

Teaching English Language, Vol. 19, No. 2, Summer & Fall 2025, in press.

Teaching English Language Journal

ISSN: 2538-5488 – E-ISSN: 2538-547X – <http://tel.journal.org>

© 2025 – Published by Teaching English Language and Literature Society of Iran

TELL
S



Please cite this paper as follows:

Behnam, N., Seifoori, Z., & Behnam, B. (2025). Developing and implementing an observation form for ELT macrostrategy use: A focus on teaching experience. *Teaching English Language, 19*(2), in press. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2025.423011.1554>

Research Paper

Developing and Implementing an Observation Form for ELT Macrostrategy Use: A Focus on Teaching Experience

Nasrin Behnam

Ph.D. Candidate in ELT, Department of English, Ta.C., Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran.

Zohreh Seifoori¹

Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English, SR.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

Biook Behnam

Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English, Ta.C., Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran.

Abstract

A broad consensus underscores the pivotal role of English teachers in enhancing student learning by maximizing learning opportunities. Within this context, the postmethod macrostrategic framework has been proposed as a theoretical lens for understanding how teachers can effectively adapt some macrostrategies to diverse local settings. Despite its conceptual significance, the framework requires localized operationalization to serve as a practical tool for teacher self-reflection and peer observation. Addressing this gap, the present study sought to develop and validate a context-sensitive observation form grounded in six essential and locally relevant teaching macrostrategies. An initial 44-item, five-point Likert scale instrument was constructed through

¹ Corresponding author: zseifoori@iau.ac.ir

2 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

an extensive review of literature and expert consultation. Using cluster sampling, the form was validated via Principal Components Analysis (PCA) with 43 Iranian EFL teachers from Tabriz and Shahin Dej, which resulted in the retention of 26 items. The validated instrument was subsequently applied to classroom observations of 10 experienced and 10 novice teachers randomly selected from local language institutes. Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) revealed that the teachers' macrostrategic implementation fell below satisfactory levels. Additionally, teaching experience was found to have a significant effect reflected in the estimated effect size estimations. The findings offer practical implications for curriculum developers, educators, and can serve to promote the practice of English language teaching.

Keywords: Observation Form, Teaching Experience, Teaching Macrostrategies, Teaching Microstrategies

Received: January 17, 2024

Accepted: September 12, 2025



1. Introduction

In the dynamic field of English Language Teaching (ELT), the limitations of method-based teaching have led theorists and practitioners to seek more flexible and context-sensitive frameworks. With the emergence of the anti-method movement in the 1980s (Allwright, 1991; Pennycook, 1989; Prabhu, 1990) and the subsequent rise of postmethod debates (Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Prabhu, 1990), this pedagogical shift has become even more observable. The idea of 'methods' failed to gain widespread adoption due to practical challenges, specialized training requirements, and the absence of clear implementation guidelines (Allwright, 1991), while teachers' uncritical acceptance of untested methods (Pennycook, 1989; Prabhu, 1990; Sturn, 1992) has also been widely acknowledged.

Among the most influential responses to these challenges is Kumaravadivelu's (2001) postmethod framework, which considers pedagogy

as practice-driven and encourages teachers to adopt innovative strategies tailored to their unique classroom contexts (Kumaravadivelu, 1994). According to Widdowson (1990), in the postmethod framework, teachers are mediators between theory and practice. Based on this theoretical reorientation, the macrostrategic framework (Kumaravadivelu, 2003) signifies a departure from traditional, rigid methods toward a more flexible, context-sensitive approach. Postmethod pedagogy emphasizes teacher autonomy, beliefs, and experience, thereby allowing teachers to be learner-centered and tailor instruction to suit the requirements of individual students. Can (2009) describes postmethod as adapted classroom practices and principles, shaped by teachers' prior knowledge, experience, and acquired teaching strategies. Within this theoretical shift, Kumaravadivelu's macrostrategic framework is a major milestone that indicates scholarly attempts to localize global principles to serve context-specific needs of the learners. localized teaching approaches that approach.

A macrostrategy refers to a broad plan that endows teachers with the freedom and independence to develop context-specific and demand-driven classroom procedures (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). Macrostrategies are operationalized through classroom microstrategies, allowing teachers to respond to learners' dynamic needs. Kumaravadivelu's (2003) macrostrategic framework consists of ten macrostrategies, including: Maximizing Learning Opportunities (MLO), Minimizing Perceptual Mismatches (MPM), Facilitating Negotiated Interaction (FNI), Promoting Learner Autonomy (PLA), Fostering Language Awareness (FLA), Activating Intuitive Heuristics (AIH), Contextualized Linguistic Input (CLI), Integrating Language Skills (ILSs), Ensuring Social Relevance (ESR), and Cultural Awareness (CA). Underlying each of these macrostrategies is a set of enacted classroom activities referred to as microstrategies that serve to maximize learner

4 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

involvement and promote instructional outcomes. They get theoretical support from input, interaction, attention, and interaction hypotheses (Krashen, 1985; Long, 1996; Schmidt, 1995; Swain, 1995) as well as proceduralization theory (DeKeyser, 1997), adaptive control of thought (Anderson, 2007), social learning (Hellermann, 2006), and sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007).

Although theoretical and empirical evidence accentuate the effectiveness of macro/microstrategies, the application of these strategies evolves with teaching experience. However, the application of these strategies evolves with teaching experience, potentially influencing instructional choices. As Kini and Podolsky (2016) emphasize, teachers play a crucial role in promoting educational effectiveness. Research presents mixed evidence regarding the relationship between teaching experience and student achievement: some studies report a positive correlation (Rice, 2003; Ladd & Sorensen, 2017; Gerritsen et al., 2014), while others find no consistent link (Hanushek & Luque, 2003; Luschei & Chudgar, 2011; Fatima Musa, 2023).

Despite a solid theoretical basis, research shows that the practical application of macrostrategies varies significantly among different experience levels. The controversy over the impact of teaching experience on the use of macrostrategies is not settled yet. It is assumed that the application of macrostrategies by novice teachers may entail reliance on ready-made institutional lesson plans (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015). Experienced teachers, however, can more readily benefit from their accumulated insights to globalize their practice (Leite et al., 2020; Ahmad, 2014). A close scrutiny of this viable divergence entails systematic assessment of practitioners based on reliable and valid observational tools.

Although interest in postmethod pedagogy is growing, there seems to be a lack of empirical tools for observing and assessing the use of macrostrategy

in real-time classroom settings. Most studies rely on questionnaires and interviews to gather data on teaching strategies (Linh & Yen, 2022; Kouraichi & Lesznyak, 2022; Chen, 2014) or the influence of teacher experience (Rostami & Mirsanjari, 2021; Soleimani & Pourrasa, 2021; Worku et al., 2024; Najafi et al., 2023). Existing instruments often focus on discrete behaviors, overlooking the strategic, principle-driven nature of macrostrategies (Ghiasvand, 2022). Moreover, the mediating role of teaching experience in macrostrategy use remains underexplored, highlighting a gap in research and teacher education.

The current study aimed to bridge this gap by developing and implementing an observation form designed to capture six key macrostrategies: MLO, FNI, FLA, PLA, CLI, and ILSs in the context of English language teaching in Iran. It is assumed that such a context-sensitive, experience-informed observation form offers value for multiple stakeholders in the Iranian context, where ELT is expanding rapidly and teacher backgrounds vary widely.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Macrostrategic Framework

Recent studies have explored various aspects of implementing macrostrategies in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Hooman et al. (2021) investigated the effect of postmethod pedagogy on senior high school students' achievement, academic self-efficacy, achievement emotions, and self-esteem. The data obtained through a posttest revealed that academic achievement, self-efficacy, emotions, and self-esteem of high school students could develop significantly as a result of using the postmethod.

Worku et al. (2024) investigated the interaction between postmethod pedagogy practice, teacher autonomy, and the experience of English teachers. They employed a mixed-method approach, which included semi-structured

6 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

interviews with 10 English instructors and a postmethod survey with 71 English instructors. Their findings suggest that postmethod pedagogy is effectively incorporated by these teachers, particularly macrostrategies such as integrating language skills, promoting negotiated interaction, and fostering learner autonomy. Integrating language skills had the highest mean among the three stated macrostrategies.

In the Iranian context, Khani and Darabi (2014) evaluated EFL teachers' performance through observation and found that facilitating negotiated interaction scored the highest among the eight macrostrategies employed. However, they also noted a limited application of postmethod pedagogy by teachers. Likewise, Najafi et al. (2023) scrutinized 18 Iranian EFL teachers' use of macrostrategies by running semi-structured interviews. The results revealed that these teachers predominantly utilized macrostrategies such as activating intuitive heuristics and contextualizing linguistic input, with the most frequent being integrating language skills. However, less emphasis was placed on promoting learner autonomy and fostering language awareness macrostrategies.

2.2 Teaching Experience

Research has also demonstrated that teaching experience significantly enhances the implementation of macrostrategies in EFL contexts (Hosseini et al., 2015; Williams & Clement, 2015). Experienced teachers are generally more adept at creating supportive learning environments, developing classroom management procedures, and addressing unexpected challenges (Leite et al., 2020). Ahmad (2014) points out that experienced teachers have a deeper understanding of their learners' needs, which enables them to apply macrostrategies more effectively. In contrast, novice teachers often rely on prescribed methods without considering their students' specific requirements (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015). Day (2012) further suggests that as

teachers advance in their careers, they become more confident and instructionally flexible.

Despite the significance of macrostrategies in EFL settings, novice teachers face obstacles in their implementation (Nguyen & Tran, 2024; Zeng, 2012). Soodmand Afshar et al. (2015) investigated the impact of teaching experience on the sense of efficacy among 135 EFL teachers and found a significant positive correlation. Research indicates that novice teachers often struggle with managing classrooms when using complex macrostrategies (Stough et al., 2015). Zarei and Afshari Sharifabad (2012) found that experienced teachers felt more autonomous and less anxious, which enhanced their sense of efficacy compared with novice teachers.

Conducting classroom research in various ways, numerous researchers (e.g., Nazari et al., 2022) have considered the observation scheme as a practical tool for analyzing classroom behavior of both learners and teachers. They examined the relationship between 23 teachers' perceptions of teaching grammar and their actual practices in the Saudi EFL context via observation. The findings revealed a negative correlation. Yet, some studies consider other schemes for gathering data, such as questionnaires and interviews (Worku et al., 2024; Chen, 2014; Najafi et al., 2023; Naseri Karimvand et al., 2014).

A cursory examination of the literature on teacher education reveals a scarcity of research on measuring and evaluating teachers' use of macro/microstrategies, particularly the differences between novice and experienced teachers in using such strategies. This gap is pronounced in the Iranian EFL context, where learners seek rapid English proficiency, and institutes offer time-constrained courses with a lack of attention to the educational background of teachers. Thus, this study aimed to operationalize teachers' use of the six effective teaching macro/microstrategies through a researcher-made observation form and examine the potential impacts of

8 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

teaching experience. To serve this purpose, the following research questions were formulated:

1. Is the newly developed ELT macrostrategy use observation form a valid and reliable tool?
2. Is there a significant difference between experienced and novice teachers in terms of ELT macrostrategy use?

3. Method

3.1 Design

This study was based on a multi-method research design. According to Taskkatori and Teddie (2010), multi-method research involves either different types of qualitative research or different types of quantitative research. For the current study, the multi-method research design proved appropriate since the researcher drew on two types of quantitative research: (i) to devise an observation form to measure experienced and novice teachers' use of effective teaching macro/microstrategies and (ii) to determine whether a significant difference exists between experienced and novice teachers in terms of ELT macro-strategy use.

3.2 Participants

43 EFL teachers participated in this study, teaching at two language institutes in Tabriz and Shahin Deh. They were included in this research due to their willingness to cooperate. Initially, data from a cluster sample of the 43 teachers underwent factor analysis using SPSS version 26 for the Macro/Micro Strategies Observation Form (M-MSOF). Institute supervisors observed these teachers in a pilot study. Notably, de Winter et al. (2009) state that reliable exploratory factor analysis (EFA) results can be achieved with N below 50, justifying the 43-teacher sample size.

For the subsequent phase and to answer the second research question, 20 female teachers were selected through cluster sampling from two prominent language institutes in Tabriz. They had completed an institutional TTC course and fell within the 23-33 age range. Each institute contributed 10 participants, selected randomly from a pool of 30 teachers. Among the 10, 5 were experienced (5-8 years) and 5 were novices (1-3 years) based on Freeman's (2001) distinction.

3.3 Instruments

Research data were collected using a validated researcher-designed Observation Form (See Appendix), refined through a pilot study. To observe macro/microstrategies utilized by novice and experienced teachers, a 44-item Likert scale observation form was crafted, guided by Kumaravadivelu's insights (2003) and further validated by input from three field experts. Three experienced supervisors from English language institutes were interviewed separately, and their recommendations regarding the microstrategies for inclusion in each macrostrategy category were meticulously documented. As a result of a thematic analysis derived from the interviews, recurring themes emerged, which consequently comprised the contents of the items. The form focused on six chosen macrostrategies: MLOs, FNI, FLA, PLA, CLI, ILSs, and notably, the exclusion of four macrostrategies—Minimizing Perceptual Mismatches, Activating Intuitive Heuristics, Ensuring Social Relevance, and Raising Cultural Consciousness—was based on expert consensus and the subjectivity inherent in the EFL context in Iran. In the current study, we focused on the functional aspect of language use and skills such as reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Therefore, Fostering Strategic Awareness (FSA) rather than Fostering Linguistic Awareness (FLA) is what we have focused on.

10 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

3.4 procedures

During item generation, the M-MSOF comprised 44 items. The decision to rotate factors followed Kline's advice (1993) against rotation when anticipating a single stand-alone factor. Following this recommendation, a non-rotational Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was conducted. This approach assesses pedagogically distinct variables on the M-MSOF without rotation. PCA is, in fact, an exploratory factor analysis that is used in exploring a data set; EFA helps establish factorial validity. It does not test hypotheses or theories, however. PCA was employed for some reasons suggested in the literature on statistics. Stevens (1996) proposed that PCA avoids some of the potential problems with 'factor indeterminacy' associated with common factor analysis, and thus, it is preferred in the early stages of scale development. Moreover, via PCA, factors are defined as linear combinations of the items that can yield a single, definitively correct solution (DeVellis, 2017). Finally, the PCA is an exploratory factor analysis that offers a more stringent test of replication than confirmatory factor analysis (Saucier & Goldberg, 1996).

Considering crucial PCA procedures, eigenvalue size and item loadings were assessed. Field's guideline (2013) led to the removal of factor loadings below 0.3. We further examined internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha) per scale and compared it with inter-scale correlation. Leung et al. (2010) propose that if scales measure distinct concepts, inter-scale correlation should be lower than their internal reliability coefficient.

To explore this, we conducted a PCA with a single component for each of the 6 scales. Initially, we evaluated the suitability of the data for each scale. Correlation matrices displayed moderately strong Pearson correlation coefficients, mostly at .3 and above. To ensure data set appropriateness for factor analysis, we examined the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling

adequacy (KMO) and Bartlett's test of Sphericity. KMO depends on partial correlations (i.e., correlations between pairs of items) rather than sample size. The KMO index ranges from 0 to 1. To be more specific, Kaiser (1974) recommends a bare minimum of 0.5. All the KMO indexes ranged from .50 to .78. This verified the sampling adequacy for the factor analysis. As the analysis indicated, the values related to Bartlett's test of sphericity for each scale reached statistical significance ($p < .05$); Bartlett's test of sphericity should be statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Upon conducting a PCA analysis on the 44 M-MSOF items, those with a communality below .2 (Child, 2006) were excluded. Specifically, items 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 38, and 41 were removed, resulting in a checklist of 26 items. To assess inter-rater reliability, two sets of teachers were observed: three experienced teachers from Goldis Language Institute and three novice teachers from Alef Institute. Both groups were observed by two supervisors, using the macro and microstrategies observation form. Each teacher underwent a single 90-minute observation session. Inter-rater reliability was gauged using intra-class correlations (ICCs) on total sub-construct scores, and the results are presented in Table 1. Notably, the novice group's 'Strategic Awareness' (SA) interrater reliability was zero due to limited variance resulting from the small pilot group size, where one rater assigned zero scores to all three teachers. This, in turn, led to zero variance and, hence, zero reliability_ a recognized outcome in such cases.

Table 1.

Inter-rater Reliability Estimates for the Observation Checklist

	Novice	Experienced
MLO	0.85	0.94

12 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

FNI	1.00	0.99
PLA	1.00	0.92
FLA (FSA)	0.00	0.92
CLI	0.83	0.94
ILSs	0.83	0.55

MLO was assessed using items 1 to 8, encompassing teachers' feedback, questioning strategies, promoting diary use for learner experiences, and building upon learners' input. FNI-related microstrategies (items 9 to 14) examined post-listening personalized interaction, communicative activities at lesson start and end, and assigning talks followed by extended teacher-moderated discussions.

Items 15 to 17 captured PLA-related microstrategies, encompassing teachers informing students about metacognitive and learning preferences and encouraging learners to contemplate and discuss their own preferences. FSA microstrategies (items 18 to 20) aimed at enhancing strategic awareness, explicitly addressing reading, listening, and writing strategies before their practical application.

For CLI, microstrategies (items 21 to 23) encompass emphasizing sentence-level contextual clues, incorporating vocabulary questions in comprehension tasks for contextual practice, highlighting cohesive features in post-reading/listening activities, and fostering cultural awareness. Regarding ILSs, microstrategies (items 24 to 26) involve initiating lessons with receptive skills, followed by productive skills, engaging students in speaking activities after language skill instruction, and assigning pair/group work for practical application.

4. Results

4.1 Macro/MicroStrategy Observation Form Validation

To answer the first research question, a 44-item observation form was devised to measure teachers' use of macro/microstrategies. As a result of piloting this checklist with 43 teachers through factor analysis, the PCA analysis on the 44 items of the M-MSOF yielded the following results. The communalities for each variable (i.e., the amount of variance in each variable that is accounted for) were initially calculated. It is often suggested to remove items with a communality value less than .2 (Child, 2006). As we found communalities lower than .2 for several items (i.e., items 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 38, and 41), we decided to delete them and re-run the analysis. After removing these items, communalities for the M-MSOF (Micro-Macro Strategies Observation Form) were estimated to range between .251 and .953. (Table 2) presents the results.

Table 2.

PCA and Cronbach's Alpha Indexes Related to the M-MSOF

Variable Scales	<i>h</i> ² (Communalities)
MLO	
Item 1. Listens to learners and builds on what they say in the pre-view (warm-up).	.706
Item 2. Listens to learners and builds on what they say in the post-view.	.652
Item 3. Asks choice questions (yes/no questions) to elicit information from the students; in the pre-view (warm-up).	.492
Item 5. Asks choice questions (yes/no questions) to elicit information from the students; in the post-view.	.559
Item 7. Asks product (wh-) questions to elicit information from students in the view.	.320
Item 9. Asks process questions (learners' opinions or interpretations) to elicit information from students in the pre-view.	.651
Item 10. Asks process questions (learners' opinions or interpretations) to elicit information from students in the post-view.	.323
Item 13. Encourages the students to develop diaries or journals of their experiences and perspectives.	.251
KMO	.78
Bartlett's test (Sig. level)	<i>p</i> = .000

14 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

Total variance explained	49.43
Cronbach's alpha	.832
FNI	
Item 17. Engages students in personalized interaction after listening texts; as in personalized discussions and opinions about the listening texts.	.524
Item 20. Engages students in relevant communicative activities at the preview stage; tasks performed in the pre-view stage to facilitate learning.	.365
Item 21. Engages students in relevant interactive activities at the post-view stage.	.636
Item 22. Assigns brief prepared talks in the form of lectures.	.272
Item 23. Engaged students in discussions of the teaching content/ topic.	.480
Item 24. The teacher moderates extended discussions on presented topics.	.604
KMO	.50
Bartlett's test (Sig. level)	$p = .000$
Total variance explained	48.03
Cronbach's alpha	.777
PLA	
Item 25. Informs students about general learning preferences and strategies.	.882
Item 26. Informs students about metacognitive strategies like planning learning, evaluating learning	.767
Item 27. Asks them to think about and discuss their own learning and strategy preferences.	.953
KMO	.625
Bartlett's test (Sig. level)	$p = .000$
Total variance explained	86.72
Cronbach's alpha	.896
FSA	
Item 34. Explicitly raises students' awareness of reading strategies, provides examples and engages them in actual strategy use.	.618
Item 35. Explicitly raises students' awareness of listening strategies, provides examples and engages them in actual strategy use.	.308
Item 36. Explicitly raises students' awareness of writing strategies, provides examples and engages them in actual strategy use.	.610
KMO	.570
Bartlett's test (Sig. level)	$p = .027$
Total variance explained	51.20
Cronbach's alpha	.394
CLI	
Item 37. Emphasizes the linguistic context to help students use sentence-level contextual clues. Meanwhile, Asks questions while pre-teaching vocabulary to contextualize vocabulary learning.	.321
Item 39. Engages students in identification of cohesive features of the linguistic input in post-reading/listening activities.	.743
Item 40. Sensitizes learners towards cultural clues.	.741
KMO	.575
Bartlett's test (Sig. level)	$p = .000$
Total variance explained	60.16
Cronbach's alpha	.518

Teaching English Language, Vol. 19, No. 2
Behnam. et al

ILSs	
Item 42. Starts the lesson with receptive skills and then presents productive skills, integratively.	.770
Item 43. Engages students in speaking activities after teaching any of the language skills.	.800
Item 44. Assigns pair/group work to let students practice what they have learned from the listening, reading, writing, and speaking lessons.	.764
KMO	.732
Bartlett's test (Sig. level)	$p = .000$
Total variance explained	77.82
Cronbach's alpha	.851

To check further, we compared inter-scale correlations with internal consistency reliability coefficients. The findings supported that each scale measured a distinct concept, as the inter-scale correlations were less than the scale's internal reliability coefficient. PCA also confirmed that the six components (MLO, FNI, PLA, FSA, CLI, and ILSs) could explain approximately 49%, 48%, 86%, 51%, 60%, and 77% of the variance for each scale, respectively. Moreover, the internal reliability of each scale was measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient. It should be noted that numerous controversies exist regarding an acceptable level of reliability. With short scales, low Cronbach values are common (Pallant, 2016). As shown in Table 2, all the scales of the M-MSOF had quite acceptable reliability values; that is, MLO, Cronbach's $\alpha = .832$; FNI, Cronbach's $\alpha = .777$; PLA, Cronbach's $\alpha = .896$; FSA, Cronbach's $\alpha = .394$; CLI, Cronbach's $\alpha = .518$, and ILSs, Cronbach's $\alpha = .851$. Pallant (2016) suggests that when reliability is low, as was the case for the FSA items, it may be more appropriate to report the mean inter-item correlation for those items. Results showed that the mean inter-item correlation was .28, which was within an acceptable range for the inter-item correlation, i.e., .2 to .4 (Briggs & Cheek, 1986). Overall, PCA verified the use of the 26-item M-MSOF as a reliable and valid instrument for assessing macro/microstrategies used by EFL teachers.

The Likert-scale observation form is scored on a scale from 0 to 4. Thus, quantifying the responses would yield a total score range of 0 to 176. The

16 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

optimal score for teachers in each macrostrategy can be calculated by multiplying the number of microstrategies related to each type by the highest value on the Likert scale (4). The lowest score that may be achieved by teachers regarding each macrostrategy is zero, indicating no use. Meanwhile, the ultimate score depends on the function of the number of microstrategies by the highest level, which is four. Hence, the ultimate score for MLO is 32 ($8 * 4 = 32$, i.e., the number of microstrategies for MLO multiplied by the largest number on the Likert scale). We shall consider a range of (8-16) as needing reconsideration and training, (17-24) as average and moderate users, and (25-32) as satisfactory users of macrostrategies. The optimal score that teachers could obtain for Negotiated Interaction is 24 ($6 * 4 = 24$). A range of (7-12) is considered as needing reconsideration and training, a range of (13-18) is considered as an average and moderate user, and finally, a range of (19-24) is considered as a high use of macrostrategy. The optimal score for all the remaining macrostrategies, i.e., FSA, CLI, ILSs, and PLA that could be obtained by teachers is 12 ($3 * 4 = 12$). A range of (4-6) is considered as needing reconsideration and training, a range of (7-9) is viewed as an average and moderate user, and a range of (10-12) is deemed as proficient in utilizing the aforementioned macrostrategies

4.2 Teachers' Use of Macro/Microstrategies across Teaching Experience

The second research question examined whether there is a significant difference in the use of ELT macrostrategies between experienced and novice teachers. To this end, the data obtained from the observation of the research participants were analyzed through inferential statistics. Initially, the descriptive statistics of the two groups were estimated.

For the experienced teachers, the highest mean ($M = 7.60$) and the lowest mean ($M = 2.50$) belong to MLO and CLI, respectively. Quite similarly, for

the novice teachers, the highest mean ($M= 7.40$) and the lowest mean ($M= 1.80$) belong to MLO and CLI. However, the mean scores obtained by experienced and novice teachers were respectively 7.60 and 7.40 for MLO, 5.30 and 4.90 for FNI, 3.40 and 2.10 for FSA, 2.50 and 1.80 for CLI, 4.80 and 4.00 for ILSs, and 5.60 and 5 for PLA. Regardless of the differences, all the averages were far below moderate use, emphasizing the participants' need for further training in the use of the macrostrategies.

To check the significance of the observed difference, the research data were analyzed via a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) after major assumptions for the MANOVA statistic were checked via the Shapiro–Wilk test, which is regarded as an appropriate test for small sample sizes. Univariate normality results were all nonsignificant; in other words, the distributions were found to be, to a great extent, normal, $p > 0.05$. In addition, to check multivariate normality, Mahalanobis distances were calculated. Multivariate normality results also indicated that the value obtained (i.e., 13.25) was smaller than the critical value (22.46). Therefore, it was safely assumed that there were no multivariate outliers. Further, a one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to examine group differences in terms of the macro/microstrategies used. MANOVA involves multiple dependent variables; these variables should be conceptually related, warranting their joint consideration (Pallant, 2016). This was the case in this study; six teaching macrostrategies constituted the construct of EFL teaching macrostrategies. While some researchers opt to perform separate statistical tests, such as t -tests for each dependent variable, this approach, according to Pallant (2016), increases the likelihood of committing a Type I error due to the accumulation of multiple statistical tests.

18 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

Further, assumption testing showed that the homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices was upheld as Box M's Sig. was larger than .001. As shown in Table 3 below, there was no statistically significant difference between the experienced and novice teachers on the combined dependent variables, $F(6, 13) = 1.54, p = .23$; Wilks' Lambda = .58; partial eta squared = .41; observed power = .40.

Table 3.

Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	<i>F</i>	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Squared	Eta	Observed Power
Group	Wilks' Lambda	.58	1.54	6.00	13.00	.23	.41		.40

However, given the long-standing debate cautioning against sole reliance on p values (Wilkinson & the Task Force on Statistical Inference, 1999) and following Wasserstein and Lazar (2016), we considered partial eta squared as a commonly used effect size estimate in MANOVA. The value obtained in this research was .417, which, according to Cohen (1988), is indicative of a very large effect size; however, because of the small sample size in this research, we considered it as a moderate effect size. This value shows that 41 per cent of the variance in micro/macrostrategies use is explained by teaching experience.

Before we examined the between-subjects effects, we checked Levene's test of equality of error variances in relation to each of micro/macrostrategies separately. It was found that this assumption was not violated as the Sig. level for each variable was larger than .001. The results for the between-subjects effects are presented in Table 4.

Table 4.*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Group	MLO	.200	1	.200	.011	.919	.001	.051
	FNI	.800	1	.800	.253	.621	.014	.076
	FSA	8.450	1	8.450	7.881	.012	.305	.756
	CLI	2.450	1	2.450	.786	.387	.042	.134
	ILSs	3.200	1	3.200	1.946	.180	.098	.262
	PLA	1.800	1	1.800	.730	.404	.039	.128
Error	MLOs	334.800	18	18.600				
	FNI	57.000	18	3.167				
	FSA	19.300	18	1.072				
	CLI	56.100	18	3.117				
	ILSs	29.600	18	1.644				
	PLA	44.400	18	2.467				

A separate consideration of the dependent variables revealed that the only difference to reach statistical significance was FSA, $F(1, 18) = 7.88$, $p = .01$, partial eta squared = .30, and observed power = .75. Furthermore, an examination of the mean scores indicated that the experienced teachers had a higher degree of macro/microstrategies use ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.17$) than the novice teachers ($M = 2.10$, $SD = .87$). Considering the effect size obtained, it can be inferred that 30 per cent of the variance in FSA use is explained by teaching experience. Statistically non-significant differences ($p > .05$) were found for maximizing learning opportunity, FNI, CLI, ILSs, and learner autonomy.

5. Discussion

The current study aimed to create and implement an observation-based tool to measure teachers' use of effective teaching macro- and microstrategies in the Iranian EFL context. The factor analysis of the final 26-item M-MSOF demonstrated that it is a reliable and valid instrument for capturing six essential macro/microstrategies (MLO, FNI, FSA, CLI, ILSs, and PLA) in

20 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

action. The application of this newly developed tool also uncovered significant differences between experienced and novice teachers in their application of these strategies. However, the overall usage of these strategies was found to be below moderate levels, with MLO, FNI, FSA, and CLI being applied minimally. It also highlighted the need for training and reconsideration of ILSs and PLA for both groups.

These findings resonate with previous research that highlights the challenges novice teachers encounter when trying to implement complex macrostrategies (Zeng, 2012; Stough et al., 2015) and the advantages of experience in managing classrooms and adapting instructional methods (Hosseini et al., 2015; Williams & Clement, 2015). The Observational method employed in this study offers a deeper insight into teaching practices compared to surveys or interviews alone (Nazari et al., 2022; Khani & Darabi, 2014), revealing the subtleties of real-time classroom strategy implementation that questionnaires may overlook. Similarly, Worku et al. (2024) and Najafi et al. (2023) show that integrating language skills, promoting negotiated interaction, and fostering learner autonomy are frequently applied macrostrategies. However, our study found that their overall application was limited across both groups of teachers.

The findings, however, run counter to some previous studies. Mostafavi et al. (2022) reported that a teacher's education level, rather than their teaching experience, played a role in their feedback strategies, while Zarei and Afshari Sharifabad (2012) found negligible differences in efficacy-related factors between novice and experienced teachers. These discrepancies suggest that contextual and institutional factors may influence how experience affects the application of classroom strategies.

The limited use of macrostrategies by both novice and experienced teachers in the current study can be understood through the lens of the

sociocultural and institutional context of ELT in Iran. Many teachers undergo teacher training courses (TTCs) that focus on a standardized and uniform set of teaching principles, resulting in similar teaching methods across experience levels. Consequently, the application of macrostrategies tends to be limited, regardless of experience, particularly for MLO, FNI, FSA, and CLI. Furthermore, the observed gaps may be an indication of a broader cultural tendency toward prescriptive teaching and a lack of autonomy in EFL institutes, which limits teachers' ability to adapt and flexibly apply postmethod strategies. The findings underscore the urgent need to revise TTC programs to prioritize macrostrategic principles and experiential learning, thereby promoting reflective practice and adaptive expertise among both novice and experienced teachers.

6. Conclusion

The findings emerging from the current study accentuate the need for Iranian EFL teachers to develop greater awareness of microstrategies and, for the purpose of enhancing their teaching effectiveness, to intentionally use such microstrategies. The legitimacy of this need is quite conceivable in the new millennium since postmethod pedagogy is highly reliant on teachers whose reflective practice, autonomy, and strategic knowledge, according to Cochran-Smight & Villegas (2015) and Day (2012), can augment their teaching effectiveness and use of a wide range of teaching strategies. The newly developed observation form offers a practical tool for researchers, teacher educators, and teachers to evaluate, reflect upon, and refine classroom practices. This contributes to a more context-sensitive use of postmethod pedagogy.

While the M-MSOF observation form provides a framework for monitoring macro/microstrategy use, its low implementation suggests that teachers require more targeted professional development opportunities. Fostering

22 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

teacher awareness of macrostrategies such as MLO, FNI, FSA, and CLI can improve classroom management, learner engagement, and communicative competence (Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Zeng, 2012). This aligns with the broader literature, which suggests that teachers who strategically apply micro-level interventions achieve better teaching results and more meaningful learning experiences for their students (Leite et al., 2020; Stough et al., 2015).

However, it should be borne in mind that awareness of macro/microstrategies alone is insufficient. Teachers must learn how to integrate these strategies effectively to maximize student learning outcomes (Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Hosseini et al., 2015). What can facilitate achieving this level of expertise for Iranian EFL teachers is systematic attempts to design training programs that can assist teachers in bridging the gap between theoretical postmethod frameworks and classroom practice. Such programs need to be expanded to include ways of operationalizing microstrategies in context (Worku et al., 2024). Such training programs, along with teacher education policies and professional development programs, should aim to clarify how theoretical concepts might be operationalized and put into practice by actively encouraging student teachers and novices to apply these microstrategies to their practice

Future research could benefit from conducting factor analysis with a larger sample of teachers to enhance validation. Furthermore, the instrument's efficacy could be bolstered by integrating qualitative methods such as interviews and questionnaires. This enables researchers to draw more robust conclusions about teachers' utilization of macro/microstrategies. In addition, the deliberate focus on exclusively female educators in this study inherently serves as a delimitation, confining the scope of the findings. While this gender-specific lens yields valuable insights, it also limits the generalizability

of the conclusions across a broader range of teachers. Furthermore, the use of observation forms introduces a degree of subjectivity, which is considered a limitation of this study. This choice allowed for context-rich insights but may have limited the generalizability of the findings.

References

- Abduh, M. Y., & Algouzi, S. (2020). Revisiting grammar teaching in a Saudi EFL context: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(4), 291-306.
- Adeyemi, T. O. (2008). Teachers' teaching experience and students' learning outcomes in secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Information Technology*, 7(5), 201-209.
- Ahmad, A. M. (2014). Kumaravadivelu's framework as a basis for improving English language teaching in Saudi Arabia: Opportunities and challenges. *English Language Teaching*, 7(4), 96-110. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n4p96>.
- Allwright, D. (1991). The death of the method. (*Working papers, No.10*). The Exploratory Practice Center, University of Lancaster, England.
- Anderson, R. (2007). Thematic content analysis (TCA). *Descriptive presentation of qualitative data*, 3, 1-4.
- Bates, E., and B. MacWhinney (1982). Functionalist Approaches to Grammar. In L. Gleitman, & E. Wanner (Eds.). *Language acquisition: The state of the art* (pp. 173-128). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Briggs, S. R., & Cheek, J. M. (1986). The role of factor analysis in the development and evaluation of personality scales. *Journal of Personality*, 54(1), 106-148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1986.tb00391.x>
- Broady, E., and M. M. Kenning (1996). *Promoting Learner Autonomy in University Language Teaching*. London: CILT.
- Can, N. (2008). Post-method pedagogy: Teacher growth behind walls. Proceedings of the 10th METU ELT Convention.
- Can, N. (2009, December). Post-method pedagogy: Teacher growth behind walls. In *Proceedings of the 10th METU ELT Convention*. Ankara, Turkey.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). Globalization, methods, and practice in periphery classrooms. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 134-150). London, UK: Routledge.

24 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

- Chen, M. (2014). Postmethod Pedagogy and Its Influence on EFL Teaching Strategies. *English Language Teaching*, 7(5), 17-25.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Villegas, A. M., Abrams, L., Chavez-Moreno, L., Mills, T., & Stern, R. (2015). Critiquing teacher preparation research: An overview of the field, part II. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(2), 109-121.
- Day, C. (2012). The role of teachers in the professionalization of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 717–725. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.02.020>.
- de Winter, J.C., Dodou, D., & Wieringa, P.A. (2009). Exploratory factor analysis with small sample sizes. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 44(2), 147-81. doi: 10.1080/00273170902794206. PMID: 26754265.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (1997). Beyond explicit rule learning: Automatizing second language morphosyntax. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(2), 195-221.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Field, A. (2013) *Discovering statistics using SPSS*, 4th edn. London: SAGE.
- Freeman, D. (2001). Second language teacher education. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 72-79). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Gerritsen, S., Plug, E., & Webbink, D. (2014). *Teacher quality and student achievement: Evidence from a Dutch sample of twins* (Vol. 294). CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis.
- Ghiasvand, F. (2022). A multisemiotic investigation of Iranian EFL teachers' turn-allocation strategies in their classroom interactions. *جستارهای زبانی*, 13(3), 429-452.
- Hanushek, E., & Luque, J. (2003). Efficiency and equity in schools around the world. *Economics of Education Review*, 22(5), 481–502.
- Hellermann, J. (2006). Classroom interactive practices for developing L2 literacy: A microethnographic study of two beginning adult learners of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 377-404.
- Hooman, Y., Rezvani, R., & Afraz, Sh. (2021). The impact of postmethod pedagogy on academic achievement, self-efficacy, emotions, and self esteem according to the dynamic systems theory. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 11(3), 193-214.
- Hosseini, E. Z., Nasri, M., & Afghari, A. (2015). Looking beyond teachers' classroom behaviour: Novice and experienced EFL teachers' practice of

- pedagogical knowledge to improve learners' motivational strategies. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(3), 152–169. <https://www.jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/view/1045>.
- Jahan, R. (2019). Contextualising postmethod ideas in Bangladeshi school. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*. 12(2). 64-73.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31-36.
- Karimvand, P. N., Hessamy, G., & Hemmati, F. (2014). The place of postmethod pedagogy in teacher education programs in EFL language centers of Iran. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(2), 59-91.
- Khany, R., & Darabi, R. (2014). ELT in Iran: Reflection of the principle-based and post-method pedagogy in language teaching. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 908-916.
- Kline, P. (1993). *Handbook of psychological testing*. London: Routledge.
- Kouraichi, B., & Lesznyák, M. (2022). Teachers' use of motivational strategies in the EFL classroom: A study of Hungarian high schools. *Anglica: An International Journal of English Studies*, 31(2), 147-168.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E) merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, 28(1), 27-48.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL quarterly*, 35(4), 537-560.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ladd, H. F., & Sorenson, L. C. (2017). Returns to teacher experience: Student achievement and motivation in middle school. *Education Finance and Policy*, 12(2), 241–279. Retrieved from https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/10.1162/EDFP_a_00194.
- Leite, L. O., Go, W., & Havu-Nuutinen, S. (2020). Exploring the learning process of experienced teachers focused on building positive interactions with pupils. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 66(1), 28–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2020.1833237>.
- Leung, Y. Y., Ho, K. W., Zhu, T. Y., Tam, L. S., Kun, E., W-L., & Li, E. K-M. (2010). Testing scaling assumptions, reliability and validity of medical outcomes study short-form 36 health survey in psoriatic arthritis. *Rheumatology*, 49, pp.1495–1501. doi:10.1093/rheumatology/keq112.

26 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

- Linh, N. T. T., & Yen, P. H. (2022). EFL teachers' strategies and challenges in promoting high school students' autonomy in vocabulary learning. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(4), 88-105.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.
- Luschei, T., & Chudgar, A. (2011). Teachers, student achievement, and national income: Across-national examination of relationships and interactions. *Prospects*, 41, 507–533.
- Mostafavi, M., Shokrpour, N., & Afraz, Sh. (2022). The relationship between Iranian teachers' experience and education, and their written feedback on their students' papers. *Teaching English Language*, 16(2), 31-62. <https://doi.org/10.22132/TEL.2022.154830>
- Musa, F. (2023). Influence of teacher quality on students' academic achievement in English language in senior secondary schools in Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Education Research*, 11(4), 19-25.
- Najafi, T., Razmjoo, S. A., & Sahragard, R. (2023). Postmethod pedagogy macrostrategies utilized by Iranian EFL teachers. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(4), 13-25.
- Nazari, M., Boustani, A., & Sheikhi, M. (2022). A case study of the impact of a teacher education course on two Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs and practices about grammar teaching. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 7(1), 1-19.
- Nguyen, A. T., & Tran, A. H. T. (2024). Challenges and strategies in managing disruptive behaviours: Insights from Vietnamese novice EFL teachers. *Vietnam Journal of Education*, 8(3), 258–273. <https://doi.org/10.52296/vje.2024.492>.
- Pallant, J. (2016). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS program* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(4), 589-618.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no best method—Why?. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(2), 161-176.
- Rice, J. K. (2003). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes*. Washington DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Rice, J. K. (2010). The Impact of Teacher Experience: Examining the Evidence and Policy Implications. Brief No. 11. *National center for analysis of longitudinal data in education research*.

- Rostami, F., & Mirsanjari, Z. (2021). A study of Iranian novice vs. experienced EFL teachers' perceptions of teaching grammar: Searching for professional development. *Interdisciplinary Studies in English Language Teaching*, 1(2), 129-148.
- Saucier, G., & Goldberg, L. R. (1996). Evidence for the Big Five in analyses of familiar English personality adjectives. *European Journal of Personality*, 10(1), 61-77. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0984\(199603\)10](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0984(199603)10).
- Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning*, 9, 1-63.
- Soleimani, H., & Pourrasa, E. (2021). Iranian novice and experienced EFL teachers' perspectives on challenges and affordance of mobile assisted language learning (MALL) in an EFL context. *Quarterly of Iranian Distance Education Journal*, 3(2), 77-93.
- Soodmand Afshar, H., Fazelimanie, A., & Doosti, M. (2017). Developing an inventory to investigate current professional development needs of Iranian EFL teachers. *Journal of Teaching English Language*, 11(2), 161-194.
- Soodmand Afshar, H., Rahimi, A., Ghonchehpour, A., & Saedpanah, E. (2015). The impact of teaching experience on Iranian EFL teachers' sense of efficacy and their perception of English teacher distinctive characteristics. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 714-719.
- Stevens, J. (1996). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Stough, L. M., Montague, M., Landmark, L., & Williams-Diehm, K. L. (2015). Persistent classroom management training needs of experienced teachers. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 15(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v15i1.1340>.
- Sun, Q., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Understanding novice and experienced teachers' cognitions and practices for sustainable teacher development: The case of form-focused instruction in English language teaching. *Sustainability*, 14(8), 4711.
- Swaffar, J. K. Arens, K. & Morgan, M. (1982). Teacher classroom practices: Redefining method as task hierarchy. *Modern Language Journal* 66(1), 24-33.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-44). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

28 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

- Thorne, S. L., & Lantolf, J. P. (2007). A linguistics of communicative activity. *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*, 62, 170-195.
- Wen, W. P., & Clément, R. (2003). A Chinese conceptualisation of willingness to communicate in ESL. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 16(1), 18-38.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, G., & Clement, J. (2015). Identifying multiple levels of discussion-based teaching strategies for constructing scientific models. *International Journal of Science Education*, 37(1), 82–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2014.966257>.
- Worku, M.B., Birbirso, D. T., Degago, A. T., Amassu, A. (2024). Assessing the teaching practice of English instructors in Ethiopian universities through the lens of post-method pedagogy. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*.15(1).72-84.URI: <https://hdl.handle.net/10481/91354>. DOI: [10.47750/jett.2024.15.01.008](https://doi.org/10.47750/jett.2024.15.01.008)
- Zarei, A. A. & Afshari Sharifabad, N. (2012). Perceptions as to the effect of intrinsic factors on teacher efficacy. *Basic Research Journal of Education Research and Review*, 1(1), 4-14.
- Zeng, Z. (2012). Convergence or divergence? Chinese novice EFL teachers' beliefs about postmethod and teaching practices. *English Language Teaching*, 5(10), 64 - 71.

Appendix: The Macro/Microstrategy Use Observation Form

Directions: Listed below are a set of Statements describing teachers' use of various microstrategies while teaching. While observing the class, please circle the number that applies to the teacher's use of the specified strategies. Five numbers follow each statement each indicating the frequency of the teacher's use of that strategy. They include:

0=Almost never, 1=Occasionally, 2=Sometimes, 3=Usually, and 4=Almost always.

Teacher's Name..... Experience: Class Level:

Observer:

In the observed class, the teacher ...	0	1	2	3	4
1 Listens to learners and builds on what they say in the pre-view (warm-up).					
2 Listens to learners and builds on what they say in the post-view.					
3 Asks choice questions (yes/no questions) to elicit information from the students; in the pre-view (warm-up).					
4 Asks choice questions (yes/no questions) to elicit information from the students; in the post-view.					
5 Asks product (<i>wh</i> -) questions to elicit information from students in the view.					
6 Asks process questions (learners' opinions or interpretations) to elicit information from students in the pre-view.					
7 Asks process questions (learners' opinions or interpretations) to elicit information from students in the post-view.					
8 Encourages the students to develop diaries or journals of their experiences and perspectives.					
9 Engages students in personalized interaction after listening texts; as in personalized discussions and opinions about the listening texts.					
10 Engages students in relevant communicative activities at the preview stage; tasks performed in the pre-view stage to facilitate learning.					
11 Engages students in relevant interactive activities at the post-view stage.					
12 Assigns brief prepared talks in the form of lectures.					
13 Engages students in discussions of the teaching content/topic.					
14 The teacher moderates extended discussions on presented topics.					
15 Informs students about general learning preferences and strategies.					
16 Informs students about metacognitive strategies like planning learning, and evaluating learning.					
17 Asks them to think about and discuss their own learning and strategy preferences.					
18 Explicitly raises students' awareness of reading strategies, provides examples and engage them in actual strategy use.					
19 Explicitly raises students' awareness of listening strategies, provides examples and engage them in actual strategy use.					
20 Explicitly raises students' awareness of writing strategies provides examples and engage them in actual use.					
21 Emphasizes the linguistic context to help students use sentence-level contextual clues. Meanwhile asks questions while pre-teaching vocabulary to contextualize vocabulary					

30 Teaching English Language

Developing and implementing ...

learning.

- 22 Engages students in identification of cohesive features of the linguistic input in post-reading/listening activities.
 - 23 Sensitizes learners towards cultural clues.
 - 24 Starts the lesson with receptive skills and then presents productive skills, integratively.
 - 25 Engages students in speaking activities after teaching any of the language skills.
 - 26 Assigns pair/group work to let students practice what they have learned from the listening, reading, writing, and speaking lessons.
-



2025 by the authors. Licensee Journal of Teaching English Language (TEL). This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>).