Journal of Language and Translation
Volume 6, Number 1(11), (pp.17-30), 2016

Development and Validation of an Instrument to Evaluate English Language Teachers' Lesson Planning Self-concept

Fatemeh Faryabi [1] , Adnan Satariyan[2*]
[1] Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literature, Department of English Language and literature, University of Tehran, Iran
[2] Faculty of Education, University of Tasmania (UTAS), Australia
[2] Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

Received: 17 April, 2016 Accepted: 28 July, 2016

Abstract
This study aimed to develop and validate an instrument to evaluate English language teachers' lesson planning self-concept. To this end, 30 English teachers were asked to prepare a sample lesson plan and 15 of them were invited to participate in a semi-structured interview. A tentative questionnaire including six factors namely: classroom management, lesson planning conformity, planning efficacy, variety and adaptation, goal setting, and metacognitive knowledge, was then designed. The designed instrument was piloted to 300 English language teachers and validated using exploratory factor analysis. The findings of the study suggested a model questionnaire (30 items), including five factors (goal setting and metacognitive knowledge as one factor), for the evaluation of English language teachers' lesson planning self-concept.

Keywords: English language learning, English language teaching, Evaluation of a lesson plan, Lesson planning self-concept

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, with the growing interest in the field of teacher education, teachers have become the main focus of investigation in the field of education (Thomas, 2012). Teachers play a significant role in foreign/second language education (Bulger, Mohr, & Walls, 2002; Darling-Hammond, 2001; Hall & Smith, 2006; Little, Goe, & Bell, 2009). Teachers can affect students' motivation, learning, and academic success (Harmer, 2007). Teachers' beliefs can also influence their pedagogy (Borg, 2006; Hall & Smith, 2006) as well. Scholars such as Borg (2001, 2006), Kumaravadivelu (2012), and Peacock (2001) investigate the relationship between teachers' belief and their pedagogy. Borg (2003) defines teacher's cognition as the invisible aspect of teachers' profession, namely their beliefs, thoughts, and perceptions. In another study Borg (2006) asserts that teachers' thinking can lead their pedagogy. Kumaravadivelu (2012) also states that teachers' beliefs can form their pedagogies and teaching behavior. Considering the importance of teachers' belief, therefore, it is worth including this while investigating teachers' practice and pedagogy.

Beliefs are the unobservable dimensions of language teaching that cannot be identified directly and need to be measured (Borg, 2001; 2003;

*Corresponding Author's Email: Adnan.Satariyan@utas.edu.au

2006). According to the theory of self-perception (Bem, 1967), one way, to identify individuals' beliefs, is to understand how teachers perceive themselves in a particular situation, which is called 'self-concept'. Mercer (2011) refers to 'self conception' as 'self-belief' or 'self-perception'.

Research on teacher cognition has mainly revolved around three basic phases of teaching, including 'before instruction' or the 'pre-active teaching phase' (planning), 'during instruction' or the 'interactive teaching phase', and 'after instruction' or the 'post teaching phase' (reflection) (Hall & Smith, 2006; Rusznyak & Walton, 2011). Anderson (2015) mentions the importance of lesson planning in teacher education and assessment.

Review of the recent literature (e.g. Kyriacou, 1995; Woodward, 2001; Zazkis, Liljedahl, & Sinclair, 2009) indicates that empirical studies in relation to teachers' lesson planning have been conducted from the 1970s. Hall and Smith (2006), however, claim that most of the studies are based on standardised models and prescriptive approaches. The advancement of cognitive psychology has encouraged researchers to adopt a psycholinguistic and process oriented approach in lesson planning (e.g. Gülten, 2013; Liyanage & Bartlett, 2010; Mutton, Burn & Hagger, 2010; Sougari, 2011).

This research study addressed the significance of daily lesson planning of English language teachers as an essential activity for successful teaching and learning. This study also attempted to develop and validate an instrument for identifying teachers' self-concept in their daily lesson planning in English language classes.

Lesson planning is an inherent quality of effective teaching (Causton, Theoharis, & Trezek, 2008; Zazkis et al., 2009). Harmer (2007) states that an outstanding characteristic of effective teachers is developing a lesson plan before instruction. In fact, Harmer emphasizes the efficacy and necessity of daily lesson planning in promoting teaching quality. Baily (1996) argues that lesson plan is "like a road map, which describes where the teacher hopes [to go during their instruction], presumably taking the students along" (p.18). Lesson planning helps teachers to execute curriculum guidelines, syllabus elements, institutional and schools' rules and regulations and their own educational ideologies and attitudes (Calderhead, 1996). According to Richards (1998), daily lesson planning is a means of thinking about the lesson before the class, anticipating the possible problems, making the lesson structured, and creating a map as a guide for teachers. Farrell (2002) asserts that lesson planning has some advantages i.e. it helps teachers feel relaxed and secure, gain mastery over the content of the lesson, anticipate the issues in classrooms, facilitate the flow of the session, and it also has a positive effect on students' needs and preferences. Lesson planning contributes to creation of a link between curriculum and instruction in classrooms (Byra & Coulon, 1994). Each lesson plan is an indicator of the central components of a lesson, such as goals and objectives, timing issues and teaching materials. (Masemann, 2012).

Teaching can include three stages of planning, implementation, and evaluation, which Jackson (1968) articulates these stages as 'pre-active', 'interactive' and 'post-active. These stages develop in a recurring and cyclical mode (Hall & Smith, 2006; Tsui, 2005). Farrell (2002) points out that planning is the decision making phase in which teachers ponder on the objectives of the lesson, develop teaching materials, design teaching activities, and consider all the issues in relation to implementing the lesson. In the implementation stage (interactive), teachers not only teach as it is planned but also modify and adapt their plans to adjust to the unpredictable context of classroom. On the other hand, in the evaluation stage, teachers engage in the outcome of their plans. In fact, they reflect on the implementation stage and make further decisions to improve their teaching. Planning and decision making are cognitive processes that form the pre-active phase of teaching; in this phase, teachers are concerned with reflecting on how to plan for lessons (Tsui, 2005). Tsui also points out that the cognitive processes of teachers in the planning phase imply their beliefs toward teaching and how they execute the pedagogical rules and expectations of schools or institutes into their plans.

Calderhead (1996) asserts that lesson planning has five characteristics. He considers planning as informal, creative, knowledge-based, and flexible process that occurs within a 'practical and ideological' context. The first characteristic, which is informality of the lesson plan, distinguishes experienced from novice teachers in formatting lesson plan. The second characteristic, creativity of planning process, suggests that experienced teachers apply new ideas and consider practicality in the process of planning their lesson. Knowledge-based planning is the third characteristics, which means that effective and successful planning necessitates content knowledge that novice teachers may lack and experienced teachers have the required knowledge. Flexibility is known as the fourth characteristics and pertains to the amount that experienced teachers may transfer into their planning task and this differs from novice teachers. Novice teachers usually adhere to prescribed models of lesson planning, which limit their creativity and flexibility. The fifth lesson-planning feature signifies that planning is conducted in accordance with a set of contextual factors, such as, classroom environment and students.

Clark and Yinger (1979) suggest that lesson planning has three major functions. Overcoming internal feelings (i.e. decreasing anxiety, gaining self-confidence, and security), accomplishment of instructional goals (i.e. developing the materials, designing activities, arranging time for the tasks), and class management (i.e. organising instructional activities).

Following the review of the literature, three lesson planning models were identified. These models are briefly summarized here. The first model of lesson planning was put forwarded by Ralph Tyler in 1950. For a long time, this model has been the dominant model of lesson planning and has been widely used by teachers and teacher trainers around the world. Tyler's model is a 'linear' and 'rational' model of planning which comprises four stages, namely (1) specifying the objectives, (2) selecting learning activities, (3) organizing learning activities, and (4) specifying evaluation procedures. It is a 'linear ends-means model' which adopts a highly rational and scientific method to achieve planning task (Yinger, 1980). It is worth mentioning that this model has been proposed for any types of educational planning e.g. curriculum planning or daily lesson planning (Yinger, 1980). Another model for lesson planning was proposed by MacDonald (1965), Macdonald, Wolfson, and Zarot (1973), and Eisner (1967) called the integrated ends-means model. In this model, there is no specific stage for goals and objectives as it is asserted that teachers begin their planning by specifying teaching activities rather than defining objective. Moreover, this model brings ends and means of teaching together that is, it integrates ends and means and rejects the idea of defining and setting goals initially. Yinger (1980) and Clark and Yinger (1979) developed a structured model of the proactive teaching phase that is planning. This model includes five levels of planning that teachers are mainly engaged in, namely 'yearly', 'term', 'unit', 'weekly', and 'daily' lesson planning. They also formulated a theoretical model of lesson planning which consisted of three stages, including 'problem finding', 'problem formulation' and 'problem solution', then, implementing the plan, which follows evaluation and regularization of it. This three stage model based on teachers' daily or weekly planning works in a cyclic manner. The teacher first starts with problem finding and ponders on the plan with reference to the relevant content of the lesson, its objective, and his/her own knowledge and experience. Following the first stage, the teacher engages in problem formulation and solution. Problem formulation entails designing activities based on investigation and adaptation of learning experiences. Finally, solution involves implementing the plan along with an ongoing evaluative component. In this stage, the teacher both implements and evaluates the efficacy of his plan through reflection which leads to routinization of some activates.

Conceptual Framework of the Lesson Planning Self-Concept Instrument

To design an English language teachers' lesson planning self-concept instrument, a comprehensive

literature review was carried out to find the main themes and components of lesson planning. Following the review of literature, some models of lesson planning (e.g. Tyler, 1950; MacDonald, 1965; Macdonald, Wolfson, & Zarot, 1973; Clark & Yinger, 1979), which are the often cited models of lesson planning, were identified. The models mainly dealt with the stages of lesson planning, which enlightened the researchers about the main phases of planning process. The researchers drew some lesson planning related factors from the literature. In addition, based on examining a number of lesson plans collected from language teachers and the analysis of semi- structured interviews, classroom management, variety and adaptation, lesson planning conformity, and goal setting were identified.

In the following paragraphs some literature on 'self-concept' has been discussed. As stated earlier, a means of identifying individuals' beliefs is through understanding how the person perceives himself in a particular situation (Bem, 1967) that is his self-concept. A person's self-concept is the beliefs one holds about oneself also called self-belief, or, one's self-perception (Mercer, 2011). also states that the investigation and exploration of self-concept should be conducted in a 'domain specific' manner. In other words, it has to identify how an individual perceives and evaluates him/herself in a particular context. Bong and Skaalvik (2003) claim that there is an overlapping alikeness between two self-constructs, namely self-efficacy and self-concept which makes it difficult to tell them apart. More interestingly, a number of researchers (e.g. Bong & Clark, 1999; Schunk, 1996; Pajares, 1992) believe that academic self-concept involves a self-efficacy component (Bong & Skaalvik 2003, Mercer, 2011). This self-efficacy component is 'task specific'. Self-efficacy is defined as individuals' perception about their own abilities. Schunk (1990) asserts that self-efficacy is an influential variable in the individuals' tendency to take part in various tasks and the amount of effort they put into those tasks. It is considered that individuals are more intrinsically motivated and put more value in the activities in which they perceive themselves as self-efficacious. In addition, in light of the previous research studies, 'self-related metacognitive knowledge' is another component within self-concept construct (Mercer, 2011). Theoretically, metacognition consists of metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive regulation. (Farvell, 1979). Metacognitive knowledge is the knowledge of self, the strategies to use for different tasks and knowledge of effective strategies (Pintrich, 2002). According to Farvell (1979), metacognitive knowledge has three types, namely knowledge of person, knowledge of task, and knowledge of strategy. Self-knowledge is a kind of 'self-awareness' (Pintrich, 2002) that is the person is aware of his learning and teaching processes. For instance, "you may be aware that your study session will be more productive if you work in the quiet library rather than at home where there are many distraction" (Livingston, 1997, p.3). Drawing upon the self-concept construct, two more factors termed metacognitive knowledge and planning efficacy were identified. The following table presents the components of lesson planning along with their definitions.

Table 1

Tentative Conceptualization of ELT Teacher Lesson Planning Self-Concept

	Components of ELT Teacher Lesson Planning Self-Concept
1	Classroom Management: Teachers' actions taken to make classroom a socially supportive and academically facilitative learning environment (Evertson & Weinstein, 2006).
2	Lesson Planning Conformity: The extent to which teachers conform to preparing lesson plans before instruction.
3	Planning Efficacy: It refers to how much the teacher perceives him/herself 'capable' of lesson planning
4	Variety and Adaptation: It refers to designing various tasks and activities or changing materials to fit a specific group of students.
5	Goal Setting: It is the cognitive process of specifying what one is trying to accomplish.
6	Metacognitive Knowledge: The knowledge about the factors that might impact performance, knowledge about strategies, and knowledge about when and why to use strategies.

METHODS

Participants

To gain an understanding of teacher lesson-planning, thirty English language teachers who were teaching 'Family and Friends 4' (Simmons, 2009) and 'Top Notch Fundamentals' (Saslow & Ascher, 2011) at eight English institutes in Tehran were recruited based on criterion sampling (only those teachers who taught Family and Friends4 and Topnotch Fundamentals) which means seeking only those participants who match the purpose of research and satisfy a specific criteria (Dornyei, 2007). These teachers were asked to deliver one sample of their daily lesson plans for a predetermined chapter of the aforementioned books, proportionately. It is noteworthy that Family and Friends 4 and Top Notch Fundamentals are the common English language teaching textbooks taught in Iran.

Fifteen English language teachers (eight females and seven males) teaching at different proficiency levels (elementary, intermediate, and advance) in English institutes in Tehran were also recruited. In this study, the researcher aimed to identify teachers' beliefs and perceptions toward planning across all proficiency levels.

Furthermore, four teacher education experts including two Ph.D. graduates and two university professors were consulted about the first version of the researcher made instrument. Following that, forty English language teachers teaching at different proficiency levels participated in piloting phase of the study. The sample of the pilot phase was drawn using convenience sampling procedure. At last, 300 English language teachers, 166 females and 134 males, who were teaching English at schools and institutes in Tehran and Isfahan were invited to fill the researcher made questionnaire.

Data collection instruments

The present study made use of three instruments as follows. Firstly, thirty lesson plans collected from thirty English language teachers teaching Family and Friends 4 (Simmons, 2009) and Top Notch Fundamentals (Saslow & Ascher, 2011) at eight institutes in Tehran were used for exploring and analyzing how English language teachers write their lesson plans, what formats they follow, and what elements they include in their lesson plans. A chapter from two predetermined books was specified in advance to be able to analyze and compare the lesson plans more systematically. Moreover, two proficiency levels were chosen to be able to examine lesson planning in both lower and upper proficiency levels. It is worth mentioning that the aforementioned books are among the most popular books taught in English institutes in Iran. For analyzing the lesson plans a checklist (WVABE Comprehensive Lesson Plan Rubric) was used. The researchers selected this checklist from among many other checklists which were available on the internet. The checklist selected for the present study was both comprehensive compared to other available checklists and could be used with written lesson plans without classroom observation. The second instrument used in the present study was a semi-structured interview to delve into teachers' views about lesson planning. The final instrument was the researchers' made questionnaire, which comprised 33 items designed on 2 five Likert scales; one ranging from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree' (14 items) and the other ranging from 'Never' to 'Always' (15 items).

Procedure

This study used a mixed methods design and made use of both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. At first, a through literature review was carried out. Second, in order to meticulously examine how teachers prepare lesson plan, thirty samples of lesson plans were collected from thirty English language teachers for further content analysis. As pointed out earlier, these lesson plans were based on one chapter of two pre-determined books, namely Family and Friends 4 (Simmons, 2009) and Topnotch Fundamentals (Saslow & Ascher, 2011). The purpose of this phase was to find tangible samples of ELT teacher lesson planning behavior. The content analysis of lesson plans using 'WVABE Com-

prehensive Lesson Plan Rubric' and researchers' own conceptualization based on previous literature review, indicated a lack of consideration for students' assessment, lack of variety, and unclear lesson objective. The analyzed lesson plans were written mainly in terms of a number of activities. Few lesson plans had taken materials adaptation into account. In fact, they had followed the course book step by step. Most of the activities had been taken from the course books and few teacher-made activities or tasks were observed.

Fifteen English language teachers were then invited for an interview session in relation to their opinions about aspects of lesson planning. All the teachers were informed about the overall purpose of the interview in advance. The semi-structured face to face interview consisted of eight open ended questions. Each interview lasted approximately thirty minutes. Afterwards, the data from oral interviews was transcribed for further analysis.

Review of the literature and analysis of the interviews and lesson plans resulted into six constructs, including classroom management, planning efficacy, variety and adaptation, goal setting, metacognition, and conformity to lesson planning. To analyze the interview transcripts for their common themes, the researchers tried to develop teachers' responses into meaningful categories. Finally the related categories were clustered under their themes.

After reviewing the available literature thoroughly, analyzing the collected lesson plans, and interviewing the teachers, the tentative instrument comprising 38 items was developed. In this regard, four English language teaching (ELT) experts went through the items to express their opinions regarding the wording and content of the items. Their views were exerted, subsequently, four items were excluded, two items were added, and some of the items were modified. The first version of the questionnaire which consisted of 36 items was piloted with forty teachers. After piloting and examining the results, three items were deleted. Lastly, to validate the instrument, the finalized version with 33 items was administered to 300 EFL teachers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This study aimed to design and validate an English language teachers' lesson planning self-concept instrument. As discussed earlier, the 33-item questionnaire was designed on two five Likert scales and administered to 300 English language teachers. Forty three questionnaires were discarded due to their careless completion. Table 2 presents the number of items related to each factor in the theoretical conceptualization of EFL teachers' lesson planning self-concept.

Table 2

Number of Items in Each Component in the Lesson Planning Self-Concept Questionnaire.

Components of Lesson Planning	Number of Items in Each Component
Classroom management	9
Lesson planning conformity	3
Variety and Adaptation	7
Planning Efficacy	8
Goal Setting	4
Metacognitive knowledge	2
Total	33

In data analysis phase, the researchers intended to measure internal consistency of items and the validity of the theorized factors. To this aim, factoranalysis was run. Factor analysis has two main phases, including exploratory and confirmatory.

Exploratory factor analysis (EFC) is applied "to determine underlying constructs for a set of measured variables" (Suhr, 2006, p.1) while confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is basically applied to test a new model based on previous

models and theories. EFA was the major statistical procedure of data analysis of the present study because there was no prior instrument or model regarding lesson planning self-concept in the literature.

The data analysis was performed in three phases as follows: Firstly, to ensure the sample adequacy and suitability of data set for running factor analysis, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sample adequacy was run. As shown in table 1, KMO statistic is .776 and Bartlett's test is significant (p=0.000). According to Pallant (2006, 2007), a KMO value of .6 or above associated with a significant Bartlett's test shows that the data set is suitable for further factor analysis.

Table 3
KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.776
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1416.775
	Df	435
	Sig.	.000

Table 4 shows total variance explained by five factors. As indicated, the five factors make up 56.53% of the total variance. Factor one explains 24%, factor 2 accounts for 13.7%, factor 3 explained 8.6% and factors 4 and 5 accounts for 5.3% and 4.86% respectively.

Table 4
Total Variance Explained

Component	**Initial Eigenvalues**			**Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings**			**Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings** [a]
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
1	7.200	24.001	24.001	7.200	24.001	24.001	6.063
2	4.110	13.700	37.701	4.110	13.700	37.701	3.715
3	2.582	8.605	46.306	2.582	8.605	46.306	5.212
4	1.610	5.365	51.671	1.610	5.365	51.671	1.754
5	1.460	4.868	56.539	1.460	4.868	56.539	2.275
6	1.151	3.838	60.378				
7	1.057	3.524	63.902				
8	1.001	3.337	67.239				
9	.930	3.100	70.339				
10	.854	2.847	73.185				
11	.783	2.612	75.797				
12	.739	2.464	78.261				
13	.664	2.213	80.474				
14	.627	2.090	82.563				
15	.562	1.873	84.436				
16	.533	1.777	86.213				
17	.475	1.584	87.797				
18	.433	1.445	89.242				
19	.412	1.375	90.617				
20	.402	1.340	91.957				
21	.379	1.262	93.219				
22	.336	1.121	94.340				
23	.327	1.091	95.431				

24	.292	.973	96.404
25	.255	.851	97.255
26	.214	.715	97.970
27	.200	.666	98.636
28	.166	.552	99.188
29	.133	.444	99.632
30	.110	.368	100.000

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. When components are correlated, sums of squared loadings cannot be added to obtain a total variance.

Secondly, in order to identify the construct validity of lesson planning self-concept questionnaire, an exploratory factor analysis was run. The results indicated the existence of eight initial factors in contrast to the theorized six factors. Since the factor loadings did not seem to be optimal, a series of confirmatory factor analyses, using principal components analysis technique with Varimax rotation, were also tested on the data with different fixed factors ranging from two to eight. The most appropriate pattern of factor loadings showed five factors. The item loadings on the five extracted factors showed different loadings from what was initially expected based on the tentative framework of the present study. In fact, in some cases, items pertaining to a component in the theoretical framework did not load on the same factor. Statistically, some items failed to load on their expected factors.

This finding resulted in slight modifications in the original conceptual model so that it can reflect the obtained factor loadings. Thus, based on the results of factor analysis, 3 items were deleted (items 1, 20, 28) from the questionnaire because they loaded on irrelevant factors. These items focused on 'contribution of lesson planning to teaching', ' designing activities based on my own preferences rather than students' interest, and 'difficulty in finding and analyzing students' needs'. It can be inferred from the results of factor analysis that teachers were either uncertain about the above mentioned items or failed to understand them. Say it differently, the items were unclear to them. After the deletion of these three items from the original questionnaire, its reliability was measured once again through the Cronbach alpha. The new reliability was .79, which was slightly higher than thereliability of the questionnaire before deleting the three items, which was .78. The new reliability shows that the deleted items did not contribute to the constructs and the instrument. Finally, five components and their corresponding items were loaded, namely classroom management, lesson planning conformity, variety and adaptation, planning efficacy, and goal setting and metacognition. The best pattern of factor loadings indicated five factors accounting for 56.53% of the total variance (table 4).

It is worth noting that factors number four and five which were 'goal setting' and 'meta-cognition' loaded as one factor in the factor analysis, which was the most appropriate pattern of factor loadings. One reason can be the small number of items of the metacognitive knowledge factor. On the other hand, it has been shown that goal setting and metacognition are related. In fact, many research studies have established a link between metacognition and goal setting (e.g. Coutinho, 2007; Ford, Smith, Weissbein, Gully, & Salas, 1998).

Table 5

Rotated Component Matrix of Factor Analysis on the Items of the Lesson Planning Questionnaire

Item No	Gist of the Item	Factors				
2	Teaching effectiveness without lesson plan	75				
3	difficulty in dealing with problematic parts of the lesson	68				
5	Feeling confident without lesson plan	34				
6	Enhancing students' engagement in activities	42				
7	Class room management without a lesson plan	35				
11	Ability to control noisy students	55				
12	Running classes smoothly	69				
14	Responding to students' questions	54				
8	Planning before every session		60			
10	Writing lesson plans to satisfy the supervisor		44			
13	Using lesson plans prepared by other teachers		51			
17	Taking students' characteristics into account			41		
18	Designing various activities			45		
21	Consulting various resources			66		
25	Using course books only			30		
26	Including warm-up activities			52		
22	Taking students' styles into account			43		
9	Facing difficulty in lesson planning				54	
16	Facing difficulty in how to begin planning				54	
19	Difficulty in timing activities				70	
29	Difficulties in specifying clear lesson objectives				80	
4	Time-consuming planning				49	
31	Difficulty in sequencing activities				33	
23	Difficulty in deciding what to do in classes				61	
24	Lesson plans with clear objectives					57
27	Setting meaningful goals					53
30	Specifying an outcome					58
32	Including an assessment component in the lesson plan					40
15	Evaluating the plan after its implementation					44
33	Thinking about effectiveness of the lesson plan after its implementation					46

The finalized components of the instrument with their corresponding items are reported in table 5.

Table 6

Finalized Components of Lesson Planning Self-Concept Questionnaire: Reflecting the Obtained Factor loadings.

Components of Lesson Planning Self-Concept
Classroom Management (Factor 1) (items 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14)
Lesson Planning Conformity (Factor 2) (items 8, 10, & 13).
Variety and Adaptation (Factor 3) (it items 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 22)
Planning Efficacy (Factor 4) (items 9, 16, 19, 29, 4, 31, 23)
Goal Setting and Metacognitive knowledge (Factor 5) (items 24, 27, 30, 32, 15, 33)

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics of the ELT Teacher Lesson Planning Self-Concept Instrument (n=257).

Components and Total of the Instrument	N of the Items	Mean	SD
Classroom Manageemnt	8	27.29	2.75
Lesson Planning Conformity	3	7.77	1.26
Variety and Adaptation	6	20.96	3.31
Planning Efficacy	7	16.24	4.92
Goal Setting and Meta-cognition	6	23.76	4.38
Total	30	96.04	10.87

The above Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics of the scores obtained from the participants. It includes the mean, standard deviation, and the total for each component of the lesson planning self-concept instrument. In order to calculate the participants' scores on each component, the values of the options they had selected were added. As some items were reverse scored their options were inverted before the calculation The value of the obtained score on each component or the total value shows the degree to which teachers perceive a positive self-concept toward their lesson planning. In other words, teachers who obtained a higher score had a more positive lesson planning self-concept than their counterparts with a lower score.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results obtained from the data analysis indicated that ELT-based lesson-planning has five underlying constructs. Furthermore, internal consistency of items and validity of theorized factors were measured through a validation phase. It can be inferred from the scores achieved from participants that the items of the developed instrument were representative of their lesson-planning experiences. Therefore, it can be used as a reliable and valid instrument for measuring ELT teachers' lesson-planning self-beliefs.

From a Pedagogical perspective, planning forms an important phase in teaching English. Teachers' self-belief can also have a great influence on their teaching behavior as self-concept affects motivation and behavior of the teachers in classroom (Roche & Marsh, 2000).

In conclusion, this study considered lesson planning constructs and attempted to design an instrument, which can reflect teachers' self-concept towards their lesson planning practice.

References

Bem, D. J. (1967). Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance Phenomena. *Psychol*. Rev. 74, 183–20010.1037/h0025145

Bong, M. & Clark, R. (1999). Comparison between self-concept and self-efficacy in academic motivation research. *Educational Psychologist*, *34*(3), 139-153.

Bong, M. & Skaalvik E. M. (2003). Academic self-concept and self-efficacy: how different are they really? *Educational Psychology Review*, 15, 1-40.

Borg, S. (2001). Self-perception and practice in teaching grammar. *ELT Journal*, 55 (1), 21–9

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, *36*(2), 81-109.

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education*. London: Continuum.

Bulger, S. M., Mohr, D. J., & Walls, R. T. (2002). Stack the deck in favor of your students by using the four aces of effective teaching. *Effective Teaching*, 5(2).

Byra, M., & Coulon, S. C. (1994). The effect of planning on the instructional behaviors of pre-service teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 13 (3), 123-139.

Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers' beliefs and knowledge. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (1996). *Handbook of educational psychology*. New York: Macmillan Library Reference USA, Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Causton-Theoharis, J., Theoharis, G., & Trezek, B. (2008). Teaching pre-service teachers to design inclusive instruction: a lesson-planning template. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *12*(4), 381-399.

Clark, C. M., & Yinger, R. J. (1979*). Three studies of teacher planning.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Coutinho S. A. (2007). The relationship between goals, metacognition, and academic success. *Educate*. 7, 39–47.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). The research and rhetoric on teacher certification: A response to "Teacher certification reconsidered". New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Eisner, E. W. (1967). Educational objectives: Help or hindrance? *The School Review*, 75(3), 250-260.

Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (2006). Classroom management as a field of inquiry. In C. Evertson, & C. Weinstein, (Eds). *Handbook of classroom management*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Farrell, T.S.C. (2002). Lesson planning. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, J. K., Smith, E. M., Weissbein, D.A., Gully, S. M., and Salas, E. (1998) Relationships of goal orientation, metacognitive activity, and practice strategies with learning outcomes and transfer. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 218-233.

Gülten, A. (2013). Am I planning well? Teacher trainees' voices on lesson planning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *93*, 1409-1413.

Hall, T., & Smith, M. (2006). Teacher planning, instruction and reflection: What we know about teacher cognitive processes. *Quest*, *58*(4), 424-442.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow, England: Pearson Longman.

Jackson, P.W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). *Language teacher education for a global society*. New York: Routledge/Taylor and Francis.

Kyriacou, C. (1995). *Essential teaching skills*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes.

Little, O., Goe, L., & Bell, C. (2009). *A Practical Guide to Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Liyanage, I., Bartlett, BJ. (2010). from autopsy to biopsy: A metacognitive view of lesson planning and teacher trainees in ELT. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26 (7), 1362-1371.

Macdonald, J. B. (1965). Myths about instruction. *Educational Leadership, 22*(8), 609–617.

Macdonald, J., Wolfson, B., & Zaret, E. (1973). *Reschooling society: a conceptual model*. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Masemann, V. (2012). Living in diversity: Lesson plans for secondary schools. *International Review of Education*, *58*(3), 429-430.

Mercer, S. (2011). *Towards an understanding of language learner self-concept*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Mutton, T., Burn, K., & Hagger, H. (2010). Making sense of learning to teach: learners in context. *Research Papers in Education*, 25(1), 73-91.

Pajares, M . F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62 (3), 307−32.

Pallant, J. (2006). *SPSS Survival Manual: a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*, 4th Edition, Crows Nest, New South Wales.

Pallant, J., (2007). *SPSS Survival Manu*al, 3rd Edition, Crows West, New South Wales.

Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: a longitudinal study. *System*, *29*(2), 177-195.

Pintrich, P. (2002). The Role of Metacognitive Knowledge in Learning, Teaching, and

Assessing. *Theory Into Practice*, *41*(4), 219-225.

Richards, J. (1998). *Beyond training*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press.

Roche, L. A., & Marsh, H. W. (2000). Multiple dimensions of university teacher self-concept. *Instructional Science*, 28, 439–468.

Rusznyak, L. & Walton, E. (2011). Lesson planning guidelines for student teachers: A scaffold for the development of pedagogical content knowledge. *Education As Change*, *15*(2), 271-285.

Saslow, J., & Ascher, A. (2011). *Top notch Fundamentals*. Longman: Pearson Education.

Simmons, N. (2009) *Family and Friends 4*, Oxford University Press.

Schunk, D. H. (1990). Goal setting and self-efficacy during self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 25, 71–86.

Schunk, D. H. (1996). Self-efficacy for learning and performance. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Sougari, A. M. (2011). Student teachers' decision-making skills in relation to lesson planning: The impact of a practicum. Selected papers from the 19th international on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 57-67.

Suhr, D. (2006). Exploratory or Confirmatory Factor Analysis. SAS Users Group International Conference (pp. 1 - 17). Cary: SAS Institute, Inc.

Thomas, R. (2012). Learning, teaching and education research in the 21st century: An evolutionary analysis of the role of teachers. *International Review of Education*, *58*(4), 589-591.

Tsui, A. (2005). Expertise in Teaching Perspective and Issues. In K. Johnson (Ed.), *Expertise second language learning and teaching* (pp. 167-189). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tyler, R. (1950). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago

Woodward, T. (2001). *Planning lessons and courses*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Yinger, R. (1980). A Study of Teacher Planning. *The Elementary School Journal*, *80*(3), 107-127.

Zazkis, R., Liljedahl, P., & Sinclair, N. (2009). Lesson Plays: Planning teaching vs. teaching planning. *For the learning of mathematics*, 29 (1), 40-47.

Biodata

Fatemeh Faryabi graduated with a master's degree in the field of TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) at the university of Tehran in Iran. She also received her bachelor's degree in TEFL from Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University (SRTTU) in Iran. Her research interests are task-based language teaching and teacher education.
Email: Faryabi@ut.ac.ir

Adnan Satariyan completed his PhD of Second Language Education at the University of Tasmania (UTAS) in Australia. He is NAATI certified interpreter and taught at the faculty of Education and the National Institute for Maritime Education, Training and Research (AMC) at the University of Tasmania. He received his bachelor's degree in English translation studies and his master's degree in TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) from Azad University, South Tehran Branch, in Iran. Adnan is a keen researcher and has been the author and co-author of many books, research papers and book chapters relating to language teaching and learning. His research interests center on pedagogy of literacy skills, metalinguistic awareness, teacher development and leadership, psycholinguistics, problems of second language teaching/learning, action research, course curriculum, and classroom-based studies.
Email: Adnan.Satariyan@utas.edu.au

"Appendix"

English Language Teacher Lesson Planning Questionnaire

Please fill in the demographic information below. Your information will be confidential and will only be used for research purposes.

Gender	Female Male
Age	…….
Teaching Experience (Years/Months)	School ……. Institute ……. Private …….
University Degree	No degree BA in English MA in English Ph.D. in English
Degree in other fields (Please specify, if any)	……..……...

Instruction: Thank you for your agreeing to participate in this study. The following items relate to your lesson planning and preparation in English language teaching classrooms. There are no correct or incorrect answers. The researcher is only interested in your honest response for research purposes.

Please mark your response in the appropriate cell.

		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly agree
1	My classes will not go properly without a well prepared plan.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Without planning, I face difficulty in dealing with the problematic parts of the lesson.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Planning for lessons takes too much of my time.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Without a lesson plan, I feel confident handling my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
5	When I teach by lesson plans, my students' engagement in activities enhances.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I can manage my classes successfully without a lesson plan.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I plan before every session.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I face difficulty in lesson planning.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I write lesson plans for satisfying the supervisor or principal.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Attending the class without a plan reduces my ability in controlling noisy students.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Without planning, it is difficult for me to run lessons smoothly in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I prefer to use lesson plans prepared by other teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Without planning and preparation, I may face difficulty in responding to my students' questions.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Evaluating my lesson plan after its implementation leads to my professional development.	1	2	3	4	5

		Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Always
15	In the planning phase, I hesitate about how to begin planning for lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
16	While planning, I take my students' characteristics, such as age and proficiency level into account.	1	2	3	4	5
17	While planning, I consult different resources and use a variety of teaching materials.	1	2	3	4	5
18	When I am planning, I design various activities that are interesting to all students.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Timing activities is difficult for me, because I do not know how the lesson will go in the class.	1	2	3	4	5
20	I design activities based on the learning styles of different students.	1	2	3	4	5
21	Due to the unpredictability of the classroom context, it is difficult to decide on what I am going to do in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
22	My lesson plans have clear objectives according to course book.	1	2	3	4	5
23	For lesson planning, I use course books as the only resource.	1	2	3	4	5
24	I include warm up and opening activities in my lesson plans.	1	2	3	4	5
25	While preparing lesson plans, I identify meaningful goals and objectives of the lesson.	1	2	3	4	5
26	While planning, I have difficulties in formulating clear objectives for my lesson plans.	1	2	3	4	5
27	In the planning phase, I specify an outcome for the lesson to be reached.	1	2	3	4	5
28	Sequencing activities appropriately is a difficult task for me.	1	2	3	4	5
29	While preparing lesson plans, I decide on how to assess my students' learning.	1	2	3	4	5
30	After I deliver the lesson, I think if my lesson plan was effective or not.	1	2	3	4	5