QUESTIONNAIRE AS A TOOL FOR DATA PRODUCTION IN STUDIES ON BELIEFS OF LANGUAGES STUDENT TEACHERS IN INITIAL EDUCATION

Luciana Kinoshita[1]

ABSTRACT

This study examined the use of questionnaires as an instrument of data production in investigations of student teachers' beliefs regarding language teaching and learning in initial education. Our objective was to assist in developing questionnaires in research on this subject. Therefore, we conducted a bibliographic study and reported our experience in building this instrument. The results showed that creating a questionnaire for research on the topic requires the researcher to engage in extensive theoretical and technical preparation.

Keywords: Questionnaire; Beliefs; Initial teacher education.

RESUMO

O tema em estudo é o questionário como instrumento de produção de dados em investigações sobre crenças no ensino-aprendizagem de idiomas de alunos-professores em formação inicial. Nosso objetivo é auxiliar na elaboração de questionários em pesquisas que versem sobre esse assunto. Para tanto, desenvolvemos estudo bibliográfico e relato de nossa própria experiência em construir o instrumento. Os resultados apontam que criar um questionário para pesquisas sobre o tema exige do pesquisador bastante preparação teórica e técnica.

Palavras-chave: Questionário; Crenças; Formação inicial de professores.

[1] Professor at the Federal University of Southern and Southeastern Pará (Unifesspa) and Ph.D. in Education from University of São Paulo (USP). E-mail: luciana.kinoshita@unifesspa.edu.br

FIRST CONSIDERATIONS

Within the context of teaching–learning one (or more) foreign languages (FL), we can think of beliefs as representations that those involved in language teaching–learning have about the processes of teaching–learning a new FL or other factors (e.g., stereotypes, social context, culture, etc.) that may positively or negatively influence them. Representations can be shared, maintained, constructed, and reconstructed by individuals throughout their lives, including prior to beginning the initial teacher education process and/or after its completion.

As this is a complex subject, our objective is to help develop questionnaires about beliefs in language teaching–learning for student teachers during their initial education. We hope that this text can serve as a guide for (future) students, teachers, and researchers who wish to construct questionnaires to apply in their own investigations on the subject.

Our study consists of bibliographical research and an experience report using a questionnaire (see Appendix A) for undergraduate students in a Bachelor of Education with a major in an FL. Work developed as part of our Ph.D. dissertation dealt with beliefs about teaching and learning the language as an FL during the course of their degrees.

In this study, we intend to answer the following research questions:

• What are the advantages of using questionnaires in research on beliefs?

• What are the disadvantages of using questionnaires in research on beliefs?

• How should a questionnaire be designed to develop research on beliefs?

This paper consists of five parts, followed by a list of references. The first is an introductory section, and the others deal with different questionnaire concepts, aspects relevant to the instrument (advantages and disadvantages of its use), creation of questionnaires about beliefs. We end with some final considerations concerning the study. An example of a questionnaire is included in the appendix.

1 DIFFERENT QUESTIONNAIRE DEFINITIONS

Questionnaires are employed in studies in different areas, even beyond the limits of the academic environment. Examples include satisfaction surveys, quality control, etc.

Several definitions have been proposed for this instrument, some of which we present in this section.

Initially, we considered it relevant to establish the difference between a questionnaire and a form, which could be confusing due to their similarities. Gil (2002) defines a questionnaire as a "means a set of questions that are answered in writing by the respondent"[2] (ibidem, p. 114, our translation), while "a form [...] can be defined as a data collection technique in which the researcher formulates previously elaborated questions and writes down the answers"[3] (ibidem, p. 115, our translation). One prominent inequality is that the dominant record in the questionnaire is written. At the same time, the form is oral and may record the answers via audio/video means and/or written responses.

A complementary concept to that of the aforementioned author is that of Gerhardt et al (2009, p. 69):

> Questionnaire - It is a data collection instrument consisting of an ordered series of questions that must be answered in writing by the informant without the researcher present. It aims to raise opinions, beliefs, feelings, interests, expectations, and situations experienced.[4] (Our translation)

In this definition, we see an expansion of what was said by the first author. Here, a questionnaire is no longer simply a set of questions but a series of them that must be ordered and answered in the researcher's absence. We also have, in this perception, the confirmation that beliefs can be raised through the application of questionnaires.

Other theorists, such as Moresi (2003, p. 65), have proposed concepts that can help us better understand the term. He defines the questionnaire as follows:

> It is a data collection instrument consisting of an ordered series of pre-elaborated questions, systematically and sequentially arranged with items that constitute the research theme that must be answered in writing and without the researcher present. It is a planned conversation.[5] (Our translation)

---

[2] Original text: *entende-se um conjunto de questões que são respondidas por escrito pelo pesquisado* (GIL, 2002, p. 114)

[3] Original text: *formulário [...] pode ser definido como a técnica de coleta de dados em que o pesquisador formula questões previamente elaboradas e anota as respostas.* (GIL, 2002, p. 115)

[4] Original text: *Questionário - É um instrumento de coleta de dados constituído por uma série ordenada de perguntas que devem ser respondidas por escrito pelo informante, sem a presença do pesquisador. Objetiva levantar opiniões, crenças, sentimentos, interesses, expectativas, situações vivenciadas.* (GERHARDT et al, 2009, p. 69)

[5] Original text: *É um instrumento de coleta de dados, constituído por uma série ordenada de perguntas pré-elaboradas, sistemática e seqüencialmente dispostas em itens que constituem o tema da pesquisa, que devem ser respondidas por escrito e sem a presença do pesquisador. É uma interlocução planejada.* (MORESI, 2003, p. 65)

Treating the mechanism as a planned dialogue is a striking aspect of the definition proposed by the author; therefore, we decided to use it in our research. Planning is essential for developing a questionnaire that meets the study objectives. Namely, it involves reflection and decisions on the form, content, choice, wording, number, and order of questions, as well as the design and layout of the instrument as a whole. In agreement with Fanning (2005), although there exists no universal truth about how a questionnaire should be structured as its characteristics must be determined according to the purpose of the investigation and subjects, thorough planning is essential for greater respondent participation, which will be directly proportional to their motivation to take part in the study.

It is necessary to emphasize that questionnaires are only one of many possible ways to generate data in research involving beliefs. These instruments that have been used extensively in studies dealing with the subject, such as Barcelos (1995), Caldas (2008), Fernandes (2010), Lopes (2007), Oliveira (2013), Pavan (2012), and Silva (2005), among others.

We consider the investigations mentioned in the above examples to indicate that it is possible to use questionnaires as a resource when studying beliefs. Although some also make use of other instruments (interviews, classroom observations, etc.), as stated by Marchesan and Ramos (2012), and despite its relatively low application controls, it is an adequate mechanism to explore beliefs because it is not concerned with the search for evidence per se but with the understanding of participants' ideas and emotional states in relation to language teaching–learning.

When we employ an instrument such as the questionnaire, due to the absence of the researcher at the time of its application, it is possible to offer greater freedom to the subject in that they may feel more comfortable expressing what he/she needs to say (PAVAN, 2012). Preparing it properly is also crucial for the answers to be considered valid and reliable (MARCHESAN; RAMOS, 2012). Taking into account the limitations and advantages of the instrument, which are presented in the next section, and relating them to the participants and research objectives is also essential to induce subjects to see the questionnaire an opportunity to voice their opinions on matters of interest, such as FL teaching–learning.

2 RELEVANT ASPECTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Among the aspects relevant to the questionnaires, this section notes advantages and limitations that can be applied to this research instrument. For didactic purposes, we have organized the section into two parts: the first deals with the advantages and the second with disadvantages.

2.1 Questionnaire advantages

There are several advantages to using the questionnaire as a research tool. We emphasize some of the benefits of utilizing it in studies. As Meadows explains: "self-completion questionnaires offer low cost compared to other methods, potential coverage of a dispersed population and broader coverage in the population of the study. They avoid the possibility of interviewer preconceived ideas" (2003, p. 562).

In this excerpt, we indicate three advantages that researchers can obtain when they elect to use a questionnaire in their survey:

- Low cost;
- Coverage of a dispersed population;
- Coverage of a more significant number of people; and
- Low possibility of including the researcher's preconceived ideas.

This list can be complemented with what Dörnyei (2003b) highlights as the advantages of using the same instrument:

- Researcher's time;
- Researcher's effort;
- Faster and more direct data processing; and
- Versatility.

We can also add to the list an item not mentioned by previous theorists but indicated by Hannan and Anderson (2007):

- Production of easy-to-quantify data.

Let us look at each of the benefits mentioned so far. The low cost, for example, is linked to the fact that little is needed to reproduce questionnaires, which usually consist of paper, printing ink, and, if necessary, envelopes. In addition, there is the possibility of eliminating all material costs by administering it in an online environment, as we did in our study using Google Forms.

The <u>coverage of a dispersed population and a larger number of people</u> refers to the reach obtained using a self-completion instrument. The fact that there is no need to have all the subjects at the same time in the same place makes it easier for more people with different profiles to be included in the study, which was suitable for our investigation involving more than one category of participants (in our case, freshmen and senior undergraduates).

Questionnaires, when properly designed, revised, and pre-tested, are <u>unlikely to include the researchers' preconceived ideas</u> or those of other people interested in the area. This is why, according to Barcelos (2001), they have been widely used in research on beliefs. Moreover, they are less threatening than observations in which the presence of the observer may influence behavior and practices.

The <u>researcher's time and effort</u> are also aspects that favor the instrument in question. The time interval and effort needed to complete a questionnaire are significantly less than those required to interview the same number of people (DÖRNYEI, 2003b).

These features enable <u>faster and more direct data processing</u>. The lower complexity of compilation is also due to the fact that the <u>data produced are easier to quantify</u> because the quantifiable information obtained can be measured simply by counting items or by analyzing the content of written responses (HANNAN; ANDERSON, 2007). It is worth remembering that this only applies to some cases as the information generated from open questions generally does not carry the aforementioned characteristics.

Finally, <u>versatility</u> is similarly beneficial in questionnaires, as reported by Dörnyei (2003b, p. 10), "they can be used successfully with a variety of people in a variety of situations targeting a variety of topics." It is necessary to carefully and dexterously build an instrument with these characteristics because, as we will see in the following subsection, there are also several disadvantages of using a questionnaire.

2.2 Questionnaires disadvantages

Despite having the positive characteristics mentioned in the previous subsection, questionnaires also have some limitations concerning the researcher's need to be aware of the instrument aspects to work effectively. In this subsection, we highlight some of them and discuss how they were overcome in our investigation.

Meadows (2003, p. 562, our translation) points out some of the disadvantages: "[...] self-completion questionnaires have the potential for low response rates, require a level of education to complete the questionnaire, as well as the availability of a precise list or sampling frame to select the sample of respondents." Thus, the author emphasizes three negative aspects:

- Low response rates;

- Requirement of minimum education level; and

- Need for list/sampling of respondents.

Dörnyei (2003b) mentions the second difficulty pointed out by Meadows (2003) and adds the following:

- Simplicity and superficiality of the answers;

- Insecure and unmotivated respondents;

- Little or no opportunity to correct respondents' errors;

- Tendency towards social desirability (or prestige);

- Self-deception;

- Tendency to approval;

- Halo effect; and

- Tiredness.

We will discuss each aspect mentioned in more detail. The first disadvantage (<u>low response rates</u>), as stated by Tuten, Urban, and Bosnjak (2000), involves the speed, quality, and quantity of responses. As it is a self-completed instrument, the investigator has no control over the process of answering the questionnaire. However, when it comes to investigating beliefs, as in our study, sometimes only the subjects who answer the questions quickly will provide responses of high quality or quantity. This may mean that they are more certain about what they think about the subject and/or have had a previous opportunity to reflect on it.

As for the <u>minimum level of education requirement</u>, this will always be necessary when working with questionnaires, since, in consonance with Dörnyei (2003b), it is assumed that the participants are literate. The same was true of our investigation. However, we still have to worry about looking for subjects who fit the academic and professional profile of the expected sample population; hence, there is <u>need for a list/sampling table of respondents</u> to select individuals matching the profile corresponding to each category. This guarantees that

the minimum level of education, defended by Dörnyei (idem), is contemplated, since, in the case of our research, all respondents were enrolled in higher education.

Another possible limitation is the presence of <u>insecure and unmotivated respondents</u>. According to Tuten, Urban, and Bosnjak (2000), several factors contribute to people wanting to participate in research: curiosity, the opportunity to contribute to the study, personal knowledge about the subject, and material incentives. Considering these, we decided to follow the instructions of Bosnjak and Batinic (2000) to guarantee respondent motivation and safety. Specifically, we incorporated the following in our instrument: (1) information about the precise investigation aims, (2) contact information regarding the researcher's email address, (3) guarantee of receiving feedback on the results, (4) complete anonymity of the answers, and (5) a personal appeal to encourage participation.

The issue of <u>little or no opportunity to correct respondents' errors</u> can also negatively influence the results if due care is not taken. In line with Döring (2000, p. 347), as "[…] there is no direct contact between researcher and respondent," corrections are not possible. However, when dealing with beliefs, there is no need to correct the information produced in the questionnaire itself since beliefs can (and more appropriately should) change during the course of the subject's education and not through or because of the research.

<u>Self-deception</u>, <u>tendency for prestige</u>, and <u>approval</u> are complementary limitations; therefore, we discuss them together. As Dörnyei (2003b) reports, questionnaire answers are not always accurate. This happens, in part, because of the three factors mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph. Sometimes, as a defense mechanism, we tend to respond in ways that we consider more sophisticated or approved by academia, society, the job market, etc. Additionally, in a study on beliefs like ours, this type of response, which in other circumstances could compromise the reliability of the data, is essential because it reveals the ideas, values, interests, and desires that the subjects have as ideals.

The <u>halo effect</u> is a psychological phenomenon that consists of deducing that "[…] nice people tend to have nice attributes and less nice people have less nice attributes" (NISBETT; WILSON, 1977, p. 250). It is a human tendency to generalize (DÖRNYEI, 2003b). Given this, in our questionnaire, we avoid any affirmation, denial, or question whose authorship can be directly attributed to some theorist or trend with which the participants can identify and tend to agree or disagree with or answer under any influence beyond their own beliefs.

The <u>simplicity and superficiality of the answers</u> are commonly linked to <u>tiredness</u>, <u>insecurity</u>, and <u>lack of motivation</u>, which we have already addressed above. In agreement with Gräf (2000, p. 79), "the respondent can also easily become bored by long delays when filling in the questionnaire." The size, complexity, organization, and layout, both of the questionnaire as a whole and individual questions, influence the time required for completion and, consequently, the resulting fatigue, which, in turn, affects how simple and superficial the given answers are.

It is important to note here that not all the limitations of the questionnaire as a research instrument should necessarily be considered disadvantages when the topic under investigation is beliefs since some help much more than compromise the data produced.

3 CREATION OF A QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT BELIEFS

We used the public domain website and Brazilian federal and state universities' theses and dissertations databases to search for academic productions on the subject and found 152 works: 25 Ph.D. dissertations and 127 master's theses. Various instruments were used to produce data on beliefs, as shown in the table below.

Table 1 - Data production/collection instruments in Brazilian theses and dissertations about beliefs

Instrument	Representativeness[6]
Autobiography	7
Chat	2
Drawing (themed)	2
Research journal	8
Reflective diary	11
Training meeting	12
Interview	66
Documentary sources	5
Focus group	2
Inventory	2
Logs	5
Class observation	50
Field observation	30
Didactic project/workshop	2
Questionnaire	60
Written narrative	11
Oral narrative	6

---

[6] The number of times a given instrument was used in different studies.

Experience report	2
Informal report/conversation	4
Life story session	3
Viewing session	10
Reflective session	11
Others[7]	19
Total	330

Source: Author

We found that questionnaires were used in 60 of these productions, which represents a very significant number. Indeed, questionnaires were second only to the interviews which, in general, tend to be employed after the application of the questionnaires as a way to validate them. Therefore, in our Ph.D. dissertation, we chose to use both instruments as well as a focus group. We dedicate this section to describing the elaboration of the questionnaire in more detail. Specifically, we consider some essential points for its development as follows:

- Divide into parts/sections;

- Decide on the type of questions;

- Create questions for each part/section;

- Generate instructions for answering questions;

- Prepare a consent form;

- Allow space for feedback;

- Choose a reproduction environment;

- Test the instrument; and

- Revise the instrument.

By dividing the questionnaire into parts/sections, we avoided simply creating an extensive list of questions and made it more organized and standardized. When the respondents find an instrument that they believe have been professionally prepared, they tend to respond with more care and seriousness. In this type of division, especially in longer questionnaires, the ideal is that the last part/section contains questions of a bibliographic nature, which are more closed and direct and therefore demand less reflection and time to be answered because, by the end, the subject is likely to be more tired and less willing to participate.

---

[7] Some instruments (19) appearing only once in one work were not explicitly included in the table due to space limitations and their low representativeness. They are letters, class diaries, dialogue diaries, scales, phrases, didactic material, mediation, participant observations, one-minute-papers, lesson plans, portfolios, verbal protocols, metaphors, visual narratives, written reflections, self-help session reports, interaction sessions, phone calls, performance tests, and proficiency tests.

Deciding the type of questions is a complex task, and thinking about how they will be ordered, structured, and presented is essential. We advise starting with the most general questions and then moving on to more specific ones, as "open questions of opinion must precede closed questions when dealing with the same topic. With this, we seek to prevent the alternatives of the closed question from interfering with the answer to the open question"[8] (MARCHESAN; RAMOS, 2012, p. 453, our translation).

Creating questions for each part/section is delicate and laborious work when researching beliefs because it is necessary to avoid, as much as possible, that the question itself influences the answer (or even modifies the belief) of the subject. In this sense, the more straightforward and direct the question, the better its effect.

Thinking about how to formulate instructions for answer questions is also necessary. The directions should be brief, situated right at the beginning of the questionnaire, and contain key information such as the average time to answer, what to do in case of doubts, to whom and how to return the replied form (if it is printed), the deadline for responding, and the contact information of researcher and supervisor (if any). In our research, we had a good experience generating the instructions in the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) format, as they were concise and direct.

It is essential to prepare a consent form so that participants are aware of and accept the study conditions and authorizes their participation. The terms therein should be clear: purposes for which the data will be used, whether any (financial) compensation will be provided to participants and how to obtain it, the possibility of disclosing the data (where and how?), anonymity status, and instructions on what and how to do if the subject wants to withdraw from participating in the research (how and who to contact?), etc. In printed questionnaires, it is common to allocate, next to the terms, a place for the date, signature, or even the pseudonym the participant wishes to use. In contrast, in online questionnaires, it is customary to situate the terms right before the questions, making it only possible to progress to the next stage after accepting them.

Allowing space for feedback is optional but essential and advisable so that the respondent has the opportunity to add further comments. It can be a precious space

---

[8] Original text: *questões de opinião abertas devem preceder às questões fechadas quando tratarem do mesmo tópico. Com isso, busca-se evitar que as alternativas da questão fechada interfiram na resposta da questão aberta* (MARCHESAN; RAMOS, 2012, p. 453)

contributing to the research that generates an open dialogue between the participant and researcher, thereby expanding researcher–participant interaction.

There are two classic alternatives when choosing the means of reproduction: printed or online. Both have specificities as well as advantages and disadvantages. The decision on which to use should depend on the resources available at the time of data production and the ability of the researcher and participants to use each resource. In our research, we opted for the online mode using Google Forms. Currently, countless others are available on the market; some are paid, and others are free, such as Survio, MindMiners, Typeform, and SurveyMonkey, among others. It is then up to the researchers to choose the one that best suits their needs.

Although not mandatory, it is interesting to test the questionnaire before applying it to the chosen sample population to correct any errors that may have gone unnoticed and avoid future problems. Ideally, the test should be carried out with subjects with characteristics and profiles similar to those of the participants so that the questions and instrument, as a whole, are adapted to them. By testing the instrument, the research can observe; for example, whether a certain question generates the expected answers or whether any reformulation is necessary to make it more explicit or specific. In the case of research on beliefs, it is essential to discern whether the questions' type, order, structure, or presentation may influence the beliefs produced in the answers.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

We created the present text with the objective of helping elaborate questionnaires about beliefs in language teaching–learning for FL student teachers. We believe that we achieved this because we built a guide that can guide students, professors, and researchers wanting to prepare questionnaires to apply in their own research on the subject.

We also answered our three guiding questions:

• What are the advantages of using questionnaires in research on beliefs?

Low cost, dispersed population coverage, coverage of a more significant number of people, low possibility of researcher preconceived ideas, less researcher effort, faster and more direct data processing, and increased versatility.

• What are the disadvantages of using questionnaires in research on beliefs?

Low response rates, requirement for a minimum level of education, need for a list/sampling of respondents, simplicity and superficiality of responses, insecure and unmotivated respondents, little or no opportunity to correct respondents' mistakes, tendency toward social desirability (or prestige), self-deception, tendency toward approval, the halo effect, and fatigue.

• How should a questionnaire be designed to develop research on beliefs?

Dividing it into parts/sections, deciding on question types, creating questions for each part/section, considering how to formulate instructions, drafting a consent form, allowing space for feedback, choosing a reproduction environment, and testing and correcting the questionnaire.

Our study results indicate that the elaboration of questionnaires for investigations dealing with beliefs in FL teaching-learning is not an easy or simple task since it requires the research engage in significant theoretical and technical preparation. Nevertheless, it is possible to build quality instruments following our guidelines and instructions.

REFERENCES

AUTHOR, 2018. [Reference hidden to ensure text anonymity]

BARCELOS, A.M.F. Metodologia de pesquisa das crenças sobre a aprendizagem de línguas: estado da arte. **Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada**, v. 1, n. 1, p. 71-92, 2001.

_____. **A cultura de aprender língua estrangeira (inglês) de alunos de Letras**. 1995. 199f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística Aplicada) – Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem, Universidade Estadual de Campinas – Unicamp, Campinas. 1995.

BOSNJAK, M; BATINIC, B. Understanding the willingness to participate in online-surveys: the case of email questionnaires. In: BATINIC, B. et al. (eds.). **Online social sciences**. Seattle; Hogrefe & Huber, 2000. p. 107-116.

CALDAS, S.M. **Crenças de uma professora formadora a respeito do papel do professor de língua estrangeira (inglês)**. 2008. 148f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística Aplicada) – Departamento de Línguas Estrangeiras e Tradução, Universidade de Brasília - UnB, Brasília, 2008.

DÖRING, N. Studying online-love and cyber-romance. BATINIC, B. et al. (eds.). **Online social sciences**. Seattle; Hogrefe & Huber, 2000. p. 337-359.

DÖRNYEI, Z. **Questionnaires in second language research**: construction, administration, and processing. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2003.

FANNING, E. Formatting a paper-based survey questionnaire: best practices. **Practical, Assessment, Research & Evaluation**, v. 10, n. 12, p. 1-14, ago. 2005.

FERNANDES, F.A. **Crenças sobre a cultura de ensinar e aprender línguas de uma professora de inglês como língua estrangeira (LE) sem formação em Letras**. 2010. 126f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística Aplicada) – Departamento de Línguas Estrangeiras e Tradução, Universidade de Brasília – UnB, Brasília, 2010.

GERHARDT, T.E. et al. Unidade 4 – Estrutura do projeto de pesquisa. In: GERHARDT, T.E.; SILVEIRA, D.T. (orgs.). **Métodos de pesquisa**. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS, 2009, p. 65-88.

GIL, A.C. **Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa**. 4ª ed. São Paulo; Editora Atlas, 2002.

GRÄF, L. Assessing internet questionnaires: the online pretest lab. In: BATINIC, B. et al. (eds.). **Online social sciences**. Seattle: Hogrefe & Huber, 2000. p. 73-93.

HANNAN, A.; ANDERSON, J. **Questionnaires in Education Research**. Faculty of Education, University of Plymouth, 2007.

KINOSHITA, L. **Crenças e expectativas sobre ensinar/aprender a ser professor de língua estrangeira** (Representações de graduandos, formadores e agentes governamentais: o caso da formação docente inicial na Unifesspa). 2018. 774 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2018.

LOPES, G.R. **Crenças em estratégias de aprendizagem de línguas (Inglês) de alunos de cursos de Letras**. 2007. 244f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística Aplicada) – Departamento de Línguas Estrangeiras e Tradução, Universidade de Brasília – UnB, Brasília, 2007.

MARCHESAN, M.T.N.; RAMOS, G.R. Check list para a elaboração e análise de questionários em pesquisas de crenças. **Domínios de Lingu@agem**, v. 6, n. 1, p. 449-460, 2012.

MEADOWS, K.A. So you want to do research? 5: Questionnaire design. **British Journal of Community Nursing**, v. 8, n. 12, p. 562- 570, 2003.

MORESI, E. (Org.). **Metodologia da pesquisa**. Brasília; Universidade Católica de Brasília, 2003.

NISBETT, R.E.; WILSON, T.D. The halo effect: Evidence for unconscious alteration of judgments. **Journal of personality and social psychology**, v. 35, n. 4, p. 250-256, abr. 1977.

NUNAN, D. **Research methods in language learning**. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2009.

OLIVEIRA, K.C. **A cultura de aprender língua estrangeira (inglês) de alunos ingressantes e egressos do Ensino Fundamental II**. 2013. 184f. Dissertação (Mestrado em

KINOSHITA, L.

Linguística Aplicada) – Departamento de Línguas Estrangeiras e Tradução, Universidade de Brasília – UnB, Brasília, 2013.

PAVAN, C.A.G. **Por inteiro e por extenso: o processo real de formação inicial de professores de línguas**. 2012. 163 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística Aplicada) – Instituto de Letras, Universidade de Brasília – UnB, Brasília, 2012.

SILVA, K.A. **Crenças e aglomerados de crenças de alunos ingressantes em Letras (Inglês)**. 2005. 243f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística Aplicada) – Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem, Universidade Estadual de Campinas – Unicamp, Campinas, 2005.

TUTEN, T.L.; URBAN, D.J.; BOSNJAK, M. Internet surveys and data quality: a review. In: BATINIC, B. et al. (eds.). **Online social sciences**. Seattle; Hogrefe & Huber, 2000. p. 7-27.

APPENDIX A – Questionnaire model about beliefs for FL student teachers in initial education

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQs)

What is the purpose of this questionnaire?
From the information obtained through this instrument, we intend to understand beliefs about the teaching–learning of the language of their major in the undergraduate degree and, based on this understanding, arrive at representations of the teaching–learning of the language in the studied region.

Why should I participate?
Your answers and opinions are fundamental for our study to be successful. You may choose not to answer any of these questions. However, for the survey to be representative, it is essential that you complete and return or submit your responses.

Where will the information provided be used?
The information provided will be used in the researcher's Ph.D. dissertation in the graduate program in (program and university hidden to maintain anonymity).

Will my privacy be protected?
Your personal data will not be reported. Your responses may only be used for statistical and academic purposes and may not be disclosed or used in an identifiable manner for any other purpose. To ensure confidentiality, please do not include your name or contact details anywhere other than on this cover.

How long will the survey take to complete?
On average, it will take 45 minutes to respond, including the time to review your responses.

How can I return the questionnaire?
Online version: Click on 'submit' at the end of the form.
Printed version: Return it at (place name hidden to maintain anonymity) to deliver your survey to the researcher or contact the research at (email address hidden to maintain anonymity).
If you have the printed version and prefer the online version, please contact us asking for the questionnaire link.

CAN WE CONTACT YOU LATER?

The information in this table is an optional part of the questionnaire coverage. Therefore, its completion is optional and voluntary. Fill it in only if, among the options below, you wish to do any of the following:*

( ) Receive a copy of the study results
( ) Cooperate in the next phase(s) of the research
( ) Participate in workshops/lectures the researcher will offer in return for your participation

Please inform us of your details so that we can contact you.
(They will not be included in the study or any publications, but if you choose any of the above options, we need at least one way to contact you.)

Name: _____
Email: _____
Telephone: _____

* You can choose 1, 2, 3, or none of these alternatives.

CONSENT FORM

You are guaranteed complete confidentiality and are free to withdraw at any time. If you have questions about the investigation, you can contact us.

Name withheld to maintain anonymity (researcher)
Hidden email address to maintain anonymity

Name withheld to maintain anonymity (supervisor)
Hidden email address to maintain anonymity

( ) I declare that I have read the information on this page, agree to the established terms, and wish to participate in the research, knowing that I will not receive any compensation for my participation.

_____, ____/____/_____.   Signature: _____

WE APPRECIATE YOUR CONTRIBUTION!

PART 1 - FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN THE PRESENT

1. Are you taking the Bachelor of Education in a foreign language because you intend to be (or currently already are) a language teacher?
° Yes
° Partially yes
° No
° Definitely not

2. Are you enjoying learning your language major in the undergraduate degree?
° Yes
° Partially yes
° No
° Definitely not

3. Is it possible to learn a language by studying only during the Bachelor of Education in a foreign language?
° Yes
° Partially yes
° No
° Definitely not

4. What would you change in the teaching–learning process of your major language during the undergraduate degree? Why?
_____
_____
_____

5. What would you NOT change in the teaching–learning process of your major language during the undergraduate degree? Why?
_____
_____
_____

PART 2 - IN THE PRESENT AND FUTURE

Personal beliefs

6. Do you have professional plans for the future?
° Yes
° No
Which one(s)?
_____
_____
_____

7. Do you have academic plans for the future?
° Yes
° No
Which one(s)?

_____
_____
_____

8. Do you have plans to improve your major language skills in the future?
° Yes
° No
Which one(s)?

_____
_____
_____

9. How can the university help you to implement the plans mentioned in Questions 6 to 8?

_____
_____
_____

Beliefs about the teaching–learning of the major language in teacher education

10. In your opinion, what are the qualities/skills of a good foreign language teacher?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

11. What do you need to learn–teach during an undergraduate degree to educate foreign language teachers well?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

12. Which of these qualities/competencies have you already started to learn in your undergraduate degree?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

13. What qualities/competencies would you still like to learn during your undergraduate degree?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

14. Do you believe your undergraduate degree prepares foreign language teachers well?
º Yes
º Partially yes
º No
º Definitely not
Why?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

15. How can language teachers' initial education (undergraduate degree) at your university be improved?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

PART 3 - PROFILE

Personal

16. Date of birth: _____

17. Gender:
º Male
º Female
º Other: _____

18. Place of birth (city/state):_____

19. What color/race do you identify with?
º Yellow
º White

° Indigenous
° Brown
° Black
° Other: _____

20. Concerning your parents or guardians, you:
° Are more educated than them
° Have attained the same level of schooling as them
° Are less educated than them

Professional

21. Do you teach the language of your major?
° Yes
° No
° Not currently, but I have taught it in the past.
If yes, for how long you have been teaching? _____

22. Check the alternative(s) that correspond(s) to your experience as a language teacher: (If you have no experience as a language teacher, do not answer.)
° Early childhood education
° Elementary school
° High school
° Higher education
° Language school
° Private class
° Other: _____

23. Do/Did you work in any other activity besides teaching languages?
° Yes
° No
° Not currently, but I have worked in the past.
If so, where do/did you work? _____
For how long have you worked? _____

Academic

24. Are you taking or have you taken (but not completed) any other higher education degree in addition to your Bachelor of Education in a foreign language?
° Yes. Which one(s)?_____
° No

25. Have you completed any higher education degree (undergraduate, graduate certificate, master's, or Ph.D.) in addition to your Bachelor of Education in a foreign language?
° Yes. Which one(s)?_____
° No

Linguistic/Cultural

26. Check the environment(s) in which you studied your major foreign language (you can choose more than one if necessary).
° Early childhood education
° Elementary School
° High school
° Higher education
° Face-to-face language school
° Distance learning language school
° Private class
° Exchange program
° Autonomous studies[9]
° Other: _____

27. Among the above environments, which was THE MOST relevant experience to your major foreign language learning (the one in which you learned THE MOST)?
_____

28. Among the above environments, which was THE LEAST relevant to your major foreign language learning (the one in which you learned the LEAST)?
_____

29. How proficient in your major's foreign language do you consider yourself <u>nowadays</u>?[10]
° A1
° A2
° B1
° B2
° C1
° C2

30. How satisfied are you with your current proficiency in the foreign language of your major?
° Very satisfied
° Satisfied
° Dissatisfied
° Very dissatisfied
° Indifferent

31. How proficient were you in your major's foreign language when you started your undergraduate degree?
° A1
° A2
° B1
° B2
° C1

---

[9] When you study alone, outside the school context, and without the formal guidance of a teacher.
[10] Check the description of each level in the table on the last page of the questionnaire.

° C2

32. How proficient do you expect to be in your major's foreign language by the end of your undergraduate degree?
° A1
° A2
° B1
° B2
° C1
° C2

33. What would be, in your opinion, the ideal minimum proficiency for a language teacher to work in a language school?
° A1
° A2
° B1
° B2
° C1
° C2
° In this case, there is no ideal proficiency applicable to all situations.
° I have no set opinion on the subject.

34. What would be, in your opinion, the ideal minimum proficiency for a language teacher to work in public elementary and high schools?
° A1
° A2
° B1
° B2
° C1
° C2
° In this case, there is no ideal proficiency applicable to all situations.
° I have no set opinion on the subject.

35. What would be, in your opinion, the ideal minimum proficiency for a teacher to work in a degree course in a Bachelor of Education in a foreign language?
° A1
° A2
° B1
° B2
° C1
° C2
° In this case, there is no ideal proficiency applicable to all situations.
° I have no set opinion on this matter.

Would you like to leave more information about yourself or the topic of the questionnaire? Are there any suggestions or feedback you would like to give us? (The use of this space is optional.)

_____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PARTICIPATING!

Table 1 – Common Reference Levels: global scale

Basic user	A1	Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and basic phrases aimed at satisfying the needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows, and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided that the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help the listener understand.
	A2	Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of immediate relevance (e.g., very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe aspects of his/her background, immediate environment, and matters in areas of immediate need in simple terms.
Independent user	B1	Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise while traveling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics that are familiar or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes, and ambitions, and briefly provide reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.
	B2	Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialization. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue, giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.
Proficient user	C1	Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts and recognize implicit meaning. Can express himself/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious search for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic, and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, demonstrating the controlled use of organizational patterns, connectors, and cohesive devices.
	C2	Can understand virtually everything heard or read with ease. Can summarize information from different spoken and written sources, reconstruct arguments, and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express himself/herself spontaneously, very fluently, and precisely differentiate finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.

Source: Adapted from COUNCIL OF EUROPE. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Language Policy Unit: Strasbourg, 2001. p. 24. Available at: https://rm.coe.int/16802fc1bf Accessed in: 23 Dec. 2022.