Journal of
Language and Translation
Volume 12, Number 3, 2022 (pp. 87-100)

Developing and Validating EFL Teacher Effectiveness Questionnaire: Investigating the Impact of Modular Instruction

Parisa Tahan Shizari[1], Farid Ghaemi[2*], Natasha Pourdana[3], Kobra Tavassoli[4]
[1] Ph.D. Candidate, English Department, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran
[2] Assistant Professor, English Department, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran
[3] Assistant Professor, English Department, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran
[4] Assistant Professor, English Department, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran

Received:November 7, 2021 Accepted: January 9, 2022

ABSTRACT
Teacher effectiveness is regarded as a significant issue in the field of language teaching which has recently received experts' attention in SLA research. However, no valid instrument has been developed to precisely evaluate the attitudes of Iranian EFL students and/or teachers towards different aspects of teacher effectiveness in the classroom. To do so, in the first phase of this study, a conceptual framework was generated after a comprehensive review of the related literature, and the first draft of the newly-developed EFL teacher effectiveness questionnaire with 47 items was developed and validated with 224 participants. To identify the main components of the questionnaire, an Exploratory Factor Analysis followed by a Confirmatory Factor Analysis was carried out to measure its construct validity. Consequently, the final draft of the questionnaire comprised 42 Likert-point items. In the second phase of the study, the participation of 322 EFL students and 50 EFL teachers was demanded to investigate the effect of modular instruction on EFL teacher effectiveness in the real classroom context. The research results suggested that (1) Iranian EFL learners had a highly positive attitude towards teacher effectiveness constructs such as teacher behavior, attitude, rapport, interest, and effective teaching practice, and (2) the modular instructions had a positive effect on EFL teacher effectiveness. The findings had several pedagogical implications for EFL teachers, teacher educators, and materials developers as the knowledge of teacher effectiveness and modular instruction could positively affect the nature and conditions of language teaching and learning.

Keywords: KARDS; Modular instruction; Perception; Teacher effectiveness

INTRODUCTION

Language teacher education has been developed and consolidated in the last decade of the twentieth century. There is a general agreement that traditional models of teacher education are based on the limited and limiting concept of language knowledge transmission (Steenekamp, Merwe, & Mehmedova, 2018). According to Sardabi, Biria, and Ameri Golestan (2018), the conceptualization of language teaching has a long, interesting, but rather twisting history. Similarly, Brown (2000) phrased it as "changing winds and shifting sands of language teaching" (p. 137). This history of language teaching has witnessed many methods and procedures, and they have all tried to find better and more useful ways of teaching languages. Now more than ever, it can be observed that teacher educators care for constructs such as teacher effectiveness which plays a crucial role in learning and teaching (Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

* Corresponding Author's Email: *ghaemi@kiau.ac.ir*

Furthermore, several studies have investigated the impact of modular instruction as a factor affecting second/foreign (L2) teacher effectiveness (Freeman, 2001; Johnson, 2006; Khatib & Miri, 2016). The language teacher education modular model consists of knowing, analyzing, reviewing, doing, and seeing (KARDS) constructs (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). While each module is autonomous, it is still a component of a larger context. It is also believed that the model provides a framework for L2 teachers to theorize their practice, thus helping them upgrade their understanding of the nature of language teaching and learning. The impact of modular instruction on teacher effectiveness has been under-researched in the Iranian EFL teaching context (e.g., Hassani, Khatib & Yazdani Moghadam, 2020), and due to the significance of teacher effectiveness as well as the pivotal role of Modular Instruction in ELT, the present study attempted to develop a teacher effectiveness questionnaire (TEQ) and empirically validate its constructing components and subsequent effects in real EFL classrooms. The following research questions were put forth to address these goals:

Q1. Is the developed Teacher Effectiveness Questionnaire (TEQ) reliable and valid?

Q2. Does modular instruction significantly affect teacher effectiveness in EFL classes?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher Effectiveness

From 1990 onward, technical developments have dominated SLA research in measuring teacher effectiveness. These have been brought about by the invention of two techniques of multi-level modeling (MLM) (see Goldstein 1995) and structural equation modeling (SEM) (see Cochran-Smith, & Lythe, 2009). Multi-level modeling has enabled researchers to tease out the interacting variables at the social, school, classroom, and individual student levels. Partly as a result of these technical developments, several researchers (e.g. Richards, 2008; Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001; Muijs & Reynolds, 2000) have elaborated on the issue of differentiated teacher effectiveness. Their focus was made on teacher effectiveness by adopting different roles (Askew et al., 1997; Breen, 2001), in different organizational structures (Richards, 2008; Sammons et al., 1997), or inside different sociocultural contexts (Borich, 1996; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). The teachers are expected to play a crucial role in developing education systems. Their roles include the leadership of others inside and outside classrooms. Moreover, the teacher effectiveness differentiated across various subject matters in the curriculum, or across different disciplines (science or algebra against mathematics), or in response to different cultural and organizational contexts has been the researchers' concern (Richards, 2008).

Previous research has gone through several evolutionary topics and phases from presage-process-product studies to the intra-psychic characteristics of effective L2 teachers (Borich, 1996) up to the new paradigms in investigating teacher belief systems, efficacy, and constructive teaching strategies (e.g., Muijs & Reynolds, 2002; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). In a study of 36 science teachers using a battery of personality tests, Borich (1996) found connections between classroom climate and teachers' psychological needs for gaining power in a subservient class with little conflict with students. In another study, Brophy (1992) found a strong relationship between teachers' self-rating on factors such as needs for achievement, affiliation and abasement, dominance, change, order and heterosexuality, and their teaching behaviors. Brookfield (1991) also reported a relationship between teachers' personality types and their effective teaching behaviors. From a different perspective, Winch (1996) examined the role of teachers' experience and their effective behaviors and reported that teaching experience can only occasionally become a predictor of teachers' success in the classroom.

The educational psychological models are different from the education production function models in several ways. So that the educational psychological models share the variable of 'time' with the education production function models. Moreover, the variables of 'covered content' and 'quality of instruction', as well as the psychological factors of 'learning aptitude' and 'motivation', are incorporated in

them (Walberg 1984). Carroll (Carroll, 1963) is commonly known as the pioneer of the educational psychological models who originally suggested that the L2 learners' mastery is the ratio of the time students spent on the learning tasks to the optimum amount of time they would need to perform the task. Carroll (1963) acknowledged that the learning time consists of three important constituents: an opportunity (i.e., the allotted time for learning), the L2 learners' perseverance (i.e., the amount of time the L2 learners have engaged actively in language learning), and L2 learning aptitude (i.e., the necessary amount of time to learn under optimal instructional context). Twenty-six years after the construction of his model, in 1989, Carroll pointed out that in his original model the concept of the 'quality of instruction' needs further elaborations. Carroll's educational psychological model was the conceptual basis for Bloom's model of mastery learning (Bloom 1968), Rosenshine's concept of direct instructions (1983), and Walberg's educational productivity model (1984). Walberg has added a category of environmental variables to Carroll's model main factors.

Since the mid-1980s, a blending of approaches to educational effectiveness has taken place. This development is reflected in the work of researchers who have attempted to develop comprehensive models of educational effectiveness by embedding the findings of school effectiveness research, research on teacher effectiveness, and the early input-output studies (Stringfield & Slavin, 1992; Scheerens, 1992; Creemers, 1994). The main characteristics of the resulting models are that the antecedent conditions are classified in terms of inputs, processes, and context of schooling and the models have a multi-level structure, where schools are nested in contexts, classrooms are nested in schools, and pupils are nested in classrooms or teachers.

Current research on teacher effectiveness usually has gone through several discrete phases from presage-product studies to the new paradigms focusing on L2 teacher beliefs, efficacy, and constructivist teaching strategies. It has to be pointed out, however, that this chronological ordering is in many ways simplistic as the phases overlap, and the research on some of the 'older' factors is continuing. (e.g. Muijs & Reynolds 2002, Teddlie & Stringfield 1993). Indeed, the elements of the initial phases can regain popularity and interest in the pedagogical research at later dates, it is the case in the L2 teacher personality. The personality profile of the L2 teachers is a vital characteristic of Hay McBer's model, which has recently come to the fore through the study on teacher effectiveness (McBer, 2000).

Modular Instruction

Kumaravadivelu (2012) constantly argued the L2 teaching pedagogy from the post-national, postmodern, postcolonial, post-transmission, and post-methodological perspectives (Goe, 2008). He challenged the L2 teacher educators to discourage the assumptions that teaching EFL always propagates Western knowledge, devalues local languages and cultures, and solely benefits the economies of the Western nations. The "post" on which he focused the majority of his arguments includes the concepts of disappearing national borders, embracing diversity and culturally relevant teaching languages and cultures, denouncing the traditional methods of L2 teaching that eventually lead to assimilating, and encouraging an anti-methods approach, respectively.

As Kumaravadivelu (2006) maintained, what seems essential in L2 teacher education is to develop L2 teachers who are reflective, autonomous, analytical, and transformative. Such prospective L2 teachers are capable of problem-solving and thinking of local solutions to local problems. Kumaravadivelu (2006) further promoted a new global worldview to educate language teachers and suggested a modular model for pre-service teachers leading to critical pedagogy in the classroom (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). Inspired by the revolutionary arguments in the post-transmission and post-method epistemologies, Kumaravadivelu presented three principles of particularity, practicality, and the possibility to operationalize modular L2 teacher education.

In the SLA research, the pedagogy of

practicality seeks to empower teachers by encouraging them "to theorize from their practice and practice what they theorize" (Kumaravadivelu, 2006, p. 59). The pedagogy of *particularity* sensitizes the L2 practitioners and educators to their students' linguistic, social, and cultural backgrounds and various language-related needs. Finally, the pedagogy of *possibility* relates L2 teaching to the process of socio-cultural transformation by targeting "the sociopolitical consciousness that students bring with them to the classroom" (p. 59). Kumaravadivelu's modular model, which was introduced in 2012 was structured in the form of five constituent modules - knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing (KARDS). He argued that to become self-determining and self-transforming, L2 teachers have to (a) develop their L2 professional, procedural and personal knowledge base (Knowing) and (b) analyze their students' needs, motivational background, and self-learning autonomy (Analyzing). They should also (c) (re)evaluate their own identities, belief systems, and ethical values (Recognizing) and (d) perform on language teaching principles, theorizing, and dialogizing with their students (Doing). Finally, they have to (e) monitor their teaching behaviors and techniques constantly (Seeing).

METHOD

Participants

A non-random convenience sampling method was used to select the participants who were available and willing to partake in this study. The participants were selected from the population of university students and EFL teachers of English majors at Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch, and the students at different levels of language proficiency in language institutes in Karaj. The first group of the participants (used for validation purposes) consisted of 224 undergraduate students and EFL instructors at Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch, the Language Center Islamic at Azad University, Karaj Branch, and the EFL students in Modern Citizenship Training Center.

Table 1

Demographic information for Group 1

Percentage	N		Variables
64.7	145	Female	Gender
35.2	79	Male	
31.1	70	Modern Citizenship Center (students)	Affiliation
18.6	42	Modern Citizenship Center (teachers)	
31.1	70	Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch	
18.6	42	Language Center at Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch	

The participants' second group (pretest and posttest group) was divided into two divisions. Division 1 consisted of EFL teachers, including 100 females and 22 males (N= 122) at Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch, the Language Center Islamic at Azad University, Karaj Branch, as well as the EFL students in Modern Citizenship Training Center. Division 2 consisted of a sample of the EFL students who took part in the validation of the questionnaire (N = 100). Table 2 summarizes the demographic information on the selected EFL teachers in this study.

Procedures

This study had two phases. In Phase 1, after a comprehensive literature review, a conceptual framework for the Iranian EFL teacher effectiveness questionnaire was developed, followed by piloting and validating procedures. In Phase 2, the questionnaire was pretested and post-tested to observe the effects of modular instruction on the EFL teacher effectiveness.

Table 2

Demographic information for Group 2: Division 1

Percentage	N		Variables
81.96	100	Female	Gender
18.03	22	Male	
29.50	36	Modern Citizenship Center	Affiliation
29.50	36	Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch	
40.98	50	Language Center at Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch	

Phase 1: Development of a Theoretical Framework

Addressing First Research Question

The conceptual framework for the developed questionnaire was extracted from some articles and papers by Kazemi and Soleimani (2016), Goe (2008), Meksophawannagul (2015), and Jones (2006). In the initial questionnaire draft, the respondents were required to rank the general factors of teacher effectiveness from the most important (1) to the least important (5). To pilot the developed questionnaire, it was distributed among Group 1 in this study (n = 224). An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using the principal axis factoring method and Varimax rotation was run on the data. Preliminary results indicated that the assumption of sampling adequacy was not retained (KMO = .254 < .60). However, the results of Bartlett's test of sphericity (χ^2 (1081) = 2514.15, p = .000) indicated that there were not zero correlations among all items; hence a lack of identity.

The first round of EFA on the extracted nine factors accounted for 73.19 percent of the total variance in the questionnaire outcome. Whereas the TEQ was supposed to measure four factors, Table 4 displays the factor loadings of the 47 items under the nine extracted factors. The results indicated that 13 items should be dropped from EFA; i.e. items 2, 3, 4, 5, 17, 22, 24, 36, 38, 39, 40, 44, and 46. These items either did not load on their respective factors or had loadings on more than one factor.

After dropping the above-mentioned 13 items, another EFA was run on TEQ with 34 items. Preliminary results indicated that, unlike the first EFA, the assumption of sampling adequacy was retained (KMO = .741 > .60). The results of Bartlett's test of sphericity (χ^2 (561) = 1705.17, p = .000) also indicated no correlations among all items; hence lack of identity. The second round of EFA on TEQ extracted five factors which accounted for 72.99 percent of the total variance. All items loaded under the respective factors; except for items 18 and 21 and 37 which were dropped on the second round. Next, EFA was run for the third time on TEQ with 31 items. Preliminary results indicated that the assumption of sampling adequacy was retained (KMO = .778 > .60). The results of Bartlett's test of sphericity (χ^2 (465) = 1471.63, p = .000) also indicated no zero correlations among all items; hence lack of identity. The third round of EFA on TEQ extracted four factors which accounted for 70.07 percent of the total variance (Table 3). As displayed in Tables 3 and 4,

- Items 1, and 6 to 12 loaded on the second factor which was labeled as the *attitude* factor.
- Items 13 to 16, 19, 20, 23, and 25 to 33 loaded on the first factor to form the *procedures* factor.
- Item 34, 35, 41, and 42, which had their loadings on the third factor, measured as *qualification* factor,
- Items 43, 45, and 47 loaded on the fourth factor are considered *rapport* factors.

Cronbach's alpha reliability for the attitude section of the questionnaire was α = .930. Table 5 displays the item-total correlations of the eight items measuring *attitude*. All items had at least moderate contribution to total score; i.e. = > .30.

Table 3

Total Variance Explained (third 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	12.669	40.866	40.866	12.395	39.983	39.983	11.416	36.825	36.825
2	5.453	17.591	58.457	5.109	16.481	56.465	5.186	16.730	53.554
3	2.465	7.952	66.409	2.234	7.206	63.671	2.602	8.394	61.949
4	2.302	7.425	73.834	1.984	6.401	70.072	2.518	8.123	70.072
5	.931	3.005	76.839						
6	.726	2.341	79.179						
7	.677	2.183	81.362						
8	.649	2.095	83.457						
9	.604	1.949	85.406						
10	.565	1.823	87.229						
11	.520	1.678	88.907						
12	.445	1.437	90.344						
13	.416	1.342	91.685						
14	.323	1.041	92.726						
15	.301	.972	93.698						
16	.281	.908	94.606						
17	.221	.714	95.320						
18	.205	.660	95.980						
19	.204	.657	96.637						
20	.166	.537	97.174						
21	.153	.495	97.669						
22	.149	.481	98.149						
23	.130	.418	98.567						
24	.106	.341	98.908						
25	.083	.268	99.176						
26	.072	.232	99.408						
27	.066	.212	99.619						
28	.038	.124	99.743						
29	.034	.110	99.853						
30	.027	.089	99.942						
31	.018	.058	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

Table 4

Rotated Factor Matrix (the third round of EFA)

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
TE1	.104	**.830**	.226	.067
TE6	.272	**.773**	.065	.041

TE7	-.069	**.743**	.050	.064
TE8	.161	**.757**	.019	.052
TE9	.001	**.745**	.171	.110
TE10	.013	**.803**	.119	.005
TE11	.188	**.720**	.199	.014
TE12	.186	**.812**	.157	.057
TE13	**.869**	.123	.026	.111
TE14	**.877**	.044	.140	.125
TE15	**.754**	.221	-.054	-.043
TE16	**.866**	.160	.050	.057
TE19	**.766**	.013	.054	.157
TE20	**.875**	.053	-.001	.111
TE23	**.869**	.167	.017	.137
TE25	**.847**	.234	-.042	.130
TE26	**.828**	.059	-.070	.080
TE27	**.814**	.070	-.058	.072
TE28	**.794**	.072	.041	.142
TE29	**.831**	-.049	.135	.033
TE30	**.856**	.118	.063	.030
TE31	**.791**	.000	.035	.077
TE32	**.827**	.100	.131	.077
TE33	**.866**	.084	.061	-.085
TE34	.080	.146	**.777**	.142
TE35	-.012	.231	**.750**	.090
TE41	.025	.143	**.852**	-.025
TE42	.073	.216	**.660**	-.034
TE43	.156	.116	-.014	**.869**
TE45	.151	.084	.042	**.895**
TE47	.204	.102	.148	**.864**

Table 5

Item-Total Statistics; Attitude Section of TEQ

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
TE1	18.36	57.704	.831	.915
TE6	18.44	60.823	.764	.920
TE7	18.34	61.168	.698	.925
TE8	18.28	59.920	.741	.922
TE9	18.38	61.220	.734	.923
TE10	18.48	61.193	.777	.920
TE11	18.52	61.193	.719	.924
TE12	18.34	57.413	.809	.917

Cronbach's alpha reliability for the procedure section of the questionnaire was $\alpha = .975$. Table 6 displays the item-total correlations of the 16 items measuring *procedure*. All items had at least a moderate contribution to the total score.; i.e. = > .30

Table 6
Item-Total Statistics; Procedure Section of TEQ

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
TE13	39.44	293.272	.875	.973
TE14	39.36	296.725	.878	.973
TE15	39.38	307.016	.752	.974
TE16	39.64	297.378	.869	.973
TE19	39.46	301.437	.767	.974
TE20	39.56	293.639	.870	.973
TE23	39.38	296.485	.881	.972
TE25	39.48	294.867	.856	.973
TE26	39.42	296.412	.817	.973
TE27	39.32	297.773	.807	.974
TE28	39.48	301.928	.797	.974
TE29	39.56	298.415	.813	.973
TE30	39.38	295.016	.851	.973
TE31	39.38	300.240	.782	.974
TE32	39.68	294.753	.829	.973
TE33	39.58	294.738	.846	.973

Cronbach's alpha reliability for the attitude section of the questionnaire was $\alpha = .789$. Table 7 displays the item-total correlations of the seven items measuring attitude. All items had at least moderate contribution to total score; i.e. = > .30.

Table 7
Item-Total Statistics; Rapport Section of TEQ

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
TE34	15.40	20.122	.611	.742
TE35	15.46	21.886	.581	.751
TE41	15.42	21.351	.539	.758
TE42	15.34	21.943	.447	.777
TE43	15.74	22.849	.415	.781
TE45	15.62	22.608	.468	.771
TE47	15.62	21.832	.566	.754

Phase 2: The Impact of Modular Instruction on Teacher Effectiveness

To further examine the newly-developed Teacher Effectiveness questionnaire, it was pretested and post-tested after the 122 selected EFL teachers in two selected language institutes and Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch was invited to attend classes to receive an introduction to the principles of Modular Instruction. The classes were held for 15 sessions. First, they had lukewarm reactions to the classes as they thought the classes would not be helpful, 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 optimistic that the tutorial sessions would positively impact the teacher effectiveness

taught by the highly motivated teachers. The selected EFL teachers were required to attend their regular classes and use the principles of KARDS in teaching. At the beginning and end of their teaching course, the impact of KARDS and modular instructions was investigated by running the TEQ both with the EFL teachers and students in terms of pre-and post-tests.

Addressing Second Research Question

EFL Teachers' Performance on Pretest and Posttest of TEQ

Since the assumptions of homogeneity of variances and homogeneity of covariance matrices were not retained in both sets of collected data (EFL teachers and EFL students), the analysis was not carried out by calculating the repeated measures ANOVA. Therefore, two separate paired samples t-tests were run to compare the EFL teachers' mean scores on the pre-test and post-test of the TEQ. Descriptive statistics in Table 8 reported that the EFL teachers had higher mean scores on posttest of effectiveness (M = 187.04, SD = 8.79) than pretest (M = 145.74, SD = 9.44).

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics; Pretest and Posttest of Teacher Effectiveness (Teachers)

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Teacher Effectiveness	Pretest-	145.74	122	9.445	1.336
	PostTest	187.04	122	8.790	1.243

Table 9 represents the results of the paired samples t-test (t (121) = 98.75, p = .000, Cohen's d = 4.52 representing a large effect size) indicated that EFL teachers had a significantly higher mean score on the post-test of teacher effectiveness questionnaire than the pretest. In other words, the EFL teachers' performance in the real classroom was largely affected by their knowledge of KARDS and using modular instructions.

Table 9

Paired-Samples t-test; Pretest and Posttest of Teacher Effectiveness Questionnaire

Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
			Lower	Upper			
41.300	2.957	.418	40.460	42.140	98.755	121	.000

EFL Students' Performance on Pretest and Posttest of TEQ

After descriptive statistics on the data, another paired samples t-test was run to compare the EFL students' mean scores on the pre-test and post-test of TEQ to investigate their perceptions of teacher effectiveness before and after receiving modular instructions. Based on the results displayed in Table 10, EFL students had higher mean on posttest of effectiveness (M = 193.01, SD = 14.79) than pretest (M = 154.54, SD = 18.57).

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics; Pretest and Posttest of Teacher Effectiveness (Students)

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Teacher Effectiveness	Pretest-	154.54	322	18.576	1.035
	Posttest	193.01	322	14.797	.825

The results of the paired samples t-test (t (99) = 75.28, p = .000, Cohen's d = 2.29 in Table 11 representing a large effect size) indicated that the within-group differences as a result of EFL students' performance on the pretest and posttest of TEQ were statistically significant.

Table 11

Paired-Samples t-test; Pretest and Posttest of Teacher Effectiveness (Students)

Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
			Lower	Upper			
38.472	9.170	.511	37.467	39.477	75.285	99	.000

In other words, it can be said that the EFL teachers' modular instruction under the influence of KARDS was effective in their classroom teaching.

DISCUSSION

The present study was conducted to fill in the L2 teacher education literature gap by developing a teacher effectiveness instrument for assessing EFL/ESL teachers and students' perception of teacher effectiveness and their informed practice in the EFL context. The researchers' objective was to add to the precision with which such assessment could be carried out in the Iranian EFL context, besides available instruments of teacher effectiveness. This attempt led to a teacher effectiveness questionnaire (TEQ) with significant components of EFL teachers' attitudes, procedures, qualifications, and rapport. Theoretically supported by a comprehensive review of the literature (Goe, 2008; Jones, 2006; Kazemi & Soleimani, 2016; Meksophawannagul, 2015, to name a few), TEQ met the quality criteria of a valid and reliable questionnaire.

To check the construct validity of the researcher-made questionnaire, the exploratory factor analysis was conducted to identify the items on which the construct "teacher effectiveness " is loaded. The critical assumptions to conduct factor analysis were assessed. The sampling adequacy assumption was checked using Varmix rotation which indicates that this assumption is not retained and the results should be interpreted with caution. However, the results of Bartlett's test of sphericity indicated that there were correlations among factors representing the same construct. The results of factor analysis can then be used to identify the loaded items

A new theme in L2 teacher effectiveness was explored by relying upon statistical analysis. Teacher effectiveness was proved to actively contribute to the L2 teachers' *sensitivity to learning in EFL settings*. This component is composed of the essence of teacher effectiveness in EFL teachers since it conceptually represents the impact of the Iranian EFL community's social values and normative attitudes on learning. Behind the broad concept of teacher effectiveness are the critical and game-changing factors such as self-assessment of teaching quality and dynamic classroom management which are properly addressed in TEG under the qualification section. This inclusiveness was supported by the participants' feedback which was in line with the concepts of KARDS (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). It was proved that the EFL students, as well as teachers, wholeheartedly advocated the concepts addressed in TEQ. Teacher Effectiveness is a comprehensive concept discussed that focuses on components such as Teaching Quality and Classroom Management as well as the syllabus taught. The results obtained are unique concerning 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 EFF teachers' application of modular instructions inspired by KARDS in the classroom environment and receiving immediate feedback in terms of EFL teachers and learners' perception of teacher effectiveness. Relying upon the collected data by the TEQ administration, it was observed that modular instruction can actively contribute to the Iranian EFL teacher and learner attitudes towards the quality of teaching. The results of the study suggest that modular instruction can have an immense impact on teacher ecological validity as it was observed the teachers who manipulated modular instructions developed a highly positive attitude towards the conditions of learning and generated deeper rapport with their students. Their training positively changed the atmosphere for the teachers and students in language classes.

CONCLUSION

This study addressed the different important issues of L2 teacher effectiveness, its components, and its impact in the real classroom context. The researchers came up with several implications for future researchers and teaching practitioners. Since the Iranian L2 academic community grew a positive attitude towards teacher effectiveness after training in KARDS, more attention has to be paid to the detailed components of teacher effectiveness to promote the existing quality of the status quo. In general, acquiring the knowledge of KARDS can enable the EFL teachers to have a better grasp of the concept of teacher effectiveness and rise more students' positive attitudes towards the concept of teacher effectiveness.

Relying on the findings in this study, the Iranian L2 academic community has excellent ideas regarding Teacher Effectiveness and a high positive attitude towards its components. Therefore, it seems that the preliminaries for Teacher Effectiveness are adequately provided in Iranian educational contexts in general, and the L2 context in particular. However, more attention has to be paid to the details of teacher effectiveness 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 teacher Effectiveness is another indication of the interest found in the Iranian EFL context. The participants had a more positive attitude toward Teacher Effectiveness after their teachers got familiar with 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 effectiveness and had a statistically significant effect on the attitudes of the students concerning the concept of Teacher Effectiveness.

The implications of this study are still skeptical of some limitations. The data in this study were collected from a large body of teacher and learner participants; however, a non-random sampling procedure was conducted to select the available and willing-to-cooperate volunteers. Therefore, the findings might become divergent in further research with communities with different ethnic backgrounds or language proficiency. Moreover, the results in this study were limited to the EFL students' perception of teacher effectiveness without collecting feedback from their assessment performance in immediate or delayed tests. A further investigation to address the constructs mentioned above might shed more light on the area under study.

REFERENCES

Askew, M., Brown, M., Rhodes, V., William, D., & Johnson, D. (1997). *Effective teachers of numeracy: Report of a study carried out for the teacher training agency*. London: King's College, University of London.

Borich, D.G. (1996). *Effective teaching methods* (3rd ed.). New Jersey Columbus, Ohio, Merrill and Imprint of Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs.

Breen, M. (2001). Overt participation and covert acquisition in the language classroom. In: M. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning* (pp. 112–140). Harlow: Pearson Education.

Brookfield, S. D. (1991). The development of critical reflection in adulthood. *New Education, 13*(1), 39-48.

Brophy, J. (1992). Probing the subtleties of subject-matter teaching. *Educational Leadership*, *49*(7),4-8.

Brown, A. (2002). *The language and communication of SMS: An exploratory study of young adults' text-messaging*. Unpublished BA dissertation, Cardiff University.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance*: *Practitioner research for the next generation.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Freeman, D. (2001). Second language teacher education. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 72-80). Cambridge: CUP.

Goldstein, E.S. (1995). An AP-1 (Jun/Fos) binding site negatively regulates transcription. A. Dros. Res. Conf. 36: 272 B.

Goe, L. (2008). Teacher quality and student achievement: Making the most of recent research. TQ Research & Policy Brief. URL (last checked 28 December 2011).

Hassani, V., Khatib, M., Yazdani Moghaddam, 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.

Hopkins, D., & Reynolds, D. (2001). The Past, Present, and Future of School Improvement: Towards the Third Age. *British Educational Research Journal*, *27*(4), 459-475.

Jones, V. (2006). How do teachers learn to be effective classroom managers? In C. M. Evertson & C. S.

Kazemi, A., & Soleimani, N. (2016). On the relationship between EFL teachers' classroom management approaches and the dominant teaching style: A mixed-method study. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 4*(2), 87-103.

Khatib, M., & Miri, M. (2016). Cultivating multivocality in language classrooms: Contribution of critical pedagogy-informed teacher education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 13*(2), 98-131. doi: 10.1080/15427587.2015.1137197

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). In defense of post-method. *ILI Language Teaching Journal, 1*(1), 15-19.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012) *Language Teacher Education for a Global Society: A Modular Model for Knowing, Analyzing, Recognizing, Doing and Seeing*. Routledge.

McBer, H. (2000). *Research into Teacher Effectiveness: A Model of Teacher Effectiveness*. Nottingham: Department for Education and Employment.

Meksophawannagul, M. (2015). Teacher and learner views on effective English teaching in the Thai context: The case of Engineering students. *English Language Teaching, 8*(11), 99.

Muijs, D., & Reynolds, D. (2000). School effectiveness and teacher effectiveness in mathematics: some preliminary findings from the evaluation of the Mathematics enhancement program (Primary). *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 11*(3), 273-303.

Muijs, D., & Reynolds, D. (2002). Teachers' beliefs and behaviors: What really matters? *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 37,* 3-15.

Richards, J. C. (2008). Second language teacher education today. *RELC Journal, 39*(2), 158-177.

Sammons, P., Thomas, S., & Mortimore, P. (1997). *Forging links: Effective schools and effective departments*. London: Paul Chapman.

Sardabi, N., Biria, R., & Ameri Golestan, A. (2018). Reshaping teacher professional identity through critical pedagogy-informed teacher education.

International Journal of Instruction, 11(3), 617-634.

Steenekamp, K., van der Merwe, M., & Salieva Mehmedova, A. (2018). Enabling the development of student-teacher professional identity through vicarious learning during an educational excursion. *South African Journal of Education, 38*(1), 1-8.

Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (1993). *Schools make a difference: Lessons learned from a 10-year study of school effects*. New York: Teachers College Press.

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

Biodata

Parisa Tahan Shizari is a Ph.D. 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 interested in post-methodology and has participated in various conferences and also published some articles in scholarly journals.
Email: *parisatahan@gmail.com*

Farid Ghaemi is an assistant professor of applied linguistics. He has taught undergraduate and graduate courses at different universities for more than 30 years. He has published extensively in national and international journals.
Email: *ghaemi@kiau.ac.ir*

Natasha Pourdana is 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 interest are formative language assessment, language task construction, and translation quality assessment.
Email: *natasha.qale@gmail.com*

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 Ph.D. levels. Her areas of interest are language assessment and teacher education. She has published in different journals and presented at national and international conferences on these topics.
Email: *kobra.tavassoli@gmail.com*

Appendix A

The Developed Teacher Effectiveness Questionnaire

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

For each item, please check one box which best matches your feelings.

Teacher Effectiveness	strongly agree	Agree	slightly agree	No feelings	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
1. are friendly							
2. develop good relationships with students							
3. share personal experiences							
4. care about their students							
5. are patient							
6. listen to students							
7. keep a positive attitude in general							
8. are charismatic							
9. are aware of the student's English education background							
10. understand the different student levels							
11. have a sense of humor							
12. are enthusiastic about language teaching							
13. give clear explanations							
14. use good examples							
15. use a variety of teaching methods							
16. use Persian selectively							
17. correct writing errors							
18. correct speaking errors							
19. teach grammar							
20. encourage group work							
21. encourage student participation in class							
22. encourage participation of the students with low confidence							
23. talk slowly in English							
24. use easy words							
25. ask questions frequently							
26. ask questions then wait for volunteers to answer							
27. ask individual students to answer questions							
28. give students plenty of time to answer questions							
29. treat all students fairly							
30. prepare students well for exams							
31. give students clear grading guidelines							
32. require students to work hard during class							
33. require students to do homework							
34. are well qualified for EFL teaching							
35. have a good knowledge of grammar							
36. have a good knowledge of vocabulary							
37. are well prepared for every lesson							
38. provide a syllabus detailing weekly course content							
39. explain the instructional methods to the Class							
40. tell students the lesson objectives for each lesson							
41. stick to the syllabus							
42. provide students with extra materials							