



Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)

Vol. 22, No. 1, September 2019, 185-242

Development of Quality of Classroom Life Questionnaire in L2 Contexts: Investigating the Impact of Modular Instruction

Parisa Tahan Shizari, Farid Ghaemi *, Natasha Pourdana, Kobra Tavassoli

Department of ELT and Translation, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran

Abstract

Quality of Classroom Life is considered as a serious issue in academia around the world, and it has recently received global inquiry in EFL and ESL contexts. However, no questionnaire has been developed to assess the Iranian students' and teachers' attitudes towards the quality of life in the classroom. After developing a conceptual framework, the final draft of the developed questionnaire with 71 items was administered to the main sample of participants (n=150). An Exploratory Factor Analysis was performed to identify the components of the instrument, followed by Confirmatory Factor Analysis to measure its construct validity. As a result, the final draft of the Quality of Classroom Life Questionnaire comprised 71 Likert-point items. In phase 2, a number of EFL students and teachers (50 teachers and 322 students) participated in the study which was intended to observe the impact of Modular Instruction on the Quality of Classroom Life. Findings of the study suggested that: (a) the Iranian students and teachers had highly positive attitude towards the Quality of Classroom Life, and believed that educational view, teaching quality, classroom environment, classroom management, quality of classroom interactions and puzzle content played a crucial role in exploratory practice; and (b) the modular instruction which was the descendant of Postmethod instruction had a positive impact on the Quality of Classroom Life. The findings promise implications for teachers and teacher educators as well as the materials developers as the knowledge of classroom quality and modular instruction can enhance their understanding of the nature and conditions of learning.

Keywords: Attitude, Modular Instruction, Perception, Quality of Classroom Life, Questionnaire, Exploratory Practice

Article Information:

Received: 28 May 2019

Revised: 11 July 2019

Accepted: 25 July 2019

Corresponding author: Department of ELT and Translation, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran Email: ghaemi@kiaau.ac.ir

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

The last decade of the twentieth century has been described as a period of development and consolidation in language teacher education. What seems to have emerged is a general agreement that traditional models of teacher education are based on the limited and limiting concept of knowledge transmission. Now more than ever, it can be observed that teacher educators care for constructs such as quality of classroom life and teacher knowledge which play a crucial role in learning and teaching (Kumaravadivelu, 2005). The pedagogical tendencies which have characterized second/foreign language teaching have been extensive. According to Stern (1983), the conceptualization of language teaching has a long, fascinating, but rather tortuous history, and Brown (2000, P.137) phrases it as “changing winds and shifting sands of language teaching”. This history has been formed mainly in terms of diverse teaching methods and procedures, each of which has attempted to find more effective and efficient ways of teaching languages and each of which has been based on different views of what languages are and of how they are best taught. The present study is inspired by the Exploratory Practice developed by Dick Allwright (2004) and Modular Instruction developed by Kumaravadivelu (2012).

Accordingly, the quality of classroom life (QoCL) was investigated and a questionnaire has been developed based on the components of QoCL. As of the date of the publication of the present paper, no questionnaire has been proposed to measure the Quality of Classroom Life based on Dick Allwright's Exploratory Practice. Attempt has been made to develop such a questionnaire to explore the quality of life in EFL classes in Iranian context. The questionnaire focuses on the topmost needs and interests as well as the must-take measures to ensure that the teacher and students experience a sense of unity and cooperation.

Furthermore, the impact of modular model for language teacher education on the quality of classroom life has also been investigated. The Modular Model consists of five modules (KARDS): Knowing, Analyzing, Reviewing, Doing and Seeing (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). The proposed model takes a modular view of teacher education with multiple entry points and multiple exit points. It is argued that each module, while autonomous, is part of a larger context, each shaping and being shaped by the others. It is also argued that the model provides a framework for prospective/practicing teachers to construct their own theory of practice, thus helping them transcend their current opposition of marginality. The impact of Modular Instruction on the Quality of Classroom Life has never been investigated in any research around the globe. The present study is the first attempt to practically observe these effects.

Overall, this study can hopefully have very promising results regarding the benefits of quality of classroom life as well as the impact of Modular Instruction on the classroom life.

1.2. The Present Study

The primary goal of this study was to develop a questionnaire to evaluate the quality of classroom life and to investigate the effects of Modular Instruction on promoting the quality of classroom life in EFL contexts. The following research questions were put forth to address these goals:

- 1: What are the components of Quality of Classroom Life based on Exploratory Practice?
- 2: To what extent is the Quality of Classroom Life Questionnaire reliable and valid?
- 3: Does Modular Teaching have any significant effects on the Quality of Classroom Life in EFL classes?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Exploratory practice

EP is especially interesting given the current shift of focus towards developing the quality of teaching in universities and EFL/ESL settings. EP should be of particular interest to those who want to engage in professional development activities that do not compete with the need to conduct more traditional research because it minimizes the 'parasitic' nature of classroom research, 'parasitic' because conventional classroom research takes time and effort from the real learning and teaching activities (Allwright, 2003).

The first aim of EP is to prioritize the quality of life of our learning–teaching environment above any concern for instructional efficiency. The second aim EP tries to achieve is to develop our understandings of the quality of learning–teaching life instead of simply searching for ever 'improved' teaching techniques. Finally EP recognizes the fundamentally social nature of the mutual quest for understanding, in which both learners and teachers can develop. According to Allwright (2004), there are four steps that have to be taken to practice EP as follows: (a) The puzzle, (b) The method, (c) Reflection and interpretation and (d) Implications.

We need fundamental global principles for general guidance (e.g. bringing people together is more fruitful than pushing people apart). We must then work out the implications of these for our everyday local practice ('How can we get our students to work together in our particular context?'). Thinking about acting locally in a principled way generates more thinking about our global principles, and helps us to develop these. 'Think globally, act locally'.

According to Allwright (2004), the principles of EP are as follows: Put quality of life first; Work primarily to understand classroom life; Involve everybody (i.e., learners are co-researchers); work to bring people together (atmosphere of collegiality); work for mutual development; integrate the work for understanding into classroom practice (EP should not be 'parasitic'); Make the work a continuous enterprise.

According to Allwright (2016), working together to understand classroom life as it is the best way for learners and teachers to make their language classroom lives both satisfying and productive. He developed five Propositions about learners, and then proposed Seven Principles for inclusive practitioner research.

The amount of research on the quality of classroom life has been extensive, but no questionnaire has been proposed in the world to measure the Quality of Classroom Life. As mentioned above, the first phase of the present research focused on the development of a questionnaire to measure the factors involved.

2.2. Modular instruction

Modular Instruction is in fact the offspring of Postmethod Instruction, and the first reference to the term postmethod goes back to Kumaravadivelu (1994). Kumaravadivelu (2006), however, traces the roots of the method critique to scholars such as Pennycook (1989) and Prabhu (1990). Pennycook argued that any knowledge is of a political, interested nature in the sense that it represents and safeguards the views of only a certain social group. In other words, knowledge is not objective and any knowledge formulation (and here method can be viewed as a formulation of how English should be taught) “reflects a particular view of the world and is articulated in the interests of unequal power relationships” (pp. 589–590). Prabhu (1990), following another line of argument, rejected the concept of method because it is the teacher who should make the crucial learning and teaching decisions about what works or does not work in his or her classroom based on his or her sense of plausibility or principled pragmatism. Methods do not help teachers in this decision-making process because, by nature, methods are constructed in a general way to make them applicable to a wide range of contexts.

The postmethod discourse has tried to include these concerns in its formulation, and the view of teaching it proposes apparently encompasses

both matters of practice and politics. Three principles, or pedagogies, summarize how postmethod defines L2 teaching: practicality, particularity, and possibility (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, 2003, 2005). The pedagogy of practicality aims at according equal importance to practitioners' theory vis-à-vis those of theoreticians and seeks to empower teachers by encouraging them "to theorize from their practice and practice what they theorize" (Kumaravadivelu, 2006, p. 59), and the pedagogy of particularity is intended to sensitize practitioners to their students' linguistic, social, and cultural background and needs. The pedagogy of Possibility relates language teaching to the process of social transformation by tapping "the sociopolitical consciousness that students bring with them to the classroom" (Kumaravadivelu, 2006, p. 59). Here language teaching acknowledges the critical dimension of the profession.

The modular model, which was introduced in 2012 is structured in the form of five constituent modules—Knowing, Analyzing, Recognizing, Doing and Seeing (KARDS). What teachers have to basically do in order to become self-determining and self-transforming individuals. They have to (a) develop their professional, procedural and personal knowledge base; (b) analyze learner needs, motivation, and autonomy; (c) recognize their own identities, beliefs and values; (d) perform teaching, theorizing and dialogizing; and (e) monitor their own teaching acts. Any viable teacher education program, then, must promote the conditions and capabilities necessary for present and prospective teachers to know, to analyze, to recognize, to do, and to see learning, teaching, and teacher development. It must help them to develop a holistic understanding of what happens in their classroom, so that, eventually, they will be able to theorize from practice and practice what they theorize.

Adopting a post transmission method of teaching, King suggested a modular model for pre-service teachers leading to the use of critical pedagogy in the classroom. On the basis of sociocultural epistemology, preservice teachers should think about their own personal teaching styles and cultural ideologies rather than a specific methodology that has been effective for others in the past (King, 2013).

In 2019 a KARDS questionnaire was used to classify the teachers into a more KARDS-oriented group and a less-KARDS oriented group.

The findings showed that there were four big shifts from “uncertainty of practice to certainty of practice”, “the use of fewer macro-strategies to the use of more macro-strategies”, “linguistic and technical view of language teaching to critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching”, and “conformity to nonconformity to dominant ideologies” in teachers’ professional identities in both groups. The changes were analogous and/or identical in nature but not in quantity, and they should be underscored and incorporated in teacher education programs. (Hassani, Khatib, & YazdaniMoghaddam, 2019a, 2019b).

In spite of the studies mentioned above, the contributions of KARDS to teacher education have not been fully investigated in EFL/ESL contexts to the best knowledge of the researchers. Dearth of research in this specific area in the context of Iran, the substantial credit allocated to the process of professional identity reconstruction in teacher education, and the global wave to ESL/EFL teacher education programs encouraged the researchers to carry out a research on the effects of Modular Instruction (KARDS) on the quality of Classroom Life in Iranian EFL context.

3. Method

3.1. Participants

A non-random convenience method of sampling was used to include the participants who were available and willing to partake in this study. The participants were selected from among the population of university students of English majors at Azad University-Karaj Branch as well as the students at different levels of English proficiency in English Institutes in Karaj.

Two groups of participants were selected for the purpose of instrumentation and validation. The first group of the participants (used for Validation purposes) consisted of undergraduate university students and EFL students, including 145 females and 79 males (N = 224) at Islamic Azad University-Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University_ Karaj Branch (Language

Center) as well as EFL students in Institute for Modern Citizenship Training Center. The researcher also made sure they had already passed a number of English courses.

Table 1

Demographic information for Group 1

| Variables | | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------|---|-----------|------------|
| Gender | Female | 145 | 64.4 |
| | Male | 79 | 35.1 |
| Affiliation | Modern Citizenship Training Center (Students) | 71 | 31.5 |
| | Modern Citizenship Training Center (Teachers) | 42 | 18.6 |
| | Azad University (Karaj) | 70 | 31.1 |
| | IAU Language Center (Karaj) | 42 | 18.6 |

The second group (pretest and post-test group) of the participants consisted of undergraduate university students and EFL students, including 226 females and 96 males (N= 322), at Islamic Azad University-Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University_ Karaj Branch (Language Center) as well as EFL students in Institute for Modern Citizenship Training Center.

Table 2

Demographic information for Group 2

| Variables | | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------|---|-----------|------------|
| Gender | Female | 226 | 70.1 |
| | Male | 96 | 29.8 |
| Affiliation | Modern Citizenship Training Center (Students) | 165 | 51.2 |
| | | 25 | 7.7 |
| | Modern Citizenship Training Center (Teachers) | | |
| | Azad University (Karaj) | 70 | 21.7 |
| | IAU Language Center (Karaj) | 62 | 19.2 |

3.2. Design of the Study

This study had two phases. In Phase 1, after a comprehensive review of literature, a conceptual framework for the Iranian Exploratory Practice questionnaire was developed, followed by piloting and validating procedures and then the questionnaire was pre-tested and post-tested to observe the effects of modular instruction on the quality of classroom life.

3.2.1. Phase 1: Development of a Theoretical Framework

The questionnaire on Quality of Classroom Life is intended to collect the statistically relevant and significant information about the quality of classroom life in Iranian EFL context. The questionnaire is extracted from a number of articles and papers by Allwright (2003, 2004), Rio, Lyra, Fish and Braga (2003), Coleman (2006), Winch (1996), Celani (2006), Moos and David (1981), Kuschnir and Machado (2003), Gunn (2003), etc. The components were transformed into a questionnaire with initial 71 items. The 71 items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (a) strongly disagree, (b) disagree, (c) no idea, (d) agree and (e) strongly agree. The

participants were required to recognize the tracks of Quality of Classroom Life Questionnaire in the paraphrased texts (if any) and choose one option. The initial draft of the questionnaire was designed with seven components as follows:

Component I: General Ideas of QoCRL (items 1-7) in the questionnaire construed the participants' general awareness of QoCRL. The items representing this theme were adapted from the Allwright (2004) and modified to suit the Iranian target academic population.

Component II: Educational View on QoCRL (items 8-11) in the questionnaire presented the ideas put forth by Winch (1996) and modified to address the Iranian academic audience.

Component III: Teaching Quality (items 12-28) in the questionnaire represented the ideas put forth by the Organization for Economic Cooperation (OECD, 1994) and modified to address the Iranian academic audience.

Component IV: Classroom Environment (items 29-32) in the questionnaire represented the ideas put forth by Moos and David (1981) and modified to address the Iranian academic audience.

Component V: Classroom Management (items 33-37) in the questionnaire represented the ideas by Richards (2001) and modified to address the Iranian academic audience.

Component VI: The Quality of Classroom Interaction (items 38-54) in the questionnaire represented the ideas put forth by Coleman (2006), Woods (2006), Wright (2006) and modified to address the Iranian academic audience.

Component VII: Puzzle Content in Exploratory Practice (items 55-71) in the questionnaire represented the ideas put forth by Lyra, Fish Braga and Braga (2003) and modified to address the Iranian academic audience.

3.2.1.1. Exploring Construct Validity of Quality of Classroom Life

The Quality of Classroom Life questionnaire (QoCLQ) was distributed among 187 EFL students. After collecting and entering the responses into the SPSS Ver. 25 (2017), 37 respondents dropped out due to their irresponsible answers. They either checked the same choice across all 71 items or left majority of the items unanswered. Then an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using principal axis factoring method and varimax rotation was run on the data. Preliminary results indicated that the assumption of sampling adequacy

was retained ($KMO = .787 > .60$) (Table 3). the results of Bartlett's test of sphericity ($\chi^2 (2485) = 6262.37, p = .000$) indicated that there were not zero correlations among all items; hence lack of identity.

Table 3

KMO and Bartlett's Test; Quality of Classroom Life Questionnaire (first round of EFA)

| | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | .787 |
| | Approx. Chi-Square | 6262.376 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Df | 2485 |
| | Sig. | .000 |

The first round of EFA on QoCLQ extracted 15 factors which accounted for 58.67 percent of total variance whereas, the EETQ was supposed to measure seven factors.

The statistical analysis displays the factor loadings of the 71 items under the 15 extracted factor. The results indicated that 11 items loaded under irrelevant factors, as follows;

- Items one to seven loaded under the first factor which is labeled as "general idea".
- Items eight to 12 loaded under the second factor which is labeled as "educational view".
- While items 13 to 29 were supposed to load under the third factor "teaching quality", three of the items; i.e. items 17, 20 and 24 had their loadings under irrelevant factors.
- Items 30 to 33 loaded under the fourth factor which is labeled as "classroom environment".
- Items 34 to 38 loaded under the fifth factor which is labeled as "classroom management".

- While items 39 to 55 were supposed to load under the sixth factor “quality of classroom interactions”, four of the items; i.e. items 41, 46, 47 and 53 had their loadings under irrelevant factors.
- And finally, while items 56 to 71 were supposed to load under the seventh factor “puzzle content in exploratory practice”, four of the items; i.e. items 56, 59, 64 and 68 had their loadings under irrelevant factors.

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using principal axis factoring method and varimax rotation was run on the remaining 60 items. Preliminary results indicated that the assumption of sampling adequacy was retained ($KMO = .839 > .60$). The results of Bartlett’s test of sphericity ($\chi^2 (1770) = 5676.71, p = .000$) indicated that there were not zero correlations among all items; hence lack of identity. The second round of EFA on QOCRQ extracted seven factors which accounted for 56.74 percent of total variance (Table 4).

Table 4

Total Variance Explained; Quality of Classroom Life Questionnaire (second round of EFA)

| Factor | Initial Eigenvalues | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
|--------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 11.457 | 19.095 | 19.095 | 11.022 | 18.370 | 18.370 | 7.338 | 12.230 | 12.230 |
| 2 | 6.353 | 10.589 | 29.684 | 5.932 | 9.887 | 28.257 | 7.089 | 11.816 | 24.045 |
| 3 | 5.731 | 9.551 | 39.235 | 5.252 | 8.753 | 37.010 | 6.609 | 11.015 | 35.061 |
| 4 | 4.495 | 7.492 | 46.727 | 4.106 | 6.843 | 43.853 | 4.430 | 7.384 | 42.445 |
| 5 | 3.440 | 5.733 | 52.460 | 3.050 | 5.084 | 48.936 | 2.950 | 4.917 | 47.361 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|-------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| 6 | 2.83 | 4.727 | 57.187 | 2.437 | 4.062 | 52.998 | 2.916 | 4.860 | 52.221 |
| | 6 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2.61 | | | | | | | | |
| | 0 | 4.350 | 61.536 | 2.245 | 3.742 | 56.740 | 2.711 | 4.519 | 56.740 |
| | 1.02 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | 1.702 | 63.238 | | | | | | |
| 9 | | .966 | 1.611 | 64.849 | | | | | |
| 10 | | .933 | 1.556 | 66.404 | | | | | |
| 11 | | .884 | 1.473 | 67.877 | | | | | |
| 12 | | .834 | 1.389 | 69.267 | | | | | |
| 13 | | .810 | 1.349 | 70.616 | | | | | |
| 14 | | .799 | 1.331 | 71.947 | | | | | |
| 15 | | .779 | 1.299 | 73.246 | | | | | |
| 16 | | .742 | 1.236 | 74.482 | | | | | |
| 17 | | .703 | 1.171 | 75.653 | | | | | |
| 18 | | .678 | 1.129 | 76.783 | | | | | |
| 19 | | .664 | 1.106 | 77.889 | | | | | |
| 20 | | .647 | 1.078 | 78.967 | | | | | |
| 21 | | .631 | 1.052 | 80.019 | | | | | |
| 22 | | .611 | 1.018 | 81.038 | | | | | |
| 23 | | .574 | .957 | 81.995 | | | | | |
| 24 | | .544 | .906 | 82.901 | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|------|------|------|--------|
| 25 | | .519 | .865 | 83.765 |
| 26 | | .512 | .854 | 84.619 |
| | | .511 | .852 | 85.471 |
| 28 | .480 | .799 | | 86.271 |
| 29 | .476 | .793 | | 87.064 |
| 30 | .454 | .757 | | 87.821 |
| 31 | .446 | .744 | | 88.565 |
| 32 | .434 | .723 | | 89.288 |
| 33 | .420 | .700 | | 89.988 |
| 34 | .401 | .668 | | 90.655 |
| 35 | .379 | .631 | | 91.287 |
| 36 | .359 | .598 | | 91.885 |
| 37 | .344 | .573 | | 92.458 |
| 38 | .338 | .563 | | 93.021 |
| 39 | .315 | .525 | | 93.546 |
| 40 | .305 | .508 | | 94.055 |
| 41 | .299 | .498 | | 94.553 |
| 42 | .277 | .461 | | 95.014 |
| 43 | .257 | .429 | | 95.442 |
| 44 | .253 | .421 | | 95.864 |
| 45 | .242 | .404 | | 96.267 |
| 46 | .222 | .370 | | 96.638 |
| 47 | .218 | .364 | | 97.002 |

27

| | | | | | | |
|----|------|--------|--------|--|----|------|
| 48 | .215 | .358 | 97.360 | | | |
| 49 | .188 | .313 | 97.673 | | | |
| 50 | .171 | .284 | 97.957 | | | |
| 51 | .161 | .269 | 98.226 | | | |
| 52 | .150 | .250 | 98.477 | | | |
| 53 | .144 | .240 | 98.716 | | | |
| 54 | .129 | .215 | 98.932 | | | |
| 55 | .126 | .210 | 99.142 | | | |
| 56 | .119 | .199 | 99.341 | | | |
| 57 | .107 | .178 | 99.518 | | | |
| 58 | .103 | .172 | 99.690 | | 59 | .094 |
| | .157 | 99.847 | | | | |
| | | 100.00 | | | | |
| 60 | .092 | .153 | | | | |
| | | 0 | | | | |

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

Table 5 displays the factor loadings of the 60 items under the seven extracted factors. All items loaded under their respective factors.

Table 5

Rotated Factor Matrix; Quality of Classroom Life Questionnaire (second round of EFA)

| | Factor | | | | | | |
|---------|--------|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| QOCRQ1 | .011 | .015 | .042 | .795 | .052 | .048 | .027 |
| QOCRQ2 | .088 | .103 | .047 | .817 | .026 | .044 | .008 |
| QOCRQ3 | .119 | .102 | .082 | .776 | .026 | .035 | .048 |
| QOCRQ4 | .012 | .057 | .101 | .766 | .097 | .091 | .031 |
| QOCRQ5 | .116 | .090 | .046 | .766 | .059 | -.007 | .008 |
| QOCRQ6 | .089 | .112 | .090 | .774 | .042 | -.012 | .035 |
| QOCRQ7 | .066 | .048 | .081 | .731 | .062 | .131 | .063 |
| QOCRQ8 | .050 | .095 | .093 | .020 | .714 | .022 | .033 |
| QOCRQ9 | .068 | .025 | .049 | .115 | .773 | .064 | .052 |
| QOCRQ10 | .046 | .073 | .113 | .071 | .754 | .077 | .142 |
| QOCRQ11 | .088 | .092 | .107 | .129 | .742 | .057 | -.004 |
| QOCRQ12 | .042 | .002 | .145 | .010 | .745 | .099 | -.013 |
| QOCRQ13 | .093 | .029 | .681 | -.006 | .087 | .090 | .051 |
| QOCRQ14 | .154 | .117 | .683 | .079 | -.013 | .036 | -.065 |
| QOCRQ15 | -.028 | .128 | .679 | .087 | .048 | .092 | .018 |
| QOCRQ16 | .064 | .064 | .702 | .067 | .085 | .058 | .063 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------|-------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------------|-------------|
| QOCRQ18 | -.047 | .076 | .656 | .076 | .053 | .038 | .038 |
| QOCRQ19 | .087 | .077 | .718 | -.009 | -.043 | .059 | .036 |
| QOCRQ21 | .096 | .032 | .650 | .076 | .022 | -.034 | .013 |
| QOCRQ22 | -.043 | .089 | .618 | .092 | .097 | .099 | -.017 |
| QOCRQ23 | .062 | .087 | .689 | .033 | .048 | -.022 | .084 |
| QOCRQ25 | .032 | .113 | .646 | -.041 | .009 | .050 | -.058 |
| QOCRQ26 | .062 | .034 | .649 | .000 | .045 | .061 | .057 |
| QOCRQ27 | .041 | .063 | .676 | .014 | .042 | .026 | .063 |
| QOCRQ28 | .093 | .116 | .681 | .027 | .053 | .007 | -.020 |
| QOCRQ29 | .056 | .022 | .646 | .082 | .096 | -.014 | -.002 |
| QOCRQ30 | .091 | .124 | .063 | .018 | .051 | .094 | .847 |
| QOCRQ31 | .101 | .101 | .024 | .057 | .040 | .083 | .775 |
| QOCRQ32 | .135 | .067 | .051 | .016 | .063 | .076 | .779 |
| QOCRQ33 | .009 | .053 | .061 | .106 | .047 | .075 | .794 |
| QOCRQ34 | .045 | .048 | .049 | .115 | .027 | .785 | .089 |
| QOCRQ35 | .035 | .086 | .030 | .051 | .080 | .708 | .062 |
| QOCRQ36 | .092 | .018 | .125 | -.022 | .098 | .694 | .070 |
| QOCRQ37 | .056 | .021 | .092 | .121 | .057 | .687 | .069 |
| QOCRQ38 | .042 | .095 | .125 | .030 | .041 | .808 | .025 |
| QOCRQ39 | .059 | .715 | .131 | .022 | .011 | .022 | .041 |
| QOCRQ40 | .072 | .696 | .050 | .099 | .038 | .018 | .063 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------|-------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| QOCRQ42 | .023 | .670 | .082 | .056 | -.054 | .057 | .050 |
| QOCRQ43 | .110 | .741 | .146 | .039 | .076 | -.076 | .069 |
| QOCRQ44 | .121 | .740 | .044 | .069 | .072 | .115 | .014 |
| QOCRQ45 | .037 | .698 | .055 | .090 | .052 | .002 | .037 |
| QOCRQ48 | .055 | .736 | .146 | .056 | .069 | .004 | .029 |
| QOCRQ49 | .128 | .623 | .117 | .073 | .065 | -.002 | -.033 |
| QOCRQ50 | .124 | .768 | .027 | .057 | .010 | .078 | -.083 |
| QOCRQ51 | .049 | .687 | .011 | .051 | -.022 | .060 | .063 |
| QOCRQ52 | .005 | .793 | .095 | .031 | .050 | .038 | .070 |
| QOCRQ54 | .046 | .762 | .103 | -.028 | -.046 | .066 | .042 |
| QOCRQ55 | .062 | .747 | .073 | -.003 | .081 | -.017 | .069 |
| QOCRQ57 | .751 | .038 | .059 | .080 | .053 | .034 | .024 |
| QOCRQ58 | .787 | .008 | .123 | .066 | .016 | -.035 | .083 |
| QOCRQ60 | .763 | .065 | .016 | .087 | .081 | .074 | .076 |
| QOCRQ61 | .766 | .065 | .091 | .074 | .052 | -.011 | .069 |
| QOCRQ62 | .769 | .120 | .117 | .090 | .016 | .014 | .070 |
| QOCRQ63 | .786 | .130 | .001 | -.001 | .033 | .045 | -.006 |
| QOCRQ65 | .758 | .048 | .065 | -.038 | .063 | .101 | -.008 |
| QOCRQ66 | .815 | .075 | .023 | .043 | -.002 | .061 | .027 |
| QOCRQ67 | .768 | .090 | .070 | .098 | .011 | .014 | .033 |
| QOCRQ69 | .717 | .068 | .036 | .048 | .083 | .037 | .046 |
| QOCRQ70 | .714 | .137 | .053 | .012 | -.004 | .009 | -.022 |
| QOCRQ71 | .802 | .035 | .076 | .034 | -.016 | .020 | .044 |

3.2.1.2. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Indices

Table 6 displays the Cronbach's alpha reliability for the general idea section of QOCRQ. The questionnaire enjoyed a reliability index of .92.

Table 6

| <i>Cronbach's Reliability; General Ideal (QOCRQ)</i> | |
|--|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .920 | 7 |

Table 7 displays the item-total-correlations of the items measuring general idea. All items had at least moderate; i.e. $\geq .30$ contribution to total score.

Table 7

| <i>Item-Total Statistics; General Idea (QOCRQ)</i> | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Scale Mean if Deleted | Scale Corrected Item Deleted | Item- Cronbach's Correlation | Item Variance Deleted |
| QOCRQ1 | 16.95 | 55.541 | .754 | .907 |
| QOCRQ2 | 16.95 | 55.011 | .789 | .904 |

| | | | | |
|--------|-------|--------|------|------|
| QOCRQ3 | 16.96 | 54.844 | .760 | .907 |
| QOCRQ4 | 16.99 | 55.825 | .742 | .909 |
| QOCRQ5 | 17.04 | 56.253 | .739 | .909 |
| QOCRQ6 | 16.94 | 55.251 | .758 | .907 |
| QOCRQ7 | 16.97 | 56.845 | .717 | .911 |

Table 8 displays the Cronbach's alpha reliability for the educational view section of QOCRQ. The questionnaire enjoyed a reliability index of .92.

Table 8

| <i>Cronbach's Reliability; General Ideal (QOCRQ)</i> | |
|--|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .874 | 5 |

Table 9 displays the item-total-correlations of the items measuring educational view. All items had at least moderate; i.e. $\geq .30$ contribution to total score.

Table 9

| <i>Item-Total Statistics; Educational View (QOCRQ)</i> | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
| QOCRQ8 | 11.33 | 27.593 | .669 | .856 |
| QOCRQ9 | 11.28 | 26.377 | .724 | .842 |
| QOCRQ10 | 11.43 | 26.730 | .717 | .844 |
| QOCRQ11 | 11.40 | 26.658 | .702 | .848 |
| QOCRQ12 | 11.38 | 26.761 | .699 | .848 |

Table 10 displays the Cronbach's alpha reliability for the teaching quality section of QOCRQ factor removing the three items which failed to contribute to this construct. The questionnaire enjoyed a reliability index of .92.

Table 10

Cronbach's Reliability; Teaching Quality (QOCRQ)

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .923 | 14 |

Table 11 displays the item-total-correlations of the items measuring teaching quality. All items had at least moderate; i.e. $\geq .30$ contribution to total score.

Table 11

Item-Total Statistics; Teaching Quality (QOCRQ)

| | Scale Mean if | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|---------|---------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| QOCRQ13 | 37.31 | 183.905 | .663 | .917 |
| QOCRQ14 | 37.27 | 185.180 | .668 | .917 |
| QOCRQ15 | 37.28 | 184.632 | .663 | .917 |
| QOCRQ16 | 37.13 | 183.843 | .687 | .916 |
| QOCRQ18 | 37.24 | 184.667 | .635 | .918 |
| QOCRQ19 | 37.32 | 183.186 | .690 | .916 |
| QOCRQ21 | 37.26 | 186.932 | .629 | .918 |
| QOCRQ22 | 37.21 | 187.722 | .603 | .919 |
| QOCRQ23 | 37.23 | 183.254 | .672 | .917 |

| | | | | |
|---------|-------|---------|------|------|
| QOCRQ25 | 37.17 | 186.100 | .623 | .919 |
| QOCRQ26 | 37.35 | 186.443 | .629 | .918 |
| QOCRQ27 | 37.25 | 184.737 | .655 | .918 |
| QOCRQ28 | 37.15 | 184.233 | .666 | .917 |
| QOCRQ29 | 37.23 | 186.918 | .628 | .918 |

Table 12 displays the Cronbach's alpha reliability for the classroom environment section of QOCRQ. The questionnaire enjoyed a reliability index of .88.

Table 12

| <i>Cronbach's Reliability; Classroom Environment (QOCRQ)</i> | |
|--|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .888 | 4 |

Table 13 displays the item-total-correlations of the items measuring classroom environment. All items had at least moderate; i.e. = > .30 contribution to total score.

Table 13

Item-Total Statistics; Classroom Environment (QOCRQ)

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item- Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|---------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| QOCRQ30 | 8.53 | 14.371 | .802 | .837 |
| QOCRQ31 | 8.57 | 15.845 | .736 | .862 |
| QOCRQ32 | 8.56 | 15.926 | .746 | .859 |
| QOCRQ33 | 8.54 | 15.552 | .735 | .863 |

Table 14 displays the Cronbach's alpha reliability for the classroom management section of QOCRQ. The questionnaire enjoyed a reliability index of .86.

Table 14

Cronbach's Reliability; Classroom Management (QOCRQ)

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .866 | 5 |

Table 15 displays the item-total-correlations of the items measuring classroom management. All items had at least moderate; i.e. $= > .30$ contribution to total score.

Table 15

Item-Total Statistics; Classroom Management (QOCRQ)

| Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | |

| | | | | |
|---------|-------|--------|------|------|
| QOCRQ34 | 11.63 | 23.415 | .728 | .828 |
| QOCRQ35 | 11.61 | 23.972 | .658 | .845 |
| QOCRQ36 | 11.63 | 24.274 | .653 | .846 |
| QOCRQ37 | 11.67 | 24.573 | .649 | .847 |
| QOCRQ38 | 11.83 | 23.187 | .751 | .822 |

Table 16 displays the Cronbach's alpha reliability for the quality of classroom interactions section of QOCRQ factor removing the four items which failed to contribute to this construct. The questionnaire enjoyed a reliability index of .94.

Table 16

| <i>Cronbach's Reliability; Quality of Classroom Interactions (QOCRQ)</i> | |
|--|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .938 | 13 |

Table 17 displays the item-total-correlations of the items measuring quality of classroom interaction. All items had at least moderate; i.e. = > .30 contribution to total score.

Table 17

| <i>Item-Total Statistics; Quality of Classroom Interactions (QOCRQ)</i> | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
| QOCRQ39 | 34.84 | 182.793 | .703 | .933 |
| QOCRQ40 | 34.83 | 183.997 | .682 | .934 |

| | | | | |
|---------|-------|---------|------|------|
| QOCRQ42 | 34.81 | 185.889 | .653 | .934 |
| QOCRQ43 | 34.80 | 182.685 | .736 | .932 |
| QOCRQ44 | 34.78 | 182.495 | .729 | .932 |
| QOCRQ45 | 34.75 | 184.536 | .683 | .934 |
| QOCRQ48 | 34.81 | 183.607 | .729 | .932 |
| QOCRQ49 | 34.71 | 187.954 | .620 | .935 |
| QOCRQ50 | 34.79 | 181.874 | .750 | .931 |
| QOCRQ51 | 34.85 | 184.560 | .667 | .934 |
| QOCRQ52 | 34.85 | 179.137 | .773 | .931 |
| QOCRQ54 | 34.81 | 181.200 | .741 | .932 |
| QOCRQ55 | 34.71 | 181.001 | .729 | .932 |

Table 18 displays the Cronbach's alpha reliability for the puzzle content in exploratory practice section of QOCRQ factor removing the four items which failed to contribute to this construct. The questionnaire enjoyed a reliability index of .95.

Table 18

| <i>Cronbach's Reliability; Puzzle Content (QOCRQ)</i> | |
|---|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .948 | 12 |

Table 19 displays the item-total-correlations of the items measuring puzzle content in exploratory practice. All items had at least moderate; i.e. $= > .30$ contribution to total score.

Table 19

Item-Total Statistics; Puzzle Content (QOCRQ)

| | Scale Mean if Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|---------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| QOCRQ57 | 30.81 | 166.153 | .738 | .944 |
| QOCRQ58 | 30.89 | 164.901 | .773 | .942 |
| QOCRQ60 | 30.83 | 166.381 | .752 | .943 |
| QOCRQ61 | 30.87 | 164.761 | .756 | .943 |
| QOCRQ62 | 30.91 | 164.582 | .767 | .943 |
| QOCRQ63 | 30.89 | 164.566 | .769 | .943 |
| QOCRQ65 | 30.97 | 167.878 | .738 | .944 |
| QOCRQ66 | 30.95 | 164.609 | .796 | .942 |
| QOCRQ67 | 30.93 | 165.351 | .760 | .943 |
| QOCRQ69 | 30.91 | 168.617 | .709 | .945 |
| QOCRQ70 | 30.90 | 168.789 | .697 | .945 |
| QOCRQ71 | 30.89 | 165.076 | .781 | .942 |

3.2.1.3 Testing Assumptions

As it was mentioned above, the data were analyzed through paired-samples t-test which assumes lack of univariate and multivariate outliers and normality

of data. The univariate outliers were detected by computing standardized scores (Z-scores) for the dependent variables. The participants whose Z-scores were higher than ± 3 , were considered as outliers, and hence, dropped out of analyses. As displayed in Table 21, all variables had Z-scores higher than ± 3 . The following ID numbers were dropped out; 61, 72, 89, 101, 102, 112, 135, 157, 161, 240, 260, 360, 378, 391, 398 and 399.

Table 20

Descriptive Statistics of Standardized Scores

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-------------------------|-----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| Zscore (Pre-QOCRQ) | 400 | -3.146 | 3.426 | .000 | 1.00 |
| Zscore (Post-QOCRQ) | 400 | -4.528 | 1.866 | .000 | 1.00 |
| Zscore (Pre-Effective) | 400 | -3.853 | 2.888 | .000 | 1.00 |
| Zscore (Post-Effective) | 400 | -3.860 | 1.849 | .000 | 1.00 |

The multivariate outliers were identified by computing the Mahalanobis Distances (Table 21) which were compared against the critical value of chisquare for 4 degrees of freedom, there were 4 dependent variables in this study, at .001 levels of significance (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2014); i.e. 18.46. Twelve more cases; i.e. 51, 64, 65, 114, 155, 182, 225, 252, 273, 309, 368 and 385, whose Mahalanobis D values higher than 18.46, were dropped out.

Table 21

Descriptive Statistics of Mahalanobis Distances

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|----------------------|-----|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| Mahalanobis Distance | 384 | .116 | 38.165 | 3.989 | 5.646 |

After removing the univariate and multivariate outliers, the normality of the data was checked through skewness and kurtosis indices. As displayed in Table 22 the absolute values of the skewness and kurtosis indices were lower than 2, (Bachman 2005, and Bae & Bachman 2010). Thus it was concluded that the present data did not show any significant deviation from normality.

Table 22

Descriptive Statistics; Testing Normality of Data

| Group | | N | Skewness | | Kurtosis | |
|----------|----------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| | | Statistic | Statistic | Std. Error | Statistic | Std. Error |
| Teachers | Pre-QOCRQ | 50 | .354 | .337 | -.592 | .662 |
| | Post-QOCRQ | 50 | .504 | .337 | -.838 | .662 |
| | Pre-Effective | 50 | -.004 | .337 | -.930 | .662 |
| | Post-Effective | 50 | .056 | .337 | -.574 | .662 |
| Students | Pre-QOCRQ | 322 | -.364 | .136 | -.568 | .271 |
| | Post-QOCRQ | 322 | .064 | .136 | -.988 | .271 |
| | Pre-Effective | 322 | -.318 | .136 | .457 | .271 |
| | Post-Effective | 322 | -.313 | .136 | -.647 | .271 |

3.2.2. Phase 2 of the Study: The Impact of Modular Instruction on Quality of Classroom Life

To test the newly-developed Quality of Classroom Life questionnaire, the questionnaire was pre-tested and post-tested after the teachers in the abovementioned institutes were invited to attend classes to get familiar with

the principles of Modular Instruction. The classes were held for 15 sessions. First they were lukewarm reactions to the classes as they thought the classes would not be useful, but after the first four sessions, almost all teachers became interested and attended all the sessions. They all believed that modular instruction opened a new chapter in their worldview about language teaching. The classes were all taught by the researchers and the focus of attention was on the details of KARDS. As a result, the researchers were positive that the instruction would have a positive effect on the quality of the classes taught by the highly motivated teachers.

3.2.2.1. Exploring the Research Question

Does Modular Instruction have any significant effects on the Quality of Classroom Life in EFL classes?

The researchers decided to analyze the second research question using repeated measures ANOVA; however, the assumptions of homogeneity of variances and homogeneity of covariance matrices were not retained. That was why two separate paired-samples t-tests were run to compare the teachers' means on pretest and post-test of QOCRQ. The same analysis was run for the students.

3.2.2.2. Comparing Teachers' Means on Pretest and Post-test of Quality of Classroom Life

A paired-samples t-test was run to compare the EFL teachers' means on pretest and post-test of QOCRQ in order to probe the minor nullhypothesis 2-1. Based on the results displayed in Table 23 it can be claimed that the EFL teachers had higher mean on post-test of QOCRQ ($M = 309.88$, $SD = 18.24$) than pretest ($M = 233.14$, $SD = 19.30$).

Table 23

Descriptive Statistics; Pretest and Post-test of Quality of Classroom Life (Teachers)

| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------|------------|--------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| QOCRQ | Pre-QOCRQ | 233.14 | 50 | 19.301 | 2.730 |
| | Post-QOCRQ | 309.88 | 50 | 18.248 | 2.581 |

The results of the paired-samples t-test ($t(49) = 132.03$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 4.08$ representing a large effect size) (Table 24) indicated that EFL teachers had a significantly higher mean on post-test of QOCRQ than pretest. Thus null-hypothesis **was rejected**. Table 24

Paired-Samples t-test; Pretest and Post-test of Quality of Classroom Life (Teachers)

| Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|------------|----------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------|------|
| 95% Confidence | | | | | | | |
| Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | Interval of the Difference | T | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | |
| | | Mean | Lower | Upper | | | |
| 76.740 | 4.110 | .581 | 75.572 | 77.908 | 132.035 | 49 | .000 |

3.2.2.3. Comparing Students' Means on Pretest and Post-test of Quality of Classroom Life

A paired-samples t-test was run to compare the EFL students' means on pretest and post-test of QOCRQ in order to probe the minor null-hypothesis 2-2. Based on the results displayed in Table 25 it can be claimed that the EFL students had higher mean on post-test of QOCRQ ($M = 305.75$, $SD = 26.13$) than pretest ($M = 226.69$, $SD = 35.55$).

Table 25

Descriptive Statistics; Pretest and Post-test of Quality of Classroom Life (Students)

| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---------------|-----------|--------|-----|----------------|-----------------|
| Effectiveness | PreQOCRQ | 226.69 | 322 | 35.554 | 1.981 |
| | PostQOCRQ | 305.75 | 322 | 26.135 | 1.456 |

The results of the paired-samples t-test ($t(321) = 96.22$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 2.53$ representing a large effect size) (Table 26) indicated that EFL students had a significantly higher mean on post-test of QOCRQ than pretest. Thus null-hypothesis 2-2 **was rejected**.

Table 26

Paired-Samples t-test; Pretest and Post-test of Quality of Classroom Life (Students)

| Paired Differences | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|------------|----------------------------|---|----|-----------------|
| 95% Confidence | | | | | | |
| Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | Interval of the Difference | T | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| | | | Mean _____ | | | |
| | | | Lower Upper | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|------------|------|
| 79.059 | 14.744 | .822 | 77.443 | 80.675 | 96.222 321 | .000 |
|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|------------|------|

Table 27

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices; QOCRQ

| | |
|---------|-----------|
| Box's M | 81.550 |
| F | 26.774 |
| df1 | 3 |
| df2 | 94081.931 |
| Sig. | .000 |

Table 28

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances; QOCRQ

| | | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---------------|---|---------------------|-----|---------|------|
| | Based on Mean | 22.665 | 1 | 370 | .000 |
| | Based on Median | 22.339 | 1 | 370 | .000 |
| Pre- QOCRQ | Based on Median and with adjusted df | 22.339 | 1 | 345.640 | .000 |

| | | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|--------|---|---------|------|
| | Based on trimmed mean | 22.413 | 1 | 370 | .000 |
| | Based on Mean | 12.252 | 1 | 370 | .001 |
| | Based on Median | 12.454 | 1 | 370 | .000 |
| Post-QOCRQ | Based on Median and with adjusted df | 12.454 | 1 | 360.569 | .000 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | 12.546 | 1 | 370 | .000 |

3.2.2.4. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability

Table 29 displays the Cronbach's alpha reliability for the pretests and post-test s of teacher effectiveness and QOCRQ. The results showed that the reliability indices for the pretest and post-test of QOCRQ were .97 and .97, and pretest and post-test of teacher effectiveness enjoyed reliability indices of .92 and .90.

Table 29

| <i>Reliability Statistics; Pretests and Post-tests of QOCRQ</i> | | |
|---|------------------|------------|
| | Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| Pre-QOCRQ | .969 | 71 |
| Post-QOCRQ | .969 | 71 |

4. Discussion

The present study was conducted to fill in the literature gap by developing a valid instrument for assessing EFL/ESL students' knowledge of Quality of Classroom Life and their informed practice in EFL context. This attempt led

to a QoCRL Questionnaire with seven components of General Ideas of QoCRL (items 1-7), Educational View on QoCRL (items 8-11), Teaching Quality (items 12-28), Classroom Environment (items 29-32), Classroom Management (items 33-37), The Quality of Classroom Interaction (items 38-54) and Puzzle Content in Exploratory Practice (items 55-71). Relying on statistical analysis, a new theme of Quality of Classroom Life was explored. Quality of Classroom Life was proved to actively contribute into the Iranian academics' sensitivity to learning in EFL settings. This component was named as Quality of Classroom Life, since it conceptually represented the impact of the social values and normative attitude of the Iranian academic community to learning. The feedback that the researchers received from the participants was in line with the concept of 'Collegiality' advocated by Allwright and it was proved that the students as well as teachers were wholeheartedly advocated the concepts with regard to QoCL.

The Quality of Classroom Life is in fact a comprehensive concept discussed by Allwright (2004) which focuses on components such as Teaching Quality and Classroom Management. The results obtained are unique with regard to the fact that such a questionnaire has not been developed so far and it can be a gateway for researchers and teachers as well as students to look critically at what goes on in the classroom.

The second line of research in this study focused on the impact of modular instruction on the Quality of Classroom Life and it was observed that modular instruction can actively contribute into the Iranian EFL attitudes towards quality in English classes. The results of the study indicated that the modular instruction had an immense impact on Quality of Classroom Life. As of the date of the publication of the present study, no other research has been directed towards the effect of modular instruction. In this study it was observed the teachers who were exposed to Modular Instruction developed a highly positive attitude towards the conditions of learning and their training positively enhanced the rapport between the teachers and students. Their training positively changed the atmosphere for the teachers and students in language classes.

5. Conclusion and Implications

The questionnaire was designed with seven components as follows: Component I consisted of the general Ideas of QoCRL (items 1-7) construed the participants' general awareness of classroom quality. Component II which was the Educational View on QoCRL (items 8-11) in the questionnaire presented to address the Iranian academic audience awareness to instructional aspects of quality. Component III or the Teaching Quality (items 12-28) was modified to address the part of life which is brought up by the teacher and Component IV: Classroom Environment (items 29-32) addressed the Iranian EFL environment. Component V was concerned with the Classroom Management issues (items 33-37). Component VI, the Quality of Classroom Interaction (items 38-54) in the questionnaire, addressed the degree of interaction as one of the important issues to determine classroom quality and finally component VII focused on the Puzzle Content in Exploratory Practice (items 55-71).

Relying on the findings in this study, Iranian L2 academic community has excellent ideas with regard to the quality of classroom life and high positive attitude towards its components. Therefore, it seems that the preliminaries for quality of classroom life are adequately provided in Iranian educational contexts in general, and in L2 context in particular. However, more attention has to be paid to the details of quality to enhance the educational level in Iran. Findings in the second phase of the study also proved that the Iranian L2 academic teachers were highly interested in Modular Instruction as they all attended the training sessions with great enthusiasm. The positive effect of modular instruction on the quality of classroom life is another indication of the interest which can be found in Iranian EFL context. The participants had a more positive attitude towards the quality of classroom life after their teachers got familiar the principles of Modular Instruction and implemented such principles in their classes effectively. In general, knowledge of KARDS enabled the teachers to have a better grasp of the concept of quality and had a statistically significant effect on the attitudes of the students with regard to the concept of quality of classroom life.

Therefore, it seems that in addition to improving the Iranian L2 teachers' awareness, right attitude, and deep perception towards Quality of Classroom Life, their beliefs to the academic misconducts in scholarly activities need to be fundamentally reshaped. The newly-designed Quality of Classroom Life Questionnaire is hoped to properly equip the Iranian teachers, test developers, materials developers, and policymakers with a valid instrument to assess the quality of classroom life in EFL/ESL settings. Moreover, the obtained data in this study can assist the educators to devise remedial tutorial courses to improve the quality of life in classes. It is noteworthy that the data in this study were collected from a large number of participants; however, a non-random sampling procedure was conducted to select only Iranian students studying English as an FL. Therefore, the researchers are skeptical about the findings to be divergent in the further research with participants in other communities with other ethnic backgrounds, since their academic beliefs would not be in complete accordance with the Iranian students.

6. References

Allwright, D. (2003). Exploratory practice: Re-thinking practitioner research in language teaching. *Language Teaching Research* ,7(2),113–41.

Allwright, D.(2004a). Innovation: Going beyond ‘success’. Paper presented at the RELC Seminar, Singapore.

Allwright, D. (2004b). Developing principles for practitioner research: The case of exploratory practice. Paper presented at the AAAL Colloquium, Portland, Oregon, USA, May.

Allwright D., Hanks J. (2016) *The Developing Language Learner: An Introduction to Exploratory Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Bachman, L. F. (2005). Building and supporting a case for test use.

Language Assessment Quarterly, 2, 1–34.
https://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15434311laq0201_1

Bae, J., & Bachman, L. F. (2010). An investigation of four writing traits and two tasks across Two languages. *SAGE*, 27(2) 213-234.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Celani, M. A. (2006). Language teacher educators in search of locally helpful understandings. In S. Gieve& I. K. Miller (Eds.), *Understanding the English classroom* (pp. 226-238). New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Coleman, H. (2006). Darwin and the large class. In: Understanding the language classroom. In S. Gieve & I.K. Miller(eds.). London: Palgrave Macmillan, Chapter 6 in this volume.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gunn, C., McSporran, M., Macleod, H., & French, S. (2003). Dominant or different?Genderissues in computer supported learning. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 7(1), 14-30.

- Hassani, V., Khatib, M., YazdaniMoghaddam, M. (2019). An Investigation of Teachers' Perceptions of KARDS in an EFL Context. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 7(28), 135-153.
- King, E. T. (2013). Review of language teacher education for a global society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing. *TESL-EJ*, 16(4).
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 27– 48.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. London: Yale University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2005). In defence of post-method. *ILI Language Teaching Journal*, 1(1), 15-19.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). *Language Teacher Education for a Global Society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing and seeing*. Routledge. <https://dx.doi.org/978-0-415-87738-1>
- Kuschnir, A.N., & Machado, B.S. (2003). Puzzling, and puzzling about puzzle development. *Language Teaching Research*, 7, (2), 163–80.
- Lyra, I., S., Fish Braga, & Braga, W.G. (2003). What puzzles teachers in Rio de Janeiro, and what keeps them going? *Language Teaching Research*, 7(2), 143–62.
- Moos, R.H. ,& David, T.G. (1981). Evaluating and changing classroom settings. In: J.L. Epstein & P.W. Jackson (Eds.), *The Quality of School Life, Lexington Books* (pp.59-80). Lexington.

Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 589- 618.
[https://dx.doi.org/ 10.2307/3587534](https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587534)

Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no best method-Why? *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 161-176.

Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Winch, C. (1996a). The aims of education revisited. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 30(1), 33-44.

Winch, C. (1996b). Constructing worthwhile curricula. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 30(1), 45-6.

Notes on Contributors:

Parisa Tahan Shizari a PhD Candidate at Islamic Azad University-Karaj Branch. She has taught English at different levels of language proficiency and currently teaches translation courses and Applied Linguistics. She is highly interested in Applied Linguistics, Methodology and PostMethodology. She has participated in various conferences and also published some articles in scholarly journals.

Farid Ghaemi is an assistant professor of Applied Linguistics and ELT. He has taught undergraduate and graduate courses at different universities for more than 30 years. He has published extensively in national and international journals.

Natasha Pourdana is a PhD holder of TEFL who is currently an assistant professor at Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch, Iran. She has several publications on language assessment, translation quality assessment and language teaching. Her fields of interests are formative language assessment, language tasks construction and translation quality assessment.

Kobra Tavassoli is an assistant professor of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran. She is teaching language assessment, research methodology, and language teaching methodology courses at BA, MA, and PhD levels. Her areas of interest are language assessment and teacher education. She has published in different journals and presented in national and international conferences on these topics.

Quality of Classroom Life (QoCRL) Questionnaire

This questionnaire is going to be used to investigate the qualities of classroom life from the perspective of Iranian English language teachers and students. Findings of this study are hoped to be beneficial to both Iranian English language teachers and learners. English language teachers will be able to check the suitability of their own and their colleagues' beliefs regarding foreign language teaching and learning, trying to enhance their teaching practice regarding the needs and purposes of their learners as far as possible. Learners will develop more positive attitudes towards English language learning.

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate your opinion after each statement by putting an X that best describes the extent to which you believe the statement applies to you.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please circle your response to the items. Rate aspects of the questionnaire on a 1 to 5 scale:

1 = "Strongly disagree," or the lowest, most negative impression

2= "Disagree"

3 = "Neither agree nor disagree," or no adequate impression

4= "Agree"

5 = "strongly agree," or the highest, most positive impression

Strongly disagree—Strongly agree

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. General Ideas of QoCRL | | | | | |
| 1-This is an excellent class than any other class. | | | | | |
| 2-The class activities fit my purposes and goals. | | | | | |
| 3- I enjoy being and living in class. | | | | | |
| 4- I have a good feeling about the class. | | | | | |
| 5- The activities give me clear information about culture. | | | | | |
| 6- The information provided in class helps me to use English for social purposes. | | | | | |
| 7- I understand the activities in class perfectly. | | | | | |
| strongly disagree—strongly agree | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| II. Educational View on QoCRL | | | | | |
| 8-The class activities help me reach my goals in life. | | | | | |
| 9-I learn a lot of interesting things in class. | | | | | |
| 10- I will never stop learning English. | | | | | |
| 11-We have all the necessary facilities for learning English in class. | | | | | |
| 12- The staff, teacher and other students are all friendly and helpful. | | | | | |
| III. Teaching Quality | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 13- The teacher masters the subject he/she teaches. | | | | | |
| 14- The teacher is skillful enough to teach the subject matter. | | | | | |
| 15- The teacher can evaluate his/her own teaching. | | | | | |
| 16- The teacher criticizes and corrects himself/herself. | | | | | |
| 17- The teacher empathizes with the students. | | | | | |
| 18- The teacher respects students and pays attention to the students' understanding and feelings. | | | | | |
| 19- The teacher can manage the class effectively. | | | | | |
| 20- The teacher distinguishes the connection between his/her personal and professional lives. | | | | | |
| 21- The teacher knows believes in the concept of work centrality. | | | | | |
| 22- The teacher is highly committed to his/her work. | | | | | |
| 23- The teacher's voice is easy to hear. | | | | | |
| 24- The teacher has a positive feeling about his/her work. | | | | | |
| 25- The teacher is satisfied with his/her job. | | | | | |
| 26- The teacher's morale is very high. | | | | | |
| 27- The teacher tries to avoid student burn-out. | | | | | |
| | strongly disagree → strongly agree | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28- The teacher tries to motivate the students in different ways. | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 29- The teacher tries to reduce the students' stress in different ways. | | | | | |
| IV. Classroom Environment | | | | | |
| 30- The environment of the class is so interesting. | | | | | |
| 31- There is a strong sense of relationship between the teacher and the students. | | | | | |
| 32- The class is directed towards the goals of the students. | | | | | |
| 33- The class is directed towards change. | | | | | |
| V. Classroom Management | | | | | |
| 34- We can observe orderly classroom management and routines. | | | | | |
| 35- The course syllabus is highly organized. | | | | | |
| 36- There are no interruptions in the sense of individual learning needs. | | | | | |
| 37- There is an overall class success rate in general examinations. | | | | | |
| 38- There is complete dedication of time to these common objectives. | | | | | |
| VI. The Quality of Classroom Interaction | | | | | |
| 39- The students understand the materials. | | | | | |
| 40- The quality of interaction is high in the senses of both nature and goodness. | | | | | |
| 41- The learners and teachers make their decisions about teaching and learning. | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 42- The gestures, use of space, dresses, and eye contacts are desirable and based on respect. | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|

Appendix (A)

| | strongly disagree | | | strongly agree | |
|---|-------------------|---|---|----------------|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 43- There is attention to cognitive and affective aspects of learning. | | | | | |
| 44- The students have a sense of creativity, and aesthetic sensibilities. | | | | | |
| 45- There is a lot of attention to affect language learning (being and doing). | | | | | |
| 46- There is a lot of attention to emotions, preferences, and attitudes. | | | | | |
| 47- The classroom participants respond when they perceive and understand the meaning (the language meaning) of speech | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 48- The students simultaneously take an active, responsive attitude toward it | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|



| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 49- There is good interpersonal and interactional relationships with them. | | | | | |
| 50- The teacher uses expressive intonation when addressing students. | | | | | |
| 51- The teacher addresses everyone in the classroom. | | | | | |
| 52- There is continuity in class over days, weeks, months. | | | | | |
| 53- There is continuity in linguistic interaction. | | | | | |
| 54- The use of this shared history of relationship is observed in class. | | | | | |
| VII. Puzzle Content in Exploratory Practice | | | | | |
| 56- The teacher motivates the learners to learn more and enjoy learning. | | | | | |
| 57- The teacher tries to reduce the institutional lack of interest. | | | | | |
| 58- The teacher and students pay attention to the discipline issues in class. | | | | | |
| 59- The learning process leads to social involvement. | | | | | |

| | strongly disagree | | strongly agree | | |
|--|-------------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 60- There are work-oriented puzzles to lead to life-oriented understandings. | | | | | |
| 61- The teacher and students have positive relationship with each other. | | | | | |
| 62- The lessons lead to the understanding of the context in class. | | | | | |
| 63- Both the teacher and learners assume responsibilities during group-work. | | | | | |
| 64- There is positive peer support and constructive attitude in class. | | | | | |
| 65- The interference of learners' life in classroom events is observed. | | | | | |
| 66- The degree of communicative interaction is excellent. | | | | | |
| 67- The moods, personalities, and participation of everyone is taken into account. | | | | | |
| 68- The teacher pays attention to students' confidence, comfort zone, culture and shared background information. | | | | | |
| 69- The written feedback is used in class as a means of clarifying the points and removing the obstacles. | | | | | |



| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 70- The tone, and intention of the teacher show that he empathizes with the students. | | | | | |
| 71- The students have the desire to express puzzles about their lives. | | | | | |

Appendix (B)

Total Variance Explained; Quality of Classroom Life Questionnaire (first round of EFA)

| | Initial Eigenvalues | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| | | % of Total Variance | Cumulative % | | % of Total Variance | Cumulative % | | % of Total Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 11.599 | 16.337 | 16.337 | 11.225 | 15.810 | 15.810 | 7.521 | 10.593 | 10.593 |
| 2 | 6.463 | 9.103 | 25.440 | 6.097 | 8.588 | 24.398 | 7.201 | 10.142 | 20.735 |
| 3 | 5.859 | 8.252 | 33.693 | 5.451 | 7.678 | 32.076 | 6.832 | 9.622 | 30.357 |
| 4 | 4.583 | 6.455 | 40.147 | 4.238 | 5.969 | 38.045 | 4.549 | 6.407 | 36.764 |
| 5 | 3.580 | 5.042 | 45.190 | 3.228 | 4.546 | 42.591 | 3.156 | | |
| | | 4.445 | 41.210 | | | | | | |
| | 0.000 | | | | | | | | |
| | 3.000 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| 6 | | 4.230 | 49.419 | 2.626 | 3.699 | 46.290 | 3.012 |
| | | 4.242 | 45.452 | | | | |
| | 3 | | | | | | |
| | 2.74 | | | | | | |
| 7 | | 3.864 | 53.283 | 2.414 | 3.400 | 49.690 | 2.810 |
| | | 3.957 | 49.409 | | | | |
| | 3 | | | | | | |
| | 1.72 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | 2.424 | 55.707 | 1.143 | 1.609 | 51.299 | .926 |
| | | 1.305 | 50.713 | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | | |
| | 1.60 | | | | | | |
| 9 | | 2.260 | 57.967 | 1.077 | 1.517 | 52.816 | .906 |
| | | 1.276 | 51.989 | | | | |
| | 5 | | | | | | |
| | 1.32 | | | | | | |
| 10 | | 1.870 | 59.837 | .826 | 1.163 | 53.979 | .871 |
| | | 1.226 | 53.216 | | | | |
| | 8 | | | | | | |
| | 1.29 | | | | | | |
| 11 | | 1.817 | 61.654 | .789 | 1.112 | 55.091 | .820 |
| | | 1.155 | 54.371 | | | | |
| | 0 | | | | | | |
| | 1.20 | | | | | | |
| 12 | | 1.692 | 63.346 | .707 | .996 | 56.087 | .817 |
| | | 1.151 | 55.522 | | | | |
| | 2 | | | | | | |
| | 1.14 | | | | | | |
| 13 | | 1.607 | 64.953 | .644 | .907 | 56.994 | .806 |
| | | 1.135 | 56.656 | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------|-------|--------|--------|------|--------|------|
| | 1.11 | | | | | | |
| 14 | | 1.567 | 66.520 | .606 | .853 | 57.846 | .727 |
| | | 1.024 | 57.681 | | | | |
| | 2 | | | | | | |
| | 1.05 | | | | | | |
| 15 | | 1.489 | 68.009 | .589 | .830 | 58.676 | .707 |
| | | .995 | 58.676 | | | | |
| | 8 | | | | | | |
| 16 | | .978 | 1.377 | 69.386 | | | |
| 17 | | .942 | 1.326 | 70.713 | | | |
| 18 | | .900 | 1.268 | 71.981 | | | |
| 19 | | .847 | 1.193 | 73.174 | | | |
| 20 | | .809 | 1.139 | 74.313 | | | |
| 21 | | .760 | 1.070 | 75.383 | | | |
| 22 | | .753 | 1.061 | 76.444 | | | |
| 23 | | .710 | .999 | 77.444 | | | |
| 24 | | .708 | .997 | 78.440 | | | |
| 25 | | .693 | .976 | 79.416 | | | |
| 26 | | .680 | .958 | 80.374 | | | |

| | | | |
|----|------|------|--------|
| 27 | .641 | .903 | 81.277 |
| 28 | .634 | .893 | 82.170 |
| 29 | .617 | .869 | 83.039 |
| 30 | .591 | .832 | 83.871 |
| 31 | .561 | .790 | 84.660 |
| 32 | .544 | .767 | 85.427 |
| 33 | .539 | .758 | 86.186 |
| 34 | .502 | .707 | 86.893 |
| 35 | .485 | .683 | 87.576 |
| 36 | .481 | .678 | 88.254 |
| 37 | .458 | .645 | 88.898 |
| 38 | .423 | .596 | 89.494 |
| 39 | .411 | .579 | 90.073 |
| 40 | .399 | .562 | 90.635 |
| 41 | .397 | .559 | 91.194 |

| | | | |
|----|------|------|--------|
| 42 | .382 | .539 | 91.732 |
| 43 | .364 | .513 | 92.245 |
| 44 | .349 | .492 | 92.737 |
| 45 | .331 | .466 | 93.202 |
| 46 | .318 | .448 | 93.651 |
| 47 | .306 | .431 | 94.082 |
| 48 | .306 | .431 | 94.512 |
| 49 | .289 | .407 | 94.919 |
| 50 | .286 | .402 | 95.321 |
| 51 | .272 | .382 | 95.704 |
| 52 | .246 | .347 | 96.050 |
| 53 | .236 | .332 | 96.382 |
| 54 | .233 | .329 | 96.711 |
| 55 | .214 | .301 | 97.012 |

| | | | | |
|----|------|------|---------|-------------|
| 56 | | .207 | .292 | 97.304 |
| 57 | | .200 | .281 | 97.585 |
| 58 | | .180 | .254 | 97.839 |
| | | 59 | .174 | .245 98.084 |
| 60 | .172 | .242 | 98.326 | |
| 61 | .155 | .218 | 98.544 | |
| | | | 98.74 | |
| 62 | .146 | .205 | 9 | |
| 63 | .129 | .181 | 98.931 | |
| 64 | .120 | .168 | 99.099 | |
| 65 | .110 | .155 | 99.254 | |
| 66 | .103 | .145 | 99.400 | |
| 67 | .100 | .141 | 99.541 | |
| 68 | .095 | .134 | 99.676 | |
| 69 | .094 | .132 | 99.808 | |
| 70 | .071 | .100 | 99.908 | |
| 71 | .065 | .092 | 100.000 | |

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

