

The British Council Standards as a Tool for Evaluating Iraqi EFL Teachers

Amjed Abdul Ridha Kareem¹ and Lihadh Abdul Ameer Kareem Mubarak²

Abstract

Different ways to evaluate EFL teachers include the British Council Standards criteria. The contentious issue in the questions of the British Council Standards revolves around applying the three domains (Knowledge, Skills, Values, and attitudes) of evaluation for EFL teachers and scrutinizing the British Council Standards to ascertain their suitability for evaluating EFL teachers in Iraq. Typically, evaluation can be done by considering students' achievements or from students' perspectives. Evaluation is a significant challenge due to the large student population in urban and rural schools. The population comprises Baghdad, Wasit, Dhi Qar, Misan, Ninevah, and Kirkuk. The sample is drawn from students attending nine general directorates during the academic year 2023-2024. The total number of participants in the study was 2014 male and female students. This study employs a combination of qualitative and quantitative methodologies. The statistical methods employed to assess the internal consistency of the questionnaires are specifically targeted towards students in EFL preparatory schools. The instrument's reliability is tested using Cronbach's alpha F-test, ANOVA, Two-Sample t-test, and One-Sample t-test. The study found that Iraqi EFL preparatory schoolteachers have successfully implemented and met British Council standards. At the same time, some teachers have applied these requirements to various degrees.

Keywords: EFL Teacher Evaluation, British Council Standards, Evaluation Purposes, Evaluation Methods

INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of teachers significantly influences the quality of education. Exceptional teachers profoundly influence classroom administration and directly impact student learning and the overall standard of instruction. Prior research efforts have examined the performance of teachers. Studies conducted by Jones (1998) and Ndungu et al. (2015) indicate that the effectiveness of teachers in leading their classes is contingent upon the amount of time and effort they invest in preparing and implementing their lectures. Concurrently, additional studies aimed to ascertain, from the viewpoint of students, the specific aspects that contribute to the effectiveness of educators. There is no text provided. The research undertaken by Darling-Hammond (2014) in the United States is crucial for teacher assessment. The evaluation process is experiencing significant and transformative changes in almost every state and district nationwide. As we begin implementing these reforms, it is essential for schools, teachers, and, most importantly, students that new policies enhance the standard of teaching while avoiding potential problems that could harm education. It is imperative not to replace existing problems with new ones; instead, we should seize this moment of change to ensure that teacher assessment is done correctly. There is widespread consensus that teacher assessment in the United States needs comprehensive restructuring. Current systems provide limited assistance to teachers in enhancing their teaching methods or effectively differentiating between successful and failing students. The tools employed occasionally only partially embody the fundamental characteristics of effective instruction. Principals, particularly in large schools, need help allocating enough time and possessing the competence to evaluate all the instructors they oversee thoroughly.

Moreover, it is even more difficult for them to provide intensive instructional support to teachers who require it. Several principals still require access to the necessary professional development and support to acquire the expertise needed to become proficient instructional leaders and evaluators of teaching. The current structure of US assessment generally needs more contribution to teacher learning or the provision of reliable, timely information for personnel choices. The enduring challenges underscore the need for tests and evaluations in

¹ MA Candidate, Department of English Language, College of Basic Education, University of Babylon, Baghdad, Iraq E-mail: amjedbrown12345678@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8614-1855>

² Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon, Hilla, Iraq. E-mail: huh.abdula@uobabylon.edu.iq, <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5361-7968>

EFL instruction to track student progress. They assist in evaluating where teachers demonstrate exceptional skills and areas that need work, provide constructive and advantageous criticism, and enhance the benchmarks for English language instruction.

For Iraqi English language education to be excellent and practical, EFL teachers must be evaluated. Evaluation is more rational when standards are carefully created and matched to instructional needs in instructors' settings. British Council Standards BCS has detailed educational program evaluation standards, rules, and criteria. The requirements emphasize real teaching experience and skill in EFL instruction in addition to extensive direction. EFL teachers can learn pedagogical theory from the BCS, a valuable resource for administrators and teachers. The criteria stress practical teaching experience and training skills and provide extensive guidance. Teachers can self-assess using the BC's Continuing Professional Development Framework. This application is designed to help EFL teachers develop professionally. The 55-item evaluation can be used for self-assessment and the growth of teachers' skills. The BC's requirements for EFL teacher evaluation emphasize outstanding teaching methods, professional skill development, and improvement in English language education.

The assessment of EFL teachers in Iraq has undergone discernible stages. Initially, the evaluation was exclusively conducted by expert supervisors in (TEFL). The second phase, which commenced in 2010/2011, depends on the BCS when conducting the assessment. A significant shortage of trained supervisors is needed for further transition. Furthermore, an innovative assessment technique was initiated in 2022 to address this issue. This technique is called "critical friend" evaluation. A critical friend is a supervisor responsible for reviewing curriculum, teachers, and head teachers, sometimes known as the "developer manager." The Ministry of Education in Iraq frequently endeavors to create educational initiatives, experiences, and visions that have effectively enhanced Iraq's academic standing in many nations. After implementing critical friend evaluation, numerous unforeseen barriers and drawbacks emerged, which should have been considered (the Directorate of General Education Second Karah, 2023).

A significant drawback of critical friends is that EFL teachers are frequently assessed by individuals needing more expertise in English. A single supervisor, acting as a critical friend, evaluates teachers from various specializations. Often, the evaluation is based on the school manager's subjective opinion. This experience involved the temporary suspension of the specialist supervisors' duties. Through the researcher's interactions with various school administrations, the researcher, having eight years of experience in teaching, has observed a consensus that the most effective approach to evaluating EFL teachers is to have supervisors who are specialized in TEFL. Classroom observations can be conducted by trained professionals, such as administrators or evaluators, to evaluate teaching methods, lesson planning, and the general classroom atmosphere. These observations can offer valuable feedback and accurately pinpoint areas needing development.

According to the researcher, who has eight years of experience, if the same method(critical friend) is used for evaluating the school principal without the expert supervisor, it will decrease motivation among EFL teachers who feel distressed during the assessment process. The lack of a specialized and supportive critic will lower their academic performance and slow the teaching/learning process. Its outcomes are at risk, consequently putting the students' academic standing at risk.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teachers play a crucial role in improving the quality of education as their knowledge, skills, and experiences are critical factors in determining their effectiveness and professionalism (Arnon & Reichel, 2007; Shukla, 2014; Syahrudin et al., 2013). Devoid of these components, educators cannot address the challenges associated with classroom instruction and student comprehension. The common issues that arise in the classroom include 1) a tendency to prioritize the activity over the students' needs; 2) ineffective communication at inappropriate levels; 3) teaching subjects that are not relevant to the student's actual learning needs; 4) insufficient preparation; 5) rushing through the textbook; and 6) limited classroom interaction.

Teachers' abilities can be evaluated and categorized based on their training and experience levels. As Richards (2001) suggested, the effectiveness of a teacher's ability to facilitate teaching and learning measures their

qualifications. This includes the skill to prepare teaching materials that cater to student's needs and the capacity to address challenges in both teaching and learning, enabling them to handle any issues that may arise effectively.

Experienced teachers, typically considered competent, can overcome shortcomings in the curriculum, tools, or resources to improve their teaching (Richards, 2001). Therefore, instructors must focus on the learning objectives that require assessing, changing, and implementing curriculum materials to teach effectively (Schwarz et al., 2007).

The Supervisory Committee for External Evaluation is one of the evaluation techniques used by the Iraqi Ministry of Education. This committee, which consists of professionals from various fields, evaluates school principals, curricula, students, and facilities in depth on prearranged dates. However, EFL teachers are also considered. Supervisors needing more English language competency can impartially evaluate the EFL teachers. They cannot assess EFL teachers' language proficiency and academic abilities from a unique viewpoint.

Multiple crucial factors must be considered when assessing Iraqi EFL teachers from supervisors' viewpoint. These factors encompass the following:

1- Language Proficiency: Evaluating the teacher's aptitude in the English language, encompassing their abilities in spoken communication, listening comprehension, reading, and writing. This is quite significant since it directly affects their ability to operate efficiently.

2- Pedagogical Knowledge: Assessing the teacher's comprehension of (EFL) instructional approaches, strategies, and maneuvers. This encompasses their expertise in developing instructional plans, implementing effective classroom management strategies, and adapting teaching methodologies to cater to the unique requirements of a heterogeneous student population. The assessment evaluates the teacher's capacity to establish a favorable and captivating learning atmosphere by employing efficient classroom management techniques. This includes their classroom arrangement, strategies for managing conduct, and abilities for fostering student participation and concentration.

3—Instructional Delivery: Evaluate the teacher's method of presenting the lesson, including the clarity of their explanations, the efficient utilization of instructional materials and resources, and their capability to generate meaningful learning experiences for students.

4- Evaluation and Feedback: The teacher should use suitable evaluation techniques to gauge student advancement and deliver prompt feedback. This pertains to their proficiency in creating and implementing evaluations that align with educational goals and offer pertinent feedback to foster student development. Professional Development: Consider the teacher's commitment to continuously improving their professional abilities and desire to participate in self-reflective activities. It encompasses engaging in seminars and conferences or joining collaborative professional learning groups. Supervisors ought to offer constructive feedback to assist teachers in enhancing their educational practices and tackling any areas of difficulty. Consistent and efficient communication and support are crucial for promoting the professional development of Iraqi (EFL) teachers.

Adhering to particular standardized and predetermined criteria when assessing EFL teachers is rational and essential. Teachers who possess logical thinking skills are necessary. Regional differences exist within various directorates and occasionally within the same directorate. To address these disparities, it is crucial to consider the following principles when conducting the evaluation:

1. Curriculum Alignment: Evaluating teachers' capacity to synchronize their instructional approaches with the official curriculum established by the Directorates of Education. This entails ensuring that the teacher's content, learning objectives, and instructional materials adhere to the curriculum rules.

2. Lesson Planning: This entails assessing the teacher's readiness and the structure of their lessons following the curriculum. It also includes evaluating the teacher's proficiency in establishing explicit learning objectives, choosing suitable instructional methods, and integrating diverse resources to improve student learning.

3. Classroom Management: Evaluating the teacher's competence in effectively managing the classroom environment and maintaining a positive and conducive learning atmosphere. This involves assessing their methods for maintaining discipline, promoting student engagement, and effectively managing teaching time.
4. Student Assessment: This entails evaluating the teacher's utilization of suitable assessment techniques to appraise student learning following the guidelines established by the Directorates of Education. Additionally, it involves assessing the teacher's capacity to create assessments aligned with educational goals, offer valuable feedback to students, and utilize assessment data to guide instruction.
5. Professional Development: Evaluating the extent of the teacher's participation in compulsory or suggested professional development initiatives established by the Education Directorates. This includes participating in workshops, training sessions, or collaborative learning opportunities to augment their teaching skills and knowledge. Supervisors should acquaint themselves with the precise evaluation standards and methods established by the Directorates of Education. Supervisors can effectively evaluate Iraqi English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers by utilizing performance indicators or rubrics that conform to established criteria. To maintain uniformity, equity, and congruence with the overall aims and objectives of the education system in Iraq, supervisors can align the evaluation process with the criteria set forth by the Ministry of Education in Iraq. Although these principles are broad, it is advisable to customize the assessment criteria to suit the particular circumstances and requirements of Iraqi English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers. Furthermore, involving Iraqi English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers in the assessment procedure via self-evaluation or peer observation can significantly augment their professional growth.

According to Catano and Harvey (2011), nine characteristics are crucial for effective teaching. These characteristics are availability, communication, conscientiousness, creativity, feedback, individual concern, professionalism, problem-solving, and social awareness. These characteristics are essential for instructors to teach the English language effectively. To attain the objective of effective instruction, Shian-yun (2012) asserts that when teaching English as a foreign language, an EFL teacher must possess proficient teaching abilities, extensive Knowledge of the English language systems, including their mechanics and the process of language acquisition and usage, as well as a high level of English proficiency. By possessing these abilities, learning would be effectively accomplished. Hence, to assess the efficacy of teaching, it is imperative to analyze the teachers' performance in the classroom. The assessment is necessary to gauge instructors' actions within the school rather than their potential performance in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 2009; Goe et al., 2008). Jabbarifar (2009) outlines several teaching and learning characteristics that must be considered during the evaluation process. The critical areas of focus are the utilization of textbooks and instructional materials, student academic performance, and the entirety of the educational programs.

Assessing the effectiveness of teachers involves evaluating their performance through three distinct aspects: measuring the inputs, processes, and results. Inputs encompass all aspects of teacher quality, including their background, views, expectations, experience, and pedagogical and topic expertise. Processes are centered around the interaction that takes place in a classroom between educators and learners. Outputs refer to the outcomes of classroom activities, including their effects on student performance, graduation rates, student conduct, involvement, attitudes, and emotional well-being (Goe et al., 2008). Assessing the teachers' performance is crucial to identifying their strengths and areas for professional improvement.

Teachers are widely recognized for their substantial influence on the success of their students in school and their ability to cultivate students' enthusiasm for the subject matter they impart. Therefore, the primary objective of language teachers is to provide high-quality instruction. This prompts an examination of the significance of assessing educators, particularly those specializing in teaching English to foreign language learners (EFL). According to Danielson (2001), educators usually recognize the necessity of implementing a carefully constructed evaluation system to enhance their instructional methods and uphold consistent teaching success. Hence, the present study aims to analyze the prevailing state of Iraqi EFL teacher assessment and present valuable perspectives for enhancing the efficacy of the BCS framework.

According to Banks (1977), evaluation is regarded as a technical component of instruction and vital to teaching and learning because it provides ongoing feedback to ensure the system remains adequately calibrated. Similarly,

Nevo (2013) states that evaluation is the systematic process of acquiring and sharing Knowledge regarding the value of educational activities in terms of their goals, designs, implementation, and outcomes. Evaluation aims to enhance the quality of academic activities and improve an educational product during its developmental stages. Additionally, evaluation demonstrates the final product's worthiness once its development is concluded. The objectives of the evaluation serve several functions, with the primary objectives encompassing the assessment of instructional material efficacy, the provision of crucial insights into students' progress, and the facilitation of curriculum improvement. The evaluation process yields valuable information for teachers, supervisors, and other educational entities, offering tangible proof regarding the strengths and weaknesses of evaluative literature. Similarly, these BCS encompass significant material that caters to the needs of both teachers and learners, categorizing them into three domains: Knowledge, Skills, Values, and attitudes.

METHODOLOGY

The current study is an explanatory research set to examine the suitability of the BCS for evaluating Iraqi EFL teachers. The primary goal of this descriptive research is to accurately describe the implementation of BCS in evaluating EFL teachers in Iraq.

Population and Sample

The participants were over 2,100 students across nine education directorates in Iraq, and the correct responses were from 2014 students. These were allocated based on governorates, including Nineveh, Kirkuk, Baghdad, Wasit, Dhi Qar, and Misan. The purpose was to collect unbiased responses without disclosing the respondents' identities. The survey was conducted over two weeks. The researchers focused on and explained the three domains (Knowledge, Skills, values, and attitudes) relevant to the current study. The sample covers students from preparatory schools, which include three preparatory classes, namely fourth-year classes (689) of the sample (34.2%) percent, fifth-year classes fifth class(660) with (32.8%), and sixth-year classes(665) in the sixth class (33%) of the total sample size. The number and percentage of the participants for each class are shown in Table (1) below.

Table 1 Academic Achievement of Students

ACADEMIC	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Fourth class	689	34.2
Fifth class	660	32.8
Sixth class	665	33.0
Total	2014	100.0

The current study used a mixed-methods analysis to accomplish its objectives. The researchers aim to determine the suitability of BCS for evaluating EFL preparatory schoolteachers. The objectives also encompass determining the percentages and correlations of implementing these criteria in the context of English language instruction in Iraq. The researcher collected data from preparatory school students in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades.

Instruments of the Study

The instrument used in the current study was a questionnaire adapted from the BCS. The questionnaire items were presented to a jury of thirteen TEFL and linguistics experts from various Iraqi universities to assess the instruments' face and content validity. The jury of experts did not raise any objections to the questionnaire items. The experts unanimously concurred that the questionnaire was thorough and precise, and that the criteria selection had been meticulously tailored to align with the research topic. The scale assesses EFL Iraqi preparatory schoolteachers; it consists of nineteen standards encompassing 57 performance characteristics. Using a five-point Likert scale, respondents can choose from the following answer options: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree. The instrument's validity is confirmed by thoroughly evaluating the research topic with a panel of experts specializing in EFL. The goal is to determine if the items effectively capture the intended aims of the study. If the experts determine that the inquiry accurately assesses the

purported concept, it is deemed genuine based on its outward characteristics. Otherwise, the researcher should modify the questionnaire according to experts' opinions (Becuwe,2016). The statistical methods employed to assess the internal consistency of the questionnaire are specifically targeted towards students in EFL preparatory schools. Face validity necessitates an expert to visually inspect the items in the questionnaire and determine that the instrument is a legitimate measure of the concept being evaluated solely based on its outward appearance (Bolarinwa, 2015). The questionnaire in this study was partitioned into two sections. The initial section contains the personal details of the participants, including their gender, grade level, and the governorate they belong to. The BCS comprises nineteen criteria, each comprising five individual components.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results of the Questionnaire

The researchers computed the alpha coefficient for each study standard to determine the scale's reliability. Table (2) below shows that Cronbach's alpha values are high for the three domains (Knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes), indicating stability. The alpha coefficient is commonly used in constructing scales for topics with multiple answer choices. In this context, one is assigned to the response "strongly disagree." A value of 5 is transferred to the reaction "strongly agree." The scale's reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha.

Table 2 Cronbach Alpha Results for the Standards

STANDARDS	NUMBER OF ITEMS	CRONBACH'S ALPHA
Knowledge	12	0.863
Skills	26	0.950
Values and Attitude	19	0.942

Interpreting the Responses to the Questionnaire

The mean and standard deviation (SD) were calculated to determine the orientation of the participants' questionnaire responses toward agreement, neutrality, and disagreement regarding all items (see Table 3).

Table 3 Five-point Likert scale statements.

LEVEL	WEIGHT MEAN
Strongly disagree	1.80-1
Disagree	2.60-1.81
Natural	3.40-2.61
Agree	4.20-3.41
Strongly Agree	5-4.21

Table (3) shows the range for the five-point Likert scale statements. The degrees of agreement will be determined for the scale's statements, where the researcher added a five-point Likert scale as follows: Range/number of scale statements = (5-1) /5 = 0.8.

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics and One-Sample t-Test Results of Knowledge Performance Indicators.

TERMS	LICKERT SCALE										MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	ORIENTATION	P-VALUE
	STRONGLY AGREE (5)		AGREE (4)		NEUTRAL(3)		DISAGREE(2)		STRONGLY DISAGREE (1)					
	F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%	f	%				
1.1	2	0.1	2012	99.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.00	0.03	Agree	0.000
1.2	668	33.2	695	34.5	427	21.2	159	7.9	65	3.2	3.86	1.06	Agree	0.000
1.3	670	33.3	714	35.5	429	21.3	135	6.7	66	3.3	3.89	1.05	Agree	0.000
1.4	680	33.8	615	30.5	404	20.1	216	10.7	99	4.9	3.78	1.17	Agree	0.000
2.1	800	39.7	695	34.5	315	15.6	130	6.5	74	3.7	4.00	1.07	Agree	0.000
3.1	905	44.9	661	32.8	274	13.6	114	5.7	60	3.0	4.11	1.03	Agree	0.000
4.1	855	42.5	575	28.6	302	15.0	153	7.6	129	6.4	3.93	1.20	Agree	0.000
4.2	797	39.6	660	32.8	375	18.6	100	5.0	82	4.1	3.99	1.07	Agree	0.000
5.1	709	35.2	674	33.5	395	19.6	150	7.4	86	4.3	3.88	1.10	Agree	0.000
5.2	601	29.8	474	23.5	387	19.2	249	12.4	303	15.0	3.41	1.41	Agree	0.000

6.1	761	37.8	619	30.7	352	17.5	154	7.6	128	6.4	3.86	1.19	Agree	0.000
6.2	684	34.0	666	33.1	415	20.6	160	7.9	89	4.4	3.84	1.11	Agree	0.000
Knowledge		33.6%		37.5%		16.9%		7.1%		4.9%	3.88	1.04	Agree	-
	71.1%							12.0%						

As shown in Table (4), the percentage of agreement (Strongly Agree and Agree) about the Knowledge domain is 71.1%. While the percentage of neutrality was 16.9% and disagreement was 12.0%. It is noted that this variable has an arithmetic mean equal to (3.88), and the standard deviation value is equal to (1.04), indicating that the sample's trend agrees. Observing the results in Table (6), the trend in each question is agreement. This is supported by the results of the One-Sample t-test, which indicates the presence of all of these items in the education directorates under study. The P-value is less than the level of significance, which is equal to (0.05), except for item (5.1), where the P-value is More than 0.05.

Table 5 One-Sample t-Test Results of Knowledge Standards.

CODE	TERMS	P-VALUE
Kndg1	The teacher knows the subjects they teach.	0.000
Kndg2	The teacher knows and understands the curriculum requirements for the subjects taught.	0.000
Kndg3	The teacher knows and understands how to present the subject matter to students.	0.000
Kndg4	The teacher knows and understands how students learn and develop.	0.000
Kndg5	The teacher knows and understands modern pedagogy.	0.000
Kndg6	The teacher knows and understands methods of educational evaluation (assessment and testing).	0.000
Kndg	Knowledge	0.000

Table (5) above shows that all the teachers use the statements in the section of BCS that deals with Knowledge to teachers according to the opinions of the study sample because the P-value values are all less than 0.05.

Table 6 Two-Sample t-Test Results of Knowledge Standards According to Gender

CODE	MIN	MAX	P-VALUE
Kndg1	Male	Female	0.019
Kndg2	-	-	0.441
Kndg3	-	-	0.580
Kndg4	-	-	0.144
Kndg5	-	-	0.094
Kndg6	-	-	0.574

Table (6) above shows no statistically significant differences between genders, as all P-values are over 0.05, except for the first standard in the knowledge domain, which is to the advantage of females.

Table 7 F-Test (ANOVA Table) Results of Knowledge Standards According to General Directorates

CODE	MIN	MAX	P-VALUE
Kndg1	Dhi-Qar	Second Karkh	0.000
Kndg2	Misan	First Rusafa	0.000
Kndg3	Kirkuk	First Rusafa	0.000
Kndg4	Dhi-Qar	Second Karkh	0.000
Kndg5	Dhi-Qar	First Karkh	0.000
Kndg6	Kirkuk	Second Karkh	0.000

Table (7) above shows the differences according to general directorates. There are statistically significant differences between the general educational directorates in all standards related to the knowledge domain because the P-values are all less than 0.05.

Table 8 F-Test (ANOVA Table) Results of Knowledge Standards According to Academic Levels.

CODE	MIN	MAX	P-VALUE
Kndg1	-	-	0.052
Kndg2	-	-	0.069
Kndg3	Fifth	Sixth	0.011
Kndg4	Fifth	Fourth	0.017
Kndg5	-	-	0.167
Kndg6	-	-	0.076

Table (8) above shows the differences in students' academic levels. There are no statistically significant differences according to academic level in standards related to the knowledge domain because the P-values are all greater than 0.05, except for the third and fourth standards.

Table 9 Descriptive Statistics and One-Sample t-Test Results of Skills Performance Indicators.

TERMS	LICKERT SCALE										MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	ORIENTATION	P-VALUE	
	STRONGLY AGREE (5)		AGREE (4)		NEUTRAL (3)		DISAGREE (2)		STRONGLY DISAGREE (1)						
	f	%	F	%	f	%	F	%	f	%					
1.1	733	36.4	678	33.7	383	19.0	102	5.1	118	5.9	3.90	1.13	Agree	0.000	
2.1	669	33.2	664	33.0	397	19.7	184	9.1	100	5.0	3.80	1.14	Agree	0.000	
3.1	890	44.2	603	29.9	317	15.7	113	5.6	91	4.5	4.04	1.11	Agree	0.000	
3.2	904	44.9	556	27.6	318	15.8	118	5.9	118	5.9	4.00	1.17	Agree	0.000	
3.3	921	45.7	629	31.2	315	15.6	78	3.9	71	3.5	4.12	1.04	Agree	0.000	
4.1	922	45.8	652	32.4	275	13.7	95	4.7	70	3.5	4.12	1.04	Agree	0.000	
4.2	754	37.4	591	29.3	413	20.5	126	6.3	130	6.5	3.85	1.18	Agree	0.000	
4.3	590	29.3	616	30.6	490	24.3	192	9.5	126	6.3	3.67	1.17	Agree	0.000	
4.4	528	26.2	514	25.5	503	25.0	272	13.5	197	9.8	3.45	1.28	Agree	0.000	
5.1	855	42.5	685	34.0	335	16.6	88	4.4	51	2.5	4.09	0.99	Agree	0.000	
5.2	754	37.4	659	32.7	379	18.8	116	5.8	106	5.3	3.91	1.12	Agree	0.000	
5.3	656	32.6	597	29.6	407	20.2	199	9.9	155	7.7	3.70	1.23	Agree	0.000	
5.4	799	39.7	607	30.1	356	17.7	150	7.4	102	5.1	3.92	1.15	Agree	0.000	
5.5	713	35.4	649	32.2	387	19.2	159	7.9	106	5.3	3.85	1.15	Agree	0.000	
6.1	632	31.4	614	30.5	423	21.0	200	9.9	145	7.2	3.69	1.21	Agree	0.000	
6.2	589	29.2	570	28.3	431	21.4	211	10.5	213	10.6	3.55	1.30	Agree	0.000	
6.3	515	25.6	492	24.4	480	23.8	268	13.3	259	12.9	3.37	1.33	Agree	0.000	
6.4	628	31.2	602	29.9	488	24.2	171	8.5	125	6.2	3.71	1.17	Agree	0.000	
7.1	542	26.9	629	31.2	484	24.0	210	10.4	149	7.4	3.60	1.20	Agree	0.000	
7.2	516	25.6	608	30.2	583	28.9	177	8.8	130	6.5	3.60	1.15	Agree	0.000	
7.3	606	30.1	570	28.3	421	20.9	247	12.3	170	8.4	3.59	1.26	Agree	0.000	
7.4	605	30.0	570	28.3	422	21.0	247	12.3	170	8.4	3.59	1.26	Agree	0.000	
7.5	495	24.6	604	30.0	591	29.3	196	9.7	128	6.4	3.57	1.15	Agree	0.000	
8.1	733	36.4	585	29.0	406	20.2	157	7.8	133	6.6	3.81	1.20	Agree	0.000	
8.2	692	34.4	609	30.2	406	20.2	158	7.8	149	7.4	3.76	1.21	Agree	0.000	
8.3	744	36.9	570	28.3	437	21.7	109	5.4	154	7.6	3.81	1.21	Agree	0.000	
Skills		34.3%		30.1%		20.7%		8.3%		6.6%	3.77	1.18	Agree	-	
		64.4%						14.9%							

Table (9) above shows that the percentage of agreement (Strongly Agree and Agree) for the Skills domain is (64.4%). In comparison, the percentage of neutrality is 20.7%, and of disagreement is 14.9%. This variable has an arithmetic mean equal to (3.77), which indicates that the trend of the sample is towards agreement, and the standard deviation value is equal to (1.18). Table 6 also shows that the trend in each question is agreement for all items, and the t-test results support this, as the P-value for all items is less than 0.05.

Table 10 One-Sample t-Test Results of Skills Standards.

CODE	TERMS	P-VALUE
Sk1	The teacher can explain the subject matter clearly and make it attractive to students.	0.000
Sk2	The teacher can plan students' learning appropriately.	0.000
Sk3	The teacher can communicate and interact effectively with students.	0.000
Sk4	The teacher can motivate students to learn.	0.000
Sk5	The teacher can manage the classroom effectively.	0.000
Sk6	The teacher can use modern teaching methods and strategies that engage students actively in learning and enable them to develop practical learning skills.	0.000

Skl7	The teacher can evaluate students' performance efficiently and accurately and use the evaluation outcomes to promote students' progress.	0.000
Skl8	The teacher can enable all students to learn effectively by considering students' differences.	0.000
Skl	Skills	0.000

Table (10) above shows that all the teachers use the statements in the section of BCS that deals with skills to teachers according to the opinions of the study sample because the P-value values are all less than 0.05.

Table 11 Two- Sample t-Test Results of Skills Standards

CODE	MIN	MAX	P-VALUE
Skl1	-	-	0.792
Skl2	Male	Female	0.001
Skl3	-	-	0.136
Skl4	-	-	0.287
Skl5	-	-	0.060
Skl6	Male	Female	0.026
Skl7	Male	Female	0.000
Skl8	Male	Female	0.003

Table 12 F-Test (ANOVA Table) Test Results of Skill Standards According to General Directorates.

CODE	MIN	MAX	P-VALUE
Skl1	First Karkh	Second Karkh	0.000
Skl2	Dhi-Qar	First Rusafa	0.000
Skl3	Second Rusafa	First Rusafa	0.000
Skl4	Dhi-Qar	First Karkh	0.000
Skl5	Dhi-Qar	Second Karkh	0.000
Skl6	Second Rusafa	First Karkh	0.000
Skl7	Dhi-Qar	First Karkh	0.000
Skl8	Kirkuk	First Rusafa	0.000

Table (12) above shows statistically significant differences among the general education directorates in everything related to the Skills domain because the P-values are all less than 0.05.

Table 13 F-Test (ANOVA Table) Test Results of Skills Standards According to Academic Levels.

CODE	MIN	MAX	P-VALUE
Skl1	-	-	0.197
Skl2	-	-	0.388
Skl3	Fifth	Sixth	0.037
Skl4	-	-	0.173
Skl5	-	-	0.068
Skl6	Fifth	Fourth	0.000
Skl7	Fifth	Fourth	0.004
Skl8	-	-	0.053

Table (13) above shows no statistically significant differences according to academic level in standards related to the Skills domain because the P-value is more than 0.05, except for the third, sixth, and seventh standards.

Table 14 Descriptive Statistics and One-Sample t-Test Results of Values and Attitude Performance Indicators.

ITEMS	LICKERT SCALE										MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	ORIENTATION	P-VALUE
	STRONGLY AGREE (5)		AGREE (4)		NEUTRAL (3)		DISAGREE (2)		STRONGLY DISAGREE (1)					
	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%				
1.1	853	42.4	501	24.9	436	21.6	106	5.3	118	5.9	3.93	1.17	Agree	0.000
2.1	718	35.7	653	32.4	384	19.1	142	7.1	117	5.8	3.85	1.15	Agree	0.000
3.1	757	37.6	581	28.8	421	20.9	127	6.3	128	6.4	3.85	1.18	Agree	0.000
3.2	559	27.8	577	28.6	541	26.9	185	9.2	152	7.5	3.60	1.20	Agree	0.000
3.3	729	36.2	619	30.7	434	21.5	123	6.1	109	5.4	3.86	1.14	Agree	0.000
4.1	708	35.2	626	31.1	440	21.8	128	6.4	112	5.6	3.84	1.14	Agree	0.000
4.2	784	38.9	589	29.2	425	21.1	114	5.7	102	5.1	3.91	1.13	Agree	0.000
4.3	853	42.4	558	27.7	361	17.9	131	6.5	111	5.5	3.95	1.16	Agree	0.000

4.4	679	33.7	628	31.2	477	23.7	131	6.5	99	4.9	3.82	1.12	Agree	0.000	
5.1	626	31.1	637	31.6	479	23.8	140	7.0	132	6.6	3.74	1.16	Agree	0.000	
5.2	705	35.0	592	29.4	443	22.0	137	6.8	137	6.8	3.79	1.19	Agree	0.000	
5.3	494	24.5	586	29.1	608	30.2	151	7.5	175	8.7	3.53	1.19	Agree	0.000	
6.1	680	33.8	643	31.9	469	23.3	108	5.4	114	5.7	3.83	1.12	Agree	0.000	
6.2	591	29.3	652	32.4	481	23.9	160	7.9	130	6.5	3.70	1.16	Agree	0.000	
6.3	764	37.9	548	27.2	497	24.7	93	4.6	112	5.6	3.87	1.14	Agree	0.000	
6.4	545	27.1	621	30.8	588	29.2	137	6.8	123	6.1	3.66	1.13	Agree	0.000	
7.1	696	34.6	547	27.2	433	21.5	168	8.3	170	8.4	3.71	1.25	Agree	0.000	
7.2	583	28.9	621	30.8	529	26.3	154	7.6	127	6.3	3.68	1.15	Agree	0.000	
7.3	776	38.5	576	28.6	395	19.6	158	7.8	109	5.4	3.87	1.17	Agree	0.000	
Values and Attitude		34.2%		29.7%		23.1%		6.8%		6.2%		3.79	1.16	Agree	-
		63.9%						13.0%							

The results about the domain of value and attitude show that the percentage of agreement (Strongly Agree and Agree) is 63.9%. In comparison, the percentage of neutrality is 23.1%, and the percentage of disagreement (Disagree and Strongly Disagree) is 13.0%. This domain has an arithmetic mean equal to (3.79), which indicates that the sample's trend is towards agreement, and the standard deviation value is equal to (1.16).

Table 15 One-Sample t-Test. Results of Values and Attitude Standards.

CODE	TERMS	P-VALUE
VL_atd1	The teacher is committed to the profession of teaching, to their students' learning, and promoting their learning so that they all make progress and perform well.	0.000
VL_atd2	The teacher is committed to developing and consolidating the national and ethical values in students.	0.000
VL_atd3	The teacher is committed to positive relationships with students and professional colleagues in the school, families, and society.	0.000
VL_atd4	The teacher is committed to active participation in school activities.	0.000
VL_atd5	The teacher is committed to self-evaluating and improving their performance through professional development.	0.000
VL_atd	Values and attitude	0.000

Table (15) above shows that all the teachers use the statements in the section of BCS that deals with values and attitudes toward teachers, according to the opinions of the study sample, because the P-values are all less than 0.05.

Table 16 Two-Sample t-Test Results of Values and Attitude Standards.

CODE	MIN	MAX	P-VALUE
VL_atd1	Male	Female	0.001
VL_atd2	Male	Female	0.002
VL_atd3	-	-	0.392
VL_atd4	-	-	0.117
VL_atd5	Male	Female	0.012

Table (16) above indicates that there are no statistically significant differences based on gender in the third and fourth standards since their P-values exceed 0.05. Statistically significant gender disparities exist in the first, second, and fifth standards to the advantage of females.

Table 17 F-Test (ANOVA Table) Test Results of Values and Attitude Standards According to General Directorates

CODE	MIN	MAX	P-VALUE
VL_atd1	Second Rusafa	First Rusafa	0.000
VL_atd2	Dhi-Qar	First Rusafa	0.000
VL_atd3	Misan	First Karkh	0.000
VL_atd4	Second Rusafa	First Karkh	0.003
VL_atd5	Dhi-Qar	Second Karkh	0.000

Table (17) above shows statistically significant differences between the general education directorates in everything related to the Values and Attitude domain because the P-value values are all less than 0.05.

Table 18 F-Test (ANOVA Table) Test Results of Values and Attitude Standards According to Academic Levels.

CODE	MIN	MAX	P-VALUE
VL_atd1	-	-	0.054
VL_atd2	-	-	0.119
VL_atd3	Sixth	Fourth	0.024
VL_atd4	Fifth	Fourth	0.000
VL_atd5	Sixth	Fourth	0.002

Table (18) above shows no statistically significant differences according to level for the first and second standards because their P-values are greater than 0.05. There are statistically significant differences according to level for the third, fourth, and fifth standards because their P-values are less than 0.05.

CONCLUSION

According to the study results, the researchers concluded that the BCS is suitable for evaluating EFL teachers in Iraq. Even though there are some limiting factors in implementing the BCS, such as the vast number of students in preparatory schools, lack of facilities like using technology in the teaching process, etc., in summary, conducting additional interviews with teachers and students would yield significant insights into their feedback processes and perspectives on assessment feedback. Furthermore, classroom observations provide a more profound comprehension of how teachers and students participate in evaluation and the assistance they receive from principals, supervisors, and the general directorate of education in enhancing their performance based on BCS evaluation literacy. The study's findings indicate that Iraqi EFL preparatory schoolteachers demonstrate diverse levels of competency in reaching the standards set by the British Council. Some teachers show a firm grasp and skillful use of these principles, while others would improve with more professional development and training. It is recommended that The Ministry of Education recognize the need to provide ongoing support and resources to enhance the teaching skills of EFL teachers in Iraq. Also, prioritize Knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes to strengthen English language instruction in Iraqi preparatory schools.

The study also focuses on BCS suitability and teachers' performance review and control. It should also study practical ways to improve teacher training programs and their effects on students' academic achievement.

REFERENCES

- Aimah, S., & Purwanto, B. (2019). Evaluating Teachers' Performance: A Need for Effective Teaching. <https://doi.org/10.24167/celt.v19i1.1369>
- Aimah, S., Ifadah, M., & Bharati, D. A. L. (2017). Building Teacher's Pedagogical Competence and Teaching Improvement through Lesson Study. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 8(1), 66–78.
- Ajisafe, O. E., Bolarinwa, K. O., & Tuke, E. (2015). Issues in Business Education Programme: Challenges to National Transformation. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(21), 208-212.
- Akbari, R., & Yazdanmehr, E. (2011). EFL teachers' recruitment and dynamic assessment in private language institutes in Iran. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 8, 29–51.
- Albert, M. A., Danielson, E., Rifai, N., Ridker, P. M., Prince Investigators, & PRINCE Investigators. (2001). Effect of statin therapy on C-reactive protein levels: the pravastatin inflammation/CRP evaluation (PRINCE): a randomized trial and cohort study. *Jama*, 286(1), 64–70.
- Aldeman, C. (2012). Teacher preparation strategy. Presentation to the National Academy of Education Steering Committee on Evaluating Teacher Education Programs: Toward a Framework for Innovation, June 25.
- Al-Hammad, Y. (2011). Teaching performance assessment for the intermediate school English teachers in Hail per the Teaching Quality Standards. Retrieved on Feb. 2024 Master's Thesis, Imam Muhammad Bin Saud Islamic University, Saudi Arabia.
- Amit-Aharon, A., Warshawski, S., & Itzhaki, M. (2020). Association Between Witnessing and Justifying Workplace Violence Towards Nurses in Israel. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 52(6), 713-721.
- Aravamudhan, N. R., & Krishnaveni, R. (2015). We are establishing and reporting content validity evidence for the Training and Development Capacity Building Scale (TDCBS). *Management*, 20(1), 131–158. <https://hrcaak.srce.hr/141598>
- Arnon, S., & Reichel, N. (2007). Who is the ideal teacher? Am I? Similarity and Difference in Perceptions of Students of Education Regarding Qualities of a Good Teacher and of Their Qualities as Teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 13(5), 441-464.
- Arnon, S., & Reichel, N. (2007). Who is the ideal teacher? Am I? Similarity and Difference in Perception of Students of Education Regarding Qualities of a Good Teacher and Their Qualities as Teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 13(5), 441-464.
- Bailey, K. (2007). *Language teacher supervision: A case-based approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Banks, W. P. (1977). Encoding and processing of symbolic information in comparative judgments. In *Psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 11, pp. 101–159). Academic Press.
- Becuwe, H., Tondeur, J., Roblin, N. P., Thys, J., & Castelein, E. (2016). Teacher design teams as a strategy for professional development: The role of the facilitator. *Educational Research and Evaluation*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2016.1247724>
- Becuwe, H., Tondeur, J., Roblin, N. P., Thys, J., & Castelein, E. (2016). Teacher design teams as a strategy for professional development: The role of the facilitator. *Educational Research and Evaluation*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2016.1247724>
- Beishuizen, J. J., Hof, E., van Putten, C. M., Bouwmeester, S., & Asscher, J. J. (2001). Students' and Teachers' Cognitions about Good Teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 185–201.
- Bell, T. (2005). Behaviors and attitudes of effective foreign language teachers: results of a questionnaire study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(2), 259–270.
- Brandt, C. (2010). Giving reflection a voice: A strategy for self-evaluation and assessment in TESOL teacher preparation. In C. Coombe, M. Al-Hamly, P. Davidson, & S. Troudi (Eds.), *Evaluating teacher effectiveness in ESL/EFL contexts* (pp. 199–212). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 328–375). New York: Macmillan.
- Brown, I., & Crumpler, T. (2013). Assessment of foreign language teachers: A model for shifting evaluation toward growth and learning. *The High School Journal*, 96(2), 138–151.
- C. Coombe, M. Al-Hamly, P. Davidson, & S. Troudi (Eds.), *Evaluating teacher effectiveness in ESL/EFL contexts* (pp. 232–244). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Catano, V. M., & Harvey, S. (2011). Student Perception of Teaching Effectiveness: Development and Validation of the Evaluation of Teaching Competencies Scale (ETCS). *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(6), 701–717.
- Cogshall, J. G., Bivona, L., and Reschly, D. J. (2012). *Evaluating the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs for support and accountability*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 98–104. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.78.1.98.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 3rd ed. SAGE Publications, California: USA.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometric*, 16(3), 297–334. doi:10.1007/bf02310555.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). "One Piece of the Whole: Teacher Evaluation As Part of a Comprehensive System for Teaching and Learning." *American Educator* 38 (1): 4–14. Davis, A., C. Winch, and G. Lum, eds. 2015. *Educational Assessment on Trial*. London: Bloomsbury Academic. <http://digital.casalini.it/9781472572318>.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession*. Washington, DC: National Staff Development Council, 12(10).
- Delgado, R. (2019). Why Cohen's Kappa should be avoided as a performance measure in classification. *PLoS One*, 14(9), e0222916.
- Fan, X. (2012). "The Test is Reliable"; "The Test is valid": Language Use, Unconscious Assumptions, and Education Research Practice. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-012-0036-y>
- Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Hui-Ling, W., Hui-Ling, W., Chung, C. H., & Yi-Chun, L. (2023). Exploring the Predictors of Teacher Well-Being: An Analysis of Teacher Training Preparedness, Autonomy, and Workload. *Sustainability*, 15(7), 5804.
- Ida, Z. S. (2017). What Makes a Good Teacher? *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(1), 141–147.
- Jabbarifar, T. (2009). The Importance of Classroom Assessment and Evaluation in the Educational System. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of Teaching and Learning (ICTL 2009)* INTI University College, Malaysia.
- Jabbarifar, T. (2009). The Importance of Classroom Assessment and Evaluation in the Educational System. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of Teaching and Learning (ICTL 2009)* INTI University College, Malaysia.
- Jones, J. (1998). *Lesson planning: towards purposeful learning and effective teaching*. Universidad de Alcalá: Servicio de Publicaciones.
- Jones, J. (1998). *Lesson planning: towards purposeful learning and effective teaching*. Universidad de Alcalá: Servicio de Publicaciones.
- Ndungu, B. W., Allan, G., & Emily, B. J. (2015). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation by Principles on Effective Teaching and Learning in Public Secondary Schools in Githunguri District. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(9), 10–17.
- Nevo, D. (2013). The conceptualization of educational evaluation: An analytical review of the literature. *New directions in academic evaluation*, pp. 15–29.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schwarz, N. (2007). Attitude construction: Evaluation in context. *Social cognition*, 25(5), 638–656.

The British Council Standards as a Tool for Evaluating Iraqi EFL Teachers

- Shian-yun, B. (2012). Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Taiwan's EFL Context. Selected papers from the Twenty-First International Symposium on English Teaching.
- Shukla, S. (2014). Teaching Competency, Professional Commitment, and Job Satisfaction Study of Primary School Teachers. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 4(3), 44–64.
- Syahrudin, et al. (2013). Teachers' Pedagogical Competence in School-Based Management. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 7(4), 213-218.
- Three coefficients for analyzing the reliability and validity of ratings. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, pp. 45, 131–141.