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Abstract
This study investigated the relationship among Iranian English teachers’ adversity quotient, personal growth initiative, and pedagogical success. The participants comprised 28 male and female English teachers and a total of 336 male and female EFL learners who attended the abovementioned teachers’ classes (12 for each teacher). Stoltz’ (1997) Adversity Response Profile (ARP) and Robitscheck’s (1998) Personal Growth Initiative Scale (PGIS) were administered among the 28 teachers while Moafian and Pishghadam’s (2009) Characteristics of Successful Iranian EFL Teachers Questionnaire (SIETQ) was administered among the 336 students. To look into the relationship and the predictability of the three aforesaid constructs, a Pearson product-moment correlation and subsequently multiple regression analysis were run following all statistical prerequisites necessary for running these parametric tests. The results demonstrated that there was a significant correlation among the teachers’ scores on the ARP and SIETQ, and their PGIS and SIETQ. Also, there was a significant difference in the predictability of the teachers’ SIETQ by their ARP and PGIS.
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The significance of teachers’ fundamental role in the classroom and their quality of teaching is perhaps an incontrovertible fact in all pedagogical fields with English Language Teaching (ELT) being no exception. Unlike the majority of the 20th century during which the emphasis was predominantly laid on the ELT methodology and, as its corollary the materials, the later decades were coterminous with perhaps a disillusionment with the teaching method itself. This is perhaps due to the fact that a glance at the history of ELT in that century is first and foremost demonstrative of the rise and fall of many methods as a result of their failure to deliver their anticipated outcomes. Put simply, ELT practitioners were continuously given the promise of a panacea remedy which simply did not work in actual practice. In the words of Rivers (1991) which were stated amidst the confusion, “What appears to be a radically new method is more often only a variant of existing methods presented with the fresh paint of new terminology that camouflages their fundamental similarity” (p. 283).

Against this backdrop and towards the ending decades of the 20th century and especially following the post method era – owing perhaps to the growing impact of postmodernism – the previous view towards teachers (which was arguably prompted by the tradition and practice of the audiovisual method) as merely mechanical executors of external prescriptions was substituted by the growing paradigm that teachers are actively thinking decision-makers whose discretion should be empowered (Freeman, 2002; Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

Founded directly and/or indirectly upon the thinking of many prior pedagogists such as Paulo Freire who emphasized the notion of liberation in education (1970), the post method condition advocates three aspects of learner autonomy: academic, social, and liberatory (Kumaravadivelu, 2001) merging perhaps together the pedagogies of particularity, practicality, and possibility (Khatib & Fat’hi, 2012). Accordingly, the
focus shifted away from method as the ultimately determining variable to teacher in an era labeled the death of method by Allwright (1991).

Given this priority of teachers’ role in the classroom in the post, method thinking compared to the other factors and components of teaching, teachers’ upgrading their teaching performance and reengineering their teaching procedures in order to enhance their efficacy are thus indispensable in the classroom (Bandura, 2008). All endeavors and initiatives on the side of teachers aimed at enhancement are of course essentially put in place in order to meet the growing diversity of learners’ needs (Epstein & Willhite, 2015). This is crucially relevant as “Teaching cannot be defined apart from learning. Teaching is guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learner to learn, setting the conditions for learning” (Brown, 2007, p. 8).

Accordingly, teachers’ level of success in fulfilling the set pedagogical goals is synonymous with success generally in every profession “wherein this success may somehow contribute to an individual’s feeling of happiness and contentment in life” (Cando & Villacastin, 2014, p. 355). Being a complex process, teachers’ pedagogical success is influenced by a multiplicity of elements and parameters such as teacher quality and attributes. Brown and Marks (1994, as cited in Ghanizadeh & Moafian, 2011, p. 255) noted that, “Pedagogically successful teachers research their own teaching and the teaching of others and thereby become better informed about the strengths and weaknesses of their teaching performance; effective teachers willingly examine critically what they are doing in classroom”.

Aspiring to be an effective and efficient teacher achieving pedagogical success, a teacher requires to adapt oneself to diverse situations and continue to grow as a person as well as a teacher. To this end, the concept of personal growth initiative (PGI) which was developed by Robitschek (1998) is defined as, “active, intentional engagement in the process of personal growth,” (p. 185). Robitschek (2003) also states that
PGI is an orientation toward one’s change and development across the different life domains that one encounters. Furthermore, PGI can be regarded as a metacognitive construct or awareness and control of intentional and voluntary involvement in cognitions and behaviors which encourage growths in the various aspects of life (Robitscheck & Keyes, 2009).

Meyers, van Woerkom, De Reuver, Bakk, and Oberski (2015) consider PGI as “a critical resource for today’s graduate students facilitating not only academic but also future career success” (p. 50). Moreover, Stevic and Ward (2008) reason that individuals who enjoy high levels of PGI progress from university to employment more easily since they have achieved an adequate degree of certainty about their roles in life and have thus identified their career goals.

Perhaps one ongoing challenge in the process of growth and success is dealing with the difficulties of each day, i.e., adversities. As stated by Tian and Fan (2014, p. 252), “Adversity refers to an unfortunate event or circumstance or the state of serious and continued difficulty”. To this end, Stoltz (1997) was the first to label and describe adversity quotient (AQ) where he conceptualized AQ as “a measure of how you respond to adversity” (p. 7). In effect, responses to adversity affect individual efficiency performance and success (Stoltz & Weihenmayer, 2008). According to Stoltz, many pieces of research working at dozens of organizations in a variety of industries have demonstrated that “those with higher AQs enjoy a host of benefits including greater performance, productivity, creativity, health, persistence, resilience, and vitality than their low AQ counterparts” (p. 9).

It is quite plausible then – at least at a conceptual level – the three constructs of teachers’ pedagogical success, PGI, and AQ seem to be related to one another as all three are per se oriented towards the same overarching goal of enhanced teaching in the classroom. Furthermore, another similarity among the three aforesaid variables is that they seek the
betterment of teaching while being focused on teachers’ improvement of their own abilities. Of course one must not forget that this proposition of interrelationship holds probably valid in the pretext of post method thinking which clearly emphasizes a shift of theorization from the unimodality of teaching to its multimodality in that a teacher attribute is by no means an isolated feature independent of other features (Akbari, 2008).

**Purpose of the Study**

Having said the above and as a result of their teaching experience, the researchers have come to notice quite various responses EFL teachers provide in facing adversities including employing multiple strategies to approach and handle learners’ diverse characteristics. In addition, the challenge of mastery over the teaching materials and the attempt to be pedagogically successful are inter alia the factors that could present barriers to a certain number of EFL teachers’ improvement and at times serve as the reason they actually quit their jobs. Ironically, the two researchers have observed that all the aforementioned seemingly negative factors could act as motivation elements for some teachers. Hence, the researchers have been interested to know how teachers’ handling of adversities correlates with their pedagogical success and desire to grow professionally.

This interest is by no means merely a personal desire and/or propelled by the experience of the researchers. As discussed earlier, teachers’ pedagogical success, AQ, and PGI are conceptually interrelated. Having said that, however, the researchers were not able to come across any studies testing the relationship among the three variables. Therefore, there seems to be a clear gap in this regard in the existing literature and, as such, there is a solid rationale then to investigate this interrelationship empirically and see whether the interaction extends beyond conceptualization.
In addition, two previous studies conducted by one of the researchers demonstrated the significance of AQ in predicting teachers’ classroom management and professional development (Marashi & Fotoohi, 2017). Therefore, the researchers were interested to see how AQ and PGI interact together when it comes to another very important teaching feature, that is pedagogical success. Accordingly, the purpose of the present study was to explore whether EFL teachers’ AQ and PGI are likely to relate to their pedagogical success or not, and indeed if they do so, how they may differentiate in predicting EFL teachers being pedagogically successful and effective. Hence, the following research questions were raised:

Q1: Is there any significant relationship between EFL teachers’ adversity quotient and their pedagogical success?
Q2: Is there any significant relationship between EFL teachers’ personal growth initiative and their pedagogical success?
Q3: Is there any significant difference between EFL teachers’ adversity quotient and their personal growth initiative in predicting their pedagogical success?

**Review of the Related Literature**

**Pedagogical Success**

EFL teachers’ pedagogical success has been characterized by Brosh (1996) as “the teacher’s command of the target language, his/her ability to organize, explain and clarify, his/her ability to arouse and sustain interest and motivation, being fair to students by showing neither favoritism nor prejudice and availability to students” (p. 125). Anderson (2004) describes effective teaching and pedagogical success as the achievement of targeted goals whether determined by themselves or prescribed by others. Evidently, this conceptualization pre-necessitates the possession of the required knowledge and skills to obtain those goals.

There is, of course, an almost universal consent on the priority of the role of the teacher in successful pedagogy as asserted by different scholars
in various empirical studies conducted in varying contexts (e.g., Borg, 2003; Elizabeth, May, & Chee, 2008; Galluzzo, 2005; Jacobs, 2007; Penrose, Perry, & Ball, 2007) to the extent that Sanders (2000) states that ELT teachers are the main source of language input and practice as they model L2, facilitate the learning process, give feedback, and also motivate students.

According to Brookfield (1995), successful teachers know their instructional objectives, do not waste time, and get to work immediately using numerous and proper strategies to teach, engage, and check their students’ comprehension while considering the pace of their teaching. Lowman (1996, as cited in Khabiri & Jazebi, 2010) has also stated that effective teachers motivate and influence their students with a pleasant and memorable attitude to reach their maximum ability which results in maximum learning.

A number of underlying constructs such as knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy together with socio/affective skills are also at work to guarantee one’s pedagogical success (Park & Lee, 2006). Furthermore, Faranda and Clarke (2004) categorize the characteristics of successful English teachers as being the five major domains of “rapport, delivery, fairness, knowledge and credibility, and organization and preparation” (p. 275).

Perhaps because of being a relatively new measurable conceptualization, the number of empirical studies on teachers’ pedagogical success seems to be restricted. These researches have demonstrated the correlation of pedagogical success with a number of other language learning/teaching constructs and variables such as teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs and students’ English language achievement (Wossennie, 2014), teachers’ emotions (Toraby & Modarresi, 2018), and even spiritual intelligence (Roohani & Darvishy, 2015). In addition, Ghorbani, Akbari, and Ghonsooly (2015) showed that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers’ pedagogical
success; in other words, gender bears no determining role in teachers’ pedagogical success.

**Personal Growth Initiative**

PGI comprises one of the dimensions of psychological wellbeing; indeed, lack of PGI can negatively affect individuals’ lives (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). In this regard, research demonstrates that lower PGI is correlated with hardship in the process of adapting to novel contexts and, consequently, the individuals involved with this change may indeed experience further stress and anxiety while gaining lower degrees of life satisfaction (Stevic & Ward, 2016).

PGI appears to be conceptually linked with positive psychology, i.e., “the scientific study of positive human functioning and flourishing on multiple levels that include the biological, personal, relational, institutional, cultural, and global dimensions of life” (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000, p. 5). While the term dates back at least to Maslow (1954, as cited in Shestra, 2016), positive psychology was mainstreamed and popularized by Seligman (1995) building upon the notion that psychology has been too focused on the clinical disease model thus needing to revisit its original mission to promote mental health and happiness (Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson, 2005). To this end, Robitschek and Keyes (2009) assert that PGI is an essential and significant construct in building and developing individuals’ wellbeing – the goal of positive psychology.

According to Ayub and Iqbal (2012), PGI is necessary for all aspects of life for people from all age groups, from coping with life stressors to mastering new skills and establishing a close relationship. Bhattacharya and Mehrotra (2014) believe that “Working towards one’s goal in an active and meaningful way forms a core aspect of PGI” (p. 122).

PGI constitutes the cognitive subcomponents of self-efficacy which are one’s beliefs, attitudes, and values that encourage personal
growth; this attribute, however, is broader than self-efficacy in that it includes behavioral components as well, which involve implementing the cognitions across growth domains (Ogunyemi & Mabekoje, 2007). Thence, the distinctive characteristic of PGI is the intentionality of the process of self-change (Robitschek, 1999), which hugely depends on doing the right things at the right time (Ayub & Iqbal, 2012).

Research has established that individuals with higher PGI tend to enjoy more psychological, emotional, and social wellbeing (Robitschek & Keyes, 2009) and less psychological and emotional hardship (Robitschek & Kashubeck, 1999). “People with high levels of personal growth initiative not only are aware that they have developed over time but also are proactive about the change process, intentionally seeking out or capitalizing on opportunities for development” (Robitschek & Cook, 1999, p. 129). Further studies reveal that PGI is “correlated negatively with chance locus of control and psychological distress” (Robitschek & Keyes, 2009, p. 323) while being positively correlated with better problem-focused coping (Robitschek & Cook, 1999), self-esteem (Kashubeck-West & Meyer, 2008), self-efficacy (Ogunyemi & Mabekoje, 2007), self-compassion (Neff, Rude, & Kirckpatrick, 2007), and general wellbeing (Joshanloo & Ghaedi, 2009).

**Adversity Quotient**

In the words of Stoltz (1997), AQ delineates “how well you withstand adversity and your ability to surmount it. It predicts who will overcome adversity and who will be crushed, who will exceed expectations of their performance and potential and who will fall short, who gives up and who prevails” (p. 7). Phoolka and Kaur (2012) maintain that “Investigating individuals’ AQ provides the answer to this question that why some people, although emotionally well-adjusted and high on IQ fail and give up on adversities while some others persist and strive for success” (p. 109). They further state that AQ can be “useful to predict performance,
motivation, empowerment, creativity, productivity, learning, energy, hope, happiness, vitality, emotional health, physical health, persistence, resilience, attitude, longevity, and response to change” (p. 109).

Having a higher AQ, an individual can deal more effectively with difficulties and turn them into constructive opportunities (Tian & Fan, 2014, p. 252). According to Dweck (2007), parents, teachers, peers, and other people who have fundamental roles in an individual’s life can form one’s response to adversity throughout life. But the response to adversity can be changed inasmuch as one’s brain for success can be rewired. Furthermore, Vantakesh, Shirvanjani, and Gandhi (2014) maintain that when people change their habits intentionally, they discard their old habits and pick up new ones. Consequently, those with higher AQ exceed their limitations and expectations of others and will enjoy its benefits.

The quotient as conceptualized and formulated by Stoltz (1997) comprises four fundamental dimensions, labeled CO2RE (control, origin, and ownership, reach, and endurance). Control is the degree of the perceived ability to respond to and handle the situation (actual control is hard to measure). O2 represents origin and ownership. Origin concerns the source of the adversity caused and ownership refers to the extent of readiness to assume responsibility for its outcome. Reach translates into the extent the hardship spreads into other facets of one’s life, and endurance is synonymous with the perceived duration of the adversity and its cause.

Empirical studies on AQ demonstrate a significant correlation with other attributes. For instance, Williams (2003) revealed that students gained higher achievement scores at schools which had principals with higher AQ. Bakare’s (2013) study demonstrated that AQ has a significant relationship with academic performance. Another study was conducted by Cornista and Macasaet (2013) demonstrating a significant correlation between the respondents’ AQ and each of the domains of achievement
motivation. In recent research, Marashi and Fotoohi (2017) showed that both introvert and extrovert EFL teachers’ AQ and professional development have a significant relationship while the results of a forthcoming study by the Author revealed that both introvert and extrovert EFL teachers’ AQ is a significant predictor of their effective classroom management.

**Method**

**Participants**

The participants of this study comprised two groups: teachers and learners. The first group originally consisted of 30 male and female English teachers in different language schools in Tehran who were chosen non-randomly based on their availability and willingness to participate in this study. Out of these 30, two teachers were discarded following the descriptive statistics analyses since they were found to be outliers. The participants were between 25 to 45 years old with at least two years of teaching experience. The majority of them majored in English (Literature, ELT, and Translation); all teachers had passed extensive teacher training courses.

The detailed demographic features of the teachers (pertaining to all original 30 teachers) described above appear in Table 1 below. As can be seen, the overwhelming majority of the teachers were aged lower than 40 with between 5-15 years of experience and only four of them had not majored in English.

Table 1.

Demographic Data of the 30 Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second group of participants were male and female learners who attended the abovementioned teachers’ classes. This group originally consisted of 360 EFL learners (12 for each teacher) with the age range of 15 to 55. As two teachers were removed from the study (explained above), their students (12 × 2 = 24) were also discarded leaving a total of 336 learners. These students were studying in pre-intermediate and intermediate classes and their educational level differed from high school students to MA holders in different majors including medicine, engineering, and humanities. The basis for the selection of the classes was random: one of the several classes of each teacher – which included at least 12 students – was selected randomly. Furthermore, if there were more than 12 students in a class, 12 of them were selected randomly.

**Instruments**

Three questionnaires were used in the process of conducting this study described in detail below. Two of the instruments were developed outside Iran while one was constructed in Iran. All three questionnaires are highly valid as reported below.

**Adversity response profile.** In this study, the Adversity Response Profile (ARP) Quick Take version 6.0 which was developed and validated by Stoltz (1997) was used. All the four dimensions of AQ, namely control, ownership and origin, responsibility, and endurance are measured through
the ARP. This instrument measures an individual’s style of responding to adverse situations and measures one’s adversity level, likewise. The ARP Quick Take presents 30 scenarios or events, each of which is followed by two questions to be responded to on a five-point Likert scale. It takes most respondents 25-30 minutes to answer the questions. According to Stoltz and Weihenmayer (2008), the reported reliability of the ARP is as follows: control: 0.82, ownership: 0.83, reach: 0.84, endurance: 0.80 and AQ: 0.91. The ARP demonstrates excellent validity, as well. Grandy (2009) validated the ARP in terms of convergent or internal validity and discriminant or external validity.

Personal growth initiative scale. The Personal Growth Initiative Scale (PGIS) developed by Robitscheck (1998) is devised to capture cognitive and behavioral aspects of intentional self-change. This questionnaire includes nine items rated on a six-point Likert-type format ranging from 1 (definitely disagree) to 6 (definitely agree). It takes 5-7 minutes to answer these questions. By adding up the responses on the items, the final score would be calculated. Robitscheck (1998) reported internal consistency estimates ranging from 0.78 to 0.88 and a test-retest reliability of 0.74 for eight weeks in college student samples with a Cronbach’s alpha being 0.86.

Successful Iranian EFL teachers’ questionnaire. In this study, teachers were evaluated by their learners through Moafian and Pishghadam’s (2009) Successful Iranian EFL Teachers’ Questionnaire (SIETQ). This questionnaire was devised based a number of tools such as Suwandee’s Questionnaire (1994) and the comments of EFL teachers and learners. The instrument consists of 47 likert-type items and every item is followed by alternatives ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. It takes about 20 minutes for the learners to answer the SIETQ. Moafian and Pishghadam conducted a factor analysis to demonstrate the construct validity of the instrument. The total reliability of the SIETQ was very high (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.94) with the result of the item-total correlations, assessed for all items, ranging from 0.40 to 0.62 (Birjandi & Bagherkazemi, 2010).
Procedure

In order to respond to the questions raised in this study, the following procedure was carried out by the researchers. The very first step was to obtain the consent of 30 EFL teachers to participate in the study. Once they were available, the researchers would arrange to meet each of them individually and administer the two questionnaires (ARP and PGIS) to them.

Prior to administering the two questionnaires to the teachers, the researchers briefly explained the purpose of the study to each teacher in less than five minutes and subsequently asked each participant to provide them with the demographic information they needed (described in Table 1 above). The researchers also guaranteed confidentiality to the teachers in that their scores would not be shared with anyone without their prior consent.

Next, the researchers gave the questionnaires to the participants; for 15 teachers, the ARP was given first and then the PGIS and the reverse order with the other 15 teachers to minimize any possible sequence effect. The researchers asked the participants to respond as accurately as possible and they explained that in order to maintain a uniform procedure, they would have to refrain from answering any questions the participants may have. Once the questionnaires were filled in the due time, the researchers collected them and told the participants that they could give the results to each teacher if they were interested.

Following the data gathering from the teachers, the researchers administered the SIETQ to the students of the 30 teachers. This had to be done of course in the very last session of each class so that the learners would have had one complete term with each teacher. The researchers explained that this was simply a research study and the results would be confidential and there would be no impact on either the teachers or the learners. The learners were further encouraged to either respond accurately or not participate at all. Furthermore, the learners were asked to provide
their demographic information before filling out the questionnaire. Once the data was fully gathered, the researchers commenced the statistical analyses described below which comprises a series of correlation tests and a multiple regression analysis of course together with all the prerequisites required for running these parametric tests.

**Results**

**Descriptive Statistics**

**ARP.** As discussed in full detail before, the ARP was administered among the teachers participating in this study; the descriptive statistics of this administration appears in Table 2. The mean and the standard deviation of the scores stood at 95 and 147, respectively. Furthermore, the scores represented normalcy with the skewness ratio falling within the acceptable range of ±1.96 (0.532 / 0.427 = 1.24). Also, the reliability of the scores in this administration was 0.89 using Cronbach Alpha.

Table 2.
Descriptive Statistics of the Scores of the EFL Teachers on the ARP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>118.83</td>
<td>9.538</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid (listwise)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PGIS.** Next, the 30 EFL teachers took the PGIS with the scores appearing in Table 3. As is seen in the table, the mean and the standard deviation of the scores stood at 37.83 and 7.78, respectively. Furthermore, the scores represented normalcy with the skewness ratio falling within the acceptable range of ±1.96 (0.532 / 0.427 = 1.24). The reliability of the scores in this administration was 0.91 using Cronbach Alpha.
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of the Scores of the EFL Teachers on the PGIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGIS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37.83</td>
<td>7.777</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid (listwise)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIETQ.** Finally, the 360 EFL learners of the 30 teachers sat for the SIETQ. As stated earlier, two teachers were removed from the analysis due to their being outliers. Accordingly, the two classes of these teachers were discarded as well leaving a total of 336 EFL learners.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of the Mean Scores of the 336 Learners on the SIETQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes of Teacher</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>198.33</td>
<td>27.747</td>
<td>-.363</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>221.67</td>
<td>12.434</td>
<td>-.520</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>194.25</td>
<td>24.406</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>200.58</td>
<td>27.278</td>
<td>-.651</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>211.58</td>
<td>12.831</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>216.00</td>
<td>11.670</td>
<td>-.433</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>214.92</td>
<td>16.763</td>
<td>-.556</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>214.17</td>
<td>20.248</td>
<td>-.744</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>224.75</td>
<td>15.633</td>
<td>-.886</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>193.50</td>
<td>26.037</td>
<td>-.935</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>215.58</td>
<td>12.154</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>181.17</td>
<td>31.273</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>146.67</td>
<td>21.559</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responding to the Research Questions

Following the calculation of the descriptive statistics above and with the skewness ratios of all the sets of scores representing normalcy, the researchers were able to employ parametric tests.

First Research Question / Null Hypothesis

To test the first null hypothesis of the study which was formulated based on the first research question, i.e., there was no significant relationship between EFL teachers’ AQ and their degree of pedagogical success, the Pearson correlation test was run (Table 5). As is evident in Table 5, there is a significant correlation at the 0.01 level among the teachers’ scores on the ARP and SIETQ ($r = 0.432$, $p = 0.005 < 0.05$) meaning that the first null hypothesis was rejected. Furthermore, $R^2$ (or
common variance) which is the effect size for correlation was 0.187 which is moderate in size (Larson-Hall, 2010).

Table 5. 
Correlation of the Teachers’ Scores on the ARP and SIETQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARP</th>
<th>SIETQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARP</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIETQ</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.432**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Second Research Question / Null Hypothesis

To test the second null hypothesis, i.e., there was no significant relationship between EFL teachers’ personal growth initiative and pedagogical success, the Pearson correlation test again was run (Table 6). As is evident, there is a significant correlation at the 0.01 level among the teachers’ scores on PGIS and the SIETQ (r = 0.521, p = 0.003< 0.05) meaning that the second null hypothesis was rejected. Furthermore, R² was 0.271 which signifies a large effect size (Larson-Hall, 2010).

Table 6. 
Correlation of the Teachers’ Scores on the PGIS and SIETQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PGIS</th>
<th>SIETQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGIS</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIETQ</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.521**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Third Research Question / Null Hypothesis
As the previous null hypotheses were rejected, i.e., a significant correlation existed among the three constructs, running a multiple correlation was justified. The assumption of normality of distribution was already established; the remaining assumptions of multicollinearity and homoscedasticity are discussed below.

Table 7.
Coefficients\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>21.799</td>
<td>7.053</td>
<td>3.091</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>7.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>3.005</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 7, the tolerance value for the predictor variable is 0.778 (above the cut-off point of 0.10) while the VIF value is 3.692 (lower than the cut-off point of 10). Hence, the assumption of collinearity has not been violated (Pallant, 2007). Next is the assumption of homoscedasticity. As can be seen in Figure 1, the points are lying in a reasonably straight diagonal line from the bottom left to top right. Furthermore, Figure 2 depicts a roughly centralized rectangular distribution. To this end, homoscedasticity was not violated either.
Figure 1. 
*Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual*

Figure 2. 
*Scatterplot*
To test the null hypothesis, the information in Table 8 was used. The multiple R in the population equals 0.001 which means that indeed there was a significant difference in the predictability of EFL teachers’ pedagogical success by their AQ and personal growth with AQ being a significantly better predictor than PGI in predicting pedagogical success; thus, the third and last null hypothesis raised in this study was also rejected.

Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2520.185</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1260.092</td>
<td>27.517</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7555.809</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>45.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10075.994</td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictor variables: (Constant), ARP & PGIS
b. Predicted variable: SIETQ

One last check was to see whether there were any unusual cases in the score distribution or not and whether they had any undue influence over the results or not. For this, the casewise diagnostics had to be checked. The result was that no cases had a standardized residual value outside ±3.00.

**Discussion**

The findings of this study signify a notable association among the three constructs. A number of studies have been reported in the ELT literature on the go-togetherness of each of these variables with other relevant constructs, some of which are discussed here.

Regarding AQ, Canivel (2010) concluded that this variable has a positive relationship with school principals’ performances and practice at their schools while the results of the studies performed by Huijuan (2009) and Bakare (2013) assert that individuals who have higher AQs also have better academic performances. Furthermore, Cando and Villacastin (2014)
in their study indicated a significant relationship between EFL teachers’ AQ and their teaching performance.

Furthermore, Bautista (2015) reported a significant correlation between faculty members’ AQ and their teaching performance while Parvathy and Praseeda (2014) shown a significant negative relationship between academic problems and AQ with the effect of self-esteem partialled out among student teachers; understandably, teachers who enjoyed higher AQ encountered fewer academic problems. In the context of special education teachers for children with disabilities, Santos (2013) has demonstrated that AQ may be used as part of faculty development programs to help these teachers dealing with such a demanding job become more resilient and competent members of the workforce.

As for EFL teachers’ PGI, the ELT literature is filled with studies (described earlier) which show a positive relationship between this variable and other characteristics of an individual such as self-esteem and self-acceptance (Kashubeck-West & Meyer, 2008), self-efficacy (Ogunyemi & Mabekoje, 2007), self-compassion (Neff et al., 2007), autonomy (Robitschek & Kashubeck, 1999), and purpose in life (Robitschek & Keyes, 2009). In addition, in a study performed by Ayub and Iqbal (2012), a significant relationship between PGI and psychological wellbeing was established while Yakunina, Weigold, Weigold, Hercegovac, and Elsayed (2013) drew such a relationship between PGI and life satisfaction.

At the same time, Weigold and Robitschek (2011) demonstrated that “Difficulties in identifying opportunities for personal growth are also associated with the adoption of ineffective coping strategies, such as the prevalent use of emotion-focused coping strategies rather than the use of problem-focused strategies (p. 255). Furthermore, high PGI indices are negatively correlated with distress (Hardin, Weigold, Robitschek, & Nixon, 2007), stress (Yakunina, Weigold, & Weigold, 2013), and
posttraumatic stress and depression (Shigemoto, Low, Borowa, & Robitschek, 2016)

And finally regarding EFL teachers’ pedagogical success, Ghaemi and Taherian (2011) report a significant relationship between EFL teachers’ critical thinking and their pedagogical success while Ghanizadeh and Moafian (2011) found a significant relationship between EFL teachers’ pedagogical success and their self-efficacy. Furthermore, Roohani and Darvishi (2015) delineated a positive correlation between L2 teachers’ pedagogical success and their spiritual intelligence. As noted earlier in the literature review section, there are only a very few studies reported on pedagogical success (and to the researchers’ best knowledge, the majority of them have been reported in this study); all of these studies, of course, delineate a positive correlation between this construct and other such variables.

The point worth noting as an outcome of the researchers’ literature review is that apparently there are no studies available which report divergent results for pedagogical success, PGI, and AQ. In other words, one can conclude that each of the three variables demonstrates a significantly convergent trend with most – if not all – constructs which serve advantageously in the ELT context both for teachers and learners while they correlate negatively with disadvantageous factors and features (examples of both categories have been provided above).

One may conclude from the results of the present study that how a teacher deals with adversities correlates with his/her efficiency performance and success perhaps because “adversities are transformed into beneficial and advantageous opportunities” (Tian & Fan, 2014, p. 252). Accordingly, those EFL teachers who have higher AQ and PGI are pedagogically more successful teachers and have more satisfied learners. These are the ones who adapt themselves to diverse situations, can handle stress, changes, and difficulties better, and also intentionally engage themselves in self-development throughout their professional lives.
Such teachers are well aware of their fundamental role in the classroom and are sensitive to the paramount importance of their teaching quality. This is why they set instructional objectives for their classes and work hard to engage and motivate each student using numerous appropriate strategies. Naturally, since these teachers are more resilient and capable in dealing with hardship and, at the same time, more inclined to grow and enhance their personal features, they would not give up the process of striving for excellence all that easily. Consequently, such teachers who are better apt personally and professionally (e.g., hold a higher rate of AQ and PGIS) constantly endeavor to improve their teaching performances and reengineer their teaching procedures in order to meet the growing diversity of learners’ needs.

Interestingly, the outcome of this study demonstrated that AQ is a significantly more decisive parameter than PGI in predicting a teacher’s pedagogical success. In simple terms, the findings elucidate the fact that one’s personal motivation and initiative while being a necessary prerequisite is by no means a sufficient indicator. It is not just how motivated one is to achieve a goal but how that individual is intrinsically wired to address and overcome extrinsic barriers which do the trick. A closer look at this issue would perhaps highlight the stronger power of one’s internal locus of control over his/her external locus in that perhaps the ultimate level of one’s drive and motivation is synonymous with his/her resilience in transforming threats or disadvantages into opportunities and advantages.

The finding of this study is very much in congruence with the result of Marashi and Fotoohi’s (2017) study in revealing that AQ is a more decisive factor than the personality variable of extroversion/introversion in determining teachers’ professional development. Another forthcoming study by the Author demonstrates that AQ again is a more decisive variable than extroversion/introversion in determining classroom management.
Generally speaking, the researchers were not able to find any studies in the literature which would attribute a secondary function and/or impact to AQ; indeed, any investigation into AQ would demonstrate a pivotal role to this human variable in teaching. Hence, albeit a somewhat recently conceptualized notion which has become quantitatively measurable, AQ is gaining growing momentum as a decisive feature for teachers. All this gives further weight to the remarkable importance of AQ in teaching, the pedagogical implication of which is discussed in the next and final section.

**Conclusion**

The findings of the present study have certain pedagogical implications for EFL teachers, teacher educators, and principals of language schools. Teachers, for their part, have an undoubtedly influential role in educating better learners and helping them improve. Their success presents itself in their learners’ success, better learning, and passion to learn. Those teachers interested in getting familiar with the concept of AQ and PGI and their growth techniques in order to be better able to handle classroom difficulties and also become aware of the steps required for teachers to self-improve can educate themselves on these two constructs.

In addition, EFL teachers could refer to teacher educators and their peers in order to benefit from their experience and also discuss theirs with them. Benefiting from some regular meetings where teachers with different ages and teaching experiences share their various accounts and knowledge can also be considerably contributory.

Having a higher AQ, a teacher can deal more effectively with difficulties and turn them into constructive opportunities (Tian & Fan, 2014). Considering EFL teachers with lower AQS, Dweck (2007) asserts that one’s response to adversity can be changed inasmuch as one’s brain for success can be rewired. Therefore, teachers can bear in mind that intentionality is a critical factor in improving their AQ thereby achieving further pedagogical success.
In addition to the role played by teachers, educational managers and teacher trainers need to provide teachers with the necessary support and resources and train, observe, and give them feedback to be able to implement the theories of AQ effectively in their classrooms upon confronting adversities and difficulties. This support in practicing and learning how to control problematic circumstances during teaching could enable teachers to transform the negative energy accumulated in a complicated instance and the setbacks it could cause into a facilitated path to pedagogical success.

As discussed in the previous section concerning the significance of AQ in predicting pedagogical success (as an outcome of this study) and professional development and classroom management (previous studies), one preliminary procedure for educational establishments could be assessing teachers’ AQ as a requirement of both teacher training programs and in-service courses. Consequently, those teachers who score low on the construct could be provided specific training guidelines in different modalities (including introductory presentations by AQ specialists, peer roundtables where teachers share with each other their actual adverse experiences and try to provide solutions, anger management training, self-esteem boosting training, relaxation techniques, etc.) thus allowing them the opportunity to raise their AQ and subsequently enhance their pedagogical success.

To further corroborate the findings of this study, this research could be replicated among different sociocultural groups while taking into consideration various moderator variables such as gender, age, years of experience, and the proficiency levels at which teachers teach. In addition, the same study could be conducted among English teachers of the public sector as they face a perhaps entirely different set of adversities compared to teachers in the private sector domain. Needless to say, such studies which include detailed comparative data analysis could provide more
useful insights concerning the degree of the external validity of the findings of the present study.
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**Appendix**

**Adversity Response Profile**

**Instructions**

There are 30 events listed. Complete the questions for each event as follows:

1. Vividly imagine each event as if it is happening now, even if it seems unrealistic.
2. For both of the questions following each event, circle a number 1 through 5 that represents your response.

1. Your coworkers are not receptive to your ideas.
The reason my coworkers are not receptive to my ideas is something over which I have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No control</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason my coworkers are not receptive to my ideas is something that completely has to do with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>O-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **People are unresponsive to your presentation at a meeting.**

The reason people are unresponsive to my presentation is something that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relates to all aspects of my life</td>
<td>R-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason people are unresponsive to my presentation will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always exist</td>
<td>E-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **You make a lot of money from a major investment.**

The reason I am making a lot of money is something that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relates to all aspects of my life</td>
<td>R+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason I am making a lot of money will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always exist</td>
<td>E+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. You and your loved ones seem to be drifting further and further apart.

The reason we seem to be drifting further apart is something that:
Relates to all  1  2  3  4  5 Just relates to this situation
aspects of my life
R–

The reason we seem to be drifting further apart will:
Always  1  2  3  4  5 Never exist again
exist
E–

5. Someone you respect calls you for advice.

The reason this person called me for advice is something that:
Relates to all  1  2  3  4  5 Just relates to this situation
aspects of my life
R+

The reason this person called me for advice will:
Always  1  2  3  4  5 Never exist again
exist
E+

6. You have a heated argument with your spouse (significant other).

The reason we have a heated argument is something over which I have:
No control  1  2  3  4  5 Complete control
C–

The outcome of this event is something for which I feel:
Not at all  1  2  3  4  5 Completely responsible
responsible
Ow–
7. **You are required to relocate in order to keep your job.**
The reason I am required to relocate is something that:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relates to all aspects of my life</td>
<td>Just relates to this situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

R–
The reason I am required to relocate will:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always exist</td>
<td>Never exist again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

E–

8. **A valued friend does not call on your birthday.**
The reason my friend didn’t call me is something over which I have:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No control</td>
<td>Complete control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

C–
The reason my friend didn’t call me is something that completely has to do with:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Other people or factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

O–

9. **A close friend becomes seriously ill.**
The reason my friend is seriously ill is something over which I have:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No control</td>
<td>Complete control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

C–
The outcome of this event is something for which I feel:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all responsible</td>
<td>Completely responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Ow–

10. **You are invited to an important event.**
The reason I am being invited is something over which I have:
No control 1 2 3 4 5 Complete control

C+
The reason I am being invited is something that completely has to do with:
Me 1 2 3 4 5 Other people or factors

O r +

11. You are turned down for an important assignment.
The reason I am being turned down for this assignment is something that:
Relates to 1 2 3 4 5 Just relates to this situation
all aspects of my life
R–
The reason I am being turned down for this assignment will:
Always 1 2 3 4 5 Never exist again
E–

12. You receive some negative feedback from a valued coworker.
The reason I am receiving negative feedback is something that:
Relates to 1 2 3 4 5 Just relates to this situation
all aspects of my life
R–
The reason I am receiving negative feedback will:
Always 1 2 3 4 5 Never exist again
E–

13. You receive a pay increase.
The reason I am receiving a pay increase is something over which I have:
No control  1  2  3  4  5  Complete control

C+
The reason I am receiving a pay increase is something that completely has to do with:
Me  1  2  3  4  5  Other people or factors

O  +

14. Someone close to you is diagnosed with cancer.
The reason she or he has cancer is something that:
Relates to all  1  2  3  4  5  Just relates to this situation
aspects of my life
R–
The reason she or he has cancer will:
Always  1  2  3  4  5  Never exist again
E–

15. Your latest investment strategy backfires.
The reason my strategy is backfiring is something that:
Relates to all  1  2  3  4  5  Just relates to this situation
aspects of my life
R–
The reason my strategy is backfiring will:
Always  1  2  3  4  5  Never exist again
E–

16. You miss your airplane flight.
The reason I missed my flight is something over which I have:
No control  1  2  3  4  5  Complete control

C–
The reason I missed my flight is something that completely has to do with:
Me  1  2  3  4  5  Other people or factors

O₉–

17. You are selected for an important project.
The reason I am being selected for this project is something over which I have:
No control  1  2  3  4  5  Complete control

C+
The outcome of this event is something for which I feel:
Not at all  1  2  3  4  5  Completely responsible

O₉+

18. The project you are in charge of fails.
The reason the project is failing is something over which I have:
No control  1  2  3  4  5  Complete control

C–
The outcome of this event is something for which I feel:
Not at all  1  2  3  4  5  Completely responsible

O₉–

19. Your employer offers you a 30 percent pay cut to keep your job.
The reason I am asked to take the pay cut is something over which I have:
The reason I am asked to take the pay cut is something that completely has to do with:

Me

Other people or factors

20. **You receive an unexpected gift on your birthday.**

The reason I received this gift is something that:

Relates to all aspects of my life

Just relates to this situation

The reason I received this gift will:

Always exist

Never exist again

21. **Your car breaks down on the way to an appointment.**

The reason my car broke down is something that:

Relates to all aspects of my life

Just relates to this situation

The reason my car broke down will:

Always exist

Never exist again

22. **Your doctor calls to tell you that your cholesterol level is too high.**
The reason my cholesterol is too high is something that:
Relates to all aspects of my life
R–
The reason my cholesterol is too high will:
Always exist
E–

23. You are chosen to lead a major project.
The reason I am being chosen is something over which I have:
No control
Complete control
C+
The reason I am being chosen is something that completely has to do with:
Me
Other people or factors
Or+

24. You place several phone calls to a friend, and not one of them is returned.
The reason my friend did not return my call is something that:
Relates to all aspects of my life
R–
The reason my friend did not return my call will:
Always exist
E–
25. You are publicly praised for your work.
The reason I am being praised is something that:
- Relates to all aspects of my life: R+
- Just relates to this situation:

The reason I am being praised will:
- Always exist: E+
- Never exist again:

26. At your physical exam, your doctor cautions you on your health.
The reason my doctor is cautioning me is something over which I have:
- No control: C–
- Complete control:

The outcome of this event is something for which I feel:
- Not at all responsible: Ow–
- Completely responsible:

27. Someone you respect pays you a compliment.
The reason I was paid a compliment is something over which I have:
- No control: C–
- Complete control:

The outcome of this event is something for which I feel:
- Not at all responsible: Ow–
- Completely responsible:

The reason I am receiving this appraisal is something over which I have:
No control  1  2  3  4  5  Complete control

C–
The outcome of this event is something for which I feel:
Not at all  1  2  3  4  5  Completely responsible
responsibility

Ow –

29. **You do not receive a much-anticipated promotion.**
The reason I did not receive a promotion is something over which I have:
No control  1  2  3  4  5  Complete control

C–
The reason I did not receive a promotion is something that completely has to do with:
Me  1  2  3  4  5  Other people or factors

O₁ –

30. **You are elected by your peers to head an important committee.**
The reason I am being elected is something that:
Relates to all  1  2  3  4  5  Just relates to this situation
aspects of my life
R+
The reason I am being elected will:
Always  1  2  3  4  5  Never exist again
E+
Personal Growth Initiative Scale

Using the scale below, check the number which best describes the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1 = definitely disagree
2 = mostly disagree
3 = somewhat disagree
4 = somewhat agree
5 = mostly agree
6 = definitely agree

1. I know how to change specific things that I want to change in my life.
2. I have a good sense of where I am headed in my life.
3. If I want to change something in my life, I initiate the transition process.
4. I can choose the role that I want to have in a group.
5. I know what I need to do to get started toward reaching my goals.
6. I have a specific action plan to help me reach my goals.
7. I take charge of my life
8. I know what my unique contribution to the world might be.
9. I have a plan for making my life more balanced.
### Characteristics of Successful Iranian EFL Teachers Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>نتایج مورد</th>
<th>موافق</th>
<th>مخالف</th>
<th>کلیه</th>
<th>موافق</th>
<th>مخالف</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. از دانش کافی نسبت به موضوع تدریس برخوردار است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. اطلاعاتان جدید و به روز است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. با زبان اموزان رابطه صمیمانه ای برقرار می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. به زبان اموزان احترام می‌گوید.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. زبان اموزان را به خوبی تعریف می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. توانایی مدیریت و اداره کلاس را دارد.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. حس اخلاق است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. صبور و با احترام است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. از دانش کافی نسبت به موضوع تدریس برخوردار است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. اطلاعاتان جدید و به روز است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. با زبان اموزان رابطه صمیمانه ای برقرار می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. به زبان اموزان احترام می‌گوید.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. زبان اموزان را به خوبی تعریف می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. از وسایل کمک آموزشی مناسب مانند ویدیو، فیلم و غیره استفاده می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. اشتهایی برای تدریس دارد.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. به موضوعی که تدریس می‌کند علاقه‌مند است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. اعتماد به نفس دارد.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. اشتهایی برای تدریس دارد.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. از زبان اموزان قوی تر برای پیشرفت زبان اموزان ضعیف تر استفاده می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. به موضوعی که تدریس می‌کند علاقه‌مند است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. اعتماد به نفس دارد.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. به موضوعی که تدریس می‌کند علاقه‌مند است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. اشتهایی برای تدریس دارد.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. از وسایل کمک آموزشی مناسب مانند ویدیو، فیلم و غیره استفاده می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. از زبان اموزان قوی تر برای پیشرفت زبان اموزان ضعیف تر استفاده می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. به موضوعی که تدریس می‌کند علاقه‌مند است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. اعتماد به نفس دارد.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. به موضوعی که تدریس می‌کند علاقه‌مند است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. اشتهایی برای تدریس دارد.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. از وسایل کمک آموزشی مناسب مانند ویدیو، فیلم و غیره استفاده می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. از زبان اموزان قوی تر برای پیشرفت زبان اموزان ضعیف تر استفاده می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. به موضوعی که تدریس می‌کند علاقه‌مند است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. اشتهایی برای تدریس دارد.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. از وسایل کمک آموزشی مناسب مانند ویدیو، فیلم و غیره استفاده می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. از زبان اموزان قوی تر برای پیشرفت زبان اموزان ضعیف تر استفاده می‌کند.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. به موضوعی که تدریس می‌کند علاقه‌مند است.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 além de se preocupar com o crescimento pessoal.

37. O professor é conhecido por sua capacidade de criar uma atmosfera de cooperação e respeito entre os alunos.

38. O professor é um modelo de comportamento, demonstrando habilidades de liderança e resiliência.

39. O professor é capaz de lidar com situações difíceis de forma eficaz e adequada.

40. O professor é reconhecido por sua habilidade em gerenciar o tempo de forma eficaz, permitindo que todos tenham oportunidade de participar.

41. O professor é conhecido por sua habilidade em criar um ambiente de aprendizagem positivo e envolvente.

42. O professor é reconhecido por sua capacidade de criar um ambiente de aprendizagem envolvente e positivo.

43. O professor é reconhecido por sua habilidade em gerenciar o tempo de forma eficaz, permitindo que todos tenham oportunidade de participar.

44. O professor é reconhecido por sua capacidade de lidar com situações difíceis de forma eficaz e adequada.

45. O professor é conhecido por sua habilidade em criar uma atmosfera de cooperação e respeito entre os alunos.

46. O professor é reconhecido por sua capacidade de criar uma atmosfera de cooperação e respeito entre os alunos.

47. O professor é reconhecido por sua habilidade em criar uma atmosfera de cooperação e respeito entre os alunos.

48. O professor é reconhecido por sua habilidade em criar uma atmosfera de cooperação e respeito entre os alunos.

49. O professor é reconhecido por sua habilidade em criar uma atmosfera de cooperação e respeito entre os alunos.

50. O professor é reconhecido por sua habilidade em criar uma atmosfera de cooperação e respeito entre os alunos.

51. O professor é reconhecido por sua habilidade em criar uma atmosfera de cooperação e respeito entre os alunos.

52. O professor é reconhecido por sua habilidade em criar uma atmosfera de cooperação e respeito entre os alunos.

53. O professor é reconhecido por sua habilidade em criar uma atmosfera de cooperação e respeito entre os alunos.