REFLECTIVE EVALUATION OF EFL TEACHERS VERSUS THEIR STUDENTS' EVALUTION

Wiwik Andreani

English Department, Faculty of Language and Culture, Bina Nusantara University,
Jln. Kemanggisan Ilir III No. 45, Kemanggisan/Palmerah, Jakarta Barat 11480
wiwik@binus.edu

ABSTRACT

Article investigated the grading of teaching values and its relation to the rating performance of the teachers. For this purpose, 27 EFL teachers were randomly chosen from Bina Nusantara University. Some teachers taught only English Department students and some others taught students of other Departments, for example Computer Science, Marketing Communication, Management, Visual Communication Design and Chinese Department. They were asked to grade twelve values in their teaching according to the order of importance and to answer a set of questions on those values. Besides, their students filled in a questionnaire with the aim of evaluating the teachers' performance from September 2008 until June 2010 (three semesters).The results of the study suggest that there is a change in the teaching-value grading along with teaching experience. However, there is no relationship between teaching values and getting high/low rating performance, the reason of which is not dealt with in the study. Expertise, Enthusiasm, Reliability and Attentiveness were teaching values selected as most important for the EFL teachers. Moreover, most teachers were graded higher in their soft skills rather than hard skills, especially in giving the students an opportunity to ask questions and to have a discussion during the teaching and learning process. Finally, when teachers taught small and big classes, surprisingly most of them got higher rating performance from their students of big classes, for both their hard and soft skills.

Keywords: EFL teachers, teaching performance, teaching values, hard skills, soft skills

ABSTRAK

Artikel menyelidiki hubungan nilai pengajaran dengan kinerja dosen. Sampel terdiri dari 27 dosen EFL Universitas Bina Nusantara yang dipilih secara acak. Dosen diminta menyusun 12 nilai berdasarkan kepentingan ketika mereka mengajar dan menjawab pertanyaan sesuai dengan nilai tersebut. Mahasiswa diminta mengisi evaluasi dosen selama 3 semester, yaitu September 2008 sampai Juni 2010. Simpulannya adalah terdapat perubahan di dalam penilaian cara mengajar seiring dengan pengalaman mereka mengajar. Walaupun demikian, tidak ada hubungan antara nilai pengajaran dengan perolehan kinerja yang tinggi/rendah, dengan alasan di luar konteks penelitian. Expertise, Enthusiasm, Reliability, dan Attentiveness adalah nilai pengajaran yang terutama dipilih para pengajar EFL. Kebanyakan dosen dinilai lebih tinggi untuk soft-skill dari pada hard-skill mereka karena telah memberi kesempatan mahasiswa bertanya dan berdiskusi selama proses pengajaran.Akhirnya, ketika dosen mengajar di kelas besar atau kecil, ternyata mereka mendapat rating kinerja yang lebih tinggi pada saat mengajar di kelas besar, baik untuk hard skill atau soft skill mereka.

Kata kunci: Dosen EFL, kinerja dosen, nilai pengajaran, hard skill, soft skill

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

It is undeniable that quality education must be supported by quality teachers since teachers play an important role in determining students' success. The importance of teachers' role can be clearly seen in English Teaching, for example; an English teacher functions as a guide as well as a model for their students. Teachers, therefore, should consistently improve themselves to be professional teachers and both teachers and students should always be life-long learners.

In doing their jobs teachers need feedback or evaluation from the institution, superior, peers and students. In reality, however, there are teachers who do not like evaluation although evaluation is crucial because it can suggest how teachers might change certain attitudes or teaching techniques to improve their teaching performance. Besides, evaluation also gives feedback to teachers so that they know what is expected of them – what they are doing well and how they might improve themselves. Moreover, evaluation is usually closely related to the financial reward teachers will get. In this instance, evaluation can boost teachers' morale since they should be rewarded for above average or excellent performance.

This is what teachers in Indonesia are now experiencing; they are evaluated and if they pass the evaluation, they will be granted a teacher certification ('sertifikasi guru / dosen'). This certification includes self-evaluation, evaluation from the superior, peers and students, the consistency among which will determine whether or not teachers pass the certification.

The study is meant firstly to find out the relationship between self-evaluation of EFL teachers and evaluation from their different–three–semester students. The self-evaluation in this study refers to the reflection of the values EFL teachers hold in their teaching while the evaluation from the students are taken from on-line questionnaire filled in for three consecutive semesters. Secondly, this paper discusses which skills of teachers, whether hard or soft skills, get higher or lower scores of evaluation from their students.

Research Questions:

In short, the paper wants to answer the following questions: (1) Is there a change in the teaching–value grading along with teaching experience?, (2) Do teachers getting high / low rating performance from their students hold the same values?, (3) What skills – hard or soft skills – of teachers are graded lower / higher by students?, (4) Do teachers teaching big classes get higher / lower rating performance from their students compared to those teaching small classes?

Literature Review

Teaching and learning process is a life-long business. It is there when someone is born to the world and it goes on and on until he / she has to leave the world. In its formal context teaching and learning process is conventionally done in the classroom, under the roof, in a building. However, with the advancement of technology, it is now not limited to the four-wall room. We are now accustomed to the on-line learning since internet technology has reached remote areas all over the world. Therefore, nowadays people can learn something new easily; it is only as simple as pushing the button of the keyboard and a huge bundle of information will pop up in front of our eyes in a split of second. In this instance, USAID and the local Indonesian government have funded a coaching program for teachers to use technology. The pilot program was done by the Education Development Center, USA, which involved 92 teachers and 12 coaches. All 92 coached teachers implemented what they learned

in technology-based professional development. Thus, if teaching and learning process has gone some changes, what should teachers do?
(http://www.edc.org/newsroom/articles/giving_teachers_help_they_need, retrieved on June 15, 2010)

According to Mortiboys (2005:2), "conventionally, a teacher brings two things to the classroom that are of value to the learners. One is expertise in the subject, whether it is basic mathematics, leadership in business or the novels of Thomas Hardy. The other is knowledge of learning and teaching methods – a teacher's pedagogy, such as how to structure the content being presented, how to encourage participation by learners, use of materials and so on." Furthermore, he suggests that the third thing should be emotional intelligence. Teachers must be emotionally intelligent in their teaching because by being emotionally intelligent they have no difficulty in interacting with and motivating their learners. Therefore Mortiboys (2005:3) suggests that emotional intelligence be reflected in teacher training courses at all levels and be included in every teacher's development.

What are the characteristics of a good teacher, then? In the paper, a teacher meant is only limited to an English teacher. Allen (1980) in Brown (2001:429) offers the following list of characteristics of good ESL teachers: (1) Competent preparation leading to a degree in TESL, (2) A love of the English language, (3) Critical thinking, (4) The persistent urge to upgrade oneself, (5) Self-subordination, (6) Readiness to go the extra mile, (7) Cultural adaptability, (8) Professional citizenship, (9) A feeling of excitement about one's work.

When the previous list is observed, it can be seen that half of it is about values or soft skills of teachers, for example a love of the English language, the persistent urge to upgrade oneself, and a feeling of excitement about one's work. This also means that soft skills of English teachers have already been counted in their career since a long time ago. Nowadays soft skills or interpersonal skills or social skills are known as emotional intelligence or at least part of emotional intelligence. Brown himself (2001: 430, table 23.1) has made a long list of characteristics of a good language teacher, as follows:

Good Language-Teaching Characteristics

Technical Knowledge
    • Understands the linguistic systems of English phonology, grammar, and discourse.
    • Comprehensively grasps basic principles of language learning and teaching.
    • Has fluent competence in speaking, writing, listening to, and reading English.
    • Knows through experience what it is like to learn a foreign language.
    • Understands the close connection between language and culture.
    • Keeps up with the field through regular reading and conference/workshop attendance.
 	
Pedagogical Skills
    • Has a well-thought-out, informed approach to language teaching.
    • Understands and uses a wide variety of techniques.
    • Efficiently designs and executes lesson plans.
    • Monitors lessons as they unfold and makes effective mid-lesson alterations.
    • Effectively perceives students' linguistic needs.
    • Gives optimal feedback to students.
    • Stimulates interaction, cooperation, and teamwork in the classroom.
    • Uses appropriate principles of classroom management.
    • Uses effective, clear presentation skills.
    • Creatively adapts textbook material and other audio, visual, and mechanical aids.
    • Innovatively creates brand-new materials when needed.
    • Uses interactive, intrinsically motivating techniques to create effective tests.

Good Language-Teaching Characteristics

Interpersonal Skills
- Is aware of cross-cultural differences and is sensitive to students' cultural traditions.
- Enjoys people; shows enthusiasm, warmth, rapport, and appropriate humor.
- Values the opinions and abilities of students.
- Is patient in working with students of lesser ability.
- Offers challenges to students of exceptionally high ability.
- Cooperates harmoniously and candidly with colleagues (fellow teachers).
- Seeks opportunities to share thoughts, ideas, and techniques with colleagues.

Personal Qualities
- Is well organized, conscientious in meeting commitments, and dependable.
- Is flexible when things go awry.
- Maintains an inquisitive mind in trying out new ways of teaching.
- Sets short-term and long-term goals for continued professional growth.
- Maintains and exemplifies high ethical and moral standards

It can be clearly seen from both previous lists that a good language teacher should have two things: hard skills and soft skills, the latter of which is closely related to what is defined as emotional intelligence as quoted by Singh (2006), among others:

"Emotional intelligence is the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth" (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

"Emotional intelligence reflects one's ability to deal with daily environment challenges and helps predict one's success in life, including professional and personal pursuits" (Bar-On, 1997).

"Emotional intelligence is the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships. Emotional intelligence describes abilities distinct from, but complementary to, academic intelligence or the purely cognitive capacities measured by IQ" (Goleman, 1998).

"Emotional intelligence is the ability of an individual to appropriately and successfully respond to a vast variety of emotional stimuli being elicited from the inner self and immediate environment" (Singh, 2003).

From the previous definitions, it can be concluded that emotional intelligence is someone's ability to respond to anything in emotionally appropriate manner and to manage his/her emotions. In the implementation of emotional intelligence in the working field, some research have reported that there is a positive relationship between emotional intelligence, social intelligence and job performance (Hopkins & Bilimora, 2007, Bar-On, 2010). Moreover, for years Bar-On has done some research whose result depicts that emotional intelligence consistently shows that it has a highly significant relationship with someone's performance in his work (Bar-On, 2010).

English teachers, in this case, can be assumed as employees in an educational institution and they are also expected to have a good emotional intelligence so that they can 'produce' quality

students through quality teaching and learning process. Singh did a research in India in 2003 and found out that different professions need different rank of emotional intelligence. Out of 18 professions evaluated, teachers get the fifth rank, which means that teachers need a high emotional intelligence.

Another research was also done by Ghanizadeh & Moafian (2009), which involved 89 English teachers in several language institutes in Mashhad, Iran. The result shows that there is a positive and significant correlation between emotional intelligence of the English teachers and their teaching performance. The teachers were evaluated by their-826 students who filled in a questionnaire 'Characteristics of successful EFL teachers'.

This study is in fact simpler than the previously mentioned research. It does not cover every item of emotional intelligence; it only covers values, which is included in self-awareness as part of emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1998). The questionnaire used to evaluate the English teachers' performance is divided into two big items: hard skills and soft skills of teachers. In the study teachers are considered good when they get at least an average score of 3, on a 4-point scale. The score is relatively lower than that implemented at Montana State, which requires a faculty member an average score of 3.6, on a 4-point scale, to qualify for a pay raise. "To get scores this high," Professor Trout said, "I have to make a lot of students happy." To make students happy, he should be careful about the amount of work he instructs the students to do, about his expectations for student performance, and about the standards he set for scoring the students' work. (Trout, 2000 in Schultz & Schultz, 2010). Moreover, "research on student evaluations shows that students consistently assign low ratings to teachers who set high standards and strict course requirements." (Schultz & Schultz, 2010:108). Even though the result of the research on student evaluations may be true, this is not included in the analysis of the study. It is perhaps a topic that will be worth for further research.

Context and Participants

The research project was carried out at a private university located in West Jakarta. There were twenty-seven lecturers teaching English to various departments in the university volunteering to be the participants. They were given a list of twelve values to grade according to the order of importance and they were asked to answer some questions on the grading of the values. The lecturers were asked to do value grading and answering questions for two times; the first was in October 2009 and the second was in June 2010. The list of values was given in different format; the first was randomly written without any description (see appendix A) but the second was written in alphabetical order with some description of the words (see appendix B). The first grading will be compared to the second one to see whether or not there is a change between them. The classes the lecturers taught, the total of which were 281 classes, were classified into three categories: small classes of the English Department having less than 50 students, small classes of non-English Departments with less than 50 students, and big classes of non-English Departments having more than 50 students. Besides lecturers, the research also involved the first until the seventh semester students, the total of which was 8,944 students taught by the lecturers for three semesters, from odd semester of the 2008/2009 academic year until odd semester of the 2009/2010 academic year (September 2008 – June 2010). The students of non-English Departments had a two-credit English course per semester while the English Department students had various content courses held in English, such as Literature, Linguistics, and Language Skills, all of which were either two or four credits per semester. One semester consists of thirteen meetings (mid-semester and final-semester exams are not included). The students met once a week for a hundred minutes when they took a two-credit course and two hundred minutes for a four-credit course per meeting. During 8th – 10th meeting the students were asked to fill in an on-line questionnaire on their teacher performance every semester. The questionnaire consists of 8 questions; questions 1 – 4 are meant to evaluate the lecturers' hard skills and questions 5 – 8 are evaluation questions for soft skills.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

After the data of teaching values were collected, they were analyzed and the result can be seen in the Table 1 and 2:

Table 1 First Value Grading Based on the Order of Importance

Characteristic	Order of importance			Total
	1st rank	2nd rank	3rd rank	
Expertise	13	6	3	22
Reliability	5	6	1	12
Enthusiasm	5	4	6	15
Warmth	2	3	3	8
Ability to improvise		2	5	7
Attentiveness		3	1	4
Perseverance	1			1
Dynamism	1		2	3
Sense of humor		1	2	3
Readiness to experiment		2	2	4
Flexibility			2	2
No of lecturers	27	27	27	81

Table 2 Second Value Grading Based on the Order of Importance

Characteristic	Order of importance			Total
	1st rank	2nd rank	3rd rank	
Expertise	11	5	2	18
Reliability	3	5	1	9
Enthusiasm	5	5	8	18
Warmth	2	2	2	6
Ability to improvise	1	2	2	5
Attentiveness	3	2	5	10
Perseverance		1	1	2
Dynamism		3	2	5
Sense of humor	1	1		2
Readiness to experiment		1	3	4
Flexibility	1		1	2
No of lecturers	27	27	27	81

From the previous tables, it can be seen that there is a change in the grading of values. When lecturers were given the first list of values, which was randomly written, *Expertise* got the biggest points (22 points), which means that twenty-two lecturers (81%) selected *Expertise* as the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd rank of importance to them, while *Enthusiasm* and *Reliability* were in the second and third position having 15 and 12 points each. Coincidentally the values written in the first, second and third rows are the values selected by most lecturers; *Expertise* is in the first row, *Reliability* in the second row, and *Enthusiasm* in the third row (see appendix A).

Table 1 and 2 show that there is a change of value grading when the first-given list is compared to the second-given list, which was alphabetically written (see appendix B). Even though

the order of importance changes, the three values selected for the second time remain the same (*Expertise, Enthusiasm,* and *Reliability*). This time there is an additional value as the second rank: *Attentiveness*. *Expertise* and *Enthusiasm* are in the same rank, which is the first order of importance having 18 points each, meaning that eighteen lecturers (67%) selected the two values as the most important values in their teaching. Thus the lecturers regarded hard skills (*Expertise*) as important as soft skills (*Enthusiasm*) in their teaching. Furthermore the study also reveals how values relate to teaching experience. Table 3, 4, and 5 contains the classification of the participants in the study based on their teaching experience:

Table 3 Classification of Lecturers Based on Teaching Experience

Number of teachers / lecturers*	Teaching experience					
	≤ 5 years	6–10 years	11-15years	16-20 yrs	21-30 yrs	> 30 years
	3	7	2	7	5	3
Total	27 teachers / lecturers*					

Note: *Teachers and lecturers are used interchangeably in the research.

The following tables show the relationship between teaching values and teaching experience.

Table 4 First value grading based on teaching experience

Characteristic	Teaching experience					
	≤ 5 years	6–10 years	11-15years	16-20 yrs	21-30 yrs	> 30 years
Expertise	3	7	2	5	4	1
Reliability	1	2	2	3	4	
Enthusiasm	3	4		5	1	2
Warmth	1	1	1	3	1	1
Ability to improvise	1	2		1	2	1
Attentiveness					3	1
Perseverance						1
Dynamism			1	1		1
Sense of humor				3		
Readiness to experiment		3				1
Flexibility		2				

Table 5 Second value grading based on teaching experience

Characteristic	Teaching Experience					
	≤ 5 years	6–10 yrs	11-15yrs	16-20 yrs	21-30 yrs	> 30 years
Expertise	2	6	1	5	4	
Reliability	1	3		1	3	1
Enthusiasm	2	6		5	3	2
Warmth		1	1	3		1
Ability to improvise	1		1	1	1	1
Attentiveness		2	1	3	2	2
Perseverance	1		1			
Dynamism		2		2	1	
Sense of humor				1	1	
Readiness to experiment	2	1			1	
Flexibility			1		1	

From tables 4 and 5, it is depicted that the longer the teachers teach, the less important *Expertise* is for them. It appears that teachers are getting more and more aware that *Expertise* is not the only thing a teacher should master. In table 5 we can see that *Enthusiasm* and *Expertise* were selected by the same number of teachers, whether they are 'junior' or 'senior' in their teaching experience, meaning that all of them considered the two values as the most important ones in their teaching. Besides, the longer they teach the more teachers agreed to have *Attentiveness* as the second important value in their teaching. This fact possibly shows that the longer teachers teach, the more aware they are of the importance of soft skills to complement their hard skills in the teaching and learning process. The following are some examples of the explanations teachers gave for the value grading shown in the previous tables:

Teacher 3 -- who has been teaching English for ten years – said "I grade the teaching values in the order of building a good rapport first with the students, then moving on to the originality and creativity aspects, and finally ending with necessary skills and knowledge required to transmit. This order is based on my own experience as a teacher that you cannot teach students anything unless you have successfully established a good relationship with them. Five or ten years ago, I would rank the order the other way around, beginning from hard skills first, then moving on to the soft skills. The shift happens because of many factors, including lack of teaching experience, the culture of workplace contexts, limited knowledge and understanding of pedagogical practices, etc." This teacher put *Attentiveness* in the first rank, *Warmth* in the second rank, and *Enthusiasm* in the third rank.

Teacher 4 – who has been teaching for six years – said: "Five or ten years ago, the order would be different; perhaps I would rely on the characteristics that only cover the 'fundamental' methods / theory of teaching and not the social skills, which are later proven to be the characteristic needed in 'real' teaching atmosphere." He also said: "The real teaching environment is very different. I think there is a big gap between the theories and 'the real world' of teaching." The teacher chose *Enthusiasm* as the first rank, *Expertise* in the second rank, and *Readiness to experiment* in the third rank."

Teacher 27 – who has been teaching English for 36 years – chose *Attentiveness* as the first rank, *Reliability* in the second rank, and *Readiness to experiment* in the third rank. He said: "I would rank the teaching values differently if I ranked them five or ten years ago, because when I was young, I wanted to give, give, and give something to make other people successful, but now I become aware that before doing and giving something we have to listen first to our students in order to find out their real needs."

Teacher 11 – who has been teaching English for ten years – explained: "For me, I grade the teaching values in this order as a reflection of my experience. Teaching requires willingness to cast a critical eye on our practice, our pedagogy and ourselves." She graded *Expertise* in the first rank, *Attentiveness* in the second rank, and *Enthusiasm* in the third rank.

Teacher 18 – who has been teaching English for 27 years – explained: "I grade the teaching values in this order based on my experience as a teacher. I used to think that a lecturer must be an expert, but then I feel that the students will be easy to work with if they trust you. Now I think that as a teacher I must help them to understand the lesson better and then you will have the feeling of a great pleasure in teaching and you don't feel tired of teaching anymore." She put *Reliability* in the first rank, *Enthusiasm* in the second rank, and *Flexibility* in the third rank.

From the explanations previously mentioned, it can be concluded that the teaching value grading changes along with the teaching experience. Eleven teachers said that they would have graded the teaching values differently if they did it five or ten years ago, while other eleven teachers said the grading would be slightly different and only five of them said that it would be the same. From the

analysis of the teaching values, it is found out that only three teachers, out of the twenty-seven teachers, consistently chose the same values for the first, second and third rank when they were asked to grade the values at two different times, although the order of importance is different. Twelve teachers chose four values for the first and second time of grading, whereas ten and two teachers chose five and six values in their order of importance for the first and second time of grading, as can be seen below in Table 6.

Table 6 Change of Teaching Value Grading

Number of teachers	Teaching values selected	Values of 1st grading vs 2nd grading
2	6 values	Totally different
12	4 values	Two values different
10	5 values	Only one value different
3	3 values	Exactly the same

As it is previously mentioned, the lecturers are consistently evaluated by their students every semester. They require at least an average score of 3, on a 4-point scale to have a good teaching performance. However, the following table shows that not all lecturers got the required-3 score; only thirteen lecturers (48%) got the average score of 3 for both hard and soft skills. From table 7 it can be seen that when lecturers got an average score of >3 for their soft skills, they also got a >3-score for their hard skills, except 2 lecturers. Furthermore, it can be concluded that their rating performance does not relate to the values they hold. This happens probably because of two reasons: the value has not been well implemented yet or the rating performance done by the students is not objective. These reasons are not discussed in the study and they might be worth for further research.

Table 7 Teacher Rating Performance

Number of teachers	1st value of each teacher	Rating Performance (Hard Skills)	Rating Performance (Soft skills)
3	Expertise	< 3	< 3
2	Attentiveness	< 3	< 3
5	Warmth, Sense of humor, Ability to improvise, Flexibility, Enthusiasm	< 3	< 3
1	Expertise	< 3	3
2	Enthusiasm, Reliability	< 3	> 3
6	Expertise	> 3	> 3
2	Enthusiasm	> 3	> 3
3	Attentiveness, Warmth, Reliability	> 3	> 3
1	Enthusiasm	> 3	> 3.6
1	Expertise	> 3	< 3
1	Reliability	> 3.6	> 3

Next, when the average scores of hard skills and soft skills of the lecturers are compared (see Table 7), interesting results are gained. There are twenty lecturers whose average scores of soft skills are higher than those of the hard skills, whereas five lecturers have got higher average scores of their hard skills than those of the soft skills and two lecturers have the same average scores of their hard and soft skills. The specific soft skill which got the highest scores in the students' evaluation is the lecturers' skill in giving the students opportunity to ask questions and to have a discussion during the teaching and learning process. Twenty lecturers (74%) got the highest scores for this soft skill. In this case, it can be concluded that the lecturers' soft skills are better than their hard skills from the students' point of view. This is reflected in the lecturers' explanation previously mentioned that when they are more experienced in teaching, they likely shift their focus of attention to the soft skills.

In the research thirteen lecturers, out of twenty-seven ones, taught small classes of English Department students and big classes of non-English Department students. When the rating performance of teaching small and big classes is compared, it is known that the scores of big classes is higher. Ten lecturers (77%) got higher scores in their hard skills and nine lecturers (69%) got higher scores in their soft skills when teaching big classes. This is quite a surprise since most people believe that teaching big classes is more difficult than teaching small classes. Table 8 shows the detailed rating performance.

Table 8 Teachers' Rating Performance − Small vs Big Classes

Teachers	Rating Performance Hard Skills Small Classes	Rating Performance Hard Skills Big Classes	Rating Performance Soft Skills Small Classes	Rating Performance Soft Skills Big Classes
1	0	−0.16	0	−0.17
2	0	0.02	0	0.05
3	0	0.39	0	0.35
4	0	0.10	0	0.17
5	0	−0.07	0	−0.02
6	0	0.29	0	0.22
7	0	0.36	0	0.34
8	0	0	0	−0.04
9	0	0.06	0	0.05
10	0	0.16	0	0.15
11	0	0.14	0	0.13
12	0	0.22	0	0.93
13	0	−0.18	0	−0.16

In the research, there were nineteen lecturers teaching big and small classes of non-English Department. When the scores of the students' evaluation are compared, it can be seen that the students of big classes gave higher scores to their lecturers than those of all classes taught (see Table 9); thirteen lecturers (68%) got higher scores in their hard skills from the students of the big classes they taught, while five lecturers (26%) got higher scores in their hard skills from the students of all classes they taught, and only one lecturer got the same score for his hard skills in teaching big and all classes he taught. On the other hand, seventeen lecturers (89%) got higher scores for their soft skills from big classes rather than all classes they had. Only one lecturer got lower score for his soft skills from the big classes he taught and another lecturer got the same score from the students of the big and all classes. Thus, from the research it is found that the biggest portion of the lecturers' rating performance – both hard and soft skills – is contributed by students from big classes. Whether or not the result is consistent in any context with any participant, further research is needed.

Table 9 Teachers' Rating Performance − Big vs All Classes

Teachers	Rating Performance Hard Skills Big Classes	Rating Performance Hard Skills All Classes	Rating Performance Soft Skills Big Classes	Rating Performance Soft Skills All Classes
1	0	0.12	0	−0.02
2	0	−0.01	0	−0.04
3	0	−0.11	0	−0.11
4	0	−0.36	0	−0.32
5	0	−0.06	0	−0.10
6	0	0.04	0	−0.01
7	0	0.05	0	−0.05
8	0	−0.02	0	−0.02
9	0	−0.12	0	−0.10
10	0	−0.19	0	−0.17

Table 9 Teachers' Rating Performance − Big vs All Classes *(continued)*

Teachers	Rating Performance Hard Skills Big Classes	Rating Performance Hard Skills All Classes	Rating Performance Soft Skills Big Classes	Rating Performance Soft Skills All Classes
11	0	0.03	0	0.03
12	0	−0.18	0	−0.17
13	0	0	0	0
14	0	−0.02	0	−0.01
15	0	−0.1	0	−0.09
16	0	−0.1	0	−0.08
17	0	−0.17	0	−0.11
18	0	0.15	0	−0.13
19	0	−0.06	0	−0.04

CONCLUSIONS

To sum up the entire research, the results of the study suggest that there be a change in the teaching-value grading along with teaching experience. The more experienced a teacher is, the more soft skills he focuses on to complement the hard skills he has had. The first time the lecturers were given the list of teaching values, *Expertise*, *Enthusiasm* and *Reliability* were selected as the first, second and third rank based on the order of importance. However, the second time the lecturers were asked to do the same thing, *Expertise* and *Enthusiasm* were in the first rank, *Attentiveness* was in the second rank, and *Reliability* was in the third rank. Furthermore, because teaching values are not fixed and their implementation is very difficult to evaluate, further research is needed to find out whether there is a relationship between teaching values and high/low rating performance of teachers since the study reported that there was no relationship between teaching values and the rating performance of the teachers. Moreover, in the study almost all teachers are graded higher of their soft skills compared to their hard skills, especially in giving students an opportunity to ask questions and to discuss something. The scores of teachers' hard and soft skills were proven to be higher in big classes rather than small classes. This is very surprising since most people think that teaching English to more than 50 students in one classroom is more difficult than that in small classes. Therefore, again, further research is needed to prove the consistency of the result, whether it happens in other contexts with other participants.

REFERENCES

Bar-On, R. (2010). Emotional Intelligence: An Integral Part of Positive Psychology. *South African Journal of Psychology, 40(1), 54-62.*

Brown, D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. 2ⁿᵈ edition.* NY: Pearson Education.

Ghanizadeh, A., & Fatemeh Moafian. (2009). The role of EFL teachers' emotional intelligence in their success. *ELT Journal Advance Access, November(3), 1-12. doi:10.1093/elt/ccp084.*

Goleman, D.. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence.* London:Bloomsbury

Hopkins, M..M., & Bilimoria,D. (2007). Social and Emotional Competencies Predicting Success for Male and Female Executives. *Journal of Management Development, 27(1), 13-25.* ww.emeraldinsight.com/0262-1711.htm.

Mortiboys, A. (2005). *Teaching with Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Routledge.

Schultz, D. & Schultz, S. (2010). *Psychology and Work Today. 10th edition*. USA: Pearson.

Singh, D. (2006). *Emotional Intelligence At Work. A Professional Guide. 3rd edition.* New Delhi, India: Response Book.

Appendix A

List of teaching values (I)

Here are 12 characteristics that can be associated with teachers. Rank them 1 -- 12 in order of importance to you.

Characteristic	Ranking 1 -- 12
Expertise	
Warmth	
Enthusiasm	
Flexibility	
Dynamism	
Flamboyance	
Attentiveness	
Sense of humor	
Reliability	
Perseverance	
Readiness to experiment	
Ability to improvise	

- What makes you grade them in this order? For instance, is it your own experience as a learner, long ago or recently? Or is it your experience as a teacher?

- How different would your ranking have been if you had done this exercise five years ago, or perhaps 10 years ago?

- Why is that?

Appendix B

List of teaching values (II)

As teachers, we are supposed to have certain characteristics. Based on your experience, please rank the characteristics below - that can be associated with teachers - in order of importance to you.

Characteristic	Ranking 1 -- 12
Ability to improvise	
Attentiveness: an action of listening to or watching someone carefully because you want to make sure that they have everything they need	
Dynamism	
Enthusiasm	
Expertise	
Flamboyance : a condition of behaving in a confident or exciting way that makes people notice you	
Flexibility	
Perseverance	
Readiness to experiment	
Reliability : a condition in which you can be trusted or depended on	
Sense of humor	
Warmth	

- What makes you grade them in this order? For instance, is it your own experience as a learner, long ago or recently? Or is it your experience as a teacher?

- How long have you been teaching? What are your specialties?

- How different would your ranking have been if you had done this exercise five years ago, or perhaps 10 years ago?

- Why is that?