

# International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies

ISSN: 2308-5460



## Andragogically Oriented Teaching Method versus Pedagogically Oriented Teaching Method to Improve General English Achievement: A Comparative Study

[PP: 81-89]

**Ehsan Namaziandost**

**Amir Sabzevari**

(Corresponding author)

**Hosna Rasooyar**

Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Islamic Azad University  
Shahrekord Branch, Shahrekord, Iran

### ABSTRACT

Andragogy and Pedagogy refer to the methods and practices applied in teaching adult. This study compared the effects of Andragogically and Pedagogically Oriented Teaching Method (AOTM and POTM) on Iranian EFL learners' General English Achievement. To achieve this objective, 80 intermediate participants were selected from 115 students based on the results of Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT). The selected participants were then randomly divided into two equal groups; group A and group B. Afterwards, the researchers measured the participants' general English by administering a general English achievement test as pre-test. Then, they taught group A using AOTM and group B using POTM. The whole treatment lasted 12 sessions. At the end of the study, a post-test was given to both groups to determine the effects of the treatment on the students' general English achievement. Finally the data were analyzed by using paired and independent samples t-tests. The obtained results showed that there was a significant difference between the post-tests of AOTM and POTM groups. The findings indicated that the AOTM group significantly outperformed the POTM group ( $p < .05$ ) on the post-test. The implications of this study can make the teachers aware that teaching via different methods can provide better results for all language learners.

**Keywords:** *Andragogy, Pedagogy, Learning Method Orientations, Intermediate EFL Learners, Iran*

ARTICLE INFO	The paper received on	Reviewed on	Accepted after revisions on
	16/03/2018	14/04/2018	13/06/2018

### Suggested citation:

Namaziandost, E., Sabzevari, A. & Rasooyar, H. (2018). Andragogically Oriented Teaching Method versus Pedagogically Oriented Teaching Method to Improve General English Achievement: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 6(2). 81-89.

### 1. Introduction

It is important to choose the proper method of teaching if palatable learning achievement needs to be gotten. There are a few components influencing the determination of instructing technique. One of them is thinking about the age of the students. Regarding the age, students are arranged into young students and adult students; and the determination of teaching method ought to see whether the learners appertain to young or adult students.

From philosophical point of view, there are two sorts of teaching methods. They are andragogy and pedagogy methods. Both of them are not specifically teaching methods which can be actualized in the educating and learning process; yet they both contribute philosophical orientation to the sorts of teaching methods in the specialized or operational level. Andragogy is a philosophical teaching methods orientation viewed pertinent as given to adult students, while pedagogy method is the

one suitable to be actualized to the youthful students.

In spite of the fact that the word andragogy was being used as ahead of schedule as 1833, Malcolm Knowles is for the most part credited with advancing idea in the United States in the 1970s. Knowles characterized andragogy as "the craftsmanship and study of helping adults realize," which he appeared differently in relation to the utilization of "pedagogy," which he said was initially worried about helping youngsters learn (as vouched for by the historical underpinnings of the world). Over time, the utilization of the word pedagogy turned out to be so weaved with instructional outline in general that the two have turned out to be for all intents and purposes synonymous. Actually, today a great many people mean instructional plan in general when they utilize "pedagogy." According to Knowles, andragogy lays on four critical presumptions about adult students and how they contrast from child



students. Andragogy expect that, as individuals develop their self-idea moves from reliance to self-direction; their developing store of experience starts to fill in as an asset for learning; their preparation to learn becomes oriented progressively toward the formative errands of their social parts, and they start to need to apply what they have realized immediately to life's genuine difficulties. Accordingly, their orientation toward learning shifts from one of subject focused to one of problem focused. Numerous educationists particularly those principally worried about the instructing of children and youth put more noteworthy accentuation on information of topic and learning condition. Their supposition is that once educators know the topic exceptionally well and the learning condition is conducive, scholarly work can occur viably. To these educationists hence, method of teaching is an auxiliary issue, the extent that learning is concerned. Students can be taught utilizing any kind of teaching method the instructors so wish to embrace.

Learners at colleges, seen from their age, are positively sorted into adult students. Andragogy is subsequently considered as the swift teaching method orientation. In any case, the reality repeatedly found is that the learners still have low independency of learning; and this is not the character of adult students. Moreover, the speakers themselves still frequently for all intents and purposes regard the learners as youthful students, despite the fact that they asserted to already outline the syllabus and the lesson design situated to the teaching method for adult learners. This reality may be seen at Iranian Azad Universities. Productive reactions originate from a few schools where the learners of Azad Universities lead teaching practice; the students still have low accomplishment of teaching practice as they likewise still have low independency and innovativeness in setting up the educating, especially identified with the utilization of instructional abilities of teaching, such the utilization of classroom language and the utilization of things required in educating as media of educating.

This examination is endeavoring to offer answer for adapt to the problems as some past inquires uncovered that andragogy had took great risks to impressive teaching method orientations to enhance the students' success especially their of language learning.

Christian (1983) made an adjustment from Hadley's (1975) EOQ, for regular citizen military students which went to classes at Tinker Air Force Base. He uncovered contrasts managing if classes were obligatory or intentional. He did not check conceivable connections between instructive orientation, age and sexual orientation.

Davenport and Davenport (1986) duplicated Christian's (1983) research and incorporated the connection between age, sex, scholarly accomplishment, and instructive orientation among students at the University of Wyoming. Their investigation uncovered that female students had a preferable andragogical propensity.

Choy and Delahaye (2002) explored the learning approaches, study propensity, and availability for self-coordinated learning of 266 youth matured 17-24 years of age and enlisted in four Technical and Further Education Institutes. Three instruments were utilized, the Study Process Questionnaire (Biggs, 1988), SOQ (Christian, 1983), and the Learning Preference Assessment (Guglielmino & Guglielmino, 1991). The information demonstrated that most youth have a dominating surface way to deal with learning, an inclination for an andragogical orientation, and a low level of preparation for self-coordinated learning.

Wilson (2005) in his research to create a sound psychometric device gave understanding of andragogy's impact on two student results, learning and euphoria. The discoveries showed adult students selected in a MBA degree program gave confirmation of learning and were not influenced by andragogy. However, concurrence with educator and course was affected by view of andragogical instructing practices.

Deveci (2007) started an examination on andragogical and pedagogical tendency of adult students learning English as a foreign language. The study went for uncovering the andragogical and pedagogical propensities of Turkish adult EFL students.

Eventually, Sealana (2014) examined and recorded the viability of andragogical instructional conveyance techniques in contrast with conventional (pedagogical) instructional conveyance strategies to enhance educating and training methodologies for learning government-ordered course content. Alluding to the different aftereffects of the past inquires on

andragogy; this study is another comparative research to look at the effectiveness of AOTM and POTM to enhance the students' general English achievement in Iranian classes.

After this background, the following research questions were formulated-

RQ1: Do using AOTM and POTM significantly affect intermediate EFL learners' general English achievement?

RQ2. Which teaching method (AOTM or POTM) has significant effect on intermediate EFL learners' general English achievement?

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Andragogy**

Andragogy etymologically gets from a Greek root word, agogus importance to lead. Andra implies adult. Andragogy communicatively signifies "the workmanship and investigation of educating/driving adults" (Knowles, 1980). As a teaching strategy orientation, in andragogy the student is the middle; while the instructor is generally the facilitator. Once more, in andragogy adult students have an andragogical experience of self-course, self-sufficiency, accountability regarding choices, asset of experience, execution of social parts, and instantaneousness of use or activity. Knowles' proposal (1980) is that andragogical propensity of teaching technique achieves more important results since it propels students to uninhibitedly pick the learning objectives, substance, and procedures. Andragogical teaching has students anticipate that the instructor will give a situation that leads learning, give some control over the learning procedure, and bolster more elevated amounts of self-heading (Henry, 2009).

#### **2.1.1 Andragogically Oriented Teaching Method (AOTM)**

Andragogy does not have a place with teaching technique, but rather has a tendency to go to the level philosophical ideas speaking to the adult students' inclusion in instructing and learning process. The andragogical impacts in instructing are seen through teaching strategies. In other words, there are numerous teaching techniques demonstrating and orienting to andragogy or andragogically arranged. Those sorts of teaching techniques are as exhibited as follows:

1) Small group exchange and peer training (likewise called "Think Pair-Share" or "Idea Tests"). Learners are welcomed to consider the response to an inquiry the educator

gives, and examine the inquiry themselves. A few students are exhibited the agreement to the class. (Anderson, Mitchell, & Osgood, 2005).

2) Effective utilization of clickers Hand-held electronic gadgets is to make students namelessly pick answers of various decision inquiries continuously (Smith, Wood, Krauter, & Knight, 2011).

3) One-minute papers

Toward the finish of class an open-ended inquiry is given to students to be replied in one minute by composing the appropriate responses on record cards (Rivard & Straw, 2000). 4) Interactive address exhibits; Students anticipate the result of a classroom presentation, watch the examination or exhibit, expand the outcomes, and mirror the observed result (Sharma et al., 2010). 5) Case contemplates; Students take inferences and give a detailed portrayal of a situation in light of a genuine story (Preszler, 2009). 6) Idea mapping; Students make a visual portrayal (like a stream outline) distinguishing and demonstrating the interconnections among different thoughts of a particular theme or issue (Yarden, Marbach-advertisement, & Gershoni, 2004). 7) Tutorial worksheets; Based on guided-disclosure worksheets students work in little groups to get a fasten of rationale to settle an issue or a reasonable trouble, while the teacher manage the groups by focusing on questions and bring them into discussion (Finkelstein & Pollock, 2005). 8) Problem-based learning; In groups learners figure out how to adapt to mind boggling, multifaceted, and practical issues, to discover fundamental foundation material as required (Preszler, Dawe, & Shuster, 2007). 9) Just-in-time teaching; students answer the inquiries concerning pre-class reading on the web, a couple of hours before class. Answers are ordered in view of finish and exertion, not rightness, and give the teacher's lesson designs (Marrs & Novak, 2004). 10) Analytical challenge before lecture (likewise called "creation exercises"); Students endeavor to answer inquiries before finding the appropriate responses in class (Schwartz & Bransford, 1998). 11) Computer reproductions and recreations by utilizing intelligent PC reenactments or web based diversions; students figure out how to imagine marvels, test forecasts, get quick, directed input to investigate virtual analyses (Harris et al., 2009). 12) Group tests; similar learners get a test twice independently and in groups (Klappa, 2009). 13) Problem sets in groups;



Students endeavor to settle issue sets in groups and turn in one arrangement of arrangements for every group (Cortright et al., 2005). 14) Random calling; the learners are picked indiscriminately to answer inquiries from the educator. The educator welcomes student by student indiscriminately to share remark on a student's reaction (Buck, 1997). 15) Writing with peer review; Students assess each other's written work utilizing a rubric or criteria gave by the educator (Pelaez, 2002).

## 2.2 Pedagogy

Pedagogy is etymologically additionally a Greek root word, *peda* or *paid* which is identical in significance with child. It is communicatively characterized as the craftsmanship and study of teaching children (Knowles, 1980 & Conner, 2004). Learners with academic tendencies have no need to know the reason of their learning as they are reliant on their educators. In other words, in pedagogy the instructor is the focal point of educating, and the educator with endorsement too parental weights, grades spur the students to peruse.

### 2.2.1 Pedagogically Oriented Teaching Method (POTM)

Pedagogy does not have a place with teaching strategy, but rather has a tendency to go to the level philosophical ideas speaking to the adult students' contribution in educating and learning process. The educational impacts in instructing are seen through educating strategies. In other words, there are numerous teaching methods speaking to and arranging to instructional method or academically situated. Those sorts of teaching techniques are as displayed as takes after: 1) Direct guideline; The instructor as the focal point of educating gives the scholastic substance to coordinate the exercises of students and keep up an emphasis on scholarly accomplishment (Killen, 1998). 2) Lecture by instructor; Instructor requests that students to listen and react data in established educating (Marsh, 2000). 3) Recitation oral inquiries by instructor addressed orally by students; Teacher presents questions and infrequent inquiry which students need to reply (Marsh, 2000). 4) Lecture-exhibit by instructor; Instructor gives data and material students watch, listen, and rehearse (Marsh, 2000). 5) Classwork and homework assignments (Module 4-B). 6) Construction of vocabulary records and vocabulary drills; Teacher gets students listen and rehash vocabulary the instructor gives (Marsh,

2000). 7) Memorizing the students remember things, despite the fact that they don't comprehend (Module 4-B). 8) Reviewing is given to expand understanding by espousing semantic system (Module 4-B). 9) Questioning; Teacher gives well-shaped inquiries to students for creating basic reasoning abilities (Module 4-B and Setianingrum and Saleh, 2016). 10) Discussion drove by educator (Module 4-B). 11) Textbook task Assignments from course readings are given to students as learning material and student worksheet (Rukmini, 2009)

### 2.3 Differences between Pedagogy and Andragogy

In light of Knowles' assessments (1980, 1987) on pedagogy method and andragogy, the accompanying is no holds barred examination of andragogy and pedagogy:

*Table: 1 Key differences between Pedagogy and Andragogy*

Andragogy	Pedagogy
Students request themselves to be the educator to have duty regarding choices about educational programs, aptitudes procurement, teaching technique, and assessment of learning. It actualizes a "student-focused" approach. Students' related knowledge fundamentally influences their learning procedure or result.	Students request the educator to have duty regarding choices about educational programs, abilities procurement, teaching procedure, and assessment of learning.
Students' "status to learn "is energized generally by inner boosts, for example, an expansion in pay or progression of position	Students' "status to learn "is energized for the most part by outside boosts, for example, an expansion in compensation or improvement of position
Students investigate or encounter enthusiasm for learning superior to draw particular instructive subjects	Students are "drawn" to particular instructive subjects as opposed to investigating or encountering enthusiasm for learning
Students are spurred by inside negative weights from guardians, companions, and expert associates	Students are roused by outer negative weights from guardians, companions, and expert partners
It speaks to an elective arrangement of presumptions about how adults learn	It demonstrates to a fundamental philosophy
It is "process-situated"	It is "content-situated"

Regarding previous studies, Saleh, Mujiyanto, and Shofwan (2017) compared the andragogically and pedagogically orientated learning methods for English as a foreign language adults learners. The Educational Orientation Questionnaire (Christian, 1983) was utilized. Sixty adults at speaking for Instructional Purposes classes in English Education Department Muria Kudus University are included in the study. The findings indicated that the subjects are more to have orientation of andragogy than that of pedagogy. However, the wide range of scores suggested that they were not rigid in their orientations and tended to hold pedagogical tendency towards learning too. Moreover, in another study, Saleh, Mujiyanto, and Warsono (2018) tried to compare the effectiveness of implementing AOTM and POTM to improve the female and the male students' achievement of teaching practice. This was a quantitative study including 87 students joining *Speaking for Instructional Purposes (SIP)* classes at EED MKU. The instruments

utilized were pre and posttests of teaching practice in SIP classes. The results revealed that AOTM was more effectively implemented to enhance the male students than the female ones.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Participants**

Deciding to carry out this work, 115 computer engineering students from Islamic Azad University of Ramhormoz were selected. Both male and female students were included in the population of the study. The researchers further relied on the results of Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) to make them homogeneous. Finally 80 of them were chosen for the target participants. They were divided into two groups. One group comprised 40 participants was taught by AOTM, and the other group consisting of 40 participants was taught by POTM.

#### **3.2 Instrumentation**

The first instrument which was utilized in the present study to homogenize the participants was OQPT. It helped the researchers to have a greater understanding of what level (i.e., elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate) his participants were at. This test had 60 multiple-choice items and based on it the learners whose scores were 40 to 47 were intermediate students and were selected as the target participants of the study.

The second instrument for gathering information was a researcher-made general English achievement pre-test (Appendix) which was designed based on the students' course book. It consisted of 90 objective items mainly focused on grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Each item received one point and there was no penalty for false responses. Reliability and validity of the mentioned test were measured. After constructing the test, it was checked by four experts for its face and content validity. That is, to get sure about the Content Validity Index of the test items, four experienced English teachers read through the tests and made some changes regarding the clarity, simplicity and the representativeness of items. Subsequently, the test was modified and then piloted on a similar group in another University whose course book and level were the same. After applying validation and piloting, the necessary changes and modifications to achieve item characteristics, i.e., item facility, item discrimination, and choice distribution were made in the test. Finally, the test was prepared to use. Its reliability was calculated through KR-21 ( $r=0.868$ ).

The third instrument which was utilized in this study was a researcher-made general English achievement post-test- the modified version of the pre-test. It was given to the participants after three months to measure the impacts of treatment i.e., teaching through AOTM and POTM. All characteristics of the post-test were the same as those of the pre-test in terms of time and the number of items. The only difference was that the order of questions and alternatives were changed to wipe out the probable recall of pre-test answers.

#### **3.3 Procedures**

First, OQPT was given to 115 students from Islamic Azad University of Ramhormoz, Iran. Based on their performance in the mentioned test, 80 intermediate students were selected as the target participants of the study. After selecting the target participants, they were randomly divided into two equal groups (Group A and Group B). Each group included 40 participants. Then the researchers employed a researcher-made general English achievement pre-test to the both groups. After that, he taught group A using AOTM and group B using POTM. In group A (AOTM) students had control over their learning experience and they were 100% responsible for their own learning. They were also deeply involved not only in planning, but also in evaluating their learning, as they knew what knowledge they want to acquire. On the contrary, in group B, learners were not self-directed; they still depended on their teacher throughout the learning process. Therefore, their teacher was responsible not only of what will be taught, but also of how it will be taught and evaluated. In addition, students in group A built an increasing reservoir of experience. This increasing experience became a deepening resource for their learning. Group B, on the other hand, had very little experience and must relied on the experience of others to learn. When a person is young, their application of a subject in group A is postponed and their orientation is subject-centered.

Their application of learning in group A became immediate and more problem-centered. They encountered problems, learned how to solve those problems, and then immediately applied their knowledge to those problems. Contrarily group B' application of a subject was postponed and their orientation was subject-centered. Generally, in group A all activities were determined and managed by the students



themselves, resulted to a student-centered class. On the contrary, group B was a teacher-centered class which most activities were identified and carried out by the teacher himself. The whole treatment lasted 12 sessions. In the first session, the participants were homogenized; and in the second session the students took the pre-test. From the third session to the eleventh session the mentioned treatment was practiced. In the twelfth session, the post-test was given to determine the effects of the treatment on the students' general English achievement. When the data were all gathered via pretest-posttest, it was time to carry out the analysis.

**3.4 Data Analysis**

In order to answer the research question, data analysis was carried out by using SPSS software version 25. In data analysis, first of all, the normality of distribution was investigated. For normality, Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test was used. Finally, to examine the effects of the treatment on improving the participants' general English achievement, paired and independent samples t-test were run. Paired samples t-test was used to compare the pre and post-tests of each group and independent samples t-test was applied to compare the experimental group's pre and post-tests to the control group's pre and post-tests.

**4. Results**

In order to analyze the gathered data, the SPSS software version 22 (Statistical Package for Social Science) software was used. The obtained results are reported in the following tables. First of all, the normally distribution was computed through Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test.

*Table 2: One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test*

	Group A Pretest	Group A posttest	Group B Pretest	Group B Posttest
N	40	40	40	40
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean 37.2500	76.0250	37.1500	41.0750
	Std. Deviation 1.89128	8.39868	2.43426	5.32718
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute .104	.223	.126	.170
	Positive .103	.143	.107	.156
	Negative -.104	-.223	-.126	-.170
Test Statistic	.104	.223	.126	.170
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.200 <sup>c,d</sup>	.000 <sup>c</sup>	.107 <sup>c</sup>	.005 <sup>c</sup>

a. Test distribution is Normal.  
 b. Calculated from data.  
 c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.  
 d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

In data analysis, first of all, the normality of distribution was investigated. For normality, Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test was used. Table 2 displays that the statistics of scores are normal as the results obtained from using SPSS 22. In this case, the parametric statistics like independent samples t-test and

paired samples t-test can be used to get the final results.

*Table 3: Descriptive Statistics (Pre-test of Both Groups)*

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pre test Group A	40	37.2500	1.89128	.29904
Group B	40	37.1500	2.43426	.38489

Table 3 depicts the descriptive statistics of both groups on the pretests. Based on the above table, the mean of group A on the pre-test is 37.2500 and the mean of group B is 37.1500. As it is shown in the table, both groups had almost equal performance on the pre-tests. Their mean scores is a testimony for our claim.

*Table 4: Independent Samples T-test (Pre-test of Both Groups)*

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
Pretest	Equal variances assumed	4.087	.047	.205	78	.838	.100	.487	-.870	1.07
	Equal variances not assumed			.205	73.509	.838	.100	.4874	-.871	1.07

In Table 4, an independent samples t-test was used to show the scores of both groups on the pre-test. Since Sig (.838) is greater than 0.05, the difference between the groups is not significant at (p<0.05). In fact, they performed the same on the pre-test.

*Table 5: Descriptive Statistics (Post-tests of both Groups)*

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post test Group A	40	76.0250	8.39868	1.32795
Group B	40	41.0750	5.32718	.84230

Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics of both groups on the post-tests. Based on the above table, the mean of group A is 13.90 and the mean of group B is 17.68. As it is observed in the above table, group A (Andragogically Oriented Teaching Method (AOTM)) had better performance than group B (Pedagogically Oriented Teaching Method (POTM)) on the post-test. There is a significant difference between the performance of the group A and group B.

*Table 6: Independent Samples T-test (the Post-test of Both Groups)*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Interval Difference	Confidence of the Interval
								Lower	Upper	
Posttest	Equal variances assumed	18.876	.000	22.22	78	.000	34.95	1.57	31.81	38.08
	Equal variances not assumed			22.22	66.00	.000	34.95	1.57	31.81	38.08

Table 6 indicates that the difference between the both groups is significant at ( $p < 0.05$ ). In fact, the AOTM group (Group A) outperformed the POTM group (Group B) on the post-test. It can be concluded that the treatment had positive effects on the performance of the group A on the post-test

*Table 7: Paired Samples Statistics (Pre and Post-tests of Both Groups)*

Pair	Group	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1	Group A Posttest	76.0250	40	8.39868	1.32795
	Group A Pretest	37.2500	40	1.89128	.29904
2	Group B Posttest	41.0750	40	5.32718	.84230
	Group B Pretest	37.1500	40	2.43426	.38489

*Table 8: Paired Samples T-test (Pre and Post-tests of Both Groups)*

		Paired Differences			t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)		
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower		Upper			
Pair 1	Group A posttest - Group A Pretest	38.7750	8.701	1.375	35.992	41.55	28.183	39	.000
	Group B Posttest - Group B Pretest	3.9250	5.136	.812	2.282	5.567	4.833	39	.000

In the above table, paired samples t-test was used to compare the pre and post-tests of each group. Since Sig (.000) is less than 0.05, the difference between the post-test and pre-test of both groups is significant. Therefore, the researchers concluded that both groups improved from pretest to posttest, but regarding their performance on posttest (as revealed in table 5), group A (AOTM group) was improved significantly.

**5. Discussion and Conclusion**

Regarding the first question of this study “Do using AOTM and POTM significantly affect intermediate EFL learners' general English achievement?”, it was found that both methods had effects on students' general English improvement as revealed through paired sample t test. Moreover, answering the second question, the results of this study showed that the students who received Andragogically

Oriented Teaching Method (AOTM) had better performance compared to those who were trained through Pedagogically Oriented Teaching Method (POTM). The results statistically revealed that AOTM group significantly did better than the POTM group ( $p < .05$ ).

It may be firmly viewed that although not in accordance with the flow of instructing orientation that andragogy is teaching orientation for adult students and pedagogy is that for the youthful ones, youthful students can be engaged with classes applying AOTM like the adult students. AOTM compared to POTM both as teaching orientation methods was more effective to be given to adult learners including to the students of Iranian context particularly in general English classes in which they learn how to teach EFL well. All the more particularly, the fact said that accomplishment of language learning was not really in accordance with success of educating, as achievement of language learning as well as imagination in setting up the educating and furthermore utilizing the educating instructional abilities which impacted students accomplishment of educating.

Generally speaking, this study tried to investigate the effect of AOTM and POTM on students' general English achievement. The results showed that those students who were taught through AOTM, performed remarkably better. It can be concluded that the students who were learning English as a foreign language tended to be more andragogically oriented in their learning. However, the obtained scores in another group additionally show a propensity towards pedagogical orientations. Therefore, it would be false to assume that the learners would only go for the andragogical and/or pedagogical items. When the quantity of the students observed to be andragogically oriented is viewed, the goal and the requirements of the students on a course ought to be considered. Therefore, before starting certain courses, educators need to find out the needs, interests, and purposes of their target groups. For example, if the students of English needed to learn the language to utilize it in social groups, the instructive program should help them build up their communicational aptitudes. Teachers ought not to expect that all their students will be andragogically situated. In sorting out the instructive settings and the materials, educational elements should be thought about. It is likewise critical to know



about the individuals who could be absolutely andragogical or pedagogical in a group. Just along these lines would educators be able to give instructively proper chances to every single individual student, empowering them to achieve more students. Students who are pedagogically arranged ought to be drawn closer in educational ways first. Then, step-by-step they would benefit from outside intervention to have and welcome the andragogical encounters.

Teachers should be educated about the idea of learning orientation. Teachers who value the significance of this idea and know how to utilize it would discover the learning orientation of their student from the earliest starting point. Teachers ought to likewise learn their own orientation, which would enable them to make an examination between their own and their students' orientation, giving them the chance to construct sensible desires and mastermind the learning condition as needs be.

### References

- Anderson, W. L., Mitchell, S. M., & Osgood, M. P. (2005). Comparison of Student Performance in Cooperative Learning and Traditional Lecture-Based Biochemistry Classes. *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education*, 33(6), 387-93. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bmb.2005.49403306387>
- Biggs, J. B. (1985). The role of meta-learning in study processes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 55, 185± 212.
- Buck, H. J. (1997). Maximizing Student Learning with the Use of Random Oral Questioning in the College Classroom. *Florida Journal of Educational Research*, 37(1). Retrieved from [http://feraonline.org/fjer/archive/1997/1997\\_Buck.htm](http://feraonline.org/fjer/archive/1997/1997_Buck.htm).
- Choy, S. C., & Delahaye, B. (2002). *Andragogy in Vocational Education and Training: Learners' perspective*. Paper presented at the 5th Annual Conference of the Australian VET Research Association (AVETRA), Melbourne, Australia.
- Christian, A. C. (1983). A Comparative Study of the Andragogical-Pedagogical Orientation of Military and Civilian Personnel. *Doctoral dissertation*. Oklahoma State University. Retrieved from <https://shareok.org/bitstream/handle/11244/20245/Thesis-1982D-C555c.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Conner, M. L. (2004). Andragogy and Pedagogy. Retrieved from <http://agelesslearner.com/intros/andragogy.html>
- Cortright, R. N., H.L. Collins, & DiCarlo. S. E. (2005). "Peer instruction enhanced meaningful learning: ability to solve novel problems." *Advances in Physiology Education* 29(2): 107-11.
- Davenport, J., & Davenport, J. H. (1985). Knowles or Lindeman: Would the Real Father of American Andragogy Please Stand Up?. *Lifelong Learning*, 9 (3), 4-5.
- Deveci, T. (2007). Androgical and Pedagogical Orientations of Adult Learners Learning English as a Foreign Language. *Journal of New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 21(¾), 16-28. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nha3.10287>
- Finkelstein, N. D., & S. J. Pollock. (2005). Replicating and Understanding Successful Innovations: Implementing Tutorials in Introductory Physics. *Physics Education Research*, 1(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.1.010101>
- Guglielmino, P. J., & Guglielmino, L. M. (1991a). *The learning preference assessment*. USA: Organization Design and Development.
- Hadley, H. (1975). Development of an instrument to determine adult educators' orientations: Andragogical or pedagogical (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1975). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 35, 759a.
- Harris, M. A., Peck, R. F., Colton, S., Morris, J., Neto, E. C., & Kallio, J. (2009). A Combination of Handheld Models and Computer Imaging Programs Helps Students Answer Oral Questions about Molecular Structure and Function: A Controlled Investigation of Student Learning. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 8(1), 29-43. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.08-07-0039>
- Henry, G. W. (2009). *An Historical Analysis of the Development of Thinking in the Principal Writings of Malcolm Knowles*. (Doctoral Dissertation). School of Learning and Professional Studies, Faculty of Education, Queensland University of Technology.
- Killen, R. (1998). *Effective Teaching Strategies*. Australia: Social Science Press.
- Klappa, P. (2009). Promoting Active Learning through "Pub Quizzes"— a Case Study at the University of Kent. *Bioscience Education*, 14(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.3108/beej.14.c2>.
- Knowles, M. (1978, 1990). *The Adult Learner a Neglected Species*, Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Knowles, M. (1980). *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: from Pedagogy to Andragogy*. New York: Cambridge Books.

- Marrs, K. A., & Novak, G. M. (2004). Just-in-Time Teaching in Biology: Creating an Active Learner Classroom Using the Internet. *Cell Biology Education*, 3(1), 49-61. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.03-11-0022>
- Marsh, C. (2000). *Handbook for Beginning Teachers* (2nd ed). Australia: Pearson Education.
- Pelaez, N. J. (2002). Problem-Based Writing with Peer Review Improves Academic Performance in Physiology. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 26(3), 174-184. <https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00041.2001>
- Preszler, R. W., Dawe, A., & Shuster, C. B. (2007). Assessment of the Effects of Student Response Systems on Student Learning and Attitudes over a Broad Range of Biology Courses. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 6(1), 29-41. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.06-09-0190>.
- Rivard, L. P., & Straw, S. B. (2000). The effect of talk and writing on learning science: An exploratory study. *Science Education*, 84, 566-593. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-237X\(200009\)84:5%3C566::AID-SCE2%3E3.0.CO;2-U](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-237X(200009)84:5%3C566::AID-SCE2%3E3.0.CO;2-U).
- Rukmini, D. (2009). Model Written Texts in the Recommended Senior High School English Textbooks. *TEFLIN Journal*, 20(2), 180-193.
- Saleh, M. R., Mujiyanto, A., & Warsono, A. (2018). The effectiveness of andragogically oriented teaching method to improve the male students' achievement of teaching practice. *English Language Teaching*, 11(2), 113-121.
- Saleh, M. R., Mujiyanto, A., & Shofwan, A. (2017). Andragogy and pedagogy: learning method orientations for EFL adult learners. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 5(2), 32-41
- Schwartz, D. L., & Bransford, J. D. (1998). A Time for Telling. *Cognition & Instruction*, 16(4), 475-522. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1604\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1604_4).
- Sealana, R. K. (2014). Examining the Efficacy of Adult Learning of Government-Mandated Content Using Andragogical Delivery Methods versus Traditional Pedagogical Delivery Methods. San Francisco: University of San Francisco.
- Setianingrum, D., & Saleh, M. (2016). Classroom Interaction Patterns in Higher Education. *English Education Journal*, 6(2), 10-16.
- Sharma, M., Johnston, I. D., Johnston, H., Varvell, K., Robertson, G., Hopkins, A., Stewart, C., Cooper, I., & Thornton, R. (2010). Use of interactive lecture demonstrations: A ten year study. *Physics Education Research*, 6(2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.6.020119>.
- Smith, M. K., Wood, W. B., Krauter, K., & Knight, J. K. (2011). Combining Peer Discussion with Instructor Explanation Increases Student Learning from In-Class Concept Questions. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 10(1), 55-63. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.10-08-0101>.
- Wilson, M. (2005). *Constructing measure: An item response modeling approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Yarden, H., Marbach-ad, G., & Gershoni, J. M. (2004). Using the Concept Map Technique in Teaching Introductory Cell Biology to College Freshmen. *Bioscene: Journal of College Biology Teaching*, 30(1), 3-13.

**Appendix: Samples from Researcher-developed Test used as both Pretest and Posttest**  
(All characteristics of the post-test were the same as those of the pre-test in terms of time and the number of items. The only difference was that the order of questions and alternatives were changed to wipe out the probable recall of pre-test answers.)

#### Grammar

- I have been living in Madrid \_\_\_\_\_.  
A. since ten years  
B. ten years ago  
C. for ten years  
D. ten years
- This is the \_\_\_\_\_ thing I have ever done.  
A. harder  
B. hardest  
C. more hard  
D. hard
- If I want to pass my exam, I \_\_\_\_\_.  
A. will have to  
B. would have to  
C. had to  
D. want to
- Don't make so much noise. Noriko \_\_\_\_\_ to study for her ESL test!  
A. try  
B. tries  
C. trying  
D. is trying
- I \_\_\_\_\_ for my pen. Have you seen it?  
A. will look  
B. looking  
C. look  
D. am looking

#### Vocabulary

- I couldn't find my glasses yesterday. I was \_\_\_\_\_ them all day.  
A. looking at  
B. looking for  
C. looking on  
D. looking in
- I can never beat her at tennis – she \_\_\_\_\_ the ball very hard.  
A. knocks  
B. hits  
C. kicks  
D. throws
- Jamal has just sent me \_\_\_\_\_ to arrange plans for this weekend.  
A. a blog  
B. an email  
C. a website  
D. an application
- A film \_\_\_\_\_ is a person who directs films.  
A. director  
B. director  
C. directist  
D. direct
- A \_\_\_\_\_ looks after children when parents are out.  
A. baby-looker  
B. child-sitter  
C. baby-sitter  
D. baby-setter

#### Reading Comprehension

Read the following passages and then select the best choice for each item.

##### Passage 1: Moblogging

*Moblog* is a combination of two words. The first word is *mobile*, which means a *mobile camera phone* or *camera*. The second word is *blog*, a website for posting words and pictures. Typically, mobloggers are people who take photos or videos with their phones and post them on the Internet. Moblogging has caused a lot of excitement. It has also caused a lot of concern.

With a picture phone and a moblog, anyone can be a reporter. Moblogging first got the world's attention during a terrorist attack on four London buses. People were posting photos on the Internet many minutes before real reporters could get there. Similarly, information about car accidents has been broadcast right away. Moblogging is done just for fun, too. Posted on some moblogs you can find photos of friends making funny faces, photos from people traveling, and photos of new babies. Other fun moblogs might be spotting famous people, pictures of food in restaurants, or new clothes.

However, moblogs can be dangerous, too. Not long ago in Korea, a woman's dog made a mess on the train, but she refused to clean it up, became angry, and left. Her picture was taken and posted on the Internet, along with the story of what she did. People all around the country were angry with her. Imagine how she felt! Moblogging can be wonderful, but it's really impolite to post another person's picture on the Internet without asking permission. One idea from Japan may help: people can no longer quietly take pictures with their cell phones. Japanese cell phones "click" like a real camera when you take a picture.

- In line 3, *post* probably means \_\_\_\_\_.  
a) sell  
b) put  
c) send  
d) buy
- In line 6, *reporter* probably means \_\_\_\_\_.  
a) a person whose job is to tell us the news  
b) a student who writes reports  
c) a person who makes movies  
d) a teacher who teaches students
- In line 9, *broadcast* probably means \_\_\_\_\_.  
a) talked about by many people  
b) put on a television news show  
c) posted on the internet for people to read about  
d) none of them
- In line 14, *but she refused to clean it up, became angry, and left*, the woman probably became angry because \_\_\_\_\_.  
a) she didn't like her dog  
b) she didn't want to clean up the mess  
c) she didn't want her pictures on the internet  
d) she lost her pictures
- In line 18, *one idea from Japan may help*; the new idea is helpful because \_\_\_\_\_.  
a) everyone will know when a cell phone picture is taken  
b) pictures will be taken faster than before with camera phones  
c) everyone will ask permission before taking pictures  
d) everyone needs cell phone

Complete questionnaire can be requested through email to- [amir.sabzevari@yahoo.com](mailto:amir.sabzevari@yahoo.com)