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Introduction

Teacher development has served to disseminate ideas for developing an image of a language teacher. It is a process wherein four conceptualizations, namely skill learning, cognitive process, personal construction, and reflective practice have been identified (Richards & Farrell, 2005, pp. 6-7). These areas have been the center of attention in most teacher-related
resources, and materials developers have extensively touched upon them in English Language Teaching (ELT) textbooks so as to present the image of an effective teacher.

The image in question has been researched extensively; however, the wealth of studies documented on it has majorly employed quantitative approach with a self-report questionnaire at their heart. In fact, only a few research projects have ever addressed the issue from a qualitative perspective to find out whether similar or different characteristics from those derived from quantitative studies might be unearthed. The dominance of quantitative research method has greatly made it hard for qualitative researchers to steer away from a set of recursive keywords, which are believed to be the characteristics of an effective teacher. Gillham (2000, p. 123) admits that in the data gathering phase of a study, “no single method has been so much abused” than questionnaires. The principle drawback of questionnaires is that the items must be adequately easy to be understood by the subjects; this, as Moser and Kalton (1971) believe, is unfitting for delving profoundly into a phenomenon.

Additionally, a series of haphazard keywords gleaned from research studies conducted in the past have yet to produce a satisfying list of features associated with a good language teacher across varied educational backgrounds (e.g., universities, junior/senior high schools, or language institutes).

Also, there is a wide range of studies on teacher characteristics in mainstream education, but relatively, far fewer studies have focused on the characteristics of a good teacher of English as a foreign language (EFL) in the field of language teaching across relevant educational settings.

Moreover, it may be too hard to find a comprehensive research project into the characteristics of an effective language teacher, which brings together data from three sources for analysis using a qualitative methodology in a single research venture. The reasons for this lack can be because of either the tameless nature of qualitative research or the collective awareness that teachers’ minds may not be easily researchable.

These highlight the need to explore the qualities of an effective teacher qualitatively and in a triangulated fashion this time based on ideas and opinions either implicitly or explicitly expressed in ELT textbooks authored by expert teachers, and interviews with effective teachers and good language learners in the hope of finding a meeting point among the three sources.

The concern discussed above is the gap in the literature worth filling. Thus, this study intends to delve into such qualities represented as constructs in the minds of those involved in the classroom setting using a rarely employed research methodology: qualitative approach. Specifically, the current study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the qualities of an effective language teacher from the perspective of textbook authors in the field of language teaching?
2. What are the qualities of an effective language teacher from the perspective of good language teachers?
3. What are the qualities of an effective language teacher from the perspective of good language learners?
4. What are the qualities of an effective language teacher from the collective perspectives of textbook authors in the field of language teaching, good language teachers, and good language learners?
5. Is there a meaningful association between textbook authors in the field of language teaching, language teachers, and language learners’ perspectives?

The results of the study conduce to researchers interested in discovering the qualities of an effective teacher or formulating the theory of Universal Teacher in significant ways. Firstly, researchers are likely to realize that investigating the minds of exceptionally great
teachers using numbers-based meaning might not produce appropriate results even though quantitative method is often advocated because of its precision. The Quan camp is interested in a priori categorization and generalities whereas the Qual camp is drawn towards explorations and particularities, about which a research venture about the qualities of an effective language teacher should be. In other words, researchers might realize that it is the qualitative method, which can potentially assist researchers in delineating the ultimate characteristics of an effective teacher, eventually resulting in a substantial change in teacher recruitment in the future. In addition, the findings of the present study, if corroborated by quantitative tools and further research, will equip stakeholders with the knowledge and awareness of powerful gate-holding tools to employ prospective teachers, capable of outstanding performance.

Review of Literature

Characteristics of Effective Teachers

Allen (1980) over three decades ago ascertained the characteristics of good English teachers:

- Competent preparation leading to a degree in English language teaching
- A love of the English language
- Critical thinking
- The persistent urge to upgrade oneself
- Self-subordination
- Readiness to go the extra mile
- Cultural adaptability
- Professional citizenship
- A feeling of the excitement about one’s job (p. 429)

In this list, the only item concerning language teaching skills is the first characteristic. The remaining qualities relate to the personality of a person who has chosen teaching as a career. For instance, “self-subordination” suggests independence or the ability to stand on one’s feet without relying on anyone else, a characteristic which can help a teacher rise to the challenges of teaching. For instance, a teacher has to design many lesson plans for a three-month semester. This amount of professional work might not be within the power of someone who constantly needs help from others. Another item on the list is “professional citizenship,” indicating that a teacher should act as professionally as possible in the context of education as well as the society at large.

Pennington (1990), a decade later, introduced prominent features of a successful teacher:

- Knowledge of the theoretical foundations of language learning and language teaching
- Analytical skills necessary for assessing different teaching contexts and classroom conditions
- Awareness of alternative teaching techniques and the ability to put these into practice
- Confidence and skill to alter your teaching techniques as needed
- Practical experience with different teaching techniques
- Informed knowledge of yourself and your students
On this list, only three items regard the personality of a teacher. The rest concentrate on the professionality aspect. Comparing the two lists above, one can see the former majorly highlights personality-related features while the latter introduced a balance between personality-based qualities and professionalism. It also seems that within a decade, the centrality of personality in determining the characteristics of an effective teacher diminished considerably.

In the following, two lists from the turn of the century are presented and compared. On the first list, Brown (2007) addressed a number of qualities encapsulated into four categories:

- Technical knowledge
- Pedagogical skills
- Interpersonal skills
- Personal qualities (p. 492)

Each category includes specific qualities. The first two regard knowledge of subject matter (a second/foreign language) and teachings skills, respectively. The third and the fourth relate to communication skills which help the teacher establish rapport with learners. The last one describes those qualities that a mature adult person is expected to display in the society in general and in classroom in particular.

Along the same lines, Harmer (2007b) presented the hallmarks of a good language teacher:

- Recognizing students
- Listening to students
- Respecting students
- Being even-handed (p. 114)

The list does not bring into group anything about pedagogical knowledge, meaning that the author might have taken the importance of such skills for granted. It is as if this short list is a late addition to another main list which comprehensively focuses on pedagogical issues.

Comparing Brown (2007) and Harmer (2007b), one can observe that the former comprises categories of characteristics related both to the personality and professionalism of an EFL teacher while the latter solely focuses on personality. Therefore, only concluding based on the content of the two lists above, one can observe a discrepancy between the perspectives of the two EFL authors.

**Studies on Characteristics of Effective Teacher**

Turning to questionnaire-based research studies, which take into account the perceptions of both teachers and learners, Park and Lee (2006) purported to promote the research into effective teacher characteristics in Korea. Their new research project hinged on a questionnaire consisting of three components: English proficiency, pedagogical knowledge, and socio-affective skills. Their findings demonstrated that the teachers perceived significantly more different characteristics than students in all three constructs with teachers ranking English proficiency first, and the students ranking pedagogical knowledge highest. Another study with a similar research methodology was conducted by Al-Mahrooqi, Denman, Al Siyabi, and Al-
Maamari (2015) whose findings indicated that while both teachers and students can agree on the importance of the qualities, highlighted in the questionnaire, they differ in the way they rank the characteristics in question.

Not often enough did questionnaire-based studies incorporate both teachers and students’ perceptions of qualities of a good language teacher. The literature is rife with research ventures attempting to uncover the qualities in question in a one-sided fashion focusing on either learners or teachers’ perspectives. For instance, Arikan, Caner, and Celik (2013) constructed a large-scale study aiming to create a profile of students’ perceptions concerning the qualities of an effective teacher. Their findings were in accord with those of previous researchers contending that students perceived a successful teacher to be fair and just (Korkmas & Yavuz, 2011) and to demonstrate enthusiasm for teaching (Cheung, 2006; Feldman 1986; Murray, 1997). Effective language teachers are successful in reducing learners’ anxiety while managing their class skillfully. They also create a comfortable learning atmosphere (Chen & Lin, 2009; Cheung, 2006; Cubukcu, 2010; Ghasemi & Hashemi, 2011; Sarag-Siizer, 2007; Taskafa, 1989; Telli, den Brok & Cakiroglu, 2008; Wichadee, 2010). Such teachers treat students with warmth and kindness (Feldman, 1986; Yılmaz, 2011). Another study of this kind was reported by Salahshour and Hajizadeh (2013) whose outcome is a long list of features covering different aspects of teaching and teachers’ personality.

The studies reported so far commonly use questionnaires as their central data gathering tool to explore the complicated mind of a teacher and/or a learner, which Dornyei (2007) regards as “a flexible and highly context-sensitive micro-perspective of the everyday realities of the world” (p.29). Therefore, the use of such a simple tool to examine such a complex area is questionable because, in the averaged-out world of quantitative method, the subtleties of individual stories of teachers and learners will be lost.

Mixed-methods research studies on the characteristics in question are also a common practice in the literature. These studies suffer from one common flaw: employing a questionnaire either before or after holding interviews with participants. The pre-designed items on a questionnaire or in an interview guide might make subjects alter their responses as they are likely to learn from the questions posed to them. This can cast a large shadow on the dependability and trustworthiness of the study. One typical example of this kind is a study conducted by Chen (2012) who investigated the favorable and unfavorable characteristics of EFL teachers from the perspectives of university students in Thailand. The findings of the study pointed to two significant areas, namely personal trait-related, and classroom teaching-related features with the former playing a vital role in good teaching. Performing a mixed-method approach on both teachers and learners’ perceptions of qualities of good teachers, Chang (2016) discovered that learner participants valued teachers who developed a feeling of empathy toward them. They strongly favored teachers who treated the class with respect and courtesy and exhibited fairness.

Reviewing the literature also reveals that there exist far too many studies reporting numerous language teachers’ qualities without indicating how the features came to be chosen. These indicators representing the characteristics a teacher possesses or is supposed to possess are passed down from one research project to the next devoid of an explanation. For instance, Broder and Dorfman (1994) reported that more than half of the students in their study preferred teachers who could create a pleasant atmosphere. Their study did not determine what constituted “a pleasant atmosphere.”

Researcher’s Positionality and Bias

As the researcher behind the current project, I have been an EFL teacher for close to two decades. I have trained many an EFL teacher for the past decade and have witnessed some
of them reaching prominence and success in the field and some, failing as soon as they began. However, I had already seen this sort of rise and fall in my past learning experiences when I was a student. I had witnessed some of my teachers being constantly successful and some not. This observation led to the realization that all the effective teachers might have certain qualities in common. Therefore, this was the starting point of the current study.

I chose a qualitative study because I believe the observed phenomenon reported above is hard to pin down and only an in-depth analysis is likely to bring this unwritten construction to the realm of words.

The data collection process took place in a language institute owned and managed by the researcher (that is me). This was advantageous because, above all, it resolved the problem of gate-holders, who would otherwise obstruct the process, making it impossible for the project to begin. Commonly, no private language school with successful teachers would accept to be part of the study because the proposition would be construed as a threat and a way of espionage.

As a researcher, I managed the interview sessions. Because I am the general director of the institute, it can be argued that the interviewees, especially, teachers would feel uneasy in my presence. However, the organizational culture of the institute is very friendly. The welcoming atmosphere facilitated the exploration of the minds of the informants. If the interviews were to be conducted in a school where I did not know the staff, the Hawthorne and white-coat effects would probably become a greater issue.

In order to minimize the Hawthorne and white-coat effects, I made the setting of the interview room as non-threatening as it was possible. The interview session routinely began with friendly small talks. I would not wear too formal attire, nor did I frown upon the participants. I would keep smiling throughout the session. These actions did also help with mitigating the white-coat effect because, after the first few minutes, I would explicitly notice a sign of relief on the informants’ faces. What facilitated the removal of stress was the fact that the participants did not have to speak English; they would speak in their mother tongue: Farsi.

To control the Hawthorne effect, I kept the questions related to the informants’ personal lives, so they were not expected to change their behavior for my benefit. They were supposed to relay stories about their past experiences with their teachers from different educational contexts, and whenever I felt that there was a digression or vagueness, I would ask probe questions. One imminent threat in the process was that informants would say what they assumed I wished to hear. The action against this was that I (the researcher) was conscious of contradictions (if any) in the interviewees’ words about their most influential teachers.

Another action against the Hawthorne effect was the questions I had included in the questionnaire. These questions were designed in a way that the subjects had to repeat their answers to similar questions much like a loop. If what they had said earlier were in line with the truth and spoken based on actual experiences, the informants would effortlessly remember it again, meaning they had not produced responses for my benefit. Such cases did not occur in the process.

One last measure against the Hawthorne effect was the number of the informants selected for the interviews. Excluding the participants in the pilot phase, 19 informants were invited to the interview process. When we examined the common patterns of similarities emerging from data analysis, we safely concluded that the Hawthorne effect was greatly minimized because the data showed thought-provoking outcomes which will be tabulated in the following.

Concerning researcher’s bias, one deterrent action was employing a research assistant, an MA graduate in language teaching. My assistant was trained to perform data coding by observing my data coding style from the pilot interviews. I trained her for this because her main function during the real data analysis was to re-read my codes and critique them. This measure was modeled after the inter-rater reliability concept in the quantitative method. As was
expected, there appeared too many conflicting codes between the two coders (my assistant and I), often leading to dramatic changes in the draft-sheets.

Despite its advantages, one disadvantage of using two coders was that the estimated time for data coding, which was about three months, became approximately six months of disputes over the codes. One of the unresolved disputes concerned rapport and knowledge of pedagogy (KP). I coded some excerpts as rapport. However, my assistant would argue that rapport is not only an ability related to a teacher’s personality, but also it is an influence of a teacher’s knowledge on students, invisibly compelling them to respect and follow their teacher. Although my research assistant’s view bore some truth, I decided not to allow the interpretation of the excerpts to go far beyond the semantics of the excerpts and the definition of the keywords.

I also took action to ensure intra-coder reliability. I emulated the notion of intra-rater reliability by coding the data in one day and recording it once again two weeks later. This time gap was fruitful because often my second coding would be different in some respects.

Design of the Study

The present study is designed based on a qualitative multi-method approach (Morse, 2003). It is fundamentally exploratory. The goal here is to go beyond what has been recorded so far with the routine of quantitative or mixed methods approaches. The exploratory nature of the current study also denotes an inadequacy in earlier quantitative descriptions of the characteristics of an effective language teacher as they were heavily reliant on questionnaires as the central data collection tool.

One benefit of engaging a qualitative approach to probe the topic at hand is that it gives the researcher access to the minds of author-teachers, teachers, and learners. The researcher did not choose a quantitative method because as Dornyei (2007) states, “Qualitative researchers…. question the value of preparing an overall, average description of a larger group of people because in this way we lose the individual stories” (p. 27). In these stories, the researcher is looking for meanings, which cannot be found utilizing the quantitative research method while summing up numbers. These meanings can be explored and extracted by what Dornyei (2007) refers to as “the researcher’s subjective sensitivity, training, and experience” (p. 28).

The qualitative research design adopted in the current academic venture consists of three different phases. In the first phase of the study, the textbooks were analyzed. Semi-structured interviews were also deployed for the second and third stages of the study to cross-validate the findings obtained from the first phase. The data from the three stages were analyzed using qualitative content analysis, which is also titled “latent level analysis” by Dornyei (2007, p. 245) because of its deep level interpretive nature.

Generally, the purpose of the study is not to predict characteristics of an effective teacher a priori, but to explore characteristics of good language teachers from the perspectives of author-teachers, effective teachers, and good learners. Therefore, it is the researcher who formulates the questions and interprets the meaning of the outcomes; hence, the selection of qualitative content analysis.

Data Collection Techniques

In this study, we utilized qualitative content analysis of documents and semi-structured interview transcriptions as a major technique for data collection to investigate the qualities of good language teachers.
As a powerful tool in qualitative methodology, qualitative content analysis was employed to codify the three sets of collected data manually. It entails codification of themes, exploration of patterns, interpretation of outcome, and formulation of a theory (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). This analytical method helped the coders (the researcher and his assistant) systematically review, examine, and interpret crucial excerpts drawn from textbooks written by ELT author-teachers. This, in turn, led the coders to elicit meaningful data to design a semi-structured interview as the second major data collection technique, which in turn resulted in two more rich datasets (interviews with selected teachers and learners). The interviews were again examined in the same fashion as the textbooks.

Participants

The informants were selected based on purposeful sampling from Safirelian Language and IELTS House, a private language school in Bushehr province, Iran. There were two separate groups of informants, namely effective language teachers, and good language learners whose profiles are presented in Appendix A.

The participant teachers (first group) were selected by consulting a supervisor sufficiently informed of the teacher performance evaluations which were systematically recorded and filed in the institute. The results of student evaluation forms for teachers were also patiently observed for more active decision-making. One final approach in choosing a typical good language teacher was the researcher’s professional judgment. The researcher has been a language teacher for more than seventeen years and has taught thousands of language learners and trained hundreds of teachers. All these measures were taken to make sure that only good and effective teachers were selected.

The student participants (second group) were typical successful language learners. They were meticulously nominated based on similar criteria as discussed above. Their teachers would academically describe them as good learners who were actively involved in the classroom interactions displaying continued commitment, and considerable improvement.

The average teaching or learning experience of the informants was about 7 years. In the same vein, Ericsson, Prietula, and Cokely (2007) showed that even the most gifted performers need a minimum of ten years (or 10,000 hours) of concentrated training. It is worth noting that this level of expertise is rather rare. For this reason, it was not the intention of the researcher to seek it for reasons related to practicality. True expert teachers are not ubiquitous. That is why their views can be arguably analyzed using textbooks they authored.

Noteworthy to mention is that gender was not the focus of the current study. The age range of the teacher informants happened to be 25-34 years old. This is quite common in the population under study. Also, the age range of learners turned out to be 25-36 years old.

The sample size for semi-structured interviews was determined based on the saturation point which is common in qualitative research. Unlike the quantitative method which requires a large sample size to flatten differences among individuals, the qualitative approach highlights those differences rather than focusing on mean experiences (Polkinghorne, 2005); therefore, the sample size is not important. What matters is to keep the informant selection process open to the point of saturation, which Glaser and Strauss (1967) defined as the point when further information does not appear to push the study any further but simply repeats what previous subjects have already revealed. This saturation point was reached by the seventh participant teacher. However, the interview process continued with two more teachers to help mitigate some of the biases/ threats inherent in qualitative research. These, according to Maxwell (1996), include description and observation of the truth as well as manipulation of data for the sake of a theory. Researcher’s bias and presence both can also be sources of such threats.
Similarly, the data saturation point was gained when the seventh student was interviewed, yet three more interviews were conducted, and the process terminated at the tenth.

Procedure

The procedure to complete this research included three major steps which took approximately one year to complete. The first one was to randomly select standard textbooks. In order to do so, university teachers’ ideas and Google search were two vastly exploited resources. However, the final choice was restricted to the professional opinions of university professors, the availability of the sources, and their relevance. For instance, there were major books written by professional language teachers on teaching, in which language teachers’ qualities were not explicited. Therefore, these books were excluded. As a result of this search, over thirty books were primarily collected which were examined to identify topics associated with the qualities in question. If none, the book would be simply removed from the list (see Appendix B).

Upon the selection of the textbooks, we extracted the most relevant sections in each of the books elaborating on the important qualities of a good language teacher. These excerpts were lifted from the book sections and were arranged in a tabulated fashion. Altogether 417 data entries from 23 textbooks were collected.

The second and third stages of this study hinged on semi-structured interviews. The semi-structured interview guide was piloted (See Appendix C) with two language teachers and two students to make sure that it functioned optimally. The pilot stage resulted in two major revisions of the instrument. In the first revision, the first question in the guide was: [translated in English]: Regardless of the subject of teaching, we remember some teachers for the rest of our lives. Have you ever had a teacher like that in your life? When the participants heard this, they would talk about teachers who mistreated them. However, this was not to happen at the beginning of the interview. The aim was to have the informants discuss their positive experiences with effective teachers first, and the question about ineffective teachers would have to be asked later in the interview. Therefore, this question was changed into: Regardless of the subject of teaching, we remember some teachers for the rest of our lives. They are like shining stars. Have you ever had a teacher like that in your life? With this small change, the participants showed no sign of misunderstanding.

This new second version was once again piloted to see if there existed any doubt in its capacity to gather relevant data. Upon re-piloting, the researcher noticed one of the questions, which was placed once in the middle and once in the end did not produce any useful data. Eliminating the question in the middle would, therefore, help the interview look more like a natural conversation and reduce its timing to a desirable 30 minute-talk.

In order to invite informants to the interview (even in the piloting phase), an invitation letter was handed to each participant. When the informants expressed willingness to attend the meeting, an appointment was made. Each informant was informed that the meeting would last about an hour. They chose a time when they did not feel pressured by their own tasks. In the interview room, which was cozy, quiet, and neat, the researcher (as the interviewer) warmly welcomed each individual to establish rapport. Then the interviewer handed over a consent letter (Appendix D). Noteworthy it is to mention that this consent letter was preapproved by the supervising professor who oversaw the project from the beginning to the end, but as is customary, the consent letters of this sort in the English Language Department do not have to be reviewed by Human subjects Board because the supervision of the assigned supervising professor is deemed adequate.

The interviewer would allow some time for the interviewee to read it. After that, the researcher explained the content of the consent letter to assure the participants that their
The confidentiality was of utmost importance. The interviewees were informed of the fact that the study presented a minimal risk to them, and care was taken to ensure that they fully understood the nature of the study. They were also made aware that their participation in the study would be completely voluntary. Moreover, they were assured of the confidentiality of their information.

Upon the start of the interviews, the questions in the protocol were followed serially. This is because the questions had already been logically arranged. Within some of the interviews, the researcher used probing questions to elicit more information where the interviewees did not extend their answers. The interviews were conducted in the participants’ mother tongue (Persian) to facilitate the ease of communication.

At this point, several measures were taken to minimize the Hawthorne effect. First, the interviews were designed in a way that the participants would have to repeat their answers to the questions twice or more. Moreover, the questions were of different formats seeking identical answers. Therefore, an inconsistency in the answers would indicate a problem. In addition, there was a probing question specifically chosen to be asked in case the researcher felt that the interviewees were giving answers which they thought the interviewer would want to hear. The probe was: “Tell me a story about.” This question would get the informants to tell a real story from their experience that could verify the characteristics of effective teachers they had just pointed out.

Phases two and three, in addition, involved recording the interviews for the purpose of transcribing the data. The researcher decided to use full transcriptions since it was imperative to codify all the informants' perspectives very cautiously. One important point is that the transcriptions were analyzed without translating them into English since the researcher himself had conducted the interviews. Besides, meanings could be lost in translation.

One noteworthy point here is that a statistical test, namely Pearson Chi-Square (the fifth research question) was applied to the characteristics gleaned in the last step to warrantee that the observed differences between the three sets of categorical data (ELT textbook authors, interviewed teachers, and learners’ perspectives) were not by chance.

Data Analysis Procedure

Data processing and analysis included three steps:

Pre-coding: Qualitative data analysis often begins with pre-coding. That is, much of the analysis had already taken place in the mind of the researcher while collecting the data. For instance, while reading different relevant book sections, the phrases, “being a real person” and “being authentically her/himself” seemed to be pointing towards the idea of authenticity, a keyword which would be immediately written down for further etymological analysis to see if it would be a credible keyword.

Coding: The researcher and his assistant (the second coder) read the collected data back and forth to get a general understanding of the data. For instance, the data collected from major ELT textbooks were reviewed repeatedly. Each sheet was read more than four times just to generate a sense of understanding of the authors’ perceptions of the qualities of an effective teacher. The same procedure was applied to interview transcriptions.

The relevant sentences, words, or phrases in the excerpts from the textbooks and the interviews signaling a certain quality of a successful language teacher were underlined. They were then given a label that best resonated with them. The labels were informative. The researcher looked up every selected keyword in an online etymology dictionary. The root of every keyword was carefully examined before it passed as an acceptable theme. The meanings assigned to the codes were needed to be clear so that the final coding scheme could fulfill the
criterion of consistency. In this meticulous fashion, thirteen well-defined themes emerged from the content analysis of each dataset.

**Second-level coding:** In the second-level coding, the coders intended to go beyond the thirteen labels to find patterns that would develop from the emergent themes. Our goal was to zero in on the initial codes and to look at the emergent abstract commonalities across these themes. To do so, the coders attempted to cluster the themes under a broader label. Hence, two new abstract themes were explored. For instance, knowledge of pedagogy and knowledge of subject matter are commonly considered as professional requirements of a teacher creating a new umbrella theme conceptualized as “professionalism.” Additionally, the other surfaced characteristics were clustered under one general term known as “personality.”

The following excerpt clarifies how the coding process worked. In this extract taken from *How to Teach English*, Harmer (2007a) states: “Students want not only to see a professional who has come to teach them, but also to glimpse the “person as well” (p. 24). The word, professional, was interpreted as knowledge of pedagogy, and the phrase “person as well” was coded as authenticity because, in the context of the excerpt, the meaning of the phrase encompassed the definition of the word authenticity. Another example clarifying how the coding worked, is an excerpt from an interview with a selected teacher under the pseudonym of MA-T, who stated: “The reason that he was in my mind is that he would care about the language learners, [pause] the students, in fact, not in terms of curriculum, but as a person…” The underlined parts were interpreted as a thought expressed concerning rapport which is a quality in the category of personality. One more instance from the coding process showing how the initial and second-level coding came to work is a statement made by MA-S (a student informant): “They know how to work…What I believe in is their love of work, Love their work…their passion for their work.” The underlined phrases were interpreted as knowledge of pedagogy, and enthusiasm, respectively in the initial coding; they were re-coded in the second-level coding as professionalism and personality in order.

**Dependability and Trustworthiness**

Necessary measures were taken to ensure the dependability and trustworthiness of this research study guaranteeing that its findings are credible, transferable, confirmable, and dependable. The taxonomy of quality criteria introduced by Lincoln and Guba (1985) is the foundation upon which the current qualitative study was designed and executed. The first and the most important measure confirming the credibility of the study was the triangulation of data which strengthens a study by combining multiple perceptions towards one reality. In this study, author-teachers’ reality of an effective teacher’s characteristics (extracted from textbooks), effective teachers’ views (extracted from interviews), and good learners’ realities (derived from interviews) were combined and triangulated to arrive at one collective reality shared by the three groups.

Transferability as a tenet of dependability and trustworthiness (generalizability) provides evidence to readers that conclusions of the study can apply to other similar situations. This, indeed, has been one of our concerns in this study.

Another serious measure to safeguard dependability and trustworthiness was the collaboration of two coders. This ensured the confirmability aspect. During designing and the piloting stages of the semi-structured interview, both coders cooperated to train themselves in the art of coding the data before the actual coding phase began. The aim was to calibrate the way both coders thought and interpreted the data. This was a time-consuming phase, but fruitful in that both coders eventually reached a point where they would more agree than disagree on how to code a certain piece of data. Coders, in the beginning, coded the data separately and
only then revealed the results in a session where notes were compared, and the disparities were conferred and resolved.

One final approach to warranting dependability and trustworthiness was inviting two inquiry auditors (external auditors) for constant review and examination of the research process and the data analysis in order to ensure that the findings were consistent.

Results

The Perspective of ELT Authors

The first research question addressed the characteristics that ELT authors deemed important in discussing effective teachers in their textbooks.

Table 1

Emergent Themes from Content Analysis of Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Initial Codes</th>
<th>Tallies</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Initial Codes</th>
<th>Tallies</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledge of pedagogy</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Physical attributes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, thirteen themes were uncovered from the qualitative initial coding of the selected textbooks, arranged in descending order of tallies and percentages.

The data for the second-level coding shows that, of the total number of tallies, the number of qualities related to personality stood at a large figure of 284 while that for professionalism was relatively lower at 253.
Table 2

Overview of Initial and Second-level Coding of Textbooks (Tallies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Textbooks</th>
<th>KP</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Rapport</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Rhetoric</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Consciousness</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
<th>Humor</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Physical Attribute</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>B11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>B13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>B16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>B17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>B18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>B20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>B22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 229 98 52 32 28 24 18 13 12 10 9 3 284 253 537

Note: B = Book  KP = Knowledge of pedagogy  KS = Knowledge of subject matter

Table 2 summarizes the results of the initial and second-level coding of each selected textbook and provides an overview of the discovered characteristics from the qualitative analysis of all the 23 textbooks.

The keywords in Table 1 were referred to covertly or overtly in the designated textbooks. The first keyword is knowledge of pedagogy (KP). It is a commonly understood term in the field of language teaching, but for the sake of clarification, according to Erbay, Erdem, and Sağlamel (2014), pedagogical knowledge refers to “the knowledge of processes and strategies that help teachers deal with content. It ranges from knowing how to give feedback, how to organize and explain content, and how to manage the classroom” (p. 44). Every piece or chunk of text that resonated with this definition was collected under the code: KP.

As an example, KP was implied in the statement, “… the teacher should be aware of the factors and processes that are considered to facilitate L2 development” (Kumaravadivelu, 2006, p. 25). In this extract, “be aware of” resonates with “the knowledge” mentioned in the
definition, “the processes and strategies” reflect the “the factors and processes,” and “content” indicates “L2” (Second Language). Therefore, the code KP was chosen for this piece.

Critical thinking is the second keyword. The relevant definition for it was stated in a study on critical thinking and education by Glaser (1941) who defined critical thinking as,

the ability to think critically… involves three things: (1) an attitude of being disposed to consider in a thoughtful way the problems and subjects that come within the range of one’s experiences, (2) knowledge of the methods of logical inquiry and reasoning, and (3) some skill in applying those methods (para. 4).

To illustrate, Critical Thinking was inferred from the phrase, “…being evaluators of their own effect (Hattie, 2012, p. 31). To be an “evaluator” of our effect, first, we need to be able to be “disposed” to see the “effect” we have had on learners. Without this quality, there will be no observation of the effect. Furthermore, to “evaluate” a phenomenon such as our effect on a classroom, we need to employ a form of knowledge which is the result of the repetition of the evaluations we have performed over time. In other words, effective teachers have been the evaluators of their effect so many times that we can assume they have developed the knowledge necessary to conduct an evaluation. From the knowledge and the idea of repetition, we can easily deduce the notion of skill, which is gained through practice and experience. Therefore, this excerpt along with other similar pieces is hinting at the notion of critical thinking, so it was eventually labeled so.

Rapport was the third keyword. Brown (2007) defines rapport as “…the relationship or connection you establish with your students, a relationship built on trust and respect that leads to students feeling capable, competent, and creative” (p. 202). This definition was applied to varied pieces.

To exemplify, rapport was implied in the statement, “both an ally and an authority” (Brookfield, 2006, p. 55). In the definition, the teacher as an “authority” is entrusted with establishing the “connection,” hence the use of the pronoun, “you.” The word, “ally” clearly suggests the type of relationship a teacher must establish with the class. To caption the obvious, alliances are often built on “trust” and “respect,” two qualities whose absence can bring about chaos.

Empathy was the fourth keyword. In the absence of a favorable definition in the literature on language teaching, we turned to Online Merriam Webster Dictionary for a definition: “the action of understanding, being aware of, being sensitive to, and vicariously experiencing the feelings, thoughts, and experience of another of either the past or present without having the feelings, thoughts, and experience fully communicated in an objectively explicit manner.”

For instance, empathy reflected in the words, “patient in working with students of lesser ability” (Brown H. D., 2007, p. 430). The word, “patient” which is often used in association with an effective teacher originates from Latin, meaning “to suffer.” It is the ability to wait without feeling annoyed. The question we asked ourselves was: where does this quality stem from? Throughout data analysis, we chose different codes to cover this particular quality. In the end, we decided to choose “empathy” whose definition would cover a wide range of excerpts. Our conviction was that the ability to suffer without being annoyed comes from the understanding of thoughts or experiences of another. That is why the piece in question along with many other were classified as empathy.

Rhetoric the fifth keyword, which is defined by Online Merriam Webster Dictionary as the ability to use language effectively, especially to persuade or influence people. This definition was used as a keyword, based on which the excerpt, “An effective teacher encourages the students with positive feedback” was coded (Nunan, 2015, p. 8). Therefore, any
excerpt that resonated with the definition and suggested the use of language to persuade learners to improve their language skills was labeled, “rhetoric.”

The importance of the knowledge of subject matter, the sixth keyword, was explicitly echoed in “Understanding of curriculum and materials” (Richards & Farrell, 2005, p. 4). The term content knowledge refers to “the body of knowledge and information that teachers teach and that students are expected to learn in a given subject or content area, such as English language arts, mathematics, science, or social studies. Content knowledge generally refers to the facts, concepts, theories, and principles that are taught and learned in specific academic courses, rather than related skills—such as reading, writing, or researching—that students also learn in school” (Content Knowledge, 2016).

Enthusiasm was the seventh keyword. Online Merriam Webster Dictionary defines it as a “strong excitement of feeling.” The reason for selecting this word instead of many other synonyms was that many authors described this quality of an effective teacher as if it is spiritual. The etymology of enthusiasm according to Online Merriam Webster Dictionary reveals that the original use of the word was associated with spirituality. Therefore, any description of an effective teacher that was in line with this definition was labeled, “enthusiasm.”

To illustrate, enthusiasm was considered the subject of the statement, “They show enthusiasm and passion for the job of teaching” (Lopez-Burton & Minor, 2014, p. 172). The reason this excerpt was categorized as enthusiasm was not the direct mention of the word itself but was its pairing with the word, “passion,” which suggests the intensity of one’s interest in a job.

“What the teacher thinks of students and how students are treated” denotes respect (Harmer, 2007a, p. 25). According to Online Merriam Webster Dictionary, respect, the eighth keyword, means “an act of giving particular attention” or “consideration. It is an activity that needs a doer who in this context is the teacher who “thinks of” or “considers” the learners in the class and the way they are treated.”

When Lopez-Burton and Minor (2014, p. 161) stated, “They are aware of their audience,” we coded it as being conscious of events in the classroom because the notion that a teacher must be aware of the ongoing in the class was repeated 12 times in different sources on language teaching Consciousness, our ninth keyword, according to Online Merriam Webster Dictionary means “perceiving, apprehending, or noticing with a degree of controlled thought or observation.” It seems that the authors included in this analysis did not simply mean that teachers should not feel tired or go to class with a distracted mind. In fact, these authors’ words suggested intentionality in the act of observing the learners in the class which is reflected in the definition.

Authenticity was the tenth keyword which was resonated in the imperative, “Be a Real Person” (Garrett, 2014, p. 46). In the field of language teaching, authenticity is often applied to materials used in the classroom. In that sense, the realness or trueness to original materials is the subject of discussion. However, the authors of ELT materials included in the current study seem to apply the term to the teacher as a person. Online Merriam Webster Dictionary defines authenticity as being “true to one's own personality, spirit, or character,” which suggests that the teachers should not mask their personalities with pretensions, hence the categorization of any excerpt which denoted being a real person.

Humor, the eleventh quality, as one characteristic of an effective teacher was viewed in the idea that “In a positive learning atmosphere, the teacher has a good sense of humor” (Scrivener, 2011, p. 16). Online Merriam Webster Dictionary defines humor as “the mental faculty of discovering, expressing, or appreciating the ludicrous or absurdly incongruous.” It is therefore a mental capacity that an effective teacher must possess. It might be obvious from
nine excerpts that we found what humor means, yet the provision of a definition was necessary to make it clear what the authors included in the study implied when mentioning this quality.

Fairness, the twelfth characteristic, was seen in the declaration that “Good teachers would not let their students suffer any consequences for their own misdeeds” (Orange, 2008, p. 156). According to Online Merriam Webster Dictionary, fairness means showing “fair or impartial treatment” toward others. It suggests “lack of favoritism toward one side or another.” In all the nine pieces derived from the selected textbooks, this notion was easily visible. In the excerpt above, we can see a good teacher is portrayed as someone who shows fair treatment toward learners by not punishing them for a misdeed committed by the teacher him/herself.

Physical attribute, the thirteenth quality, reverberated in the phrase, “Personal appearance” (Brown H. D., 2007, p. 434). This particular keyword required little interpretation because the quality in question concerned the way a teacher looks such as tardiness, attire, or cleanliness.

The Perspective of Interviewed Effective Teachers

The second research question focused on how quality teachers perceived effective teachers.

Table 3

Emergent Themes from Content Analysis of Interviews from Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Initial Codes</th>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Initial Codes</th>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Knowledge of pedagogy</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Physical attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2, thirteen themes were uncovered from the qualitative initial coding of interviews with allegedly effective teachers.

The data for the second-level coding reveals that the number of qualities related to personality boasted 233, being of a significant magnitude in comparison with the record for professionalism at merely 69.
Table 4

Overview of Initial and Second-level Coding of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Rapport</th>
<th>KP</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>Humor</th>
<th>Rhetoric</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Consciousness</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
<th>Physical Attribute</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AK-T</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LG-T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MA-T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MR-T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MSH-T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RJ-T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SZ-T</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SM-T</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SHG-T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: KP = Knowledge of pedagogy  
KS = Knowledge of subject matter

Table 4 summarizes the results of the initial and second-level coding of each interview and provides an overview of the discovered characteristics from the qualitative analysis of all the transcribed interviews.

The participant teachers voiced their opinions in different fashions. For instance, AK-T pointed to the importance of rapport and defined it as “…very appropriately, treating a human being.” This translated excerpt was taken from a context in which the informant was talking about the relationship between a teacher and students. That is the teacher (AK-T) was relaying a story about how important it is to establish a connection with the students in class before you open your book and start teaching as if no one is there in the class. That story ended in the statement above, which began with a modified adverb “very appropriately” being used to highlight such a relationship with a student as “a human being,” which, interpretively speaking, resonated much better with the definition of rapport, mentioned before.

The significance of the knowledge of pedagogy was mirrored in the statement by another teacher (LG-T), who recommended that an effective teacher should “use discovery learning towards students.” This piece was labeled KP because the participant directly mentioned a “strategy” in language teaching to deliver “content” to learners. “Strategy” and “content” originate from the definition of Knowledge of Pedagogy which was delivered above.

The reference to empathy was detected in the interview with SM-T, who described an unempathetic teacher as: “… he didn’t care about us. I mean, he would not do anything for us to like him [as an effective teacher].” We believe the informant was implying that the teacher in the story lacked empathy or the sensitivity to understand how students thought or felt. The latter part of the comment suggests a complete disassociation between the world of the teacher and the world of the students.

SHG-T referred to the quality “enthusiasm” while describing a teacher as someone who conveyed no enthusiasm towards the profession: “She didn’t care [about her job]. She would leave us just be in the class.” The teacher in this story did not share the intense passion many effective teachers have and often communicate it to the class. Otherwise, the informant would be able to detect it and relay it to us. According to the definition of the word, offered in the previous section, the enthusiasm for the job is so intensive that it seems to be spiritual in nature, hence visible for people around.
Respect was mentioned in terms of physical punishment. For instance, MA-T talked about a teacher, who “did not believe in punishment, especially, corporal punishment.” Physical punishment in the view of this participant seemed to mean a lack of consideration for students. When a teacher raises his/her hand to hit a student, the teacher is not giving particular attention to that person. Hence, the keyword, respect, was used. Noteworthy is that according to the Online Merriam Webster Dictionary, the Latin root for “respect” means “to look back” or “regard.” Our interpretation of the excerpt based on the context (the story) was that the informant was feeling dissatisfied with the teacher who lacked this quality.

MSH emphasized the importance of knowledge of subject matter when she stated that “[An effective teacher] would work on the topic of discussion [grammar lesson] at home.” Based on the definition mentioned before, the informant here is discussing the importance of working on the content, which, based on the context, was a grammar lesson, hence the label, knowledge of subject matter.

Rhetoric was inferred from what MR-T relayed about an effective teacher who would motivate her students by kindly saying “these lessons have to be studied or will pile up and become harder to study.” The teacher who was depicted here probably knew how to use language to persuade the students to study. This is the definition of the word rhetoric, mentioned previously. The informant told us that they would simply do their homework. What was left unsaid was that they would comply simply because what their teacher said influenced them. Obviously, we could use the word “motivation” instead of the word “rhetoric,” but we decided to choose the latter because it seemed close to being a skill or an actual characteristic than the former, which fundamentally suggests giving someone a reason to do something.

SM-T used the phrase, “a man of laughter” to mean humor as an important quality of a teacher. The choice we made here seemed obvious, but looking at the context where this excerpt stems from, we realized that the student was not simply talking about humor but rather a sense of humor which according to the definition presented before indicates an ability developed in an individual.

RJ-T criticized a teacher for not taking the responsibility to correct his mistakes by saying, “it was irresponsible of him… I think.” This excerpt was one of the most challenging pieces that we interpreted. Based on the context, it seems that the informant is complaining about a lack of critical thinking in the teacher whom the story is about. Based on the definition of critical thinking offered in the previous section, this quality requires the ability to detect a problem, the knowledge to solve it, and the skill to apply the knowledge to the problem. The teacher described here seems not to be able to see that the students needed feedback. Based on the context, it is hard to infer that the teacher did not know feedback was part of teaching. Generally, most teachers, even novice teachers, are aware of the importance of feedback. The teacher simply did not recognize the problem, which indicates a lack of critical thinking.

“Fairness” was referred to in relation to favoritism as MR-T used the phrase, “preference-based treatment” to describe an unfair teacher. The wording in the comment along with the context aligns well with the definition of fairness, presented above.

SHG-T believed that “you must distinguish between a sad day and not a sad day [in their faces],” which signals the fact that teachers must be conscious of the events in the class because they are preoccupied with their own problems. The excerpt indicates that the teacher in question had a degree of control over observing the changes in the class and even on the faces of students. Therefore, since the excerpt greatly aligns with the definition of consciousness, mentioned before, we labeled it so.

Authenticity was often mentioned in relation to pretentious behavior. As a case in point, AK-T expressed dissatisfaction towards teachers who “pretend that they are good people.” This way of looking at the trueness of a teacher to who he/she is, was the central theme in all the six cases we found in the data from interviews with teachers.
SZ-T thought that an effective teacher among many things must be a “good dresser,” a phrase coded as physical attribute. Only this excerpt was found in the data related to teachers’ physical attributes, and it did not need interpretive analysis as it was direct.

The Perspectives of Good Learners

Table 5

Emergent Themes from Content Analysis of Interviews from Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Initial Codes</th>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Initial Codes</th>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Knowledge of pedagogy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Physical attributes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the initial coding of the interviews with the selected language learners are presented in Table 5.

The results of the second-level coding of all the transcribed interviews showed that in contrast to a sizeable figure for personality-related qualities (200 tallies), the figure for professionalism reached well below half that for personality: 78 counts.

Table 6

Overview of Initial and Second-level Coding of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Rapport</th>
<th>KP</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Rhetoric</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Humor</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Consciousness</th>
<th>Physical Attributes</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MS-S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MA-S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RS-S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SB-S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SE-S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FA-S</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MG-S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 summarizes the results of the initial and second-level coding of each interview and provides an overview of the discovered characteristics from the qualitative analysis of all ten interviews.

The keywords in Table 5 were assigned to ideas and thoughts shared by participant students in different shades and forms. For example, FA-S used the phrase, “the way I am treated” to discuss rapport. The context of the conversation concerned the relationship between a student and a teacher. Therefore, based on the definition of rapport presented before, the excerpt here and 61 other similar cases were marked “rapport.”

FF-S complained that teachers “do not use a variety of techniques” as a way of talking about the knowledge of pedagogy. This extracted piece falls within the parameter of the definition of knowledge of pedagogy, mentioned before because it is directly related to the “strategies” used to deliver “content.”

IJ-S said “[Effective teachers] try to give you hope” by which it was construed that rhetoric was the quality he was referring to. We think the informant here is implying that teachers should persuade students to continue learning despite shortcomings, an implicit notion that is in line with the definition of rhetoric.

HK-S described a teacher who “angrily pulled a student’s hair” as a way of discussing respect. Respect as defined before regards an act of considering others in a situation. It seems from the context that the learner here was angry because her existence, dignity, and identity were disregarded.

IJ-S pointed out the issue of “university education” as a way of talking about subject matter knowledge. In this conversation, he clarified that by a university degree, he meant language learning. In other words, the informant insisted that a language teacher must have a decent understanding of the subject matter he/she is teaching. This is a clear example of the definition of the keyword.

RS-S described a teacher directly using the term “empathetic.” Yet the reason the excerpt was classified under “empathy” was not the direct mention of it. The context that led to the mention of empathy was about a teacher who would not frown upon those adult learners delivering their assignments late because she would understand that life was hard. This indicates that the teacher in question had within her the capacity to understand her learners, which reflected of the definition we offered before.

MA-S, among other participants, discussed enthusiasm with “love of the job.” The excerpt here is the conclusion of its preceding statements which meant that the origin of a teacher’s feeling for the job had an unknown source. That is why this piece and 25 other similar implicit and explicit comments were classified as enthusiasm.

MS-S relayed a story about a teacher who was “funny but not in a disrespectful way.” Through this, she highlighted the importance of humor. What is salient in the comment was the teacher’s ability to laugh at something ludicrous without insulting the students. This trait hidden in the comment was labeled “humor.”

SE-S expressed that his teacher was a “great analyst,” referring to the teacher’s critical thinking skill. From the context surrounding this comment, it is apparent that the informant was amazed at how the teacher recognized a problem in the lesson plan and resolved it quickly, which suggests that the effective teacher in question did know how to tackle a problem. The
highlighted part of the context was the informant’s amazement concerning the speed with which the teacher would discover that the lesson plan was not helping a portion of the learners in the class learn the lesson.

RS-S told a story about a teacher who was even aware of the changes in his students’ facial expressions: “He once told me, ‘you feel different today’ [a detectable sense of astonishment in voice].” The comment strikingly aligns well with the definition of consciousness presented before, hence the classification.

MG-S said, “He loved a well-dressed teacher.” The comment made by the informant here is the outcome of a story about an effective teacher who paid meticulous attention to everything including how he dressed to appear in front of the students.

Authenticity was referred to as not wearing “a mask” by SB-S. The idea of “mask” reminded us of the Latin root of the word “person” (Merrian-Webster, n.d.), according to Online Merriam Webster Dictionary, which is “persona,” a mask worn by actors. This comment, therefore, was categorized under the keyword, authenticity.

IJ-S pointed to fairness in terms of nepotism by describing a teacher who would “care only about a few, not the rest.” The description did not agree with the notion of impartiality, which is inherent in the word, fairness.

The Collective Perspective about the Qualities of an Effective Language Teacher

Having collated all the data from the three sources above (triangulation phase), the researchers were able to answer the final research question: What is the collective perspective concerning the qualities of an effective teacher?

Table 7

*Initial Coding: Collective Perspective*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Initial Coding</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledge of pedagogy</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Physical attributes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 summarizes the findings in this stage showing the number of implicit and explicit mentions of the themes across the three datasets.
Table 8

Second-Level Coding: Collective Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Second-level Coding</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 compares the number of mentions of each second-level coding theme across the three datasets, namely interviewed teachers, learners, and textbooks authors by ELT authors.

The overall view of the collective results of our second-level coding of the three sources of data showed that while 717 tallies were directly or indirectly related to characteristics about a teacher’s personality, 400 counts pointed to the professionalism of a teacher.

The Association Between EFL Textbook Authors, Teachers, and Students’ Perspectives

To answer the fifth research question, the Pearson Chi-square test was applied to Table 8 to determine whether there is a significant association between the two categorical sets, namely Professionalism and Personality in relation to the perceptions of ELT textbook authors, interviewed teachers and learners. Hence, the Pearson Chi-square test based on the selected significance level of 0.05 (as is shown in Tables 9 and 10).

Table 9

Collective Perspective: Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Two Aspects of an Effective Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT Authors</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

Collective Perspective: Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>59.193</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>60.039</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Assoc.</td>
<td>54.880</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 99.55.
As can be seen in Table 10, the findings show that the value of test statistics is 59.193 with a corresponding p-value of 0.000, and the p-value is smaller than our chosen significance level (a = 0.05).

Discussion

The Perspective of ELT Authors

As demonstrated in Table 1, knowledge of pedagogy was referred to far more than the other qualities at 43%. Second in rank was critical thinking (18%), followed by rapport (10%). The frequency with which the other characteristics were mentioned dwindles reaching a low of 1% for physical attributes, yet all these thirteen qualities were implicitly and explicitly discussed or mentioned by the selected textbooks collectively. In other words, having left no stone unturned while qualitatively analyzing the relevant sections of 23 books, we managed to find only thirteen recurring characteristics, making up an effective language teacher. Noteworthy it is to mention that throughout the whole process, we did not omit any factor or quality from our findings even if the quality was mentioned once only.

Another finding in this section was that the knowledge of pedagogy ranked first. This suggests that author-teachers are sufficiently expressive about the technicality of teaching methodology, and that might be why their books reflect their most harbored thoughts about pedagogy above everything else.

One unanticipated outcome was about the ranking of the knowledge of pedagogy and the knowledge of subject matter. While 43% of the coded data concerned the former, only 4% was about the latter. Both elements have been a subject of intense discussion in the literature as two aspects related to teacher’s professionalism, yet ELT authors do not seem to view them as equally important. The reason might be that ELT textbook authors take subject matter knowledge for granted. For this, it captures less attention than pedagogy.

The findings from the qualitative content analysis of the selected textbooks were to a great extent substantiated by Brown (1978) who regarded affective factors as the key qualities of an effective EFL teacher and suggested that such a teacher is understanding, creates meaningful communication atmosphere, and enhances learners’ self-esteem. Dincer, Goksu, Takkac, and Yazici (2013), likewise, pointed to features such as socio-affective skills, pedagogical knowledge, subject-matter knowledge, and personality traits. Similarly, Pettis (1997) stated, to be professionally effective, language teachers must guarantee a balance of principles, knowledge, and skills; they look for a wide range of classroom activities and a different content area. Effective language teachers have also been described as having great competence in the target language they are teaching and a collection of personal characteristics, namely sensitivity, affection, and tolerance (Vadillio, 1999). In the same vein, Brosh (1996) drew attention to the characteristics of an effective language teacher, including a mastery of the target language, the ability to describe, illuminate, and spark interest and motivation among language learners, fairness, and the capability to be supportive to learners.

The Perspective of Interviewed Teachers

As summarized in Table 3, the same thirteen qualities discovered from textbooks emerged from the initial coding of teachers’ interviews. This was one very important finding and also highly unexpected. We expected to identify new characteristics or at least the absence of some of the characteristics discovered in the previous phase, yet the results in this phase were commensurate with the ones in the previous stage. It was as if there was a perfect convergence between what the ELT authors perceived and what effective teachers spoke of.
The reason for this is not, of course, out of the ordinary. Textbooks seem to have affected and possibly shaped the mentality of many ELT teachers. This implies that what teachers mentioned in their interviews is likely to have roots in the textbooks they read or the training they have had.

Another unexpected outcome was that the selected teachers, unlike author-teachers, were concerned most about rapport as the most essential quality of an effective language teacher. This was inconsistent with the quantitative findings of Arikan (2010), Khojastemehr and Takrimi (2009), Birjandi and Rezanejad (2014), or Demiroz and Yesilyurt (2015). One reason could be that in a private language institute, students are usually treated like customers who should be kept satisfied.

The second-level coding of teachers’ interviews (Figure 2) resulted in another unanticipated outcome as well. The informants were approximately three times more concerned with personality-related traits than professionalism which is in sharp contrast to the findings of the previous phase where the analysis of ELT authors’ perspectives showed a fair balance between professionalism and personality. We have already mentioned that the study took place in a private institute where learners are more treated as customers than learners. That is, students, unlike public schools, pay for their education benefiting the private institutes financially. Therefore, in these contexts, students are often treated more as customers than students, and for this reason, the teacher-student relationship paradigm is overshadowed by a buyer-seller paradigm. This may have impacted the selected teachers’ perspectives because they are often expected by stakeholders in private institutes to attract students rather than repelling them by being strict. In other words, this phenomenon (The importance of a teacher’s personality) can be due to this seller-buyer paradigm, likely governing the relationship between teachers and students in private institutes.

The Perspectives of Good Learners

The most striking finding in this stage was that the same thirteen qualities emerged from qualitative data analysis of the interviews with good learners. Here, no additional characteristics were discovered, and the number of themes remained intact. The only disparity observed was in the order in which the qualities were mentioned by the informants. Such discrepancies were also reported by Park and Lee (2006) and Chang (2016).

Another important finding was that good learners much like teachers valued rapport, and knowledge of pedagogy above other qualities. This finding was corroborated by Zamani and Ahangari (2016) and Arikan, Taşer, and Saraç-Süzer (2008).

Turning to the second-level coding (Figure 3), student participants devoted three times more attention to the teacher’s personality (72%) than to professionalism (28%). This is not completely unexpected. Learners are not pedagogy literate. Thus, what attracts their attention is the personality of the teacher which is an easier topic to discuss. According to the findings, a teacher was viewed as an individual possessing exemplary human qualities with an expertise in teaching.

The Collective Perspective about the Qualities of an Effective Language Teacher

One obvious finding from this final phase as depicted in Figure 4 and Table 7, is that the participant students and teachers and ELT authors shared thirteen common grounds concerning the qualities of good teachers. That is, they alluded to identical themes concerning qualities in question.

Moreover, the knowledge of pedagogy was collectively ranked as the most important factor in making an effective teacher among the rest. The greatest proportion of the significance
attached to this originates from textbooks; it is easy to see that ELT authors have a deeper understanding of pedagogy, hence writing more about it in comparison.

Rapport was the second most significant quality. It is discussed that establishing rapport is a characteristic of excellent teachers which builds relationships and enhances learning (Lownan, 1995). Another reason for the saliency of this feature is that it is closely related to the unique social and interpersonal nature of the ESL/EFL classrooms. As Stevick (1980) claims success is less contingent on materials, methods, and linguistic analyses; it, however, draws more on interactions between individuals in the classroom which is dependent more on personality.

Furthermore, even though the collated data shows how important the inner workings of a teacher’s mind is, the knowledge of pedagogy is one aspect of a teacher’s life in classrooms, which usually comes to be noticed first and above everything else. This facet is deemed so crucial that it overshadows other qualities a teacher must possess. In other words, every characteristic of a successful teacher is translated in terms of one’s ability to employ the technique and teach well. This can create a blind spot for students, observers, or researchers to see what else is important about being a successful teacher.

It is also noteworthy to mention that the findings in the initial coding stage, reported in Table 7, are in line with those listed, deliberated, or stated by Allen (1980), Pennington (1990), Stronge (2007), Brown (2007), Harmer (2007b), Harmer (2012), Scrivener (2005), and Scrivener (2011). The findings here are also in congruence with (several of) the findings by Zamani and Ahangari (2016), Shishavan and Sadeghi (2009), Wood (1998), Metcalfe and Game (2006), Korthagen (2004), Brosh (1996), SoodmandAfshar and Doosti (2014), and Pennings, van Tartwijk, Wubbels, Claessens, van derWant, and Brekelmansn (2014). On the other hand, the findings in the second-level coding phase (Figure 4) do not confirm those found by Moradi and Sabeti (2014) and Javid, Farooq, and Gulzar (2012).

The Association Between EFL Textbook Authors, Teachers, and Students’ Perspectives

Our findings reveal that there is a statistically significant association between teachers, students, and ELT textbook authors’ perspectives and the two aspects of an effective teacher, namely professionalism and personality.

Conclusion

The current research sought to explore the attributes of good EFL teachers from the perspectives of language teaching textbooks, language learners, and language teachers.

The most important conclusion drawn from this study is that using a rarely employed research methodology, namely qualitative approach, can potentially produce results, which reflect the experiences, personal stories, and deeply harbored beliefs of those involved in the study as opposed to the use of questionnaires, which can potentially guide the mentality of the subjects towards some methodically listed characteristics on a Likert scale. Although the generalizability of a qualitative research project is questionable, its findings being closer to what informants think can be later tested through quantitative approach.

Moreover, in light of the content analysis of ELT textbooks, thirteen themes were uncovered concerning qualities of good teachers in which the knowledge of pedagogy, critical thinking, and rapport were most widely addressed by ELT authors. In this regard, teacher training programs for prospective teachers should place more weight on teaching methods, critical thinking, and interpersonal skills. The results also displayed that ELT authors put great store on the professionalism and personality of a language teacher. Building on this, teacher
trainers are recommended to strike a balance between these two constructs in the current professionally oriented training programs.

The results of semi-structured interviews of teachers and students demonstrated the identical themes consistent with the ones drawn from ELT textbooks. Also, the findings of the study indicated that the characteristics of good teachers as perceived by language learners and language teachers were convergent substantiating those of the ELT authors. Language learners and language teachers alike viewed rapport as the single most important attribute of a language teacher. They both place a high value on the personality of a language teacher. Teacher educators and language teachers should take advantage of advances in educational psychology associated with teacher personality. Also, teacher training programs as well as in-service training courses need to address rapport building strategies between teachers and students. Further, applied linguists and researchers are also urged to orchestrate efforts to map out the concept of rapport for one vital purpose: turning this vague notion into a palatable and acquirable skill for novice teachers.

The results of the present study, limited as they might be, can form the sound basis for a new vital segment to teacher training courses, namely a personality training course. The course can entail the introduction of qualities that make up an effective teacher along with the definitions of keywords as was done in this study. The major purpose of the course can be to bring into teachers’ consciousness the existence of these characteristics using examples from effective teachers from a wide range of nations all over the world. For instance, if a new teacher learns what empathy is by learning from the example of an effective teacher who clearly shows sensitivity to the pains and problems of students outside the class which contribute negatively to student performance, the recruit will likely be able to emulate the same behavior repeatedly until over time and through supervision, empathy can become a common characteristic in the behavioral set of the new-be teacher.

Furthermore, the results can provide insight into teacher recruitment programs empowering researchers in different branches of applied linguistics or psychology to design tools that can efficiently screen applicants who wish to become language teachers as presently, there is a dire need to create a system whose output is the selection of prospective and competent teachers. Conceivably, the output of this tool or test can be a potential teacher index or a band-score informing stakeholders and teacher trainers of the energy or time they should invest in the prospective teachers.

The findings of this study are subject to at least one limitation. The participant teachers and students were selected from one language institute (or educational context). Consequently, caution should be exercised in generalizing the findings of this study. However, further studies with a sample size variation are called for to provide a detailed picture of the qualities of good language teachers.
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## Appendix A

### Profile of Participant Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK-T</td>
<td>Ph.D. candidate in teaching</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG-T</td>
<td>BA in English language literature Celta Cert. Safirelian certified teacher</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-T</td>
<td>MA in English language teaching Safirelian certified teacher</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSH-T</td>
<td>BA in English language literature Safirelian certified teacher</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA-T</td>
<td>BA in English language literature Safirelian certified teacher</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ-T</td>
<td>TESOL Cert. Safirelian certified teacher</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SZ-T</td>
<td>TESOL Cert. Safirelian certified teacher</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG-T</td>
<td>BA in English language literature Safirelian certified teacher</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM-T</td>
<td>BA in English language literature Safirelian certified teacher</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Profile of Participant Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language learners</th>
<th>Years of learning English</th>
<th>Level of English</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA-S</td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF-S</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK-S</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Upper-intermediate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ-S</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG-S</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Upper-intermediate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-S</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA-S</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Upper-intermediate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-S</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-S</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-S</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

List of textbooks included in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25 biggest mistakes teachers make and how to avoid them</td>
<td>Carolyn Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A course in language teaching practice</td>
<td>Penny Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>An intercultural approach to English language teaching</td>
<td>John Corbett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Effective classroom management <em>the essentials</em></td>
<td>Tracey Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Essential teacher knowledge <em>core concepts in English language teaching</em></td>
<td>Jeremy Harmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Expertise in Second Language Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>Keith Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How to teach English</td>
<td>Jeremy Harmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Learner and Teacher Autonomy <em>concepts, realities, and responses</em></td>
<td>Terry Lamb, Hayo Reinders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Learning teaching, the essential guide to English language teaching</td>
<td>Jim Scrivener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Methodology in language teaching <em>an anthology of current practice</em></td>
<td>Jack C. Richards, Willy A. Renandya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Never work harder than your students and other principles of great teaching</td>
<td>Robyn R. Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Novice Language Teachers <em>Insights and Perspectives for the First Year</em></td>
<td>Thomas S. C. Farrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>On Being a Language Teacher <em>a personal and practical guide to success</em></td>
<td>Norma Lopez-Burton, Denise Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Professional Development for Language Teachers <em>strategies for teacher learning</em></td>
<td>Jack C. Richards, Thomas S. C. Farrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms</td>
<td>Jack C. Richards, Charles Lockhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The skillful teacher <em>on technique, trust, and responsiveness in the classroom</em></td>
<td>Stephen D. Brookfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher Professional Development for Improving Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>Bert Creemers, Leonidas Kyriakides, Panayiotis Antoniou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teaching by principles <em>an interactive approach to language pedagogy</em></td>
<td>H. Douglas Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teaching English as a Foreign Language for Dummies</td>
<td>Michelle Maxom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teaching English to speakers of other languages <em>an introduction</em></td>
<td>David Nunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The practice of English language teaching</td>
<td>Jeremy Harmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Understanding Language Teaching <em>from method to post method</em></td>
<td>B. Kumaravadivelu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Visible Learning for Teachers <em>Maximizing impact on learning</em></td>
<td>John Hattie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Semi-structured questionnaire guide (Translated)
Exploring the qualities of a good language teacher

Part 1: Demographic information

1. Male or female [not to be asked by the interviewer]
2. What is your level of education? (University level and/or language level)
3. How long have you been working? [For teachers] How long have you been learning English? [For language students]
4. How old are you?

Part 2: General questions about experiences with teachers

1. Regardless of the subject of teaching, we remember some teachers for the rest of our lives. They are like shining stars. Have you ever had a teacher like that in your life?
2. [Specific probe questions about keywords the interviewee uses]
3. What specifically made this teacher very memorable for you?
4. [Teaching differently? Behavior?] 
5. Have you ever had a teacher who did not match any of these descriptions? Someone who was not your favorite? Some like a black hole, this time?
6. There are teachers that we do not remember at all. Sometimes we do not even remember their names. Teachers between the shining stars and black holes? Is this true for you?
7. Let’s talk about shining stars? Do you have many of these great teachers or just a few?
8. What do they have in common?
10. How about black holes?
11. What are the qualities of a good teacher in general?

Part 3: Specific questions about language teachers

1. So now tell me about a language teacher you have had who matched/matches these descriptions.
2. What are the qualities of a good language teacher in your opinion?
3. Some say a language teacher should be a better individual than a professional one; some refute this. How about you?

Part 3: In-depth questions about the qualities of a good language teacher [for teacher interviewees]

1. As a language teacher, what do you imagine your students say about you?
2. What would they say about your best qualities?
3. What qualities of yours would they complain about?
4. Some say a language teacher should be a better individual than a professional one; some refute this. How about you?
Appendix D

Consent Form

I have read the information presented in the information letter about a study being conducted by Mohammad Mohammaditabar of the Azad University of Shiraz. I have had the opportunity to ask any questions related to this study, to receive satisfactory answers to my questions, and any additional details I wanted.

I am aware that I have the option of allowing my interview to be digitally recorded to ensure an accurate recording of my responses.

I am also aware that excerpts from the interview may be included in the dissertation and/or publications to come from this research, with the understanding that the quotations will be anonymous.

I was informed that I may withdraw my consent at any time without penalty by advising the researcher.

This project had been reviewed by and received ethics clearance through the supervising professors of the researcher. I was informed that if I have any comments or concerns resulting from my participation in this study, I may contact the advising professors ((bagheries@gmail.com) and (mortazayamini@gmail.com)).

With full knowledge of all foregoing, I agree, of my own free will, to participate in this study.

☐ YES    ☐ NO

I agree to have my interview tape-recorded.

☐ YES    ☐ NO

I agree to the use of anonymous quotations in any thesis or publication that comes of this research.

☐ YES    ☐ NO

Participant’s Name:

Participant’s Signature:    Date:

Researcher’s Signature:    Date:

Researcher’s Title:    Department:

Advisor Signature:    Date:

Advisor Title:    Department:

Advisor Signature:    Date:
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