

# *Codes of Behavior in IELTS Speaking Interview*

## *--A Study of Georgian IELTS instructors*

**Hamed Ghaemi**

*Bahar Institute of Higher Education*  
*ghaemiacademy@gmail.com*

**Keywords:** Behaviour; codes; interviewing; Standards, IELTS

**Abstract:** The purpose of the current study was to construct a Codes of Behaviour Questionnaire for IELTS Speaking Interview. To this end, the questionnaire was designed by selecting the most significant factors of behavioural issues in IELTS Interviewing based on quantitative approach. The scale which consisted of four main categories, are (1) Values system factor, (2) Fairness, (3) Content factor, and (4) Interpersonal relationship, along with 28 items. After employing EFA and CFA, it was revealed that the questionnaire consists of high validity. Moreover, the reliability of the questionnaire was assessed by running Cronbach's Alpha which was .825. As an alternative to the traditional approach, this study utilized structural equation modelling (SEM) with multiple indicators to examine the validity and reliability of Codes of Behaviour in IELTS Interviewing Questionnaire. Finally, statistical results and implications were discussed.

### **1. Introduction**

An interview is a special kind of dialogue to realize individuals' perspectives. Patton (1990, p.278) believes that the aim of interviewing is to discover "what is in or on someone else's mind". It is also "a malleable instrument for data collection, empowering multi-sensory channels to be employed: verbal, non-verbal, spoken and heard". (Cohen et al, 2007, p.349). According to Kvale (1996, p. 14), an interview is an exchange of views between two or more persons on a subject of mutual interest. This explanation refers to the social dimension of human nature. Interviews allow parties to uphold their insights of the world, and to articulate how they reflect positions from their perspectives (Cohen et al, 2007). Consequently, with this clarification, "the interview is not solely concerned with collecting data about life: it is part of life itself, its human embeddedness is unavoidable" (Cohen et al, 2007, p.349). An interview is not a usual, daily conversation (Dyer 1995: 56–8). It is carried out for different aims: as a sort of research qualitative method, for evaluation of people's qualities, hiring individuals for a job, etc. There are diverse types of interviews: standardized interviews; in-depth interviews; ethnographic interviews; elite interviews; life history interviews; focus groups (LeCompte and Preissle, 1993), semi-structured interviews, group interviews (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992), structured interviews (Lincoln and Guba, 1985), exploratory interviews (Oppenheim, 1992: 65).

The interviewers are entirely in charge of the interview procedures employed (Jones and Bartlett Publishers), so they should stick to some behavioural norms and standards. They "shoulder a heavy burden to be behavioural because they possess great authority and power" (Jones and Bartlett publishers, p.27). Regarding the importance of "interview" in most fields especially in IELTS speaking interview, it is unquestionably an urgent need to have a comprehensive assortment of the

most substantial factors of behavioural issues which should be well-thought-out by interviewers where a thoughtful absence of such issues can be simply felt. Accordingly, the present study tries to find some standards and codes of behaviour in an IELTS speaking interview that can be utilized as a framework for those who are engaged in the process of IELTS interview such as IELTS instructors, examiners, and so on.

## 1.1. Theoretical Background

Generally, behaviour refers to standards for defining levels of goodness. Behaviour is usually loaded with emotional verdicts about ideas, troubles, activities, etc. (ÖZTÜRK, 2010). Regrettably, we are gradually forgetting our behaviour and this tendency must be checked immediately. Perhaps our IELTS instructors, education policies, syllabus for teacher education, and educational institutions play a substantial role in this respect.

Behavioural education is vital at every single aspect of our lives. Decisions generated by legislation governing the education system in schools and classrooms need to be closely revisited. A teacher is more than just a teacher. Because a teacher is deputized not only with training IELTS candidates but also with helping them grow and develop as human beings, the real teacher must be not only dexterous at inspiring learning, but also a model of conduct (Davies, 2004).

Professional behaviour has become more momentous over the years. As we become more enthusiastic in our profession, the issues become much more complex and harder. Professional groups have gradually been at work evolving, rereading, and humanizing. Professionals ask for more ample codes to have better management. Candidly, it is a sign of development, expansion, and professional overconfidence, when a professional group is working under a code of behaviour (Bruun, 2014).

Professional behaviour is usually defined as the idea of knowing what is accurate or erroneous in professional life. This means doing the right thing while still following personal beliefs. It is also described as the system of moral values applied in one's career or professional work. Each code of behaviour may be a formalization of preceding practises into new procedures. Professional behaviour also contains matters such as professional sanctuary. In addition, codes of behaviour vary by cultural set, profession, and numerous disciplines (Ruitenbergh, 2016). Conservatively, behaviour is purely a matter of social accessibility and behaviour that could only be structured by resolution. And resolution may fluctuate from society to society, community to community. This is titled behavioural relativism.

While working with human contributors, researchers ought to strictly monitor behavioural concerns. According to Cohen et al (2007), as interviews are well-thought-out as an interference into respondents' private lives about the time assigned and level of thoughtfulness of questions asked; a high standard of behavioural deliberations should be preserved. Accordingly, behavioural issues should be deliberated on at all phases of the interview course. Although the straightforwardness and intimacy of the interview state would be a social challenge to researchers as it may rouse respondents to disclose information that they might remorse in the future, and there is a likelihood that the connection may turn to a quasi-therapeutic relationship for which many researchers may not be qualified. So, to avoid activating any trouble, researchers should warranty that the collected data will be meticulously private and nameless. Otherwise, participants should know that their contribution in the interview is completely voluntary and can be withdrawn whenever they like.

Numerous treasured information can be collected through an interview, predominantly in non-literate populations. Interviews permit researchers to examine deeper into subjects of interest and carry on with familiar hints in a way that other research methods simply do not permit. Additionally, interviews strengthen the connexion between the researcher and the participants of the

study. Interviews, likewise, provide the researcher with a much enhanced understanding of the population of interest, but this understanding is accompanied by definite hazards that the researcher must state earlier and during the course of the interview. A researcher might hurt an interviewee even without wanting to do so. Socio-behavioural research does not generally comprise a risk of physical harm, but there is a great possibility that psychological and/or social harm may arise.

### 1.1.1. IELTS Speaking Interview

In 2001 the IELTS interview format and criteria were brushed up. A main alteration was the modification from a single international scale to a set of four analytic scales focusing on dissimilar characteristics of oral proficiency. From testing standpoint, it is distinct since it is interactive in nature and has to be measured directly in live interface. The rudimentary aim of developing speaking skill is to interact efficaciously in that particular language and it encompasses comprehension as well as production. Speaking test has been a part of global large scale language proficiency tests like IELTS and TOEFL.

Speaking test is the last of the four tests in IELTS. It entails a face to face interview between the candidate and an IELTS trained examiner. The interview lasts for 11 to 15 minutes and is recorded. The test is divided into three phases (Fig. 1):

- Phase 1 is introduction which is conducted in a successions of short questions and answers in order to make the candidate comfortable and to develop some acquaintance with the applicant. The examiner asks simple questions about candidate's own self like his/her home, family, country, work, study, interests etc. For example: "Why did you decide to study Engineering?" "What are some of the most popular drinks in your country?"
- Phase 2 is an individual long turn in which the candidate has to speak on a chosen topic for 1 to 2 minutes. Each candidate is given a topic and he/she is supposed to talk about it in the form of a monologue in limited time i.e. 1 to 2 minutes. The object or topic to be described is general in nature like a river, beach or a film etc.
- Phase 3 embraces a two way discussion or dialogue between the candidate and the interviewer. It is thematically related to the topic of the long turn i.e. phase 2.

<p><b>Part 1: Introduction and Interview (4–5 minutes)</b></p> <p>Examiner introduces him/herself and confirms candidate's identity. Examiner interviews candidate using verbal questions based on familiar topic frames.</p> <p><b>Part 2: Individual long turn 3–4 minutes (including 1 minute preparation time)</b></p> <p>Examiner asks candidate to speak for 1–2 minutes on a particular topic based on written input in the form of a general instruction and content-focused prompts. Examiner asks one or two questions at the end of the long turn.</p> <p><b>Part 3: Two-way discussion (4–5 minutes)</b></p> <p>Examiner invites candidate to participate in discussion of more abstract nature, based on verbal questions thematically linked to Part 2 prompt.</p>
--

**Figure 1** Interview Structure

All areas aforementioned have also been used as the foundation to form the vital constructs of our questionnaire presented in this study which are (1) Values system factor, (2) Fairness, (3) Content factor, and (4) Interpersonal relationship.

The code of behaviour allows us to define the moralities and duties of the profession, exert a de facto regulatory effect, ameliorate the profile of the profession, motivate and provoke specialists by endeavouring to clarify their raison d'être, raise awareness and consciousness of issues, and lastly

improve feature and reliability. Conversely, we must also consider: Whether the theoretical standards are obligatory, or are purely a desire, whether such a code is indispensable or useful, whether behavioural values are general or culturally relativistic (Cohen et al, 2007).

Interviews that are realized based on behavioural standards and principles will often give us more eye-catching and edifying outcomes (Dezube, 2017). The first and the most principal issue in executing an interview is creating a situation for participants to give truthful and substantial replies (Dezube, 2017). Kvale (1996: 111–20) cited two major elements of behavioural issues in interviews: confidentiality, and the consequences of the interviews. Confidentiality in an interview means that the information transferred by the candidate should not be divulged by the interviewer. And finally, the interviewer should be responsible for the consequences of the interview. Even if the applicant is cognisant about the attitude of the interviewer, interview data is prejudiced and untruthful (Patton, 1990). Best & Kahn (2006) argued that “the interviewer must make sure the person being interviewed understands that the researcher does not hold any preconceived notions regarding the outcome of the study” (p. 266). Also, Van Kammen and Stouthamer-Loeber (1998) referred to the training of the interviewers to conduct their work accurately. Best & Kahn (2006) added that the interviewer need to know his position. He should not state his idea and should inform the interviewees that they are not to be adjudicated at all. He should pay full attention to the interviewees’ words. Approval and open-mindedness should be kept during the interview irrespective of the overall status of the interviewee. Information should be conveyed spontaneously and enthusiastically without forcing to act used. Interviewing should be done with mutual respect and the interviewer ought to provide a situation in which the participants feel at ease and with no pressure. The other behavioural issue in interviewing is that the interviewers should think and plan about the whole steps of the interview, including what is being interviewed, how it is carried out, and probable concerns that it may bring. Another factor pertained to the data analysis and publication of interviews in research is the “emotional turmoil” the interviewer may encounter with while dealing with the material upon revisiting (Brounéus, 2011). During transcribing, it may be hard and exhausting to listen to the interview again, or during writing up, making decisions on what to eliminate may sense unbearable; the feeling of having the duty to report everything can be much overpowering (Brounéus, 2011).

In the area of interview and behaviour, some researches have been conducted. Brounéus (2011) in her study has investigated the process, skill, and behaviour of interviews in peace research and has elucidated those steps systematically. AllMark et al., (2009) described a literature review on some behavioural issues in in-depth interviews. They clarified five universal behavioural issues in in-depth interviewing, containing discretion and privacy, destruction, dual role and over-involvement, and politics and power. Kont-Kontson et al. (2013) examined interviewers’ feelings of their roles while the management of the oral proficiency interview and suggested many interviewer training strategies to defeat the problems. Reemann et al. (2013) examined the act of interviewers while the oral proficiency interview. Their findings revealed “an overall attempt to follow the scripted interview format envisaged for this examination, but alterations to the script prevail with both gender groups” (p. 209). Alas (2010) scrutinised the inception and development of the foreign language national examination in Estonia and traced the changes in that examination system. Alshenqeti (2014) appraised the worth and limitations of interviewing as a data collection method and clarified behavioural problems about the use of interviews. Loui (2005) in his study argued that “to support the teaching of behaviour in science and engineering, educational technologies offer a variety of functions: communication between IELTS candidates and instructors, production of documents, distribution of documents, archiving of class sessions, and access to remote resources” (p. 435). Also, in a study, Salehnia and Ashraf (2015) investigated “on the relationship between IELTS instructors’ commitment to professional behaviour and IELTS candidates’ self-esteem”.

Thus, they found a significant positive relationship between professional behaviour and IELTS candidates' self-esteem. A study was done by Chesley and Anderson (2003) to answer the question of "are IELTS instructors Qualified to Teach Behaviour?" pointed to different behavioural problems that arise in a coordinated context and argued that "academics who teach business behaviour have to first understand the complex behavioural situations in which they find themselves if business behaviour is to be taught in a meaningful way". In another study, DeAngelis (2014) qualitatively inspected the relationship between academic Deans, Codes of Behaviour, and their Fiduciary Duties and explained those principals of academic settings must obey two series of professional rules; as college members, they must adhere to their institution's internally developed code of behaviour; as executives, they must accomplish the depository responsibilities of resolution and belief.

## **2. Method**

### **2.1. Participants**

A sample of 288 IELTS instructors from all over Georgia participated in this study. They were chosen based on purposive sampling. They were experienced in IELTS speaking interview. Regarding the total sample, 154 were males and 134 were females. The participants' age ranged between 28 and 48. The instructors had all majored in the various branches of English such as teaching, literature, and translation and mostly held M.A. degree. Among them, 55 IELTS instructors also took part in the qualitative phase of the study.

### **2.2. Instruments**

#### **2.2.1. Interview**

55 IELTS instructors were interviewed to share their ideas to explore the most well-suited and suitable components of the code of behaviour in IELTS interviewing. The interviews were conducted in the context of Georgia and digitally recorded. In addition, each interview lasted 50 to 75 minutes depending on the status and working experience of the IELTS instructors. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed for content analysis. There were 55 interview transcriptions.

#### **2.2.2. Interview Behaviour Scale**

The IELTS Interview Behaviour Scale is a questionnaire made by the present study researcher. It consists of two parts that aim at measuring the knowledge and the level of commitment of IELTS instructors to behaviour while designing and implementing the process of interviewing. How it is done and the quality through which it is administered/performed. Consequently, the first part of the questionnaire is related to the participants' demographic information. The second part targeted the instructor's knowledge and the level of commitment of IELTS instructors to behaviour that they were asked to choose one of the four choices for each item ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". The scale consisted of four main categories are (1) Values system factor, (2) Fairness, (3) Content factor, and (4) Interpersonal relationship, along with 28 items. In addition, the questionnaire possessed high construct validity and high reliability after running EFA, CFA, and Cronbach's alpha respectively.

## 2.3. Procedure

To construct the IELTS Interview Behaviour Scale, the researcher followed two explicit steps: first developing the questionnaire and second checking its reliability and validity.

For development of the questionnaire, the researcher trailed all the procedures and steps provided by Dornyei (2003) of how to construct and administer a questionnaire. At first, researchers had a vast study about behavioural issues in IELTS interviewing. After delving into all the related scientific articles along with the previous aforementioned procedures, the items of the questionnaire were developed. To make sure that all the dimensions of behaviour in the interviews have been stated among the items in the questionnaire, checking content validity, the researchers asked some experienced IELTS instructors in the process of interviewing to go through the items carefully and suggest any further ideas about the issue under study. As a result, some of the items were reworded for lucidity and some of the items which elicited a similar point were deleted. The outcome of the questionnaire was 28 items each having four options to be chosen by the participants, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". In addition, the questionnaire consisted of four main categories/factors: The scale consisted of five main categories are (1) Values system factor, (2) Fairness, (3) Content factor, and (4) Interpersonal relationship.

For estimating the validity of the questionnaire or better to say the analysis of the results, except for the procedures mentioned above, SEM was employed, EFA and CFA. Besides, the items were scored according to the Likert type scale of four points ranging from (1) "strongly disagree" to (4) "strongly agree". It should be noted that negatively worded items were reverse-scored so that a total positively-oriented score could be achieved. Also, the validity of the scale was assessed afterward through running Cronbach's Alpha. The results regarding the reliability and validity of the questionnaire are entirely deliberated in the Results section of the paper.

## 3. Results

After analysing the qualitative data, four main categories of codes of behaviour in interviewing were identified: (1) Values system factor, (2) Fairness, (3) Content factor, and (4) Interpersonal relationship.

Under the factor of "Values system", the interviewers should develop a set of moralities or ideals that guide their interview conduct. Regarding the component of "Fairness", the interviewers should be fair-minded in interviewing. "Content factor" refers to the matter of the content of the interview questions. The content should be informative and unblemished and in line with the goal of the interview. "Interpersonal relationship factor" refers to making a good interpersonal relationship with the interviewee.

The validation of the scale was conducted in three main steps: (1) exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with principal component analysis and varimax rotation, (2) confirmatory analysis to determine the robustness of the factor structure on one randomly determined half of the dataset (training); (3) cross-validation using multi-group invariance testing between half of the dataset (training) and the unused second half of the dataset (testing).

### 3.1. Explanatory Factor Analysis

To assure the construct validity of the test, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with principal component analysis and varimax rotation was run. The 28 items of the Code of Behaviour in IELTS interviewing scale were subjected to EFA and the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. The KMO was .711, exceeding the recommended value of .6, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. Principle component analysis revealed the presence of five components with eigenvalues exceeding

1. Moreover, the highest loading for each item was considered as the appropriate factor for that item. Results of the EFA can be seen in Table 1.

**Table 1** *Rotated Component Matrix for Code of Behaviour in interviewing scale*

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
N16	.78				
N6	.75				
N21	.52				
N26	.49				
N17		.74			
N22		.63			
N27		.59			
N2		.53			
N7		.53			
N12		.47			
N3			.85		
N13			.86		
N8			.76		
N23			.69		
N18			.59		
N9				.86	
N14				.79	
N19				.69	
N25					.68
N5					.67
N20					.56
N10					.61

As Table 1 shows, the four factors can be regarded as the five constructs that the test claims to measure, namely: (1) Values system factor, (2) Fairness, (3) Content factor, and (4) Interpersonal relationship. Items of loadings less than .30 were excluded and finally 28 items remained.

Following this, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was run to see whether the ten-factor solution obtained in EFA can be confirmed. For this purpose, CFA was run to assess the fit of the model on one random half of the sample. Table 2 illustrates the criteria used for the present study below.

**Table 2** *Model-Fit Indices for formative assessment Scale*

	$\chi^2$	df	$\chi^2/df$	GFI	CFI	RMSEA
<b>Acceptable fit</b>			<3	>.90	>.90	<.08
<b>Model</b>	721.15	220	3.744	.95	.98	.079

According to Table 2, the CFA confirmed the structure of the Behaviour scale in IELTS Speaking Interview.

In addition, the CFA was cross-validated on the second half (144 participants) using multi-group invariance testing. The analysis has equal numbers of cases in each group because little is known about the possible effect of unequal group sizes on results gained from a multiple group SEM analysis. The training participants (N = 144) and the testing participants (N = 144) subsets were compared to test the robustness of the two-factor model.

The results of multi-group comparisons indicated that the two-factor structure on the 34 items was equally robust in both random sets. In addition, the two sets of samples proved factorially invariant

( $\chi^2/df = 3.744$ ,  $RMSEA = .057$ ,  $CFI = .86$ ,  $GFI = .96$ ). CFA model for Code of Behaviour in interviewing scale is (F1) = Values system factor, (F2) = Fairness, (F3) = Content factor, and (F4) = Interpersonal relationship.

### 3.2. Reliability

Moreover, to examine the reliability of the scale, Cronbach's alpha was used. The reliability coefficient was .811 for the total scale, which shows the scale enjoys high reliability (See Table 3). It should also be added that because eighteen items were deleted, the numbering of the items in this questionnaire changed in the final draft of the questionnaire.

**Table 3** *The Reliability Indices of Code of Behaviour in interviewing scale*

Subscale	Number of Items	Cronbach alpha
F1	7	.77
F2	6	.79
F3	5	.83
F4	10	.91
Total Scale	28	.825

### 4. Discussion and conclusion

Iwashita and McNamara (2003) stated that interviewers bear a heavy load to act behaviourally-accepted as they own great power and control. The interviewer is the only one accountable for the interview methods used; only conscience acts as the standard. No fixed rule makes the decision-making process easy. The interviewer should think of his or her behaviour as though it were to be publicized for all to know about. If the interviewer starts to explain or defend techniques used, then probably the techniques used are not behavioural. Conducting an IELTS interview is a crucial area in which means are as significant as the end.

While pretty much everyone approves that it's important to live according to what's right and to escape acting in a wrong way, not everyone always agrees on what's right or what's wrong in any assumed situation. Wigglesworth (2001) maintained that a code of behaviour is personal and diverse for each individual. It regulates an individual's response to a specific situation and also accounts for the different responses revealed by different individuals in the same situation.

As Brown et al (2005) point out IELTS instructors have a daily impact on the lives of IELTS candidates, hence they are often held to high standards. At the core of all of their responsibilities, they're required to serve as solid role models and establish behavioural behaviours as they relate with IELTS candidates, colleagues, parents, and others. Following a professional code of behaviour helps validate IELTS instructors act professionally and behaviourally at all times.

Cobb (2002) believed that behaviour as the moral principle of every profession, as an inseparable feature of every professional's identity, needs special care and attention in the fields and professions that directly touch and shape the mind and soul of every human being such as teaching. IELTS instructors form their IELTS candidates' life not only by teaching but also through the way they act and through their performance in their classes (Cumming et al, 2003). Thus, the role of behaviour is even more critical and vital in fields like IELTS speaking interview and especially for IELTS



instructors. While this very important issue has long been neglected and ignored in any parts of the world and many education systems.

Different researches have been conducted to propose some principles and guidelines for behaviour and professional ethic in IELTS speaking interview and particularly regarding interviewing, while only a few conducted in the IELTS field have a comprehensible collection of the most significant factors of behavioural issues which should be considered while conducting an interview (Foster et al, 2000). Because of the lack of consideration to this critical issue, the researchers attempted to construct the Interview Behaviour inventory to assess IELTS instructors' commitment and to introduce those behavioural matters involved in the process of interviewing. To do so, the researchers went through several stages of scale development as well as investigated many related scientific articles.

The Interview Behaviour Scale, a questionnaire made by the present study researchers, consists of two parts that aim at measuring the knowledge and the level of commitment of IELTS instructors to behaviour while designing and implementing the process of interviewing. How it is done at universities and the quality through which it is administered. Consequently, the questionnaire contained a section eliciting participants' demographic information and another that targeted the professors' knowledge, and the level of commitment of IELTS instructors to behaviour.

The Inventory made by the researchers followed two clear steps: first designing the questionnaire through immense review of the related literature and related scientific articles besides following the procedures and steps provided by Dornyei (2003) and second checking its reliability, construct validity, content validity (to assure that all dimensions of behaviour in IELTS SPEAKING INTERVIEW have been mentioned among the items in the questionnaire) by the help of some experienced IELTS instructors in the process of interviewing, and finally the overall validity and the analysis of the results of the questionnaire via SEM, EFA, CFA and Cronbach's Alpha.

The actual primary result was a questionnaire devised with 50 items in a form of a Five-point Likert Scale. Later on, after proofreading, piloting, and all necessary alterations, some of the items were reworded to be richer and 18 questions were omitted to improve the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. The final version contains 34 items each having four options to be chosen by the participants, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Moreover, the questionnaire consists of five main categories/factors regarded as the five constructs that the test claims to measure, namely: (1) Values system factor, (2) Fairness, (3) Content factor, and (4) Interpersonal relationship.

The questionnaire possessed high construct validity and high reliability after running EFA, CFA, and Cronbach's alpha respectively. The validation of the scale was conducted in three main steps: (1) exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with principal component analysis and varimax rotation, (2) confirmatory analysis to determine the robustness of the factor structure on one randomly determined half of the dataset (training); (3) cross-validation using multi-group invariance testing between half of the dataset (training) and the unused second half of the dataset (testing). Besides, to assure the construct validity of the test, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with principal component analysis and varimax rotation was run. Moreover, to examine the reliability of the scale, Cronbach's alpha was used. The reliability coefficient was .811 for the total scale, which shows the scale enjoys high reliability.

The 28 items of the Code of Behaviour in interviewing scale were subjected to EFA and the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. The KMO was .711, exceeding the recommended value of .6, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. Principle component analysis revealed the presence of five components with eigenvalues exceeding 1.

In addition, the CFA was cross-validated on the second half using multi-group invariance testing. The results of multi-group comparisons indicated that the two-factor structure on the 34 items was equally robust in both random sets. In addition, the two sets of samples proved factorially invariant. The findings of this study can also be extremely helpful in the improvement of professionalism in IELTS speaking interview and can also be considered as complementary features alongside professional development programs regarding language teaching and testing. Likewise, the study may have implications for IELTS instructors and educational administrators to improve performance in IELTS speaking interview.

It should also be noted that behaviour and behavioural principles are culture-bound. They may differ in diverse cultural settings and contexts. Therefore, the further researcher can also be administered in other countries with different cultural backgrounds and in various contexts which may turn out to have dissimilar yet interesting results as well.

Several other related areas seem to require further study. The researcher's position in the process of the interview will create certain behavioural issues. For instance, the researcher must decide whether to:

- Be quite objective or be involved,
- Apply counselling methods,
- Attempt to protect and support the participant,
- Challenge the interviewee,
- Be attentive to the gender, culture, sexuality, and class of the interview topic while planning who should take on an interview,
- Employ process agreement throughout the whole process,
- Use actual quotes while reporting the interview.

All such choices may have major impacts on the collected data and results.

## References

- [1] Alas, E. (2010). *The Foreign language national examination validity is defined by its oral proficiency interview interlocutor behavior.* (Doctoral thesis, Tallinn University). Retrieved from [www.tlu.ee/kirjastus](http://www.tlu.ee/kirjastus)
- [2] AllMark, P. J., Boote, J., Chambers, E., Clarke, A., McDonnell, A., Thompson, A. and Tod, A. (2009). *Behavioral issues in the use of in-depth interviews: literature review and discussion.* *Research behavior review*, 5 (2), 48-54.
- [3] Alshenqeeti, H. (2014). *Interviewing as a data collection method: A critical review.* *Foreign Linguistics Research*, 3(1), 39-45.
- [4] Ary, D., Jacobs, L.Ch., Sorensen, Ch., & Razavieh, S. (2006). *Introduction to research in education.* USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- [5] Barbour, R. & Schostak, J. F. (2005). *Interviewing and Focus Groups.* In: B. Somekh & C. Lewin, (eds.) *Research Methods in the Social Sciences* (pp. 41-48). London: Sage.
- [6] Bechhofer, F. & Paterson, L. (2000). *Principles of Research Design in the Social Sciences.* London: Routledge.
- Bell, J. (1987). *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-time Researchers in Education and Social Science.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- [7] Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences.* London: Pearson.
- [8] Best, G. W. & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education.* U.S: Pearson Education.
- [9] Beyer, L. (1997). *The moral contours of teacher education.* *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(4), 245-254. <http://answers.ask.com>, [http://www.ehow.com/how\\_7788174\\_behavioral-profession](http://www.ehow.com/how_7788174_behavioral-profession)
- [10] Blaxter, L., Hughes, C. & Tight, M. (2006). *How to Research.* (3rd Ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- [11] Bogdan, R. G. and Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative Research for Education (second edition).* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- [12] Brinkmann, S. & Kvale, S. (2005). *Confronting the behavior of qualitative research.* *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 18, 157-181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10720530590914789>
- [13] Brown, D. J. (2001). *Using Surveys in Language Programs.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Brown, J. D. (2005). *Research methods for applied linguistics.* In: A. Davies and C. Elder, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 476-500). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

- [15] Brown, A, Iwashita, N and McNamara, T, (2005). *An Examination of Rater Orientations and Test-Taker Performance on English-for-Academic-Purposes Speaking Tasks*, TOEFL Monograph series, MS-29, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ
- [16] Brounéus, K. (2011). *In-depth interviewing: The process, skill, and behavior of interviews in peace research*. In *Understanding peace research: Methods and challenges* (pp. 130-145). London, New York: Routledge.
- [17] Caetano, A. P. (1997). *Dilemas dos professores*. In M. T. Estrela (org.), *Viver e construir a profissão docente*. Porto: Porto Editora, 191-221.
- [18] Caetano, A. P. (1998). *Dilemas dos professores, decisão e complexidade de pensamento*. *Revista de Educação*, VII, 1, 75-90.
- [19] Caetano, A. P. (2002). *Tensões na investigação-acção e processos de mudança*. *Actas do 5º Colóquio da Sociedade Portuguesa de Ciências da Educação de 2000*. Porto: Sociedade Portuguesa de Ciências da Educação.
- [20] Chesley, G. & Anderson, B. (2003). *Are IELTS instructors qualified to teach behavior?* *Journal of Academic Behavior*, 1, 217-219.
- [21] *Code of Behavioral Conduct*. (2008). National association for the education of young children, Retrieved Feb 10, 2009, from <http://www.naeyc.org/about/positions/>
- [22] Cobb, T, (2002). *The Web Vocabulary Profiler, Ver. 1.0, computer program*, University of Québec, Montréal, retrieved from [http://www.er.uqam.ca/nobel/r21270/textools/web\\_vp.html](http://www.er.uqam.ca/nobel/r21270/textools/web_vp.html)
- [23] Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [24] Colnerud, G. (2006). *Teacher behavior as a research problem: syntheses achieved and new issues*. *IELTS instructors and Teaching: theory and behavior*, 12(3), 365-385.
- [25] Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. (3rd Ed.). Thousand Okas, CA: Sage.
- [26] Cumming, A, Kantor, R, Baba, K, Eouanzaoui, E, Erdosy, U and James, M, (2003). 'Analysis of discourse features and verification of scoring levels for independent and integrated prototype written tasks for New TOEFL', draft project report, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.
- [27] DeAngelis, W. J (2014). *Academic deans, codes of behavior, and .... fiduciary behavior*. *Journal of Academic Behavior*, 12,209-225.
- [28] Dezube, D. (2017). *How to interview to uncover a candidate's behavioral standards*. *Monster Worldwide*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from [hiring.monster.com/.../interviewing-candidates/interview-questions-to-ask-candidates](http://hiring.monster.com/.../interviewing-candidates/interview-questions-to-ask-candidates)
- [29] Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [30] Dörnyei, Z. & Skehan, P. (2003). *Individual differences in second language learning*. In: C. J. Doughty and M.H. Long, (Eds), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 589– 630). Malden, MA: Blackwell. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492.ch18>
- [31] Drew, P., Raymond, G. & Weinberg, D. (Eds.), (2006). *Talk and Interaction in Social Research Methods*. London: Sage.
- [32] Dyer, C. (1995). *Beginning Research in Psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [33] Estrela, M. T. (1999). *Ética e formação profissional dos educadores de infância*. *Cadernos de Educação de Infância*, 52, 27-32.
- [34] Estrela, M. T. (2003). *O pensamento ético-deontológico de professores em estudos portugueses*. *Cadernos de Educação FaE/UFPEL, Pelotas*, 21, 9-20 (Jul-Dez), 9-20.
- [35] Estrela, M. T. (2008). *Reflexões preliminares a uma intervenção no domínio de uma formação ética de professores para o amanhã*. In J. J. Boavida & A. Del Dujo, *Sociedade sem Fronteiras — os limites da educação (em publicação)*.
- [36] Estrela, M. T. & Marques, J. (2008). *Vers une formation éthico-déontologique des enseignants*. Paper presented at the Paris International Conference on Education, Economy and Society (18 July).
- [37] *Ethic*. (2009). In Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. Retrieved February 16, 2009, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ethic>
- [38] Foster, P, Tonkyn, A and Wigglesworth G, (2000). 'A unit for all measures: Analysing spoken discourse', *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 21, no 3, pp 354-375
- [39] Gubrium, J. F. & Holstein, J. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [40] Hammersley, M. & Gomm, R. (2008). *Assessing the radical critiques of interviews*. In: M. Hammersley, (Ed.), *Questioning Qualitative Inquiry: Critical Essays* (pp. 89-100) London: Sage.
- [41] Hansen, D. T. (2001). *Teaching as a moral activity*. In V. Richardson, *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. Washington: American Educational Research Association, pp. 826-857.

- [42] Hermanowicz, J. C. (2002). *The great interview: 25 strategies for studying people in bed*. *Qualitative Sociology*, 25(4): 479-499. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1021062932081>
- [43] Ho, D. (2006). *The focus group interview: Rising the challenge in qualitative research methodology*. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29(1), 1-19.
- [44] Iwashita, N and McNamara, T, (2003). 'Task and interviewer factors in assessments of spoken interaction in a second language', unpublished report, Language Testing Research Centre, The University of Melbourne
- [45] Jones and Bartlett Publishers, LLC. *Behavior surrounding interviewing*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from [samples.jbpub.com/9780763766436/66436\\_CH02\\_FINAL.pdf](http://samples.jbpub.com/9780763766436/66436_CH02_FINAL.pdf)
- [46] Jung, J., Ressler, J., & Linder, A. (2018). *Exploring the Hidden Curriculum in Physical Education*. *Advances in Physical Education*. 08. 253-262. 10.4236/ape.2018.82023.
- [47] Kont-Kontson, R., Alas, E. & Liiv, S. (2013). *Developing interviewer proficiency: A self-perception survey*. *Eesti Rakenduslingvistika Ühingu Aastaraamat*, 9, 113–129.
- [48] Kvale, S. (1996) *Interviews*. London: Sage.
- [49] Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [50] Kvale, S. (2003). *The psychoanalytic interview as inspiration for qualitative research*. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes, & L. Yardley (Eds.), *Qualitative research in psychology* (pp. 275– 297). Washington, USA: American Psychological Association.
- [51] Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. (2nd Ed.). Thousand Okas, CA: Sage.
- [52] Laing, R. D. (1967) *The Politics of Experience and the Bird of Paradise*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- [53] LeCompte, M. and Preissle, J. (1993) *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research* (second edition). London: Academic Press.
- [54] Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- [55] Loui, M.C. (2005). *Educational technologies and the teaching of behavior in science and engineering*. *Science and Engineering Behavior*, 11, 435-446.
- [56] Oppenheim, A. N. (1992) *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement*. London: Pinter.
- [57] ÖZTÜRK, S. (2010). *The opinions of preschool IELTS instructors about behavioral principles*. *Journal of Educational Sciences: Theory & Behavior*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from [www.kuyeb.com/pdf/en/aa84601b4415f7bf01a5a7b04ecd1c9bENTAM.pdf](http://www.kuyeb.com/pdf/en/aa84601b4415f7bf01a5a7b04ecd1c9bENTAM.pdf)
- [58] Patton, M. Q. (1990) *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (second edition). London: Sage.
- [59] Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [60] Reemann, E., Alas, E. & Liiv, S. (2013). *Interviewer behavior during oral proficiency interviews: A gender perspective*. *Eesti Rakenduslingvistika Ühingu Aastaraamat*, 9, 209–226.
- [61] Reis Monteiro, A. (2006). *Deontologia ou ética profissional: a exceção das profissões da educação*. *Seminário Ser Professor Hoje*, organizado pelo Sindicato dos Professores da Grande Lisboa.
- [62] Salehnia, N. & Ashraf, H. (2015). *On the Relationship between Iranian EFL IELTS instructors' Commitment to Professional Behavior and their IELTS candidates' Self-Esteem*. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(5), 135-143.
- [63] Scheopner, A.J. (2005) *Behavior and behavioral knowledge in teaching: A book review*. *TEACHING Exceptional Children Plus*, 1(3) Article 5. Retrieved [date] from <http://escholarship.bc.edu/education/tecplus/vol1/iss3/5>
- [64] Seïça, A. (2003). *A docência como praxis ética e deontológica*. Lisboa: Ministério da Educação/DEB.
- [65] Silva, M. L. (1994). *A profissão docente. Ética e deontologia profissional*. Master's dissertation. Lisboa: Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences of the University of Lisbon.
- [66] Strike, K.A. (1990). *Teaching behavior to IELTS instructors: What the curriculum should be about*. *Journal of Teaching & Teacher Education*, 6(1), 47-53.
- [67] Van Kammen, W. B., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1998). *Practical aspects of interview data collection and data management*. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.). *Handbook of applied social research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [68] Wigglesworth, G. (2001). 'Influences on performance in task-based oral assessments' in *Task based learning*, Eds. M Bygate, P Skehan, and M Swain, Addison Wesley Longman, pp 186-209
- [69] Willemse, M.; Lunenberg, M. & Korthagen, F. (2005). *Values in education: a challenge for IELTS instructors' educators*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 205-217.
- [70] Woods, P.; Jeffrey, B.; Troman, G. & Boyle, M. (1997). *Restructuring schools, reconstructing IELTS instructors*. Buckingham: Open University Press.