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Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to shed light with the respect of experience on which teachers’ professional knowledge become connected to their teaching performance and illustrate which domains of knowledge are consistent with teaching process during their occupational years. In seeking an answer to research questions, we first consider what is different about teachers’ knowledge from teachers’ beliefs. We then consider specific domains of knowledge including English for specific purposes, assessment, lesson planning, sociolinguistics, and language environment regarding to language teaching. To assess the relationship in these domains, twenty experienced and less-experienced EFL teachers participated in the study. Each teacher’s knowledge was examined and performance was observed and inter-correlations of obtained data were calculated. Finally, the results show that, on the whole, experienced teachers produced significantly association between knowledge and performance compared to the novice teachers.
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1. The Concept of Knowledge

Knowledge and understanding of how to put it in practice in teaching context are complicated issues. Many researchers believe that the definition of knowledge originates from the period of Socrates (Acikalin, 2009).
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Furthermore, Plato proposed that knowledge has three components comprising beliefs, truth, and justification (Woolfolk-Hoy & Murphy, 2001). In the original philosophical, information depends upon a "reality situation" that's being decided upon in a residential district of people. Based on that explanation, information is really an opinion that fits two criterions: (a) the reality of what's said and (b) the reason some body has for thinking it (Woolfolk-Hoy & Murphy, 2001). Similarly, knowledge is defined as “everything that is known; organized body of information” in Oxford Advanced Learner’s English Dictionary. In Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, it is meant by “What people knows; the fact, information, skills, and comprehending and interpreting that one has achieved through learning or experienced” (as cited in Zhao, 2012; p.70). Regarding these two meanings, the researcher may infer that information possesses a complex abstract notion and expression (Zhao, 2012).

Several scholars and methodologists such as Pajares (1992) have built effort to tell apart between knowledge and beliefs. On the basis of the different features between belief and knowledge, Calderhead (1996) stated that beliefs are generally referred to “suppositions, commitments, and ideologies while knowledge refers to factual propositions and the understanding that inform skillful action” (p.715). Richardson (1996) also distinguished knowledge from beliefs with respect to the notion of "truth condition". Ernest (1989) proposed a distinguish between beliefs and knowledge by determining an instance where two instructors could have similar knowledge, but you can teach English or subjects with a problem-solving orientation, while another features a more didactic approach as a result of different beliefs they maintain.

2. Teacher’s Professional Knowledge

Teacher’s professional knowledge is used to refer to whole related knowledge pertinent to occupational realm (Smey, 2007). This occupational competence has been made of from different components of knowledge as it is following.
2.1. Subject Knowledge

Subject matter knowledge is only one of the several components of knowledge that Shulman (1986, 1987) identify as being necessary for effective teaching. According to Mohammed (2006), “these components comprise: subject matter knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, curriculum knowledge, knowledge of educational aims, goals and purposes, and knowledge of learners” (p.25). Thus, an instructor has to set up a posture to be able to provide a strategy the topic being shown with particular issues, such as for instance which cultural events are linked to the topic, what's their relationship to cultural issues and their price in everyday life (Kennedy, 1990). Also, he must be ready so your instructor may detect misconceptions of the data made available from the pupils and entirely realize the techniques needed for the exchange of the data and abilities connected to the topic being shown (Shulman 1987; p.9). Yet another necessity for an instructor will be information on every matter in this program or syllabus of the class or position he shows, and that regards, this permits him to change an interdisciplinary way of the substance, as an example, applying photographs, analogies and information purchased by pupils through different matters (Ernest, 1989). Eventually, familiarity with the topic shown relates to a teacher's beliefs.

In a study that was conducted by Askew et al., (1997) and Medwell et al., (1998), teachers’ effectiveness is strongly influenced by the opinion teachers have of the subject they teach. Moreover, “teachers with a more ‘holistic’ outlook on the subjects they teach tend to be more effective” (Turner-Bisset, 2001; pp.28-29).

Richards (2011) retains that subject material understanding is the exact same material knowledge. He also mentioned that material understanding or subject material understanding is among the main problems in next language instructor training teaching.

In reality, that is “material knowledge” which provided a fresh perception or see for question and conversation in next language teaching. Furthermore, Richards (2011) also distinguishes “knowledge” from “skill”, while there is small big difference regarding the realistic abilities language educators required to understand and understand, but there's not as contract regarding what the conventional or academic subject material of language training is. Thus, material understanding identifies what educators or teachers involve understanding in what they show (Richards, 2011).
It indicates what they learn about language training itself and ensures understanding which may maybe not be provided by educators of different topic areas or areas.

Content knowledge or subject matter knowledge has rudimentary origins and roots in language teaching and applied linguistics (Richards, 2011). Occasionally, the content knowledge or subject material familiarity with language teaching has descends from the branch of applied linguistics, which grew out of in the 1960s – at comparable time that language teaching was developed with the advent of new methods such as audio-lingualism and situational language teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Later, applied linguistics produced the corpus of specialized academic knowledge and theory that offered the basis of new approaches to language teaching, and this knowledge base was shown the programs that started to offer from this time (Richards, 2011). Others produced error in unique that understanding and it is a result of disappointment to appreciate between disciplinary understanding and Pedagogical material knowledge (Richards, 2011).

2.2. Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Pedagogical content knowledge is “the special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding” (Shulman, 1987), therefore, it is considered as a teacher professional knowledge component (Hashweh, 2005).

Based on Richards (2011), pedagogical content knowledge refers to the data that gives a cause for language teaching and learning. Also, it’s knowledge that arises from the study of language teaching and language learning itself and which can be assisted in different various methods to the objective of practical problems in language teaching and teaching (Richards, 2011).

He also contends that pedagogical content knowledge include “course work in areas such as curriculum planning, assessment, reflective teaching, classroom management, teaching children, teaching the four skills, and so on” (p.6).

It is worth noting that teacher knowledge test manufactured by Cambridge ESOL is a typical example of a current attempt to offer a basis in relevant pedagogical content knowledge for teachers and students (Richards, 2011).
Correspondingly, pedagogical content knowledge has the following advantages for teachers as follows:

- Preparing teachers to comprehend learners' wants, needs, and demands
- Permitting them to spot learners' problems and issues,
- Planning appropriate instructional purposes for lessons, and syllabus
- Choosing and designing learning tasks or activities,
- Evaluating students' learning,
- Utilizing authentic activities and tasks,
- Evaluating and choosing published materials (Richards, 2011).

2.3. Knowledge of Learners

Knowledge of learners includes knowledge on the biological, social, psychological and cognitive development of students. In this such knowledge, on main problems relates to group dynamics and interaction between students along with teachers and students, students behavioral problems, learning motivation, adjustment issues, learning difficulties (Liakopoulo, 2011). Shulman (1987) maintains that knowledge of learners is related to the faces and properties' learners.

2.4. Knowledge of Teaching Methodology

Teaching methodology knowledge is a way to define the necessary qualifications of a teacher is to give a complicated description of the teaching methodology (Liakopoulo, 2011). This presentation of the precise structural components of instruction is the following: 1) lesson planning, i.e. a teacher's pre-lesson activities and actions (organization of content into thematic units, transformation of teaching material into teachable knowledge, definition of teaching goals, methodological organization of teaching, time planning, choice of evaluation process).

Lesson planning can differ, with respect it's short-term (weekly lesson planning or unit planning) or it's long-term (for the whole semester or academic year); 2) teaching performance, i.e. enforcing your choices made during planning (teaching path, didactic organization, application of teaching forms, direct behaviors of the teacher, usage of teaching methods and aids;
3) evaluation of teaching, i.e. evaluating the outcome mainly by assessing student performance (basic principles, forms, goals, assessment techniques).

2.5. Curriculum Knowledge

The curriculum is a tool in which determines the didactic wide choices of a teacher (Liakopoulos, 2011). Hence, Teachers should know the curriculum, textbooks, the rules and laws of the education system and, as a whole, the state’s role in education (Shulman 1986; p.10, Shulman 1987; pp.9-10). At once, nevertheless, the needs of culture nowadays require a important way of the curriculum and their version to the wants deriving from context. In accordance with Shulman (1987), curriculum understanding has been certain understand of the assets and applications that use as “resources of the trade” for educators and researchers.

2.6. General Pedagogical Knowledge

This field devotes to the organization of the classroom, to motivating and recalling students’ attention, combining resources, learning theories and pedagogical principles. Shulman (1987) feels that this type of understanding describes concepts and proper class administration and business, which improve the information of particular subjects. Actually, Shulman (1987) stated that general pedagogical knowledge is “with special mention of those broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organization that appear to transcend subject matter” (p.8). Hence, this kind of knowledge secures a construction of mental representations compulsory for the understanding and explanation of the college or university classroom. Furthermore, this knowledge is totally vital for lesson planning, since it helps the teacher's moralistic selections (Ernest, 1989).

2.7. Knowledge of Contexts

A teacher is known as upon to judge the context, by which he teaches and acts respectively, and his actions are defined by surrounding situations; quite simply, you can find no prearranged attitudes that could match and correspond with every occasion (Liakopoulos, 2011). You can find specific attitudes on reality, definite principles and theories, research findings, which a teacher may use to interpret and understand the context, and an array of techniques and approaches which is often used, depending on the specific situation and context.
Therefore, familiarity with contexts pertains to familiarity with the surroundings and the environmental surroundings by which a teacher is needed to work like the university, the region, the state. Specifically, it offers familiarity with the students and their family background, the whole local community, education setting, the business and management of the college unit, the real history and philosophy of education Atlanta divorce attorneys state, the institutional framework and administrative structure of education (Liakopoulo, 2011).

In this regard, Shulman (1987) believes that familiarity with contexts including the workings of group or classroom, the governance and financing of school areas, to the type of communications and cultures.

2.8. Knowledge of “Self”

It’s certainly one of the most crucial aspects of teacher. A fundamental qualification of teachers, related for their views on the role, responsibilities, training and qualifications, rights and professional development, working conditions, values, and philosophy (Liakopoulo, 2011). Similarly, it’s chiefly associated using their professional development through reflection, to learning through their teaching experience, regarding their working environment (Kagan, 1992). The way in which teachers understand and interpret their role shapes not just their options, but additionally the direction they comprehend and interpret, and make use of this knowledge.

Those types of categories, pedagogical content knowledge is of particular interest since it recognizes the distinguishing bodies of knowledge for teaching.

It characterizes the mix of content and pedagogy in to a comprehending of how special and particular matters or topics, issues are recognized, represented, and adjusted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction (Shulman, 1986). Also, pedagogical content knowledge is to tell apart the comprehending of the information specialist from that of the pedagogue.

3. Teacher’s Beliefs

One of the other major issues needed to be taken into consideration in the present study is the teacher’s beliefs with the respect of teacher’s knowledge.
Teachers are very affected by their values, which are tightly related making use of their principles, and their opinions of the world (Williams & Burden, 2000); beliefs govern individual’s attributes (Incecay, 2011); Nespor (2009) stated that beliefs are closely associated using what individuals think, people know but offer a powerful filter which monitors, redefines, distorts, or reforms thinking and information processing and teacher beliefs play an important role in teachers' decision making about lesson planning and instructional tasks; and Bandura (1986) stated that an individual's decisions throughout his/her life like teaching are heavily influenced by his/her beliefs.

In comprehensive review of the literature on teachers' beliefs, Pajares (1992), Williams and Burden (2000), and Zheng (2009) suggested that teachers' beliefs had a remarkable effect rather than teachers' knowledge on the way they planned and designed their classes and lessons and how people arrange and determines tasks and activities, problems, and were better predictors of how teachers behaved in the classroom.

According to Pomeroy (1993), Pajares (1992), and Savasci-Acikalin (2009), teacher beliefs have considerably discussed by scholars and researchers in order to comprehend the type the connection between teacher beliefs and teacher practice. Hashweh (1996), Haney et al., (1996), Beck et al., (2000), Haney and McArthur (2002), Levitt (2002), Roehrig and Kruse (2005), Balighizade and Farshchi (2009), and Abadi and Marzban (2012) have found that teacher beliefs are consistent with classroom practice in different aspects of teaching beside their knowledge influence.

Abelson (1979) defined beliefs with respect to people manipulating knowledge for a particular purpose or under a necessary circumstance.

In other hand, Brown and Cooney (1982) defined beliefs as the same dispositions to action and major determinants of actions. Unlike knowledge systems, belief systems do not require general consensus regarding the validity and acceptability of beliefs. Individual beliefs do not even require internal consistency in the belief system. Finally, Nespor (1987) also differentiated these two terms based on episodic structure. A knowledge system is stored in semantic networks whereas belief systems consist of episodically-stored material influenced by personal experiences or cultural and institutional sources (Savasci-Acikalin, 2009).
With regarding to consistency of beliefs and practice, Calderhead (1996) argues that there are five main areas of teaching practice in which teachers have been found to hold significant beliefs. These areas which are closely related and might be interconnected are the following: a) beliefs about learners, b) subjects or curriculum, c) learning how to teach, d) concerning the self and, e) beliefs about the type of teaching.

4. Language Teacher Evaluation

Language classroom observation is a practical tool in addition to different kinds of assessments to measure and scrutinize teacher’s practice and how well they apply knowledge in their teaching procedure. Many of the reviews and synopses of the classroom observation research, such as that of Williams (1989), have consistently showed that a number of classroom behaviors significantly and positively devote to students' academic achievement. A few proportions of class training such as, for instance, doing everyday opinions, showing new product, doing led training, giving review and correctives, leading self-determining training, and doing regular and regular evaluations have revealed to be considerably and really dedicated to pupils' academic achievement (Williams, 1989). In other hand, research using systematic classroom observation has provided the learners with a considerable knowledge base that has helped us understand effective teaching.

According to Williams (1989), observations are usually preceded and followed by discussions and debates; so, when observations combined with the wider and broader context of teaching practice, classroom observations are perceived to play an important role in teacher formation.

Also, there is an observation for assessment; certainly, this was the traditional, and often the only reason for observing teachers and classrooms (Gebhard, 2005). Moreover, Williams (1989) states that classroom observation usually improve a section of any teacher training programs, whether initial training or in-service training. He also maintains that “these observations are generally based on the assumption that teachers should put into practice what they have learnt on their course, and the trainer’s role is to judge whether what has been taught has in fact been carried out properly” (p.85).
Based on Barcósi (2007), class statement is recognized as being a crucial factor in instructor education. He also thought that class statement is distinctive from the sides of instructor training. Barcósi (2007) considered class observation being a necessary section of any instructor teaching plan, whether pre-service or in-service. Also, it is recognized as the procedure of acquiring the activities of the classroom. Gebhard (1999) holds that class statement is an essential problem for certain requirements of non-involvement. In Gebhard's claims (2005), statement is “non-judgmental information of class activities that may be examined and provided interpretation” (p.35). Actually, that see has sources in the notions of scholars such as Allwright (1988), Cohen (2000) that gathering aim data moves beyond the class to construct an experience of still another important part of the teaching-learning condition, exclusively what is called debate (Barcósi, 2007).

Scott (2010) claims that class observation has regarded as a method linked to the standard assertion program. Additionally, class observation is recognized as a crucial aspect in the progress of understanding and training in general (Scott, 2010). Based on Scott (2010), class observation has several crucial applications among academic settings. He also mentioned about the entire intent behind class observation is to gauge just how wherever training consequences on pupils' understanding and to ensure all learners' needs are met. Scott (2010) retains that class observation is an activity that provides a way of discussing great training around a college or perhaps a classroom. Class observation helps the pupils produce higher recognition of their particular skills and places for growth as class practitioners and provides an impetus for skilled speak amongst students.

According to Waxman (1995), classroom observation has many valid and important educational purposes.

In general, purpose of classroom observation can be summarized and divided into three important purposes or areas: (1) description of instructional practices; (2) investigation of instructional inequities for different groups of students; and (3) improvement of teachers' classroom instruction based on feedback from individual classroom or school profiles. Milanowski, King and Koppich (2007) stated that classroom observation has mentioned about features of applying class remark as still another way of measuring instructor efficiency the following:
It's appropriate to occupations and occupations by which efficiency procedures centered on outcomes are hard to improve.

It guarantees that important proportions of efficiency that rise above procedures outcomes, such as for instance how outcomes are acquired, are taken in to consideration.

It centers on proportions of efficiency that may support educators understand the text between their efficiency and their pay.

Additionally, it will offer feedback to workers about what they could do to acquire crucial outcomes, for instance; behaviors, job and strategies.

In addition, Williams (1989) lists the benefits of classroom observations as follows:

- Class remark shown dilemmas and issues for educators and instructors, and usually trigger amazing pressure and worried about the area of the teacher.

- Class findings offer a chance for educators to boost their possess conclusions of what continues in their very own classrooms.

- Class remark enhances the pupils' consciousness of what their pupils are performing and relationships that get devote their class.

In accordance with Williams (1989), classroom observation has principles that the teachers can ideally like to do in a classroom. Hence, the researchers created seven principles: (1) development; (2) limited and focused content; (3) course-link; (4) teacher-centeredness; (5) future-development; (6) positiveness; (7) flexibility.

Material and Method

The participants were twenty EFL teachers, who were divided as less experienced included ten teachers who had two to five years teaching experience and all were English teaching B.A holders or English teaching B.A students and experienced teachers who had five to eight years teaching experience and they certainly were English teaching M.A holders or English teaching M.A students, selected among different English language institutes throughout the city - Zanjan. All twenty teachers choose to go through Teacher Training Courses (TTCs) in the institutes in that they taught.
To be able to collect data, the researchers prepared five domains of knowledge tests with ten questions for each domain to assess teacher's knowledge including English for specific purposes (ESP), assessment, lesson planning, sociolinguistics, and language environment. These knowledge tests extracted from book entitled "Texes: English as an additional language" (ESL) compiled by Sharon Wynne (2010).

The observation checklist was made with regards to questions of knowledge tests for per skill mentioned previously on the bases of recordings of teachers' classes. It included items with five choices including "Excellent", "Great", "Good", "Needs improvement", and "Not applicable" are presented. The scale was made and developed as a remark tool to rate an individual instructor's teaching performance.

Video tape which includes been recorded 90 minutes for just one session of every teacher was to examine the teacher's performance according to mentioned domains. Internal consistency (coefficient alpha) has been evaluated at all type of questionnaire were all at satisfactory levels. At the start of the semester, knowledge test was handed to the teachers to judge the degree of their knowledge. This 50-items knowledge test was mentioned before was allocated 50 minutes. After collecting the data test sheet, the researchers observed the performance of teachers of every group through video tapes which includes been recorded 90 minutes for just one session of every teacher and scored them from one to five as "Excellent", "Great", "Good", "Needs improvement", and "Not applicable". Actually, the researchers compared the degree of teachers' knowledge by making use of their performances through set of observations which designed regarding knowledge tests. To carry out the statistical analysis, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 16.0 for Windows Vista Home Premium, was applied to run statistical analysis of the four instruments.

With the intention to this research percentage, frequency, mean, standard deviations were conducted, as well. To explore the inter-correlations among teachers' performance, two-tailed Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficient were employed.
Results and Discussion

1. ESP Domain

ESP domain descriptive statistics based on Pearson Correlation addressing the relationship between the ESP knowledge and performance of the less experienced teachers depicted in Table-1 reveals the level of significance (.101) is higher than the threshold 0.05; this suggests that the difference between the two variables is insignificant. Compared to their counterparts among experienced teachers, the significance level (.005) is lower than the threshold (0.05), indicating that there is a statistically significant difference between the variables.

ESP in this very specific study may also concern the teachers' technicality in teaching as well as their ESP (English as Specific Purpose) knowledge and performance variables. As to this very issue, when the two groups are compared, the results, contrary to some other areas, showed that their experience plays some role more effective than pure moderation. It means that significant variations were reported as far as their experiences were concerned in the relationship between the variables in question; knowledge and practice.

Defined technicality of teacher in teaching, ESP in this study can be supplemented by the efforts being exerted to promote ELL's academic literacy, as suggested by Short and Echeverria (2005), among some components emphasis on academic vocabulary development which requires and means expanding academic vocabulary knowledge beyond what is included in the textbooks along with promoting academic talks are of crucial significance. Materialization of such goals is attributed to ESP domain knowledge, which might be an area characterizing experience teacher from novice counterpart. Fortunately, the relevant findings are in line with Short and Echeverria's position as the experience teachers outperformed both in theory and practice in this study.

As to the ESP domain, the results pertinent to the less experienced teachers suggest that the difference between the two variables is not statistically significant. However, both descriptive and inferential statistics are compatible with each other, though being against what was seen as to the former group as far as the ESP knowledge and performance variables were related.
As the data reveal, there is a statistically significant difference between the variables in question indicating that the more experienced teachers teach their lesson technically and they possess not only higher ESP knowledge but also apply it in practice. The significant findings in this domain between the target groups are in consistent with Górska-Porecka (2013) that are mainly attributable not to a special TEFL technical or ESP teacher development program, rather to the teachers' professional development from EGP methodology to ESP teaching competency in the light of personal endeavor as well as their experiences.

2. Assessment Domain

Based on the Pearson Correlation in Table-1 between assessment knowledge and performance of less experienced teachers, the level of significance is .060 which means that it is insignificant. There is not corresponding between their knowledge and performance. In Table-2 the level of significance of experienced teachers is .027 which underlines that the difference between knowledge and the performance variables is statistically significant. Obviously, assessment and teaching are both theoretically and pedagogically interwoven. On the other hand, both of them are to some extent functions of their academic and teaching experiences as it was shown in this very empirical study that their experience proved to be effective in determining the relationship between teaching methodology domain between the less and more experienced teachers. The same trend holds, luckily, true with regard to the assessment domain. In other words, the results supported the fact that the teachers' assessment knowledge and their ability to put it into practice enjoy different pictures between the participants.

As far as the less experienced teachers were concerned, it could be concluded that there is no significant relationship between assessment knowledge and performance proving that there is no effect of assessment knowledge on their assessment performance in practice. Contrary to this, more experienced teachers proved to be more practical in terms of assessment.

It means that not only their rate of assessment knowledge has been enhanced in the course of experiences, but they are also more practical in terms of assessment and testing as their assessment knowledge and the relevant efficiency factors are statistically significant sustaining the fact that more experienced and thereby skilled educators evaluate their pupils both on time and based on their teaching methodology principles.
O’Loughlin (2006) in an article has tried and reported from many scholars on the relationship between language assessment knowledge and skill and teacher’s experience. He asserts “students’ capacity and willingness to grasp the new knowledge and ideas presented to them in class is strongly influenced by their prior experience with assessment as language learners and teachers”. His position is also supplemented by many others such as Kleinsasser (2005), Bailey & Nunan (1996), Freeman & Richards (1996), Johnson & Golombek (2002) and Golombek & Johnson (2004). Theses practitioners have tried to associate teaching methodology knowledge, language assessment skill and ultimately student’s success to teacher’s experience in the two interwoven variables. The findings of my study in both domains are very much in line with their positions as there proved to be statistically significant differences between the groups when the experience was involved.

3. Lesson Planning Domain

In Table-1, the results of lesson planning knowledge and performance among the less experienced teachers is .174 compared to those of their more experienced counterparts which is .100 in Table-2 reveal partially the same results as both data sets indicate that the difference between the two variables in both groups is not significant.

Most probably, lesson planning is a variable claimed to be more related to teachers’ variables. It is claimed by Richards and Renandya (2002) that “...not many teachers enter a classroom without some kind of plan” (p. 31). According to Ur (2012), lesson planning is an indication of teacher’s professional development (PD). Knowledge of how plan a lesson and nature and extent of its actualization were hypothesized to be correlated.

Contrary to this assumption, the results of this study showed that nature of relationship between these two variables was not much a function of their experience level as both groups enjoyed partially similar characteristics indicating that the relationship between them was not statistically significant. He holds that a lesson plan is essential for novice teachers and convenient for experienced teachers.
Planning a lesson is affected by four main factors schematically displayed in the following figure:

![Diagram of lesson planning factors]

These claims are also supported in (DCSF 04252004 G) and (DCSF 0429-0434-2004 G). If we can identify EFL/ESL teacher's professional development partially dependent on the accumulation and integration of the variables depicted in this figure, it could then be safely claimed that our teachers are still in need of further educational programs so that these factors can be prompted. And in the course of PD, which is to some extent a function of experience as well, they will get prompted in terms of lesson planning knowledge and its practical use.

Then, insignificant relationship between the theory and practice of lesson planning among our teachers can be related to some sort of imbalance in the parameters contributing to and building up their professional development including their planned teaching.

4. Sociolinguistics Domain

The significant level of The Pearson correlation in Table-1 for the relationship between sociolinguistics competence skill and performance of less experienced teachers is .025 and it is positive.
The Pearson Correlation in Table-2 for experienced teachers is .010 and suggests that the difference between the sociolinguistics and the performance variables is statistically significant.

Posner (1985) says that “A key factor in understanding any teaching situation is the social and physical context – the rules, facilities, values, expectations, and personal backgrounds, which act as resources, constraints, and direct influences on teaching and learning” (cited in Richards, 2011, p. 16). Evidently, sociolinguistics is relevant to teaching ESL/EFL. In this respect, researchers such as Afful (2006) Kloss (1966), to name a few, have tried to justify the contribution of sociolinguistic knowledge to ESL/EFL teaching, though they have not approached the issue from teacher’s experience perspectives. They hold that teachers are required to obtain sociolinguistic process of language which can contribute to the L2 learners’ development. In line with the significance attached to the role of sociolinguistics in the field, the findings of this study related to the both groups of participants entailed interesting ideas; meaning that the relationship between the target variables in both groups revealed significant. As far as the less experienced teachers were concerned, the significance level of the Pearson Correlation Test between the sociolinguistics knowledge and performance variables indicated that there is a statistically significant difference between the variables in question. The pertinent statistics on the latter group; more experienced teachers, showed that there was statistically significant difference as a far the target members were related.

These findings are in line with the importance of context knowledge in teaching as claimed by Liakopoulo (2011), based on which one finds specific attitudes on reality, definite principles and theories, research findings, which a teacher may use to interpret and understand the context, and an array of techniques and approaches which is often used, depending on the specific situation and context. Shulman’s (1987) belief that contextual familiarity and type of communications and cultures existing in it is a part of teacher’s professional development, is supported in this study.

Moreover, if, as commonly, it is held that familiarity with students’ cultural backgrounds is a part of the teacher’s professional development, the findings are in line with what is suggested by Cummins (2005) in claiming that academic talks delicate messages to pupils regarding the worthiness of previous activities and the appropriateness of the language and tradition within the broader societal context.
This study is also in line with Ogbu (1978) who supported direct and positive correlation between valuing students' cultural values and their academic achievements. Then those teachers who are more familiar with social values in teaching and exercise them in practice are considered more professionally developed.

5. Language Environment Domain

On the basis of acquired result in Table-1 for the relationship between language environment knowledge and performance of less experienced teachers is .016, compared to those of their more experienced counterparts which is .025 in Table-2 revealed partially the same results as both data sets indicate that the difference between the two variables in both groups is significant.

It is worth starting the discussion on this domain with a quotation from Akbulut (2007) “rather than a given curriculum, a dynamic approach to language teacher education seems to be ideal in helping trainees adjust the reality. If teacher educators have an understanding of their trainees' knowledge, they become more successful in relating the reality and the theory to their preexisting knowledge in a more appropriate way. Moreover, the program needs to involve teacher trainees in different contexts of teaching”.

This quotation is more directly related to the language environment domain or realities of language use situation. A similar idea holds true with regard to test usefulness characteristics called authenticity referring to the match between testing conditions and target language use (TLU) (Bachman, 2000). Additionally, Akbulut (2007) cites from Freeman et al. (1996) that when teachers are educationally trained to teach, they are more possibly involved in the discourse of the new professional easily, which helps them exchange their experience of an ideal discourse community. These speculations are of double-purpose since not only do they assert on the importance of TLU, but also they indicate teacher's development to consider the rationale behind language use. Moreover, by language environment domain it was meant possibility of having and incorporation of several variables into teaching.

They mainly cover issues like family desire to mingle with native-speakers, effective communication in the target society, parents' involvement in school programs, natural atmosphere of students' involvement in their education, encouragement of the students' participation and presentations, etc all aimed at incorporation of the target language environment in teaching context.
As far as the relationship between these variables was concerted, the findings revealed that there is statistically meaningful and positive relationship between them between both groups of the participants. The results of the Pearson Correlation between the language family and environment knowledge and performance on the less experienced teachers showed significance level of relationship. In the same vein, more experienced teachers proved to enjoy both knowledge of the linguistic domain and its application as the Pearson Correlation between the language environment knowledge and the performance highlighted statistically significant difference between the target variables.

Therefore, the findings of this study from the language environment domain perspective suggest that the target teacher groups proved to have the knowledge of the target community; EFL, in which the language is supposed to be used and they luckily try to put their knowledge into practice according to the TLU considerations.

**Table-1: Pearson Correlation Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Less Experienced Teacher</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.697*</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.734*</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.734*</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.734*</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table-2: Pearson Correlation Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Experienced Teachers</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.805* .005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>.805* .005</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.698* .027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>.698* .027</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Planning</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.549 .100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>.549 .100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistics</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.765* .010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>.765* .010</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Environment</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.697* .025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>.697* .025</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Conclusion

The main finding of this study is that the association between knowledge and performance of novice teachers is not comparable to that of experienced teachers in terms of five domains of knowledge of investigation.
According to this result, we can conclude that the experience factor can play a significant role in activating knowledge and make it consistent with pedagogical practice in teaching realm. Therefore, these novice teachers may need more time and experience to attain the ability to apply this knowledge. However, on the basis of this empirical work, several concerns emerged need to be investigated further. For example, the question of what can accelerate the process with which teachers can apply in order to make their knowledge consistent with their teaching instead of waiting for experience enlargement opens prospects for future research.
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