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Abstract—This study aimed to explore the relationship between English language education policy (ELEP) and teacher effectiveness (TE) at grade three senior high schools (G3SHS) in Mashhad, Iran. To this end, the English Language Policy Inventory (ELPI) designed and validated by Khodadady, Arian, and Hosseinabadi (2013) and English Language Teachers’ Attribute Scale (ELTAS) developed and validated by Khodadady, Fakhrabadi and Azar (2012) were administered to 48 teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL) and their 1072 EFL learners. The correlational analysis of results showed that the two ELEP and TE domains correlated significantly with each other. The same analysis revealed significant relationships between Harmonic Curriculum, International Interaction, Internationalizing Native Culture, Methodological Development, International Understanding, All-Compassing Improvement and Functional Organization genera of the ELPI and Qualified, Social, Stimulating, Organized, Proficient, Humanistic and Self-Confident genera of the ELTAS. The findings are discussed from both theoretical and empirical perspectives and suggestions are made for future research.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In order to define “language” as the main single concept forming a part of his textbook Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, Brown (2007) reviewed the literature and concluded that no single definition will fulfill the objective. He, therefore, opted for a composite definition consisting of eight statements which he believed ‘provide a reasonably concise “25-word-or-less” definition of language’ (p. 6). Similarly, in order to supply his readers of the textbook Research Principles, Methods and Statistics in Applied Linguistics with a distinct definition of “research”, Khodadady (2013) followed Brown because “a composite definition captures the nature of research and sheds light on some research features which are usually overlooked in single definitions” (p. 2).

The present researchers believe single and composite definitions of words such as “language” and “research” derive their rationale from two approaches of schema theory, i.e., macrostructural and microstructural, employed to describe reading comprehension ability in the literature (Khodadady, 1997; Khodadady & Herriman, 2000). Single definitions are macrostructural in that they are approached as universally accepted knowledge expressed and endorsed by authorities in the field helping readers understand what they read because they are “guided by the principle that every input is mapped against existing schema and that all aspects of that schema must be compatible with the input information” (Carrell, 1983).

The writers who offer composite definitions are, however, followers of microstructural approach because they provide their readers with as many relevant concepts as they deem necessary in order to help their readers relate to the concept under comprehension as they themselves do. The approach is based on the assumption that there is no single definition or macro concept shared by both writers and readers but a series and combination of concepts represented by the writers’ words or “schemata” (Khodadady, 2013) which help readers understand what the writers say and agree or disagree with them as an objective criteria of their understanding. The present study is based on a microstructural approach in which the relationship between English language education policy (ELEP) and teacher effectiveness (TE) is explored.

Dixon (2009), for example, adopted a macrostructural approach towards the ELEP when he related it to a “wide range of educational practices with obvious social, cultural, and even political implications” (cited in Kiany, Mirhosseini & Navidinia, 2011, p. 50) as a single definition. Similarly, Karyolemou () defined the ELEP macrostructurally as decisions...
made on ideological issues dealing with nationhood, citizenship and identity. Microstructural approach, however, starts with specifying each and all the sentences and their constituting schemata stating the reasons for which English language is taught and then builds the ELEP on these statements made under specific conditions in given places and at a given period of time.

Khodadady, Arian, and Hosseinabadi (2013) [henceforth KA&H], for example, reviewed the literature and identified 64 statements unofficially elaborating the ELEP in Iran and developed their English Language Policy Inventory (ELPI) to explore the domain. By drawing on Khodadady and Hessarzadeh’s (2014) treatment of each word used in texts such as the ELPI as schemata, Khodadady and Aryanjam (2014) parsed and codified all the schemata comprising the ELPI studies to study them linguistically and cognitively as Khodadady and Dastgahian (2015) did with the 102 statements comprising the English Language Teachers’ Attribute Scale (ELTAS) developed and validated by Khodadady, Fakhrabadi and Azar (2012) [henceforth KF&A].

The linguistic analysis of 250 schema types comprising the ELPI, for example, shows that they belong to 14 genera, i.e., 55 adjectives (22.0%), 3 adverbs (1.2%), 101 nouns (40.4%), 60 verbs (24.0%), 3 conjunctions (1.2%), 6 determiners (2.4%), 12 prepositions (4.8%), 1 pronoun (.4%), 1 syntactic verb (.4%), 4 names (1.6%), 2 para-adverbs (.8%), and 2 particles (.8%). These genera in turn establish the superordinate categories of semantic (n = 219, 87.6%), syntactic (n=23, 9.2%) and parasyntactic (n=8, 3.2%) domains, indicating that the ELEP which is unofficially followed in Iran is defined in a language which has its own specific schema types, genera and domain having hierarchical relationships with each other.

While for a word such as ‘globalize” the EEL teachers cannot, for example, find any entry in the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (Onions, 1973) because of historical reasons, they should relate it to the schema “Iran” in the first statement of the ELPI, “one of the ELEPs is globalizing Iran”, in order to decide whether they teach the EL in their classes in order to make their country globally known and accepted. Hence, the schema of “globalization” is understood and interpreted in reference to the other schemata constituting the statement. To differentiate the cognitive analysis of a statement from its linguistic analysis, Khodadady and Dastgahian (2016) employed the term “species” expressing a concept which is broader than its constituting schemata when they are understood individually, i.e., “one”, “of”, “the”, “English”, “language”, “teaching”, “policy”, “is”, “globalizing”, and “Iran”.

As agentive, comparative, dative and superlative species form the linguistic genus of adjectives contributing to the language of the ELPI, out of 64 statements comprising the inventory, species 2, 9, 16, 17, 26, 30, 31, 40 bring up concepts which are closely related to the globalization of Iran as stated in species 1 and thus form a cognitive genus called Internationalizing Native Culture by KA&H. While no researcher has established any logical genera for the ELEP anywhere in the world so far, KA&H did extract the genus of Internationalizing Native Culture along with Harmonic Curriculum, International Interaction, Methodological Development, International Understanding, All-Compassing Improvement, and Functional Organization genera from the responses of 619 English language teachers who took the ELPI in 2013. They were offering general English and English for specific purposes in secondary and tertiary education center in Mashhad, Iran.

According to Khodadady and Aryanjam (2014), the schemata, species and genera of the ELPI constitute the domain of ELEP within a hierarchical system in which the relationship of the ELPI with other variables of concern can be explored. The present researchers have, therefore, adopted the microstructural approach of schema theory to find out whether there is any significant relationship between the ELEP and TE domains as measured by the ELPI and ELTAS, respectively. The study also explores whether the seven genera of the ELPI relate significantly to Qualified, Social, Stimulating, Organized, Proficient, Humanistic, Self-Confident, and Lenient genera of the ELTAS.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

Two groups of participants took part in the present study voluntarily: grade three senior high school (G3SHS) students and their EFL teachers.

1. English Language Learners

One thousand seventy four G3SHS students took part in the study. Two of them were, however, removed from the study because they had not answered most of the items on the ELTAS. The age of 1072 participants ranged between 13 and 19 (mean = 16.80, SD = .79). In terms of gender, 891 (83.1%) and 181 (16.9%) were female and male, respectively. They specified Persian (n = 1028, 95.9%), English (n = 23, 2.1%), Kurdish (n = 10, .9%), Lori (n = 1, .1%), and Turkish (n = 8, .7%) as their mother language. They were studying at 30 senior high schools as shown Table 1. As can be seen, the highest number of participants were studying at Saadi (n = 69, 6.4%), Imam Reza ((n = 65, 6.1%), and Sayadeh Shirazi (n = 56, 5.2%) senior high schools.
2. Teachers of English as a Foreign Language

Seventy five EFL teachers took part in this study. It was, however, realized that twenty seven of them had administered the ELTAS to their G4SHS students. These teachers were excluded from the study because Khodadady and Dastgahian’s (2014) findings show that the genera underlying the ELTAS differ from G3SHS to G4SHS students. Forty one and seven of the remaining forty eight teacher three teachers were female and male in gender, respectively. They were holding associate diploma (n=1, 2.1%), BA/BSc (n=30, 62.5%), MA/MSc (n=16, 33.3%) degrees in Chemistry (n=1, 2.1%) English Language and Literature (n=2, 4.2%), English Literature (n=3, 6.3%), English Translation (n= 3, 6.3%), Linguistics (n=2, 4.2%), and Teaching English as a Foreign Language (n=37, 77.1%). They had been teaching English from three to 29 years (Mean=17.18, SD=7.17) in senior high schools. They all spoke Persian as their mother language.

B. Instruments

Three instruments were employed in this study: a Demographic Scale, English Language Teachers’ Attribute Scale and English Language Policy Inventory.

1. Demographic Scale

For gathering the data related to EFL teachers a Demographic Scale (DS) containing 13 questions was designed to be used with the ELPI. They dealt with the teachers’ age, place of teaching, level and years of teaching EFL, gender, marital status, field and degree of study and the language they spoke at home. Also a DS was developed to be used with the ELTAS to collect the demographic information related to G3SHS students’ age, gender, overall English achievement score in 2013, and the language they spoke at home. Questions in both DSs require giving short answers in writing and selecting a certain alternative from among few choices.

2. English Language Teachers’ Attribute Scale

The English Language Teachers’ Attribute Scale (ELTAS) developed and validated by KF&A was used in this study. They scrutinized teacher evaluation questionnaires employed at Azad University, Brock University, Danesh Primary School in Torbat, Khayyam University, Mottahari High School, Nasrabad High School in Torbat, Samand Guidance School, and Tabaran Higher Education Institute and listed all teacher attributes found on these forms. Then they filtered them with the attributes brought up by Brosh, (1996), Elizabeth, May and Chee (2008), Park and Lee (2006) Moafiyan and Pishghadam (1998) and Suwandee (1995) to complete the list and finally added some based on their own personal teaching experiences. KF&A submitted the finalized list to the committee responsible for English language teaching in Education Bureau in Mashhad and developed their 102-item ELTAS.

The incomplete statement “my present English teacher ...” on the ELTAS directed the respondents to focus on the teachers who offered English to them at the time the project was conducted. They were asked to evaluate each of the 102 attributes describing their teachers by choosing one of the five alternatives provided. Species one, for example, required them to completely agree, agree, express no idea, disagree or completely disagree with the statement that the teachers are fair and based on some rules.” KF&A administered the scale to 1328 female G3SHS students and extracted eight genera from 94 species by subjecting their students’ responses to Principal Axis Factoring and rotating the factors via Varimax with Kaiser Normalization, i.e., Qualified, Social, Stimulating, Organized, Proficient, Humanistic, Self-Confident, and Lenient. They reported the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of .95, .94, .90, .89, .89, .89, .44 and .47, for the eight genera, respectively.

3. English Language Policy Inventory

In addition to the ELTAS, the English Language Policy Inventory (ELPI) developed by KA&H was employed in this study. They reviewed the literature and identified 64 statements representing the most pertinent species of ELEP domain followed unofficially in Iran (Kiany, Navidinia, & Momenian, 2010; Kiany, Mirhosseini & Navidinia, 2011; Kiany, Mahdavy & Ghafar Samar, 2011). Each statement on the ELPI is introduced by the incomplete statement “one
of the English language teaching policies …”. It is followed by the verb schema “is” to provide the EFL teachers with a common theme to decide the relevance of each species of ELEP to their own teaching.

The first species, for example, required the 619 EFL teachers participating in KA&H’s study to completely disagree, disagree, disagree to some extent, express no idea, agree to some extent, agree and completely agree with “globalizing Iran” as a species of ELEP. The application of PAF and VKN to their responses showed that the 64 species loaded acceptably on seven genera, i.e., i.e., Harmonic Curriculum, International Interaction, Internationalizing Native Culture, Methodological Development, International Understanding, All-Compassing Improvement and Functional Organization. Further statistical analyses showed that the ELPI and its seven genera had the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of .97, .96, .88, .85, .87, .88, .82, .75, respectively.

C. Procedures

After coordinating with the authorities of various senior high schools and EFL teachers the measures were distributed among G3SHS students by the second researcher in person. The teachers had told the students that they would consider taking the ELTAS as part of their class activity and give them some credit for their participation. While they were taking the scale, the teachers themselves completed the ELPI. As the students were completing the ELTAS, the second researcher walked along the aisles and ensured that the students answered all the questions as she interacted with them in their mother language. During the interaction no particular question dealing with the species of scales were raised. Some occasional comments were, however, made by teachers regarding the ELPI and its development process. Upon having the ELTAS and ELPI completed within approximately 20 and 30 minutes, respectively, the researcher expressed her appreciation, wrote her contact number on the board and announced that interested participants could get in touch with her if they wanted to know the results.

D. Data Analysis

The descriptive statistics of the ELTAS and ELPI was estimated to determine the functioning of the measures. Cronbach’s alpha was employed to establish the internal consistency of the measures and their underlying genera. Since correlational studies are designed to investigate the nature and strength of functional relationships among the variables of interest (Brown, 1988), the statistics of covariance belonging to the two measures were also estimated by utilizing Pearson correlations. All statistical analyses were performed by using IBM SPSS statistics 20 to test the hypotheses below.

H1. There will be no significant relationship between English language policy and teacher effectiveness.

H2. The domain of English language policy will not correlate significantly with the genera of teacher effectiveness.

H3. The genera of English language policy will not correlate significantly with the genera of teacher effectiveness.

III. RESULTS

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of the ELPI and its seven underlying factors. As can be seen, the inventory is a highly reliable psychological measure of ELEP as determined by G3SHS English teachers ($\alpha = .99$). Its reliability level is even higher than the alpha reported by KF&A ($\alpha = .97$) with 619 secondary and higher education (SHE) teachers. Similar to the domain, the genera constituting the ELEP of G3SHS teachers are more reliable than those of SHE teachers Functional Organization genus, for example, has the coefficient of 0.88 and 0.75 for the two groups, respectively. These results show that the ELPI provides a more reliable measure of ELEP when it is administered to teachers offering English to a specific grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genera and Domain</th>
<th># of Ss</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>This study</th>
<th>KA&amp;H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Curriculum</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>103.10</td>
<td>33.159</td>
<td>-511</td>
<td>-.666</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Interaction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.79</td>
<td>12.760</td>
<td>-738</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalizing Native Culture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.06</td>
<td>12.010</td>
<td>-416</td>
<td>-.384</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological Development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>11.257</td>
<td>-425</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Understanding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>12.112</td>
<td>-392</td>
<td>-.669</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Compassing Improvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>7.122</td>
<td>-363</td>
<td>-.384</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Organization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>5.123</td>
<td>-235</td>
<td>-.950</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPI</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>311.23</td>
<td>84.242</td>
<td>-511</td>
<td>-.274</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics of the ELTAS and its genera. As can be seen, the alpha reliability coefficient (RC) of the scale is as high as the RC obtained by KF&A (.97). Among the seven factors, the Qualified and Social genera have the highest RC’s, i.e., .94 and .92, respectively. Stimulating, Organized, Proficient, and Humanistic factors enjoy acceptable levels of reliability as well, i.e., .87, .84, .85, and .83, respectively. Self-Confident factor, however, has an RC of .50 which is the second lowest. It was expected because it consists of only two species. The Lenient genus, nonetheless, is the lowest in reliability, i.e., $\alpha = .34$, in spite of consisting of three species. Its RC is even lower than the coefficient reported by KF&A ($\alpha = .47$). In sharp contrast, the Self-Confident genus is, however, the only
factor whose RC in this study (.50) is higher than that of KF&A’s (.44), indicating that the more self-confident the G3SHS teachers are, the less reliable they become in their leniency.

### Table 3
**Descriptive Statistics of the ELTAS and Its Underlying Factors (N = 1072)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genera</th>
<th># of Ss</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Alpha This study</th>
<th>Alpha KF&amp;A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>102.09</td>
<td>21.699</td>
<td>-0.820</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.71</td>
<td>11.351</td>
<td>-0.611</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>11.946</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45.79</td>
<td>8.390</td>
<td>-0.583</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.20</td>
<td>7.953</td>
<td>-0.715</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>7.173</td>
<td>-0.371</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confident</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>1.893</td>
<td>-1.007</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>2.573</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>-0.351</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELTAS</strong></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>341.12</td>
<td>62.127</td>
<td>-0.419</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational analysis of the ELPI and ELTAS showed that they were significantly related ($r = .091, p < .01$) and thus rejected the first hypothesis that there will be no significant relationship between English language policy and teacher effectiveness. The correlation coefficients (CCs) presented in Table 4 also rejected the second hypothesis to a large extent as well. As can be seen, as a measure of ELEP domain, the ELPI correlates significantly with the Qualified ($r = .107, p < .01$), Proficient ($r = .087, p < .01$), Social ($r = .069, p < .05$) and Humanistic ($r = .068, p < .05$) genera of teacher effectiveness domain.

### Table 4
**Correlations between the ELPI and the Factors Underlying the ELTAS (N = 1072)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELPI and Its Genera</th>
<th>ELTAS Genera</th>
<th>Qualified</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Stimulating</th>
<th>Organized</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Humanistic</th>
<th>Self-Confident</th>
<th>Lement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELPI</td>
<td></td>
<td>.107***</td>
<td>.060*</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.070*</td>
<td>.087**</td>
<td>.068*</td>
<td>.047*</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>.100**</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.063*</td>
<td>.085**</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td>.072**</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalizing Native Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>.065*</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>.113**</td>
<td>.096**</td>
<td>.066*</td>
<td>.070*</td>
<td>.102**</td>
<td>.087**</td>
<td>.075*</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td>.133**</td>
<td>.101**</td>
<td>.080**</td>
<td>.094**</td>
<td>.114**</td>
<td>.089**</td>
<td>.073*</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Compassing Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.133**</td>
<td>.110**</td>
<td>.081**</td>
<td>.107**</td>
<td>.102**</td>
<td>.102**</td>
<td>.060*</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td></td>
<td>.094**</td>
<td>.060*</td>
<td>.061*</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.073*</td>
<td>.062*</td>
<td>.045*</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The results presented in Table 4 above reject the third hypothesis to a large extent as well, i.e., the genera of English language policy will not correlate significantly with the genera of teacher effectiveness. As can be seen, the Qualified genus of teacher effectiveness, for example, correlates significantly with all the genera constituting ELEP, i.e., International Understanding ($r = .133, p < .01$), All-Compassing Improvement ($r = .133, p < .01$), Methodological Development ($r = .113, p < .01$), Harmonic Curriculum ($r = .100, p < .01$), Functional Organization ($r = .094, p < .01$), International Interaction ($r = .072, p < .05$), and Internationalizing Native Culture ($r = .065, p < .05$), indicating that policy designers have to rely on Qualified G3SHS teachers in order to enforce their polices.

**IV. Discussions and Conclusion**

The microstructural approach of schema theory provided the present researchers with a sound rationale to study the domains of English language education policy (ELEP) and teacher effectiveness (TE). The results showed a significant relationship between the two domains which can be justified by focusing on the linguistic and cognitive structures of the ELPI and ELTAS through which the domains have been explored. Four hundred eighty-five schema types comprise the two domains among which only 56 are common to both, i.e., a, achievements, activities, all, and, approach, appropriate, at, attention, based, both, by, content, culture, different, English, evaluation, for, foreign, high, hours, ideas, in, information, is, knowledge, language, learners, learning, lesson, life, materials, methods, necessary, needs, not, objectives, of, on, programs, qualitatively, quantitatively, skills, social, students, such as, teaching, the, their, through, time, to, use, values, way, and with.

The comparative analysis of schemata comprising the two domains is based on Khodadady and Lagzian’s (2013) study in which they parsed and categorized 70 pages of the English textbook entitled "Radiology: Principles and Interpretation" (White & Pharoah, 2004) and compared them with their Persian translation, RADIOLOGY DAHAN: OSOOL WA TAFSIR (Valizadeh, trans. 1384). Their results showed that "the two texts differed significantly from each
other at the domain, genus and species level” (p. 81) when they were analyzed linguistically. While two texts dealing specifically with the same cognitive domain expressed in two languages, i.e., radiology, differ from each other linguistically, finding a significant relationship between the two distinct domains of English language policy and teacher effectiveness assumes great educational importance.

In spite of having 56 common schemata, the ELPI differs significantly from the ELTAS in having 190 schemata which are distinct as regards the 239 schemata comprising the ELTAS. The Chi-Square analysis shows that the number of common and distinct cognitive schemata comprising the ELPI and ELTAS is significantly different from each other ($\chi^2 = 111.023$, df = 2, $p<.001$). The difference shows itself best in the semantic relationship the cognitive schemata enter into with each other in the two scales. “Achievement” as a common cognitive schema, for example, relates to species 56 of ELPI, “understanding and transferring human cultural heritage and scientific achievements” whereas its contribution to the ELTAS occurs in the context of species 47, i.e., “Encourages achievements and discourages unacceptable behaviours”.

The statistical and schema-based findings of this study thus show that teacher training, learner education and policy development must be interwoven and supported locally and nationally at all levels of education because they are significantly related to each other. The cognitive schema “achieve” in species 15, for example, represents the policy of “achieving the superior position in science, economy and technology in the area”, however, no concrete steps are ever taken either by the ministry of education or by any other ministry to hold local and national English tests to identity the teachers and students who excel in their English achievement. There is no doubt that identifying and rewarding teachers and students who have reached “superior position in English” will provide external motivation for others to follow the suit.

As a cognitive domain, the ELEP relates significantly to the Qualified ($r = .107, p<.01$), Proficient ($r = .087, p<.01$), Organized ($r = .070, p<.05$), Social ($r = .069, p<.05$) and Humanistic ($r = .068, p<.05$) genera of TE domain. These findings show that EFL teachers’ qualification, proficiency, being organized and sociable need to be emphasized in pursuing ELEPs at G3SHSs. Teachers scoring high on these genera should be encouraged and supported by awards or various types of recognition such as being named as the best or most accomplished teacher of year. The Lenient genus, however, must be discouraged by taking appropriate actions such as holding and administering objective tests. This is because it relates significantly neither to the ELEP nor to its underlying genera.

As the first factor underlying the ELPI, Harmonic Curriculum genus is the most complex in terms of its constituting 23 species and 203 schema token and 116 schema types. It requires harmonizing and choosing appropriate educational content and materials, reforming, supervising and reviewing educational objectives and curriculum by determining the time and effort required, offering comprehensive and high quality services, attending to policies, objectives, teaching materials and methods, training teachers, establishing stable educational programs, harmonizing curriculum with the educational conditions and facilities, developing economy via tourism, trade and technology, emphasizing speaking and listening skills, promoting interpersonal and intercultural relationships, getting language policy designers and enforcers work together, determining, directing and designing educational activities, choosing the content of materials taught to lower ages in the framework of amusement and entertainment, teaching foreign languages to all, attending to local areas, organizing the educational content of upper levels in harmony with the content of other areas of learning in order to deepen their quality, expanding social relationship, employing the experiences of other countries in revising and modifying curriculum, decreasing language learning age and educational grade, choosing content by focusing on improving qualification and combining it with the ethical thought, criticism and evaluation as well as Islamic-Iranian identity, designing educational programs in a professional manner and organizing teaching content based on learners’ needs.

The Harmonic Curriculum Genus of ELPI relates significantly to three genera of teacher effectiveness, i.e., Qualified ($r = .100, p<.01$), Proficient ($r = .085, p<.05$), and Organized ($r = .063, p<.05$), emphasizing its irrelevance to five genera underlying the ELTAS, i.e., Social, Stimulating, Humanistic, Self-Confident and Lenient factors. According to an officially employed teacher of ministry of education, the EFL teachers have to give a passing score to those students who fail the English course otherwise they will use a regulation which allows them to move to a higher grade if they fail one course only. In other words, they are forced by regulations to be lenient officially. The finding of this study do show that no Harmonic Curriculum could be enforced by EFL teachers in their classes if they adopt a social, stimulating, humanistic and lenient approach in their G3SHS classes.

As the second factor underlying the ELPI, the International Interaction genus consists of eight species, 47 schema tokens and 43 schema types. It highlights the role of English language in catching up with scientific progresses made in the west, increasing the possibility of talking to other nations, benefiting from cumulative information networks, providing the opportunity for finding better jobs, creating effective relationships with the international society, entering universal interactions, training global citizens and translating and writing books dealing with various scientific fields. Not surprisingly, the International Interaction genus relates significantly only to the Qualified factor underlying the ELTAS ($r = .07, p<.05$). According to Khodadady, Fakhrabadi and Azar (2012), Qualified EFL teachers 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 (p. 120)

Nine species, 60 and 40 schema tokens and types, respectively, represent the cognitive genus of Internationalizing Native Culture (INC). It entails popularizing Islamic-Iranian culture, advertising Islam in the world, confronting cultural invasion and changing its direction to transferring native culture, teaching English based on Islamic principles, values and objectives, paving the way for globalization of the Persian language, teaching the language based on national and native culture, transferring native culture and identity to the global society, globalizing Iran and decentralizing teaching and learning decisions.

In spite of having national and religious objectives, the INC genus shows significant relationship only with the Qualified genus of teacher effectiveness (r= .065, p<.05). The schema “culture” plays a key role in forming the INC genus because it has a token of four and enjoys the distinct semantic features of “Islamic-Iranian”, “native”, and “national” within the genus. Unfortunately, however, to the best knowledge of the present researchers, no clear and operationalized definition of “culture” has been offered so far to be captured and measured with a psychological measure such as the ELPI dealing specifically with Iranian culture.

Lantolf and Thorne (2006), for example, defined culture as “an objective force that infuses social relationships and the historically developed uses of artifacts in concrete activity” (p. 1). They elaborated it further by claiming that “culture is (1) supra-individual and independent of any single person, and (2) rooted in the historical production of value and significance as realized in shared social practice” (p. 1). Lantolf and Thorne offer language as the truest example of “symbolic artifacts” (p. 62). If these scholars’ argument holds true, the culture-dependent genus of the ELPI must relate to the genera of ELTAS because of their common language i.e., Persian.

The findings of this study, however, support the argument very weakly as they establish a significant relationship between the INC and Qualified genera as two culturally related factors. They do, nonetheless, reject Lantolf and Thorne’s (2006) view as regards the relationship between the INC and the remaining seven genera of teacher effectiveness domain, i.e., Social, Stimulating, Organized, Proficient, Humanistic, Self-Confident, and Lenient. Other research projects are though needed to be conducted to specify what “Islamic-Iranian”, “native”, and “national” cultures are and how they differ from Western culture as represented in the Persian language as a symbolic artifact through which effectiveness of teachers in teaching another language is evaluated.

The results of this study support Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s (1997) definition of culture as “a shared system of meanings.” (p. 13) as reflected in the language spoken in a community. Microstructural view of schema theory, however, not only highlights Hofstede’s (1997) view that culture is a structure of collectively held values and collective mental programming which separate or distinguish various groups of people from others but also adds the element of individuality to the collectively acquired system of meanings. Contrary to Lantolf and Thorne (2006), Khodadady (2013) believed that the acquisition of “culture” as a schema happens as the acquisition of other schemata does. As a shared system of meanings it must first be acquired intra-individually and thus its collective nature depends on individuals first and foremost. His belief stems from his emphasis on individual differences in the formation of concepts such as “culture”. In other words, he questions the existence of a macro schema called “culture” which dictates its semantic features to Iranians. These are the individual Iranians who establish their own culture.

As the fourth factor underlying the ELPI, Methodological Development genus consists of eight species, 77 and 50 schema tokens and types, respectively. It calls for employing various language teaching methods in classrooms, attending to students’ styles and interests, employing novel teaching materials and original content to approach objectives pursued in life, changing language teaching objectives from written to all skills involved in language learning, designing teaching material and supplementary syllabi by employing technological developments such as compact discs and internet, changing evaluation methods and employing new testing approaches continuously by providing direct and indirect feedbacks to students, educating language teachers and increasing teaching hours.

The Methodological Development genus relates significantly to Qualified (r=. 113, p<.01), Social (r=.096, p<.01), Stimulating (r=.066, p<.05), Organized (r=.070, p<.05), Proficient (r=.102, p<.01), Humanistic (r=.087, p<.01), and Self-Confident (r=.075, p<.05) genera of teacher effectiveness domain. These findings thus emphasize the fact that following certain genera of ELEPs by EFL teachers relates significantly to their effectiveness. Among the six genera of TE domain, for example, Qualified and Social genera occupy the most important position due to their fairly stronger relationships with the Methodological Development. It also enters into a significant relationship with Social, Stimulating, Organized, Proficient and Humanistic genera of teacher effectiveness as well because it basically deals with the schema “teaching” having a token of five. It involves “teaching methods”, “teaching materials”, “teaching objectives”, “teaching … supplementary syllabi” and “increasing teaching hours”. Even the Self-Confident genus of TE
domain which deals with teacher’s personal attributes relates significantly to the *Methodological Development*, showing that the more “novel teaching materials and original content” the EFL teachers employ as their policy “to approach objectives pursued in life”, the more Self-Confident they are judged to be in their career.

The fifth factor of the ELPI represents the genus of *International Understanding* consisting of eight species, 50 schema tokens and 44 schema types. It views English as a means of expressing ideas, understanding and transferring human cultural heritage and scientific achievements, getting familiar with western culture, harmonizing teaching content with acceptable universal literature, using international capacities appropriately, transferring services and knowledge at universal level, reinforcing the role of language in national curriculum, and expanding political relationships.

Two schemata play a key role in the *International Understanding* genus of ELEP: “transferring” and “universal”. They involve “transferring human cultural heritage and scientific achievements”, “transferring services and knowledge at universal level” and “harmonizing teaching content with acceptable universal literature”. The very emphasis on “universal” role of language in “transferring human cultural heritage and scientific achievements” and “using international capacities appropriately” has helped EFL teachers become more effective in their teaching because the *International Understanding* genus relates significantly to Qualified (\(r = .133, p < .01\)), Social (\(r = .101, p < .01\)), Stimulating (\(r = .080, p < .05\)), Organized (\(r = .094, p < .05\)), Proficient (\(r = .114, p < .01\)), Humanistic (\(r = .089, p < .01\)), and Self-Confident (\(r = .073, p < .01\)) genera of teacher effectiveness domain. These findings help realize how questionable the views of those scholars who view “culture” as “(1) supra-individual and independent of any single person, and (2) rooted in the historical production of value and significance as realized in shared social practice” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 1) are.

The majority of G3SHS students, if not all, have had no opportunity to visit any Western society so that they could be classified as its members sharing the Westerners’ social practice. They have, however, employed their own personal experiences with their EFL teachers in their classes to evaluate them, providing the data upon which the findings of the present study are based. For example, they believe that their EFL teachers are Proficient if they “know English grammar and culture well”. In other words they resort to their own background knowledge dealing with culture in order to reach *International Understanding* rather than acquire this particular genus of language policy through interaction with international community. This is even the case with the members of communities which come from two countries located in the same continent such as Asia.

Van Dyne, Ang and Koh (2008) [VA&K], for example, developed Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) and validated it with members of diverse communities such as Americans and Singaporeans. Khodadady and Ghahari (2011) [K&G] translated the CQS into Persian and validated it with 854 Iranian undergraduate and graduate students. As the results presented in Table 5 show, different degrees of significant relationships exist between the four genera constituting the cultural intelligence of Iranians and Singaporeans. While the cognitive and motivational genera correlate the highest with each other for Iranians (\(r = .41, p < .01\)), they correlate the lowest for Singaporeans (\(r = .25, p < .01\)). When the members of two countries located in the same continent differ in establishing such relationships, how can they understand the communities of other cultures internationally if they have not lived among them? In other words, cultural intelligence is a schema domain which is as much individually acquired as it is employed collectively within specific society to solve everyday problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>K&amp;G (N = 854)</th>
<th>VA&amp;K (N = 447)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CQS 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cognitive</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Motivational</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behavioral</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meta-cognitive</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 2 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.37*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The *All-Compassing Improvement* genus is the sixth factor underlying the ELPI which consists of five species, 47, and 35 schema tokens and types, respectively. It involves improving educational centers both qualitatively and quantitatively, increasing student’s physical and psychological health, improving the quality of education based on country’s needs and priorities, achieving the superior position in science, economy and technology in the area and equalizing education on the basis of language teaching and learning standards.

Although Qualified genus of TE domain shows the same degree of relationship with *All-Compassing Improvement* as it does with *International Understanding*, i.e., \(r = .133, p < .01\), the former plays a more important role in TE domain because it correlates the highest with its Social (\(r = .110, p < .01\)), Organized (\(r = .107, p < .05\)), and Humanistic (\(r = .102, p < .01\)) genera. These results show that both teachers and other authorities involved in teaching English in Iran need to lay a greater emphasis on achieving the objectives specified in the *All-Compassing Improvement* genus if they wish to render teaching English as effective as possible at G3SHSs. It becomes all the more important when it is realized that this particular genus of ELEP correlates significantly with the Stimulating (\(r = .081, p < .01\)), Proficient (\(r = .102, p < .05\)), and Self-Confident (\(r = .062, p < .01\)) genera of TE domain.
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As the last factor of the ELPI, Functional Organization genus consists of three species, 42 token and 33 types of schemata. It deals with the policies of organizing English course content through cultural, scientific, economic and political functions, making the principles of language education relevant to ideological, political and social necessities on a macro level and attending to the teachers, schools, cultures and students’ local languages in different areas of the country. Similar to the Harmonic Curriculum, International Interaction, Internationalizing Native Culture, Methodological Development, International Understanding, and All-Compassing Improvement genera of ELEP domain, the Functional Organization correlates the highest with the Qualified genus of teacher effectiveness ($r = .094, p < .01$). This finding highlights the EFL teachers’ qualification as the main genus through which policies pursued through English language teaching at G3SHSs can be enforced.

Due to its decisive role, the Qualified genus of TE domain shows stronger relationship with seven genera of the ELEP domain than its Social, Stimulating, Organized, Proficient, Humanistic, and Self-Confident genera do. However, among the seven factors underlying the ELPI, the significant relationship the Qualified genus holds with the Functional Organization ($r = .094, p < .01$) is stronger than those of Internationalizing Native Culture ($r = .065, p < .05$) and International Interaction ($r = .072, p < .05$). These findings provide empirical evidence for the Qualified EFL teachers to focus more on their students’ cultural, scientific, economic and political needs as well as local languages than on International Interaction and Internationalizing Native Culture. These teachers do, nonetheless, need to focus the most on International Understanding and All-Compassing Improvement genera because they reveal the strongest relationship with their qualification ($r = .133, p < .01$).

The Functional Organization also correlates significantly with Social ($r = .060, p < .05$), Stimulating ($r = .061, p < .05$), Proficient ($r = .073, p < .05$), and Humanistic ($r = .062, p < .05$) genera of TE domain. Since the Proficient genus holds a fairly stronger relationship with the Functional Organization than Social, Stimulating and Humanistic genera do, it provides policy designers and enforcers with empirical evidence to emphasize the proficiency of EFL teachers when they recruit new teaching staff or offer in-service educational programs. Had these findings been available to Mr. Ahmadianejad, the former president of Iran, he might have stopped recruiting unqualified teachers as academic members of Iranian universities.
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