



THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES

Volume 25, Issue 3 (2018), Pages 1-97

SPECIAL ISSUE: Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Director-in-Charge: **Seyed Mehdi Mousavi**, Associate Professor of Archaeology

Editor-in-Chief: **Masoud Ghaffari**, Associate Professor of Political Science

Guest-editor: **Dr Goudarz Alibakhshi**, Assistant Professors of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Managing Editors: **Shahin Aryamanesh**, PhD Candidate of Archaeology

English Edit by: **Ahmad Shakil**, PhD.

Published by **Tarbiat Modares University**

Editorial board:

A'vani, Gholamreza; Professor of philosophy, Tarbiat Modares University

Bozorg-e-bigdeli, Saeed; Associate Professor of Persian Language and Literature, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Dabir moghaddam, Mohammad; Professor of Linguistics, Allame Tabatabaei University, Tehran, Iran

Ehsani, Mohammad; Professor of Sport Management, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Etemadi, Hossein; Associate Professor of Accounting jobs, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Ghaffari, Masoud; Associate Professor of Political Science, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Hafezniya, Mohammadreza; Professor in Political Geography and Geopolitics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Hojjati, Seyed Mohammad bagher; Professor, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Hossini, Ali Akbar, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Khodadad Hosseini, Seyed Hamid; Professor in Business, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Kiyani, Gholamreza; Associate Professor of Language & Linguistics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Kord Zafaranlu, Aliyeh; Associate Professor of General Linguistics-Phonology, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Manouchehri, Abbas; Professor of Political science, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Mehr Mohammadi, Mahmoud; Professor of Curriculum, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Mohaghegh Damad, Seyed Mostafa; Professor of law, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

Mohseni, Manouchehr; Professor of Sociology, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Najjarzadeh, Reza; Associate Professor of Economics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Nasseri Taheri, Abdollah; Professor of History, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Parvini, Khalil; Professor of Arabic literature, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Sadr, Seyed Kazem; Professor of Management, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Taslimi, Mohammad Saeed; Professor of Management, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran

Valavi, Ali Mohammad; Professor of History, Al Zahra University, Tehran, Iran

Zanjanizadeh, Homa; Associate Professor of Sociology, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Akbarian, Reza; Professor of Philosophy, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

The International Journal of Humanities is one of the TMU Press journals that is published by the responsibility of its Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Board in the determined scopes.

The International Journal of Humanities is mainly devoted to the publication of original research, which brings fresh light to bear on the concepts, processes, and consequences of humanities in general. It is multi-disciplinary in the sense that it encourages contributions from all relevant fields and specialized branches of the humanities.

The journal seeks to achieve the following objectives:

- To promote inter-disciplinary research in all areas of the humanities.
- To provide a forum for genuine and constructive dialogues between scholars in different fields of the humanities.
- To assist researchers at the pre-and post-doctorate levels, with a wealth of new and original material.
- To make ideas, topics, and processes in the humanities intelligible and accessible to both the interested public and scholars whose expertise might lie outside that subject matter.

Address: **Humanities faculty, Tarbiat Modares University, Nasr, Jalal AleAhmad, Tehran, Iran. P.O.Box: 14115-139**

Web Address for manuscriptsubmission: <http://ejjh.modares.ac.ir/>

Contents

Teachers' Attitudes towards the Use of MALL Instruction in Iranian EFL Context Hossein Bozorgian	1
Becoming an EFL Teacher: Prospective Teachers' Professional Identity in a Critical Teacher Education Program Narges Sardabi, Reza Biria, Ahmad Ameri Golestan	19
The Uncanny Gender: Gender and the Unrepresentability of Subject Formation in Margaret Atwood's Surfacing and Bodily Harm Roya Elahi, AmirAli Nojournian	33
The Honor of Being Colonized: A Bhabhaian Reading of Elif Shafak's Honour Behzad Pourgharib, Somayeh Kiani, Sepideh Ziadbakhsh	49
In-service Professional Development Scale for EFL Teachers: A Validation Study Mohammad Bagher Shabani, Goudarz Alibakhshi, Alireza Bahreman, Ali Reza Karimi	63
Intercultural teaching in L2 classrooms: Exploring English language teachers' beliefs Zia Tajeddin and Atefeh Rezanejad.....	79

In-service Professional Development Scale for EFL Teachers: A Validation Study

Mohammad Bagher Shabani¹, Goudarz Alibakhshi², Alireza Bahremand³,
Ali Reza Karimi⁴

Received: 2019/1/7

Accepted: 2019/5/22

Abstract

In-service professional development activities seem to be of much significance to teachers who face challenges in teaching or teaching related issues such as assessment and curriculum development. Despite the rich literature review of teachers' professional development, in-service professional development needs of EFL teachers have not been assessed yet. The present study aimed at developing and validating an in-service professional development needs scale for EFL teachers. In doing so, a mixed research method was used. In the qualitative phase, the professional development needs were explored through interviewing with 20 EFL teachers who were selected through purposive sampling. In the quantitative phase, the professional development scale was submitted to 220 teachers. Data were analyzed through running exploratory factor analysis and Cronbach's alpha. Results showed that extracted professional development needs were reduced to four main areas: a) teaching, communication skills and assessment, b) educational psychology and technology, c) material development, and d) language and meta-language skills. The findings can be used by language schools and educational centers to provide EFL teachers with the most urgent professional development needs.

Key Words: In-service training, Teacher development, EFL Teachers, Professional Development

¹. Assistant professor, Imam Khomeini International University, Qazvin, Iran. Email: sahabi_b@modares.ac.ir (Corresponding Author).

². Assistant professors, Allameh Tabataba'i University Email: alibakhshi@atu.ac.ir

³. Faculty of English Language and Literature, Velayat University, Iranshahr, Iran..

⁴. Graduate student of Payame-noor-University, Iran.

Introduction

Teachers around the world, due to the educational settings, face some challenges, some of which are the same for all. They prefer to teach their students independently from their colleagues. Sometimes they, especially the novice ones, become very overwhelmed by the demands of school bureaucracy, and if they do not receive insightful feedback or regular supervision, they might become frustrated (Murray, 2010). It has been argued that professional development activities are one of the alternative solutions to these problematic issues (Bailey, Curtis & Nunan, 2001).

Teacher development has been defined as a consistent cycle of teacher learning which begins with initial/ pre-service teacher training and lasts for as long as a teacher may remain in the profession (in-service training). Teaching as a profession persuades teachers and enhances their societal expectations to think of finding ways to improve and contribute to the students' academic outcomes (Alibakhshi & Dehvari, 2015; Castle, 2006; Craig, 2003; Mushayikwa & Lubben, 2009; Olson & Craig, 2001). It has also argued that, to be an effective teacher, teachers need a combination of professional knowledge and specialized skills as well as their own personal qualities and experiences. Moreover, acquiring new skills and adding to their knowledge are among the major reasons teachers endeavor to attend activities designed for professional development (Bailey, etal, 2001). According to Murray (2010), learning about new techniques and ways to empower teachers in English language teaching seems to be both motivating and encouraging for both an experienced and a novice teacher. Like the teachers of the other fields, English language teaching experts believe that ongoing

professional development is of much significance, particularly in today's rapidly, constantly, and technologically changing world. Teachers of English as foreign language are more likely to try the recent innovations in language teaching theories and educational technology with their students (Chisman & Crandall, 2007). As Day and Sachs (2004) argue, the term continuing professional development (CPD) implies all the activities teachers engage in during the course of a career to enhance their work. Such activities as Kelly (2006) believe, are intended to result in a process, on-going teacher learning, through which teachers become expertise.

Teacher professional learning is a fairly complex process that requires teachers' emotional and cognitive involvement both collectively and individually, their capacity and willingness to investigate where each one stands (Romano, 2006; Runhaar, 2008; Reis-Jorge, 2007). Teachers' professional development has been studied and presented in the relevant literature in different ways (to name just a few, Craft, 2000; Kelly, 2006; Mann, 2005; Roberts, 1998). But at the center of such attempts, has always been the recognition that professional development is related to teachers' learning, and transforming their knowledge into practice so that they can contribute to their students' growth (Bolam, 2000).

Teachers' professional development has been studied and presented in the relevant literature in different ways (e.g., Roberts, 1998; Craft, 2000; Mann, 2005; Kelly, 2006). But always at the center of such attempts has been the idea that professional development is greatly related to teachers' learning, learning how to learn, and transforming their knowledge into practice

so that they can contribute to their students' growth (Bolam, 2000). Teacher professional learning is a fairly complex process that requires teachers' emotional and cognitive collective and individual involvement, their capacity and willingness to investigate where each one stands (Burbank & Kauchak, 2003; Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson, 1992; Johnson & Golombek, 2011; Karimi, 2011; Romano, 2006; Runhaar, 2008; Reis-Jorge, 2007). Teachers' perceptions of CPD and the activities which they undertake to develop professionally have been investigated in different contexts. However, an instrument for assessing Iranian EFL teachers' professional development needs has not been developed. More importantly, it is not known whether the developed instrument has the required psycho. Neither, have the matches and mismatches between Iranian EFL teachers holding TEFL majors and those who hold non-TEFL majors been explored. Therefore, it is expected that an exploratory study can provide insight into the CPD experiences of Iranian EFL teachers holding TEFL majors and those who hold non-TEFL majors. Through this study, the in-service professional needs of Iranian EFL teachers are explored and it will be discovered whether TEFL and non-TEFL major holders have the same in-service professional development needs or not.

Purpose of the Study

The main objective of the present study was to validate the scale for assessing in-service professional development needs of EFL teachers. It also aimed at comparing professional development needs of certified and non-certified EFL teachers. More specifically, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the constituting components of EFL teachers' in-service professional development assessment scale?
2. Does the developed scale have the required psychometrics characteristics (internal consistency & Construct validity)?

Review of the Related Literature *Professional Development*

According to Polk (2006), a noteworthy part of teaching ought to be that of learning. It is obvious that teaching and learning coincide with each other hence, the discussion of teaching proceeds the discussion of learning. What is here and there is the response that definitely ties teaching and learning together that is, in addition to the fact that teachers teach and students learn, teachers must learn similarly as the students do. It is a must for teachers to consistently learn new knowledge, and persistently advance as experts (Polk, 2006).

The terms in-service education and training (INSET) and CPD are once in a while utilized reciprocally (Craft, 2002). INSET is characterized as all in-service training activities and instruction which expertly qualified educators manage to enhance their expert information, attitudes, and abilities to teach students more effectively (Roberts, 1998). It is accepted that instructors taking part in INSET learned fundamental showing abilities in their ITE and have obtained essential information important for educating (Eraut, 1994). It additionally expects that INSET exercises can make educators comfortable with the diverse alternatives accessible which can help enhance their training (Richards & Nunan, 1990).

According to Day (1999), INSET generally tends to be translated as a scope of time-bound organized, formal and top-down in-service learning exercises intended to conquer the gap between instructors' present level of aptitudes and knowledge and the level needed by their job in the organization (Roberts, 1998). INSET regularly perceived as the most rapid way for constructing teachers on the occupation, consolidates components of both preparing and improvement. Such exercises might be certified or non-authorize and can be recognized from less formal in-service (practicing and) progression work that educators additionally participate in (Day, 1999).

However, CPD is seen to incorporate both less formal opportunities which might be started by people or gatherings of educators utilized inside similar organizations or area and formally structured opportunities, for example, INSET actions that might be required by external agencies and are encouraged by others, (for example, PD suppliers) (Evans, 2002). Less formal activities can be progressing and self-initiated and stimulated. Regardless of whether the procedure is practicing dominated or not, CPD is probably going to enhance educators' knowledge, abilities and practice and therefore upgrade their expert status by moving instructors towards skills (Kelly, 2006).

As Stuart et al. (2009) supposed, teacher development is a continuum of learning with regards to the teacher's entire occupation, with teachers inside a foundation situated at different places along the continuum. Learning during the early years is generally for developing understanding practice, followed by later

times of reflection on work and exchange because of which educators may keep on increasing new bits of knowledge and enhance their abilities. This is the place a program of CPD is bolded as an important activity and may adopt the different strategies or structures described in this section based on to the teacher's individual or contextual needs.

According to Glover and Law (2005), there is no single concurred meaning of CPD and the writing, for the most part, gives differing understandings or interpretations of CPD that are taken as definitions. These incorporate CPD as continuous learning. CPD might be individual or entire school staff improvement (Gravani & John, 2005) or educator advancement that upgrades instructors' demonstrable skill and additionally polished methodology (Evans, 2002). These depictions are by profitable in affecting how instructors see or comprehend CPD as well.

For the most part, research seems to show that teachers' view of CPD falls into various classifications; improving subject linked knowledge and aptitudes, improving criticality, intellectual abilities and cooperative critical thinking abilities (Flores, 2005; Keay, 2006). Interestingly, open doors for discovering that happen amid ordinary practice are frequently seen distinctively and at times are not perceived as CPD (Keay, 2006) by foundations where instructors are utilized. This regularly impacts the patterns of CPD exercises that teachers take part in.

Models of Professional Development

A model of professional development can be characterized as a pattern or plan that is used to guide the designing of a program (Joyce & Weil, 1980). In their extensive review of the research, Drago-Severson

(2004), Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1989) and Marczely (1996) found out that seven discernible models of professional development are used for teachers: (1) in-service training, (2) observation/assessment, (3) development/improvement process, (4) study groups, (5) inquiry/action research, (6) individually guided activities, and (7) mentoring.

In-service training: In-service training is the most widespread or traditional form of professional development. It often occurs during a predetermined period of time. During the training, a presenter leads and shares ideas and expertise to teachers. It may involve various kinds of different group-based activities. It may also include presentations and discussions. Training may come through several formats like workshops, colloquia, demonstrations, role-playing, and simulations. It is considered a cost-effective model since large groups of educators are reached at once. The same knowledge base is shared with all participants.

Observation/assessment: Observation/assessment are another model of professional development that involves colleagues who provide feedback based on observations about the performance of fellow educators. Both the observers and the observed learn from the process. Significant time commitments and well-planned activities are needed. Guskey (2003) concluded that goal-oriented and focused observations, which documented improvements and provided feedback and recommendations for follow-up activities, were most effective.

Development/improvement process: Development/improvement process is a model of professional development whereby the participant teachers are brought together

to make decisions and changes in organizational plans, procedures and activities. It might require participants to critically review organizational programs, curriculum and instruction, or decisions made on particular problems. Guskey (2003) also noted that the principal advantage of this model of professional development is the improvement of specific knowledge and skills of participants due to increased awareness about issues. The model also helps participants to develop different perspectives, become more aware of diversity within the organization, and to develop their interpersonal skills as they interact with the group.

Study groups: The use of study groups is still another model of professional development that is used to arrive at solutions to common problems. It often involves the entire school staff or teacher participants from other academic institutions. The staff members or participants are usually placed into groups of four to six members, and each group is required to focus on different aspects of the problem. Recommendations and findings of each group are later shared with the whole population of the participants. Study groups provide unique opportunities for all the members to work together and bring focus to improvement efforts. Study groups pave the way for professional learning communities and provide opportunities for ongoing professional development. Guskey (2003) stressed that study groups should be organized, clearly focused, and given sufficient time.

Inquiry/action research: Inquiry/action research is also a useful professional development model in which each individual asks critical questions about his/her own practice and searches for

answers to these questions. It includes selecting a problem, collecting and analyzing data about this problem, getting to know more about the problem through reviewing the related literature, reviewing alternative courses of actions, taking action about the problem, and documenting the results. This is said to be a thoughtful process that involves individual reflection, systematic decision-making and problem solving. The model is based on the assumption that the staff members have the ability and the potential to formulate questions and search for objective answers to them (Guskey, 2003). It also involves initiative on the part of the individual, as well as commitment over a period of time, to resolve the problem.

Individually guided activities: The individually guided activities, as a model of professional development, begin with the individual's own determination to meet his or her own professional development goals based on their learning needs. Each participant teacher selects activities that they think will help them in achieving their goals. The model begins with identifying the individual's need, working out a plan to meet this need, deciding on relevant learning activities, and at the end evaluating the efficiency and the usefulness of the learning activities. The model provides more opportunities for individualization and meeting specific needs for skill building and development expertise. Selected goals should present enough challenges that are worth pursuing and are related to the grave goal of improvement in student learning (Guskey, 2003).

Mentoring: Mentoring, as a professional development activity involves a pair which consists of two teachers: a more experienced and a less experienced teacher. This pair

decides to have regular encounters to discuss goals, issues, and problems, and to make on-the-job observations. The pair also reflects on their practices. This model encourages lifelong and productive professional development relationships. If followed properly, these initiatives can have positive impacts on teacher performance and consequently student performance which is the subject of investigation in the following section.

Methodology

Participants

Participants of the study were selected in three steps. In the first step, 20 EFL teachers were selected through purposive sampling. They were interviewed and asked to elaborate on the most important professional development needs. The second group consisted of 10 applied linguists who were selected to comment on the content validity of the study. And the third group consisted of 220 EFL teachers who were either teaching at language institutes or high schools. They were selected convenience sampling. All teachers were selected from language institutes in Tehran. The applied linguists were also selected from state universities in Tehran.

Method

To meet the goals of the study a mixed research design: Qualitative- quantitative was used. Different phases of the study are described as follows.

Phase I

In the first phase of the study, the sample was selected. Then, each participant was invited to comment on the most important in-service training course which they find important and influential in their

professional development. Hence, semi-structured face-to-face individual interviews with open ended questions was conducted to collect the data of the study. Semi-structured interviews helped the researcher to explore the most frequently reported PD needs from interviewees' own perspectives with the assumption that reported needs reflect the real intentions of the selected teachers as the informants of the study. Moreover, open ended questions helped the researcher to develop rapport with participants, explore his research questions deeply, elicit information and generate answers which allow a true assessment of participants' beliefs. The data saturation point occurred when 20th participant was interviewed. The most frequently reported professional development needs were explored and the instrument was drafted. Each extracted need was carefully worded, followed by a semantic differential (the least important =1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8= the most important).

Phase II

The second phase consisted of 3 steps. In the first step, the extracted needs were submitted to a panel of 6 experts. A 5-point scale was used by each participant to evaluate each item as appropriate, accurate, and representative: a =irrelevant and should be deleted, b = seemingly relevant but major revision needed, c = relevant but minor revision needed, and d = relevant, clear and precise. At the end, the instrument was revised in line with the comments of the panel.

In the next step, some of the items were revised to avoid awkward wording and increase the clarity and readability of the items. Finally, the face validity of the developed instrument was examined. That is, the language of the scale was reviewed for clarity by 15 teachers. During piloting the survey, the participants did not report any problems in understanding the wording and meaning of the items, which demonstrated the face validity of the instrument.

Phase III: Construct Validation

In order to estimate the construct validity of EFL teachers' professional development needs, 220 EFL teachers were selected through convenience sampling. The developed scale was submitted to the participants while they were present in the language institutes in which they were teaching. Each questionnaire was scored anonymously, and the participants' informed consent was obtained. The return rate was 90%. The data from the 200 returned questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS Version 22. Internal consistency of the developed instrument was estimated through running Cronbach's alpha and the construct validity was estimated through running exploratory factor analysis with Varimax rotation method.

Results

Results including the initial categorization of EFL learners' in-service professional language needs and construction validation are presented in the following tables.

Table 1. Initial categories of in-service professional development need of EFL Teachers

Categories	Sub-categories
Teaching skills	Developing teaching language skills and sub-skills

	Communicative and task based teaching
	Effective teaching methods
	Learner-centered approaches
	Team –teaching/ Peer-observation
	Innovations in teaching/learning
Communication/management skills	Creating relaxed Atmosphere
	Management strategies and skills
	Establishing rapport/empathy with Students
	Managing the class, time, etc
	Establishing rapport with colleagues
Assessment	Innovations in types of assessment
	Test development
	Test psychometrics
	Test consequences
Educational technology	CALL
	Social networks/ multimedia
	Electronic learning
	Educational devices
Educational psychology	Student confidence
	Learner autonomy
	Learner motivation
	Teacher TSE
	Teaching motivation and attitude
Curriculum development	Material development/ adaptation/adoption
	Lesson plan
	Book evaluation
About Language Knowledge	Discourse & Pragmatics
	Rhetoric & Genre
	Communication strategies
Language development	Language skills
	Super segmental features
	Grammar
	Idioms/ proverbs/ and collocation

The above items were administered to the selected participants of the study. The participants were asked to rate the importance of each professional development need using semantic differential scale (less important =1, 2,

3.....8= the most important). The completed filled in questionnaires were coded and entered into SPSS software. The internal consistency and construct validation results are presented in the following tables.

Table 1. Internal Consistency of the Scale

Scale component	Alpha
A (teaching/management, and assessment)	0.91
B(educational technology & psychology)	0.91

Curriculum, development	0.90
Language and meta language development	0.88
Total	0.93

Results of exploratory factor analysis including results of KMO and Bartlett's Test, initial Eigenvalues of the extracted components, screen plot and component matrix are presented in the following tables and graph.

As it is shown in the above table, the alpha coefficient for each component and the whole scale exceeded 0.88. Therefore, it could be strongly argued that the developed scale enjoyed acceptable internal consistency.

Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Table 2. KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.875
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6298.534
	Df	378
	Sig.	.001

As it is shown in the above table, KMO value is 0.87 which means that sample is adequate for factor analysis.

Table .3 Eigenvalues and Variances Explained by Each Component

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.364	33.4	33.4	9.364	33.4	33.4
2	8.237	24.1	57.5	8.237	24.1	57.5
3	5.487	19.1	77.6	5.487	19.1	77.6
4	4.2	13.2	90.8	4.2	13.2	90.8

the variance. However, initial Eigenvalue of the fourth component is 4.2 and it explains 13.2 % of the variance. As it can also be seen, the 28 items submitted to exploratory factory analysis were reduced to only four components with Eigenvalues of 1 and above. The loading factors of the items belonging to each component are presented in the following Table.

As it is shown in the above table, four components were extracted which explained 90. 8 percent of the variances. The initial Eigenvalue of the first component is 9.36 and it explains 33.44 % of the variance. The initial Eigenvalue of the second component is 8.23 and it explains 24. 1 % of the variance. The initial Eigenvalue of the third component is 5.48 and it explains 19. 1 % of

Table 4. Results of Varimax Rotation

	Factors			
	1	2	3	4
Teaching language skills and sub-skills	.7			
Communicative and task based teaching	.65			
Effective teaching methods	.68			
Learner-centered approaches	.66	.11		
Team –teaching/ Peer-observation	.69	.15		
Innovations in teaching/learning	.7	.19		
Creating relaxed Atmosphere	.65	.11		
Management strategies and skills	.64	.11		
Establishing rapport/empathy with Students	.56	.15		
Managing the class, time, etc	.54	.19		
Establishing rapport with colleagues	.53	.11		
Innovations in types of assessment	.62	.11		
Test development	.63	.15		
Test psychometrics	.59	.19		
Test consequences	.56	.11		
CALL	.34	.83		
Social networks/ multimedia	.39	.80		
Electronic learning	.34	.84		
Educational devices	.33	.44		
Student confidence	.26	.46		
Learner autonomy		.67		
Learner motivation		.65		
Teacher TSE		.58		
Teaching motivation and attitude		.59		
Material development/ adaptation/adoption		.39	.81	
Lesson plan		.37	.79	
Book evaluation		.35	.75	
Discourse & Pragmatics				.87
Rhetoric & Genre				.81
Communication strategies				.82
Language skills				.76
Super segmental features				.75
Grammar				.72
Idioms/ proverbs/ and collocation				.71

Discussion

As it was shown in Table 4, the first component of the scale which was thematically coded as teaching, management, and assessment needs consists

of 15 items and the loading factor of each item exceeds 0.47. With regard to teaching, results show that teachers need to take courses on teaching language skills and sub-skills, communicative and task based

teaching, effective teaching methods, learner-centered approaches, team – teaching/peer-observation, innovations in teaching/learning. It can also be seen EFL teachers need to develop their profession through taking courses on creating relaxed atmosphere, management strategies, and skills, establishing rapport with students, managing the class time, and establishing rapport with the colleagues. Moreover, the results showed that EFL teachers need to take courses on assessment and testing most particularly innovations in types of assessment, test development, test psychometrics, and test consequences.

As it can also be seen, the second component, educational technology and psychology consists of 9 items. the main professional needs related to educational technology are CALL, social networks/multimedia, electronic learning, and educational devices. On the other hand, EFL teachers reported that they need to take courses to learner how to enhance student confidence, learner autonomy, learner motivation, teacher teaching self- efficacy, and teachers' teaching motivation and attitudes. Moreover, it can be seen that three of the needs constitute one factor which was thematically coded as teachers' needs for material development including material development/ adaptation/adoption, lesson plan, and book evaluation. Furthermore, seven professional needs constituted the fourth component which was thematically coded as language and meta language development including needs for developing their meta language knowledge: discourse and pragmatics, rhetoric and genre, and communication strategies as well as language knowledge including language skills, suprasegmental features, grammar, proverbs, and collocations.

The same findings were reported by a number of studies (Alibakhshi & Dehviri, 2015; Alibakhshi, 2015; Borg, 2006; Brog, 2017; Timperley, Wilson, Barrar, & Fung, 2007; Richards, 2008; Richards & Nunan, 1990; Burns, Freeman, & Edwards, 2015; Canagarajah, 2013; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008). Findings also revealed that within the realm of teaching skills and methods, in-service EFL teachers need to takes in-service courses on teaching language skills and sub-skills, effective teaching methods, recent innovations in teaching, and learner-centered approaches to educations. It is also seen that EFL teachers need to develop their knowledge of language skills, linguistics knowledge and metalinguistic if they want to maintain updated. Therefore, in line with some researchers interested in the field, it can be argued EFL teachers' in addition to teaching knowledge, they need content knowledge which need to be learned continuously (Freeman, 2002).

With regard to the teachers' needs for in-service courses on management/communication skills, educational technology, assessment, and curriculum development, and in line with the findings of the other researchers, it can be argued that EFL teachers need to have general pedagogical knowledge to learn more about instructional process (e.g., teaching methods, classroom management), student learning (e.g., individual dispositions of students and their learning processes), and assessment (e.g., diagnosing principles and evaluation procedures (König, 2013, 2014; Ölmezer-ÖztürkAydın, 2018; Plake,1993; Popham, 2009; Price, Rust, O'Donovan, Handley, & Bryant, 2012; Xu, & Brown, 2017).). The findings are also consistent with the related previous works

(Kessler & Plakans, 2008; Shulman, 1987; Schoenfeld, 1998; Son, Robb, & Charismaidji, 2011). The main finding of the related studies is that pedagogical content knowledge consists of teacher knowledge of curriculum, learners, teaching strategies, assessment types and methods, the use of technology such as CALL, and multiple representations.

With regard to teachers' need for language skills, as Borg (2006) believes, it could be argued language teaching is determined by a curriculum which takes into account both oral and written competencies and heavily relies on specific teaching methods and strategies that support oral communication (Spada, 2007; Watzke, 2007). An EFL teacher's knowledge base is limited when he or she lacks appropriate communication skills, but at the same time, the sole command of the target language will not suffice to provide high quality learning opportunities to students.

Regarding the second research question, it could be stated that the developed scale and its different

components enjoyed high level of internal consistency. Moreover, considering the findings related to construct validation, it could be argued that the developed scale enjoyed acceptable construct validity. Also, it can also be postulated that EFL teachers need to take courses on four main areas of applied linguistics: teaching and assessment, educational psychology and technology, material development, and general language as well as metalanguage.

Concluding Remarks

In line with the findings of the study, it could be concluded that language institutes and teacher development centers need to assess the EFL teachers' professional development needs through administering this scale. They can also get familiar with the priority and urgency of professional development needs of EFL teachers so that they can provide the teachers with the most urgent professional development needs in order to enhance the quality of EFL teachers' teaching and help them keep updated.

References

- Alibakhshi, G. (2015). Challenges in promoting EFL learners' autonomy: Iranian EFL teachers' perspectives. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 4(1), 79-98.
- Alibakhshi, G., & Dehvari, N. (2015). EFL teachers' perceptions of continuing professional development: A case of Iranian high school teachers. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 17(2), 29-42.
- Bailey, K.M., Curtis, A. & Nunan, D. (2001). *Pursuing Professional Development: The Self as Source*. Canada: Heinle & Heinle, Thomson Learning.
- Bolam, R. (2000). Emerging policy-trends: some implications for continuing professional development. *Journal of In-service Education*, 26 (2), 267-279.
- Borg, S. (2006). The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(1), 3-31.
- Borg, S. (2017). Identity and teacher research. In G. Barkhuizen (Ed.), *Reflections on language teacher identity research* (pp.126-132). London: Routledge.
- Burbank, M. D., & Kauchak, D. (2003). An alternative model for professional development: investigations into effective collaboration. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19(5), 499-514
- Burke, K. (2000). Results-based professional development. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84, 29-37
- Burns, A., Freeman, D., & Edwards, E. (2015). Theorizing and studying the language-teaching mind: Mapping research on language teacher cognition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(3), 585-601.

- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Castle, K. (2006). Autonomy through pedagogical research. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22(8)*, 1094-1103.
- Craft, A. (1996). *Continuing professional development*. London, England: Open University Press.
- Craig, C. J. (2003). What teachers come to know through school portfolio development? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19(8)*, 815-827
- Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning*. London: Falmer Press.
- Day, C., & Sachs, J. (Eds.). (2004). *International handbook on the continuing professional development of teachers*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Drago-Severson, E. (2004). *Helping Teachers Learn*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Eraut, M.E. (1994). *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. London: Falmer Press.
- Evans, L. (2002). What is teacher development? *Oxford Review of Education, 28(1)*, 123-137.
- Flores, M. A. (2005). Mapping new teacher change: Findings from a two-year study. *Teacher Development, 9(3)*, 389-412.
- Freeman, D. (2002). The hidden side of the work: Teacher knowledge and learning to teach—A perspective from north American educational research on Teacher education in English language teaching. *Language Teaching, 35(1)*, 1-13
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Re-conceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 32(3)*, 397-417
- Gravani, M. N., & John, P. D. (2005). 'Them and us': Teachers' and tutors' experiences of a 'new' professional development course in Greece. *Compare, 35(3)*, 303-319.
- Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4(1)*, 63-69.
- Guskey, T.R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Guskey, T. R. (2003). Analyzing lists of the characteristics of effective professional development to promote visionary leadership. *NASSP Bulletin, 87(637)*, 4-20.
- Hoyle, E., & John, P. D. (1995). *Professional knowledge and professional practice*. Burns & Oates.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Johnson, K.E. (1992). Learning to teach: Instructional actions and decisions of preservice ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly, 26(3)*, 507-535
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2011). Preface. *Research on second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on professional development*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Joyce, B., & Weil, M., (1980). *Models of teaching*. Second edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Karimi, M. N. (2011). Variations in EFL teachers' pedagogical knowledge base as a function of their teaching license status. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 3(3)*, 83-114
- Keay, J. (2006). Collaborative learning in physical education teachers' early-career professional development. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 11(3)*, 285-305.
- Kelly, P. (2006). What is teacher learning? A socio-cultural perspective. *Oxford Review of Education, 32(4)*, 505-519.
- Kessler, G., & Plakans, L. (2008). Does teachers' confidence with CALL equal innovative and integrated use? *Computer Assisted Language Learning 21(3)*, 269-282.
- König, J. (2013). First comes the theory, then the practice? On the acquisition of general pedagogical knowledge during initial teacher education. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11(4)*, 999-1028.
- König, J. (2014). Designing an international instrument to assess teachers' General Pedagogical Knowledge (GPK): Review of studies, considerations, and recommendations. Paris, France: Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=EDU/CERI/CD/RD%282014%293/REV1&doclanguage=en>
- Marzely, B. (1996). *Personalizing professional growth*. Sage publications: Thousand Oaks, California.

- Malderez, A. & Wedell, M. (2007). *Teaching Teachers: Processes and Practices*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Mann, S. (2005). The language teacher's development. *Language Teaching*, 38 (3), 103-118.
- Mizell, H. (2010). *Why professional development matters*. Oxford, OH: Learning Forward
- Murray, A. (2010). Empowering teachers through professional development. *English Teaching Forum*, 1, 2-11.
- Mushayikwa, E., & Lubben, F. (2009). Self-directed professional development hope for teachers working in deprived environments. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(3), 375-382.
- Olson, M. R., & Craig, C. J. (2001). Opportunities and challenges in the development of teachers' knowledge: the development of narrative authority through knowledge communities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(6), 667- 684
- O'Neill, J. (1994). Managing professional development. In Bush, T. & West Burnham, J. (Eds.). *The Principles of Education Management*. Harlow: Longman.
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, E., & Aydın, B. (2018). Investigating language assessment knowledge of EFL teachers. Hacettepe University Journal of Education. Advance online publication. doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2018043465
- Plake, B. S. (1993). Teacher assessment literacy: Teachers' competencies in the educational assessment of students. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 6(1), 21-27.
- Popham, J. W. (2009). Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental? *Theory into Practice*, 48, 4-11.
- Price, M., Rust, C., O'Donovan, B., Handley, K., & Bryant, R. (2012). *Assessment literacy: The foundation for improving student learning*. Oxford: The Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development
- Radnor, H. (2001). *Researching your professional practice. Doing interpretive research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Richards, J. (2008). Second language teacher education today. *RELC Journal: a journal of language and teaching research*, 39(2), 158-177.
- Richards, J.C. & Nunan, D. (1990). *Second language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Reis-Jorge, J. (2007). Teachers' conceptions of teacher-research and self-perceptions as enquiring practitioners a longitudinal case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(4), 402-417.
- Roberts, J. (1998). *Language teacher education*. London: Arnold
- Romano, M. E. (2006). Bumpy moments in teaching: reflections from practicing teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(8), 973-985.
- Schön, D.A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (1998). Toward a theory of teaching-in-context. *Issues in Education*, 4(1), 1-94
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Son, J.-B., Robb, T., & Charismaidji, I. (2011). Computer literacy and competency: a survey of Indonesian teachers of English as a foreign language. *CALL-EJ* 12(1), 26-42. Retrieved from http://caliej.org/journal/12-1/Son_2011.pdf
- Spada, N. (2007). Communicative language teaching. In J. Cummins & C. Davions (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 271-288). New York: Springer
- Sparks, D., & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989). Five models of staff development for teachers. *Journal of Staff Development*, 19(4), 40-57.
- Stiggins, R. J. (2010). Essential formative assessment competencies for teachers and school leaders. In H. L. Andrade, G. J. Cizek (Eds.), *Handbook of formative assessment*, (pp. 233-250). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Stuart, J., Akyeampong, K. & Croft, A. (2009). *Key Issues in Teacher Education: A Sourcebook for Teacher Educators in Developing Countries*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Tao, N. (2014). Development and validation of classroom assessment literacy scales: English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers in a Cambodian Higher Education Setting.
- Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2008). *Teacher professional learning and development: Best evidence synthesis iteration [BES]*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Tsagari, D. (2008). Assessment literacy of EFL teachers in Greece: Current trends and future

- prospects. PowerPoint presentation at the 5th Annual EALTA Conference, May 9-11, Athens, Greece
- Watzke, J. L. (2007). Foreign language pedagogical knowledge: Toward a developmental theory of beginning teacher practices. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 63-82.
- Xu, Y., & Brown, G. T. L. (2017). University English teacher assessment literacy: A survey-test report from China. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 6(1), 133-158.

سنجه رشد حرفه ای ضمن خدمت برای معلم های زبان انگلیسی: مطالعه اعتبار سنجی

محمدباقر شعبانی^۱، گودرز علی بخشی^۲، علیرضا بهر مند^۳، علیرضا کریمی^۴

تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۳۹۸/۳/۱

تاریخ دریافت: ۱۳۹۷/۱۰/۱۷

چکیده

به نظر می‌رسد فعالیت‌های توسعه حرفه‌ای ضمن خدمت معلم‌ها برای معلم‌هایی که در زمینه آموزش یا مسائل مرتبط با آموزش، نظیر ارزشیابی و برنامه درسی با مشکلاتی روبه‌رو می‌شوند، مهم هست. با وجود پیشینه غنی رشد حرفه‌ای معلم‌ها، نیازهای آموزشی حرفه‌ای اختیار معلمان EFL هنوز ارزیابی نشده است. بدین منظور، از روش پژوهش آمیخته استفاده شده است. در مرحله کیفی، نیازهای رشد حرفه‌ای با مصاحبه با ۲۰ معلم زبان انگلیسی که از طریق نمونه‌گیری هدفمند انتخاب شدند، مورد بررسی قرار گرفتند. در مرحله کمی، سنجه رشد حرفه‌ای به ۲۲۰ معلم ارائه شد. داده‌ها با استفاده از تحلیل عاملی اکتشافی و آلفای کرونباخ تحلیل شدند. نتایج نشان داد که نیازهای رشد حرفه‌ای استخراج شده به چهار حوزه اصلی تقسیم شده است: الف) تدریس، مهارت‌های ارتباطی و ارزیابی، ب) روان‌شناسی و تکنولوژی آموزشی، ج) تدوین مطالب درسی و د) مهارت زبانی و فرازبانی. یافته‌ها می‌تواند توسط مدارس زبان و مراکز آموزشی برای تامین ضروری‌ترین نیازهای حرفه‌ای معلمان زبان انگلیسی استفاده شود.

واژه‌های کلیدی: آموزش ضمن خدمت، رشد معلم، معلم‌های زبان انگلیسی، رشد حرفه‌ای

۱. دانشگاه بین‌المللی امام خمینی، قزوین، ایران. shabani_b@modares.ac.ir (نویسنده مسئول).

۲. دانشگاه علامه طباطبائی، تهران، ایران.

۳. دانشگاه ولایت، ابرانشهر، ایران.

۴. دانش آموخته دانشگاه پیام نور، ایران.