

## Adaptation of characteristics of successful EFL teachers questionnaire (CoSEFLT-Q) into Turkish

Duhan Nurdan DOĞAN<sup>2\*</sup>  Duha Nur DOĞAN<sup>3</sup>  Şule DOĞAN<sup>4</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>PhD Student at the Department of English Language Education, Faculty of Education, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Türkiye.

<sup>2</sup>PhD Student at the Department of English Language Education, Faculty of Education, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Türkiye.

<sup>3</sup>Special Education Teacher, Ministry of National Education, Diyarbakır, Türkiye.

### Article Info

#### Keywords

EFL

Qualities of effective teachers

Reliability

Adaptation

#### Article History

Received 26.05.2023

Received in revised form

16.10.2023

Accepted 31.10.2023

#### Article Type

Research Article



### Abstract

In the study Moafian et al. (2019) it is aimed to adapt the Characteristics of Successful EFL Teachers Questionnaire (CoSEFLT-Q) into Turkish. The questionnaire utilized in this study was the Turkish version, and it was administered to a total of 502 students who were enrolled at Atatürk University during the academic year of 2022-2023. In the adaptation study, The English-to-Turkish translation and evaluation experts' opinion was taken. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to examine the data. The reliability analysis, the internal consistency and Cronbach alpha value of the scale were studied in this study. The scale's total internal consistency coefficient was discovered to be .995. It can be said that the Turkish version of the CoSEFLT-Q Scale is a reliable measurement tool with acceptable values.

## 1 Introduction

Many factors affect educational processes in schools. These factors can be related to the physical conditions of the school environment, the program, or working conditions as well as the stakeholders that make up the school environment. Teachers are stakeholders who engage with a wide variety of issues that influence educational processes on a daily basis (Sotto, 2011).

The topic of teaching is a subject of considerable interest and debate among educators and intellectuals. The process of learning is intricately connected to the act of teaching, with both concepts mutually influencing each other (Gholami & Asady, 2014). Teaching is a multifaceted interactional activity that includes subject matter, content, teacher characteristics, learner characteristics, methodology, materials, and learning situations (Bell, 2005). Evidently, education

**Cite:** Doğan, D., N., Doğan, D., N., & Doğan, Ş. (2023). Adaptation of characteristics of successful EFL teachers questionnaire (CoSEFLT-Q) into Turkish. *Pedagogical Perspective*, 2(2), 105-117.

\*Correspondency: duhannurdan@hotmail.com

© 2022, Pedagogical Perspective



CC BY 4.0 Except where otherwise noted, content on this site is licensed under a Creative Commons [CC Attribution 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) International license.

has been assigned to interconnected tasks with distinct dimensions. Educators play a significant role in this process. The individual maintains ongoing engagement with the student responsible for executing the curriculum, as well as with the administrator overseeing the instructional process. Furthermore, the individual assumes the role of evaluating both the student's progress and effectiveness of the teaching methods employed (Barnes & Lock, 2013). The crucial role of the instructor in the learning process is asserted. Hence, it is vital to take into account the expectations and requirements of the instructor, who plays a pivotal part in the educational endeavor (Yıldız & Taşgın, 2020).

Research studies conducted in various nations over the last three decades have found that the classroom level has a more important effect in predicting learners' accomplishments than the school level (Porter & Brophy, 1988; Pishghadam et al., 2021; Tamblyn, 2000). Most of the differences in classroom levels are also linked to teachers' actions and behaviors as well as how they plan the lesson (Kyriakides et al., 2013). It also shows that teachers' effectiveness is the most important factor in how well their students do in school, more so than other factors such as gender, classroom size (Sanders, 1999), and students' social status (Wenglinsky, 2000). When teachers consistently teach students, they learn important things. This shows that hiring bad teachers has a long-lasting effect on student growth and the entire school system (Sanders et al., 1997).

First, it is noteworthy that teacher success is a significant factor in the field of education that has garnered considerable attention in both theoretical and empirical studies. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that despite the various theoretical frameworks that have been proposed to explain this notion (e.g., Irajzad et al., 2017; McIntyre et al., 2020; Shin & Koh, 2007; Zhu et al., 2010), a universally accepted definition has yet to be established. According to Shin and Koh (2007), the elusive character of the idea of teacher success may be attributed to the fact that the definition and attainment of quality instruction by teachers can vary across different cultural contexts. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that two significant factors were found to be strongly correlated with teacher success in terms of communication behavior. As identified by Irajzad et al. (2017), these are teacher credibility and teacher-stroke factors. According to McCroskey (1998), teacher credibility refers to the level of trustworthiness viewed by learners towards their teachers, On the other hand, teacher stroke factors encompass the actions taken by teachers to acknowledge and value the worth and involvement of their students, as viewed by the students themselves (Pishghadam & Khajavy, 2014).

Likewise, the quality of any language teaching instruction is strongly based on the instructors' roles in their classes. Educators' conduct, characteristics, and talent are the most essential elements influencing students' willingness to engage effectively in class. Educators' caring, understanding, approachability, and amiability via positive nonverbal behaviors—presenting happy faces and accepting pupils' responses (Siti et al., 2010), being positive and accessible (Dallimore et al., 2004; Fassinger, 1995; 2000)—serve as motivating factors for learners and nurture their effective involvement in the class.

The significance of instructors' characteristics is highlighted in the study by Siti et al. (2010), who discovered that instructors' characteristics have a crucial impact on persuading students to participate in class discussions. Aside from strong teaching attributes, their talent might also have an impact on the classroom atmosphere. Nurzatulshima (2009) focused on three instructors by monitoring their classrooms, conducting learner interviews, and reviewing students' papers to investigate how instructors engage their pupils. Student participation was strong when the

instructor provided group effort, maintained rolling and checking on the learners' performance during practical sessions, offered fruitful awards, and prolonged pleasant collaboration. The variety of educational tactics encourages pupils to be more engaged and encourages their engagement.

Given the importance of educators' roles in the processes of target language teaching and learning (Williams & Burden, 2000), numerous studies have sought to identify particular characteristics of EFL instructors and develop a checklist to evaluate educators' pedagogical achievement in order to assist improvement and development. For example, Brosh (1996) assessed the characteristics of effective language instructors among high school teachers and learners through interviews and a 20-item questionnaire. Language commands and understandable instructions were rated highly by both the students and instructors. Items linked to teaching in the second language and being native-like, on the other hand, were ignored. Moreover, factors concerning motivation, growth, and research are more essential for instructors than for students. Instructors, on the other hand, are more essential to learners than equitable treatment of learners and fascinating instruction (Park & Lee, 2006).

In Korean setting, Park and Lee (2006) tried to investigate the aspects of good language instructors using a self-report questionnaire divided into three parts: English competence, pedagogical knowledge, and socio-affective abilities. The questionnaire was submitted to high school instructors and learners in Korea, and the findings revealed that the teachers' perspectives differed greatly from those of their pupils. Educators, for example, regarded English competence as the most important factor for a successful instructor, but learners regarded pedagogical expertise as the most important element of a good instructor.

In Iran, Shishavan and Sadeghi (2009) investigated the characteristics of successful language teachers among EFL students and teachers. The questionnaires were distributed to 59 English language teachers and 215 English language learners. The results revealed that instructors regarded command of the foreign language, a solid understanding of pedagogy, the application of particular approaches, and a positive character as essential attributes that added to being a successful language educator. Nevertheless, according to the learners, the most significant elements for efficient language education were the instructor's character and behavior toward pupils. Additionally, Khojastehmehr and Takrimi (2009) used a 50-item self-constructed questionnaire to evaluate the aspects of teacher effectiveness among 215 English teachers. The response factor analysis revealed four aspects of teaching efficacy (i.e.: Instructional strategies, communication skills, personal characteristics, and knowledge). The findings of the study revealed that the instructors in question perceived instructional tactics to hold greater significance in determining teacher effectiveness than other characteristics.

Moafian and Pishghadam (2009) developed and validated a 47-item questionnaire containing the characteristics of effective EFL teachers (the Characteristics of Successful EFL Teachers Questionnaire; CoSEFLT-Q). The CoSEFLT-Q was created with the help of EFL academics, instructors, and students as well as Suwantee's (1995) characteristics of good educators. In total, 250 EFL learners were asked to participate in the study to test the construct validity of the CoSEFLT-Q. The study's major emphasis was on English language learners' perceptions of the aspects of good language teachers. In the CoSEFLT-Q, factor analysis revealed 12 components (i.e., teaching accountability, interpersonal relationships, attention to all, examination, commitment, learning boosters, creating a sense of competence, teaching boosters, physical and

emotional acceptance, empathy, class attendance, and dynamism). Furthermore, Soodmand Afshar and Doosti (2013) identified effective EFL teaching traits from the views of 32 instructors and 376 learners using both interview and questionnaire tools. According to the findings, successful language instructors should have professional qualities, including content knowledge, the ability to present information to students, classroom management features including integrating all learners by assigning group/pair work, frequently assessing their improvements, and a decent degree of interpersonal connections.

In the Turkish context, Çakmak and Gürbüz (2018) showed the characteristics of successful language instructors as evaluated by 192 pre-service learners using a 55-item questionnaire and an interview data-gathering instrument. The outcomes of quantitative data analysis revealed that the most critical characteristics of effective teachers were competence, objectivity, and consistency, while the outcomes of qualitative data analysis identified creating a positive learning environment, managing the classroom, and preparing for the lecture as the most crucial traits of effective language teachers. In addition, Chang (2016) investigated the qualities of effective language instructors using 21 Likert-scale items and compared the viewpoints of Taiwanese learners and teachers using both questionnaires and interviews. Learners admired instructors who showed empathy and treated them with regard and civility and treated every learner equitably. Instructors, on the other hand, defined competent language teachers as those who could focus on their practice, make improvements, and have a solid grasp of the foreign language.

Finally, the qualities of a competent EFL instructor considered by 122 EFL students were described by Alzeebaree and Ali Hasan (2020). A questionnaire with 30 items, dependent on Park and Lee's (2006) description of the qualities of EFL instructors, was used to collect data. The questionnaire was divided into three sections: Content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and socio-affective abilities. The data revealed that the highest mean score was for reading English effectively, managing the classroom appropriately, being competent, and having self-control.

To summarize, the results of earlier studies on the qualities of effective teachers of English as a foreign language have been divided into two categories. The fundamental objective of the first type of research was to identify the most advantageous characteristics by contrasting various types of participants (e.g., instructors and learners, female and male students, high-achievement learners, and low-achievement learners). The second type of research focuses on developing and evaluating the construct validity of a survey instrument (Alzeebaree & Ali Hasan, 2020; Çakmak & Gunduz, 2018; Khojastehmehr & Takrimi, 2009; Moafian & Pishghadam, 2009; Park & Lee, 2006; Soodmand Afshar & Doosti, 2013).

The following literature review reveals that only a small amount of time was spent conducting a detailed assessment of the psychometric properties of the tools. There is no Turkish version of the Characteristics of Successful EFL Teachers Questionnaire Scale that can be found in the literature in terms of the methods used to measure psychometric quality. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to translate into Turkish the Characteristics of Successful EFL Teachers Questionnaire (CoSEFLT-Q) Scale that was produced by (2019). An expert opinion was sought regarding the language validity of the Characteristics of Successful EFL Teachers Questionnaire (CoSEFLT-Q), after which a correlation analysis was performed on the relationship between the English and Turkish forms of the scale. The Turkish English version of this scale is in this context. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to confirm the structural validity of the scale.

## 2 Method

### 2.1 Participants

Within the scope of this research, data were gathered from 502 learners studying at Atatürk University for the language reliability of the CoSEFLT-Q. 179, %35.5 male). The distribution of students based on the classes they studied was as follows: 115 prep school students (%23.0), 92 university freshmen (%18.2), 73 university sophomores (%14.6), 125 university third-year students (%25.0), and 97 (%19.4) university fourth-year students.

The purposive sampling method was used for criterion sampling. As a criterion, it was taken into account that all learners were studying at a public university. In this study, attention was paid to ensuring that the sample size was at least five and at most 10 times the number of items on the scale to reach accurate results and make sensitive estimations (MacCallum et al., 1999; Erkuş, 2012).

The number of participants in the first and second applications was more than 10 times the number of items (47 items) on the scale. The demographic information of the participants is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1** Sampling demographic characteristics

| Demographic Characteristics |             | First Application (n=502) |      | Second Application (n=702) |      |
|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------|----------------------------|------|
|                             |             | n                         | %    | n                          | %    |
| Gender                      | Woman       | 324                       | 64,5 | 437                        | 62,3 |
|                             | Male        | 178                       | 35,5 | 265                        | 37,7 |
| Class                       | Preparatory | 115                       | 22,9 | 145                        | 20,7 |
|                             | 1st Class   | 91                        | 18,1 | 125                        | 17,8 |
|                             | 2. Class    | 73                        | 14,5 | 115                        | 16,4 |
|                             | 3rd Class   | 126                       | 25,1 | 176                        | 25,1 |
|                             | 4th Grade   | 97                        | 19,3 | 141                        | 20,1 |
| Age                         | 18-24       | 392                       | 78,1 | 564                        | 80,3 |
|                             | 25-34       | 108                       | 20,3 | 125                        | 17,8 |
|                             | 35-44       | 8                         | 1,6  | 13                         | 1,9  |

### 2.2 Instrument

The Characteristics of Successful EFL Teachers Questionnaire (CoSEFLT-Q) established by Moafian et al. (2019) was modified. The original scale has seven sub-dimensions, each of which has its own set of items: There are 47 items in all, including teaching responsibility (eight items), attention to everyone (six items), morality (nine items), care and enthusiasm (seven items), evaluation (six items), teaching boosters (eight items), and class attendance (three items). All items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = “never,” 5 = “always”).

First, permission was obtained from Moafian et al. (2019) for the scale to be adapted to Turkish. Subsequently, the required ethical approval was obtained to perform the research. (Atatürk University Ethics Committee decision dated December 23, 2022, and numbered 23/4).

The scale was originally translated from English to Turkish by three field specialists with English language skills before the Turkish version was established. After translation from English to Turkish by three language experts, the scales were checked by two Turkish experts and two field experts. The scale is offered in one version. The scale was then examined by an evaluation

specialist, and a final draft of the scale was constructed. After a positive evaluation was received, the scale was administered to university students via an online platform. It took approximately 10–20 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

### 2.3 Data Analysis

Because the scale data did not allow unanswered items online, there were no missing data in the dataset. The analysis of the data obtained from the research applications was conducted using SPSS 22. An exploratory factor analysis was performed using the AMOS 22 tool. Spearman’s correlation analysis was performed to determine the relationship between the scale and its sub-dimensions. Explanatory factor analysis is a type of analysis that transforms groups into new variables by dividing a large number of variables into a certain number of groups, maximizing the relationship between variables and minimizing the relationship between groups (Watkins, 2018).

The varimax rotation method was used for the factor analysis. The results of the KMO and Bartlett sphericity tests were evaluated. The fact that the KMO value is close to 1 and greater than 0.5 indicates that the sample size is sufficient. The fact that the Bartlett sphericity test was significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) indicates that factor analysis can be performed. Factor loadings must be at least 0.5, and there must be at least .10 factor loading between the items loaded on the two factors. It is recommended that the explained variance be 30% in one-dimensional scales and 50% in multidimensional scales for the social sciences (Kaiser, 1974; Suhr, 2006; Sürücü et al., 2021).

The concept validity and reliability of the CoSEFLT-Q were investigated through reliability studies. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was used to determine the reliability of the CoSEFLT-Q and its individual subscales. Pearson correlation coefficients were used to determine inter-scale relationships. The results of the EFA conducted to determine the validity of the CoSEFLT scale are shown in Table 2.

## 4 Findings

### 4.1 Findings related to explanatory factor analysis (EFA)

Table 2 EFA analysis results

| First Application (n=502) |          |             |          | Second Application (n=702) |          |             |          |
|---------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|----------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|
| Scale Items               | Factor 1 | Scale Items | Factor 2 | Scale Items                | Factor 1 | Scale Items | Factor 2 |
| 1                         | ,753     | 30          | ,730     | 1                          | ,741     | 30          | ,724     |
| 2                         | ,746     | 31          | ,724     | 2                          | ,739     | 31          | ,732     |
| 3                         | ,721     | 32          | ,723     | 3                          | ,689     | 32          | ,730     |
| 4                         | ,717     | 33          | ,822     | 4                          | ,702     | 33          | ,823     |
| 5                         | ,710     | 34          | ,813     | 5                          | ,697     | 34          | ,791     |
| 6                         | ,748     | 35          | ,743     | 6                          | ,725     | 35          | ,741     |
| 7                         | ,706     | 36          | ,790     | 7                          | ,689     | 36          | ,789     |
| 8                         | ,691     | 37          | ,777     | 8                          | ,682     | 37          | ,778     |
| 9                         | ,654     | 38          | ,794     | 9                          | ,648     | 38          | ,786     |
| 10                        | ,767     | 39          | ,771     | 10                         | ,761     | 39          | ,774     |
| 11                        | ,797     | 40          | ,790     | 11                         | ,776     | 40          | ,794     |
| 12                        | ,785     | 41          | ,803     | 12                         | ,764     | 41          | ,810     |
| 13                        | ,802     | 42          | ,787     | 13                         | ,776     | 42          | ,795     |
| 14                        | ,769     | 43          | ,797     | 14                         | ,737     | 43          | ,802     |
| 15                        | ,787     | 44          | ,798     | 15                         | ,764     | 44          | ,811     |
| 16                        | ,775     | 45          | ,800     | 16                         | ,762     | 45          | ,812     |
| 17                        | ,773     | 46          | ,807     | 17                         | ,748     | 46          | ,815     |
| 18                        | ,795     | 47          | ,828     | 18                         | ,798     | 47          | ,835     |

|                            |       |                              |       |                            |       |                           |       |
|----------------------------|-------|------------------------------|-------|----------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|
| 19                         | ,792  |                              |       | 19                         | ,810  |                           |       |
| 20                         | ,757  |                              |       | 20                         | ,776  |                           |       |
| 21                         | ,797  |                              |       | 21                         | ,777  |                           |       |
| 22                         | ,785  |                              |       | 22                         | ,761  |                           |       |
| 23                         | ,778  |                              |       | 23                         | ,757  |                           |       |
| 24                         | ,759  |                              |       | 24                         | ,731  |                           |       |
| 25                         | 720   |                              |       | 25                         | ,706  |                           |       |
| 26                         | ,738  |                              |       | 26                         | ,728  |                           |       |
| 27                         | ,750  |                              |       | 27                         | ,740  |                           |       |
| 28                         | ,755  |                              |       | 28                         | ,738  |                           |       |
| 29                         | ,645  |                              |       | 29                         | ,635  |                           |       |
| Explained Variance         | 44,76 | Explained Variance           | 39,89 | Explained Variance         | 43,54 | Explained Variance        | 41,26 |
| Total                      |       | Total                        |       | Total                      |       | Total                     |       |
| Explained Variance         |       | 84,65                        |       | Explained Variance         |       | 84,80                     |       |
| KMO Test                   |       | ,981                         |       | KMO Test                   |       | ,983                      |       |
| Barlett Test of Sphericity |       | $\chi^2=49182,47$ ; $p<,001$ |       | Barlett Test of Sphericity |       | $\chi^2=69424$ ; $p<,001$ |       |

As a result of the first application, it is seen that the KMO value is .981 and the Bartlett sphericity test result ( $\chi^2=49182$ ;  $p<.001$ ) is significant. Based on these results, it was decided that the sample size was sufficient and that EFA could be performed. The scale items explained 84.65% of the total variance. While the first factor explained 44.76% of the total variance, the second factor explained 39.89%. The factor loads of the scale items were above 0.5, which was considered the least factor load. It has been determined that the CoSEFLT scale has 47 items and a two-factor structure.

Moafian and Pishghadam (2009) found that the original Persian version of the scale had 12 factors. However, Moafian et al. (2019) determined that the scale had a 7-factor structure in English. Due to these differences in the international literature, to determine the accuracy of the 2-factor structure in the Turkish version, the scale was reapplied to a different sample group and their mutual consistency was checked.

As a result of the second application, it is seen that the KMO value is .983 and the Bartlett sphericity test result ( $\chi^2=69424$ ;  $p<.001$ ) is significant. Based on these results, it was decided that the sample size was sufficient and that EFA could be performed. The scale items explained 84.80% of the total variance. While the first factor explained 43.54% of the total variance, the second factor explained 41.26%. The factor loads of the scale items were above 0.5, which was considered the least factor load. This is similar to the first study to test the construct validity of the CoSEFLT scale. The scale had 47 items and a two-factor structure.

## 4.2 Convergent validity and reliability

For convergent validity, we calculated the mean value of variance (AVE). According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), the mean variance should be above 0.50. Cronbach Alpha coefficient is generally used for reliability analysis. It is desirable that the Cronbach's alpha coefficient be at least 0.7 (Coşkun et al., 2019). As a result of the reliability analysis, it was determined that the scale and its sub-dimensions had high reliability. In addition to the Cronbach Alpha coefficient, the composite reliability (CR) coefficient was also calculated. According to Nunnally and Berstein (1994), the CR value should be greater than 0.7. The results of the analysis conducted to determine the convergent validity and reliability of the CoSEFLT scale are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3** Convergent validity and reliability analysis results

| Convergent Validity and Reliability |                    |  | CoSEFLT_Q<br>(47 Items) | Factor 1<br>(29 Items) | Factor 2<br>(18 Items) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Average Variance<br>Extracted (AVE) | First Application  |  | 0.584                   | 0.565                  | 0.614                  |
|                                     | Second Application |  | 0.571                   | 0.544                  | 0.618                  |
| Composite Reliability<br>(CR)       | First Application  |  | 0.985                   | 0.974                  | 0.966                  |
|                                     | Second Application |  | 0.984                   | 0.972                  | 0.967                  |
| Cronbach's Alpha                    | First Application  |  | .995                    | .992                   | .992                   |
|                                     | Second Application |  | .995                    | .992                   | .992                   |

According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), considering that the mean variance value should be above 0.50, the scale and its subdimensions have sufficient convergent validity. Considering that the CR value should be above 0.7, according to Nunnally and Berstein (1994), the scale and its subdimensions have a sufficient level of composite reliability. Coşkun et al. (2019) report that the CoSEFLT scale and its sub-dimensions have good reliability in both contexts, where they define “high reliability” as a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of 0.7 or above.

### 4.3 Normality distribution

When the normality test results given in Table 4 were examined, the CoSEFLT scale and its sub-dimensions did not show a normal distribution ( $p < 0.05$ ). For this reason, Spearman’s correlation analysis was preferred for the relationship between the scale and its sub-dimensions. In addition, CFA could not be performed because the normal distribution condition, which is one of the prerequisites for confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), was not met.

**Table 4** Normality analysis results

| Application        | Scale and<br>Sub-Dimensions | Kolmogorov-Smirnov |     |      |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-----|------|
|                    |                             | Statistic          | df  | Sig. |
| First Application  | CoSEFLT_Q                   | 258                | 502 | .001 |
|                    | Factor 1                    | 254                | 502 | .001 |
|                    | Factor 2                    | 279                | 502 | .001 |
| Second Application | CoSEFLT_Q                   | 238                | 702 | .001 |
|                    | Factor 1                    | 236                | 702 | .001 |
|                    | Factor 2                    | 260                | 702 | .001 |

### 4.4 Relationship between scale and sub-dimensions

According to the results of the Spearman correlation analysis, which was conducted to determine the relationship between the scale and its subdimensions, a positive and high-level correlation was found between the scale and its subdimensions (Table 5).

**Table 5** Relationship between scale and sub-dimensions

| Application        | Scale and<br>Sub-Dimensions | CoSEFLT_Q<br>(47 Items) | Factor 1<br>(29 Items) | Factor 2<br>(18 Items) |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|                    |                             | r                       | r                      | r                      |
| First Application  | CoSEFLT_Q                   | 1.00                    | .972*                  | .951*                  |
|                    | Factor 1                    |                         | 1.00                   | .890*                  |
|                    | Factor 2                    |                         |                        | 1.00                   |
| Second Application | CoSEFLT_Q                   | 1.00                    | .975*                  | .950*                  |
|                    | Factor 1                    |                         | 1.00                   | .896*                  |
|                    | Factor 2                    |                         |                        | 1.00                   |

\*p&lt;0,01

## 5 Discussion and conclusion

The present study involved the adaptation of Moafian et al.'s (2019) "Characteristics of Successful EFL Teachers Questionnaire (CoSEFLT-Q Scale)" to the Turkish context. Additionally, a reliability analysis was conducted. This scale was administered to 502 participants. It consists of seven dimensions: teaching accountability, attention to all, morality, care and enthusiasm, evaluation, teaching boosters, class attendance, and 47 items.

Specifically, the developer of the original scale, Moafian et al. (2019), benefited not only from academics at the university but also from language teachers while developing the scale. Upon examination of scale studies, it was discovered that there are existing scale studies pertaining to the various facets of effective English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors. Prior research on the characteristics of successful EFL teachers has been classified into two groups. The primary goal of the initial study was to determine the most beneficial qualities by comparing diverse differences among participants (e.g., instructors vs. learners, female students vs. male students, and high-achievement learners vs. low-achievement learners). The next type of study focuses on creating and analyzing the construct validity of a survey instrument (Alzebaree & Ali Hasan, 2020; Çakmak & Gündüz, 2018; Khojastehmehr & Takrimi, 2009; Moafian & Pishghadam, 2009; Park & Lee, 2006; Soodmand Afshar & Doosti, 2013).

According to the literature, Khojastehmehr and Takrimi (2009) and Moafian and Pishghadam (2009) fall into the second category. However, the two studies conducted to construct a survey instrument for assessing the traits of effective language instructors lacked a comprehensive assessment of the psychometric properties of the tools. When considering the quality of effective English teachers, it is evident that there is currently no scale specifically designed or modified for Turkish culture in the existing literature. Hence, this study is significant as it is an inaugural investigation. In this context, we checked the psychometric properties of the CoSEFLT-Q (via confirmatory factor analysis). The results of the study demonstrated that the current tool, which assesses the traits of effective language instructors, is a valid and trustworthy tool that might represent several features of diverse aspects of education, including teacher training programs and research. It is a certified evaluating instrument that may examine particular traits of EFL instructors, characteristics that are intimately related to their professional performance. When clearly delineated characteristics and behaviors of a pedagogically effective language instructor and key aspects are credited to "excellent" language teachers, language instructors will have particular and criterion-led objectives. and particular milestones are required in foreign language teaching programs.

Furthermore, instructors will be informed of the aspects that learners value in them, as their comments were used in the construction of the CoSEFLT-Q. They will have a better grasp of their pupils and try to address their requirements as a consequence of this insight. The findings of the current tool might also aid in-service instructors; that is, receiving feedback from learners on instructors' performance may be extremely beneficial for both administrators and language teachers. Undoubtedly, feedback is critical in assessing the effectiveness of any activity. Other researchers may use the current tool to conduct other research studies and uncover the connections between EFL instructor efficiency and other characteristics. Despite the rigour of the CoSEFLT-Q analysis, a complete judgment cannot be made solely based on this study's findings,

which are adaptation-based. The study's methods and findings were limited to the sample, which limits the generalizability of the scale and should be preserved.

## References

- Alzebaree, Y., & Ali Hasan, I. (2020). What makes an effective EFL teacher: High school students' perceptions. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 16(1.2), 169-183
- Barnes, B. D., & Lock, G. (2013). Student perceptions of effective foreign language teachers: A quantitative investigation from a Korean university. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(2), 19-36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n2.2>
- Bell, T. R. (2005). Behaviors and attitudes of effective foreign language teachers: Results of a questionnaire study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(2), 259-270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02490.x>
- Brosh, H. (1996). Perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 125-136.
- Çakmak, M., & Gündüz, M. (2018). Pre-service ELT teachers' perceptions of characteristics of effective teachers. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 38(1), 359-383.
- Chang, L. Y. (2016). 'Good' language teachers: Divergent perspectives. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 20(3), 1-14.
- Coşkun, R., Altunışık, R., & Yıldırım, E. (2019). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri (10. baskı). Sakarya Yayıncılık.
- Dallimore, E. J., Hertenstein, J. H. & Platt, M. B. (2004). Classroom participation and discussion effectiveness: Student-generated strategies. *Communication Education*, 53, 103-115.
- Erkus, A. (2012). *Psikolojide ölçme ve ölçek geliştirme 1: Temel kavramlar ve işlemler*. Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Fassinger, P. A. (1995). Professors' and students' perception of why students participate in class. *Teaching Sociology*, 24, 25-33.
- Fassinger, P. A. (2000). How classes influence students' participation in college classrooms. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 35, 38-47.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50. Doi: 10.1177/002224378101800104
- Gholami, K. & Asady, M. (2014). The professors' professional experience in relation to effective teaching phenomenon in higher education. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Curriculum*, 1(2), 5-26.
- Irajzad, F., Pishghadam, R., & Shahriari, H. (2017). Examining the stroking behavior of English, Persian, and Arabic school teachers in Iran: A mixed-methods study. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10(1), 219-236. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.10114a>
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31-36.
- Khojastehmehr, R., & Takrimi, A. (2009). Characteristics of effective teachers: Perceptions of the English teachers. *Journal of Education & Psychology*, 3(2), 53-66.
- Kyriakides, L., Christoforou, C. & Charalambous, C.Y. (2013). What matters for student learning outcomes: A meta-analysis of studies exploring factors of effective teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 36, 143-152.
- MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). *Sample size in factor analysis*. *Psychological methods*, 4(1), 84-99.
- McIntyre, N. A., Mulder, K. T., & Mainhard, M. T. (2020). Looking to relate: Teacher gaze and culture in student-rated teacher interpersonal behaviour. *Social Psychology of Education*, 23, 411-431. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-019-09541-2>.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1998). *An introduction to communication in the classroom* (2nd ed.). Tapestry Press
- Moafian, F., & Pishghadam, R. (2009). Construct validation of a questionnaire on characteristics of successful

- Iranian EFL teachers. *Pazhuhesh-e-Zabanha-ye Khareji*, 54, 127-142.
- Moafian, F., Ostovar, S., Griffiths, M.D., & Hashemi, M. (2019). The construct validity and reliability of the characteristics of successful EFL teachers questionnaire (CoSEFLT-Q). *Porta Linguarum: An International and Interuniversity Journal of Foreign Language Didactics*, 31, 53-73.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Nurzatulshima K., Lilia, H., Kamisah O., & Subahan Mohd. Meerah. (2009). Management of students' Involvement in science practical work). *Jurnal Penyelidikan Pendidikan Jilid*, 54 (1), 205-217.
- Park, G. P. & Lee, H. W. (2006). The characteristics of effective English teachers as perceived by high school teachers and students in Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 7, 236-248.
- Pishghadam, R., & Khajavy, G. H. (2014). Development and validation of the student stroke scale and examining its relation with academic motivation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 43(2), 109-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2014.03.004>.
- Pishghadam, R., Derakhshan, A., Zhaleh, K., & Al-Obaydi, L.K. (2021). Students' willingness to attend EFL classes with respect to teachers' credibility, stroke, and success: A cross-cultural study of Iranian and Iraqi students' perceptions. *Current Psychology*, 42, 4065-4079. Doi: 10.1007/s12144-021-01738-z
- Porter, A., & Brophy, J. (1988). Synthesis of research on good teaching: Insights from the work of the Institute of Research on teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 45(8), 74-85.
- Rama, S. (2011). Professor's performance for effective teaching (Kosovo case). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 12, 117-121.
- Sanders, W. (1999). Teachers, teachers, teachers! *Blueprint Magazine*, 4.
- Sanders, W., Wright, S. P. & Horn, S. P. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11, 57-67.
- Schumacker, R.E., & Lomax, R.G. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shin, S., & Koh, M.-S. (2007). A cross-cultural study of teachers' beliefs and strategies on classroom behavior management in urban American and Korean school systems. *Education and Urban Society*, 39 (2), 286 - 309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124506295280>.
- Shishavan, H. B. & Sadeghi, K. (2009). Characteristics of an effective English language teacher as perceived by Iranian teachers and learners of English. *English Language Teaching*, 2, 130-143.
- Siti Maziha, M., Nik, S., Nik, A. R., & Melor, Md. Y. (2010). Factors influencing classroom participation: A case study of Malaysian undergraduate student. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1079-1084.
- Soodmand Afshar, H., & Doosti, M. (2013). Exploring the characteristics of effective Iranian EFL teachers from students' and teachers' perspectives. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 6(1), 205- 230.
- Sotto, E. (2011). *When teaching becomes learning: A theory and practice of teaching* (2nd ed.). Continuum Education.
- Suhr, D. (2006). Exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis? *Statistics and Data Analysis*, 1- 17.
- Suwandee, A. (1995). Students' perceptions of university instructors' effective teaching characteristic. *SLLT Journal*, 5, 6-22
- Sürücü, L., Şeşen, H., & Maşlakçı, A. (2021). SPSS, AMOS ve PROCESS Macro ile ilişkisel, aracı/düzenleyici ve yapısal eşitlik modellemesi (uygulamalı analizler). Detay Yayıncılık.
- Tamblyn, P. (2000). Qualities of success: Lessons from a teacher career. *Education Canada*, 40(1), 16-19.
- Watkins, M. W. (2018). Exploratory factor analysis: A guide to best practice. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 44(3), 219-246.
- Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *How teaching matters: Bringing the classroom back into discussions of teacher quality*. The Milken Family Foundation and Educational Testing Service.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. (2000). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Yıldız, V. A. & Taşgın, A. (2020). Öğretmen motivasyon ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 9(4), 1741-1754.

Zhu, C., Valcke, M., & Schellens, T. (2010). A cross-cultural study of teacher perspectives on teacher roles and adoption of online collaborative learning in higher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(2), 147–165. Doi: 10.1080/ 02619761003631849.

## Appendix 1

### Başarılı İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Özellikleri Anketi

1: Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum, 2: Katılmıyorum, 3: Fikrim yok, 4: Katılıyorum, 5: Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

| Benim öğretmenim...   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Konuyla ilgili iyi bir bilgiye sahiptir.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. Alanıyla ilgili güncel bilgilere sahiptir.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. Öğrencilere karşı arkadaş canlısıdır.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4. Öğrencilere birey olarak saygı duyar.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5. Öğrencileri iyi anlar.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6. Sınıfı iyi yönetme becerisine sahiptir.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7. İyi huyludur.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8. Sabırlıdır.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9. Espri anlayışına sahiptir.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10. Yeni öğretim yöntem ve stratejilerinin farkındadır.                                 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11. Cd, ses kayıtları vb. gibi öğretim materyalleri kullanır.                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12. Öğretmekten zevk alır.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 13. Öğrettiği konuyla ilgilenir.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 14. Kendine güveni vardır.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 15. Öğrencileri öğrenmeye teşvik eder.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 16. Öğrencileri becerileri/yetenekleri ve zayıflıkları açısından, iyi tanır.            |   |   |   |   |   |
| 17. Zayıf olan öğrencilere yardım etmeleri için, daha iyi öğrenen öğrencileri kullanır. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 18. Yeterli sayıda ödev verir.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 19. Yeterli sayıda yazılı değerlendirme yapar.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 20. Yazılı değerlendirmelerin sonuçlarını ilan etmede hızlıdır.                         |   |   |   |   |   |
| 21. Derse iyi hazırlanmıştır.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 22. Öğrencilerin sorularını cevaplarırken dikkatli ve nettir.                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| 23. Önemli konuları ve noktaları vurgular.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 24. Dinamik ve enerjik bir kişidir.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 25. Tüm öğrencilere ilgi gösterir.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 26. Sınıf içinde ve dışında öğrencilere yardım etmeye isteklidir.                       |   |   |   |   |   |
| 27. Öğrencileri farklı şekillerde motive eder (motivasyon çeşitliliğini teşvik eder).   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 28. Doğru bir telaffuzla, anlaşılır bir şekilde konuşur.                                |   |   |   |   |   |
| 29. Temiz ve düzenli bir görünüme sahiptir.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30. Materyalleri öğrencilerin anlama düzeyinde sunar.                                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 31. Sınıfa zamanında girer.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 32. Sınıftan zamanında ayrılır.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 33. Tüm fikirlere saygı duyar.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 34. Yapıcı eleştiriyi kabul eder.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 35. Konuyu ders süresi ve saatine göre iyi organize eder.                               |   |   |   |   |   |
| 36. Puanlamada tarafsızdır.   |   |   |   |   |   |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 37. Öğretimde üretkenliğe sahiptir.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38. Tüm öğrencileri öğrenmeye dahil eder.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39. Öğrencilerin sınıfa katılımı için eşit fırsatlar sağlar.                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40. Tartışma ve soru sorma fırsatları yaratır.                                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| 41. Öğrencilere karşı, ayrımcılık yapmaktan kaçınır.                                 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42. Öğrencilerin öğrenme sorunlarıyla ilgilenir.                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43. Ders saatini, dersin amaçlarına ve farklı dil becerilerine uygun olarak ayarlar. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44. Öğrencilerle dalga geçmekten kaçınır.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45. Çok sert olmaktan kaçınır.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 46. Öğrencilerde özgüven oluşturur.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 47. Sınıfta öğrencilerin varlığını önemser.  |  |  |  |  |  |