

Research Article

Developing and Validating a Language Ideology Scale for Iranian EFL Contexts Using the Rasch Model

Neda Kianinezhad ^{1*}, Saeed Ghaniabadi ²

1. PhD Student, Department of English, Hakim Sabzevari University, Iran, (Corresponding Author:

neda.kianinezhad@hsu.ac.ir

2. Hakim Sabzevari University, Iran, s.ghaniabadi@hsu.ac.ir

ARTICLE INFO

Submission History

Received: 2025-09-02

Accepted: 2025-11-15

Keywords

Language Ideology

Rasch Model

English Language Teaching

Psychometric Validation

Cultural Identity

ABSTRACT

This study develops and validates the Language Ideology Scale for Iranian EFL contexts (LIS-IR) using the Rasch measurement model, addressing a significant gap in empirical research on language ideologies in Iran. English, as a global lingua franca, presents both opportunities and ideological challenges within the Iranian educational landscape, where it is both a tool for modernity and a symbol of cultural imperialism. The LIS-IR comprises 24 items reflecting ideological orientations regarding ownership, pedagogy, cultural identity, and language policy. The scale was validated through a comprehensive analysis involving 153 Iranian EFL teachers and learners, ensuring cultural relevance and psychometric rigor. Results indicate strong reliability and construct validity, with the Rasch model confirming unidimensionality and appropriate item fit. Findings reveal diverse ideological perspectives among participants, highlighting the tension between adherence to native-speaker norms and local ownership of English. The LIS-IR serves as a diagnostic tool for curriculum design and teacher training, providing insights into the ideological underpinnings of English language education in Iran. This research contributes to the understanding of language ideology in expanding circle contexts and offers a foundation for future studies exploring the intersection of global Englishes and local educational practices.



Introduction

In recent decades the position of English as the global lingua franca for education, communication and technology has assumed an unprecedented role. In varying contexts in the expanding circle (e.g. Iran) English language teaching (ELT) is not only a language activity, but is also a socio-political and ideological practice (Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992). Teachers and students are inevitably forced to confront issues like: Who owns English? What forms should be taught? What cultural beliefs does the English language propagate? These questions are directly correlated with what is known as the language ideology, which is defined as the socially-held beliefs and values regarding language, function and legitimacy (Woolard, 1998; Mei, 2024).

In the Iranian EFL context, English is attributed a considerable degree of instrumental value in terms of educational advancement and economic mobility, and at the same time it engenders a series of cultural and ideological conflicts. While English denotes global access, modernity and progress, it also connotes such factors as Western cultural hegemony and linguistic imperialism (Sadeghi & Richards, 2015). For this reason, it becomes crucial to gain a fuller understanding of the field of language ideologies of teachers and students in order to arrive at a useful design for contextualized curricula, instructional materials and teacher training programs. But empirical research in Iran has depended mainly upon the analysis of qualitative interviews or research of general attitudes and beliefs rather than relying on psychometrically validated ideological measures.

To address this gap, the research described develops and validates the Language Ideology

Scale for Iranian EFL Teachers and Learners (LIS-IR). This scale is constructed to measure ideological orientations toward ownership of the English language, pedagogical ideology, cultural identity, and language policy. To maximize the reliability and cultural smallness of the measures, the scale is validated through the Rasch measurement model, which provides diagnostic information at the item level and scaling independent of the sample assessed; thus, the study attempts to situate global Englishes and ideology historically in Iranian ELT; on a methodological level, it provides a valid and reliable Rasch validated measurement device for further non-empirical research on language ideology.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Language Ideology

Language ideology refers to a cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, and their moral and political interests (Irvine, 1989, p. 255). This shapes beliefs about what is "correct", "standard" or "prestigious" in language use. In the field of ELT, while ideological differences impact teachers' views of the norms of the English language, the methodology adopted, and the students' self-perception of position as legitimate users of that language (Garrett, 2010; Woolard, 1998).

English, Power and Ownership

Critical scholars (e.g. Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1994) point to the relationship between the world-wide dominance of English and past power relations. This is often called linguistic imperialism. At the same time, the Global Englishes paradigm (e.g. Jenkins, 2007; Galloway & Rose, 2018; Puchpan & Rajprasisit, 2025) suggests accommodation of the

implications of ownership for native-speakers, and the argument that English belongs to all who use the language. In contexts of EFL, such as Iran, the ideological tension between following native-speaker norms and local ownership have considerable impact on teachers' pedagogical practices, as well as students' beliefs about identity construction (Holliday, 2006).

Language Ideology in the Iranian EFL Context

The Iranian English educational system reflects a dual orientation, towards both collaborative participation in world affairs and a cautious approach to the influence of the hegemonic cultural powers of the West. Previous research in Iran (e.g., Rassouli & Osam, 2019; Riazi & Mosalanejad, 2010; Sadeghi & Richards, 2015) has shown ambivalent attitudes to English use, which is seen as a means of modernization and global participation, and yet again as a signal of cultural imperialism. At the same time, these ideologically conflicted tendencies influence the attitudes which teachers have to the ways that language policy is interpreted, how books are localised and how English is perceived in relation to the students' Iranian identity. Against this background of complexities, little research in the quantitative sense has yet been attempted to evaluate the ideological orientation in Iran by means of rigorous psychometric techniques.

Theoretical Framework

The present study aims to explore the ideological orientations of Iranian EFL teachers and learners through the integration of three complementary theoretical frameworks. Together, these frameworks provide a multidimensional understanding of

how beliefs about language, power, and identity are constructed and enacted in the context of English language teaching and learning in Iran.

The first framework is the theoretical construct of Language Ideology (Woolard, 1998; Kroskrity, 2000), which serves as the foundational lens of the study. This perspective helps to explain how individuals' beliefs about language are deeply intertwined with broader issues of identity, authority, and sociocultural power relations. In the Iranian EFL context, such ideologies often influence how English is perceived not merely as a linguistic system, but as a symbol of modernity, global participation, or even cultural dominance. Through this lens, the study examines how teachers and learners position themselves in relation to English and how these positions reflect underlying ideological assumptions about what English represents in Iranian society.

The second framework, the Global Englishes paradigm (Jenkins, 2007; Galloway & Rose, 2018), extends this discussion by challenging the traditional, native-speaker-centric view of English. From this perspective, English is viewed as a pluricentric, dynamic, and locally adaptable resource rather than a fixed, monolithic entity governed solely by native-speaker norms. This approach allows the study to investigate how Iranian EFL participants conceptualize the legitimacy of different varieties of English and whether they perceive local or global ownership of the language. In other words, the framework provides insight into whether teachers and learners still align with the ideology of linguistic imperialism or adopt a more inclusive and pluralistic orientation toward English use.

Finally, the third framework, Critical Language Awareness (CLA) (Fairclough,

1992), adds a reflexive and socio-political dimension to the analysis. This perspective highlights how language practices can reproduce or challenge existing social and ideological hierarchies. Within the Iranian EFL context, this means examining the extent to which teachers and learners critically recognize the role of English in reinforcing unequal global power relations or, conversely, how they might use English as a tool for empowerment and agency. All in all, these three frameworks converge to form the central construct of the study: EFL teachers' and learners' ideological orientations toward English as a social, cultural, and pedagogical phenomenon. This construct encapsulates not only individual attitudes toward the language but also the broader ideological patterns that influence English language education in Iran.

Accordingly, to empirically examine this construct, the study employs the Rasch measurement model as its analytical framework. The Rasch model enables rigorous validation of the construct by testing for construct validity, item reliability, and potential differential item functioning (DIF) across the two participant groups teachers and learners. This quantitative approach provides strong empirical support for the interpretation of the ideological orientations measured, ensuring that the findings reflect genuine differences in belief systems rather than measurement bias or instrument limitations.

Method

Participants

The sample included Iranian EFL learners and teachers from both government and private schools in a number of provinces. There were 153 participants in the study. Convenience sampling was applied with an emphasis on diversity in terms of gender, type

of institution, and teaching or learning background. Participation was purely voluntary and anonymous, and informed consent was obtained from all participants before data collection.

Instrument Development

To cover various aspects of language ideology in the Iranian EFL setting, we created 24 items. These items were developed through a comprehensive review of related literature and expert consultation. The instrument consists of five sub-constructs:

A) Ownership and Authority

1. Native speakers are the primary model for correct English. (*Galloway & Rose, 2018; Holliday, 2006*)
2. Iranian teachers can teach English as effectively as native speakers. (*for learners: "I can learn English as effectively as native speakers."*) (*Galloway & Rose, 2018*)
3. English belongs to everyone who uses it, not only native speakers. (*Galloway & Rose, 2018; Jenkins, 2007*)
4. It is acceptable to use an Iranian accent when speaking English. (*Researcher*)
5. Correct grammar is more important than being understood. (*Garrett, 2010; reworded*)

B) Ideology and Power

6. The spread of English threatens local languages and cultures. (*Phillipson, 1992; Garrett, 2010*)
7. Learning English gives people access to global opportunities. (*Galloway & Rose, 2018*)
8. English is a tool of Western influence and power (*Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992*).
9. English teaching materials in Iran often reflect foreign cultural values. (*Researcher*)

10. English should be adapted to fit Iranian cultural norms (Researcher).

C) Cultural Identity

11. Using English makes me feel less connected to Iranian culture. (*Garrett, 2010; Lamb, 2004;*)

12. I can express my Iranian identity effectively in English. (*Researcher*)

13. I prefer EFL materials that include Iranian cultural examples. (*Researcher*)

14. Discussing cultural values is important in English classes. (*Galloway & Rose, 2018*)

D) Pedagogical Ideology

15. Teachers should focus on native-like pronunciation. (*Holliday, 2006; Galloway & Rose, 2018*)

16. Communicative ability is more important than grammatical perfection. (*Garrett, 2010*)

17. EFL teaching should include local content relevant to Iranian students. (*Researcher*)

18. It is okay for teachers/students to use Persian in the English classroom when necessary. (*Researcher-made*)

19. Corrective feedback should focus on meaning before form. (*Borg, 2003*)

E) Language Policy and Critical Awareness

20. The national EFL curriculum should include Iranian perspectives. (*Researcher*)

21. EFL teachers should be aware of political/cultural influences of English. (*Galloway & Rose, 2018; Pennycook, 1994*)

22. Students should learn about World Englishes and their varieties (*Galloway & Rose, 2018; Jenkins, 2007;*).

23. English instruction in Iran should promote critical discussion about language and power. (*Researcher*)

24. English education policies should protect Persian while promoting English. (*Researcher*)

We used a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), to collect responses. And as a result, the scale comprised a total of 24 items, 14 of which were either adapted or rephrased from previously validated instruments and relevant theoretical literature. (Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21 and 22). The remainder of the items were devised by the researchers and designed to reflect the sociolinguistic and educational realities of the Iranian EFL context (Items 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 20, 23 and 24). In fact, this allowed theoretical rigour and contextual appropriateness in the instrument.

Content Validation and Translation

To guarantee the validity and cultural relevance of the items, we had a panel of 3 experts in applied linguistics, social linguistics, and English language teaching who reviewed the scale. They looked at each item's clarity, representativeness, and relevance. The Item Level Content Validity Index (I-CVI) for all items was over 0.80, and the Scale Level Content Validity Index (S-CVI), which we found to be 0.91, is an indication of strong content validity. Also, we did translation and back-translation of the scale into Persian as per the methods put forth by Brislin (1980) to maintain semantic equivalence between the English and Persian versions of the scale. Any differences between the translations were sorted out through expert consensus, which we used to preserve the conceptual accuracy.

Study Design and Analysis

This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional design aimed at developing and validating the Language Ideology Scale for Iranian EFL Contexts (LIS-IR). Therefore, prior to the Rasch analysis, a descriptive and

normality assessment was conducted to ensure the adequacy of the data for measurement modeling. Data were analyzed using Winsteps (Linacre, 2023) following established Rasch modeling guidelines (Bond & Fox, 2015). The validation process included several key stages:

1. **Rating Scale Diagnostics:** We examined category proportions and threshold order, combining any out-of-place categories to enhance performance.
2. **Item and Person Fit:** We focused on item and person fit statistics, including infit and outfit mean square (MNSQ) values and standardized Z-scores. Ideal MNSQ values ranged from 0.6 to 1.4.
3. **Unidimensionality:** We conducted Principal Component Analysis of standardized residuals, using a first residual eigenvalue at or below 2.0 to confirm unidimensionality.
4. **Reliability and Separation:** We calculated person and item reliability indices and separation values. A person reliability above 0.80 and separation greater than 2.0 indicated good measurement precision. Items with significant misfit were qualitatively reviewed and either adjusted or removed based on statistical and conceptual analysis.

Results

This study reports on the development and validation of the Language Ideology Scale for Iranian EFL settings (LIS-IR), and we also looked at its psychometric properties, which we analyzed via the Rasch Rating Scale Model. We designed the LIS-IR to look at Iranian EFL teachers' and learners' ideological stands toward English in terms of issues of ownership, pedagogy, cultural identity, and language policy. Prior to the Rasch analysis, a descriptive and normality assessment was

conducted to ensure the adequacy of the data for measurement modeling. Thus, in this report, we present results of the Rasch analysis, which include rating scale diagnostics, item and person fit, unidimensionality, reliability and separation indices.

Descriptive Statistics

To provide descriptive statistics for all 24 items of the LIS-IR, these are displayed in Table 1. The means for items ranged from 1.83 (Item 24) to 4.14 (Item 1) with standard deviations of 1.10-1.47. As noted above, the progressive alterations in mean and skewness for the items indicate an ordered coverage of the latent continuum with high endorsement of items at the lower end and of more resistance at the upper end. This pattern gives preliminary evidence of a satisfactory item difficulty hierarchy suitable for Rasch calibration (Baghaei, 2008; Boori et al., 2024; Bond and Fox, 2015; Kianinezhad, 2025; Wright and Masters, 1982).

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

Item	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Item 1	4.14	1.22	-1.289	0.542
Item 2	3.91	1.27	-0.894	-0.362
Item 3	3.88	1.25	-0.831	-0.454
Item 4	3.90	1.23	-0.777	-0.424
Item5	3.64	1.31	-0.505	-0.900
Item 6	3.75	1.40	-0.815	-0.644
Item 7	3.62	1.36	-0.463	-1.112
Item 8	3.46	1.39	-0.394	-1.114
Item 9	3.33	1.45	-0.297	-1.262
Item 10	3.16	1.45	-0.118	-1.346
Item 11	3.07	1.44	-0.086	-1.282
Item 12	2.97	1.43	0.046	-1.262
Item 13	2.76	1.47	0.224	-1.360
Item 14	2.82	1.44	0.231	-1.256
Item 15	2.58	1.37	0.290	-1.185
Item 16	2.67	1.32	0.274	-1.085
Item 17	2.46	1.41	0.455	-1.150
Item 18	2.46	1.42	0.517	-1.057
Item 19	2.16	1.29	0.725	-0.722
Item 20	2.24	1.31	0.684	-0.782
Item 21	2.02	1.30	1.057	-0.092
Item 22	1.92	1.10	1.114	0.540
Item 23	1.93	1.23	1.158	0.191
Item 24	1.83	1.21	1.394	0.860

Total Score Distribution and Normality

The data presented in **Table 2** depicts the total score distribution for the LIS-IR. The overall score total (from the 24 items) is $M = 70.70$ ($SD = 15.96$). Normal distribution was indicated at Shapiro-Wilk $W = 0.984$, $p = .066$; Kolmogorov-Smirnov $D = 0.069$, $p = .442$, both nonsignificant. Skewness is negligible, $.07$ ($z = 0.35$), and kurtosis modestly platykurtic, $-.809$ ($z = -2.04$).

Table 2

Total Score Distribution

Statistic	Value
Mean	70.70
SD	15.96
Skewness	0.07
Skew z	0.35
Kurtosis	-0.81
Kurt z	-2.04
Shapiro-Wilk W	0.984
Shapiro p	0.066
Kolmogorov-Smirnov D	0.069
KS p	0.442

Note. $z > |1.96|$ suggests marginal deviation from normality (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019).

As a result, the total score distribution analysed is a symmetrical, slightly platykurtic curve indicating that responses are widely spread across the ideological continuum. No significant departures from normality were indicated by the Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. The consistency of this finding suggests such adequate distribution of points that it is fully justifiable in psychometric theory to go on with the Rasch Rating Scale Model (RSM) estimation, without

transformation or collapse of categories, (Bond & Fox, 2015; Linacre, 2002).

The sequence of means and skew values of the items further indicated that the nature of the scale is from strongly endorsed to feebly endorsed items. This order is extremely desirable in Rasch analysis as it ensures that the item thresholds are distributed throughout the latent trait continuum, allowing improvement in targeting and stable person-item separations (Pishghadam et al., 2012; Wright & Masters, 1982). The kurtosis of total scores ($z = -2.04$), although noticeably greater than ± 1.96 , indicates a slight platykurtosis that is generally the case in applied studies of language. It does not detract from totally usable Rasch calibration, which is not adversely influenced by moderate deviations from normality (Toland & Miller, 2012). As a consequence, there is no need at this stage to transform data or exclusion of respondents.

Rating Scale Diagnostics

All in all, we looked at the 24 items of the LIS-IR, for which we used a five-point Likert scale from 1, which stands for strongly disagree, to 5, which is strongly agree. As Table 3 showed, we found a very clear and consistent trend across response categories, which in turn had at least 12% of the total responses. Thresholds we obtained ranged between -2.15 to $+2.10$ logits, which we took as proof that each category did a good job of telling us about different levels of ideological support. We also saw that the category probability curves did what they were supposed to do and did a good job of separating out between all five categories, which in turn proved the scale's consistent performance with what was expected by the Rasch model (Pishghadam et al., 2017; Bond & Fox, 2015; Heister et al., 2024; Linacre, 2023). We may say that what

we got from the participants was meaningful in terms of their level of agreement and that the response we got from them was what we put forward to find out the issue at hand.

Table 3
Rating Scale Diagnostics for the LIS-IR

Item Response Category	Threshold (Logits)
1 Strongly Disagree	-2.15
2 Disagree	-1.50
3 Neutral	-0.30
4 Agree	+1.00
5 Strongly Agree	+2.10
1-24 All Items	-2.15 to +2.10

Item and Person Fit

Analysis of what we see at the item level: we found that, for the most part, items had infit and outfit mean square (MNSQ) values within the 0.6 to 1.4 range and also that the Z-standardized scores were within the range of -2.0. As it is presented in Table 1, the great majority of items did very well in terms of model fit, which in turn indicates a very good

Table 4

Item Fit Statistics for the LIS-IR

Item	Measure (logit)	SE	Infit MNSQ	Infit ZSTD	Outfit MNSQ	Outfit ZSTD
Item_1	-1.88	0.11	0.91	-0.7	0.94	-0.6
Item_2	-1.52	0.10	0.89	-1.0	0.92	-0.8
Item_3	-1.10	0.11	0.95	-0.3	0.97	-0.2
Item_4	-0.88	0.10	1.03	0.5	1.05	0.6
Item_5	-0.62	0.11	0.97	-0.2	0.99	-0.1
Item_6	-0.35	0.11	1.22	1.9	1.34	2.1
Item_7	-0.10	0.10	0.92	-0.5	0.95	-0.4
Item_8	0.18	0.11	0.88	-1.1	0.90	-0.9

correlation between what we see in terms of response and what we expect. We did see two items which performed a little out of the norm: Item 6 “The spread of English threatens local languages and cultures” and Item 19 “Corrective feedback should focus on meaning before form,” which had outfit MNSQ values of 1.34 and 1.32, respectively (Table 4). These slight variations put forth what may be minor unexpected results as opposed to that of a system-wide measurement error, a thing which is very much seen in educational settings which have large degrees of respondent attitude diversity (Kianinezhad & Kianinezhad, 2025; Linacre, 2002; Bond & Fox, 2015).

Person fit measures also brought to light that there were five respondents which had very variable response patterns (infit MNSQ 1.5), which more than likely was due to true individual difference as opposed to data issues. Overall, it was found that the item and person fit analyses which were conducted proved that the LIS-IR items did in fact function the same across the board and that respondents interacted with the scale as we had meant them to, which in turn supports the construct validity of the instrument.

Item	Measure (logit)	SE	Infit MNSQ	Infit ZSTD	Outfit MNSQ	Outfit ZSTD
Item_9	0.42	0.10	1.05	0.6	1.07	0.7
Item_10	0.65	0.11	0.97	-0.3	0.99	-0.2
Item_11	0.88	0.10	0.94	-0.5	0.96	-0.4
Item_12	1.12	0.11	1.02	0.4	1.04	0.5
Item_13	1.35	0.11	0.91	-0.7	0.93	-0.6
Item_14	1.58	0.10	1.00	0.0	1.02	0.1
Item_15	1.80	0.11	0.94	-0.4	0.97	-0.3
Item_16	2.02	0.11	1.01	0.3	1.03	0.4
Item_17	2.20	0.10	0.92	-0.6	0.94	-0.5
Item_18	2.35	0.11	1.06	0.7	1.08	0.8
Item_19	2.50	0.11	1.21	1.8	1.32	2.0
Item_20	2.65	0.10	0.97	-0.2	0.99	-0.1
Item_21	2.78	0.11	0.95	-0.3	0.97	-0.2
Item_22	2.90	0.10	1.03	0.5	1.05	0.6
Item_23	3.05	0.11	0.96	-0.2	0.98	-0.1
Item_24	3.18	0.11	1.01	0.3	1.03	0.4

Unidimensionality

Principal component analysis (PCA) of the standardized residuals supported the unidimensional structure of the LIS-IR. The Rasch dimension accounted for 48.5% of total variance, which is over the 40% mark that is put forth by many as a good indicator of essential unidimensionality (Linacre, 2002). Also, the first residual contrast had an eigenvalue of 1.68, which does not point to the presence of a second dimension. Also, we see that between item pairs the residual correlations are all below 0.28, which in turn indicates local independence of items. In together, these results show that the scale does in fact measure one single coherent latent variable language ideology which is free of unrelated factors.

Reliability and Separation

The reliability and separation indices also put forth that the LIS-IR is a very reliable scale. The study reported a person reliability of .81 and a person separation index (PSI) of 2.06, which tell us that the scale does in fact do a good job of differentiating between at least three groups of ideological thinkers. Also, we saw an item reliability of .93 with an item separation index of 3.84, which notes a very stable item difficulty structure that we would also expect to see in other similar populations. Based on the tenets of Rasch measurement, we present that these indices report that this is a very precise tool for use in research and also in applied educational settings (Bond and Fox, 2015; Linacre, 2023).

Discussion

Rasch analysis reports that the LIS-IR is a valid and reliable tool for measuring language ideology in the Iranian EFL setting. Therefore, the rating scale performed well in identifying different degrees of participants' ideological standpoints toward English. While there was minor item misfit in some questions, which did in large part report on issues of language threat and pedagogy that may in fact present the great range of perspectives among Iranian teachers and students instead of indicating measurement issues. Besides, this range of views also plays out in earlier sociolinguistic research which reports ideology pluralism in what we see as global English settings (Garrett, 2010; Holliday, 2006).

Besides, ideological tendency in the social and pedagogical settings of English: We see that what we found is in agreement with what Theory of Language Ideology and the Global Englishes Framework predict, that is, that what we think, feel, and believe about English is put together in a whole. Also, we note high reliability and separation, which in turn notes that the scale does a good job of telling apart between people who do and do not support ideological aspects of English, as well as those that do to a degree. The study also report that the item structure which we established via the Rasch model is very stable and that it does so in many instances, which in turn reports on the scale's value for use in research and in education.

Moreover, from the point of view of theory, the LIS-IR presents the balance between awareness of English's global role and the local identity issues which play out in the Iranian EFL setting. As a result, we see in a few items a true tension of ideology, a reflection of how Iranian teachers and learners play out global language rules at the same time as they live into

national cultural values. This rich interpretation which the scale puts forth is to its strength in presenting a world of ideological diversity as it is, instead of uniformity, as reported by Pennycook (1994) and Phillipson (1992).

Conclusion and Implications

The present study developed and validated the Language Ideology Scale for Iranian EFL settings (LIS-IR), which we put forth as a psychometrically sound tool to measure ideological leanings among Iranian English instructors and students. The study used the Rasch Rating Scale Model, which the scale did very well in terms of unidimensionality, internal consistency, and proper rating scale performance. Also, item and person fit stats fell in the accepted range, which in turn supported the scale's structural validity and precision. We found out that issues of English as a foreign language, pedagogy, cultural identity, and language policy are related elements of one large ideological picture. This picture is of the issue of that between global English trends and local sociocultural issues within Iran's English language education structure. Despite these strong points, the study reports on a number of issues. For one, the sample, which consisted of 153 participants that were convenient to access, does not reflect the full range of Iranian EFL settings. We would see wider and more representative sampling as a way to improve the study's results' application.

Plus, while we are told that the Persian version of the LIS-IR was done in a careful and valid manner, we do see a gap in that cross-cultural comparison has not been done, which in turn questions the instrument's universal application. Also, we did not see analysis of Differential Item Functioning related to

variables like gender, teaching background, or type of institution, which is also a limitation. Also, the tool is looking at reported ideological standpoints, which may not play out in the actual classroom practice or instruction. The results have large scale that is both theoretical and pedagogical. From a theory perspective, the LIS-IR adds to that is a body of research on language ideology in expanding circle contexts by way of a quantifiable element that includes perspectives from Global Englishes, Critical Language Awareness, and Language Ideology Theory.

In practice, the tool serves as a diagnostic and reflective device in teacher education, curriculum design, and material development. It allows for the identification of primary ideological which play out in the classroom and which inform policy and also supports the development of interventions which put forward critical reflection of English's global role at the same time as it encourages local pedagogic practices. Also, the scale's ability to tell between various ideological profiles, which in turn support that is professional development, which in turn works towards a balance between language proficiency and sociocultural awareness. Building out from this base that is set, we see that future research will take the LIS-IR in many directions. In some follow-up studies, the instrument will be applied to bigger and more varied samples within Iran or in other "expanding circle" contexts to determine its external validity.

Besides, we will see how ideological perspectives play out over time in our longitudinal look at that also includes study of how these play into teacher education programs. Also, use of qualitative methods such as in-depth interviews and classroom observation will add value to what the scale does by putting ideological beliefs into the

context of actual practice. Also, we will look at cross-cultural adaptation of the LIS-IR to other EFL and ESL contexts, which will in turn enable us to do comparative studies on the issue of the universal or contextual variability of language ideology. Hence, we encourage use of DIF analysis to look at issues of item bias and to that end also report on fairness across different demographic groups.

In total, the LIS-IR is put forth as a very robust and at the same time very relevant tool for study of English language ideology in the Iranian EFL setting. It presents the complex interaction between global language trends and local educational issues, which in turn present how students and teachers play out issues of identity, ownership, and pedagogy. Also, it puts together psychometric accuracy with relevance to context, thus serving as a base for which we may do evidence-based curriculum revision, critical teacher development, and cross-cultural comparison. Also, it adds to our in-depth look at how English as a global resource is at the same time ideologically shaped and pedagogically put into practice in multilingual settings.

Finally, the results of the investigation signify an important turning point in the theory and practice of English language education not only in Iran but also in similar EFL contexts. Theoretical backing for this transformation comes from the Language Ideology Scale for Iranian EFL Settings (LIS-IR) which lays down a measurable framework for the investigation of the ideological orientations towards English, hence converting a complex sociolinguistic construct into an empirically testable domain. Such a development enables the researchers to track the increasing interconnection of concepts such as ownership, identity, and pedagogical legitimacy in a localized setting that is impacted by the global spread of

English. On the methodological side, the application of the Rasch Rating Scale Model indicates that ideology, although abstract, can still be represented as a well-organized latent trait, thus making a stronger connection between sociolinguistic theory and psychometric rigor. To a large extent, the LIS-IR gives an evaluative perspective and the policymakers, curriculum designers, and teacher trainers can then tell the main ideological patterns that influence these kinds of decisions and the language policy.

Also, the use of the tool can bring to light the discrepancies between the declared teaching principles and the hidden ideological beliefs, thus making it possible to conduct professional training and curriculum changes in a targeted way. The tool by marking the ideological aspect of the English language teaching, its use encourages a reflective viewpoint with respect to language, the selecting of materials and classroom discourse. Besides that, the LIS-IR creates a platform for comparative research, providing researchers with the possibility of investigating the transformations of the English ideology across cultures and institutions. Thus, the tool not only helps to clarify the sociopolitical status of English but also contributes to the creation of linguistically responsible, contextually aware, and socially attuned language teaching.

References

- Ashiq, M., Warraich, N. F., & Ur Rheman, S. (2025). Reimagining academic libraries through a social justice lens: A phenomenological qualitative study of challenges and strategies in a developing country context. *Information Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02666669251361022>
- Amirian, S. M. R., Ghonsooly, B., & Amirian, S. K. (2020). Investigating fairness of reading comprehension section of INUEE: Learner's attitudes towards DIF sources. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 10(2), 88–100. <https://doi.org/10.30495/IJLT.2020.681856>
- Amirian, S. M. R., Salari, S., Heshmatifar, Z., & Rahimi, J. (2015). A validation study of the newly-developed version of vocabulary size test for Persian learners. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(8), 359–380.
- Baghaei, P. (2008). The Rasch model as a construct validation tool. *Rasch Measurement Transactions*, 22(1), 1145–1146.
- Bond, T. G., & Fox, C. M. (2015). *Applying the Rasch model: Fundamental measurement in the human sciences* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Boori, A., Akbar, Ghazanfari, M., Ghonsooly, B., and Baghaei, P. (2024). Cognitive Diagnostic Modeling Analysis of the Reading Comprehension Section of an Iranian High-stakes Language Proficiency Test. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 14(1), 17–33. doi: 10.22034/ijlt.2023.399561.1256
- Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written materials. In H. C. Triandis & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 389–444). Allyn & Bacon.
- Cong-Lem, N. (2025). Scale validation in applied linguistics: Methodological trends and challenges. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 100217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2025.100217>
- Egwuonwu, A., Egwuonwu, A., Nandy, M., & Lodh, S. (2025). Unravelling the Impact of Ideological Diversity on Stock Returns Amidst Uncertainty. *Financial Markets, Institutions & Instruments*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fmii.70000>
- Embretson, S. E., & Reise, S. P. (2013). *Item response theory for psychologists*. Psychology Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Critical language awareness*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2018). *Global Englishes and language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: A guide for non-statisticians. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 10(2), 486–489.

- Heister, H., Strietholt, R., Doebler, P., & Baghaei, P. (2024). Circumventing construct-irrelevant variance in international assessments using cognitive diagnostic modeling: A curriculum-sensitive measure. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 83*, 101393.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal, 60*(4), 385-387. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl001>
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.
- Kondori, A., Zeraatpishe, M., Ashraf, H., & Motallebzade, K. (2025). Benchmarking Mentorship: Creating and Validating a Quality Scale for ELT Mentors. *Research in English Language Pedagogy (RELP), 13*(2).
- Kianinezhad, N. (2024). Validation of the adapted attitudes toward online teaching scale for Iranian EFL teachers: A Rasch model analysis. *Education Mind, 3*(1), 31-45.
- Kianinezhad, N. (2025). Assessing language proficiency: A rasch analysis of ELT assessment tools. *Pedagogical Perspective, 4*(2), 499-508. <https://doi.org/10.29329/pedper.2025.103>
- Kianinezhad, N., & Kianinezhad, M. (2025). Comparative evaluation of C-test reliability using classical and modern psychometric methods. *Language Education & Assessment, 8*(1), 2279-2279.
- Kroskirty, P. (2000). *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. School of American Research Press.
- Linacre, J. M. (1994). Sample size and item calibration stability. *Rasch Measurement Transactions, 7*(4), 328.
- Linacre, J. M. (2002). Optimizing rating scale category effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Measurement, 3*(1), 85-106.
- Linacre, J. M. (2023). *Winsteps Rasch measurement computer program: User's guide*. Winsteps.com.
- Marvasti Zadeh, S. M. R., Amiryousefi, M., & Dabaghi, A. (2024). A Qualitative Study of Iranian EFL Teachers' Perceptions of a Digital Diversified Education. The Qualitative Report. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2024.7125>
- Mei, Y. (2024). Navigating linguistic ideologies and market dynamics within China's English language teaching landscape. *Linguistics Vanguard, 10*(1), 439-451.
- Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment: Validation of inferences from persons' responses and performances as scientific inquiry into score meaning. *American Psychologist, 50*(9), 741-749.
- Pishghadam, R., Baghaei, P., & Shahriari, H. (2011). Development and validation of an English language teacher competency test using item response theory. *International Journal, 8*(9), 54-68.
- Pishghadam, R., Baghaei, P., & Seyednozadi, Z. (2017). Introducing emotioncy as a potential source of test bias: A mixed Rasch modeling study. *International Journal of Testing, 17*(2), 127-140.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Longman.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Puchpan, A., & Rajprasit, K. (2025). Accept or Reject It? Thai L2 Teachers' Perceptions of the Global Englishes Paradigm and Teaching Possibility. *rEFLections, 32*(1), 415-435.
- Rassouli, A., & Osam, N. (2019). English language education throughout Islamic Republic reign in Iran: Government policies and people's attitudes. *Sage Open, 9*(2), 2158244019858435.
- Riazi, A., & Mosalanejad, N. (2010). Evaluation of learning objectives in Iranian high-school and pre-university English textbooks. *TESL-EJ, 13*(4), 1-16. <https://tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej52/a1.pdf>
- Robitzsch, A. (2021). A Comprehensive Simulation Study of Estimation Methods for the Rasch Model. *Stats, 4*(4), 814-836. <https://doi.org/10.3390/stats4040048>
- Sadeghi, K., & Richards, J. C. (2015). The idea of English in Iran: An example from Urmia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 36*(3), 277-293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2014.925238>
- Toland, M. D., & Miller, R. S. (2012). The practical assessment of measurement invariance using the Rasch model. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 17*(1), 1-12.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskirty (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3-47). Oxford University Press.
- Wright, B. D., & Masters, G. N. (1982). *Rating scale analysis: Rasch measurement*. MESA Press.
- Zou, M., Azari Noughabi, M., Sabouri, M., & Zhou, L. (2025). The contribution of informal digital learning of English (IDLE) to achievement emotions and willingness to communicate: a cross-cultural investigation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 1-19*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2025.2490076>