

Designing and Validating a Comprehensive Scale of English Language Teachers' Attributes and Establishing its Relationship with Achievement

Ebrahim Khodadady

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

Zohre Ghallasi Fakhrabadi

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

Hoda Kanan Azar

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

Abstract

The study explored whether a comprehensive and valid scale could be designed to measure English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' attributes. To this end, the literature was reviewed and a fairly large number of teacher evaluation forms were consulted to create a pool of 147 indicators. The removal of redundant and inappropriate indicators as well as accommodating suggestions made by education authorities resulted in the development of a 102-item English Language Teachers' Attribute Scale (ELTAS). The administration of the scale to 1328 female grade three high school students in Mashhad, Iran, and applying the Principal Axis Factoring to the data and rotating the extracted latent variables (LVs) via Varimax with Kaiser Normalization showed that it contains eight factors, i.e., Qualified, Social, Stimulating, Organized, Proficient, Humanistic, Self-Confident, and Lenient. Statistical analyses indicated that not only the ELTAS itself but also its underlying factors were reliable. The highest correlations obtained between the LVs show that Qualified EFL teachers are Stimulating, Organized and Proficient while Social EFL teachers are Humanistic and Lenient. The results also show that EFL achievement correlates the highest with Lenient LV. The findings are discussed and suggestions are made for future research.

Keywords: Foreign language, attributes, achievement, teacher effectiveness

I. Introduction

Teaching English to speakers of other languages takes place in basically two distinct contexts, i.e., foreign and second. Within the first where English is learned as a foreign language (EFL), learners have virtually access to no English speakers to learn schemata such as "health", "sickness" and "nutrition" in authentic social interactions as they are heard and expressed to fulfill various real functions such as talking about physical state or seeking medical information and advice. These schemata do, however, form an indispensable part of both native and second language speakers' language as well as ideation through which not only reality is represented "on the basis of non-actual or absent stimuli" (Vygotsky, 1987, p. 107) but also social functions are fulfilled.

In order to establish, develop and relate their English schemata of “health”, “sickness” and “nutrition” to other directly as well as indirectly related schemata such as “exercise” and “treatment”, the EFL learners have, however, no choice but to read passages in which they may encounter them as the constituting units of texts. It is within such a context that EFL teachers assume their cardinal role and must of necessity help their EFL learners acquire, store and retrieve the health related schemata as indispensable parts of their EFL language by focusing on their linguistic features, i.e., syntactic and parasyntactic domains, and cognition or ideation functions, i.e., semantic domain. They do, in fact, play the role of interlocutors with whom their learners must interact in order to experience the schemata as they are experienced by native and second language users in real contexts with real interlocutors.

Khodadady and Elahi (2012) [henceforth K&E], for example, treated the words/phrases constituting the passages presented in *English for the students of Medicine* (Deedari, & Zia Hossaini, 2009) as schemata falling into the three domains of syntactic, semantic and parasyntactic. While syntactic schemata such as subject pronouns are many in token or frequency but few in type, semantic schemata such as nouns are many in type but few in token. Parasyntactic schemata such as numerals, however, have the properties of both syntactic and semantic schemata in that they can be many both in token and in type. They must, nonetheless, attach themselves to semantic schemata as syntactic schemata do in order to fulfill their ideational function hence parasyntactic.

After specifying the schemata of their instructional material, K&E developed an experimental design to find out whether Schema-Based Instruction (SBI) will result in superior performance of sixty undergraduate medical students in Mashhad, Iran. They employed Translation-Based Instruction (TBI) and SBI to teach their control and experimental groups, respectively. Since the medium of instruction in the TBI is the learners’ mother language, the responsibility of learning the EFL falls basically on its learners. The teachers in the SBI should, however, play a more active, and ontologically central, role in the SBI by presenting the schemata in as many modes as possible so that the learners can experience them as constituting units of interactions enacted in English.

In order to check and monitor the phonological performance of both control and experimental groups, K&E had their EFL learners read passages loud both chorally and individually and offered accurate pronunciations of their constituting schemata whenever necessary, i.e., aural and visual modes. In the latter group, they did, however, have the learners identify the domains of key schemata such as “health” appearing in the sentence “... one should avoid unnecessary contact with people who have colds, maintain general good health through adequate rest and nutrition, and ...” (Deedari, & Zia Hossaini, 2009, p. 14). When a learner specified “health” as a noun, K&E asked the whole class what it meant. One of the learners defined it as “not sick”. Building on the utterance, K&E asked the whole class “Is sick a noun or an adjective?” Another learner noticed the teachers’ point and immediately said, “Healthy”. To relate “health” to other schemata K&E asked why ‘health’ was a noun. To address the question, one learner offered its being preceded by the adjective schema ‘good’ as the reason.

Upon offering EFL in TBI and SBI approaches, K&E administered an unseen final examination (UFE) consisting of structure, vocabulary and reading comprehension subscales at the end of the term to both control and experimental groups. The results showed that the experimental group taught via the SBI performed significantly better than the control group taught via the TBI not only on the UFE and its subscales but also on the schema-based cloze multiple choice items test (S-Test) administered as a post test. Their findings thus show how employing and teaching schemata as the building blocks of both language and cognition bring about significant differences in EFL learning as compared to the TBI.

The procedures followed by K&E in the SBI approach provide research-based examples as regards what teachers need to do in their classes in order to teach EFL as effectively as possible. (The interested readers are also suggested to read the K&E’s Procedure section where a more comprehensive description is provided concerning the aural, oral, visual and pictorial modes of teaching schemata.) Not only the EFL teachers’ cardinal role but also the teaching approaches they adopt are largely, however, ignored in current applied linguistics in the West simply because teaching

is defined in terms of learning and EEL is employed synonymously with ESL (e.g., Brown, 2007) where the language of instruction must of necessity be in English.

It is argued in this paper approaching the EFL teaching from a schema-based perspective renders it as important as EFL learning and thus highlights designing a comprehensive scale to measure the EFL teachers' contribution to learning. In order to specify the attributes of effective teachers some scholars have, for example, prepared a list (e.g., Girard, 1977; Prodromou, 1991). Others have asked foreign language teachers themselves what attributes they consider desirable (e.g., Brosh, 1996) or how they are different from teachers of other subjects such as mathematics (e.g., Borg, 2006). Still some other researchers have asked EFL learners (e.g., Ghasemi & Hashemi, 2011) or both learners and teachers how they perceive the characteristics of effective English teachers (e.g., Babai Shishavan & Sadeghi, 2009; Park & Lee, 2006).

Most studies dealing with teacher effectiveness have, nonetheless, discussed the characteristics qualitatively (e.g., Borg, 2006), characteristic by characteristic (e.g., Babai Shishavan & Sadeghi, 2009) and on the basis of the frequency and percentage of points upon which the characteristics had been evaluated (e.g., Malikow, 2005-2006). Moafian and Pishghadam (2008) were the first researchers who compiled and validated a questionnaire to study EFL teacher characteristics. They added eight to 39 characteristics selected from 14 studies by Suwadee (1995) and validated their 47-item questionnaire by employing Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) and rotating the latent variables via Varimax with Kaiser Normalization (VKN). They extracted 12 factors, i.e., i.e., teaching accountability, interpersonal relationship, attention to all, examination, commitment, learning boosters, creating a sense of, competence, teaching boosters, physical and emotional acceptance, empathy, class attendance and dynamism.

Khodadady (2010) named Moafian and Pishghadam's (2008) questionnaire as Characteristics of Effective English Language Teachers (CEELT) and administered it to 1469 Iranian EFL learners in several private and public schools in Mashhad, Iran. By employing the same factor analysis and rotation method, i.e., PAF and VKN, he extracted five factors called rapport, fairness, qualification, facilitation and examination. Although the CEELT is a reliable and valid measure it suffers from being too broad in scope and unrepresentative in content. Instead of dealing specifically with the "English language", three of its items, i.e., 1, 13 and 35, deal with "subject matter". Its first item, for example, reads, "Has a good knowledge of *subject matter*".

In addition to addressing teaching in general, the CEELT does not address attributes dealing with the syntactic and semantic schema domains. There is, for example, no item dealing with EFL teachers' grammatical knowledge. Nor are there any items concerning vocabulary knowledge materialized in adjectives, adverbs, nouns and verbs comprising the instructional materials. With the exception of item 28, i.e., Speaks clearly with a correct pronunciation, the listening, reading, and writing skills involved in EFL teaching are left out in the CEELT. The present study has, therefore, been designed to develop and validate a comprehensive measure of EFL teacher attributes which is specific in scope and representative in content. It also explores the relationship of factors underlying the attributes and EFL achievement in grade three high schools in Mashhad, Iran.

II. Methodology

2.1. Participants

One thousand three hundred twenty eight female G3HS students took part in the research project voluntarily. However, since eleven had not answered most of the questions, they were excluded from analysis. The remaining 1317 participants were studying in 18 high schools, i.e., Aghileh, Arze Aghdas, Azadegan, Badamchi, Banovan Ghofli, Boshra, Farhikhtegan, Farzan, Fazeleh, Ghofli, Mahjoob, Namazikhah, Sady, Sedooghy, Seirafi, Somayeh, Tooba, and Zamzam in districts three and seven of Mashhad, Iran. Their age ranged between 12 and 19 (Mean = 17.15, SD = .59). They spoke

Persian (n =1294, 98.3%), English (n =2, 0.2%), Kurdish (n= 3, 0.2%), Lori (n = 3, 0.2%), Turkish (n = 12, 0.9%) and unspecified (n = 3, 0.2%) languages as their mother tongues.

2.2. Instruments

2.2.1. Demographic Scale

To collect the required data a Demographic Scale (DS) and English Language Teachers' Attribute Scale were designed and employed in this study. Self-reported overall scores on English achievement were also collected to address the relationship between teacher effectiveness and EFL achievement.

2.2.2. English Language Teachers' Attributes Scale

The English Language Teachers' Attribute Scale (ELTAS) was developed originally based on a pool of 147 indicators collected from the evaluation forms employed by Azad University, Brock University, Danesh Primary School in Torbat, Khayyam University, Mottahari High School, Nassrabad High School in Torbat, Samand Guidance School, and Tabaran Higher Education Institute. It also included characteristics brought up by some researchers (e.g., Brosh, 1996; Elizabeth, May, & Chee, 2008; Park & Lee, 2006; Pishghadam & Moafiyan, 98; Suwandee, 1995). Furthermore, the present researchers added six attributes based on their teaching experiences.

A closer analysis of the indicators, however, revealed that 40 out of the 147 attributes were either redundant or inappropriate and were, therefore, removed from the pool. Employing penalty such as assigning extra homework was, for example, considered inappropriate. The indicators collected from English sources were then translated from English to Persian by employing schema theory which approaches the words/phrases constituting indicators as schemata having syntactic, semantic and discursal relationships with each other (Khodadady, 2001, 2008; Khodadady & Golparvar, 2011; Seif & Khodadady, 2003).

The final 107-item draft of ELTAS was taken to the Bureau of Education in Mashhad to be examined and approved as part of their requirement for its administration. The committee responsible for the development of English teaching materials in the bureau announced that five indicators had to be removed, i.e., 1) Collects students' English writings and reports for exhibitions, 2) Employs appropriate teaching methods based on lesson objectives, 3) Generates intellectual excitement in students, 4) Incorporates various learning styles (e.g., intravertiveness and extravertiveness) in teaching, and 5) Is familiar with new teaching methods and strategies. To comply with their suggestions, the specified indicators were removed and the remaining 102 were used in the final version of the Persian ELTAS.

The 102 indicators comprising the Persian ELTAS were presented as statements containing attributes dealing specifically with EFL teaching. The description of each attribute was presented along with five choices with which the participants were required to completely agree, agree, to some extent agree, disagree or completely disagree. The values of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1, were assigned to these points, respectively, to run statistical analyses. The choices "completely agree" and "agree" were collapsed as were "disagree" and "completely disagree" to form the two choices of "agree" and "disagree", respectively, for the ease of presentation. (The English version of the indicators along with their loadings on the factors upon which they had their highest loading are given in Appendix. Interest readers can contact the corresponding author for the Persian version.)

2.2.3. English Achievement Score

Based on their contributions to the oral discussions brought up in the class and teachers' evaluation of students' interactions, the G3HS students receive a single oral score. It is added up to their final written examination score reflecting their English grammar and vocabulary knowledge as well as reading comprehension ability. The overall score is then reported out of 20 and 10 is adopted as the cutoff score to determine whether a given student has passed the course (Farhady, Jafarpour, & Birjandi, 1994). As a response to an open-ended question posed in the DS, the participants of this study were asked to write their latest overall score they had obtained from the teacher whose attributes they were

evaluating via the ELTAS. These scores were employed as the indices of participants' EFL achievement.

2.3. Procedures

An official request was made to the bureau of education in Mashhad to conduct the present research project in high schools. The authorities introduced the second and third authors to their third and seventh educational districts near the end of school year in 2011 on the basis of request. They were given permission to collect the data only from girls' schools and the participants of this study were of necessity chosen from female students only. This was done in coordination with the principles of high schools who had their English teachers participate in the distribution and collection of questionnaires. At least one of the researchers was, however, present in administration sessions and answered whatever questions the participants raised.

2.4. Data Analysis

To determine how well the ELTAS had functioned in terms of its latent variables (LVs), its descriptive statistics were first calculated. The reliability of the scale and its LVs was then estimated by Cronbach's alpha. For extracting the LVs underlying the ELTAS, the PAF method was employed. The extracted LVs were then rotated via VKN. In order to explore the relationship between teacher effectiveness and achievement in EFL, the ELTAS and its LVs were correlated with the students' self-reported scores. All the statistical analyses were conducted via the IBM SPSS Statistics 20 to address the following research questions.

Q1. How reliable is the ELTAS and its underlying factors?

Q2. What factors underlie the ELTAS?

Q3. How do the LVs underlying the ELTAS correlate with each other?

Q4. Do the ELTAS and its factors show significant relationships with English achievement?

III. Results and Discussion

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics as well as the percentages of times the participants have disagreed (D), had no idea (NI) and agreed with the presence of attributes brought up in the 102 indicators. As can be seen, the highest index of skewness (1.35) belongs to indicator 10, "My English teacher employs multimedia materials such as CDs and tapes", and 14, "My English teacher is self-confident", with which 79% of G3HS students have disagreed. The lowest index of skewness, however, pertains to indicator 14 (-1.67), "My English teacher is self-confident", with which 81% of participants have agreed. These results show they have described their EFL teachers' attributes as carefully as they could.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the items comprising the ELTAS

Item	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurt	D%	NI%	A%	Item	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurt	D%	NI%	A%
1	3.82	1.21	-0.92	0.06	16	16	68	52	2.92	1.37	-0.19	-0.89	33	30	37
2	2.55	1.19	0.41	-0.84	57	17	26	53	2.40	1.27	0.46	-0.69	54	27	19
3	3.50	1.33	-0.59	-0.62	20	25	55	54	2.85	1.31	-0.05	-0.80	35	35	30
4	3.29	1.32	-0.48	-0.41	20	36	44	55	3.64	1.30	-0.83	-0.15	18	19	63
5	2.33	1.33	0.61	-0.73	60	18	21	56	3.20	1.38	-0.44	-0.65	25	30	45
6	3.36	1.43	-0.51	-0.79	25	24	52	57	3.77	1.41	-0.96	-0.30	19	13	68
7	3.14	1.30	-0.50	-0.29	23	35	42	58	3.54	1.38	-0.64	-0.67	21	22	57
8	2.69	1.35	0.09	-0.88	44	27	29	59	3.72	1.29	-0.97	0.20	15	20	66
9	2.51	1.30	0.34	-0.83	52	24	24	60	3.46	1.28	-0.55	-0.53	20	27	53
10	1.81	1.16	1.35	0.99	79	9	12	61	2.92	1.39	-0.02	-1.13	37	27	36

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the items comprising the ELTAS - continued

1	.41	.38	18	.56	.61	35	.61	.63	52	.42	.39	69	.66	.66	86	.44	.41
2	.20	.23	19	.53	.55	36	.49	.46	53	.43	.43	70	.52	.49	87	.48	.45
3	.35	.34	20	.57	.55	37	.50	.48	54	.37	.36	71	.57	.58	88	.60	.61
4	.22	.22	21	.61	.60	38	.49	.47	55	.36	.40	72	.57	.56	89	.48	.45
5	.18	.19	22	.61	.59	39	.39	.38	56	.50	.49	73	.69	.67	90	.49	.45
6	.25	.24	23	.56	.53	40	.29	.30	57	.68	.70	74	.61	.60	91	.58	.53
7	.33	.31	24	.39	.37	41	.59	.59	58	.65	.65	75	.69	.68	92	.49	.45
8	.37	.39	25	.58	.60	42	.58	.59	59	.59	.57	76	.54	.52	93	.45	.45
9	.48	.49	26	.51	.48	43	.42	.42	60	.54	.53	77	.60	.59	94	.48	.44
10	.20	.15	27	.62	.61	44	.41	.39	61	.54	.52	78	.53	.49	95	.46	.41
11	.44	.45	28	.45	.43	45	.58	.58	62	.52	.50	79	.47	.43	96	.49	.47
12	.45	.43	29	.46	.43	46	.49	.47	63	.54	.51	80	.56	.56	97	.52	.49
13	.48	.47	30	.50	.48	47	.37	.33	64	.56	.54	81	.53	.51	98	.49	.48
14	.18	.16	31	.55	.55	48	.44	.42	65	.37	.35	82	.42	.44	99	.38	.36
15	.58	.59	32	.35	.30	49	.50	.49	66	.33	.35	83	.56	.54	100	.52	.49
16	.53	.52	33	.57	.56	50	.46	.43	67	.63	.61	84	.56	.54	101	.50	.45
17	.27	.26	34	.58	.58	51	.35	.37	68	.64	.63	85	.54	.54	102	.50	.47

Table 3 presents the LVs extracted via PAF in this study. As can be seen, 13 LVs were initially extracted whose eigenvalues were higher than one. However, when they were rotated via the VKN the eigenvalues of the first eight LVs reached the acceptable magnitude establishing these factors as the main underlying LVs of the ELTAS. Since the eigenvalues of the remaining five LVs are less than one, the loading magnitude of none of its constituting items reached the acceptable level, i.e., .32. LVs 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 were, therefore, considered noncontributory. These results show that the extracted eigenvalues of one are the best criterion to determine the number of LVs underlying scales.

Table 3: Total Variance (V) and Cumulative Variance (CV) explained by 13 LVs

LVs	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of V	CV%	Total	% of V	CV%	Total	% of V	CV%
1	35.13	34.45	34.45	34.64	33.96	33.96	10.27	10.07	10.07
2	3.36	3.29	37.74	2.85	2.80	36.76	8.49	8.32	18.39
3	3.03	2.97	40.71	2.53	2.48	39.24	7.27	7.12	25.52
4	2.27	2.23	42.94	1.76	1.73	40.97	6.34	6.22	31.73
5	1.86	1.83	44.77	1.33	1.31	42.28	4.61	4.52	36.26
6	1.44	1.41	46.18	0.87	0.85	43.13	3.99	3.91	40.16
7	1.37	1.34	47.52	0.82	0.81	43.94	2.07	2.03	42.19
8	1.32	1.30	48.81	0.76	0.75	44.69	1.86	1.83	44.02
9	1.30	1.27	50.09	0.71	0.70	45.39	0.89	0.87	44.89
10	1.08	1.05	51.14	0.51	0.50	45.89	0.71	0.69	45.58
11	1.07	1.05	52.19	0.48	0.47	46.36	0.60	0.58	46.17
12	1.02	1.00	53.20	0.47	0.46	46.82	0.56	0.55	46.72
13	1.01	0.99	54.19	0.45	0.44	47.26	0.55	0.54	47.26

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics as well as the alpha reliability coefficients (RCs) of the rotated LVs. (The items and the magnitude of their loadings are given in Appendix.) As can be seen, with the exception of eight items, i.e., 4, 6, 7, 39, 43, 44, 48, and 55, the remaining 94 have loaded acceptably on eight LVs called *Qualified*, *Social*, *Stimulating*, *Organized*, *Proficient*, *Humanistic*, *Self-Confident* and *Lenient* in this study. They explain 47.3% of variance in the ELTAS as shown in Table 3. The highest and lowest alpha RCs belong to *Qualified* (.95) and *Self-Confident* (.44), respectively.

Table 4:

LV	Name	# of items	Items	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurt	α
----	------	------------	-------	------	----	------	------	----------

1	Qualified	28	49, 50, 63, 65, 70, 71, 72, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, and 102	92.88	23.73	-0.35	0.02	.95
2	Social	13	27, 57, 58, 62, 64, 67, 68, 69, 73, 74, 75, 77, 90	44.75	13.32	-0.57	-0.35	.94
3	Stimulating	16	8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24, 37, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 61, 85, 86	43.23	13.27	0.18	-0.49	.90
4	Organized	12	1, 3, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32	41.06	10.54	-0.46	-0.37	.89
5	Proficient	11	17, 18, 19, 28, 34, 41, 42, 59, 60, 76, 80	38.14	9.95	-0.67	-0.12	.89
6	Humanistic	9	15, 16, 33, 35, 36, 38, 45, 46, 47	29.80	8.59	-0.41	-0.36	.89
7	Self-Confident	2	14, 40	8.13	1.74	-0.98	0.87	.44
8	Lenient	3	2, 5, 66	7.41	2.74	0.30	-0.61	.47

The first 28-item *Qualified* LV stands for the EFL teachers who evaluate their learners regularly and monitor their progress, explain the content so well that everyone understands, evaluate both qualitatively and quantitatively, identify and solve learning problems, integrate course topics, answer questions carefully and convincingly, involve all students in learning and teaching processes, handle discipline through prevention, teach materials which are closely related to the stated objectives, emphasize important points and materials, identify and pay attention to individual needs and differences, provide equal opportunities for participation, discussion and asking questions, return tests/assignments in time for subsequent work, are demographic, have high expectations of both students and themselves, help learners in and out of the class, check and mark assignments regularly, create confidence in their knowledge of course content, take learners attitudes towards learning into account even if they are negative, are available to answer questions, specify methods of evaluation clearly, maintain a welcoming environment for all students, write English well, exercise authority to control the class whenever necessary, put on clean and tidy clothes, are prompt in returning test results, tailor teaching to student needs and teach English tailored to students' ability levels

The second 13-item *Social* LV represents those EFL teachers who are cheerful, benevolent, dynamic, energetic, friendly, good-tempered, patient, caring and comfortable interacting with others. They have a good sense of humor, establish strong rapport with students, create a relaxed and pleasant atmosphere in the class, teach English enthusiastically, create self-confidence in learners and follow social codes and values and treat learners well. As can be seen in Table 5, the *Social* factor correlates the highest with the *Humanistic*, i.e., $r = .80$, $p < .01$. As the first LV, *Qualified* correlates the highest with the *Organized*, i.e., $r = .81$, $p < .01$, highlighting the fact that the first two LVs not only differ in rank but also in their relationships with other LVs constituting the ELTAS.

Table 5: Correlations between the eight factors underlying the ELTAS

Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MUELL
1 Qualified	1	.792**	.786**	.805**	.759**	.752**	.327**	.243**	.945**
2 Social	.792**	1	.710**	.717**	.690**	.803**	.250**	.373**	.888**
3 Stimulating	.786**	.710**	1	.749**	.666**	.724**	.228**	.266**	.874**
4 Organized	.805**	.717**	.749**	1	.748**	.746**	.312**	.209**	.885**
5 Proficient	.759**	.690**	.666**	.748**	1	.665**	.346**	.147**	.837**
6 Humanistic	.752**	.803**	.724**	.746**	.665**	1	.220**	.321**	.863**
7 Self-Confident	.327**	.250**	.228**	.312**	.346**	.220**	1	-.010	.338**
8 Lenient	.243**	.373**	.266**	.209**	.147**	.321**	-.010	1	.324**
ELTAS	.945**	.888**	.874**	.885**	.837**	.863**	.338**	.324**	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The third 16-item *Stimulating* LV concerns the EFL teachers who arouse their learners' interest in learning, teach how to learn outside the class, employ interesting activities, contextualize using English, have high ability learners help their low ability classmates, choose interesting syllabus, assign tasks requiring group work, have creativity in teaching, motivate students to do research, know learners' abilities, talents and weaknesses and employ appropriate evaluation techniques. They are

willing to negotiate changes to course content, teach different language skills, encourage creativity in learners and employ multimedia materials. It correlates the highest with the *Qualified*, i.e., $r = .79$, $p < .01$, highlighting another important aspect of EFL teachers' qualification

The fourth 12-item *Organized* LV specifies the EFL teachers who organize course content well in terms of hours and sessions, teach systematically, give enough and clear examples to clarify the subject matter, and state course objectives clearly. They are well-prepared for the class, present information at the right pace based on students' level of learning, reduce English language learning anxiety, grade tests and assignments fairly and based on some rules, manage the class well (by involving the students themselves), provide helpful feedback on tests and/or assignments, give sufficient number of assignments and enjoy teaching English. *Organized* LV correlates the highest with the *Qualified*, i.e., $r = .81$, $p < .01$.

As the fifth LV, the 11-item *Proficient* factor represents the EFL teachers who speak English fluently and well, understand spoken English and pronounce it well, have good general knowledge to answer the questions not directly related to the course content, read English texts well and know its vocabulary well, have up to date knowledge of course content, know English grammar and culture well, teach English in English and know foreign language acquisition theories. Similar to *Organized* LV, *Proficient* correlates the highest with the *Qualified*, i.e., $r = .76$, $p < .01$.

The sixth nine-item *Humanistic* factor relates to the EFL teachers who respect all ideas, listen to student's opinions, accept constructive criticisms, respect learners as real individuals, respond logically to suggestions and criticisms, help learners spot and overcome their weaknesses, and pay attention to students of all abilities. Not only are they are flexible and understand learners well but also encourage achievements and discourage unacceptable behaviours. The *Humanistic* LV correlates the highest with the *Social*, i.e., $r = .81$, $p < .01$,

The seventh two-item *Self-Confident* factor stands for the EFL teachers who believe their own efficacy and competence and are therefore self-confident. It correlates the highest with *Proficient*, i.e., $r = .35$, $p < .01$, followed by *Qualified*, i.e., $r = .33$, $p < .01$, revealing the significant role of proficiency and qualification in teacher effectiveness. Interestingly, *Self-Confident* is the only LV which does not show any significant relationship with *Lenient* factor highlighting the unique nature of *self-confidence* in EFL teaching.

The last three-item *Lenient* factor characterizes the EFL teachers who design simple and easy tests, give good grades and ignore cheating. It correlates the highest with *Social*, i.e., $r = .37$, $p < .01$, revealing the untoward consequence of establishing close social relations with them. As can be seen in Table 6, *Lenient* LV correlates the highest with the participants' achievement scores, i.e., $r = .16$, $p < .01$, indicating that the more lenient the EFL teachers are the higher their students' scores will be in the EFL.

Table 6: Correlations between the factors and achievement scores

Factors	Achievement	Factors	Achievement	Factors	Achievement
1 Qualified	.110**	4 Organized	.153**	7 Self-Confident	.033
2 Social	.064*	5 Proficient	.031	8 Lenient	.162**
3 Stimulating	.083**	6 Humanistic	.124**	ELTAS	.111**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

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

The correlations presented in Table 6 reveal that the ELTAS is empirically better than the CEELT because G3HS students' EFL achievement scores correlates significantly with the ELTAS, i.e., $r = .11$, $p < .01$. Feizbakhsh (2010) administered the CEELT to 1461 learners and correlated it with their self-reported EFL achievement scores. She could, however, establish significant relationship neither between the CEELT and EFL achievement nor between the underlying LVs of the CEELT and EFL achievement. In contrast, the EFL achievement correlates significantly with six LVs underlying the ELTAS, i.e., *Social*, *Stimulating*, *Qualified*, *Humanistic*, *Organized* and *Lenient*.

Among the LVs *Lenient* shows a higher correlation with the EFL achievement, i.e., $r = .16$, $p < .01$, than *Qualified* does, i.e., $r = .11$, $p < .01$, indicating teacher qualification is losing its importance in Iranian high schools from G3HS students' perspective. This implication is further supported when it is realized that *Proficient* LV shows no relationship with achievement. It remains to be investigated whether similar correlations will be obtained if achievement is measured by tests rather than self-reported scores. Future research must also show whether similar results will be obtained among male G3HS students and other graders.

IV. Conclusion

The administration of the ELTAS to a representative sample of G3HS students shows that eight LVs explain teachers' attributes, i.e., *Qualified*, *Social*, *Stimulating*, *Organized*, *Proficient*, *Humanistic*, *Self-Confident*, and *Lenient*. The ELTAS and its LVs enjoy not only acceptable levels of reliability but also factorial and empirical validities. Among the LVs, *Lenient* reveals the highest relationship with *Humanistic* as a trait on the one hand and EFL achievement as a learned ability on the other, indicating that EFL teachers evaluate their learners' achievement more on humanistic grounds than on academic standards. Similarly, *Proficient* LV correlates the highest with the *Organized* but shows no significant relationship with achievement. Since *Organized* has the second highest correlation with achievement it might be implied that proficiency in EFL teaching is reflected more in the teachers' ability to organize their teaching sessions than in what their learners learn during the school year. These findings are, however, limited to only female G3HS students. It remains to be seen whether similar results will be obtained with their male counterparts or other graders.

References

- [1] Borg, S. (2006). The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 10 (1), 3–31.
- [2] Brosh, H. (1996). Perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 125–38.
- [3] Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5rd ed.). NY: Pearson Education.
- [4] Deedari, R., & Zia Hossaini, S. M. (2009). *English for the students of Medicine*. Tehran: Samt Publication.
- [5] Elizabeth, C. L., May, C. M., Chee, P. K. (2008). Building a model to define the concept of teacher success in Hong Kong. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 623–634
- [6] Farhady, H., Jafarpoor, A., & Birjandi, P. (1994). *Testing language skills: From theory to practice*. Tehran: SAMT.
- [7] Feizbakhsh, M. (2010). *The role of emotional intelligence in EFL teachers' success at schools and institutes*. Unpublished MA thesis, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran.
- [8] Ghasemi, B., Hashemi, M. (2011). The study of the characteristics of successful english language teachers from the view point of the English language students of Islamic Azad University, Hamedan Branch. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 28, 411 – 415.
- [9] Girard, D. (1977). Motivation: the responsibility of the teacher. *ELT Journal*, 31, 97–102.
- [10] Goldberg, L. R., & Digman, J. M. (1994). Revealing structure in the data: Principles of exploratory factor analysis. In S. Strack & M. Lorr (Eds.), *Differentiating normal and abnormal personality* (pp. 216-242). New York: Springer.
- [11] Kaiser, H. F. & Rice, J. (1974). Little Jiffy, Mark IV. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 34, 111-117.
- [12] Khodadady, E. (2001). Schema: A theory of translation. In S. Cunico (Ed.). *Training Translators and Interpreters in the New Millennium, Portsmouth 17th March 2001 Conference*

- Proceedings* (pp. 107-123). Portsmouth, England: University of Portsmouth, School of Languages and Areas Studies.
- [13] Khodadady, E. (2008). Measuring translation ability and achievement: A schema-based approach. *Quarterly Journal of Humanities, Al-Zahra University*, 18(70), 56-76.
- [14] Khodadady, E., & Elahi, M. (2012). The effect of schema-vs-translation-based instruction on Persian medical students' learning of general English. *English Language Teaching*, 5 (1), 146-165. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n1p146>.
- [15] Khodadady, E., & Golparvar, E. (2011). Factors underlying religious orientation scale: a methodological approach. *Ilahiyat Studies: A Journal on Islamic and Religious Studies*, 2(2), 215-235.
- [16] MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 84-99.
- [17] Malikow, M. (2005-2006). Effective teacher study. *National Forum of Teacher Education Journal-Electronic*, 16 (3E), 1-9.
- [18] Moafian, F., & Pishghadam, R. (2008). Construct validation of a questionnaire on characteristics of successful English language teachers. *Pazhuhesh-e Zabanheye Khareji Journal* (University of Tehran), 54, 127-142.
- [19] Park, G. P., & Lee, H. W. (2006). The characteristics of effective English teachers as perceived by high school teachers and students in Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 7(2), 236-248.
- [20] Prodromou, L. (1991). The good language teacher. *English Teaching Forum*, 29, 2-7.
- [21] Seif, S., & Khodadady, E., (2003) Schema-based cloze multiple choice item tests: measures of translation ability. *Universite de Tabriz, Revue de la Faculte des Letters et Sciences Humaines, Langue*, 187(46), 73-99.
- [22] Suwantee, A. (1995). 'Students' perceptions of university instructors' effective teaching characteristics', *SLLT Journal*, 5, 6-22.
- [23] Velicer, W. F., & Jackson, D. N. (1990). Component analysis versus common factor analysis: Some issues in selecting an appropriate procedure. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 25, 1-28.
- [24] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in sociology: In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Soubberman (Eds.). *The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, Mas.: Harvard University Press.

Appendix: ELTAS indicators and their loadings on 15 factors (F)

Item	F	Load	My English teacher
1	4	.365	Grades tests and assignments fairly and based on some rules
2	8	.433	Designs simple and easy tests
3	4	.339	Enjoys teaching English
4			Is ethical (e.g., is not biased)
5	8	.388	Ignores cheating
6			Avoids making fun of the learners
7			Employs methods of evaluation consistent with course outline as initially presented
8	3	.500	Has high ability learners help low ability classmates
9	3	.521	Employs interesting learning activities and assignments
10	3	.355	Employs multimedia materials such as CDs and tapes
11	3	.384	Employs appropriate evaluation techniques
12	4	.370	Reduces English language learning anxiety
13	4	.436	Presents information at the right pace based on students' level of learning
14	7	.342	Is self-confident
15	6	.443	Accepts constructive criticisms
16	6	.374	Is flexible and understands learners well
17	5	.387	Teaches English in English
18	5	.644	Speaks English fluently and well
19	5	.535	Understands spoken English well

20	4	.512	States course objectives clearly
21	4	.469	Is well-prepared for the class
22	3	.576	Arouses interest in learning English through interesting activities
23	3	.514	Provides opportunities to use English through meaningful activities
24	3	.368	Divides class time appropriately for the different language skills based on lesson objectives
25	4	.598	Organizes course content well in terms of hours and sessions
26	4	.358	Manages the class well (by involving the students themselves)
27	2	.420	Teaches English enthusiastically
28	5	.362	Knows foreign language acquisition theories
29	4	.343	Provides helpful feedback on tests and/or assignments
30	4	.515	Gives enough and clear examples to clarify the subject matter
31	4	.556	Teaches systematically
32	4	.340	Gives sufficient number of assignments
33	6	.407	Responds logically to suggestions and criticisms
34	5	.528	Pronounces English well
35	6	.521	Respects all ideas
36	6	.396	Helps learners spot and overcome their weaknesses
37	3	.436	Motivates students to learn English and do research
38	6	.442	Respects learners as real individuals
39			Is interested in students (e.g., calls them by their names) and their learning.
40	7	.443	Believes his/her own efficacy and competence
41	5	.410	Knows English grammar well
42	5	.487	Knows English vocabulary well
Item	F	Load	My English teacher
43			Leaves the class on time
44			Enters the class on time
45	6	.503	Listens to student's opinions
46	6	.394	Pays attention to students of all abilities
47	6	.321	Encourages achievements and discourages unacceptable behaviours
48			Avoids discrimination and treats all fairly
49	1	.359	Teaches English tailored to students' ability levels
50	1	.361	Tailors teaching to student needs
51	3	.475	Assigns tasks requiring group work
52	3	.391	Knows learners' abilities, talents and weaknesses
53	3	.554	Teaches how to learn English outside the classroom (e.g., watching certain programs)
54	3	.372	Is willing to negotiate changes to course content
55			Values and checks class attendance
56	3	.359	Encourages and improves creativity in learners
57	2	.644	Is good-tempered
58	2	.654	Has a good sense of humor
59	5	.422	Has up to date knowledge of course content
60	5	.492	Has good general knowledge to answer the questions <i>not</i> directly related to the course content
61	3	.440	Has creativity in teaching
62	2	.440	Is comfortable interacting with others
63	1	.462	Is demographic in his/her approach
64	2	.399	Creates self-confidence in learners
65	1	.411	Exercises authority to control the class whenever necessary
66	8	.404	Gives good grades and (does not take it hard)
67	2	.563	Is caring
68	2	.578	Establishes strong rapport with students
69	2	.658	Is friendly
70	1	.425	Specifies methods of evaluation clearly
71	1	.467	Emphasizes important points and materials
72	1	.501	Answers questions carefully and convincingly
73	2	.699	Is cheerful and benevolent
74	2	.606	Is patient
75	2	.665	Is a dynamic and energetic person
76	5	.389	Knows English culture well
77	2	.502	Creates a relaxed and pleasant atmosphere in the class
78	1	.429	Is available to answer questions

79	1	.385	Puts on clean and tidy clothes
80	5	.491	Reads English texts well
81	1	.419	Maintains a welcoming environment for all students
82	1	.449	Checks and marks assignments regularly
83	1	.580	Evaluates learners regularly and monitors their progress during the term
84	1	.531	Identifies and solves learning problems
85	3	.497	Chooses interesting materials to teach
86	3	.445	Relates course content to learners' real life
87	1	.414	Writes English well
88	1	.565	Explains the content he covers each session so well that everyone understands
89	1	.474	Teaches materials which are closely related to the stated objectives
90	2	.370	Follows social codes and values and treats learners well
91	1	.507	Integrates course topics in a way that helps learners understand them well
92	1	.465	Provides equal opportunities for participation, discussion and asking questions
93	1	.385	Is prompt in returning test results
94	1	.444	Creates confidence in his knowledge of course content
95	1	.478	Handles discipline through prevention
96	1	.443	Takes learners attitudes towards learning into account even if they are negative
97	1	.465	Identifies and pays attention to individual needs and differences
98	1	.463	Returns tests/assignments in time for subsequent work
99	1	.453	Has high expectations of both students and himself/herself
100	1	.552	Evaluates both qualitatively and quantitatively
101	1	.452	Helps learners in and out of the class
102	1	.489	Involves all students in learning and teaching processes