can conclude that he does not like to be interrupted very much.

Al did not like to guess the meaning of words and he thinks this guessing job would not be very helpful; he has chosen 3 – neither/nor – as his answer to this question. This proves that he mostly prefers sequential and orderly learning over open-ended and random learning. Also, this supports that he is low in tolerance of ambiguity. Al also is not field-sensitive and a global learner because he does not think explaining grammar through English would be useful for him. Instead, he feels that the teacher should give a sentence to which the entire group responds orally and changes the sentence in some way indicated by the teacher. Again this proves that his thinking ability is better than his intuition. Also, he answers "not very helpful" to question 13, which asks whether he agrees with classroom discussion of some topics, although he likes to change his personal opinion but he did not find it very useful in learning grammar or language.

He weighted the sentence "students read a number of sentences, finding and correcting the mistake" as helpful. This shows that he is analytic. Although this is supported by question 36, this is not supported by his responses to questions 20 and 25.

Also, he seems to be a perfectionist because he weighted "teacher corrects all mistakes in student's writings." He does not care whether teacher cares for his feeling or not. Also, he does not like to move around so he does not rate himself as a kinesthetic learner. Al can be considered as introvert rather than extrovert because he answers question 37 "highly low", question 31 "moderately low", and question 36 "highly high". He does not like to use the computer either.

Table -2- has summarized the names of both personal learning techniques and learning and teaching activities with the respective questions measuring them. Based on the table, the respondent's replies to the questions are combined to estimate the weight of the feature in question. The result is summarized in Table -3- below. I will refer to it later.

B. MSQ Part IIb: Personal Learning Techniques

In this part, first the questions will be briefly discussed, and then the sum of the result will be compared with that of the learning and teaching technique. MSQ part IIb consists of 35 five Likert option questions with 1 equals almost never and 5 equals most of the time.

The first question is related to metacognitive strategies as well as reflectiveness. He said that he would never plan out his studying. The second question, "I need to take study breaks", is related to extraversion and kinesthetic features of the learner, on which he rated himself as 4, which means often. The third question, "I remember better if I have a chance to talk about something" is related to auditory, probably kinesthetic, and extraversion features of the learner, on which he rated himself as 5, which means most of the time. On question 4, "I have a number of projects going on, in varying states of completion", which is related to randomness, and multitasking, he rated himself as "almost never". On question 5, "mental images help me remember", which measures visual (objects, action), he rated himself as "rarely".

For question 6, "I like to know how the system works and what the rules are, then apply what I know" which measures deductive learning technique, he rated himself as "sometimes". Question 7, "I like to work with some background music", measures the multitasking feature of the learner, to which he responded "sometimes". The next question is, "I try to keep my mistakes and reverses in perspective." This question measures effective strategies or effective self-management. He responded "most of the time". Question 9, "If I write things down, I can remember them better", is related to visual and possibly kinesthetic learning techniques on which he rated himself as "sometimes". Question 10, "like to be able to move around when I work or study", measures kinesthetic, and extraversion feature of the learner, on which he rated himself as "sometimes". Question 11, "I don't mind it when the teacher tells us to close our books for a lesson", measures the auditory feature of the learner, on which he rated himself as "most of the time". Question 12, "I can trust my 'gut feeling' about the answer to a question", measures the intuition, impulsivity, and global features of the learner, on which he rated himself as "most of the time".

Question 13, "I take a lot of notes in class or lectures" measures visual and possible kinesthetic, in which he rated himself as "sometimes". Question 14, "I find ways to fill in when I can't think of a word or phrase, such as pointing, using my hands, or finding a filler word …" measures the intuition, kinesthetic and compensation strategies features of the learner on which he rated himself as "sometimes". Question 15, "I hear words in my mind when I read", measures auditory learning technique, on which he rated himself a 5, i.e., "most of the time".

Question 16, "I work better when it's quiet," measures low multitasker and kinesthetic, in which he rated himself as

"sometimes". Question 17, "I look at the ending when I start a book or story," measures random, non-sequential learning technique, which he rated "most of the time." The next question is 18, "If I use a computer to learn, I like programs with color and movement," which measures kinesthetic learning techniques. He chose "often" for this question. Question 19, "My mind wanders in class," also measures multitasking and kinesthetic learning techniques, for which he chose "almost never". On question 20, "Figuring out the system and the rules for myself contributes a lot to my learning," which measures inductive learning technique, he rated as "almost never".

On question 21, "It's useful to talk myself through a task," which measures auditory learning technique, he chose "most of the time". For question 22, "I feel the need to check my answers to questions in my head before giving them," which measures reflectiveness of the learner, he chose "almost never". On question 23, "I forget things if I don't write them down quickly," which measures visual (text) and distractible learning technique, he chose "sometimes".

On question 24, "I consider myself a 'horizontal filer' (e.g., my desk has piles of papers and books all over it), which measures random (maybe) and perceiver learning technique, he chose "almost never". For question 25, "But I can find what I need quickly", which measures random and perceiver learning technique, he chose "sometimes". On 26, "When I need to remember something from a book, I can imagine how it looks on the page," which measures visual learning technique, he chose "almost never". Question number 27, "I can do more than one thing at once," measures multitasking, which he rated as 1, meaning "almost never". Question 28, "I prefer to jump right into a task without taking a lot of time for directions," also measures kinesthetic and impulsive learner technique, for which he chose "most of the time".

For Question 29, "I am comfortable using charts, graphs, maps, and the like," which measures low auditory, he chose the answer "almost never". Question 30, "I try to be realistic about my strengths and weaknesses without dwelling on the weaknesses," measures visual and field-independent learning technique as Ehrman mentioned. He chose "most of the time" as the answer. On question 31, "I like to complete one task before starting another," which also measures sequential learning he rated as "most of the time". For question 32, "I prefer to demonstrate what I have learned by doing something real with it rather than take a test or write a paper," which also measures effective strategies and effective self-management the learner might adopt in learning, he chose "sometimes" for this question.

For question 33, "I have trouble remembering conversational exchanges word for word," which also measures kinesthetic, random, concrete, and global learning techniques, he chose "often" as the answer. On question 34, "Hearing directions for a task is better for me than reading them," which measures auditory and extraversion learning techniques, he chose sometimes. And finally, for question 35, "I like to be introduced to new material by reading about it," which measures visual learning technique, he chose "most of the time".

Because the answers are not systematically interpretable in terms of individual questions, since each question seems to measure different learning techniques, the researcher summarizes the answers so she can interpret the result. Table 3 summarizes the result.

C. Result

The result for both learner techniques and teaching techniques used in class has been summarized in Table 3 so that the teaching techniques and learner techniques can be matched to see where the problem might be. As you can see in this table, "a" stands for the learning and teaching techniques he supports or rejects and "b" represents the personal techniques he uses when studying.

As it is shown in this table, Al seems to enjoy more sequential-based teaching in the class than random teaching. He scored 21 out of 25 in sequential learning, while only 15 out of 25 on random learning (15 has changed into 25). However, when talking about his learning techniques, he has not rated himself as a sequential learner, but a random learner (he has got zero on sequential learning). Also, Al seems to be a more open-ended learner than a learner who needs external structure. He seems to be a global learner and also enjoys the global learning in the classroom (he got 9 out of 10 on global learning).

He seems to be more than average in tolerance of ambiguity. He is more field-dependent; however, his class activity learning tends to field-independency. Among learning techniques of kinesthetic, visual, and auditory, he is more auditory-based. This means that he can learn if he listens more than through vision or tactile sense. Also, his class teaching techniques are auditory based rather than kinesthetic. He is a more deductive learner, while his class teaching technique is inductive learning. He rarely uses metacognitive strategies, nor does he use compensation strategy. Also he cannot do everything at the same time, but prefers doing things one by one. He is more impulsive than reflective, while his class teaching activity requires him to be more reflective than impulsive. His learning is mostly based on intuition than judging, while as we saw, his class activity is more based on judging learners than intuitions.

V. More Information on AL

Another instrument used in this study was the Problem Integration Strategy Test which is presented in Appendix A. This test is neither an intelligence nor an aptitude test as Ehrman (1996, p. 302) [4] mentioned, but it helps the researcher understand how the respondent can develop his or her own study method. His way of sorting shows that he does pay attention to the equation, but only to the number of numerators. For example, to him s is more difficult than g, or L. The ordering he recognized from this test is as follows: i-o-s-c-p-n-j-m-e-b-l-r-h-k-d-f-a-g-q-t.

VI. Conclusion

Al has been studying English for more than a year and a half; however, he has not shown a very good improvement in his English compared to other students in his class. Although his score is mostly near the cutoff point, he has not quit because he enjoys a very high level of intrinsic motivation. His teacher believes that if he tries more he can do better, but he himself believes that he is doing his best. In this regard, he enjoys a very high self-efficacy, even in comparison to other students. He has a very positive picture of himself and he thinks he is the most studious student in his class. He also failed this term.

During the interview with Al, this researcher noticed that his mental ability is a bit behind other students. The researcher agrees with the institute supervisor and disagrees with Al's teacher that Al seems to be a bit mentally retarded, but not completely. He can work with Memory Stick and the computer very well. He is very organized in writing, although his handwriting is not age-appropriate. He paid attention to the questions very carefully and did not answer any question without care. This showed that he has the ability to learn. Even in doing the last integration problem instrument, he chose all the options through logic so we cannot accept that he is far below normal intelligence.

However, through analyzing the two questionnaires on teaching and learning techniques, this researcher noticed some discrepancies. First, Al is a more sequential learner than a random learner, while the teaching context is more random and communicative-based. This was also obvious through the interviews, because he needed everything to be mentioned with care and step-by-step.

Second, he is field-dependent while his class teaching activity is more field-independent. This would be terrible for him because he cannot be an inductive learner. Everything should be mentioned and he cannot take the details from the whole picture of language. Third, he is a more deductive learner while his class teaching technique is inductive learning.

Fourth, he rarely uses metacognitive strategies, nor does he use compensation strategy. Using metacognitive strategy is one of the good learner's features (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) [13]. Fifth, he is more impulsive than reflective, while his class teaching activity requires him to be more reflective than impulsive. His learning is mostly based on intuition than judging while as we saw, his class activity is more based on judging learners than intuitions. And finally, he is a very slow reader, both in English and in Farsi. The result is summarized in Table -3- .

Appendix Tables

Table -1-:
Ehrman taxonomy

Thin boundaries		Thick boundaries	
Feeling	Intuition or perceiving	Sensing/ judging	Thinking
Interpersonal (Diverger) Type 3	Cognitive flexibility (accommodator) Type 1	Hard work (converger) Type 4	Control (Assimilator) Type 2
Social Political Empathy	Information processing Cognitive, hypothesis Metacognitive, analysis Compensation strategies Self-management	Effort/order Persistence Study aids Memorizing Repetition	Control Cognitive order Analysis Planning
Relation with others Authorities Colleagues Host country nationals	Aptitude Achievement	Self testing Test preparation Planning Products Completed assignments practice	Concentration Self evaluation Clarify of categories Effective task management
Language proficiency			

TABLE -2-:
THE LEARNER CHARACTERISTICS MEASURED BY MSQ

Sequential learning: Questions 1, 7, 22, 30, 32, 17b (-), 31b	Random: 5, 10, 13, 4b, 17b, 24b, 25b, 33b,
Open ended learning: 5, 8, 10, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28	Need for external structure: 1, 6, 7, 9 (high), 12, 13 low need for external (-), 15, 19 (-), 21 (-), 22, 23 (-), 26 (-), 29, 30, 32, 33,
Analytic processing: 1, 14, 16, 17 (-), 20, 25, 36	Global learning: 11, 13, 19, 24, 26, 27, 28, 31, 12b, 33b
Perfectionist: 16, 20, 29	Concrete: 33b
High TOA: 5, 10, 11, 13, 24, 25, 27, 28,	Low TOA: 9, 22, 29, 30, 32, 33
Field-dependence: 6,	Field-independence: 14, 25, 30b
Field sensitive: 11,	Field insensitive:
Kinesthetic learning: 18, 19, 23, 38, 2b, 3b, 9b, 10b, 13b, 14b, 18b, 19b, 28b, 32b, 33b	Auditory: 39, 3b, 11b, 15b, 21b, 29 (-), 34b,
Inductive : 25, 20b	Deductive: 6b,
Extraversion : 31, 37, 2b, 3b, 10b, 34b,	Introversion: 36
Visual: 35b, 5b (action, object); 9b, 13b, 23b, 26b (text); 30b (schematic)	Metacognitive: 1b
Reflective: 1, 22b,	Multitask: 4b, 7b, 16b (-), 19b, 27b,
Affective strategy: 8b, 32b	Intuition: 12b, 14b
Impulsivity: 12b, 14b	Compensation strategy: 14b
Distractible: 16b, 23b	Perceiver: 24b, 25b
Self management: 32b	

TABLE-3-:
CHARACTERISTIC TOTAL

Sequential learning: 21/25 (a), 0/10b	Random: 9/15a, 9/25b
Open ended learning: 36/50a	Need for external structure: 24/51a
Analytic processing: 16/35a	Global learning: 29/40a; 9/10b
Perfectionist: 8/15a	Concrete: 4/5b
High TOA: 29/40a	Low TOA: 18/35a
Field-dependence: 4/5a	Field-independence: 7/10a; 5/5b
Field sensitive: 2/5a	Field insensitive:
Kinesthetic learning: 14/20a; 38/55b	Auditory: 4/5a, 22/24b
Inductive : 3/5a, 1/5b	Deductive: 3/5b
Extraversion : 4/5a,16/20	Introversion: 4/5a
Visual: 22/40b	Metacognitive: 1/5b
Reflective: 4/5a, 1/5b	Multitask: 3/19b
Affective strategy: 8/10b	Intuition: 9/10b
Impulsivity: 8/10b	Compensation strategy: 3/5b
Distractible: 6/10b	Perceiver: 4/10b
Self management: 3/5b	

REFERENCES

[1] Arnold, J., & Brown, H. D. (1999). A map of the terrain. In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in language learning* (pp.1-25). Cambridge: CUP.
[2] Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching. UK: Longman.
[3] Ehrman, M. E. (1996). Understanding second language learning difficulties. London: Sage Publications.
[4] Ehrman, R. (2005). Language aptitude and its relationship to instructional effectiveness in second language acquisition. *Language Teaching Research*, 9, 147-171.
[5] Ellis, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: OUP.
[6] Ellis, R. (1997). Second language acquisition. Oxford: OUP.
[7] Foss, K. A., & Reitzel, A. C. (1988). A Relational model for managing second language anxiety. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(3), 70-87.
[8] Dornyei, A., & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in second language learning. In C. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 589-630). New York: Blackwell.
[9] Halbach, A. (2000). Finding out about students' learning strategies by looking at their diaries: A case study. *System*, 28, 85–96.
[10] Kinsella, K. (1995). Understanding and empowering diverse learners in the ESL classroom. In J. Reid (Ed.), *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom* (pp. 170-195). NY: Heinle and Heinle.
[11] Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). How languages are learned (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[12] Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). How languages are learned (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[13] O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A.U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge: CUP.
[14] Reid, J. (1995). Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom. NY: Heinle and Heinle.
[15] Robinson, P. (2005). Aptitude and Second Language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 46-73.
[16] Schwarz, R. L. (1997). Learning disabilities and foreign language learning: A painful collision. Retrieved July 15, 2002 from

LDOnLine Web site: http://www.ldonline.org/ld_indepth/foreign_lang/painful_collision.html.

Minoo Alemi was born in Iran. She has been a Ph.D. candidate of TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) at Allameh Tabataba'i University in Tehran, Iran since September 2009. She graduated B.A. in English literature and M.A. in TEFL at Allameh University and Khatam University in Tehran.

As for her professional background, she has taught English over a decade at different universities in Iran. Moreover, she has been faculty member and vice-Dean of Education at Languages and Linguistics Department at Sharif University of Technology since 2008. Her main areas of interest are (1) second language acquisition, (2) ESP, (3) vocabulary, and (4) syllabus design. Alemi has published about ten textbooks in General English and ESP, a large number of papers in different areas in international journals, and given presentations on TEFL at many international conferences.

Ms. Alemi is a member of scientific board of LiBRI, Linguistic and Literary Broad Research and Innovation journal and JLTR, Journal of Language Teaching and Research.

Parisa Daftarifard is currently a PhD student at Azad university, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran. She received her MA degree from Iran University of Science and Technology in 2002. Her primary research interests concerns EFL reading, testing, and second language acquisition.

Iolanda Tobolcea is Associate Professor at the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Science, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi, Department of Clinical Psychology and Special Education. Since 1997 she is PhD in Psychology (Doctoral Thesis: The Use of Modern Audio-Video Techniques in the Therapy of Logoneurosis in Children of School Age. Current and past works: Speech and Language Disorders - therapy, psychotherapy, pedagogical counselling, psycho impaired intellect, experimental psychology. She has done studies and research activity on the methods, processes and techniques used for the recovery of persons with disabilities (language, sensory, motor, intellectual etc.). She has done many studies on the therapy of language disorders, the results of which were gathered in 7 books and more than 50 papers and conferences participations, focused mainly on the development of different software for the therapy of disorders of rhythm and fluency of speech, of writing, reading, articulation of sounds etc. Also, she collaborated with specialists in electronics and automation from the technical universities with a view to the development of devices operating on the principle of feedback sound to stuttering therapy and logoneurosis, the development of an intelligent system for the therapy of dyslalia at preschool age, the use of various audiovisual means in educational therapy of persons with disabilities.