Lazaraton, A. (1995). Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Progress Report. TESOL Quarterly, 29, 455-472.

Mc Donough, J. (1994). A Teacher Looks at Teachers' Diaries. ELT Journal, 48, 57-65.

Prabhu, N.S. (1990). There is No Best Method – Why? TESOL Quarterly, 24, 161-176.

Richards, J.C. (1996). Teachers's Maxims in Language Teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 30, 241-296.

Wolfson, N. (1986). Research methodology and the Question of Validity. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 689-699.

entirely private endeavor and gives rise to self awareness in teachers. Diaries as very valuable tools in language teaching and training can provide us with documents for formalizing the everyday working experiences. It is suggested that observations that sometimes may change the natural rhythm of the class be accompanied with the documents taken from experienced teachers' diaries.

References

Allwright, D. and Bailey K.M. (1991). Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers.

Allwight, D. (1993). Classroom-Centered Research on Language Teaching and Learning: A Brief Historical Overview. TESOL Quarterly 17, 191-204.

Brown, J.D. (1988). Understanding research in second Language Learning: A Teachers's Guide to Statistics and Research Design, U.P.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1979). Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Newbury House Publishers.

Chaudron, G. (1986). The interaction of Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches to Research: A view of the Second Language Classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 709-714.

Davis, A.K. (1995). Qualitative theory and methods in Applied Linguistics Research. TESOL Quarterly. 29, Vol. 3, 427-453.

Gaies, S. (1983). The Investigation of Language Classroom Process. TESOL Quarterly, 17, 205-217.

Henning, G. (1986). Qualitative methods in Language Acquisition Research. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 701-707.

3. Observer's will, understanding, intentions, his or her relations with the teacher who is being observed, his/her presuppositions about the teacher may affect the grading.

4. Grading of the observation sheet ranged from "excellent" to "not applicable", but there were only two other levels in between. There may be other possibilities.

5. Each class was observed by teachers for about two to five times. It may not be possible to observe all behaviors students and teachers may present in the whole term, during this limited number of observation sessions. What is needed is every session observation.

Suggestion for further research

Qualitative research, observation, and evaluation of variables in a non-quantified level are very complex procedures and need much care and interest. It is suggested that the same research be replicated with observations conducted on every session of the class. A correlational analysis is also needed between observation sheets filled by different teachers who observe the same class ? Furthermore, if any checklist is supposed to be used in observations there must be a more comprehensive list of variables to be observed. Finally, there should always be more than one way method of collecting data i.e. observation, to measure any objective, because there are always options. No single method is good for measuring a wide variety of different teacher performances.

Because of the presence of an immense number of variables observed, classroom research needs rich data at least more than those collected by observations. Mc Donough (1994) suggests the use of teacher diaries which is an

Conclusion and Implications

This study mainly focused on finding the relationship between students' achievements and the teachers' observations. In dealing with this objective, a comprehensive survey was conducted. The results of the statistical analysis are discussed as follows.

As the results of the correlational analysis show, regardless of the level of students, there was a low correlation coefficient between the mean of students' achievements at different levels and the observation grading. This indicates the lack of efficiency of the observations. The observations no.3, 4, 5, and 7 showed a moderate to low correlation coefficients, and those in no. 8, 9, and 10 showed a somewhat moderate to high coefficients. Although the number of observation sheepts for each level differed, this did not affect the quality of the observations significantly. Thus the reason for such a low correlation could be either the lack of carefulness of teachers to observe all aspects and variables of teaching or the inability of the checklist to be used For this purpose.

As the results of ANOVA show there is a significant difference between the observations on the levels of Prep1, Prep2, Prep3, CEB1, CEB2, CEB4, F1, PRB2, B1, and B2. The findings of analyses of variance also confirm the judgement of the researchers about observation. From among levels observed, however, two of them i.e. F2 and PRB1 showed no significant difference between the observations and students achievement scores. The following limitations may have been the cause.

1. Behaviors to be observed may exceed in number the variables in the checklist.

2. What is observed is not necessarily what is reported.

TABLE NO 11
Analysis of Variance
Variable: PRB 1*

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	5	2201.3041	440.2608	4.7032	0.0007
Within groups	102	9548.0563	93.6084		
Tatal	105	11749.3605			

TABLE NO 12
Analysis of Variance
Variable: B 1*

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	4	748.3398	187.0849	1.8372	0.1332
Within groups	61	6211.5968	101.8295		
Tatal	65	6959.9366			

TABLE NO 13
Analysis of Variance
Variable: B 2*

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	2	392.3150	196.1575	2.4368	0.0982
Within groups	48	3863.8983	80.4979		
Tatal	50	4256.2132			

TABLE NO 8
Analysis of Variance
Variable: F 1*

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	2	451.3307	225.6653	3.2490	0.0467
Within groups	53	3681.2218	69.4570		
Tatal	55	4132.5525			

TABLE NO 9
Analysis of Variance
Variable: F 1*

Source	D.F	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	2	79.0162	39.5081	0.3282	0.7218
Within groups	49	5898.2662	120.3728		
Tatal	51	5977.2825			

TABLE NO10
Analysis of Variance
Variable: PRB 1*

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	4	416.6254	104.1563	0.8573	0.4940
Within groups	69	8382.5649	121.4864		
Tatal	73	8799.1903			

TABLE NO 5
Analysis of Variance
Variable: Ceb 1*

Source	D.F	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	5	6409.9519	1281.9904	11.8339	0.0000
Within groups	99	10724.8374	108.3317		
Tatal	104	17134.7893			

TABLE NO 6
Analysis of Variance
Variable: Ceb·2*

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	4	3935.9794	983.9948	4.6717	0.0018
Within groups	94	19799.1848	210.6296		
Tatal	98	23735.1641			

TABLE NO 7
Analysis of Variance
Variable: Ceb 4*

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	2	252.2517	126.1258	1.7385	1991
Within groups	22	1596.1083	72.5504		
Tatal	24	1848.3600			

analysis show that there is a significant difference between most of the performances of students in different levels and the observation scales. The results are presented in tables 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

TABLE NO 2
Analysis of Variance
Variable: Prep 1*

Source	D.F	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	2	1999.5219	999.7609	6.2682	0.0024
Within groups	9	25359.8809			
Tatal	161	27359.4038			

TABLE NO 3
Analysis of Variance
Variable: Prep 2*

Source	D.F	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	5	1520.1372	304.0274	2.4967	0.0334
Within groups	146	17778.9550	121.7737		
Tatal	151	19299.0921			

TABLE NO 4
Analysis of Variance
Variable: Prep 3*

Source	D.F	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	F prob.
Between groups	6	5222.6314	1044.5263	7.8927	0.000
Within groups	155	132.3404			
Tatal	160	25735.3939			

different observation sheets filled out by teachers and the GPA's of students in classes being observed.

The second group of analysis consisted of 12 one way ANOVA's between each level's observations and the GPAs of students of the same level to find out if there was any differences between them. Description of the statistical analysis will also be presented.

Analysis no 1

To find the degree of relationship between student's achievement scores and the teachers' observation gradings, a correlational analysis was conducted the results of which can be found in table 1. The results of this analysis indicated that except for a few number of observations i.e. those of no10, no 4, no 3, no 5, no 7, no 8, and no 9 , no satisfactory coefficient was found between mean of the class achievement scores and the grades belonging to the observations.

TABLE NO 1

Correlation Coefficients

Obs. Mean	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Obs 5	Obs 6	Obs 7	Obs 8	Obs 9	Obs 10
	0.29	0.21	0.30	0.31	0.30	0.30	0.50	0.72	0.72	0.47

Analysis no 2

To answer the question of this project 12 different one way analysis of variance were conducted. The objective was to find whether each level of students had different performance in relation to the observation of teachers. The results of this

intermediate levels, intermediate levels, and the advanced for both young children and adults. Observers included both newly employed teachers and the experienced ones. Coordinators were also among observers. They are experienced teachers who are also responsible for giving reports on teachers' performance to the supervisor. The checklist included four grades for each variables; Yes, good to excellent, Yes, average/adequate, No, needs improvement, and Not applicable.

Since the GPAs of students are reported on the basis of 100 scores, the checklist was also graded on the basis of the same score, i.e. 100. The mean score of GPAs from the same teacher on the same levels were computed. The mean of the observation sheets of the same teacher provided by other teachers were also computed. To find the relationship between teacher behavior and the students' achievement, correlation coefficients between these two sets of scores were computed. To find any significant difference between these two variables one way analysis of variance ANOVA was used.

Results

There were two independent variables each with more than two levels. One was the course grade of students who belonged to different levels, which were introduced before. The other one was the observation, which was conducted by different teachers on the same class. The study was conducted to find answers to the following question:

"What is the relationship between teacher's behavior and the students' achievement?"

To find a related answer to the question of research, two sets of statistical analysis were carried out. The first group included correlational analysis between

checklist was more desirable. Because of the mentioned reason a checklist for self-observation of teachers from "Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language by Celce Murcia (1979, 327) was adopted.

The checklist comprised of four main variables including social climate, learning activities, student participation, and feedback and correction. Each of these variables had its own subdivisions or subvariables. This checklist, although planned to be used for self-evaluation of teachers, includes a large body of variables to be observed. These variables include the social climate, varieties in learning activity, opportunity for students' participation, and feedback and correction. Social climate has six subsections, including the interest of teacher toward students, his or her friendly attitude, students' intimacy and their cooperation in class activities. Varieties in language learning activities include six subsections, with focus on all skills, use of audio visual aids, variety in interactions, variety in the tasks used, and variety in techniques. Opportunity for students' participation includes five sections of assigning responsibility to students, random distribution of turns among students, maximizing students' participation and decreasing teachers domination, use of games and competitions, and providing more opportunity for students talking in class. Feedback and correction is brought with five more sections as helping students toward self-cheching, self-correction, and peer-correction, finding the sources of error instead of correcting them.

Procedure

Teachers from Iran Language Center were asked to observe the other classes for the full sessions and provide ordinal ratings to any variable they observe. Classes included those for preparation courses, which are elementary levels, pre-

method, but to find something less obviously pedagogical or even below the level of techniques which is taking place.

This study intended to provide answers to the following question: What is the relationship between teacher's behavior graded and the student's achievement?

Method

Population

In this study both coordinators and student teachers in Iran English Language Center were asked to observe the classes. The observers were holding either BA or MA or were the students of MA courses. Their field of study was either Translation or Literature in English. Their experience in teaching ranged from 1 to 5 years. Classes to be observed were all levels including those of young children and adults. Levels for the former group in this institute include three preparation courses, i.e. Prep1, Prep2, Prep3. five construction courses, i.e. Ceb1, Ceb2, Ceb3, Ceb4, Ceb5, one review course, i.e. RCB, two intermediate courses, i.e. CI1, and CI2. Adult levels include twenty courses as follows: two fundamental courses, i.e. F1, and F2, three pre-basic courses, i.e. PRB1 and PRB2, two pre-intermediate courses, i.e. PRI1 and PRI2, two intermediate courses, i.e. I1 and I2, two post-intermediate courses, i.e. PI1 and PI2, two pre-advanced courses, i.e. PRA1 and PRA2, two advanced courses, i.e. A1 and A2, and finally two post-advanced courses, i.e. A1 and A2, and finally two post-advanced courses, i.e. PA1 and PA2.

Instrument

Although it was possible to make a checklist on the basis of variables mentioned for teachers and students in Methodology books, use of a read-made

These evaluation procedures which intend to provide better services for students as an ultimate goal, should be fair, affordable, easy to implement and used for personnel decisions. Richards (1996) mentions the importance of teacher evaluation not only for program administrators, students, and researchers, but for the teachers themselves, because they themselves want to know what kind of teacher they are, and how well they perform their activities. in most language institutes including the one under study two methods are used for evaluation of: one is used to evaluate the teaching applicant's literacy and numeracy, which is done through a competency test. Then they undergo an interview which assesses their proficiency in English and their pedagogical expertise. Classroom observations are also used for training, for employment decisions, and for providing feedback for improvement of instruction. These observations are conducted either by peer teachers or by coordinators.

For some researchers who possess some sort of sociological outlook, a language class is a socially constructed event in which what is observed is the interaction of the people who are present. This interaction involves behavior of the learners and teacher to the extent that they may affect the second language instructional experience, the linguistic environment of second language instruction. patterns of participation in the language classroom, error treatment and eventually the syllabus.

What classroom-centered research wants to reflect on is not simply a single variable such as method, rather identifying variables of second language instruction, i.e. how teachers and learners accomplish classroom lessons. The objective is not to find what actually happens in language classroom in a particular

According to All right and Bailey (1991) Classroom-centered research has the quality distinct from those that concentrate on the inputs to the classroom (the syllabus, the teaching materials or the outputs from the classroom (learner achievement scores). It tries to investigate what happens inside the classroom when learners and teachers come together and as Gaies (1983) says, it rejects as simplistic any univariate classification of the second language experience and in so doing it is used to generate hypotheses rather than to test the hypotheses.

The purpose of classroom research is actually to find which variables best leads to academic achievement. Careful evaluation of results leads to well informed decision making at all levels, development of the curriculum, preparation of materials, training of teachers, preference for classroom teaching activities and techniques, and decision about individualization of instruction. The range of classroom research is broad and the number of factors and issues studied seem to be endless.

It makes not much difference, however, whether the classroom research is qualitative or quantitative in orientation, the goal of researchers has always been much the same. The purpose of both is: a) to determine which classroom processes are most to learning outcomes, or L2 products, and b) to discover what relationship these variables have to second language learning.

Evaluation of teachers is an approach used in language institutes to assess their performance and/or qualifications in relation to the roles they have against the language institute purposes. There are, of course other approaches such as peer evaluation that is useful for both normative and summative purposes, and self-observation, etc. .

comprehensively, but even the brief and random listing above shows that they are at different levels of generality as well as discreteness and tangibility.

It is note worthy that some researchers reduce their data into numbers and use statistical analyses. This process helps them to report the positive or negative relationship they have found between different types of classroom behavior. Other researchers, however, may use more qualitative approach and not rely on statistics to interpret their data. There are still others who combine the two approaches of qualitative and quantitative to their data. L2 classroom research is one of the fields that benefit a lot from a variety of deferent approaches. These approaches include ethnographic observation, simulated classroom activities and experiments, and even more complex multivariate analysis. Overlooking the importance and value of both qualitative and quantitative research reduces the significance of these types of study.

One of the cases in which this integration may seem meaningful is the classroom-centered research. Here the classroom is the object of investigation not a setting for investigation. The technique used for this purpose is either observation or introspection, or a combination of these two. Introspection according to Allwright 1983, is defined as "asking people to answer questions rather than asking them to allow themselves to be observed in action. We ask them to introspect, to reflect on their experience, and we do so by interviewing them or by giving them questionnaires to respond to ; or we combine the two and use a structured interview technique, in which the interviewer works through a set of questions equivalent to a questionnaire and records the interviewees responses." Classroom-centered research is defined as the research centered on the classroom (1986) Chaudron.

that the investigation of language acquisition will ever be said to belong to the realm of scientific inquiry.

Lazaraton (1995) also gives prominence to qualitative research in applied linguistics if it is used as an inclusion of both qualitative as well as quantitative issues. According to her qualitative research has gained more significance in terms of visibility and credibility, although its purposes, assumptions, and methods are debaed, misunderstood or ignored by some in our profession.

Wolfson (1986) is also among those who consider necessary the integration of two approaches i.e. observation and experiment toward data collection and analysis. According to her a researcher should be able to move back and forth between these two approaches repeatedly a number of times, since they complement each other. One of the important fields, which need this integration, is detecting teacher and students' behavior, a type of human interaction, in an EFL setting. It is evident that both approaches are relevant to determining a) the important variables to investigate and b) the relationships those variables have to second language learning.

In justifying the use of qualitative approach, Prabhu (1990) says that there are important variations in the teaching contexts. These variations include the other ones relating to social situation (language policy, language environment, linguistic and cultural attitudes, economic and ideological factors), educational organization (instructional objectives, constraints of time and resources, administrative efficiency, class size, classroom ethos, etc.), teacher-related factors (status, training, belief, autonomy, skill, etc.), and learner-related factors (age, aspirations, previous learning experience, attitudes to learning, etc.). Brumfit (1984 cited in Prabhu 1990) tried to categorize these variables systematically and

Introduction

SLA researchers usually utilize research designs and paradigms dominant in psychological studies. These studies based on logical positivistic approaches require the use of quasi-experimental and experimental designs to gain objective data and replicable findings by controlling human and other variables in the field of psychology. Findings of these types of research can be generalized beyond the individuals participating in the study to the population from which the sample is drawn. During 1970"s social meaning of language and ethnography of communication gave rise to a new paradigm in the field of applied linguistics. (Davis, 1995). The former approach is referred to 25 quantitative and the latter qualitative research approaches.

According to Henning (1986) quantitative research is not the only way to study language acquisition, it is only a kind of research that involves tallying, manipulation or systematic aggregation of quantities of data and it may involve the use of descriptive of inferential statistics. For him quantitative methods allow the researcher to go beyond the data themselves and to generalize to other instances not studied. Brown (1988) mentions that many researchers may adopt another approach that depends on a unique aptitude without a standardized method. This approach may focus on situations, which are not selected randomly and may provide some questionable generalizations. In this category journal keeping, library research, anecdotal summaries, observations, introspection, and retrospection may fall, through which it may be possible to describe a language or its use. With a strong position toward quantification Henning appreciated the integration of numbers and words. For him, without recourse to quantification it is inconceivable

these factors and their direct or indirect relationship to academic achievements could be helpful in designing materials, adopting techniques used for individualization of instruction and most efficiently in teachers training courses and ultimately its contribution in efficient learning.

In this study a group of student teachers and coordinators were asked to observe the classes of the more experienced teachers in an English institute. On the basis of a full session observation they were asked to fill a checklist of self-grading taken from Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language written by Celce Murcia (1979, 327). Although this was a qualitative type classroom research, the outcomes were graded and then correlated to students Grade Point Averages in every class. The correlation coefficients show that there is a moderate relationship between student teachers evaluations and the students' final achievements. Analysis of variance indicated that there was significant difference between these two independent variables.

The Relationship Between Students Achievement Scores and the Observation Grading

Dr. Seid Mohammad Ziahosseini[*]

Hajar Khanmohammad[**]

Abstract

Detecting the effects of major features of teacher and student behavior in classrooms on the teaching outcomes and the achievement of students and the factors affecting these performances have been the subject of a large body of research since 1960's. Learning outcomes have been to have close relations to the following variables: teachers' behavior, instructional and non instructional tasks, teachers and students personality, attitudes, cognitive, individual and social factors, the function and form of language in practice and endless other factors and issues. It is believed that academic achievement is closely bound to the above mentioned variables. Evaluation of

* - The Faculty of Literature and Foreign Language Allameh Tabatabaie University

** - Islamic Azad university Faculty Foreign languages English Department