International Journal of Asian Social Science

DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE POLICY INVENTORY WITHIN A FOREIGN CONTEXT

Ebrahim Khodadady

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

Leila Arian

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Branch, Mashhad, Iran

Massoumeh Ebrahimi Hossein Abadi

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Branch, Mashhad, Iran

ABSTRACT

In order to design and validate an English Language Policy Inventory (ELPI) in Iran sixty four indicators were selected from policies cited in the literature and presented on a seven-point Lickert scale to six hundred nineteen teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English for Special Purposes (ESP). The responses of the teachers were subjected to Principal Axis Factoring and the extracted latent variables (LVs) were rotated by utilizing Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. The results showed that the ELPI consists of seven LVs, i.e., Harmonic Curriculum, International Interaction, Internationalizing Native Culture, Methodological Development, International Understanding, All-Compassing Improvement and Functional Organization. In addition to having factorial validity, the ELPI and its LVs not only proved to be highly reliable but also correlated significantly with each other. The findings are discussed and suggestions are made for future research.

Keywords: Language policy, Foreign language, Curriculum, Teachers

INTRODUCTION

Although there are many references dealing with language policy (LP) finding a comprehensive definition has still remained allusive. Some scholars subsume the LP under language planning (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996; Meshtrie *et al.*, 2000; Bergenholtz, 2006; Donakey, 2007; Baldauf *et al.*, 2012) while others consider it a part of language ideology (e.g., (Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994; Wiley and Lukes, 1996; Milory, 2001) dealing basically with issues such as standardization and revitalization of language, language and nationalism and bilingualism (Wortham, 2001). Language planning; however, taps into language situations and environments in general and

national and native languages, minority languages, immigrants' languages as well as international languages in particular (Baldauf *et al.*, 2012). As Baldauf (1994) noted the LP also involves explanation and practice of planned language improvement. To the present researchers the LP is, however, much broader.

The broad scope of LP has been brought up by many scholars (e.g., (Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997; Christian, 1999; Huebner and Davis, 1999; Mellis, 2002; Spolsky, 2003; Shohamy, 2006; Kennedy, 2011). Karyolemou (2004), for example, believed that it "is shaped ideologically by the consideration of nationhood, citizenship and identity" (p. 1). According to Lippi-Green (1994) LP is "a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogeneous spoken language which is imposed from above, and which takes as its model the written language. The most salient feature is the goal of suppression of variation of all kinds" (p. 166). Kennedy (2011) defined the LP as "the deliberate attempt to change an individual's or community's use of a language or languages or a variety or varieties" (p. 2). (Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997) mentioned that LP is "a body of ideas, laws and regulations (language policy) and, change rules, beliefs and practices intended to achieve a planned change (or to stop change from the language use in one or more communities" (p. 3). According to Mukhuba (2012), it is necessary politically and governments must treat it carefully if they do not wish to be seen to be promoting one language at the expense of the others. Kiany *et al.* (2011) emphasized the considerable role the LP plays in declaring and setting up the ideals and expectations of any crucial social effort made by institutional structures. In fact policies form, direct and affect all aspects of institutional involvements.

Policy makers and educational leaders all around the world seem to have been concerned with the language to be employed at national levels. English has proved to be among the most frequently taught languages. According to Kennedy (2011), most countries believe that English is necessary for their socio-economic development and thus have adopted LPs accordingly. They have, for example, chosen English as a major subject on the curriculum or for English-medium education (a tool for development), or as means of improvement in special domains, which is often part of LPs adopted by the private sector, especially in business domains.

Obviously the present world is going through the ever-rapid process of globalization, increasing human connectivity and social relations as a result of electric technology which has virtually transformed the world to a small global village. This phenomenon has had an enormous impact on almost all countries' educational system. Knowing a universal language has thus become inevitable in the globalized world. It has found a key role in establishing and maintaining effective relations at an international level, paving the way for universal connections, spreading native culture and identity, and freely transferring science and services throughout the world (Rahimi and Nabiloo, 2008). In the global village English is definitely the most common language that is used for different purposes such as trade, tourism or cultural, political and scientific relationships (Bastardas-Boada, 2002; Kiany *et al.*, 2010). As Vez (2008) emphasized the dominant international

language after World War II has been English and since the USA is still one remaining superpower this process is accelerating. Having knowledge of English or "Englishization" (p. 2) is, in fact, necessary to have access to social positions and resources.

In his book *English as a Global Language*, Crystal (1997) asserted that "about a quarter of the world's population is already fluent or competent in English, and this figure is steadily growing - in the early 2000s that means around 1.5 billion people. No other language can match this growth" (p. 6). Similarly, Mirabela (2006) stated that

> ... some 380 million people speak it as their first language and perhaps two thirds as many again as their second. A billion are learning it, about a third of the world's population is in some sense exposed to it and by 2050, it is predicted, half the world will be more or less proficient in it (p. 850).

The flourishing number of English speakers in different parts of the world has become a matter of national concern for both policy makers and foreign language researchers (Kiany *et al.*, 2011). According to Nunnan (2002), "the emergence of English as a global language is having considerable impact on policies and practices in all countries surveyed" (p. 589). The impact of English language teaching and learning on the LP has not, however, been addressed in an empirical manner. There is no scale available, for example, to provide factorially valid variables through which the impact of LP on various areas of concern in education in general and applied linguistics in particular can be explored. The present study has, therefore, been developed to design and validate an English Language Policy Inventory (ELPI) in Iran.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Six hundred nineteen female (n=398, 64.3%) and male (n=221, 35.7%) teachers whose age ranged from 19 to 66 (mean=29.72, SD=.481) took part in the study voluntarily. They had been teaching General English and English for Special Purposes privately and in various language institutes, private and state schools, and universities in Birjand, Bojnord, Esfahan, Faroj, Ghom, Kalat, Mashhad, Rasht, Sabzevar, Tabriz, Tehran, and Zahedan from less than one to 60 years (Mean = 6.50, SD = 6.61). They had been offering General English courses at elementary (n = 69, 11.1%), intermediate (n = 87, 14.1%), advanced (n = 34, 5.5%), elementary and intermediate (n = 163, 26.3%), elementary and advanced (n = 4, 0.6%), intermediate and advanced (n = 65, 10.5%), all (n = 155, 25%), and unspecified (n = 42, 6.8%) levels. Table 1 presents the fields in which the participants had majored at Associate Diploma (n = 10, 1.6%), BA/BSc/BEng (n = 398, 64.3%), MA/MSc/MD/MEng (n = 167, p. 27%) and PhD (n = 19, 3.1%) levels. As can be seen, 563 EFL teachers (91%) had studied fields as diverse as Accounting, Agriculture and Medicine. [Fifty six (9%) teachers did not specify their fields.] The majority (n = 476, 76.9%) had, however, majored in

English Language and Literature (n = 162, 26.2%), Translation (n = 162, 26.2%), and TEFL (n = 152, 24.6%), respectively.

Table 1. EFL teachers' academic field of study

No	Field	f	%	No	Field	f	%
1	Accounting	4	0.6	20	Microbiology	1	0.2
2	Agriculture	3	0.5	21	Midwifery	1	0.2
3	Architecture	3	0.5	22	Natural resources	1	0.2
4	Biology	5	0.8	23	Nursing	1	0.2
5	Chemistry	2	0.3	24	Paramedics	1	0.2
6	Civil Engineering	1	0.2	25	Petrochemical	1	0.2
7	Computer	4	0.6	26	Philosophy	1	0.2
8	Economics	5	0.8	27	Physics	1	0.2
9	Electronics	1	0.2	28	Physiotherapy	1	0.2
10	English Language and Literature	162	26.2	29	Politics	1	0.2
11	Industrial Engineering	1	0.2	30	Psychology	1	0.2
12	Industrial power	3	0.5	31	Science	2	0.3
13	Law	4	0.6	32	Social Sciences	1	0.2
14	Linguistics	14	2.3	33	TEFL	152	24.6
15	Management	12	1.9	34	Tourism	1	0.2
16	Material Engineering	1	0.2	35	Translation	162	26.2
17	Mathematics	3	0.5	36	Veterinary	1	0.2
18	Mechanical Engineering	1	0.2	37	Wood and Paper	1	0.2
19	Medicine	3	0.5		Total	593	91.0

Out of 600 participants who had specified the language they spoke at home, the majority (n = 592, 95.6%) conversed in Persian. English (n = 3, 0.5%), Kurdish (n = 1, 0.2%), Lori (n = 1, 0.2%), and Turkish (n = 3, 0.5%) were, however, specified by the remaining few. Three hundred and two (48.8%) and 299 (48.3%) were single and married, respectively. They were teaching English at language institutes (n = 330, 53.3%), guidance schools (n = 68, 11.0%), high schools (n = 83, 13.4%), state universities (n = 29, 4.7%), Azad university (n = 17, 2.7%), and private universities (n = 43, 6.9%) when the research was conducted

Instruments

Two instruments were developed in this study, i.e., a Demographic Scale and English Language Policy Inventory (ELPI).

Demographic Scale

A demographic scale was developed consisting of 13 questions requiring short answers and selection of a particular alternative. They dealt with the participants' age, place, level and years of teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL), gender, marital status, field and degree of study and the language they spoke at home.

English Language Policy Inventory

After reviewing the literature as thoroughly as possible, 64 indicators were selected to develop the Persian English Language Policy Inventory (ELPI). Each indicator was presented as a statement

which required the participants to specify whether they agreed completely, agreed, agreed partially, had no idea, disagreed partially, disagreed or disagreed completely with the statement. The values of 7, 6, 5, 4, 6, 2 and 1 were assigned to the seven alternatives, respectively. The first statement, for example, read "one of the policies followed in teaching the EFL is globalizing Iran". (The English version of the ELPI is given in Appendix. Interested readers can, however, contact the corresponding author for the Persian version). For the ease of data presentation, the options agreed completely, agreed, and agreed partially were, nonetheless, collapsed as were the disagreed partially, disagreed and disagreed completely to form the alternatives agree (A) and disagree (D), respectively. The No Idea (NI) alternative was left intact to present the findings on a three alternative basis, i.e., A, NI and D.

Procedure

Upon having the ELPI printed and copied, the second and third researchers visited the language institutes, the bureau of education and universities in Mashhad and had it filled out by the teachers who volunteered to do so. They also attended the Translator Conference and Conference for Job Opportunities held at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad (FUM) and distributed the ELPI among the EFL teachers who agreed to take it. As can be seen in Table 2, the participants had been teaching in 88 centers. The first three highest percentages of the ELPI were completed by instructors teaching in Zaban Sara (n = 49, 7.9%), Khorasan (n = 48, 7.8%), and Mashhad High Schools (n = 41, 6.6%), respectively.

Table 2. Educational center where the EFL was offered by participants

Teaching Center	f	%	Teaching Center	f	%	Teaching Center	f	%
Afife	1	0.2	Hamzaman	7	1.1	Pasargad	3	0.5
Almizan	8	1.3	Hanane	1	0.2	Pasargad-e-Toos	1	0.2
Apadana	1	0.2	High Schools	41	6.6	Payem-e-Noor University	6	1.0
Asiya	5	0.8	Imam Hussein	6	1.0	Private Teaching	21	3.4
Azad University	7	1.1	Imam Reza College	4	0.6	Rah-e-pooyandegan	9	1.5
Azadegan	1	0.2	Jafayi	1	0.2	Rashed	2	0.3
Azaran	8	1.3	Jahadd-e-Dneshgahi	10	1.6	Rose	1	0.2
Baharestan	21	3.4	KanonFarhangi	1	0.2	Sadra	8	1.3
Bayan	7	1.1	Kanon-e-Pazhohesh	1	0.2	Safir-e-Danesh	1	0.2
Besat	1	0.2	Kanon-e-Zaban	4	0.6	Sajjad University	4	0.6
Biston	5	0.8	Kavosh	9	1.5	SepehreNovin	10	1.6
Caspian	3	0.5	Khalaghan Javan	2	0.3	Shafagh	2	0.3
Danesh	1	0.2	Khayyam University	1	0.2	Shahed-e-Hekmat	1	0.2
Darolelm	2	0.3	Khorasan	48	7.8	Shahed-e-Nosrat	1	0.2
Doctor Hesabi	10	1.6	Khordad	1	0.2	Shams-e-Toos	3	0.5
Donyay-e-Zaban	7	1.2	Kish	7	1.1	Shayan	3	0.5
Elm-o-Fan	3	0.5	Kish Air	29	4.7	Shokoh	18	02.9
Esmat	1	0.2	Kish Mehr	2	0.3	Simin	9	1.5
Faeze	6	1.0	Kish Novin	7	1.1	Sohrevardi	1	0.2
Farhang-o-Honar	2	0.3	Mahan	7	1.1	Soren	1	0.2
FarhangeAndish	15	2.4	Marefat	26	4.2	Tabaran University	5	0.8
Farhikhtegan	1	0.2	Mehr-e-Iraniyan	4	0.6	Tahghighi	1	0.2

Farzanegan	1	0.2	Meraj-e-Andishe	23	3.7	ValiyeAsr	1	0.2
Ferdows	4	0.6	Momtaz	1	0.2	Varastegan	1	0.2
Ferdowsi Hakim	1	0.2	Nikoo	1	0.2	Vesal	3	0.5
FUM	15	2.4	Ofogh-e-Novin	3	0.5	Zaban Sara	49	7.9
Gam-e-Andishe	3	0.5	Om-e-Abiha	1	0.2	Zabankade	3	0.5
Golbang	5	0.8	Orooj	1	0.2	ZabankadeMeli	9	1.5
Goldoone	1	0.2	OsturehAftab	1	0.2	Total	619	100.0
Hafez	18	2.9	Parax	28	4.5			

Data Analysis

The descriptive statistics of the 64 items comprising the ELPI was calculated to determine the pattern of responses elicited. The principle axis factoring (PAF) method was utilized to find out what latent variable (LVs) the inventory measured. The LVs were then rotated via Varimax with Kaiser Normalization (VKN) to have a clearer picture of their loadings. The rotation eigenvalue of one and higher was accepted as one of the criterion for determining the number of LVs constituting the ELPI. Items loading .32 and higher were accepted as contributing to the LV upon which they had loaded. If an item had acceptable loadings on more than one LV, its highest loading on a given LV was taken as its main contribution and its lower cross loadings were removed from other LVs. Cronbach's Alpha was estimated to determine the reliability level of the ELPI and its underlying LVs. The Pearson Correlations were also estimated to explore the relationships between the LVs. All the statistical analyses were done via the IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0 to address the following questions.

Q1. Does the ELPI have factorial validity?

Q2. How reliable are the ELPI and its LVs?

Q3. Do the LVs constituting the ELPI correlate significantly with each other?

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics of the items comprising the ELPI. As can be seen, item 32 has the lowest negative skewness value, i.e., -.24. The percentage of participants who have agreed (A) with the policy expressed in item 32, i.e., the EFL is taught "to increase teaching hours", i.e., 35%, is almost the same as those who have disagreed (D), i.e., 36%. This pattern of response has made item 32 have the lowest extraction communality (EC), i.e., 23, indicating that the lowest negative skewness value usually brings about the lowest EC.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the items comprising the ELPI (n=619)

No	M	SD	Skew	Kurt	IC	EC	D %	NI %	A %	No	M	SD	Skew	Kurt	IC	EC	D %	NI %	A %
I01	4.65	1.86	-0.69	-0.48	.55	.57	23	16	61	I33	4.71	1.67	-0.73	0.19	.49	.43	19	22	59
I02	4.37	1.80	-0.42	-0.68	.56	.59	27	23	50	I34	4.88	1.84	-0.86	-0.06	.63	.60	22	11	68
I03	4.96	1.71	-0.87	0.14	.56	.57	18	13	69	I35	4.60	1.79	-0.71	-0.21	.64	.64	24	17	59
I04	5.62	1.47	-1.68	3.03	.51	.52	9	4	86	I36	4.89	1.70	-1.01	0.68	.59	.58	17	15	68

I05	5.67	1.44	-1.64	3.19	.53	.54	7	9	84	I37	5.32	1.67	-1.31	1.35	.60	.58	14	7	79
I06	5.88	1.39	-1.87	4.09	.62	.64	7	3	90	I38	4.79	1.74	-0.92	0.50	.61	.56	19	16	65
I07	5.98	1.40	-2.06	4.89	.65	.63	7	3	91	I39	4.38	1.60	-0.67	0.52	.49	.46	19	33	47
I08	4.81	1.59	-0.92	0.86	.50	.47	14	24	62	I40	4.33	1.70	-0.60	-0.11	.54	.54	26	23	51
I09	4.28	1.71	-0.46	-0.17	.33	.30	29	24	47	I41	4.22	1.81	-0.44	-0.54	.58	.57	30	22	48
I10	5.55	1.53	-1.43	2.06	.68	.63	10	8	81	I42	4.45	1.81	-0.67	-0.17	.65	.62	27	18	55
I11	5.24	1.63	-1.27	1.55	.59	.58	12	11	77	I43	4.59	1.62	-0.77	0.27	.60	.60	20	22	58
I12	4.88	1.70	-0.95	0.52	.52	.50	19	14	67	I44	4.78	1.61	-0.95	0.96	.60	.56	15	23	62
I13	4.17	1.75	-0.35	-0.49	.58	.56	30	26	44	I45	4.31	1.75	-0.50	-0.34	.63	.64	30	19	51
I14	4.97	1.70	-1.05	0.74	.53	.53	16	14	70	I46	4.50	1.73	-0.79	0.21	.64	.62	23	21	56
I15	5.25	1.65	-1.25	1.47	.50	.45	13	11	76	I47	4.70	1.94	-0.75	-0.39	.64	.60	25	12	63
I16	4.70	1.83	-0.72	-0.13	.56	.53	23	17	60	I48	4.77	1.68	-0.95	0.69	.61	.56	18	18	64
I17	4.20	1.77	-0.34	-0.60	.55	.54	31	22	47	I49	4.79	1.84	-0.82	-0.12	.71	.70	23	11	66
I18	4.99	1.59	-1.03	1.03	.47	.39	14	16	70	I50	4.74	1.69	-0.93	0.52	.67	.64	19	17	64
I19	4.98	1.72	-1.05	0.65	.58	.58	18	11	71	I51	4.64	1.72	-0.80	0.21	.70	.68	22	16	61
I20	4.31	1.82	-0.44	-0.63	.61	.60	31	18	51	I52	4.33	1.67	-0.46	-0.07	.62	.60	24	30	46
I21	4.88	1.75	-0.81	0.05	.59	.55	20	14	66	I53	4.51	1.75	-0.72	0.20	.66	.64	23	22	55
I22	4.79	1.70	-0.74	-0.11	.65	.63	21	15	64	I54	4.88	1.75	-1.01	0.62	.64	.57	18	16	67
I23	5.30	1.50	-1.25	1.37	.63	.60	13	8	80	I55	5.33	1.75	-1.39	1.45	.66	.65	14	6	79
I24	5.01	1.56	-1.09	1.09	.59	.55	14	15	71	I56	5.04	1.86	-1.01	0.27	.51	.46	19	13	69
I25	5.20	1.60	-1.13	1.08	.58	.55	14	12	75	I57	5.08	1.98	-1.07	0.20	.63	.64	20	7	73
I26	4.45	1.77	-0.60	-0.26	.63	.68	24	23	53	I58	4.39	1.73	-0.73	0.17	.55	.50	21	28	51
I27	5.46	1.54	-1.52	2.33	.54	.49	11	7	82	I59	5.12	1.79	-1.16	0.82	.56	.51	17	9	74
I28	4.70	1.82	-0.80	-0.26	.50	.48	24	12	64	I60	5.13	1.80	-1.29	1.08	.62	.61	17	6	77
I29	5.29	1.69	-1.32	1.34	.57	.55	14	9	77	I61	5.37	1.81	-1.39	1.35	.67	.63	14	8	78
I30	4.38	1.76	-0.49	-0.30	.50	.50	25	26	49	I62	4.85	1.81	-0.89	0.20	.70	.69	20	16	64
I31	4.28	1.53	-0.76	0.91	.44	.39	18	40	42	I63	4.93	1.79	-0.95	0.35	.74	.70	18	14	68
I32	3.90	1.61	-0.24	-0.41	.31	**.23**	36	30	35	I64	4.80	1.75	-0.83	0.22	.76	.73	19	17	64

Before examining the factorial structure of the ELPI, the LVs, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett's Test were run to secure sampling adequacy. The high KMO statistic of .97 was obtained which is, according to Kaiser (1974 cited in (DiLalla and Dollinger, 2006) "marvellous" because it is in the 90s.

The statistic thus showed that the common-factor model is appropriate because the LVs extracted in the study explain the observed correlations among the variables. The significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (x^2 = 25828.279, df = 2016, $p<.001$) provided further support for the appropriateness of factor analysis and indicated that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix.

Table 4 presents the variances of ten LVs whose initial eigenvalues are one and higher. As can be seen, the very rotation of the LVs via the VKN has reduced the number of LVs to seven explaining 52.8% of variance in the ELPI.

The reduction of the LVs from ten to seven is further supported when the lower acceptable cross loadings of items on more than one LV are removed as noncontributory. For example, item 45 had the highest loading on LV1 (.62) and a low but acceptable cross loading (.33) on LV9. Since no item other than 45 had loaded on LV9, it was treated as noncontributory. Similarly, only items one and three had loaded acceptably on LV8, i.e., .45 and .39, respectively. However, since item three had a much higher loading on factor two, i.e., 52, it was removed from LV8. Since item one had loaded on factor three as well, i.e., .42, it was also removed so that factor eight could be removed along with LV10 upon which no item had loaded acceptably either.

Table-4. Total variance explained by LVs having initial eigenvalues of one and higher

Factor	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	24.468	38.231	38.231	24.049	37.576	37.576	11.758	18.371	18.371
2	3.810	5.953	44.184	3.393	5.302	42.878	5.725	8.945	27.316
3	3.047	4.760	48.944	2.597	4.058	46.936	4.741	7.408	34.724
4	1.886	2.948	51.892	1.457	2.277	49.213	4.580	7.156	41.880
5	1.689	2.640	54.532	1.235	1.930	51.143	3.335	5.210	47.090
6	1.247	1.949	56.480	.812	1.269	52.412	2.079	3.249	50.339
7	1.133	1.771	58.251	.695	1.085	53.497	1.562	2.441	52.780
8	1.085	1.696	59.947	.639	.998	54.495	.845	1.320	54.100
9	1.032	1.612	61.558	.591	.924	55.419	.749	1.171	55.271
10	1.001	1.564	63.122	.584	.913	56.332	.680	1.062	56.332

Table 5 presents the descriptive statistics and reliability estimates of the ELPI and its seven rotated LVs. As can be seen, the ELPI is a highly reliable measure of language policy, i.e., $\alpha = .97$. This level of reliability is even higher than the coefficient Khodadady and Andargani (2012) estimated when they administered the 117-item Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-I) to 669 EFL instructors in Iran, i.e., $\alpha = .95$, indicating that the ELPI consists of more homogenous LVs whose reliability coefficients range between .96 (LV1) and .75. (LV7).

Table 5. Descriptive statistics and reliability estimates of seven LVs constituting the ELPI

F	# of items	Factor name	indicators	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurt	α
1	23	Harmonic Curriculum	38 , 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64	110.23	29.85	-1.14	1.75	.96
2	8	International Interaction	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 27	44.35	8.99	-1.53	3.63	.88
3	9	Internationalizing	1, 2, 9, 16, 17, 26, 30, 31, 40	39.64	10.71	-0.51	0.20	.85

		Native Culture						
4	8	Methodological Development	18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 32	38.16	9.59	-0.87	1.12	.87
5	8	International Understanding	25, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37	39.58	10.21	-1.01	1.23	.88
6	5	All-Compassing Improvement	8, 12, 13, 14, 15	24.08	6.37	-0.80	0.99	.82
7	3	Functional Organization	39, 41, 43	13.19	4.13	-0.59	0.47	.75
	64	ELPI		332.95	65.72	-0.97	1.66	.97

The first 23-indicator *Harmonic Curriculum* LV requires harmonizing and choosing appropriate educational content and materials, reforming, supervising and reviewing educational objectives and curriculum by determining the time and effort required, offering comprehensive and high quality services, attending to policies, objectives, teaching materials and methods, training teachers, lesson plans and evaluation simultaneously and harmoniously, establishing a stable educational programs, harmonizing curriculum with the educational conditions and facilities, developing economy vi tourism, trade and technology, emphasizing speaking and listening skills more, promoting interpersonal and intercultural relationships, harmonizing language policy makers and enforcers. determining, directing and designing educational activities, choosing the content of materials taught to lower ages in the framework of amusement and entertainment, teaching and developing foreign language for all, attending to the local areas, schools and parents to plan educational programs, organizing the educational content of upper levels in harmony with the content of other areas of learning in order to deepen their quality, expanding social relationship, employing the experiences of other countries in revising and modifying curriculum, decreasing language learning age and educational grade, choosing content by focusing on improving qualification and combining it with the ethical thought, criticism and evaluation as well as Islamic-Iranian identity, designing educational programs in a professional manner and organizing teaching content based on learners' needs.The second eight-indicator *International Interaction* LV highlights the role of English language in catching up with scientific progresses made in the west, increasing the possibility of talking to other nations, benefiting from cumulative information networks, providing the opportunity for finding better jobs, creating effective relationships with the international society, entering universal interactions, training global citizens and translating and writing books dealing with various scientific fields.

As third nine-indicator LV underlying the ELPI, *Internationalizing Native Culture* entails popularizing Islamic-Iranian culture, advertising Islam in the world, confronting cultural invasion and changing its direction to transferring native culture, teaching English based on Islamic principles, values and objectives, paving the way for globalizing the Persian language, teaching the language based on national and native culture, transferring native culture and identity to the global society, globalizing Iran and decentralizing teaching and learning decisions. The fourth eight-indicator LV, *Methodological Development*, calls for employing various language teaching methods in classrooms, attending to students' styles and interests, employing novel teaching

materials and original content to approach objectives pursued in life, changing language teaching objectives from written to all skills involved in language learning, designing teaching material and supplementary syllabi by employing technological developments such as compact discs and internet, changing evaluation methods and employing new testing approaches continuously by providing direct and indirect feedbacks to students, educating language teachers and increasing teaching hours.

As the fifth eight-indicator LV, *International Understanding* views English as a means of expressing ideas, understanding and transferring human cultural heritage and scientific achievements, getting familiar with western culture, harmonizing teaching content with acceptable universal literature, using international capacities appropriately, transferring services and knowledge at universal level, reinforcing the role of language in national, curriculum, and expanding political relationships.

The sixth five-indicator LV, *All-Compassing Improvement*, involves improving educational centers both qualitatively and quantitatively, increasing student's physical and psychological health, improving the quality of education based on country's needs and priorities, achieving the superior position in science, economy and technology in the area and equalizing education on the basis of language teaching and learning standards.

As the last three-indicator LV, *Functional Organization*, deals with organizing content through cultural, scientific, economic and political functions, making the principles of language education relevant to ideological, political and social necessities on a macro level and attending to the teachers, schools, cultures and students' local languages in different areas of the country. Table 6 presents the correlation coefficients obtained among the seven factors underlying the ELPI.

As can be see, they correlate significantly not only with the ELPI itself but also with each other. *Harmonic Curriculum*, for example, correlates the highest with *International Understanding*, i.e., r = .74, *p*<.01, emphasizing the importance the EFL teachers attach to the relationship between English curriculum and the expression of ideas.

Since *International Understanding* shows the same degree of relationship with *Methodological Development*, i.e., r = .74, p <.01, the necessity of employing effective educational approaches to help offer the curriculum which is harmonizing and compatible with educational conditions and facilities may be inferred.

Table 6. Correlations between the LVs constituting the ELPI

ELPI and its underlying LVs	ELPI	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ELPI	1	.92[*]	.76[*]	.70[*]	.84[*]	.87[*]	.78[*]	.76[*]
1 Harmonic Curriculum	.92[*]	1	.58[*]	.49[*]	.71[*]	**.74**[*]	.62[*]	**.67**[*]
2 International Interaction	.76[*]	.58[*]	1	.51[*]	.62[*]	**.69**[*]	**.66**[*]	.47[*]
3 Internationalizing Native Culture	.70[*]	.49[*]	.51[*]	1	.51[*]	.54[*]	.59[*]	.60[*]
4 Methodological Development	.84[*]	.71[*]	.62[*]	.51[*]	1	.74[*]	**.66**[*]	.59[*]
5 International Understanding	.87[*]	**.74**[*]	**.69**[*]	.54[*]	**.74**[*]	1	**.66**[*]	.65[*]
6 All-Compassing Improvement	.78[*]	.62[*]	.66[*]	.59[*]	**.66**[*]	.66[*]	1	.53[*]
7 Functional Organization	.76[*]	.67[*]	.47[*]	**.60**[*]	.59[*]	.65[*]	.53[*]	1

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

CONCLUSION

The 64-item ELPI is a reliable and valid measure of English language policy in Iran consisting of seven LVs, i.e., *Harmonic Curriculum*, *International Interaction*, *Internationalizing Native Culture*, *Methodological Development*, *International Understanding*, *All-Compassing Improvement* and *Functional Organization*.

Among the LVs, *International Understanding* correlates the highest with *Harmonic Curriculum*. *International Interaction*, *Methodological Development* and *All-Compassing Improvement* and thus reveals the important role the EFL plays in promoting international understanding and interaction among teachers. Future research must, however, show whether the LVs underlying the ELPI hold any significant relationship with variables such as teachers' language proficiency and attributes.

REFERENCES

Baldauf, R.B., 1994. Unplanned language policy and planning. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14: 82-89.

Baldauf, R.B., R.B. Kaplan and N. Kamwangamalu, 2012. Language planning and its problems. Routledge, 11(4): 430-438.

Bastardas-Boada, A., 2002. World language policy in the era of globalization: Diversity and intercommunication from the perspective of 'complexity'. Noves SL: Revista de sociolingüística, Estiu.

Bergenholtz, H., 2006. Towards a definition of "communication policy", "language policy", and "language planning". Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS, 34: 1-34.

Christian, D., 1999. Looking at federal education legislation from a language policy/planning perspective. Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Crystal, D., 1997. English as a global language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DiLalla, D.L. and S.J. Dollinger, 2006. Cleaning up data and running preliminary analyses. California: Sage: The psychology research handbook: A guide for graduate students and research assistants.

Donakey, A., 2007. Language planning and policy in manchester. Unpublished master's thesis, university of manchester. Manchester: United Kingdom.

Huebner, T. and K.A. Davis, 1999. Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Kaplan, R.B. and R.B. Baldauf, 1997. Language planning: From practice to theory. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Karyolemou, M., 2004. Language ideology and language practice in higher education: Setting aside national language policies. Paper presented at the international conference on language and the future of europe. Ideologies, Policies and Practices.

Kennedy, C., 2011. Paper 2: Challenges for language policy, language and development. British Council, UK: Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language.

Khodadady, E. and T. Andargani, S. , 2012. Reliability and construct validity of factors underlying the emotional intelligence of iranian efl teachers. Journal of Arts & Humanities, 1(3): 72-86.

Kiany, G., B. Mahdavy and R. Ghafar Samar, 2011. Towards a harmonized foreign language education program in iran: National policies and english achievement. Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal (LICEJ), 2(3): 462-469.

Kiany, G., S.A. Mirhosseini and H. Navidinia, 2011. Foreign language education policy in iran: Pivotal macro considerations. Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 53(222): 49-70.

Kiany, G., H. Navidinia and M. Momenian, 2010. Revisiting the approach of national curriculum towards foreign language education. Journal of Comparative Language and Literature Research, 2(6): 185-209.

Lippi-Green, R., 1994. Accent, standard language ideology, and discrimination pretext in the courts. Language in Society, 23: 163-198.

Mellis, L.F., 2002. Race, ethnicity, dialects, language policy and ethnic monitories in the us. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Meshtrie, R., J. Swann, A. Deumert and W.L. Leap, 2000. Language planning and policy. Introducing Sociolinguistics, 3(3): 384-418.

Milory, J., 2001. Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. Journal of sociolinguistics, 5(4): 530-555.

Mirabela, P., 2006. Globalization of english. Journal of the faculty of economics, 2: 850-854.

Mukhuba, T.T., 2012. Bilingualism, language attitudes, language policy and language planning: A sociolinguistic perspective. Journal of Language and Learning, 3(2): 268-278.

Nunnan, D., 2002. The impact of english as a global language on educational policies and practices in the asia-pacific region. TESOL Quarterly, 37(4): 589-613.

Rahimi, M. and Z. Nabiloo, 2008. Globalization and the necessity of modifying english language teaching courses in iran: Challenges and opportunities (in persian). Journal of Educational Technology, 3(3): 115-124.

Ricento, T.K. and N.H. Hornberger, 1996. Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the elt professional. TESOL Quarterly, 30(3): 10-36.

Shohamy, E., 2006. Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches. London: Routledge.

Spolsky, B., 2003. Language policy. Cambridge. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Vez, M.J., 2008. European policies in tefl teacher education. The Open Applied Linguistics Journal, 1: 1-81.

Wiley, T.G. and M. Lukes, 1996. English-only and standard english ideologies in the U.S. TESOL Quarterly, 30(3): 120-144.

Woolard, K.A. and B.B. Schieffelin, 1994. Language ideology. Annual Reviews Anthropology, 23: 55-82.

Wortham, S., 2001. Language ideology and educational research. Linguistics and Education, 12(2): 253-259.

Appendix

The indicators (I) comprising the ELPI along with their loadings (L) on seven factors (F)

I	F	L	One of the English Language teaching policies is …
1	3	0.42	Globalizing Iran.
2	3	0.69	Advertising Islam in the world.
3	2	0.52	Training global citizens.
4	2	0.63	Providing the opportunity for finding better jobs.
5	2	0.69	Benefiting from ever-increasing information networks.
6	2	0.75	Not falling behind scientific progresses.
7	2	0.72	Increasing the possibility of talking to other nations.
8	6	0.37	Equalizing education on the basis of language teaching and learning standards.
9	3	0.50	Teaching language based on national and native culture.
10	2	0.61	Creating effective relationships with the international society.
11	2	0.56	Entering universal interactions.
12	6	0.45	Improving the quality of education based on country's needs and priorities.
13	6	0.48	Increasing student's physical and psychological health.
14	6	0.52	Improving educational centers both qualitatively and quantitatively.

15	6	0.39	Achieving the superior position in science, economy and technology in the area.
16	3	0.48	Transferring native culture and identity to the global society.
17	3	0.57	Paving the way for globalizing the Persian language.
18	4	0.41	Educating language teachers.
19	4	0.64	Employing various language teaching methods in classrooms.
20	4	0.60	Attending to students' styles and interests.
21	4	0.55	Changing language teaching objectives from written to all skills involved in language learning.
22	4	0.57	Employing novel teaching materials and original content to approach objectives pursued in life.
23	4	0.53	Designing teaching material and supplementary syllabi by employing technological developments such as compact discs and internet.
24	4	0.50	Changing evaluation methods and employing new testing approaches continuously by providing direct and indirect feedbacks to students.
25	5	0.43	Transferring services and knowledge at universal level.
26	3	0.76	Popularizing Islamic-Iranian culture.
27	2	0.39	Translating and writing books dealing with various scientific fields.
28	5	0.48	Getting familiar with western culture.
29	5	0.45	Appropriate use of international capacities
30	3	0.66	Confronting cultural invasion and changing its direction to transferring native culture.
31	3	0.35	Decentralizing teaching and learning decisions
32	4	0.32	Increasing teaching hours.
33	5	0.36	Expanding political relationships.
34	5	0.40	Reinforcing the role of language in national curriculum.
35	5	0.47	Harmonizing teaching content with acceptable universal literature.
36	5	0.51	Understanding and transferring human cultural heritage and scientific achievements.
37	5	0.52	Producing a tool for expressing ideas.
38	1	0.44	Designing educational programs in a professional manner.
39	7	0.44	Making the principles of language education relevant to ideological, political and social necessities on a macro level.
40	3	0.62	Teaching English based on Islamic principles, values and objectives.
41	7	0.43	Attending to the teachers, schools, cultures and students' local languages in different areas of the country.
42	1	0.43	Organizing teaching content based on learners' needs.
43	7	0.46	Organizing content through cultural, scientific, economic and political functions.
44	1	0.61	Organizing the educational content of upper levels in harmony with the content of other areas of learning in order to deepen their quality.
45	1	0.62	Attending to the local areas, schools and parents to plan educational programs.
46	1	0.68	Simultaneous and harmonious attention to policies, objectives, teaching materials and methods, training teachers, lesson plans and evaluation.
47	1	0.60	Employing the experiences of other countries in revising and modifying curriculum.
48	1	0.65	Determining, directing and designing educational activities.
49	1	0.68	Offering comprehensive and high quality services.
50	1	0.66	Harmonizing curriculum with the educational conditions and facilities.
51	1	0.71	Harmonizing educational content and materials.
52	1	0.65	Harmonizing language policy makers and enforcers.
53	1	0.69	Reforming, supervising and reviewing educational objectives and curriculum.
54	1	0.65	Promoting interpersonal and intercultural relationships
55	1	0.65	Economic development such as tourism, trade and technology.
56	1	0.58	Decreasing language learning age and educational grade.

57	1	0.65	Emphasizing speaking and listening skills more.
58	1	0.57	Choosing content by improving qualification and focusing on collective learning such as thinking, criticism and evaluation, moral values as well as Islamic-Iranian identity.
59	1	0.63	Choosing the content of lower ages in the framework of amusement and entertainment.
60	1	0.61	Expanding social relationship.
61	1	0.63	Teaching and developing foreign language for all.
62	1	0.67	Establishing a stable educational program.
63	1	0.68	Choosing appropriate educational content and materials.
64	1	0.68	Determining the necessary time and appropriate effort needed for education.