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Abstract—This study aimed at exploring English language teachers’ practices and perceptions of vocabulary teaching in Iranian private language schools. Using a qualitative research design, four competent language teachers were purposefully selected and their perceptions of vocabulary teaching were investigated from several dimensions. Three qualitative data gathering techniques including interviews, classroom observation, and stimulated recall interviews were utilized to have a thorough understanding of the participants’ practices and perceptions about vocabulary instruction. Findings revealed that although EFL teachers possessed sufficient knowledge and perspectives with respect to vocabulary teaching strategies, such stated declarative knowledge did not serve the full purposes of vocabulary teaching. Participants typically utilized decontextualized strategies more extensively than contextualized ones in their actual practices indicating that their tendencies are somehow towards traditional approaches in teaching vocabulary. In other words, teachers’ instructional practices did not capture all their stated beliefs. Furthermore, it was found that the implemented policies in English language schools which are greatly towards time economization might be a liable reason cheering teachers to deviate from their real beliefs. Finally, contributing to developmental aspects of language teaching, findings of this particular study possess several implications both for teacher education institutions and stakeholders in private language schools in Iran and other similar contexts.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge of vocabulary is frequently seen as a basic apparatus for L2 language learners on the grounds that a restricted repertoire of vocabulary hinders fruitful communication (Nation, 2011 & Schmitt, 2000). Meara (1980) states that even after the early stages of learning a second language, most of language learners identify vocabulary as their utmost single source of problems. According to Oxford (2003, p.9), “Skilled teachers help their students develop an awareness of learning strategies and enable them to use a wider range of appropriate strategies”. Several scholars (Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Bialystok, 1990; Chamot & O’Malley, 1996; Cohen, 1998; Green & Oxford, 1995; Oxford, 2003) highlight the significance of strategies for an effective language teaching and learning. Consequently, to empower learner’s proficiency level relevant to their needs, it is considerably more imperative for the language teachers to employ compelling and dynamic teaching strategies that will engage learners to master the required tasks and this can be established through teacher’s practices and their instructional approaches in the classroom. Moreover, practices teachers perform in the milieu of classrooms are usually based on their perceptions and understandings of teaching and learning. Such perceptions are often described as propositions of mind that determine teachers’ behaviors, from both psychological and educational perspectives (Debreli, 2011; Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh, 2015) and essentially affect their classroom practices, professional growth, instructional objectives, classroom collaboration designs, teaching strategies, etc. all of which consequently affect their learners and the whole school success (Harste & Burke, 1977; Ramazani, 2013). From this perspective both teachers’ practices and perceptions may accelerate or impede the success of any educational reform (Woodrow, 1991). It seems that both issues are pivotal based on which teacher educators can adjust their programs with central educational objectives. It is additionally essential to examine teachers’ perceptions inside a particular setting since it is highly context-specific (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). Although some researchers (Aliakbari & Allahmoradi, 2012; Alimorad & Tajgozari, 2016; Amiryousefi, 2015; Barzegar & Afghari, 2015; Farvardin Koosha, 2011; Katooli & Abdolmanafi-Rokni, 2015; Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2017; Rahimi & Askari Bigdeli, 2016; Ramazani, 2013; Salimi & Ansari, 2015) have so far studied teachers’ perceptions about various aspects of
language teaching in the context of Iran, no genuine research has been done regarding vocabulary instructions from teachers’ point of views. Under such intents, the present study contributes to the formation of a better recognition of English language teachers in private language schools and discloses hidden areas of their approaches which cannot be easily studied through product oriented research methods.

II. REVIEWING OF LITERATURE

A. Teachers’ Perceptions and Classroom Practice

Teachers’ perceptions are used as an umbrella term to capture all abstract intellectual resources teachers bring with them into the milieu of the classroom. Borg (2003) characterizes teacher’s perceptions as the covert intellectual aspect of teaching and it includes what teachers discern, believe, and think of their own works (Borg, 2003). Considering perception as a phenomenon that captures all intellectual resources including teachers’ beliefs, Johnson (1994) maintains that there are three basic assumptions to teachers’ beliefs: 1) Teachers’ beliefs affect how they perceive things and how they judge things. 2) Teachers’ beliefs determine how they will use teaching information in the classroom environment. And 3) Understanding of teachers’ beliefs is critical for the improvement of teaching effectiveness and programs in teacher education. It is supported by educational research that belief system determines teachers’ instructional decisions and their classroom performances to a great extent. The belief system which incorporates previous experience, prior expectation and habits, serves as a screen, and acts upon all aspects of teachers’ decision making, including adopting particular teaching approaches or activities and selecting certain instructional materials over others (Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996). Despite the fact that the basis of classroom practices is a logical system of beliefs, past research has failed to place attention on teachers’ perceptions, thinking and beliefs regarding their teaching practices (Garner, 1987) and only recently have language teachers’ thought processes begun to shed light on their classroom performance and generate discussion on language teachers’ preparation program and their paths of learning to teach. Borg (2003) posits that teaching decisions are the result of complex and conflicting perceptions related to language, learning in general and second language learning in particular, and students. Teachers’ perceptions and beliefs are significant issues since they implicitly or explicitly impact teaching practices (Borg, 2015-2005).

B. Researching Teachers’ Perceptions and Previous Studies in Second Language

Considering the significance of teaching as “the center of all education and educational reform” (p.14), Shulman (1987) points to the partial and incomplete nature of the process-product approach to investigate epistemological issues like teachers’ cognitions. Various studies into both teacher’s and learners’ belief systems have been conducted by researchers and scholars (Borg, 2003; Horwitz, 1988; Peacock, 1999; Vásquez& Harvey, 2010). A considerable lot of the reviews indicate vast contrasts amongst teachers’ perceptions frameworks, making it vital to keep on researching their impression of second language learning and teaching. As indicated by Borg (2009), teachers’ perceptions inquiry deals with exploring hidden side of teaching and teachers’ mental lives. Reviewing teachers’ perceptions studies discloses the accumulation of research around grammar, reading, and writing while other curricular domains like vocabulary and speaking are not well studied (Borg, 2009). Reviewing these studies uncovers two principle viewpoints: what teachers believe about the teaching of grammar (e.g. Berry, 1997; Borg, 2005; Johnston & Goetttsch, 2000; Schulz, 1996), and what they know of grammar (e.g. Andrews, 1999). A group of studies dealt with L2 teacher knowledge about reading (e.g., Meijer, Verloop, & Beijaard, 2001; Tercanlioglu, 2001) have contributed substantially to such studies. Reviewing the literature on teacher knowledge revealed three significant studies (e.g., Katz, 1996; Tsui, 1996) about how L2 writing is taught. In summary, it can be concluded that there are similarities among the so far mentioned group of research in the way that teachers’ beliefs affect their instructional behavior and what factors may influence teacher knowledge development. These studies also indicate the methodological preferences of teachers while teaching. Although research in language teaching has rarely paid attention to the importance of curricular aspects like vocabulary especially in Iran, Gerami and Noreen (2013) explored four EFL teachers’ perceptions of vocabulary teaching through a qualitative inquiry. Results demonstrated that participants possessed acceptable knowledge and firm self conviction about how vocabulary ought to be informed; nonetheless their practices were far from their strong beliefs.

C. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework of the Study

To succeed vocabulary teaching, language teachers need to know and employ appropriate strategies to enhance vocabulary learning (O’ Malley& Chamot, 1990). So far variety of teaching and learning models have been introduced and brought to the field to improve the quality of vocabulary teaching and learning. Irrespective to the extent of the degree of success and power of the introduced models, what can be construed as the main intentions of all are that vocabulary teaching ought to be dynamic and ought to consider the different measurements of the mental lexicon (Seal,1987).Considering such intentions and since teaching and learning vocabulary demands to hold an extensive variety of skills (Zimmerman, 1997) and requires to take advantage of memory strategies (Schmitt & Carter; 2000), Shen’s (2003) conceptualized model of vocabulary teaching and learning strategies, which is a dynamic continuum of various methodologies of vocabulary and originally adopted from Oxford and Crookall’s (1990) model, has been found suitable and selected by the researchers of this study to draw up a complete picture of teachers’ perceptions of vocabulary teaching. Generally, the adopted model includes two basic categories of contextualization and
decontextualization which are two extremes and in between vocabulary learning strategies can be taught in a pendulum fashion. Listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as skills for lexical input and output, are located in one extreme (i.e. contextualization) and word list, flashcards, and conventional use of dictionary as measurements to improve the mental lexicon are in the other extreme (i.e. decontextualization). In between other strategies like word grouping, word/concept association, imagery, keyword, physical response, physical sensation, and semantic mapping are used with tendency to remain in between or moving towards each extreme according to the recognition of the needs of the learners. The combination of all these strategies is also utilized to reestablish words.

III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Words are the most essential components in a target language since our knowledge of a language is remarkably formed by the lexical items we learn (Nation, 2011; Schmitt, 2000). Notwithstanding the centrality of vocabulary in second language teaching and learning, vocabulary is considered as the greatest source of problems of language learners (Segler, Pain, & Sorace, 2002) and conceivably language teachers face complications in how to apply their instructional decisions in order to be understandable for their students while teaching vocabulary. Scholarly literature documenting teachers’ instructions regarding vocabulary is so meager that it appears few scholars are aware of the stream of teachers’ constant decisions in the milieu of classroom and how they organize and put vocabulary in their lesson plans (Borg, 2009). The same story seems to be true as “in Iran, vocabulary is one of the most challenging issues in language teaching and what teachers do in their classes and include in their lesson plans to teach vocabulary are not clearly documented or studied” (Gerami & Noreen, 2013, p.1533). Teachers almost do not fully include this curricular area in their practices and only limit their instructions to some personal strategies. Therefore, students coming in private language institutes do not usually have a profound knowledge of vocabularies and their repertoires of lexical items are not rich enough to let them understand or generate utterances communicatively (Gerami & Noreen, 2013). Although insufficient reliable evidence and solid confirmation do exist to demonstrate that vocabulary today is a noteworthy appeal with regards to ELT in Iran, the failure of Iranian English language learners, as the yield results of private language institutions, to comprehend basic sentences or to pass on their communicative goals through straightforward words might be considered as a consistent sign to construe that ELT in Iranian private language schools, experiences some conceivable issues. Along with these lines, one of the objectives of any teaching system is inevitably teaching strategies to students on how to learn and to help them act autonomously in their learning process (Eslami Rasekh & Valizadeh, 2004; Jahangard, 2007). Although no particular training has so far been given to teachers in this respect, they teach vocabulary mostly through various traditional approaches and mainly based on their own perceptions of vocabulary learning and teaching (Gerami & Noreen, 2013). Under such circumstances it appears essential to understand teachers’ perceptions and practices of vocabulary teaching (Borg, 2003).

IV. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The main objective of this investigation is to discover English language teachers’ practices and perceptions of vocabulary teaching in Iranian private language schools and to see whether their perceptions are in alignment with their practices. The subsequent queries were generated to accomplish the objectives of the inquiry:
1. What are Iranian EFL teachers’ perceptions of vocabulary strategy instruction?
2. What strategies are practiced by Iranian EFL teachers in private language schools while teaching vocabulary?

V. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

A basic qualitative design (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015) was adopted to perform the research. This was because the majority of the research in connection to teachers’ perceptions are inside the interpretivist worldview and, therefore, the researchers are usually encouraged to adopt a qualitative data collection approach (Van Driel, Beijaard & Verloop, 2001).

B. Participants

A purposeful sampling approach (Patton, 2002) was adopted due to its rationale and influence which “lie in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth” (p.230). Four competent informants who could provide in-depth information, understand the complexity of their work and elaborate on their own experiences were selected. They were chosen from among of 127 English language teachers were given numbers for secrecy. See table 1 for more information about the participants’ background information.
have not received any focused and special education about vocabulary teaching in higher and teacher education which is compatible with what they did in the classroom. According to the themes emerged from the data, participants showed another belief (i.e. adopted belief) that the vacuum of contextualization strategies and skills was an obvious issue. Table 2 illustrates categories and Table 3 shows some evidences found for research question One.

### Summary of Findings

Themes relevant to both teachers’ perceptions about vocabulary instruction and their real practices in the classroom have been reported, as this fashion of organization was helpful to attain the best results pertinent to the questions of the study. The questions researchers in this study employed were mainly adopted from Borg (1998) and Nelms (2001). Generally, each of the participants experienced four classroom observations as well as nine interviews including: one pre-observation interview, four post-observation, and four stimulated recall interviews during the whole time of the research which took about two months. In all observations, the researcher took on the role of non-participant observer (Alwright & Bailey, 1991) and followed the guidelines about ethics proposed by Christians (2000) all through the entire course of the research. Participant teachers had to plan in such a way to be able to cover the course (Four Corners, Level 4, Units 6-9) within the time limits as determined, by language school, for them. In general, minutes allocated for data collection included 25 up to 40 minutes for each pre-observation interviews, 90 minutes for each observations, and 10 to 20 minutes (depending on the amount of time needed to clarify ambiguities observed in the classroom) for stimulated recall interviews which were conducted immediately after classroom observations, Mackey and Gass, 2005. To conduct a fruitful stimulated recall interview, each participant was first provided with adequate guidelines. Second, audio records adjacent to field notes were used as the reference to stimulate participants’ memories for more clarifications (Schepens, Aelterman & Van Keer, 2007)). Participants’ responses were all carefully recorded, transcribed and analyzed in the same fashion as for other interviews.

### Analysis and Results

Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) coding system, comprising three systematic steps of open coding, axial coding, and selective coding, was used. In open coding phase, verbatim transcripts of the audio recorded interviews and observation field notes of participants’ instructional practices were carefully read several times. To construct responsive categories, data was then broken down into units and each unit was assigned a code or label for ease of access. In the axial coding phase and through interpretation and reflection on meaning (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015), the researchers went back over all notes to identify which codes could go together. This process went on through the entire transcripts which then was put into a merging operation to obtain merged records of the categories reflecting the recurring regularities and patterns of this study.

To answer the first research question which was concerned with the participants’ perceptions of vocabulary instruction, the researchers employed a semi-structured in-depth pre-observation interview including five open-ended questions adopted from Borg (1998). Summary of findings for research question one indicates that all participants believed in the positive role of strategies in teaching of vocabulary and notably believed in selective strategies as recommended strategies for teaching and learning vocabularies) did not show perfect, according to the components of the agreed upon conceptual model in this study, by that the vacuum of contextualization strategies and skills was an obvious issue. Table 2 illustrates categories and Table 3 shows some evidences found for research question One.

To answer the second research question, multiple data collection instruments including: one pre-observation interview, four classroom observations, and four stimulated recall interviews were used for each of the participants. Themes relevant to both teachers’ perceptions about vocabulary instruction and their real practices in the classroom have been reported, as this fashion of organization was helpful to attain the best results pertinent to the questions of the study. The questions researchers in this study employed were mainly adopted from Borg (1998).Summary of findings for research question two indicates that all participants employ a group of selective strategies for teaching vocabulary in their classrooms. These strategies are as follows: synonym, antonym, definition, exemplification of words in sentences, translation, memorization, note taking, and reading words aloud in classroom. Such strategies in terms of degree of emphasis or frequency of application in the classroom were somehow different from those stated by participants as their actual beliefs and some predominant strategies (e.g. Constant use of dictionary, non-mnemonic elaboration techniques, additional reading materials, word formation, etc.) were missed to be employed in participants’ real practice in the classroom. As the emerged themes from data are concerned, participants showed another belief (i.e. adopted belief) which is compatible with what they did in the classroom. According to the themes emerged from the data, participants have not received any focused and special education about vocabulary teaching in higher and teacher education...
Participants’ showed positive perceptions and understanding of vocabulary teaching through their accentuation on the significance and helpful role of vocabulary teaching strategies. Emphasizing on the application of selective strategies, participant teachers proved that they somehow believe in a dynamic way of teaching in which the employment of several strategies and skills can provide learners with better chances to learn vocabulary (Zimmerman, 1997). It was found plausible to look at participants’ perceptions from the focal point of Shen’s (2003) conceptual dynamic continuum model of various methodologies for vocabulary teaching and learning which is basically grounded on Oxford and Crookall’s (1990) model. According to the emerged data from pre-observation interviews, participants’ perceptions did not capture skills like listening, speaking, reading, and writing to a sufficient extent and they reflected more interest and tendency of application on strategies like translation, memorization, constant use of dictionary, word formation, etc. which almost emphasize on retention and are usually considered as decontextualized strategies. Many scholars and experts (e.g., Coady, 1993; Joe, Nation, & Newton, 1996; Nation & Coady, 1988) have brought to light the certain outcomes of employing contextualization strategies enabling learners to get target words as well as their contextual implications, perceive the meaning of them or retrieve them in long-term memory, make recognitions with respect to their appropriacy and use. Since predominant contextualization strategies were not brought in light by participants both in their beliefs and practices, it might be concluded that this is one of the possible area that requires modification in terms of both declarative knowledge and practical training. Such failures, in the context of language schools, may be traced in other factors as well and the researchers of this study do not strongly attribute shortcomings to the knowledge of EFL teachers since such issue requires more investigation. It almost seems that teachers’ deviations from their actual beliefs were not totally found in their inability of vocabulary teaching. It looks as if policies implemented in the language schools, intentionally are towards more time economization and this has been mainly found to be responsible that teachers neglect contextualized vocabulary teaching and focusing on different aspects of vocabularies through various decontextualized approaches. Although this might appear as irrelevant to the aim of this study, the issue has been reported as it was found marginally in the process of the study through emerging themes. Considering that some approaches in vocabulary teaching requires communicative activities, cultural practice, practicing vocabulary through different skills, various feedbacks and interactions, etc., the importance of time and failure of participant teachers to cover relevant skills and activities then become apparent since. Grounded on the theoretical and conceptual framework of this study, and notwithstanding the participants’ knowledge of vocabulary teaching, they need assistance and modification in some areas (e.g. contextualization strategies, language skills and approaches relevant for teaching vocabulary in contextualized fashion, collaborative and involvement strategies, pragmatic based tasks and activities with more focus on listening and speaking, etc.).
their vocations. This research has been done within the interpretivist worldview with a qualitative methodology and then can be only adduced in comparable settings to the one research was led. Therefore, researchers are recommended to study the same subject with different research methodologies (e.g., mixed method, survey, etc.) to build the generalizability of the discoveries for better and large-scope policy and educational decision makings.

**TABLE 2:**

|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Decontextualized strategies | Word lists | Translation | Using known words to understand unknown words-
| Synonyms | Persian equivalents - similar word - alternative expression - opposite word - writing notes with your own words, visual recall through notes, replacement word - simple known word, using sounds and images to better retain words, etc. |
| Antonyms | Memorization | Making notes | Mnemonic |
| Flashcards (Gloss) | Definition | Simple explanation | Explaining unknown words- describing difficult words – using more simple words – unfolding hard words – writing words and their meanings on cards, writing down definitions, etc. |
| Dictionary use | Word-analysis | Word formation | Dictionary |
| Word grouping, Association | Chunk | Words’ relationships | Related words |
| Visual imagery, Aural imaginary, Physical response, Physical sensation, Semantic mapping | | | |
| Contextualized strategies | Reading, Speaking, Listening, Writing (Skills) | Read aloud | Audio lingual context, inferring meanings, guessing meanings, more context through more reading material, meaningful clarification of words, clarifying the words through examples, less reliance on memory through elaboration, lexical input and output, lexical use, listening practice, writing words in sentences, using words in oral production to link them with other words, etc. |
| | Contextual clues | More context | Non-Mnemonic Elaboration |
| | Non- Mnemonic Elaboration | Lexical out put | Lexical input |
| | | Lexical use |

**TABLE 3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category (Techniques/Activities/ strategy )</th>
<th>Some Example Evidences From Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synonym</td>
<td>“In most cases, using simple equivalents or synonyms are better to be used before translating the unknown word” (Participant 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>“I believe that defining words not only leads learners to better comprehension, but also it would be effective for learning more words in a the minimum context of that definition” (Participant 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>“Usually translation works better since it removes misconceptions. Learners cannot understand whatever definitions and explanations given for help, and more that we as teachers do not have more time to spend on every single elements of the course and we should cover it within the time limit determined for us” (Participant 3, Dec. 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorization</td>
<td>“Memorization of words is an easy approach for students to apply. It does not take the time of the classroom and students only need to focus.” (Participant 4, Dec. 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading aloud practice</td>
<td>“Reading aloud helps learners learn better through involving their other senses and it helps memory at the time of speaking to remember words and their pronunciations” (Participant 1, Dec. 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant use of dictionary</td>
<td>“I always advise my students not to leave down dictionary and constantly put your eyes on the definitions, examples, function of words, pronunciation keys, etc. To help students become independent to find out the meaning of words and practice on their own, dictionary use is the best strategy since lots of opportunities will be created and new word formations as well as new vocabularies are incidentally come into view for learners” (Participant, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Mnemonic Elaboration Technique</td>
<td>“Teachers must meaningfully clarify for learners how the words are different or used. Clarifying the problems of students through examples can help them learn words better. With little reliance on memory through elaboration and semantic mapping students can learn sooner and better” (Participant, 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reading (More context)</td>
<td>“More reading materials are needed for learners to increase: their guessing ability of meanings in different contexts, greater number of words in different topics, their familiarity with pragmatics and use of the words. Reading can help learners more than other skills” (Participant, 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word formation</td>
<td>“To help learners know wider range of vocabulary as well as their usages teachers need to help learners to deal with such cases in a dictionary” (Participant 3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Findings with respect to the second question in brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Core category based on Shen’s (2003) Model</th>
<th>Strategy (Category) based on Shen’s (2003) Model</th>
<th>Categories emerged from interviews, field notes, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decontextualized strategies</td>
<td>Word lists</td>
<td>Synonym, Antonym, Definition, Translation, Memorization, Making Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flashcards (Gloss)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualized strategies</td>
<td>Read aloud</td>
<td>Reading texts and stories aloud in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Mnemonic</td>
<td>Exemplification of words in sentences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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