Teacher Effectiveness, Educational Grade and English Achievement

Ebrahim Khodadady
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

Beheshteh Shakhsi Dastgahian
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Branch, Mashhad, Iran

Abstract—This study aimed to explore the relationship between the characteristics of teachers and grade four senior high school (G4SHS) students' achievement in English as a foreign language (EFL). To this end, the 102-item English Language Teachers' Attribute Scale (ELTAS) designed by Khodadady, Fakhrabadi, and Azar (2012) was administered to 1483 G4SHS students and the collected data were submitted to Principal Axis Factoring and Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. The results showed that the scale consists of eleven factors, i.e., Qualified, Social, Proficient, Humanistic, Stimulating, Organized, Pragmatic, Systematic, Prompt, Exam-Wise, and Lenient. When the ELTAS and its underlying factors were correlated with the students' self-reported scores on their grade three final English examination (G3FEE) held nationally in Iran, not only the scale itself but also its constituting factors showed significant relationships with the G3FEE as a measure of EFL achievement. The results of the study are discussed and suggestions are made for future research.

Index Terms—teacher effectiveness, English achievement, secondary education, construct validation

I. INTRODUCTION

The focus of studies in educational effectiveness has been mainly on observable behaviors of teachers until recently (Lowyck, 1994). According to Brok, Brekelmans, and Wubbels (2004), however, during the last decade teacher and student questionnaires were used in order to measure "teachers' and students' perceptions of teacher behavior" (p. 408). It has been demonstrated that students at primary, secondary and higher education levels are able to judge classroom environments and provide sufficiently stable, reliable, valid, and predictive ratings of teacher behaviors, evaluations, and effective characteristics (Driscoll et al., 1985; Mak, 2001; Peterson & Stevens, 1988; Scriven, 1994; Taba, Tylor, & Smith, 1998). Basic dimensions of effective teaching which have been identified in different groups, from primary classrooms to post-secondary classrooms, have, therefore, been determined through developing and investigating different questionnaires (Irby, 1978).

Brok, Brekelmans, and Wubbels (2004), for example, investigated the interpersonal behavior of secondary education teachers as a factor of teacher effectiveness, and the information needed were collected through a questionnaire called Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI). The QTI consisted of 77 items which were answered on a 5-point Likert scale, and its main version was in Dutch. For determining the reliability and validity of the QTI, several studies were done in Germany (e.g., Brekelmans, Wubbels, & Creton, 1990; Den Brok, 2001; Wubbels, Creton, & Hooymayers, 1985), America (e.g., Wubbels & Levy, 1991), and Australia (e.g., Fisher, Fraser, & Wubbels, 1992). These studies confirmed the satisfying reliability and validity of the questionnaire (Brok, Brekelmans, & Wubbels, 2004).

Moafian and Pishghadam (2008) were the first researchers who employed Suwandee's (1995) study and their own personal experiences with learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) to develop and validate a 47-item questionnaire dealing with the characteristics of successful English language teachers. They administered the questionnaire to 250 Iranian EFL learners and extracted 12 factors, i.e., teaching accountability, interpersonal relationship, paying attention to all students, examinations, commitment, learning boosters, creating sense of competence, teaching boosters, physical and emotional acceptance, empathy, class attendance, and dynamism.

In a separate study, Khodadady (2010) renamed Moafian and Pishghadam's (2008) questionnaire as Characteristics of Effective English Language Teachers (CEELT) and administered it to 1469 Iranian EFL learners in different private and state schools in Mashhad, Iran. In contrast to Moafian and Pishghadam's findings, he extracted five factors, i.e., rapport, fairness, qualification, facilitation, and examination. Khodadady, Fakhrabadi, and Azar (2012) [henceforth KF&A] scrutinized the CEELT carefully and concluded that it was not comprehensive enough in terms of subject matter. Their analysis, for example, showed that it did not deal with syntactic and semantic schema domains involved in teaching EFL. To fill the gap KF&A developed the English Language Teachers' Attributes Scale (ELTAS).

The 107 indicators comprising the original ELTAS were selected from a pool of 147 items collected from the evaluation forms employed by some universities and schools such as Azad University, Brock University, Khayyam University, Danesh Primary school and Nassrabad High School in Torbat, Samand Guidance School, Mottahari High School, and Tabaran Higher Education Institute. It also included some characteristics specified and compiled by other

researchers (e.g., Brosh, 1996; Elizabeth, May, & Chee, 2008; Moafian & Pishghadam, 2008; Park & Lee, 2006; Suwandee, 1995). And finally KF&A added six indicators to the final version of the ELTAS by resorting to their own personal experiences.

The ELTAS indicators selected from English sources were translated into Persian by resorting to schema theory (Khodadady, 2001, 2008, 2013; Khodadady & Golparvar, 2011; Seif & Khodadady, 2003). For administering and validating the 107-indicator ELTAS with grade three high school (G3SHS) students, it was taken to the Bureau of Education in Mashhad, Iran. There, five indicators were identified irrelevant by the committee responsible for the development of English teaching materials and suggested to be removed by the designers, i.e., 1) collecting students' English writings and reports for exhibitions, 2) employing appropriate teaching methods based on lesson objectives, 3) generating intellectual excitement in students, 4) incorporating various learning styles, e.g., intravertiveness and extravertiveness, and 5) being familiar with new teaching methods and strategies.

To comply with the suggestion of the committee responsible for material development in the Education Bureau in Mashhad, KF&A removed the five indicators specified above and administered the 102-item ELTAS to 1328 female grade 3 senior high school (G3SHS) students in the same city. They applied the Principal Axis Factoring method to their collected data, rotated their latent variables (LVs) via Varimax with Kaiser Normalization and extracted eight factors, i.e., Qualified, Social, Stimulating, Organized, Proficient, Humanistic, Self-Confident, and Lenient. The present study has employed the ELTAS in order to find out whether its underlying factors change when it is administered to grade four senior high school (G4SHS) students who can take part in University Entrance Examination upon successful completion of the grade.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

One thousand four hundred eighty three, 932 (62.8%) female and 551 (37.2%) male, G4SHS students took part in the study voluntarily. They had registered in Hekmat, Imam Ali, Kharazmi, Kiyan, Malek Ashtar, Meftah, Mobin, Nassr Novin, Nokhbeghan Toos, and Rangraz boys' schools and Allameh, Allameh Amini, Allameh Tabatabaii, Azadegan, Essmat, Farzan, Farzanegan, Imam Reza, Saadi, Sadoogi, and Zeinabiyeh girls' schools in educational districts of 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and 9 in 2013. Their age ranged from 16 to 21 (M = 17.76, SD = .59). They were speaking Persian (n= 1437, 96.9%), English (n= 18, 1.2%), Kurdish (n= 12, 0.8%), Lori (n=1, 1%), Turkish (n=10, 0.7%) and unspecified languages (n= 5, 0.3) as their mother tongue.

B. Instruments

A Demographic Scale and English Language Teachers' Attributes Scale were used in the study. The students' self-reported scores on Grade Three Final English Examination were also employed to investigate their relationships with teacher effectiveness.

Demographic Scale

The Demographic Scale (DS) consisted of four questions dealing with the participants' age, gender, and mother language. They were also asked to report the score they had obtained on the final English examination held at the end of school year at grade three.

English Language Teachers' Attributes Scale

The English Language Teachers' Attributes Scale (ELTAS) designed in Persian by Khodadady, Fakhrabadi, and Azar (2012) [KF&A] was used. It consists of 102 items dealing with English teachers' attributes. (The Persian ELTAS is given in Appendix. Interested readers can, however, contact the corresponding author for its English version.) The students are required to read items such as "my English teacher grades tests and assignments fairly and based on some rules" and indicate whether they "completely agree", "agree", "have no idea", "disagree" or "completely disagree" with the content of items. The administration of the ELTAS to 1328 female grade 3 high school (G3SHS) students showed that eight factors underlie their English teachers' attributes at this grade, i.e., Qualified, Social, Stimulating, Organized, Proficient, Humanistic, Self-Confident, and Lenient. KF & A reported the alpha reliability coefficient of .95, .94, .90, .89, .89, .89, .44, .47, for these factors, respectively.

Grade Three Final English Examination

On May 27, 2013 the participants of this study sat for the Grade Three Final English Examination (G3FEE) held nationally. It consisted of 14 sections. The first section comprised eight sentences in each of which one letter of two words had been removed from their middles. The test takers had to restore the missing letters, e.g., "there are two kinds of illness, ph_sical and m_ntal". The second section had nine words eight of which had to be chosen to be inserted in the eight sentences according to their meaning. Section three required changing the syntactic function of six words such as "hot" to complete six sentences such as "the … of the sun makes the earth warm". In section four the test takers had to restore a missing word by themselves in order to complete six sentences such as "a lab is a suitable place to do some … on acid". Section five required choosing one of the four syntactic alternatives such as "a. go, b. going, c. to go and d. goes" to complete six sentences such as "I didn't want to take my brother to work, but he insisted on … with me". Section six called for making two complete sentences with scrambled words while section seven required changing two direct sentences to their indirect forms.

Two black and white drawings were given in section eight to provide the context necessary for answering two open ended questions dealing with the drawings. Section nine required matching eight answers with eight numbered questions whereas two sets of four words were given in section 10 to find out whether the test takers could identity a word with a meaning different from the other three. Similarly, they had to identify two words in a set of four whose stress was different. Section 11 consisted of four sentences whose meanings were raised as four choices from which the correct one had to be chosen. Section 12 was a six-item cloze multiple choice item test developed on a paragraph and the last section consisted of one passage upon which two open ended questions, one multiple choice item and three true and false item had been made. The G3FEE was marked by two teachers and the total score was reported out of 20. The cut off score of 10 and higher determined whether the test takers had passed the English course successfully. The participants were asked to report their G3FEE in the DS.

C. Procedure

As an officially employed English teacher at Education Department of Mashhad, the second researcher contacted her female colleagues in as many schools as she could and secured their approval to administer the ELTAS in their classes. She also attended a Workshop on teaching English offered in district two of Education Organization in January, 2013. After she explained the purpose of the study, ten of her male colleagues accepted to administer the ELTAS to their male students. The contact numbers of these teachers were used to make the necessary arrangements for the administration and collection of ELTAS after its content was explained in details and the questions dealing with the two sections of the questionnaire were answered. They were reminded in particular to check the answers when the students handed in the completed scales so that no section would remain unanswered. The teachers followed the instructions and administered the ELTAS as part of class activity. They were also contacted regularly to receive their feedback. The researcher collected the completed scales in person as soon as they were held under standard conditions.

D. Data Analysis

The descriptive statistics of the five-choice items comprising the ELTAS was calculated to examine their functioning. The responses given to the choices were then subjected to Principal Axis Factoring based on the assumption that they "are driven by just a few underlying structures called factors" (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 26). The initial eigenvalues of one and higher were adopted as the only criterion to determine the number of factors underlying the ELTAS. The extracted factors were then rotated via Varimax with Kaiser Normalization to have a clearer picture of their structure. The choices "completely agree" and "agree" were then collapsed as were "disagree" and "completely disagree" to form the two choices of "agree" and "disagree", respectively, to render the presentation and discussion of items easier. The reliability of the ELTAS and its underlying factors was estimated via Cronbach's alpha. Pearson correlations were also used to explore the relationships between the factors and English language achievement. All the statistical analyses were conducted via IBM SPSS Statistics 20 to investigate the following research questions.

Q1. What is the factorial structure of the ELTAS when it is administered to G4SHS students?

Q2. How reliable is the ELTAS and its underlying factors?

Q3. Do ELTAS and its underlying factors relate significantly to G4SHS students' scores on *Grade Three* Final English Examination?

III. RESULTS

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of items comprising the ELTAS. As can be seen, their mean score ranges from 2.46 (item 5) to 4.47 (Item 14). As it can also be seen, responding to item 5, only 21% of G4SHS students have agreed that their English teacher ignores cheating (see Appendix for the percentage of responses). Eighty one percent of these students have, however, agreed that their teachers are self-confident. For these very reasons, items 5 and 14 have the lowest and highest mean scores among the attributes, respectively. These results somewhat contrast with those of KF&A. The lowest mean score in their study belongs to item 10 (1.81) showing that only 12% of 1317 female G3SHS students agreed that their English teachers employed multimedia materials such as CDs and tapes in their classes. Similar to G4SHS students' responses, the highest mean score (4.25), however, belongs to item 14 showing that 81% of G3SHS students agreed that their English teachers had self-confidence.

TABLE 1
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF ITEMS COMPRISING THE ELTAS (N =1483)

Item	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurd	Item	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurt	Item	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurt
1	4.21	.915	-1.197	1.382	35	3.87	1.058	-.720	-.043	69	4.04	.993	-.963	.544
2	2.80	1.123	.220	-.862	36	3.71	1.041	-.465	-.367	70	3.78	.973	-.438	-.244
3	4.06	1.069	-1.092	.608	37	3.47	1.095	-.261	-.527	71	4.31	.837	-1.23	1.402
4	3.86	1.050	-.573	-.259	38	3.97	.985	-.801	.271	72	4.11	.927	-.978	.700
5	2.46	1.289	.514	-.777	39	3.56	1.217	-.386	-.833	73	4.13	1.040	-1.18	.806
6	3.75	1.180	-.721	-.281	40	4.24	.857	-.895	.289	74	4.09	1.017	-.985	.333
7	3.65	1.012	-.398	-.301	41	4.35	.869	-1.43	1.987	75	4.01	1.084	-.933	.152
8	3.04	1.121	.032	-.635	42	4.43	.787	-1.48	2.412	76	3.82	1.022	-.522	-.176
9	3.21	1.170	-.153	-.699	43	4.32	.920	-1.49	2.059	77	3.88	1.058	-.792	.084
10	2.48	1.359	.580	-.869	44	4.29	.956	-1.44	1.680	78	3.85	1.066	-.725	-.038
11	3.63	1.004	-.483	-.054	45	3.93	1.019	-.825	.289	79	4.42	.866	-1.67	2.838
12	3.65	1.183	-.555	-.569	46	3.75	1.038	-.486	-.406	80	4.36	.886	-1.43	1.750
13	3.75	1.127	-.697	-.304	47	3.75	.990	-.329	-.353	81	3.73	1.071	-.536	-.359
14	4.47	.814	-1.678	2.841	48	3.83	1.119	-.814	-.007	82	3.26	1.179	-.149	-.716
15	3.84	1.100	-.729	-.088	49	3.76	1.096	-.698	-.067	83	3.63	1.102	-.509	-.374
16	3.85	1.053	-.716	-.069	50	3.71	1.038	-.544	-.131	84	3.55	1.069	-.389	-.436
17	3.54	1.285	-.569	-.782	51	3.08	1.300	-.050	-1.03	85	3.51	1.093	-.261	-.638
18	4.29	.916	-1.363	1.586	52	3.46	1.083	-.317	-.438	86	3.49	1.138	-.272	-.670
19	4.07	.977	-.838	.252	53	3.03	1.175	.021	-.684	87	3.99	1.052	-.904	.265
20	4.14	.916	-1.108	1.079	54	3.44	1.099	-.227	-.455	88	3.83	1.070	-.817	.209
21	4.32	.878	-1.400	1.909	55	4.08	1.024	-1.02	.549	89	3.89	1.015	-.720	.160
22	3.28	1.143	-.111	-.669	56	3.81	1.041	-.552	-.295	90	3.99	.986	-.864	.460
23	3.42	1.053	-.245	-.380	57	4.27	.958	-1.41	1.752	91	3.77	1.033	-.597	-.110
24	3.78	1.144	-.770	-.133	58	4.10	1.010	-1.02	.510	92	3.76	1.039	-.554	-.217
25	4.05	.982	-1.036	.723	59	4.30	.865	-1.29	1.711	93	3.75	1.131	-.694	-.181
26	3.82	1.043	-.636	-.137	60	4.13	.943	-.938	.496	94	3.86	.971	-.424	-.424
27	4.03	1.046	-.979	.327	61	3.61	1.182	-.483	-.613	95	3.84	1.017	-.595	-.191
28	3.74	.983	-.316	-.215	62	4.14	.879	-.779	.196	96	3.55	1.010	-.244	-.251
29	3.70	.957	-.383	-.143	63	3.79	1.040	-.700	.087	97	3.54	1.031	-.232	-.380
30	3.99	.980	-.910	.449	64	3.61	1.123	-.425	-.494	98	3.82	1.091	-.705	-.099
31	4.09	.964	-1.031	.675	65	3.91	1.099	-.863	.106	99	3.83	1.006	-.529	-.249
32	3.64	1.150	-.603	-.379	66	2.91	1.323	.023	-1.09	I100	3.76	.978	-.356	-.349
33	3.76	1.094	-.672	-.027	67	3.92	1.060	-.835	.168	I101	3.67	1.039	-.421	-.276
34	4.28	.922	-1.326	1.509	68	3.61	1.125	-.460	-.403	I102	3.82	1.108	-.805	.021

Table 2 presents KMO and Bartlett's test results of the present study and those of KF&A. As can be seen, the KMO statistic of both studies is .98. Since it is in the .90s considered as "marvelous" by Kaiser and Rice (1974 as cited in DiLalla & Dollinger, 2006, p. 250), the sample selected in this study is marvelously adequate to run factor analysis. As it can also be seen, the value obtained by Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, i.e., $X^2 = 79658.195$, is significant ($p <.001$), indicating that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix.

TABLE 2
KMO AND BARTLETT'S TEST

		This study	KG&A
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.980	.984
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	79658.195	71142.467
	df	5151	5151
	Sig.	.000	0.000

Table 3 presents the initial (I) and extraction communalities (EC) of items comprising the ELTAS. As can be seen, the ECs range from .15 (item 5) to .67 (item 58). In spite of having the lowest EC, item five, "my English teacher (henceforth …) ignores cheating," loads acceptably on the last factor called *Lenient*. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) argued that communality values lower than .2 indicate "considerable heterogeneity among the variables" (p. 660). This argument does not, however, hold true for item two, "… designs simple and easy tests", and item 66, "… gives good grades and does not take it hard" because they load acceptably with item five on the *Lenient* factor. Based on students' evaluation of their teachers' effectiveness, the Lenient factor consists of homogenous schema types of "having easy tests", "cheating" and "receiving good grades".

TABLE 3
THE INITIAL (I) AND EXTRACTION COMMUNALITIES (EC) OF ITEMS COMPRISING THE ELTAS

Item	IC	EC	Item	IC	EC	Item	IC	EC	Item	IC	EC	Item	IC	EC
I001	.350	.343	I022	.634	.647	I043	.499	.511	I064	.575	.572	I085	.577	.571
I002	.222	.223	I023	.553	.530	I044	.519	.504	I065	.386	.399	I086	.436	.410
I003	.372	.356	I024	.515	.486	I045	.584	.592	I066	.280	.284	I087	.386	.375
I004	.280	.272	I025	.518	.500	I046	.520	.499	I067	.596	.559	I088	.596	.619
I005	.179	.149	I026	.453	.399	I047	.376	.376	I068	.649	.629	I089	.572	.573
I006	.254	.247	I027	.581	.554	I048	.435	.391	I069	.642	.651	I090	.544	.522
I007	.391	.376	I028	.430	.383	I049	.550	.534	I070	.487	.442	I091	.615	.592
I008	.330	.317	I029	.418	.372	I050	.546	.534	I071	.528	.526	I092	.533	.476
I009	.478	.493	I030	.483	.475	I051	.371	.410	I072	.574	.583	I093	.512	.600
I010	.345	.390	I031	.525	.535	I052	.511	.488	I073	.666	.660	I094	.498	.466
I011	.437	.420	I032	.306	.283	I053	.490	.495	I074	.557	.549	I095	.471	.456
I012	.453	.422	I033	.561	.569	I054	.399	.345	I075	.644	.616	I096	.478	.457
I013	.510	.518	I034	.559	.540	I055	.406	.387	I076	.512	.533	I097	.536	.508
I014	.353	.365	I035	.593	.607	I056	.518	.495	I077	.558	.523	I098	.504	.580
I015	.538	.560	I036	.490	.471	I057	.642	.647	I078	.507	.458	I099	.416	.409
I016	.536	.543	I037	.501	.497	I058	.650	.671	I079	.500	.445	I100	.521	.491
I017	.332	.321	I038	.516	.488	I059	.616	.614	I080	.599	.585	I101	.459	.390
I018	.588	.625	I039	.411	.396	I060	.535	.532	I081	.584	.542	I102	.507	.466
I019	.535	.527	I040	.459	.450	I061	.591	.599	I082	.447	.438			
I020	.516	.486	I041	.592	.586	I062	.488	.479	I083	.510	.487			
I021	.566	.543	I042	.583	.573	I063	.434	.391	I084	.576	.566			

Table 4 presents the number of factors extracted on the basis of initial eigenvalues of one and higher. Since the adoption of .32 as the minimum loading showed that none of the 102 items loaded acceptably on factors 13, 14 and 15, they were removed as noncontributory to the construct under investigation in this study. As can be seen, the remaining 12 factors explain 46.16% of variance in the ELTAS. This percentage is larger than 44.2% explaining the eight factors extracted in KF&A's study. Similarly, compared to the four factors explaining 43.12% of variance in the construct underlying the 20-item Persian Cultural Capital Scale (CQS) validated by Khodadady and Ghahari (2011), the 12 factors underlying the ELTAS explain higher percentage of variance in the construct they underlie, i.e., teacher effectiveness.

TABLE 4
TOTAL CUMULATIVE (C) VARIANCE (V) EXPLAINED BY FACTORS

F	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	33.492	32.836	32.836	33.001	32.354	32.354	8.383	8.219	8.219
2	3.289	3.225	36.060	2.800	2.745	35.099	7.379	7.234	15.453
3	2.631	2.580	38.640	2.152	2.110	37.209	7.252	7.110	22.563
4	2.429	2.382	41.022	1.948	1.910	39.119	5.474	5.367	27.930
5	2.277	2.232	43.254	1.766	1.732	40.851	4.169	4.087	32.017
6	1.881	1.844	45.098	1.347	1.321	42.172	2.942	2.885	34.901
7	1.511	1.481	46.579	1.012	.993	43.164	2.876	2.819	37.721
8	1.430	1.402	47.981	.897	.879	44.043	2.215	2.171	39.892
9	1.356	1.330	49.311	.799	.783	44.827	2.137	2.095	41.987
10	1.286	1.261	50.571	.742	.727	45.554	1.821	1.785	43.772
11	1.209	1.185	51.757	.664	.651	46.205	1.267	1.242	45.014
12	1.165	1.142	52.899	.634	.621	46.826	1.166	1.143	46.158
13	1.120	1.098	53.996	.556	.545	47.371	1.033	1.013	47.170
14	1.067	1.047	55.043	.520	.510	47.881	.668	.655	47.826
15	1.018	.998	56.041	.503	.493	48.374	.560	.549	48.374

In order to determine the structure of extracted factors underlying the ELTAS, the rotated factor matrix was scrutinized closely. (The matrix is not given to save space.) The analysis showed that 10 items, i.e., item 1, "… grades tests and assignments fairly and based on some rules", item 4, "… is ethical", item 6, "… employs methods of evaluation consistent with course outline as initially presented", item 8, "… has high ability learners help low ability classmates" item 26, "…manages the class well", item 29, "… provides helpful feedback on tests and/or assignments", item 30, "… gives enough and clear examples to clarify the subject matter", item 55, "…values and checks class attendance", item 94, "… creates confidence in his knowledge of course content", and item 99, "…has high expectations of both students and himself/herself", did not load acceptably on any of the 12 remaining factors.

Out of 92 items which had loaded acceptably on 12 rotated factors, 21 items cross loaded on another factor (F), i.e., 11 (F5), 16 (F6), 20 (F3), 27 (F3), 36 (F1), 37 (F5), 41 (F10), 43 (F3), 44 (F3), 46 (F1), 49 (F10), 50(F10), 53 (F1), 56 (F2), 60 (F10), 64 (F1), 80 (F11), 81 (F1), 88 (F1) and 90 (F7) and 91 (F1). Only two items had cross loaded on two factors, i.e., 61 (F1 and F2) and 85 (F1 and F7). These items were removed from the structure of factors upon which they had cross loaded. The removal of cross loadings resulted in the removal of factor 10 upon which four items, i.e., 41,

49, 50 and 80, had lower acceptable cross loadings. This procedure reduced the number of actors to 11, i.e., Qualified, Social, Proficient, Humanistic, Stimulating, Organized, Pragmatic, Systematic, Prompt, Exam-Wise, and Lenient. (The items along with the factors upon which they loaded acceptably are given in Appendix).

Table 5 presents the descriptive statistics and reliability estimates of ELTAS and its underlying factors. As can be seen, the number of items comprising the factors ranges from three (Lenient) to 24 (Qualified). The ELTAS itself provides researchers and educators with a highly reliable measure of teacher effectiveness ($\alpha=.98$). The alpha reliability coefficient of its factors ranges from .39 (*Lenient*) to .93 (*Qualified*). Among the factors, *Lenient* is the only schema genus or statistical factor of teacher effectiveness whose constituting items are the same for both G3SHS and G4SHS students. It does, however, vary in its reliability level for teachers offering English to these two grades. Since its alpha reaches .47 for G3SHS students in KF&A's study, it provides a less reliable measure of leniency for English teachers at grade four, i.e., .39.

TABLE 5
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND RELIABILITY ESTIMATES OF ELTAS AND ITS UNDERLYING FACTORS

No	Factor	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Alpha
1	Qualified	1483	24	120	87.39	15.912	-.279	.315	.928
2	Social	1483	14	70	55.55	10.480	-.676	.186	.930
3	Proficient	1483	15	75	62.76	9.056	-1.092	1.704	.901
4	Humanistic	1483	9	45	34.51	6.832	-.591	.303	.883
5	Stimulating	1483	7	35	22.55	5.890	-.147	-.287	.844
6	Organized	1483	6	30	22.88	4.381	-.590	.306	.782
7	Pragmatic	1483	5	25	18.97	3.969	-.558	.179	.802
8	Systematic	1483	5	25	20.53	3.716	-.960	.853	.801
9	Prompt	1483	2	10	7.57	2.005	-.678	.007	.772
10	Exam-Wise	1483	2	10	8.42	1.569	-1.011	.976	.732
11	Lenient	1483	3	15	8.16	2.514	.197	-.343	.391
	ELTAS	1483	96	460	349.31	54.345	-.497	.478	.976

Table 6 presents the correlation coefficients obtained between the factors underlying the ELTAS. As can be seen, all the factors correlate significantly not only with the ELTAS itself but also with each other. In KF&A's study, however, the *Lenient* factor did not relate significantly to Self-Confident factor. Among the 11 factors extracted in this study, the Qualified and Social factors show the strongest relationship ($r=.77$, $p<.01$) with each other as they did in KF&A's study ($r=.79$, $p<.01$). The *Lenient* factor, however, correlates the lowest with the new Systematic factor ($r=.15$, $p<.01$) found in this study but shows the highest relationships with the Social and Humanistic factors ($r=.29$ and .26, $p<.01$), respectively.

TABLE 6
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OBTAINED BETWEEN THE FACTORS UNDERLYING THE ELTAS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
ELTAS	.929*	.883*	.830*	.836*	.768*	.800*	.799*	.765*	.537*	.689*	.317*
1 Qualified	1	.770*	.675*	.750*	.709*	.692*	.739*	.691*	.498*	.628*	.255*
2 Social	.770*	1	.715*	.736*	.639*	.640*	.664*	.613*	.447*	.602*	.285*
3 Proficient	.675*	.715*	1	.619*	.571*	.650*	.665*	.667*	.440*	.621*	.168*
4 Humanistic	.750*	.736*	.619*	1	.564*	.674*	.607*	.634*	.384*	.557*	.264*
5 Stimulating	.709*	.639*	.571*	.564*	1	.650*	.602*	.511*	.340*	.406*	.244*
6 Organized	.692*	.640*	.650*	.674*	.650*	1	.624*	.602*	.353*	.522*	.262*
7 Pragmatic	.739*	.664*	.665*	.607*	.602*	.624*	1	.564*	.437*	.604*	.189*
8 Systematic	.691*	.613*	.667*	.634*	.511*	.602*	.564*	1	.410*	.533*	.147*
9 Prompt	.498*	.447*	.440*	.384*	.340*	.353*	.437*	.410*	1	.383*	.168*
10 Exam-Wise	.628*	.602*	.621*	.557*	.406*	.522*	.604*	.533*	.383*	1	.151*
11 Lenient	.255*	.285*	.168*	.264*	.244*	.262*	.189*	.147*	.168*	.151*	1

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

Table 7 presents the correlations between G4SHS students' self-reported scores on their G3FEE and the ELTAS as well as its 11 underlying factors. As can be seen, not only the ELTAS but also its underlying factors correlate significantly with the G3FEE. The correlation coefficient obtained between the G3FEE and ELTAS in this study ($r=.15$, $p<.01$) is noticeably higher than the correlation coefficient between English achievement and ELTAS reported by KF&A ($r=.11$, $p<.01$), indicating that English teachers attributes explain more variance in the students' English achievement when they are specified at grade four than grade three. While the Lenient factor best predicts the students English achievement at grade three by having the highest correlation coefficient with the achievement score in KF&A's study ($r=.16$, $p<.01$), the Qualified factor assumes the same role for G4SHS students ($r=.17$, $p<.01$).

TABLE 7
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT AND ELTAS AS WELL AS ITS FACTORS

No	Factors	G3FEE	No	Factors	G3FEE	No	Factors	G3FEE
1	Qualified	.172**	5	Stimulating	.064*	9	Prompt	.080**
2	Social	.092**	6	Organized	.194**	10	Exam-Wise	.135**
3	Proficient	.084**	7	Pragmatic	.137**	11	Lenient	.095**
4	Humanistic	.113**	8	Systematic	.111**		ELTAS	.154**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

IV. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

A noticeable number of textbooks have been written on teaching English in recent decades. None of these sources has, however, discussed what attributes teachers should have as if they were irrelevant in effective teaching. Doff (1988), for example, focused only on developing "practical skills in teaching English as a foreign language …which do not require lengthy preparation of materials, elaborate use of aids or equipment, or complex forms of classroom organization" (p. 1). Similarly, Cook (1991) designed her own textbook because of "the complaints of language teachers that books on L2 learning were too academic and insufficiently linked to the classroom" (p. Acknowledgements). Neither Doff nor Cook did, however, provide their readers with any list, let alone explanations, of factors underlying English teachers' attributes such as those measured by the items comprising the ELTAS employed in this study.

The results of the present study are, therefore, of great importance not only to teachers who offer English in high schools but also to the trainers of the would-be teachers to prepare them as effectives instructors within specific contexts. The first and foremost important factor underlying teachers' attributes is their qualification. G4SHS students' responses to the ELTAS show that *Qualified* teachers can be described in 24 statements in Mashhad, Iran, i.e., 32, 37, 39, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 63, 65, 70, 78, 82, 83, 84, 92, 95, 96, 97, 100, 101 and 102. Their evaluation of *Qualified* teachers, however, differs from those of female G3SHS students whose responses rested on 28 statements, i.e., 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. These findings reveal the fact that moving to grade four in Iranian senior high schools entails refining the factors underlying the ELTAS and yielding previously unidentified dimensions in the same attributes.

For G4SHS students, a *Qualified* teacher, for example, checks and marks assignments regularly, identifies and solves learning problems, evaluates learners regularly and monitors their progress during the term, assigns tasks requiring group work, knows learners' abilities, talents and weaknesses, identifies and pays attention to individual needs and differences, involves all students in learning and teaching processes, motivates students to learn English and do research, evaluates both qualitatively and quantitatively, tailors teaching to student needs, provides equal opportunities for participation, discussion and asking questions, takes learners attitudes towards learning into account even if they were negative, helps learners in and out of the class, teaches English tailored to students' ability levels, handles discipline through prevention, gives sufficient number of assignments, is demographic in his/her approach, is interested in students, e.g., calls them by their names, and their learning, is willing to negotiate changes to course content, is available to answer questions, specifies methods of evaluation clearly, encourages achievement and discourages unacceptable behaviours, exercises authority to control the class whenever necessary, and encourages and improves creativity in learners.

For G3SHS students, a *Qualified* teacher also "explains the content he covers each session so well that everyone understands, teaches materials which are closely related to the stated objectives, integrates course topics in a way that helps learners understand them well and writes English well". For G4SHS students, these attributes, however, form the seventh factor underlying the ELTAS which is called *Pragmatic* in this study. Furthermore, for G3SHS students, a *Qualified* teacher "is prompt in returning test results and returns tests/assignments in time for subsequent work". These attributes, however, constitute *Prompt* genus as the ninth factor of G4SHS. In addition to *Pragmatic* and *Prompt* factors, the two statements, "…emphasizes important points and materials", and "… answers questions carefully and convincingly" load on the tenth factor called *Exam-Wise* in this study.

In contrast to *Qualified* factor whose constituting items for G3SHS students (28) were more than those of G4SHS students (24), the items constituting the *Social* factor for G4SHS students (14) is more than those of G3SHS students (13), i.e., items 27, 57, 58, 62, 64, 67, 68, 69, 73, 74, 75, 77, and 90, indicating that the latter have gained more social complexity. For G4SHS students a *Social* teacher is cheerful and benevolent, has a good sense of humor, is friendly, is a dynamic and energetic person, establishes strong rapport with students, is good-tempered, is caring, is patient, creates a relaxed and pleasant atmosphere in the class, is comfortable interacting with others, teaches English enthusiastically, maintains a welcoming environment for all students (item 81), creates self-confidence in learners, and follows social codes and values and treats learners well. (Item 81 loaded acceptably on the *Qualified* factor for G3SHS students.)

Similar to the *Social* factor, the *Proficient* factor contains more attributes for G4SHS students. While for both G3SHS and G4SHS students, a *Proficient* teacher speaks English fluently, pronounces English well, knows English vocabulary well, understands spoken English well, knows English grammar well, has up to date knowledge of course content, reads

English texts well, has good general knowledge to answer the questions *not* directly related to the course content, teaches English in English, knows English culture well, knows foreign language acquisition theories, he also "puts on clean and tidy clothes" and "is well-prepared for the class" for G4SHS student. The last two attributes, however, loaded on the *Qualified* and *Organized* factors for G3SHS students, respectively. A Proficient teacher, according to G4SHS students, not only "believes his/her own efficacy and competence" but also "is self-confident". These two attributes, nonetheless, constitute Self-Confident factor for G3SHS students, indicating that G4SHS students interpret their English language teachers' personality in terms of their language proficiency.

Social development of G4SHS students extends to the fourth factor, i.e., *Humanistic*, extracted from the ELTAS in this study. For them a *Humanistic* teacher respects all ideas, listens to student's opinions, responds logically to suggestions and criticisms, accepts constructive criticisms, is flexible and understands learners well, respects learners as real individuals, pays attention to students of all abilities, helps learners spot and overcome their weaknesses, and "avoids discrimination and treats all fairly". The last attribute of *Humanistic* factor loaded acceptably neither on this nor on any other factor for G3SHS students, showing that students in senior high schools become more conscious of their perceived discrimination when they enter grade four.

The educational pressure of preparing for university entrance examination, however, renders G4SHS students insensitive towards their classmates as reflected in the fifth *Stimulating* factor. A *Stimulating* teacher for them employs multimedia materials such as CDs and tapes, arouses interest in learning English through interesting activities, employs interesting learning activities and assignments, teaches how to learn English outside the classroom, e.g., watching certain programs, provides opportunities to use English through meaningful activities, chooses interesting materials to teach, and has creativity in teaching. For G3SHS students, however, the *Stimulating* teacher has high ability learners help low ability classmates. This attribute does not load on any factor for G4SHS students.

While the sixth factor establishes *Organized* teachers as having twelve attributes for G3SHS students in KF&A's study, it narrows down to six for G4SHS students. For the latter group an *Organized* teacher presents information at the right pace based on students' level of learning, reduces English language learning anxiety, enjoys teaching English, employs methods of evaluation consistent with course outline as initially presented, employs appropriate evaluation techniques, and states course objectives clearly. In spite of having fewer attributes than the *Social* factor, the *Organized* genus correlates with the G3FEE (r=.25, *p*<.01) as much as the *Social* factor does, explaining 6.3% of variance in G4SHS students' English achievement.

As another grade four-specific dimension of EFL teachers' effectiveness, the *Systematic* factor specifies an English instructor who teaches systematically, organizes course content well in terms of hours and sessions, leaves and enters the class on time, and divides class time appropriately for the different language skills based on lesson objectives. Among the factors constituting the ELTAS, *Systematic* genus accounts for 3.7% of variance in G4SHS students' English achievement (r =.193, *p*<.01), which is even slightly higher than 3% explained by *Proficient* factor (r =.172, *p*<.01). Future research must show whether teachers' systemeticity relates more strongly to G4SHS students' English achievement when it is measured by objective tests such as schema-based cloze multiple choice item tests.

The last factor underlying the ELTAS is *Lenient*. As the only factor whose attributes are the same for grades three and four senior high school students, it specifies an English teacher who ignores cheating, gives good grades, i.e., does not take it hard, and designs simple and easy tests. Contrary to G3SHS students whose English achievement showed the strongest relationship with the *Lenient* factor (r=.16, *p*<.01), EFL teachers' qualification shows the strongest relationship with English achievement at grade four (r=.29, *p*<.01). However, the relationship between the *Lenient* factor and English achievement (r=.18, *p*<.01) is still slightly stronger than that of *Proficiency* factor (r=.17, *p*<.01) at grade four, calling for future research to explore the relationship further. It also calls for authorities' attention in the Ministry of Education to adopt appropriate strategies and policies to reverse and/or improve the relationships found between teacher effectiveness and English achievement.

APPENDIX

THE ITEMS COMPRISING THE PERSIAN ELTAS AND THEIR LOADINGS (L) ON ELEVEN FACTORS (F)

Item	F	L	معلم زبان انگليسي فعلي من ...	Disagree %	No Idea %	Agree %
1			آزمون ها و تكاليف را منصفانه و بر اساس برخي قوانين مشخص تصحيح مي كند	4	15	81
2	11	.322	آزمون هاي راحت و ساده طراحي مي كند	46	24	30
3	6	.354	از آموزش زبان انگليسي لذ ت مي برد	8	18	74
4			از اصول اخلاقي مثل دوري از تعصب تبعيت ميكند	7	32	61
5	11	.366	از تقلب چشم پوشي مي كند	55	25	21
6			از دست انداختن فراگيران اجتناب مي كند	14	24	62
7	6	.345	از روشهاي ارزشيابي كه با طرح درس اوليه همخواني دارد استفاده مي كند	11	33	56
8			از فراگيران قوي براي آموزش فراگيران ضعيف بهره مي جويد	31	36	32
9	5	.535	از فعاليت ها و تكاليف جالب استفاده مي كند	25	35	40
10	5	.566	از مواد سمعي و بصري مثل سي دي و نوار استفاده مي كند	58	18	24
11	6	.335	ازروشهاي ارزشيابي مناسب استفاده مي كند	11	32	57
12	6	.433	اضطراب يادگيري زبان انگيسي را كاهش مي دهد	17	24	58

13	6	.500	اطلاعات را با سرعتي متناسب با سطح يادگيري تك تك فراگيران ارائه مي دهد	15	20	65
14	3	.343	اعتماد بنفس دارد	2	10	87
15	4	.573	انتقاد سازنده را مي پذيرد	10	26	64
16	4	.484	انعطاف پذير است و فراگيران را خوب درك ميكند	11	23	66
17	3	.425	انگيسي را به انگليسي تدريس مي كند	23	17	59
18	3	.710	انگيسي را به خوبي و سليس صحبت مي كند	5	12	83
19	3	.612	انگيسي محاوره اي را خوب درك مي كند	5	24	71
20	6	.329	اهداف مطالب درسي را به وضوح بيان مي كند	6	13	81
21	3	.433	با آمادگي خوبي وارد كلاس مي شود	4	11	85
22	5	.558	با استفاده از فعاليت هاي جالب، علاقه به يادگيري زبان را بر مي انگيزد	23	37	40
23	5	.495	با استفاده از فعاليت هاي معنادار، موقعيت استفاده از زبان انگليسي را فراهم مي آورد	17	38	46
24	8	.395	با توجه به اهداف درس وقت كلاس را بطور مناسبي براي مهارتهاي مختلف زبان مثل صحبت كردن و خواندن تقيسم مي كند	13	22	65
25	8	.449	با توجه به مدت هر جلسه مطالب درسي را خوب سازماندهي مي كند	8	15	77
26			با درگيركردن خود فراگيران كلاس را خوب اداره مي كند	10	26	64
27	2	.459	با شوق و اشتياق تدريس مي كند	9	17	74
28	3	.397	با نظريه هاي فراگيري زبان خارجي آشنايي دارد	5	40	54
29			بازخورد سودمندي در مورد امتحانات و تكاليف مي دهد	8	34	58
30			براي توضيح مطلب از مثالهاي روشن و كافي بهره مي جويد	8	18	74
31	8	.454	بطور منظم و نظام مند تدريس مي كند	7	15	78
32	1	.360	به اندازه كافي تكاليف ميد هد	16	25	59
33	4	.619	به پيشنهادات و انتقادات پاسخي منطقي مي دهد	10	30	60
34	3	.646	به تلفظ زبان انگيسي تسلط دارد	5	14	82
35	4	.636	به تمامي ايده ها احترام مي گذارد	9	25	65
36	4	.350	به فراگيران اجازه مي دهد نقاط ضعف خود را پيدا كرده و آنها را برطرف كنند	12	30	59
37	1	.430	به فراگيران انگيزه يادگيري انگليسي و انجام تحقيق مي دهد	17	36	47
38	4	.455	به فراگيران به عنوان افراد واقعي احترام مي گذارد	7	23	71
39	1	.355	به فراگيران و يادگيري آنها علاقه مند است (براي مثال آنها را با اسم صدا مي كند)	20	27	53
40	3	.409	به كارآيي و توانايي خود ايمان دارد	2	19	79
41	3	.539	به گرامر و دستور زبان انگليسي تسلط دارد	4	11	85
42	3	.626	به لغت و كلمات انگليسي تسلط دارد	2	10	88
43	8	.435	به موقع كلاس را ترك مي كند	5	11	84
44	8	.426	به موقع وارد كلاس مي شود	6	11	83
45	4	.620	به نظرات و عقايد فراگيران گوش مي كند	8	23	69
46	4	.404	به همه فراگيران با توانايي هاي مختلف توجه دارد	11	28	60
47	1	.332	پيشرفت را ترغيب و رفتارهاي غير قابل قبول را تقبيح مي كند	7	37	56
48	4	.331	تبعض قائل نمي شود و با همه عادلانه برخورد مي كند	12	21	67
49	1	.377	تدريس خود را با سطوح توانايي انگليسي فراگيران منطبق مي سازد	11	26	63
50	1	.400	تدريس خود را با نياز هاي فراگيران تطبيق مي دهد	11	30	59
51	1	.528	تكاليفي مي دهد كه نياز به كار گروهي دارد	33	29	38
52	1	.523	توانايي ها، استعدادها و ضعف هاي فراگيران را مي داند	17	35	49
53	5	.501	چگونگي يادگيري زبان انگليسي مثل تماشاي برنامه هاي بخصوص را ياد مي دهد	31	38	31
54	1	.351	حاضرو مايل به مذاكره براي تغيير در مطالب درسي است	16	40	44
55			حضور در كلاس را چك و به آن بها مي دهد	7	20	74
56	1	.327	خلاقيت در يادگيري و بهبود آن را ترغيب و تشويق مي كند	10	29	62
57	2	.579	خوش اخلاق است	5	13	82
58	2	.638	داراي ذوق خوش طبعي است	7	18	75
59	3	.539	دانش خوبي از مطالب درسي دارد	3	13	84
60	3	.453	دانش عمومي خوبي دارد و مي تواند سئوالاتي را كه مستقيما به درس مربوط نيستند جواب دهد	4	21	75
61	5	.429	در تدريس خلاقيت دارد	17	28	55
62	2	.464	در تعامل با ديگران راحت است	3	21	76
63	1	.359	در روش تدريس به جمعيت كلاس توجه دارد	10	26	64
64	2	.412	در فراگيران اعتماد به نفس توليد مي كند	14	33	53
65	1	.330	در مواقع ضروري از اقتدار خود براي كنترل كلاس بهره مي جويد	10	21	68
66	11	.356	در نمره دادن دست و دل باز است (سخت نمي گيرد)	38	28	34
67	2	.521	دلسوز و مهربان است	9	23	68
68	2	.599	رابطه عاطفي قوي با فراگيران برقرار مي كند	14	33	53
69	2	.637	رفتارش دوستانه است	7	19	74
70	1	.334	روش هاي ارزشيابي را به روشني مشخص مي كند	8	32	61
71	10	.454	روي نقاط و مطالب مهم تاكيد مي كند	4	11	85
72	10	.387	سئوالات را با دقت و بطور متقاعد كننده اي جواب مي دهد	5	17	77
73	2	.660	شاد و سرحال است	8	15	77
74	2	.497	صبور و شكيبا است	8	18	74
75	2	.634	فردي پر انرژي و پويا است	9	20	71
76	3	.410	فرهنگ انگليسي زبانان را خوب مي شناسد	7	33	60
77	2	.496	فضايي آرام و دلپذير در كلاس توليد مي كند	10	22	68
78	1	.346	قابل دسترسي براي پاسخگويي به سئوالات است	10	25	65
79	3	.374	لباس هاي تميز و مناسب مي پوشد	4	10	86
80	3	.517	متون انگليسي را با تسلط خوب مي خواند (قرائت مي كند)	4	12	84
81	2	.412	محيط آموزشي مطلوب و استقبال كننده اي براي همه فراگيران فراهم مي آورد	12	28	60
82	1	.580	مرتب تكاليف را بررسي و به آنها نمره ميدهد	24	36	40
83	1	.556	مرتب فراگيران را ارزشيابي كرده و پيشرفت آنها را در طول ترم زير نظر دارد	14	29	57

84	1	.563	مشكلات يادگيري را تشخيص و آنها را برطرف مي كند	16	31	53
85	5	.436	مطالب جالب را براي تدريس انتخاب مي كند	17	33	50
86	7	.407	مطالب درسي را به زندگي واقعي فراگيران ربط مي دهد	18	34	48
87	7	.445	مطالب را به انگليسي خوب مي نويسد	8	22	70
88	7	.450	مطالب هر جلسه را چنان خوب توضيح ميدهد كه همه مي فهمند	10	23	67
89	7	.462	مطالبي را تدريس مي كند كه به اهداف مطرح شده مرتبط هستند	7	27	66
90	2	.348	مقيد به ارزشهاي اجتماعي بوده و با فراگيران خوب برخورد مي كند.	6	22	71
91	7	.389	موضوعات درس را چنان به هم مرتبط مي سازد كه همه آنها را به خوبي درك مي كنند	10	28	62
92	1	.390	موقعيت يكسان براي شركت، بحث و طرح سئوال فراهم مي آورد	10	29	61
93	9	.679	نتايج امتحانات را سريع اعلام ميكند	13	25	62
94			نسبت به دانش خود درمورد مواد درسي اعتماد سازي مي كند	6	32	62
95	1	.368	نظم و انضباط را از طريق پيش گيري برقرار ميكند	9	27	64
96	1	.388	نگرش هاي فراگيران در مورد يادگيري را مد نظر دارد حتي اگر منفي باشند	11	41	48
97	1	.491	نيازها و تفاوتهاي فردي را تشخيص داده و به آنها توجه دارد	12	39	48
98	9	.648	ورقه هاي امتحانات و تكاليف را به براي انجام كارهاي بعدي به موقع بر مي گرداند	10	26	63
99			هم از فراگيران و هم از خود انتظارات بالايي دارد	8	29	62
100	1	.404	هم بطور كيفي و هم بطور كمي ارزشيابي مي كند	7	35	58
101	1	.385	هم در داخل و هم در خارج از كلاس به فراگيران كمك مي كند	10	34	55
102	1	.440	همه فراگيران را در فرايند يادگيري و تدريس دخيل مي سازد	12	22	66

REFERENCES

[1]　Brekelmans, M., Wubbels, Th., & Creton, H. A. (1990). A study of student perceptions of physics teacher behavior. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 27, 335-350.

[2]　Brok, P. D., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2004). Interpersonal teacher behavior and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15 (3-4), 407-442.

[3]　Brosh, H. (1996). Perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 125-138.

[4]　Cook, V. (1991). Second language learning and language teaching. London: Edward Arnold.

[5]　Den Brok, P. (2001). Teaching and student outcomes. Utrecht, the Netherlands: WCC.

[6]　DiLalla, D. L., & Dollinger, S. J. (2006). Cleaning up data and running preliminary analyses. In F. T. L. Leong and J. T. Austin (Ed.). *The psychology research handbook: A guide for graduate students and research assistants* (241-253). California: Sage.

[7]　Doff, A. (1988). Teach English, a training course for teachers: Trainer's handbook. Cambridge: CUP.

[8]　Driscoll, A., Peterson, K., Crow, H., & Larson, B. (1985). Student reports for primary teacher evaluation. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 9 (3), 43-50.

[9]　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.

[10]　Fisher, D. L., Fraser, B. J., & Wubbels, T. (1992). Teacher communication style and school environment. Paper presented at the 1992 ECER conference, Enschede, The Netherlands.

[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 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*, 18 (70), 55-76.

[14]　Khodadady, E. (2010). Factors underlying characteristics of effective English language teachers: Validity and sample effect. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13 (2), 47-73.

[15]　Khodadady, E. (2013). Research principles, methods and statistics in applied linguistics. Mashhad: Hamsayeh Aftab.

[16]　Khodadady, E., & Ghahari, S. (2011). Validation of the Persian cultural intelligence scale and exploring its relationship with gender, education, travelling abroad and place of living. *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, 11(7), 65-75.

[17]　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.

[18]　Khodadady, E., Fakhrabadi, Z. G, & Azar, H. K. (2012). Designing and validating a comprehensive scale of English language teachers' attributes and establishing its relationship with achievement. *American Journal of Scientific Research*, 82, 113-125.

[19]　Lowyck, J. (1994). Teaching effectiveness: An overview of studies. *Tijdschrift voor Onderwijs research*, 19, 17-25.

[20]　Mak, A. M. (2001). Rating of teacher behavior by primary school students: Are they up to it? Unpublished Master Thesis, Twente University, Enschede, the Netherlands.

[21]　Moafian, F., & Pishghadam, R. (2008). Construct validation of a questionnaire on characteristics of successful English language teachers. *Pazhuhesh-e Zabanhaye Khareji Journal* (University of Tehran), 54, 127-142.

[22]　Park, G. P., & Lee, H. W. (2006). Characteristics of effective English teachers perceived by high school teachers and students in Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 7 (2), 236-248.

[23]　Peterson, K., & Stevens, D. (1988). Student reports for school teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 2, 19-31.

[24]　Scriven, M. (1994). Using student ratings in teacher evaluation. *Evaluation Perspectives*, 4 (1), 3-6.

[25]　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.

[26]　Suwandee, A. (1995). Students' perceptions of university instructors' effective teaching characteristics. *SLLT Journal*, 5, 6-22.

[27]　Taba, H., Tylor, R., & Smith, B. O. (1998). The predictive validity of student evaluations in the identification of meritorious teachers. Research Report. Washington, DC: John Jones School District.

[28] Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). Using multivariate statistics (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
[29] Wubbels, T., & Levy, J. (1991). A comparison of interpersonal behavior of Dutch and American teachers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15, 1-18.
[30] Wubbels, Th., Creton, H. A., & Hooymayers, H. P. (1985). Discipline problems of beginning teachers, international teacher behavior mapped out. Abstracted in Resources in Education, 20, 12, 153, ERIC document 260040.

Ebrahim Khodadady was born in Iran in 1958. He obtained his PhD in Applied Linguistics from the University of Western Australia in 1998. He holds TESL Ontario and Canadian Language Benchmarks Placement Test (CLPBPT) certificates and has taught English as a first, second and foreign language to high school and university students in Australia, Canada and Iran.

He is currently an academic member of Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Branch, Mashhad, Iran. He was invited as a VIP by Brock University in Canada in 2004 and served as the Associate Director of Assessment Center at George Brown College in Toronto for almost a year. His published books are *Multiple-Choice Items in Testing: Practice and Theory* (Tehran, Rahnama, 1999), *Reading Media Texts: Iran-America Relations* (Sanandaj, Kurdistan University, 1999) and *English Language Proficiency Course: First Steps* (Sanandaj, Kurdistan University, 2001). His main research interests are Testing, Language Learning and Teaching.

Dr. Khodadady is currently a member of Teaching English Language and Literature Society of Iran (TELLSI), TESL Ontario and European Society for Translation Studies. He is on the editorial board of *Ferdowsi Review: An Iranian Journal of TESL, Literature and Translation Studies* and has reviewed some research papers for *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics* and *TESL Canada Journal* as a guest reviewer.

Beheshteh Shakhsi Dastgahian was born in Iran in 1973. She is the MA student in Applied Linguistics in Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Branch, Mashhad, Iran. She is currently teaching English as foreign language to high school and pre-university students in the educational district three in Mashhad, Iran. She has participated in all educational programs related to the State Department of Education up to now, and hold a Diploma in Computer Skills. Her main research interests include Language Proficiency and Multiple Intelligences.