

**An-Najah National University  
Faculty of Graduate Studies**

**Mapping the Strategies of Evaluation as  
Employed by the English Language Faculty  
Instructors at the Palestinian Universities &  
Higher Education Institutions**

**By  
Ghada Hamdan**

**Supervisor  
Dr. Nidal Jayousi**

**This Thesis is Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Master Degree in Methods of Teaching  
English Language, Faculty of Graduate Studies, An-Najah  
National University, Nablus, Palestine.**

**2017**

# **Mapping the Strategies of Evaluation as Employed by the English Language Faculty Instructors at the Palestinian Universities & Higher Education Institutions**

**By  
Ghada Hamdan**

**This Thesis was defended successfully on 15/ 1 /2017 and approved by:**

**Defense Committee Members**

**Signature**

**Dr. Nidal Jayousi / Supervisor**

.....

**Dr. Anwar Abd-Alraziq / External Examiner**

.....

**Dr. Suzaane Arafat / Internal Examiner**

.....

**Dr. Soheil Salha / Internal Examiner**

.....

### III

## **Dedication**

To my parents

my family

my friends

my teachers

and my students.

•

## **Acknowledgement**

My utmost gratitude is due to Allah before and after.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and respect to my supervisor, Dr. Nidal Jayousi, for his inexhaustible patience, inspiring experience and tactful guidance.

I also would like to express my warmest gratitude to my ex-professors at the English Methodology Department and the English Department at An-Najah University: Dr. Suzan Arafat, Dr. Ahmed Awad, Dr. Sameer El-Essa, Dr. Soheil Salha and others who never hesitated to help or waited to be thanked.

Special thanks are due to Dr. Mohammad Ateya from Al-Aqsa University in Gaza for his meticulous suggestions and constructive criticism.

Special thanks are also due to Dr. Anwar Abd-Alrazeq from Birzeit University for his valuable comments.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my family and my friends who stood by my side in times of need.

## اقرار

انا الموقعة أدناه صاحبة الرسالة التي تحمل العنوان:

تحديد إستراتيجيات التقويم كما يوظفها معلمو اللغة الانجليزية  
في الجامعات ومؤسسات التعليم العالي الفلسطينية

**Mapping the Strategies of Evaluation as  
Employed by the English Language Faculty  
Instructors at the Palestinian Universities &  
Higher Education Institutions**

أقر بأن ما اشتملت عليه الرسالة انما هو نتاج جهدي الخاص باستثناء ما تمت الاشارة  
اليه حيثما ورد وأن هذه الرسالة ككل أو أي جزء منها لم يقدم من قبل لنيل أي درجة علمية أو  
بحث علمي لدى أي مؤسسة تعليمية أو بحثية أخرى.

**Declaration**

The work provided in this thesis, unless otherwise referenced, is the  
researcher's own work, and not has been submitted elsewhere for any other  
degree or qualification.

Student's Name: Ghada Hamdan اسم الطالب:

Signature: ..... التوقيع:

Date: 15/01/2017 التاريخ:

## Table of Contents

Subject	Page
Dedication	III
Acknowledgement	IV
Declaration	V
Table of Contents	VI
List of Tables	VIII
List of Appendices	X
Abstract	XI
<b>Chapter One: Introduction and Theoretical Background</b>	1
1.1 The Theoretical Background of the Study	1
1.2 The Statement of the Problem	10
1.3 The Objectives of the Study	11
1.4 The Significance of the Study	11
1.5 The Questions of the Study	12
1.6 The Hypotheses of the Study	14
1.7 The Limitations of the Study	14
1.8 The Operational Definitions	15
1.9 Summary	17
<b>Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature</b>	19
2.1 Introduction	19
2.2 Aspects of Conventional Instructional Practices	19
2.3 Aspects of Conventional Evaluation Practices	23
2.4. Faculty Members & Students: Conflicting Perceptions:	27
2.5 Selection of Evaluation Tool	33
2.6 The Effects of Demographic Variables	35
2.7 Conclusion	38
2.8 Summary	39
<b>Chapter Three : Methodology</b>	41
3.1 Introduction	41
3.2 Methodology	41
3.3 Population of the Study	42
3.4 Samples of the Study	42
3.5 Instruments of the Study	44
3.6 Validity of the Study	46
3.7 Reliability of the Study	46
3.8 Procedures of the Study	47
3.9 Questions of the Study	48
3.10 Hypotheses of the Study	50

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Page</b>
3.11 Variables of the Study	50
3.12 Statistical Analysis	51
3.13 Ethical Issues	53
3.14 Summary	53
<b>Chapter Four : Results</b>	54
4.1 Introduction	54
4.2 Results Related to the Faculty's Questionnaire	54
4.3 Results Related to the Multiple-Choice Question	54
4.4 Results Related to the First Sub- Question	58
4.5 Results Related to the Main Question	61
4.6 Results Related to the Hypotheses of the Study	62
4.7 Results Related to the Students' Questionnaire	70
4.7.1 Results Related to the First Sub-Question	70
4.7.2 Results Related to the Second Sub-Question	72
4.8 Results Related to the Hypotheses of the Study	75
4.9 Summary	80
<b>Chapter Five: Results, Conclusions &amp; Recommendations</b>	81
5.1 Introduction	81
5.2 Discussion of the Research Results	81
5.2.1 The Main Practices in Instruction & Evaluation	81
5.2.2 The Underlying Institutional Practices	84
5.2.3 Evaluation Between Beliefs & Practices	86
5.2.4 Total Score of All Domains	91
5.3 Faculty's Preferable Evaluation Practices	92
5.4 Discussion of the Results Related to Faculty's Hypotheses	94
5.5 Faculty's Practices as Perceived by Students	96
A- Faculty's Instructional Practices as Perceived by Students	97
B- Faculty's Evaluation Practices as Perceived by Students	99
C- Total Score of All Domains	104
5.6 Discussion of the Results Related to the Students' Hypotheses	105
A- Discussion of the Results Related to the First Hypothesis	105
B- Discussion of the Results Related to the Second Hypothesis	105
5.7 Summary	107
5.8 Conclusions	110
Recommendations	112
<b>References</b>	116
<b>Appendices</b>	143
المُلخَص	b

### List of Tables

<b>Table No.</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table (1)	Distribution of sample according to gender	42
Table (2)	Distribution of sample according to academic qualifications	43
Table (3)	Distribution of sample according to professional experience	43
Table (4)	Distribution of sample according to age	43
Table (5)	Distribution of sample according to pedagogical interest	43
Table (6)	Distribution of students sample according to university type	43
Table (7)	Distribution of sample according to major	44
Table (8)	Reliability coefficients of domains and the total scores	47
Table (9-14)	Frequencies and percentages of responses of the multiple question	55-57
Table (15)	Means, standard deviation, percentages and levels of instruction practices among instructors	58
Table (16)	Means, standard deviation, percentages and levels of evaluation practices among instructors	59
Table (17)	Total degrees of the instructional and evaluation domains	61
Table (18)	Frequency of instructors' evaluation preferences	61
Table (19)	T-Test for independent samples due to gender	62
Table (20)	T-Test for independent samples due to academic qualification	63
Table (21)	Frequencies, means, and standard deviations due to professional experience	64
Table (22)	One-Way ANOVA to test the differences due to professional experience	65
Table (23)	Scheffe post hoc results and total degree due to professional experience	65
Table (24)	Frequencies, means, and standard deviations due to age	67
Table (25)	One-Way ANOVA to test the differences due to age	67
Table (26)	Scheffe post hoc results and total degree due to age	68



<b>Table No.</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table (27)	Frequencies, means, and standard deviations of the instruction and evaluation practices due to interest in modern pedagogy	69
Table (28)	One–Way ANOVA to test the differences due pedagogy.	70
Table (29)	Means, standard deviation, percentages and levels of students’ views about instruction practices	71
Table (30)	Means, standard deviation, percentages and levels of students’ views about evaluation practices	73
Table (31)	Means, standard deviation, percentages and levels of students’ views about instruction, evaluation practices and total degree	75
Table (32)	T-Test for independent samples of the students’ views about instruction and evaluation practices due to university	76
Table(33)	Frequencies, means, and standard deviations of the students’ views about instruction and evaluation practices due to major	77
Table(34)	One–Way ANOVA to test the differences due to major	77
Table (35)	Scheffe post hoc results	78

**List of Appendices**

<b>Appendix No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Appendix A</b>	Questionnaire Validity Committee	143
<b>Appendix B</b>	Faculty Members' Questionnaire	144
<b>Appendix C</b>	Students' Questionnaire	149

**Mapping the Strategies of Evaluation as  
Employed by the English Language Faculty  
Instructors at the Palestinian Universities &  
Higher Education Institutions**

**By  
Ghada Hamdan  
Supervisor  
Dr. Nidal Jayousi**

**Abstract**

This study aimed at mapping the common evaluation practices employed by the English language faculty members at all Palestinian universities in the West Bank and Gaza. The study investigated the faculty members' preferences among various evaluation tools. Along with the evaluation practices, the underlying instructional practices were explored to trace their effect on evaluation practices. In addition, students' views about faculty members' instructional and evaluation practices were surveyed in order to recognize students' rights and significant roles in the evaluation process. The study examined the effects of the following variables on the instructors' practices (professional qualifications, experience, gender, age and interest in modern pedagogy). On the students' side, the variables of the major discipline of English (whether it is English Language & Literature, Translation or TEFL) and the type of university (whether it is public or private) were examined.

This study was conducted at all Palestinian universities in the West Bank and Gaza in the academic year (2015-2016). The sample of the study is a stratified random. It consisted of (166) instructors and (400) students

from the two populations. The percent of instructors' sample is (75.4 %) and the percent of students' sample is (26.6 %) of the whole population. Two questionnaires were distributed; one for faculty members at all universities, and the other for majors of English at An-Najah National University in Nablus and at the Arab American University in Jenin.

The results suggest that conventional practices in lecturing and testing are common among Palestinian faculty members. Concerning the preferences of evaluation tools, formal testing is the faculty members' most-rated choice. There are significant differences among the faculty members attributed to academic qualifications, experience, age and gender, but no significant differences are attributed to the faculty members' interest in modern pedagogy. Majors of English, Translation and TEFL in both universities have moderate views regarding their instructors' performances in instruction and evaluation. However, there are significant differences among students attributed to the type of university in favor of the private university, and the major discipline in favor of the Translation major.

In the light of the results of the study, faculty members are recommended to reconsider their practices, embrace training and experiment with modern evaluation pedagogies to tailor practices according to students' needs. They are invited to attempt a balance between institutional restrictions and students' best interests, open channels of communication with students and listen to their suggestions and criticism, involve them in the evaluation process and establish enlightened

assessment culture at the English department that can put together academics' efforts to respond to the highly diverse educational needs of foreign language teaching.

## **Chapter One**

### **Introduction and Theoretical Background**

#### **1.1. Introduction:**

Higher education has a leading role in helping to build a modern country by providing better qualified generations in various fields. However, in general, higher education in the Arab World faces many problems that hinder its ability to face up with the challenges of modern times. Al-Rashdan (2010) pointed out a number of problems and challenges especially the lack of academic freedom. He described how the current situation of higher education affects instructors and students as the faculty's roles are reduced to information providers and students are not encouraged to think critically or analytically. Two main manifestations of this situation is the deeply-rooted traditional type of lecturing as a common instructional practice, in addition to traditional testing as a main evaluation practice.

Given the development in the learning-teaching pedagogies, a teacher-based practice like lecturing has become more debatable. It is usually simply planned (and technologically-assisted) aiming mostly at presenting information, explaining concepts and modeling thinking. In addition, lecturing usually sets limited time for discussion and occasional questions from students at the end of the class (in addition to its controversial attention span and inadequacy to change values or teach behavioral skills (Bligh, 2000; Bates, 2015). Further, more debate is on

traditional lecturing versus active learning. Weiman (2014) asserted that traditional lecturing has become defenseless. He argued that instructors' justifications of utilizing lecturing for teaching large classes or because of workload and content coverage are usually presented with no experimenting with other alternatives.

Rahman (2011) indicated that the value of lecturing depends on the instructor's specific objectives. If the aim is to communicate information, lecturing is reasonably efficient, if it is meant to develop the power of critical thinking and problem solving skills, discussions and other active learning strategies are more effective according to modern research. However, McKeachie and Svinicki (2006) discussed other purposes of lecturing such as using lectures for compiling updated material from a variety of sources and adapting it to students' interests as well as for helping students discover models of thinking and key concepts. Nevertheless, the researcher would like to add that the priority for teaching has changed from transmitting and organizing knowledge to generating knowledge and using high- order thinking.

Proponents of lecturing have attempted to use modern learning theories to avoid the criticism against the inherent disadvantages of traditional lecturing. Snell and Steinert (1999) discussed how interactive lecturing involves an increased interchange between teachers, students and the lecture content to promote active learning practices. This is usually presented by the use of modern technology. However, the researcher argues

that this form of lecturing is more of a byproduct of active learning. Still, it is not a sufficient equivalent to active learning which emphasizes students' roles and individualized learning.

However, the quality of instruction is determined when it utilizes high-order thinking and leads to better learning rather than teaching to the test. As testing leads to pressure on students and teachers, students' efforts are channeled into cramming and instructional time is focused on preparing for the test. Teaching to the test narrows down the curriculum, minimizes students' creativity and undermines faculty's professional autonomy. The quality of instruction is determined when it addresses students' needs and realities by providing authentic tasks, intrinsic motivation, engagement and high order thinking (Gardner, 1993).

Brown (2009), Race (2010) and Fautley & Savage (2008) confirmed that evaluation is a systematic process overlapping with and inseparable from instruction and learning. It is a valuable tool providing answers to all stakeholders on essential questions. This is how it becomes an inseparable part of instruction; it aims at measuring visible evidence of learning and skills more directly than when the learner communicates them in pen and paper as in summative and traditional evaluation. In modern pedagogies, better and different strategies are called for to draw attention to the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century demands for different learning and training, and to respond to global call for educational reform based on more



enlightened theories of learning and teaching in the wake of the growing dissatisfaction of the deeply-rooted practices in instruction and evaluation.

Views about assessment and testing have started to change more radically since the early 1990s. Wiggins (1990) and later Brown (2009) confirmed that assessment and testing are not synonymous. Brown defined tests as basic formal and institutional procedures set at certain intervals in the curriculum, and learners are expected to do their best to demonstrate how much knowledge they have attained.

In the current study, the aim of the form of the evaluation practices used by Palestinian faculty members is to arrive at a formal grade to be given to students. It focuses on endorsing summative, final judgment based mainly on testing and grading achievement. Sometimes other course components (such as discussion, cooperation and attendance) are included. In contrast, the term 'assessment' is used in modern pedagogy to refer to a more holistic, formative, continuous, learner-based and outcome-based process. It is an interactive process between students and faculty that informs them about the progress of learning and teaching (Angelo & Cross, 1993).

Within the constructivist learning theory, a meaningful evidence of learning is sought for assessment. Reeves (2006) confirmed this by criticizing the evaluation of college students' teaching. He confirmed that in an authentic learning environment, assessment is based on observations of students' engagement and analysis of learning products rather than using

just one method. Effective assessment requires the critical analysis of multiple forms of evidence that learning outcomes have been attained.

Robinson (2010), Shihadeh (2009), Mustafa (2010) and Al-Absi (2010) pointed out that evaluation has become a testing activity only with traditional tests and conventional question formats as the most common methods of evaluation. These types of tests most often measure information recall unless the educator is extremely skilled in test construction. This kind of evaluation is still separated from the learning process and set at the end of instruction. Reasons why teachers seek these forms of assessment are quite predictable. These tests are usually handy, easy to grade and formal (Robinson, 2010). Thus, instruction has become a tool for testing or teaching to the test. Shihadeh (2009) described the stressful effect of this current insufficient form of evaluation on both students and instructors. On the students' part, they are encouraged to score more grades. On the instructors' part, as testing is the most common practice for evaluation, they usually feel under pressure to make students pass tests. Shihadeh asserted the need for more holistic and quality learning visible in learning outcomes and definitely not only a testing tool.

The view of knowledge in traditional testing and lecturing places most value on 'knowing that' whereas 'knowing how' can be both difficult to teach and to assess through pencil-and-paper means. The end-of-unit test practice originated from the role of education which treats learners as 'empty vessels' and thus, the role of the teacher is to fill in as much

knowledge as possible. The conventional evaluation is to calculate what has been filled in from the perspective of how full of knowledge the learner has become (Fautley & Savage, 2008, p.7).

One more disadvantage of conventional testing is that it undermines chances of distinction in teaching (Hoffman, Assaf, and Paris, 2001). Researchers like (Hoffman et al., 2001, Serra, Gómez and Sáiz, 2014, Aquino, Ramos and Nolasco, 2015) indicated that faculty members highly regarded assessment as a vital tool to enhance learning and to promote students' development. However, in a striking contrast, the faculty considered students' participation in evaluation was not necessary. Another striking contrast the aforementioned researchers confirmed was that the most frequent tool used by (100%) of faculty was written tests and quizzes. Seemingly, instructors found pedagogical value in using written test and quizzes as main evaluation methods. In addition to workload which leads instructors to summative assessment, they interpreted this by reminding that in many universities, written tests are the most formally acknowledged evaluation practices.

Nevertheless, Pellegrino, Chudowsky and Glaser (2001) argued that conventional tests can still do a practical job such as testing facts and concepts. However, they admitted that these facts and concepts are limited sections of the curriculum which fail to probe the depth of learning. As a result, current practices of testing cannot be reliable for important decision

making. Moreover, they have shortcomings in defining critical differences in high-order thinking among students.

However, active academic professionalism stresses that faculty's practices have to be filtered. Eraut (1994) and Brookfield (1987) discussed the requirements for reflective practice and college teaching professionalism. They identified the powerful values of critical, reflective self-monitoring practitioners who can wisely invest the insights of academic life and call for making use of students' evaluation of faculty, in addition to institutional evaluation, action research, peer engagement and the utilizing of scholarly literature.

However, research has identified certain obstacles that can deter the instructors' attempts in monitoring and managing their practices such as inadequacy or lack of training in the demanding process of assessment, and in seeking new forms of instruction and assessment (Hills, 1991; Sullivan & Chalnack, 1991). Naturally, training can help faculty manage time and course plan as well as assist teachers to choose appropriate formats to assess different achievement targets that can suit course objectives and instruction (Stiggins, 1992; Fink, 2003; Sabagh and Saroyani, 2014).

One important aspect of faculty's tendencies is to adhere to teacher-based practices even after taking training in professional development (Samuelowicz and Bain, 2001; Woodbury & Gress-Newsome, 2002; Fung and Chow, 2002; Ebert-May, Derting, Hodder, Momsen, Long and Jardeleza, 2011). According to these studies, instructors demonstrated very

good theoretical and pedagogical knowledge, but it was rarely demonstrated in classroom practices.

However, assessment culture, administrative and institutional restrictions, self-efficacy, attitudes, academic qualifications, lack of training and interest in modern pedagogies, lack of motivation for research and workload can be behind this tendency. Other reasons are related to working conditions, collegial relation, students' competences as well as departmental policies (Gess-Newsome, Southerland and Johnston, 2003).

In this theoretical background, it is worthy to discuss the assessment culture since it is an important factor in shaping the administrative and institutional policy in universities in general. Concerning the effect of the spreading quality assurance culture on higher education, (Lamine, 2010) pointed out how superficial and traditional the procedures are dealt with in the Arab countries. He confirmed that there is no significant impact on public education institutions since quality assurance criteria are not integrated in university life or its management. According to Diyen (2010), Haywood (2010) and Hutching (2010) when assessment culture is institutionally fostered, faculty are more likely to be more positively involved. Hence, the lack of assessment-oriented institutional policy is often cited as a primary obstacle for faculty's genuine involvement in the work of assessment.

Looking at the students' side, perceptions of the faculty's practices in instruction and evaluation are important components of the teaching-

learning process. Exploring students' attitudes towards instructional and evaluation practices rises from the fact that students' perceptions can affect all levels of education hierarchy : they set objectives to instructors, clarify standards to students, modify instructional designs, provide valuable feedback, monitor progress as well as assess and evaluate performance (Herman, Aschbacher and Winters,1992). According to Robinson (2010), students are like customers so it is essential that teachers consider and seek their satisfaction by exploring attitudes, identifying needs and obtaining valuable feedback from students as one part of balanced assessment.

Further, in an attempt to understand the students' perceptions and the faculty members' perceptions, research has good evidence that the faculty members and students tend to have contrasting views about instruction and evaluation practices (Brown, 2006; Rashidi and Moghdam, 2014). One significant indicator of the importance of students' perceptions of classroom practices is their experiences with different modes of assessment. Sambell, McDowell and Brown (1997) tried to investigate students' attitudes when experiencing different modes of assessment and their particular effects on their learning. The researchers reported that students often had negative attitudes when they discussed traditional assessment because they considered it might have a negative effect on their learning. In contrast, when students were exposed to new forms of assessment, they demonstrated quite dramatic attitudes.

This introduction has presented the main issues which are raised in this mapping study and their overlapping and inseparable relations in the diverse field of English language teaching in higher education.

## **1.2. The Statement of the Problem:**

Peterson and Einarson (2001), Race (2010) and Rust (2007) indicated that despite the plethora of research in educational pedagogies, a review of the literature shows relatively little research on faculty members' perceptions of their instructional and assessment practices. McLellan (2001), Knight (2002), Carless (2006) and Rust (2007) considered the current situation of assessment in higher education complicated and confused due to the heavy demands on it. Furthermore, faculty's practices and falling standards are more criticized especially in higher education in different parts of the world. Naturally, instructors' practices as Pellegrino et al., (2001) and Brown (2009) criticized are embedded in social and administrative structure which they consider difficult to change especially in the testing practices.

It is noticeable that there is an overuse of the conventional testing in English language teaching in most of the Palestinian higher education institutions. The time has arrived to identify the evaluation strategies in our universities and seek more valid and inclusive forms of assessment which can provide more reliable evidence of students' competences and skills.

### **1.3. Objectives of the Study:**

This study aims at mapping the common evaluation practices among the faculty members of English in Palestinian high education institutions.

Other objectives of this study are:

- 1- Identifying the evaluation preferences among the faculty members.
- 2- Exploring the common instructional practices which underlie these evaluation practices.
- 3- Examining the rationale behind utilizing the common evaluation practices.
- 4- Defining the existing variances attributed to age, gender, qualifications and years of academic experience as well as their interest in modern pedagogy.
- 5- Exploring majors' of English perceptions of the current underlying instructional and evaluation practices.

### **1.4. Significance of the Study:**

There have been few studies in the field of faculty's practices, not only locally, but also globally since more attention has been given to school teachers' practices. The significance of exploring evaluation practices rises from the fact that it can shed light on evaluation as a very significant area in the teaching process, as well as help to explore performances,



perceptions and trends among the faculty members. Getting to know where English faculty members stand in their evaluation practices, their performance is expected to improve as they try to experiment with new techniques of evaluation. Consequently, the students' competences are expected to be more developed as they are trained to do more meaningful tasks and demonstrate evidence of their learning not available in pen and paper tests.

This study sheds more light on the current evaluation practices of English in higher education institutions and also majors' perceptions and general satisfaction with these practices. It points out to where the faculty members exactly stand from the growing interest and attention given to assessment and evaluation by global educational circles.

### **1.5. Questions of the Study:**

The main questions of the study are:

- 1- What are the most common evaluation practices utilized by the English language faculty members at the Palestinian Higher Education Institutions?
- 2- What are the faculty members' preferences among evaluation practices?

In the light of the two major questions above, the researcher considers the following sub- questions:

- 1- What are the most common instructional practices underlying the evaluation practices?
- 2- Are there any significant differences in evaluation practices among the faculty members attributed to academic qualifications, professional experience, age, gender and interest in modern pedagogy variables?
- 3- How do majors of English at An-Najah National University (ANU) in Nablus and the Arab American University (AAU) in Jenin perceive the instructional practices underlying the evaluation practices?
- 4- How do majors of English at An-Najah National University in Nablus and the Arab American University in Jenin perceive the evaluation practices?
- 5- Are there any significant differences in the perceptions of evaluation practices among majors of English at An-Najah and majors of English at the Arab American University in Jenin attributed to the major discipline (English Language & Literature, Translation and TEFL) or to the type of university: public or private?

### **1.6. Hypotheses of the Study:**

The study examines the following hypotheses:

- 1- There are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) among the faculty members in evaluation practices attributed to academic qualifications, years of experience, gender, age and interest in modern pedagogy.
- 2- There are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) among the majors of English Language & Literature, TEFL and Translation at An-Najah National University (ANU) and the Arab American University (AAU) majors in the perceptions of the evaluation practices attributed to the type of university (public or private).
- 3- There are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) among the majors of English Language & Literature, TEFL and Translation at ANU and AAU in the perceptions of the evaluation practices attributed to the major discipline variable.

### **1.7. The Limitations of the Study:**

This study has the following limitations:

1. Locative limitations: - the populations of the study consist of the English language faculty members at Palestinian universities and majors of English at ANU & AAU in Palestine.

2. Temporal limitations: the study is carried out in the academic year (2015 – 2016).
3. Human limitations: the populations of the study consist of the faculty members and majors of English at ANU & AAU in Palestine.
4. Topical limitations: - this study aims at mapping evaluation practices at higher education institutions in Palestine.

### 1. 8. Operational definitions:

- 1- **Evaluation:** in this study, evaluation is a summative, judgmental, and test-based process conducted by instructors in order to arrive at an official grade or score. It is more consistently used in this study to refer to Palestinian faculty members' testing practices.
- 2- **Evaluation practices:** a set of repetitive procedures taken by a faculty instructor to deliver a summative grade to students.
- 3- **Instructional practices:** a set of repetitive procedures taken by faculty to teach English.
- 4- **English faculty member:** the instructor or teacher of English in the English department or a higher education institution (it is used consistently in the study regardless of the master or doctoral degree).
- 5- **A major of English:** the student who studies English Language & Literature, TEFL or Translation.

- 6- **Assessment:** various techniques that educators use to evaluate, measure, document and follow up with students' learning progress and skill acquisition. In modern pedagogy, these methods are designed to give more opportunities to students to learn, be engaged in more authentic tasks and critical thinking other than paper and pencil tests.
- 7- **Conventional evaluation:** testing students to measure how much they know. The most-commonly used tools are traditional tests which contain different types of questions such as: multiple-choice, fill-ins, matching, short essays, sentence completions, short answers, true and false statement and definitions. This kind of questions goes for short, definite answers.
- 8- **Lecturing:** a teacher-based instructional practice that aims at delivering more information and covering more content. It has inherent limitation of student-based engagement.
- 9- **Perceptions:** Instructors' or students' feelings and views about their experiences regarding learning and teaching that can be reflected in their behavior and choices.
- 10- **Major discipline:** these are English Language & Literature, Translation and Methods of Teaching English (or TEFL). At Palestinian universities, the TEFL major belongs to the Faculty of

Education unless it is a minor which can be taught in the English Department in the Humanities Faculty.

### **1.9. Summary:**

This theoretical introduction draws attention to the current conventional practices in instruction and evaluation in the Arab World universities. It also casts more light on assessment culture and its restriction of academic freedom in evaluation as well as the inadequacy of traditional lecturing and testing in meeting up with the challenges and demands of teaching in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The integration of instruction and evaluation in modern pedagogies is confirmed due to its vital effect on the learning-teaching process. In the light of this assumption, the instructional practices are explored in parallel with evaluation practices to confirm their interconnectivity and overlapping effect on each other.

Another important issue in the introduction is the distinction between assessment and evaluation. According to the constructive theory, for learning to be assessed, it should have more visible evidence generated from cognitive processes. In conventional evaluation, learning and teaching are narrowed down for testing purposes.

Further, faculty's perceptions and responses are investigated to explore the reasons behind certain teacher-based practices. In addition, the theoretical background discusses the gap between faculty's beliefs and

practices. Faculty members usually refer the reasons behind their choices to departmental instructions, class size, workload, and the levels of students' competences. However, research provides evidence that testing is still their main choice in evaluation.

The introduction above stresses the need for reflective practice and active professionalism which can monitor habitual practices and survive the challenges of the teaching career.

Furthermore, this introduction emphasizes students' rights to have their views integrated in the assessment process since their contributions are considered valuable feedback.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Review of Related Literature**

#### **2.1. Introduction:**

The foreign language teaching and learning process is complicated and multi-faceted as several factors affect teaching and learning. As this is a mapping study, certain evaluation practices will be discussed as well as their underlying instructional practices. Below is a survey of what educational literature says about several faculty members' practices in instruction and in evaluation in particular. Faculty's and students' perceptions as well as faculty members' favorable assessment tools are also explored. This review highlights some key points which are relevant to the main questions of the study.

#### **2.2. Aspects of Conventional Instructional Practices:**

Traditional lecturing is expected to continue to be the main practice almost all over the world given the pressures higher education is facing due to the economic demands (Bligh, 2000; Bates, 2015) especially in many developing countries (Khan & Akbar, 1997). It is considered to be the best method to teach large numbers of students and consequently lowers costs (Moore, 1996). These inherent limitations of lecturing jeopardize deeper learning by making students passive listeners and dependent on one source of knowledge (Grunwald & Peterson, 2003).



Fink (2003), Sabagh and Saroyani (2014) criticized higher education pedagogies and their justifications since teaching facts and concepts is prioritized more than developing of intellect and values. They stressed the fact that high –order thinking skills are widely assumed to be at the core of college education. However, literature has also indicated some students' preference for traditional learning because of poor competences, lack of training and self-confidence (Struyven et al., 2008).

Orata (1999) and Bligh (2000) confirmed in their studies the effect of class size on traditional classroom practices. The researchers indicated that lectures tend to focus more heavily on the transmission of information as class size increases rather than on clarification and discussion. In return, as numbers increase, faculty members resort to more conventional testing and limited feedback. Workload is another factor against quality. Faculty members tend to use less time and preparation and consequently seek quicker and easier methods of evaluation.

Compared to active learning, traditional lecturing is considered ineffective based on pedagogical consideration of the cognitive theory (Hansen & Stephens, 2000; Sullivan, 2002; Berry, Chen and Honig, 2008). It is not very effective in high-order thinking and can suppress learners' creativity, encourage passivity, give limited feedback and neglect individual differences and motor skills (Killen, 2007; Moore, 1996). In the same context, research has confirmed that content coverage is still a high

priority for faculty members and one of the faculty self-declared reasons for using traditional lecturing (Cooper and Robinson, 2000).

Concerning the role of PowerPoint presentations in traditional lecturing to cover more content, Robinson (2010) and Bates (2015) argued that PPT presentations are usually utilized and loaded by a huge content to be presented in a short period of time. They raised the question of the quantity of learning over the quality. The traditional use of PPT presentations is less-student centered. Modern pedagogical research calls for smarter use of rich media, but not as a cosmetic means. In conclusion, any instructional practice that minimizes the learner's roles is expected to be ineffective even when utilizing rich media.

Dependence on conventional lecturing can affect the specification of language skills and the time given to authentic and meaningful language activities and tasks because better linguistic processing depends on both input and output. Carefully-structured classroom activities can make foreign language learners attempt to generate better output. The need for interaction in classroom context is best achieved by asking learners to perform tasks that require both oral and written language (Krashen, 1982; Skehan, 1998; Swain, 1995; Ellis, 2001).

Findings in Umbach and Wawrzynski's research (2005) and Vo's (2010) are in line with this approach. These researchers discussed the results of national research data which was completed by thousands of respondents (both students and instructors). The findings suggested that

students were more attracted to non-traditional activities used by instructors in different educational institutions.

Another aspect of traditional instruction is limiting students' chances in giving classroom oral presentations in fear of plagiarism and consuming course time. King (2002) discussed the merits of undergraduates' designing oral presentations such as developing real communication, integrating language skills, enhancing team work and activating students in their own learning. Zovkovic (2014) stressed that English language instruction should assist students to develop these communicative presenting skills. For this reason, she called for considering oral presentations an important part of language teaching.

Similarly, written assignments and research papers are not given the necessary attention. Andrews (2003) and Badke (2014) tackled writing skills of language majors as a manifestation of language in the argumentative persuasive styles. Badke pointed out how students lack basic skills of research in addition to their lack of critical thinking and writing skills. Although Badke admitted that writing is a demanding process, he confirmed that instructors do not teach sufficient and consistent research or writing skills. Rafidi's research (2013) at Birzeit University drew attention to a more student-centered method in developing majors' of English writing skills. The findings indicated students' preference for cooperative learning. When infused with critical thinking strategies, it effectively promoted critical thinking and progress in writing in English.

Another implication of the traditional lecturing is the lack of interest and time utilized for asking questions and classroom discussion. Effective use of questions and discussions are other tools that can be used to foster a thoughtful environment to enrich thinking in the classroom. Felder (1994) and Pennell (2000) warned against the use of questions by faculty members especially the ‘any question?’ practice at the end of the presentation. They called upon instructors to utilize questions through all the stages of the classroom presentations as an integrated part of the course plan (Cashin, 1999; Nilson, 2010).

The various aforementioned practices in instruction have been tackled in the current study. The literature review provides good evidence about the issues raised by this study and their inherent relation to conventional teaching especially in lecturing. **The literature above** confirms how conventional lecturing creates teacher-based model and minimizes students’ roles in demonstrating oral and written language. It also discusses the justifications behind these models such as faculty members’ workload, class size and content coverage concerns.

### **2.3. Aspects of Conventional Evaluation Practices:**

Assessment and evaluation are complicated processes which depend on a variety of strategies, practices and procedures to reach a judgment or a measurement (Kwako, 2003). Since the main aim of this study is to map the common evaluation practices of English language faculty members, more focus will be given to conventional or traditional testing as a most

pervasive practice for summative evaluation utilized by English language faculty members.

Assessing learning is an integral part of the learning process, therefore, this connection should be well-defined. Herman et al., (1992) used cognitive learning theory as a basis for the discussion of instruction and assessment. Cognitive learning emphasizes generating of knowledge and individualized learning experiences through developing critical thinking skills, discussion of new ideas, encouraging diverse thinking and managing individual learning differences. In the light of this theory, traditional testing has to be evaluated. Rudner (1991) and Meisels (1993) asserted that conventional testing neglects the vital cognitive processes since it only focuses on getting the right answer. As it mainly emphasizes the acquisition of simple facts and low-level thinking, it fosters superficial memorization and grade-based achievement.

As might be expected, there is a plenty of educational literature that has concentrated on the negative sides of conventional testing. In highly-evaluative situations, foreign language testing anxiety is more detectable. The studies conducted by Vogel and Collins (2002), Kassim, Hanafi and Hancock (2008), Huberty (2009) explored different aspects of tests such as the negative attitude towards instruction especially when the test involves content that was not taught in class. However, there is also evidence that moderate, reasonable and natural test anxiety leads to better performance. Herrera et al. (2007) Aydin (2007), Yahya (2013) criticized teaching to the

test and narrowing down instruction and curriculum by conventional testing.

Regarding students' views, Sambell et al., (1997) reported how students negatively criticized effects of conventional assessment on their learning because it depends more on information recall. Sambell et al., stated that conventional testing from the students' perspective is unfair and inaccurate because it is about one-shot attempt depending on last-minute cramming. Similar results were found by the action research project conducted by Waters et al., (2004) who addressed the effect of non-traditional testing on students and their assessment preferences. They found that most students preferred the new forms of assessment to be flexible in giving more choices to students and chances for better learning and decision making.

In a significant Australian case study, Campell (2008) reported students' negativity towards evaluation practices and called for educational reform and reconsidering of the current evaluation practices. He confirmed that assessment is a powerful far-reaching tool which influences the quality of higher education. In a similar study, Scot (2006) conducted a large national Australian study which included hundreds of courses to investigate key elements about the teaching-learning process. Students criticized the current practices of rote-learning, conventional testing, low-level thinking skills and lack of authenticity.

However, compared to standardized tests, classroom tests are more flexible since they are usually designed around curriculum despite their weaknesses. Despite the fact that they are conventional tests, standardized tests are given more attention in literature since they are broadly-used as a main tool for decision making in students' admission to college. They are also economic given to large numbers of students at lower costs. Further, standardized tests are considered more statistically reliable. (Mathison, 1997; Gasporro, 1997; Franklin, 2002).

Attempting to put the current evaluation practices in a less negative perspective, Kheir Allah (1998) and Almojahed (2006) called for more flexibility and expansion in constructing tests. They considered it more of a cooperative process with students as main stakeholders. Hence, constructing tests becomes a learning experience not an exclusively one-sided process or an administrative obligation with students at the receiving end.

The studies on the effect of administrative and organizational structure and its cultural effect on assessment are quite few (Whitchurch, 2006; Ashwin, Ylänne, Trigwell and Nevgi, 2006; Hutchings, 2010; Haywood Shaw and Laird, 2010; Diyen, 2010). These studies confirmed that pedagogical principles are not the only factors that can influence and shape assessment. Other complex administrative and organizational forces have to be taken into consideration. Knight's study (2002) in three colleges at a British university indicated that lecturers tended to follow the imposed

existing assessment practices. In addition, workload is another important finding that influences the decision of lecturers not to undertake time-consuming or innovative assessment and marking tasks.

Despite the hindering forces in administration and organizational hierarchy, researchers believe that dealing with poor testing cultures and other obstacles can still be developed through reflective practice and active professionalism. Studies conducted by Eraut (1994), Harris (1998) and Kreber (2009) identified the powerful value of critical, reflective self-monitoring practices using the insights of academic life, peer engagement and research. The primary benefit of reflective practice for teachers is a deeper understanding of practices and thriving for more effectiveness. It can verify teacher's beliefs and challenge traditional practices.

The **review** above supports the assumptions of the current study. It highlights the cognitive theory approach in utilizing knowledge and activating mental processes through high order thinking. It also supports the current study design in exploring instruction and its interconnection with conventional evaluation which is test-based. It also explores students' attitudes towards testing as it is currently applied.

#### **2.4. Faculty Members & Students: Conflicting Perceptions:**

Investigating how faculty perceive their practices is definitely academically and professionally rewarding since faculty can check and compare their practices in reference to current research and their



colleagues' beliefs. In addition, they can understand what their students expect from them and consequently develop better pedagogical techniques, decision making and reflective practices (Pajares, 1992). Concerning how faculty members perceive their performance, Eison (2010) reported findings from extensive workshop experience with faculty members. He pointed out that most instructors think of themselves as being very good lecturers especially by using lectures to transmit information (Lacy & Sheehan, 1997; Noordin, 2009; Toker, 2011).

However, investigating teachers' assessment practices revealed that they were not well prepared to meet the demand of classroom assessment due to inadequate training. Researchers reported that teachers are not always qualified to choose appropriate formats. Research also explained that the time constraints the teachers complained about (which prevent them from experimenting with new tools of assessment) is a result of lack of training in pursuing new forms of assessment (Hills, 1991; Sullivan, 2002; Stiggins, 2004).

Likewise, Musawy's study (2009) explored teachers' and students' perceptions of classroom assessment in a higher education institute in Afghanistan. The majority of the students involved in the study criticized the weakness of the traditional methods which were dominant in this institution although teachers favored the summative achievement tests. Additionally, the study indicated that the faculty members had not attended

any workshop or any courses about classroom assessment; they just relied on their own experiences.

Herrera, Murry & Cabral, (2007), Sambell et al.,(1997) and Campell (2008) Waters et.al., (2004), Gayton (2007) and Kvale (2007) reported how students negatively criticized effects of conventional assessment on their learning because it depends more on information recall. From students' perspective, conventional testing lacks fairness and accuracy as it has been discussed earlier in this chapter.

In general, limited research has been done on English faculty members' beliefs and practices (Sullivan, 2002; Woods, 1996; Borg, 2003, 2006; TALIS, 2009). However, available research could detect a noticeable gap between beliefs and practices in faculty's performance (Gómez and Sáiz,2014;Aquino et al., 2015; Ebert-May et al., 2011; Woodbury & Gress-Newsome, 2002; Samuel and Bain, 2002;Norton et.al., 2005; Rieg & Wilson, 2009). While few authors report positive connection between faculty's beliefs and practices, others conclude that there is no direct link (Wilcox-Herzog, 2002). It is also important to look at the impact on faculty's beliefs, practices and attitudes of professional background, type of training, qualifications and professional development, major discipline and length of experience. It is important to note that any of these relationships can have a different effect.

Again, looking at the students' side, several studies have been conducted to determine if there are differences between teachers' and

students' perceptions of the teaching-learning process. McCollin (2000) Cothran and Ward (2000) are among the researchers who reported results about the discrepancy between faculty's perceptions and students' perceptions. In general, faculty members tend to consider students' evaluation of their performance biased and immature (Douglas & Douglas, 2006; Theall and Franklin, 2001). However, advocates of students' rights to evaluate their instructors consider students as the target group who are mostly influenced by the teaching practices of their professors. They consider it a learning experience for students to develop a clearer conception of teaching that will in turn contribute to their learning. Consequently, it is essential that teachers be receptive to students' feedback (Williams & Burden, 1997; Birenbaum, 1996; Kwan, 1999; Cotterall, 1999; Davis, 2009; Shishavan & Sadeghi, 2009). Other researchers have also looked at the discrepancy from another perspective. In studies like: Horwitz, 1990; Kern, 1995; Moore, 1996; Schulz, 1996; Kikuchi, 2005; Brown, 2006; Shishavan & Sadeghi, 2009 Rashidi & Moghdam, 2014) there was a significant negative difference between teachers' beliefs about their performance and students' satisfaction with them. While teachers think highly of their practices in the classroom, students are not always satisfied with them.

In contrast with the instructors' general high perception of their performance, research provides evidence that they tend to view students less positively in terms of levels of academic competences. Cherif et al.,

(2011) conducted a study about reasons behind students' failure in college. According to (68%) of faculty, many students come to college with poor academic backgrounds to the extent that they need remedial or developmental classes in at least one necessary discipline before taking courses for college. In the same context, The Higher Education Research Institute (2004-2005) conducted a national research with a sample of (40,670) faculty members at (421) colleges and universities across all types of colleges and universities. Overall of (41%) of the faculty believed that most of the students they teach lack the basic skills needed for college level. By contrast, findings from the institute's results showed that (70%) of college students rated themselves as above average.

Hechinger Report (2011), Spaights, Kenner and Dixon (2010) examined students' perception of the academic self-image (in contrast with their instructors' general opinions about them). According to a study from the University of Wisconsin, findings in general, highlighted the positive academic self-image students had. In a national American study conducted by Higher Education Research Institute in (2005), (70%) of college students rated themselves as above average, whereas only (36%) of faculty considered students to be well-prepared. A similar study was Salli-Copur's (2008) who explored the academic self concept of Turkish English graduates over 4 years. Findings revealed that the graduates perceived themselves to be competent, however, they expressed their need for more practice.

According to Marton and Sajlo (1997), Drew (2001), Fredericks (2005) and Mostafa (2010) effective evaluation is an authentic, continuous and collaborative process between students and teachers. Hence, students can start to develop individual responsibilities and self-monitoring. Drew (2011) indicated students' needs for clear assessment and feedback. His findings indicated that students prefer individual and written feedback (although they are aware of their instructors' workload). He stressed that students' motivations and orientations influence the ways in which they perceive and act upon their understanding of assessment. McGivney's (1996) highlighted more details of students' needs for feedback. He indicated that they need rapid and regular feedback as well as specific instructions to improve and guide their work. He also indicated students' needs for clear explanations of the grading system, practice in examination techniques and discussion of answers. Similar findings were found in studies like: (Seedhouse, 2001; Zacharias, 2007; Abu Shawish and Abd Al-Raheem, 2015).

The **review** above supports the current study approach in pursuing students' perceptions and views regarding their instructors' performance. It proves the validity of the issues raised about students' academic self-image, need for individual feedback from their instructors and their attitude towards evaluation in general. This review also provides evidence of various gaps among students and their instructors which supports the approach of this study in seeking students' views and feedback.

## **2.5. Selection of Evaluation Tools:**

There are several factors which affect the selection and design of the evaluation tool. However, culture is almost always one of the very influential ones. Other factors are related to lack of formal training on assessment options, time constraints also appear to affect assessment choices, in addition to other academic competences and administrative restrictions.

Research has indicated that instructors tend to find traditional testing very handy even after taking training or being free to select among assessment tools. Traditional testing question formats are the primary form of assessment in higher education (Kvale, 2007). This kind of testing is relatively easy to design, administer and score in addition to its measurement of explicit learning and institutional approval (Norton et al., 2006). Ebert-May et al., (2011) reported the findings of a year-long professional development training to help faculty move from teacher- to learner-centered learning for undergraduates programs. The professional training was given to instructors over a long period of time to test how learner-centered the teaching will turn and how compatible the reported instructors' practices were with the feedback given by independent observers of their performance. The majority of faculty (75%) used lecture-based and teacher-centered pedagogy showing a clear disconnection between faculty's perceptions of their teaching and their classroom practices.

In a similar study, Aquino et al (2015) investigated faculty's perceptions, skills, and practices of assessment in undergraduate programs. The sample consisted of (90) professors and instructors having postgraduate ranks. Faculty's self-reported views and responses indicated that they highly regarded assessment as a major tool to enhance learning, promote students' development and assign grades. These major findings were similar to studies conducted by Serra, Gómez and Sáiz (2014). They indicated that faculty regarded student learning as important and they were also confident of their skills to carry out an assessment for that purpose. However, it was reported that faculty felt students' participation in such evaluation was not necessary. The most frequent tool used by (100%) of faculty was written tests, and quizzes. Another important finding was that all respondents admitted that there are university guidelines that affect their practices to a very significant extent. This major finding was also indicated by Grunewald & Peterson (2003). Furthermore, faculty members expressed their need for more training in classroom assessment. They revealed that their workloads and administrative duties affect their time for preparing assessment and directly leads to the handier summative testing. These findings confirm that written tests are part of the university evaluation culture.

This **review** supports the effect of assessment culture in defining assessment tools and provides more evidence about faculty members' gap

between theory and practice. It shows how much the testing culture is deeply-rooted and defiant to change.

## **2.6. The Effects of Faculty's & Students' Demographic Variables:**

Concerning the variables that might affect faculty members' views and practices, this study has explored some conventional and non-convention variables namely: academic qualifications, experience, interest in modern pedagogy, gender and age.

However, it is important to bear in mind that the effects of the demographic variables have various, sometimes contradicting results among studies. In general, the studies related to gender have produced inconclusive results, but most have shown that this variable has little or no impact on faculty performance (Marsh Arreola, 2000; Theall & Franklin, 2001; Algozzine et al., 2004).

Norton et al., (2005) conducted a study in the UK to explore the influence of gender, pedagogical training, years of experience and institutional and department culture on the beliefs and practices of faculty members. The findings indicated that the department culture has a greater influence on practices more than beliefs. It was found that the length of teaching experience and pedagogical training has no significant influence on practices. However, concerning the gender of the instructor, it was found that females tend to be more receptive to modifying their practices than males. In a similar research, Al-Thimiri & Hamdi (2015) explored



instructional and evaluation strategies. The findings of the study indicated that the faculty members' perception of evaluation standards was high among respondents followed by standards related to teaching strategies. The findings showed that there were no significant statistical differences in evaluation in all domains attributed to gender, academic rank and the academic experience of the faculty member.

Regarding the variables of age and length of experience, although they are not usually included in faculty's demographics, Coffery & Gibbs (2002), Kreber (2005) noted that years of teaching experience still can play a role in reflective experience and so it can improve learning outcomes. Al-Qaffas and Al-Farahati (2011) found that more experienced teachers with more educational qualifications tended to be more interested in evaluating different learning domains and following up with students' progress.

The current study explores the effect of certain unconventional variables that might influence students' beliefs and perceptions such as: the type of university whether it is private or public in addition to the major discipline (Translation, TEFL or English Language & Literature). Concerning the university variable, research has shown that private universities usually have a slight significance in students' perceptions and level of satisfaction. Jones (2003) and Telford & Masson (2005) reported the quality assurance influence in higher education as one main reason which has become a focus of attention for private universities. Choi's study

(2013) in a Malaysian private college yielded similar results on the effect of lecturers' competencies on students' satisfaction. Mazumder (2013) conducted a research to explore students' perceptions at chosen public and private universities in Bangladesh. Only five universities responded to the research questionnaire because the other universities were un-cooperative. This may indicate that most of the higher education institutions do not necessarily consider students' satisfaction as a priority. It was found that students at private universities have a higher satisfaction levels than public universities. However, Naidu's & Derani (2016) comparison between private and public universities in Malaysia showed less significant differences between the two types of universities.

Concerning the effect of discipline, some studies have shown that Humanities' students regard their instructors more positively than students in the social sciences or science faculties (Neumann, 2001; Franklin & Theall 1995; Scarboro, 2012).

In the Palestinian context, Essa and Naqa (2009) conducted a study about students' views regarding faculty competences in lecturing, classrooms activities and methods of evaluation. The instructional competences ranked slightly higher than the average evaluation practices related to testing, grading and classroom activities. There were no statistical differences related to students' variables of gender, major or levels. Similar results are found in Khader's & Shaat study (2010).

**Finally**, it is worthy to mention that the call for changing practices in the teaching-learning process versus the adherence to traditional practices must have created some confusion and reservation among faculty members in different parts of the world. Assessment reform has been inconsistently applied by instructors in different parts of the world (Dassa, 1990; Gipps, 1994). In general, where changes have been introduced and assisted by training, or when assessment reform is directly introduced into the teaching programs, the pace of change is slow because it is still difficult for teachers to change practices which are closely embedded within the culture around them (Shepard, 1995).

## **2.7. Conclusion:**

First, it is important to bear in mind the peculiarities of foreign language teaching and the distinctive roles foreign language teachers have. Foreign language teaching is regarded to be more complex and varied than other subjects. The methodologies are considered to be more progressive than that of other subjects, and consequently, English language teachers are needed to be more up-to-date to cope with the advanced and progressive nature of language teaching methodology (Borg, 2006). For teachers, it is a necessary step for more professional development. In addition, language teaching is always in need for new ideas and successful practices.

## 2.8. Summary:

The previous review conveys probably more of realistic practices associated with foreign language teaching in higher education. The review highlights the main aspects of the conventional practices in instruction and evaluation. It draws attention to some justifications behind these practices such as the institutional assessment culture, economic considerations, content coverage and lack of pedagogical training. The effect of the conventional practices minimizes students' chances of demonstrating their learning because of lower cognitive processes, less engagement and limited chances of demonstration of language competences in oral and written activities. Conversely, the assessment which supports the learning process as well as the products of learning tends to be more satisfactory and sufficient and goes past the limited results in conventional testing. Instead of rote learning and basic facts teaching, students are trained to practice problem-solving, open-ended questions and more authentic tasks that can generate more personalized and genuine learning.

The **review** also highlights the role of active professionalism and reflective practice in improving and monitoring habitual practices.

In addition, **the review** highlights the conflicting views between faculty members and students. The review draws attention to faculty members' general positive perceptions of their performance, whereas they tend to think less positively of students' competences. In contrast, students, who are conventionally instructed and evaluated, tend to regard their

instructors' practices less positively while they hold a positive academic self-image. Consequently, more researchers call upon faculty members to make the best use of students' evaluation of the teaching learning process as a valuable feedback resource and a tool for development in order to bridge this gap.

Finally, the review draws attention to the inconclusive results concerning the effects of demographic variables in the diverse populations of students and faculty members.

## **Chapter Three**

### **Methodology and Procedures**

#### **3.1. Introduction:**

In this chapter, the methodology used in collecting and analyzing the data is defined. The researcher has presented the research methodology, the population and the sample of the study, the research instruments, validity and reliability of the instruments, the study procedures and the statistical analysis.

#### **3.2 Methodology:**

A descriptive, analytical approach is used to achieve the main purpose and answer the research questions. To approach the problem, develop hypotheses and generate qualitative data, the researcher benefited from observation, contacts and interviews with faculty members and English majors from different universities. In addition, previous studies were used to generate more qualitative data. Two questionnaires were used to collect data about the faculty members' common evaluation practices and students' perceptions of these practices. The quantitative data is based on the statistical analysis of the responses which was used to formulate generalizations about the faculty members' practices and the English majors' perceptions as well as answer the research questions.

### 3.3. Population of the Study:

The population of this study consisted of all the English language instructors in Palestinian universities in Gaza and the West Bank. The students' population consisted of the majors of English Language & Literature, TEFL and Translation majors at An-Najah National University in Nablus and the Arab American University in Jenin. The study was carried out in the academic year (2015/ 2016). The total number of instructors was (220) and the total number of students was (1500) according to the statistics provided by the English departments.

### 3.4. The Sample of the Study:

The sample of the study is stratified random. It consisted of (166) instructors and (400) students from the whole population. The percent of teachers sample is (75.4 %) and the percent of students sample is (26.7 %) from whole population. Tables (1-8) below indicate the sample distribution in accordance to teachers and students independent variables.

#### A- Instructors' Variables:

**Table (1): Distribution of Sample According to Gender Variable:**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Male	103	62.0
Female	63	38.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table (2): Distribution of Sample According to Academic Qualification****Variable:**

<b>Academic qualification</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Master	112	67.5
Ph.D	54	32.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>100 %</b>

**Table (3): Distribution of Sample According to Professional Experience Variable:**

<b>Professional experience</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Less than 5 years	26	15.7
6-10 years	62	37.3
More than 10 years	78	47.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>100 %</b>

**Table (4): Distribution of Sample According to Age Variable:**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
25-35	40	24.1
36-45	47	28.3
46-55	41	24.7
More than 56	38	22.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>100 %</b>

**Table (5): Distribution of Sample According to Interest in Modern Pedagogy Variable:**

<b>Interest in Modern Pedagogy</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Average	11	6.6
Good	60	36.1
Very good	95	57.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>100 %</b>

**B- Students' Variables:****Table (6): Distribution of Sample According to University Type:**

<b>University</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Public	215	53.7
Private	185	46.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>



**Table (7): Distribution of Sample According to Major:**

<b>Major</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
English language & literature	175	43.8
English language Methodology	135	33.7
Translation	90	22.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### **3.5. Instruments of the Study:**

The researcher developed two questionnaires based on educational literature, related studies and other particular less-tested variables. The instructors' questionnaire consisted of (5) sections:

- The first section consisted of (6) items about demographic data namely: the instructor's gender, age, academic qualification, university, professional experience and interest in modern pedagogy.
- The second section consisted of a six-item multiple-choice question to explore the general instructional and evaluation practices among faculty members. This section is a secondary and an introductory question which requested faculty members to choose answers that best suited their cases from (5) options. The three first items were intended to explore general common instructional practices and another three items to explore general evaluation practices. This question also aimed at eliciting more responses from instructors.
- The third section and the fourth section consisted of (24) items to explore more details about the instructional (items from 1-8) and

evaluation practices (items from 1-16). The researcher applied a four-level Likert scale to test the frequency of particular instructional and evaluation practices as well as explore certain views among instructors. Here is the scale:

- Never 1 degree
  - Rarely 2 degrees
  - Sometimes 3 degrees
  - Always 4 degree
- The fifth section is a rank-order scaling question consisting of (14) options of evaluation tools for instructors to choose from according to their own preferences and priorities.

The students' questionnaire consisted of (3) sections:

- The first section consisted of (3) items about demographic data namely: governorate, type of university and major.
- The second and third sections consisted of (32) items exploring students' perceptions regarding their instructors instructional (items from 1-14) and evaluation practices (items from 1-18). A five-level Likert scale was used :

- Strongly disagree 1 degree
- Disagree 2 degrees

- Neutral 3 degrees
- Agree 4 degrees
- Strongly agree 5 degrees

### **3.6. Validity of the Instrument:**

The two questionnaires were presented to a jury in the fields of English language and TEFL at An-Najah University and Al-Aqsa University in Gaza, in addition to the researcher's supervisor. The researcher was recommended to make some modifications and additions.

### **3.7. Reliability of the questionnaire:**

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was used to find out the reliability of instructors' questionnaire and for both the two domains of the students' questionnaire and their total score.

The following Table (8) shows reliability coefficients of each domain and the total score of the questionnaire. It shows that all the reliability coefficients are (0.86) which is considered to be suitable for scientific purposes of the study.

**Table (8): Reliability Coefficients of Each Domain and the Total Score of the Questionnaire:**

<b>Domains</b>	<b>Number of items</b>	<b>Reliability coefficient</b>
Instruction practices	8	0.70
Evaluation practices	16	0.73
<b>Instructors' questionnaire</b>	24	0.75
Views on the instruction and lecturing practices	14	0.77
Views on the evaluation practices	18	0.76
<b>Students' questionnaire</b>	32	0.86

### **3.8. Procedures of the Study:**

The formal procedures were taken to carry out the study. First, after establishing the utility of the instrument, the necessary modifications were added. Second, permission was given to the researcher to start administering the questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed in the first and second semester in the academic year 2015– 2016. Every instructor and student was invited to complete the questionnaire. In order to obtain more valid and credible results, the researcher had to take several trips to all Palestinian universities to meet instructors and distribute questionnaires. Later, the researcher began to collect the questionnaires from the instructors and students. Fewer instructors' questionnaires from Gaza were completed on line, but the majority were completed in hard copies then sent by parcel mail to the researcher. The researcher herself distributed copies to most of the majors of English and TEFL at An-Najah and majors of English at the Arab American University in Jenin. The questionnaires were collected for statistical analysis.

### **3. 9. Questions of the Study:**

This research has 2 main questions:

- What are the most common evaluation practices utilized by faculty members of English at Palestinian higher education institutions?
- What do faculty members of English prefer to use for evaluation at Palestinian universities?

The first question underlies these sub- questions:

- What are the instructional practices utilized by faculty members at Palestinian universities which underlie the common evaluation practices?
- Are there any significant differences in evaluation practices among the faculty members at the Palestinian universities attributed to the academic qualification variable?
- Are there any significant differences in evaluation practices among the faculty members at the Palestinian universities attributed to the professional experience variable?
- Are there any significant differences in evaluation practices among the faculty members at the Palestinian universities attributed to the age variable?

- Are there any significant differences in evaluation practices among the faculty members at the Palestinian universities attributed to the gender variable?
- Are there any significant differences in evaluation practices among the faculty members at the Palestinian universities attributed to interest in modern pedagogy variable?

There is one main question in the students' questionnaire:

- How do majors of English, TEFL and Translation at An-Najah National University in Nablus and the majors of English, TEFL and Translation at the Arab American University in Jenin perceive the evaluation practices employed by their instructors?

More secondary questions are:

- How do the majors of English, TEFL and Translation at An-Najah National University in Nablus and at the Arab American University in Jenin perceive the instructional practices underlying the evaluation practices?

This question underlies more sub- questions:

- Are there any significant differences among the majors of English, TEFL and Translation at ANU and at AAU attributed to the type of university variable: private or public?

- Are there any significant differences among the majors of English, TEFL and Translation at ANU and at AAU attributed to the major variable: TEFL, English Language & Literature and Translation?

### **3. 10. Hypotheses of the Study:**

- There are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in evaluation practices among the Palestinian faculty members attributed to academic qualifications, professional experience, age, gender and interest in modern pedagogy.
- There are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the perceptions of evaluation practices among the majors of English, TEFL and Translation at ANU and the majors of English, TEFL and Translation at AAU attributed to type of university and major.

### **3.11. Variables of the Study:**

#### **1. Instructors' Independent Variables:**

- **Male / Female Gender.**
- **Academic Qualifications** which are divided into Masters and PhD.
- **Professional Experience** :( less than 5 years, 6-10 years, more than 10 years).

- **Age** (Less than 25 years, 26-35 years, 36-45 years, 46-55 years, more than 56 years).
- **Interest in Modern Pedagogy** which ranges from average, good, very good.

## 2. **Instructors' Dependent Variables:**

The common evaluation practices which are employed by faculty members at Palestinian Universities.

## 3. **12. Students' Independent Variables:**

- **University Type** which includes private or public.
- **Major** which includes English Language & Literature, Translation and TEFL (Methods of Teaching English).

## **Students' Dependent Variables:**

The English majors' perceptions of the common evaluation practices which are employed by their instructors.

## **Statistical Analysis:**

The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 17.0 was used to analyze data. Various statistical tests were used including means, standard deviations, percentages, frequencies, independent T-test, One way ANOVA and Scheffe post hoc test to determine the sources of differences in the rejected hypotheses.



To estimate the instructors' responses about instructional practices and evaluation practices, a four-Likert scale was used. The levels of responses were calculated in percentages as follows:

\*81.25% and more is a very high degree.

\*62.50-81.24% is a high degree.

\*43.75-62.49% is a low degree.

\*43.74 % and less is a very low degree.

To estimate students' responses, a five-Likert scale was used. The levels of responses were calculated in percentages as follows:

- 80% and more is a very high degree.
- 70-79.9% is a high degree.
- 60-69.9% is a moderate degree.
- 50-59.9% is a low degree.
- 50 % and less is a very low degree.

### **3.13. Ethical Issues:**

Permission to conduct this study was granted by the Faculty of Graduate Studies at An-Najah University. Participants of the study were informed about the purpose of the study and their participation was

voluntary. All the data of this study is considered confidential and used for the purpose of academic research only.

#### **3.14. Summary:**

In this chapter, the researcher has presented the main components of the study. The populations, the instruments and the samples have been defined. In addition, the questions of the study, the hypotheses and the variables have been specified. The validity and reliability have been described as well.

## **Chapter Four**

### **Results**

#### **4.1. Introduction:**

This chapter is divided into several parts which present the research questions and hypotheses. The research results were analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The statistical analysis has revealed the following results:

#### **4.2. Results Related to the Faculty's Questionnaire:**

At first, the researcher explores general instructional and evaluation practices in a six-item multiple choice question (about instruction and testing) which was meant as a means of orientation. Frequencies and percentages for each practice were calculated.

##### **4.2.1. Results Related to the Multiple Choice Questions:**

This section tackles the results related to the responses about common instructional practices utilized by faculty members of English:

### A. Results Related Lecturing as a Favorable Practice:

**Table (9): Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Lecturing as a Favorable Instructional Practice**

No.	Response	Frequency	Percentage
1	It can cover a lot of material	72	43.4
2	It is part of the instructor's responsibility.	65	39.2
3	Students like lectures.	16	9.6
4	This statement does not apply to my case.	9	5.4
5	Information is inaccessible.	4	2.4
<b>Total</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table (9) shows that (43.4%) of instructors see lecturing as a favorable practice of instruction because it can cover a lot of material, whereas (39.2%) see it as a part of the instructor's responsibility. Only (5.4%) do not consider lecturing as a favorable practice or applicable in their cases.

### B. Results Related to Skills Specification:

**Table (10): Frequencies and Percentages of Skills Specification Responses:**

No.	Response	Frequency	Percentage
1	There are many students.	43	25.9
2	Three formal tests are sufficient to examine skills.	38	22.9
3	Students' skills are observable by the faculty instructor.	38	22.9
4	There is no time to specify all skills requirements.	24	14.5
5	It does not apply to my case.	23	13.9
<b>Total</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table (10) shows that instructors have different views about the lack of skill specification. The highest response (25.9 %) indicates that the number of students does not allow instructors to define more learning skills. There are also equal responses rates which indicate that instructors consider skills can be either observed by the instructors or formally-tested.

### **C. Results Related to the Use of Tests More than Presentations:**

**Table (11): Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Tests are Better than Presentations:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1	Students are not trained to give them.	67	40.4
2	They are demanding to their levels.	32	19.3
3	Students are usually shy.	27	16.3
4	This statement does not apply to my case.	27	16.3
5	It is a waste of course time.	13	7.8
<b>Total</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table (11) shows that (40.4%) of instructors think tests are better than presentations because students are not trained to give them whereas (19.3%) see that they are demanding to their levels.

### **D. Results Related to Students' Non-Test Based Work:**

**Table (12): Frequencies and Percentages of Responses about Students' non-Test Based Work:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1	They are usually plagiarized from the internet.	64	38.6
2	They need more follow up.	48	28.9
3	They are hard to grade.	21	12.7
4	There is not enough time for these.	19	11.4
5	This statement does not apply to my case.	14	8.4
<b>Total</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table (12) shows that (38.6%) of instructors think students' non-test based work is usually plagiarized from the internet whereas (28.9%) see that they need more follow up.

#### **E. Results Related to the Use of Power Point:**

**Table (13): Frequencies and Percentages of Responses about the Use of PowerPoint:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1	They help me present more information	68	41.0
2	I like to use technology.	35	21.1
3	They impress students.	28	16.9
4	They enable students to take notes	22	13.3
5	This statement does not apply to my case.	13	7.8
<b>Total</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table (13) shows that (41.0%) of instructors explain that they use PowerPoint presentations in order to present more information whereas only (21.1%) of instructors like to use technology.

#### **F. Results Related to the Reasons Behind Formal Testing:**

**Table (14): Frequencies and Percentages of Responses:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1	It is more effective and reliable for evaluation.	62	37.3
2	An administrative procedure.	60	36.1
3	Other evaluation techniques are not suitable for our students.	20	12.0
4	Tests are easy to administer.	17	10.2
5	This statement does not apply to my case.	7	4.2
<b>Total</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table (14) shows that (37.3%) of instructors assume testing is taken for granted as it is more effective and reliable for evaluation whereas (36.1%) of instructors assume it is an administrative procedure.

#### **4.4. Results Related to the First Sub- Question about the Underlying Instructional Practices:**

**Table (15): Means, Standard Deviations, Percentages and Levels of Instruction Practices Among Faculty:**

No	Item	M	SD	Percentage	Level
1	Using brainstorming or concept mapping is better than students' listening and note-taking.	3.19	0.68	79.75	High
2	I think I need to collect data about my effective teaching from different sources (from other instructors and students, for example).	3.13	0.67	78.25	High
3	I prefer to discuss students' questions at the end of the class to help achieve more goals.	3.05	0.80	76.25	High
4	I think that current generations of our students might not be sufficiently motivated to perform, create or produce.	3.05	0.70	76.25	High
5	When I teach extra courses, I depend on formal testing as a reliable evaluation technique.	2.98	0.83	74.5	High
6	I think all language skills can be evaluated through testing as a reliable rating process.	2.85	0.82	71.25	High
7	I don't provide student-based tasks in classroom for every lecture because it is very demanding and time-consuming.	2.58	0.80	64.50	High
8	I find classroom tasks, which represent meaningful instructional activities, demanding and time consuming.	2.55	0.89	63.75	High
<b>Total score of instruction practices among instructors</b>		<b>2.92</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>73.0</b>	<b>High</b>

Table (15) shows that the instructional practices among instructors achieved a mean of (2.92) and a percentage of (73.0). This means that the tested instructional practices have high responses. The responses range between (63.7- 79.7%). The items (7-8) are not as high as the rest. The highest levels range between (71.2 - 79.7%). They are the items from (1-6).

#### **A- Results Related to the Main Question about Faculty's Common Evaluation Practices:**

**Table (16): Means, Standard Deviation, Percentages and Levels of Evaluation Practices Among Faculty Members:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Level</b>
1	I like to go over the exam questions with students after handing in their papers to let them learn from their mistakes.	3.48	0.68	87.0	Very high
2	I keep up to date with new developments in evaluation and assessment.	3.45	0.61	86.25	Very high
3	I try to think of different techniques for evaluations other than testing.	3.33	0.71	83.25	Very high
4	I think, since I want my students to possess meaningful learning, it is important to reconsider my evaluation practices.	3.19	0.74	79.75	High
5	The administrative instructions related to tests affect the quality of testing practices as adopted by the faculty staff.	3.07	0.71	76.75	High
6	Testing, as it is currently applied, overlooks complex thinking and problem-solving skills.	2.98	0.73	74.50	High
7	I think the test scores represent improvement or decline in teaching and learning.	2.97	0.74	74.25	High



No.	Item	M	SD	Percentage	Level
8	Essays can be a better choice than open-ended questions	2.95	0.61	73.75	High
9	I have found that multiple – choice testing format is very helpful even if they have a limited relevance to real-world learning.	2.86	0.79	71.50	High
10	I believe experimenting with non- test based evaluation needs time, effort and training which the teaching staff cannot afford.	2.84	0.80	70.25	High
11	Open- ended questions are hard to mark and grade by many instructors.	2.80	0.80	70.0	High
12	Multiple - choice tests are more efficient in determining how well facts and concepts have been acquired.	2.75	0.83	68.75	High
13	I do not allow students to take part in evaluation because it is a formal administrative procedure	2.68	1.03	67.0	High
14	I think non- test based evaluation techniques do not apply in our case.	2.61	0.92	65.25	High
15	Writing notes on test papers is unnecessary because the test grade can provide the necessary feedback to the student.	2.31	0.97	57.75	Moderate
16	I think giving students additional tasks to improve their performance in formal tests is against faculty instructions and policy.	2.23	1.02	55.75	Moderate
<b>Total score of evaluation practices among instructors</b>		<b>2.91</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>72.75</b>	<b>High</b>

Table (16) shows that the evaluation practices among instructors achieved a mean of (2.91) and a percentage of (72.75). This means that tested evaluation practices have high responses. The very high responses range between (83.25- 87 %). They are the items from (1-3). The high

responses range between (67.0 – 79.75%). They are the items from (4-14). There are two moderate responses ranging between (55 – 57%). They are the items (15-16).

**Table (17): Total Degrees of the Instruction and Evaluation Domains:**

No.	Domain	M	SD	Percentage	Level
1	Instruction practices	2.92	0.32	73.0	High
2	Evaluation practices	2.91	0.31	72.75	High
<b>Total degree</b>		<b>2.91</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>72.75</b>	<b>High</b>

Table (17) shows that the total degree of instruction and evaluation practices achieved a mean of (2.91) and a percentage of (72.75), which indicates that the items used to explore faculty's practices and beliefs have a relatively high degree of regularity in instruction and evaluation (according to the four-level Likert scale applied).

#### **B- Results Related to the Second Main Question about Faculty Members' evaluation Preferences:**

The researcher suggested (14) alternatives and asked instructors to order (6) alternatives. Table (18) shows the results.

**Table (18): Frequency of the Best Evaluation Preferences:**

Order	No	Tool	Frequency
1	3	Formal tests & exams	104
2	9	Conducting research	94
3	11	Creative papers	88
4	1	Student-proposed projects	87
5	6	A series of quizzes or chapter tests instead of comprehensive, high-stakes tests	84
6	4	Students' writing of critiques	71
7	12	Collective projects	67

Order	No	Tool	Frequency
8	13	Students' journals	59
9	5	Annotated portfolio of students' work through the term	49
10	14	Interviews & questionnaires	42
11	2	Drama & performances	35
12	8	Utilizing self-assessment & rubrics	32
13	10	Students producing films & videos	26
14	7	Student-designed tests	18

Table (18) indicates that formal tests & exams are the first best tool with (104) frequencies. Conducting research is the second best tool with (94) frequencies. Creative papers is the third best tool with (88) frequencies. Student-proposed projects is the fourth best tool with (87) frequencies. A series of quizzes or chapter tests instead of comprehensive, high-stakes tests is the fifth best tool with (84) frequencies. Students' writing of critiques is the sixth best tool with (71) frequencies.

#### 4.6. Results Related to the Faculty Members' Hypotheses:

##### A. Results Related to the First Hypothesis:

There are no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in evaluation practices among faculty members due to gender. T-Test was used for independent samples. Table (19) shows the results.

**Table (19): T-Test for Independent Samples of Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to Gender:**

Domain	Male (N=103)		Female (N=63)		T-value	Sig.*
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
Instruction practices	2.95	0.31	2.87	0.33	1.581	0.116
Evaluation practices	2.95	0.30	2.83	0.31	2.521	0.013*
Total degree	2.95	0.26	2.84	0.27	2.617	0.010*

\* Significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ), D.F = 164.

Table (19) shows that there are no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the instruction practices due to gender in instructional practices, while there are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the evaluation practices and the total degree. These differences are in favor of males. Hence, the first hypothesis is rejected.

### **B. Results Related to the Second Hypothesis:**

There are no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in evaluation practices among faculty members due to academic qualification. T-Test was used for independent samples. Table (20) shows the results.

**Table (20): T-Test for Independent Samples of Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to Academic Qualifications:**

Domain	Master (N=112)		Ph.D (N=54)		T-value	Sig.*
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
Instruction practices	2.88	0.30	3.02	0.35	2.637	0.009*
Evaluation practices	2.86	0.33	3.00	0.25	2.764	0.006*
Total degree	2.87	0.27	3.01	0.23	3.251	0.001*

\* Significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ), D.F = 164.

Table (20) shows that there are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the evaluation practices due to academic qualification. These differences are in favor of Ph.D holders. Hence, the second hypothesis is rejected.

### C. Results Related to the Third Hypothesis:

There are no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in evaluation practices among faculty members due to professional experience.

One-Way ANOVA was used to test the hypothesis. Tables (21- 23) show the frequencies, means and standard deviations of the instruction and evaluation practices due to professional experience and the results of One-Way ANOVA respectively.

**Table (21): Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to Professional Experience:**

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Professional experience</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Instruction practices	Less than 5 years	26	2.88	0.29
	6-10 years	62	2.89	0.29
	More than 10 years	78	2.96	0.35
Evaluation practices	Less than 5 years	26	2.74	0.36
	6-10 years	62	2.95	0.28
	More than 10 years	78	2.92	0.30
Total degree	Less than 5 years	26	2.79	0.28
	6-10 years	62	2.93	0.24
	More than 10 years	78	2.94	0.27

**Table (22): One–Way ANOVA to Test the Differences of Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to Professional Experience:**

Domain	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	D.F	Mean Squares	F	Sig.*
Instruction practices	Between groups	0.235	2	0.118	1.142	0.322
	Within groups	16.786	163	103.0		
	Total	17.021	165			
Evaluation practices	Between groups	0.927	2	0.463	5.032	0.008*
	Within groups	15.009	163	092.0		
	Total	15.936	165			
Total degree	Between groups	0.493	2	0.247	3.612	0.029*
	Within groups	11.124	163	068.0		
	Total	11.617	165			

\*Significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ).

Table (22) indicates that there are no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the instruction practices due to professional experience, while there are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the evaluation practices and total degree due to professional experience. Hence, the third hypothesis is rejected. Scheffe post hoc test was used to determine the source of differences. Table (23) shows Scheffe post hoc test results.

**Table (23): Scheffe Post Hoc Results to Determine the Differences in Evaluation Practices and Total Degree Due to Professional Experience:**

Domain	Professional experience	Less than 5 years	6-10 years	More than 10 years
Evaluation practices	Less than 5 years		-0.219*	-0.188*
	6-10 years			0.031
	More than 10 years			
Total degree	Less than 5 years		-0.148	-0.152*
	6-10 years			-0.004
	More than 10 years			

\*Significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ).

Table (23) shows that:

- There are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the evaluation practices due to professional experience, between the (less than 5 years) interval and the (6-10 years) interval in favor of the (6-10 years).
- There are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the evaluation practices due to professional experience, between the (less than 5 years) interval and (more than 10 years) interval in favor of (more than 10 years) interval.
- There are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in total degree due to professional experience, between the (less than 5 years) interval and the (more than 10 years) in favor of the (more than 10 years) interval.

#### **D. Results Related to the Fourth Hypothesis:**

There are no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in evaluation practices among faculty members due to age. One-Way ANOVA was used to test the hypothesis. Tables (26-28) show the frequencies, means and standard deviations of the instruction and evaluation practices due to age and the results of One-Way ANOVA respectively.

**Table (24) Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to Age:**

Domain	Age	N	Mean	SD
Instruction practices	25-35	40	2.86	0.32
	36-45	47	2.94	0.26
	46-55	41	2.95	0.37
	More than56	38	2.94	0.34
Evaluation practices	25-35	40	2.78	0.35
	36-45	47	3.02	0.26
	46-55	41	2.86	0.32
	More than56	38	2.94	0.25
Total degree	25-35	40	2.81	0.30
	36-45	47	2.99	0.21
	46-55	41	2.89	0.29
	More than56	38	2.94	0.23

**Table (25): One-Way ANOVA to Test the Differences of Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to Age:**

Domain	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	D.F	Mean Squares	F	Sig.*
Instruction practices	Between groups	0.222	3	0.074	0.713	0.546
	Within groups	16.799	162	0.104		
	Total	17.021	165			
Evaluation practices	Between groups	1.390	3	0.463	5.160	* 0.002
	Within groups	14.546	162	0.090		
	Total	15.936	165			
Total degree	Between groups	0.805	3	0.268	4.018	* 0.009
	Within groups	10.813	162	0.067		
	Total	11.617	165			

\*Significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ).

Table (25) indicates that there are no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the instruction practices due to age, while there are significant



differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the evaluation practices and total degree due to age. Hence, the fourth hypothesis is rejected. Scheffe post hoc test was used to determine the source of differences. Table (26) shows Scheffe post hoc test results.

**Table (26): Scheffe Post hoc Results to Determine the Differences in Evaluation Practices and Total Degree Due to Age:**

Domain	Age	25-35	36-45	46-55	+56
Evaluation practices	25-35		-0.240*	-0.079	-0.163
	36-45			0.162	0.077
	46-55				-0.084
	More than 56				
Total degree	25-35		-0.187*	-0.084	-0.135
	36-45			0.103	0.052
	46-55				-0.051
	More than 56				

**\*Significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ).**

Table (26) shows that:

- There are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the evaluation practices due to age, between the (25-35) interval and the (35-45) interval in favor of the (36-45) interval.
- There are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in total degree due to age, between the (25-35) interval and the (36-45) interval in favor of the (36-45) interval.

### E. Results Related to the Fifth Hypothesis:

There are no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in evaluation practices among the faculty members due to interest in modern pedagogy. One-Way ANOVA was used to test the hypothesis. Tables (27- 28) show the frequencies, means and standard deviations of the instruction and evaluation practices due to interest in modern pedagogy and the results of One-Way ANOVA respectively.

**Table (27) Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to Interest in Modern Pedagogy:**

Domain	Interest in modern pedagogy	N	Mean	SD
Instruction practices	Average	11	2.80	0.37
	Good	60	2.88	0.29
	Very good	95	2.96	0.33
Evaluation practices	Average	11	2.89	0.41
	Good	60	2.85	0.31
	Very good	95	2.94	0.30
Total degree	Average	11	2.86	0.34
	Good	60	2.86	0.25
	Very good	95	2.95	0.26

**Table (28): One–Way ANOVA to Test the Differences of Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to Interest in Modern Pedagogy:**

Domain	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	D.F	Mean Squares	F	Sig.*
Instruction practices	Between groups	427.	2	0.213	2.095	0.126
	Within groups	16.594	163	0.102		
	Total	17.021	165			
Evaluation practices	Between groups	319.	2	0.159	1.663	0.193
	Within groups	15.617	163	0.096		
	Total	15.936	165			
Total degree	Between groups	319.	2	0.160	2.303	0.103
	Within groups	11.298	163	0.069		
	Total	11.617	165			

\*Significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

Table (28) indicates that there are no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in evaluation practices among the faculty members due to interest in modern pedagogy. Hence, the fifth hypothesis is accepted.

#### **4.7. Results Related to the Research Questions in the Students' Questionnaire:**

##### **4.7.1. Results Related to the First Sub- Question:**

- How do majors of English, Translation & TEFL at ANU and AAU perceive the instructional practices underlying the evaluation practices employed by their instructors?

This question underlies more sub- questions:

- Are there any significant differences in evaluation practices among the majors of English, Translation and TEFL at ANU and majors of

English, Translation and TEFL at AAU attributed to the type of university variable?

- Are there any significant differences in evaluation practices among the majors of English, Translation and TEFL at ANU and majors of English, Translation and TEFL at AAU attributed to the major variable?

In order to answer this question, the means, standard deviations, percentages and levels for students' views about instruction practices were calculated.

**Table (29): Means, Standard Deviation, Percentages and Levels of Students Perceptions about Instruction Practices:**

No.	Item	M	SD	%	Level
1	I prefer to take notes because I expect they will be included in the test.	3.91	1.14	78.2	High
2	I can use the internet resources well to improve my learning.	3.77	1.12	75.4	High
3	I try to take many notes while the instructor is lecturing.	3.75	1.17	75.0	High
4	I think I can prepare and give a Power Point presentation in front of my class.	3.61	1.13	72.2	High
5	The instructor explains the general and specific aims of the lecture.	3.51	1.10	70.2	High
6	The explanations which the instructor presents during the lecture are meaningful and understandable.	3.50	1.13	70.0	High
7	I think the lecture is better and more interesting than listening and note-taking when the instructor first discusses the topic with us.	3.45	1.16	69.0	Moderate

No.	Item	M	SD	%	Level
8	In my courses, lecturing is the most common way of teaching.	3.45	1.22	69.0	Moderate
9	I like to take part in research and projects with my classmates.	3.36	1.17	67.2	Moderate
10	Students are given sufficient time to ask questions at the end of the lecture.	3.36	1.05	67.2	Moderate
11	When there are more students in my class, I feel I have a less chance to participate.	3.30	1.24	66.0	Moderate
12	I think Power Point presentations are similar to lectures because they give more time to the instructor.	3.14	1.06	62.8	Moderate
13	I hesitate to ask questions because I prefer to listen.	2.95	1.18	59.0	Low
14	In my classroom, chairs do not allow group work and free movement.	2.68	1.25	53.6	Low
<b>Total score of students views about instruction practices</b>		<b>3.41</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>68.2</b>	<b>Moderate</b>

Table (29) shows that the students' views about instruction practices achieved a mean of (3.41) and a percentage of (68.2), which means that students have moderate views about instructional practices. However, there are 6 items with high levels ranging between (70-78%). They are the items from (1-6). There are six items with the moderate levels which ranged between (62-69%). They are the items from (7-12). There are two items with low levels ranging between (53-59%). They are the items (13-14).

#### 4.7.2. Results Related to the Second Sub- Question:

- How do majors of English, Translation and TEFL at An-Najah National University in Nablus and the majors of English, Translation

and TEFL at the Arab American University in Jenin perceive the evaluation practices employed by their instructors?

In order to answer this question, the means, standard deviations, percentages and levels of students' views about evaluation practices were calculated. Table (30) shows the results.

**Table (30): Means, Standard Deviation, Percentages and Levels of Students Perceptions about Evaluation Practices:**

No.	Item	M	SD	%	Level
1	I think I should discuss with my instructor what I can do to score higher grades.	3.71	1.08	74.2	High
2	I need my instructor's evaluation to understand where I stand in the course	3.69	1.14	73.8	High
3	I like to discuss my progress with my instructor.	3.66	1.03	73.2	High
4	The tests I take depend more on remembering information.	3.62	1.16	72.4	High
5	I wish I could suggest more ideas to my instructor to improve the course.	3.59	1.08	71.8	High
6	I think it is more practical if my total grade does not depend mainly on written exams.	3.55	1.21	71.0	High
7	Exams and tests focus on certain skills but neglect others	3.46	1.11	69.2	Moderate
8	I prefer to have quizzes and short tests instead of longer exams.	3.43	1.32	68.6	Moderate
9	My instructor gives me clear instructions about conducting research and written assignments.	3.40	1.00	68.0	Moderate

No.	Item	M	SD	%	Level
10	I find questions which need long written answers challenging to me.	3.37	1.21	67.4	Moderate
11	I am more used to taking tests and exams than to writing papers and giving presentations.	3.33	1.16	66.6	Moderate
12	Questions like multiple choice, matching, filling blanks are very common in my tests.	3.26	1.26	65.2	Moderate
13	My instructor comments on my answers in tests.	3.17	1.13	63.4	Moderate
14	I think I do well on finals.	3.14	1.06	62.8	Moderate
15	I can prepare a research paper quickly because I mainly depend on internet resources.	2.99	1.06	60.0	Moderate
16	I think all language skills (listening, speaking, writing and reading) can be evaluated through testing.	2.91	1.31	58.2	Low
17	Taking exams is easier for me than having to conduct research and write papers.	2.91	1.20	58.2	Low
18	I think tests are the best way to determine who can pass the course and who cannot.	2.66	1.24	53.2	Low
<b>Total score of students views about evaluation practices</b>		<b>3.32</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>66.4</b>	<b>Moderate</b>

Table (30) above shows that the students' views about evaluation practices achieved a mean of (3.32) and a percentage of (66.4), which means that, students have moderate views about evaluation practices. There are six high responses with percentages ranging from (71.8-74.2%). These are the items from (1-6). There are nine items with the moderate views which ranged between (62.8 -69.2%). These are the items from (7-15).

There are three responses with low levels ranging from (53.2-59.8%). These are the items from (16-18).

**Table (31): Means, Standard Deviation, Percentages and Levels of Students Perceptions about Instruction, Evaluation Practices and Total Degree:**

No.	Domain	M	SD	Percentage	Level
1	Students' perceptions about instruction practices	3.41	0.57	68.2	Moderate
2	Students' perceptions about evaluation practices	3.32	0.51	66.4	Moderate
<b>Total degree</b>		<b>3.36</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>67.2</b>	<b>Moderate</b>

Table (31) shows that the total degree of students' views about instruction and evaluation practices achieved a mean of (3.36) and a percentage of (67.2), which means that students' have moderate views about instruction and evaluation practices.

#### **4.8. Second: Results Related to the Research Hypothesis:**

##### **A- Results Related to the First Hypothesis:**

- There are no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the perceptions of evaluation practices among the majors of English, Translation and TEFL at ANU and the majors of English, Translation and TEFL at AAU attributed to the type of university variable.

T-Test was used for independent samples. Table (34) shows the results.



**Table (32): T-Test for Independent Samples of the Students' Perceptions about Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to University:**

Domain	Public (N=215)		Private (N=185)		T-value	Sig.*
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
Students' perceptions about instruction practices.	3.33	0.65	3.50	0.45	2.967	0.003*
Students' perceptions about evaluation practices.	3.27	0.57	3.39	0.43	2.243	0.025*
Total degree	3.30	0.57	3.44	0.39	2.776	0.006*

\* Significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ), D.F = 398.

Table (32) shows that there are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the students' views about evaluation practices due to university in favor of the private university over the public university. This means that there are more significant differences in favor of AAU in Jenin over ANU in Nablus. Hence, the results provide evidence to reject the first hypothesis.

#### **B- Results Related to the Second Hypothesis:**

- There are no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the evaluation perceptions among the majors of English, Translation & TEFL at ANU and majors of English, Translation and TEFL at AAU attributed to the major variable.

One-Way ANOVA was used to test the hypothesis. Tables (33-35) show the frequencies, means and standard deviations of the students' views about instruction and evaluation practices due to major and the results of One-Way ANOVA respectively.

**Table (33): Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Students' Perceptions about Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to Major**

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Major</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Students' perceptions about instruction practices	English Language & Literature	175	3.54	0.49
	English Language Methodology	135	3.19	0.69
	Translation	90	3.49	0.39
Students' perceptions about evaluation practices	English Language & Literature	175	3.42	0.43
	English Language Methodology	135	3.13	0.61
	Translation	90	3.43	0.41
Total degree	English Language & Literature	175	3.47	0.41
	English Language Methodology	135	3.15	0.61
	Translation	90	3.46	0.35

**Table (34): One-Way ANOVA to Test the Differences of the Students' Perceptions about Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to Major:**

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Source of Variance</b>	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>D.F</b>	<b>Mean Squares</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.*</b>
Students' perceptions about instruction practices	Between groups	10.193	2	5.097	16.944	0.0001*
	Within groups	119.412	397	0.301		
	Total	129.605	399			
Students' perceptions about evaluation practices	Between groups	7.857	2	3.928	15.945	0.0001*
	Within groups	97.813	397	0.246		
	Total	105.670	399			
Total degree	Between groups	8.792	2	4.396	19.125	0.0001*
	Within groups	91.248	397	0.230		
	Total	100.039	399			

\*Significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ).

Table (34) indicates that there are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the students' views about evaluation practices due to major. Scheffe post hoc was used test to determine the source of differences. Table (35) shows Scheffe post hoc test results.

**Table (35): Scheffe Post Hoc Results to Determine the Differences in Students Perceptions about Instruction and Evaluation Practices Due to Major:**

Domain	Major	English language & literature	English language methodology	Translation
Students' perceptions about instruction practices	English Language & literature		0.351*	0.045
	English Language Methodology			-0.306*
	Translation			
Students' perceptions about evaluation practices	English Language & literature		0.291*	-0.015
	English Language Methodology			-0.306*
	Translation			
Total degree	English Language & literature		0.317*	0.011
	English Language Methodology			-0.306*
	Translation			

**\*Significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ).**

The statistical analysis of the tables above (33-35) indicates that there are significance differences among students attributed to major whether it is Language & Literature, TEFL or Translation:

- There are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in students' views about evaluation due to major, between English Language & literature and TEFL in favor of English language & literature.
- There are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in students' views about evaluation due to major between TEFL and Translation in favor of Translation.
- There are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in students' views about evaluation total degree due to major, between English Language & Literature and TEFL in favor of English language & Literature.
- There are significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in students' views about evaluation total degree due to major TEFL and Translation in favor of Translation.

**The results** above show that there are differences in the students' perceptions about evaluation practices among different majors of English. The Humanities' majors have more significant differences than the Education majors. Hence, these results provide evidence to reject the second hypothesis.

#### **4.9. Summary:**

The main results of the statistical analysis are:

- 1- Items testing faculty's conventional practices in instruction and evaluation are high.
- 2- Most of the faculty members adhere to the selection of high-stakes testing as a main tool for evaluation.
- 3- The faculty's responses tend to demonstrate a disconnection between their beliefs and practices.
- 4- There are significant differences attributed to the faculty members' qualifications, age, experience and gender. However, the faculty's high interest in modern pedagogy has not been proved significant in faculty's practices.
- 5- The students' responses are moderate where their instructors' instructional and evaluation practices are concerned.
- 6- There are significant differences in the students' responses attributed to the university type and the major discipline in favour of the private university and the English Language and Translation majors over the TEFL major.

## **Chapter Five**

### **Discussion of the Results, Conclusions and Recommendations**

#### **5.1. Introduction:**

In the first part of this chapter, the results and hypotheses of the faculty's questionnaire (gender, professional experience, age, qualifications and interest in modern pedagogies) are discussed as well as the results and hypotheses of the students' questionnaire (major discipline and university type). The second part of this chapter is devoted to presenting the main conclusions of the research. The third part is devoted to the recommendations derived from the conclusions. However, as this is a mapping study, an attempt has been made by the researcher to discuss and present the results in such a way as to highlight those teacher-student perceptions in the two overlapping areas of the teaching –learning process: instruction and evaluation. Therefore, along with indicating research questions and hypotheses, a thematic review will be presented to allow for a more coherent interpretation of the findings as they relate to or overlap with specific practices.

#### **5.2. Discussion of the Research Results:**

##### **5.2.1. The Main Practices in Instruction & Evaluation:**

The results suggest that teacher-based instructional practices along with conventional test-based evaluation tend to be the most common

practices. The findings of the short multiple-choice question indicate that (43.4%) of faculty are mainly concerned about content coverage probably because they feel under pressure. Studies conducted by Marton and Sajlo(1997), Cooper, MacGregor, Smith, & Robinson (2000) confirmed that content coverage is still a high priority for faculty members and one of the faculty's self-declared reasons for using traditional lecturing.

As almost (40%) of the faculty members consider lecturing their main responsibility, they tend to teach to the test using more of classroom time to achieve this goal. From extensive workshop experience with faculty members, Eison (2010) pointed out that most instructors think of themselves as good lecturers doing their duties by using lectures to transmit information. Even in the information age, this teacher- based practice is considered a corner stone in conventional instruction.

In addition, the use of technology (PPT, for example) is utilized by (41%) of the faculty members for content coverage and knowledge transmission, whereas it can be used to add more interactive roles among students themselves as well as between students and instructors. This result is similar to the findings by Mann & Robinson (2010) and Bates (2015) who investigated the ineffective, less-student-centered use of technology in classroom to assist traditional instruction and called for utilizing rich media in active learning.

Another result of teaching to the test is neglecting the specifying of more learning skills such as high order thinking and problem solving, in

addition to the integration of the four language skills. Consequently, this leads to more focus on conventional testing of knowledge and lower cognitive skills. Besides, it is unlikely that dependence on conventional instruction leaves time for skill development. However, faculty members' responses reflect three main attitudes. For example, three formal tests are considered by (22.9%) enough to specify skills, whereas another (22.9%) of them consider these skills as observable without testing. Still, almost (30 %) consider class size the reason for this. This finding about the effect of class size which can hinder active teaching and lead to traditional conditions. is confirmed by Orata (1999) and Bligh (2000).

In regard to the findings about the evaluation practices in the multiple-choice question, testing is considered by (37.3 %) of faculty members as more reliable and effective for evaluation, whereas (36.1%) of faculty members consider testing an administrative procedure. These two significant results are supported by Norton et al., (2006). He confirmed the dominance of conventional testing and the role of institutional restriction in this regard. As testing is considered more reliable, non test-based work does not significantly contribute to the overall grade of the course. For example, tests are considered more reliable than students' presentations by (40.4%) of the faculty members because instructors think that students are not well-trained. Researchers such as King (2002), Ellis (2001) and Zovkovic (2014) criticized the limited chances given to students to develop



vital skills as oral communication and verbal interaction through presentations and discussions as an important part of language teaching.

In regard to students' written work, it is considered by ( 38.6%) of faculty as plagiarized from the internet, whereas ( 28.9%) consider it in need of more time to follow up. Norton et al., (2006) confirmed that conventional testing is used more than written activities and research in fear of plagiarism. According to the results of this question, the faculty members tend to use most of the course time for lecturing and formal tests. However, more reasons behind the limited, non-test-based work (such as workload, class size and , underestimation of students' competences and lack of active classroom strategies) will be discussed later in this chapter.,

### **5.2.2. The Instructional Practices Underlying the Evaluation Practices:**

The researcher has found evidence of the inter-related connection between instruction and evaluation since the limited potentials of instruction leads to conventional testing. The researcher considers the less frequent use of authentic examples and student-based activities by more than (64%) of faculty inherent in traditional lecturing which cares less about students' engagement. Krashen (1982), Swain (1995), Skehan (1998), and Ellis (2001) criticized the quality of activities in the conventional learning –teaching process which can affect the teaching of language skills and the time given to authentic and meaningful language activities and tasks.

It is more likely that the quality of instruction which utilizes authentic engaging tasks can boost students' motivation towards better achievement (Gardner, 1993). Workload is another reason for conventional practices which might not allow (74.5%) of instructors to think of more active learning strategies, and consequently to attempt to use new evaluation tools other than testing to specify more language skills. The limited time for discussion pushed to the end of the lecture by (76%) of faculty is in line with using more time for teacher-based instruction.

However, two of the faculty's responses indicate less teacher-based practices namely the use of brainstorming by (79.7%) of faculty as well as getting feedback about instruction from colleagues and students. These practices were meant to test how 'divergent' from traditional practices instructors' beliefs can be. This result is similar to the findings in Mojares's research (n.d). He confirmed faculty's tendency to occasionally use brainstorming with lecturing to engage students given the inherent restriction of students' roles in traditional instruction.

Further, the results reflecting the faculty's opinions about the students' competences add more to the whole picture. These students are regarded by (76.25 %) of their instructors as not sufficiently motivated and creative. Faculty's perception of students' poor academic competences are supported by the findings in the American College Teacher Faculty Survey in (2004-2005). This major study confirmed that (41%) of faculty believed students were not sufficiently competent. Cherif et al., (2011)

indicated that according to faculty, a significant number of students come to college with poor academic backgrounds and lack prerequisites for college courses.

The use of class time for more lecturing, giving less time for authentic activities, limited classroom discussion and directing more efforts towards testing are the underlying instructional practices which have high responses among instructors. Thus, the researcher confirms that the answer to the sub-question in the instructors' questionnaire about the most common instructional practices is conventional lecturing. Weiman (2014) asserted that traditional lecturing is receiving fewer defenses. He speculated upon instructors' justifications concerning their preference to utilize lecturing in teaching large classes, for being in accordance with students' demands and note-taking in addition to their use of lecturing to cover material. He argued that these justifications are presented without real experimentation with more active learning. He further argued that covering material does not necessarily mean promoting learning. The same argument is discussed in Bligh (2000) Wilson & Korn (2007) and Race (2005).

### **5.2.3. Evaluation Between Beliefs & Practices:**

Concerning the evaluation domain, it highlights faculty members' ideal perceptions in contrast with realistic evaluation practices. The responses tend to indicate a possible inconsistency between what instructors say and what they do. The researcher considers this

comprehensible compared to similar research findings from different parts of the world. However, in addition to this possible gap between belief and practice, the researcher would also like to draw attention to the instructors' reported beliefs about dissatisfaction with testing and their need to reconsider their practices as good signs of reflective practice. The researcher considers this a vital need and a basic requirement for professionalism. As for teaching a foreign language, English faculty members have to deal with many responsibilities in addition to other duties related to the teaching profession. They express their high interest in modern pedagogies (86.2%), declare the need for reconsidering their evaluation practices (79.75%) and (74.50%) of them agree that the current testing practices neglect high order thinking and problem solving (which are one of the main aims of higher education). Rieg & Wilson (2009), Serra, Gómez and Sáiz (2014), Aquino et al (2015) indicated the same gap between faculty's self-reported beliefs and practices which is in line with this study. However, Prat (2005) referred this gap to students' levels and institutional restraints. In this regard, the researcher confirms that institutional restraints are usually influenced by the prevailing assessment culture. In addition, students' competences and lack of training might cause instructors to hesitate to use non-conventional practices.

Furthermore, the faculty members perceive students as the target group of the evaluation process not one of its stakeholders. They are still unwilling to engage students in the evaluation process. Most of the faculty

members (67.0%) consider that evaluation is exclusively a formal teacher-based practice and an administrative procedure that excludes students. Consequently, most of them (76.75%) agree that administrative policies affect the quality of testing they use. However, only (55.7%) of their responses regard giving students more chances to improve their performance is against the administrative policy. In their studies, Fink, (2003), Abu Ayyash (2011), Sabagh & Saroyani (2014) confirmed that administration and university culture are barriers of improvement .

The research finding about considering evaluation an exclusive, teacher-based practice is in line with Kikuchi's study (2005) which indicated that students' participation in evaluation practices received the lowest responses given by instructors. However, in modern pedagogy, it is considered a learning experience with students as main stakeholders (Stiggins, 2004; Almojahed, 2006; Wiliam and Thompson, 2007; Cashin & Nilson, 2010).

Concerning the faculty's attitude towards other forms of evaluation, most of the faculty members (65.25 %) consider non-test based evaluation inapplicable in our case. It is considered by (70.25%) of them as demanding in terms of time, effort and training. However, as they tend to adhere to the significance of formal test scores as indicators to improvement or decline in teaching and learning (74.50%), they continue to feel the need to reconsider their evaluation practices in order to enable students to possess more meaningful learning (79.75%). Most instructors

agree that testing as it is currently applied overlooks complex thinking and problem-solving skills (74.50%). However, responses still show that they prefer multiple-choice questions (71.50%) although this type of questioning has considerable limitations. Most faculty members use multiple choice question formats to determine how well facts and concepts have been acquired (68.75%). High responses (73.75%) show that they consider essay question format better than open-ended questions since the latter are hard to grade and mark by many instructors (70.0%). It is worth mentioning that using more traditional question formats with one-shot answers (and avoiding open-ended questions, for example) leads to depriving students of the creative thinking and reflection inherent in non-conventional questions.

Norton et al., (2006) confirmed that despite the growing interest in non-test based assessment and despite faculty's reported dissatisfaction, conventional aspects in testing continue to be used while non-conventional models are avoided. However, the researcher regards these attitudes as obstacles to active professionalism and reflective practice. Dissatisfaction with habitual practices should lead to monitoring and replacing them with more progressive ones.

Regarding the faculty's use of feedback, their practices suggest that (87%) of faculty prefer to provide general test-based and whole class feedback. The less individualized feedback is probably caused by the class size. However, Bangert-Drowns et al., (1991) confirmed that effective feedback depends on the time, the design and the form. The findings of the

current research indicate instructors' tendency in giving general, verbal whole class feedback. However, Abu Shawish and Abd Al-Raheem (2015) described slightly different instructors' feedback in the four main universities in Gaza as quite acceptable written feedback.

**The results** above provide good evidence to answer the main question of the study. The evaluation practices employed by the faculty instructors at the Palestinian universities tend to be conventional in terms of testing as the most common evaluation practice, question formats, non-applicability of modern assessment strategies and assessment culture. The conventionality of practices in higher education is supported by numerous studies (Airasian, 2002; Fink, 2003; Stiggins, 2004; Lamine, 2010; Gómez et al., 2014; Sabagh & Saroyani, 2014 and Aquino et al., 2015).

However, as conventional practices have received less defense in the last few decades, there are studies that confine lecturing to certain purposes like compiling updated information or for specific courses (Rahman, 2011; McKeachie & Svinicki, 2006). In addition, there have been studies about the value of interactive lecturing by Murphy & Namrata (2010) and Schmidt et al., (2015) who highlighted practices that involve students in technologically-assisted learning. Interactive lecturing has been described as closer to active learning than conventional lecturing. The purpose is to try to strike some balance between the instructor's roles and the student's roles. However, the researcher thinks that interactive lecturing should be handled with more care. Students' participation is still limited in terms of

meaningful tasks and oral discussions. This research has confirmed that the use of technology is not a cosmetic effect, but has to evidently enhance students' roles.

The researcher would like to draw attention that there are also differences in the quality of the lecturing practices peculiar to science disciplines more than humanities.

Further, it is important to mention that despite the criticism of conventional testing, standardized tests are given more attention since they are a main tool used for decision making in students' admission to college, efficiency, large scale testing and public accountability as literature indicates (Franklin, 2002; Stiggins, 2004; Mathison, 1997; Gasporro, 1997; Stiggins, 2004). However, despite the economic benefit of administering this kind of testing, it does not serve other purposes of evaluation especially classroom evaluation.

#### **5.2.4.Total Score of All Domains:**

The total degree of the two domains was (72.75%) which means that there are high responses on the tested instruction and evaluation practices among instructors according to the study scale. This also indicates that the tested items tackle important points in the faculty's perceptions and practices in instruction and evaluation.



### **5.3. Faculty's Preferable Evaluation Practices:**

The findings indicate that faculty members still find high-stakes testing the most reliable and effective tool of evaluation. This supports one of the major findings of this study. Assessment culture and administrative policies are behind high stakes testing as a well-established practice. This domain highlights another preference for evaluation which is conducting research and projects. However, written work is allocated fewer grades than testing probably because of instructors' workload, the concern about plagiarism and big class size. Another interesting finding is that performance assessment, alternative assessment and self-evaluation are the least ranked. As these are non-conventional methods, students are expected to be more involved in learning while the instructors' roles are dynamically changed beyond knowledge transmission. Similarly, more observable evidence of learning should be provided in these non-conventional methods since paper and pen testing does not very distinctly provide this evidence. This is in line with the reported views of instructors who consider these kinds of assessment as inapplicable in our case and demanding of more training, effort and planning. Furthermore, the prevailing institutional assessment culture adheres to conventional testing as the most reliable and effective practice in evaluation. Haywood's study (2010) reported that when assessment culture is institutionally promoted, faculty believe more strongly and are more interested in improving their assessment efforts.

The findings above are supported by Grunewald & Peterson (2003), Serra, Gómez and Sáiz (2014), Aquino et al., (2015) who indicated that faculty highly regarded assessment as a vital tool to enhance learning and to promote students' development. However, the researchers stressed that the most frequent tool used by (100%) of faculty was written tests and quizzes. Selection of formal tests was interpreted as a formal procedure compatible with administrative regulations and as a direct result of faculty's workload and lack of training in classroom assessment. Similarly, more research results provide evidence how current evaluation has become a testing activity which is directly criticized in the works of Robinson (2010), Shihadeh (2009) and Mostafa (2010).

Nevertheless, the findings are not in harmony with Borg's study (2006) who examined the peculiarities and the concept of the foreign language teachers. He regarded FL teaching to be more complex and varied than other subjects. The methodologies are regarded to be more progressive than that of other subjects, and consequently, English language teachers needed to be more up-to-date to cope with the advanced and the progressive nature of language teaching methodology. Borg's supposition might be justified by the fact that as there is a need and a preference to learn English as foreign and global language, its teaching has to be done in more effective and attractive ways.

The researcher confirms that the role of a foreign language teacher is distinctive and complex. However, the teacher's attention is usually divided

by the various learning needs (the pursue of quality and the compelling need for quantity). As traditional practices are more criticized, teachers might become confused. The findings of the current study and the researcher's interviews with faculty provide evidence of this. Dassa (1990), Gipps (1994) pointed out how the changes in pedagogy affect teachers in different ways. They also criticized the way changes are introduced resulting in diverse, selective and even counter-productive practices. They concluded that more training is needed as the pace of change is slow because it is very difficult for teachers to change practices deeply rooted and well-established in the assessment culture.

#### **5.4. Discussion of the Hypotheses of the Study:**

The main question in the instructors' questionnaire has a number of hypotheses to test the significances in evaluation practices attributed to gender, qualifications, professional experience, age and interest in modern pedagogies.

The results of the first hypothesis show that there are significant differences in the evaluation practices due to gender. These differences are in favor of males. However, it is worthy to mention that male instructors are over-presented while female instructors are only (38%) in the faculty instruction profession. According to the researcher's observations and interviews with female instructors at universities in the West Bank, they have more inclination to commit to departmental regulations. Studies

relating to gender suggest that gender has little or no impact on these practices (Arreola, 2000; Theall & Franklin, 2001).

The results of the second hypothesis show that there are significant differences in the evaluation practices due to academic qualifications in favor of Ph.D holders. According to the researcher, although professors represent (32.5%) of the sample, it is expected that they can be more experimental and less conventional in their choice of tools and question formats. During her interviews with professors in the West Bank, they expressed their dissatisfaction with certain conventional practices and the restrictive policies of evaluation. This finding is supported by the work of Al-Qaffas and Al-Farahati (2011).

The results of the third hypothesis show that there are significant differences in the evaluation practices due to professional experience. The source of differences is attributed to longer years of experience (more than 10 years). It is expected that professional experience encourages instructors to think more about their practices as also found in Coffery & Gibbs (2002), Kreber (2005), Al-Sir (2003) and Al-Qaffas & Al-Farahati's research (2011). However, in Al-Thimiri & Hamdi's study (2015) experience is not significant.

The results of the fourth hypothesis indicate that there are significant differences in the evaluation practices due to age. The source of difference is in favor of (36-45) over younger ages of the sample. Similar to longer years of experience, age is expected to encourage instructors to

reconsider practices. This finding is supported by Coffery & Gibbs (2002) and Kreber (2005).

The results of the fifth hypothesis show that there are no significant differences in evaluation practices due to interest in modern pedagogies. It is worthy to mention that most of the instructors reported they have very good interest in modern pedagogy. The researcher refers this to the lack of academic freedom, the prevailing assessment culture and the possible gap between instructors' beliefs and their actual practices. This finding is supported by Norton et al., (2006).

As the instructional and evaluation practices are complicated areas in the teaching-learning process, there are inconclusive results about the significance of the aforementioned variables in international, regional and local research. This is confirmed in Norton et al., (2005) and (2010), Arreola (2000), Marsh (2000), Al-Qaffas and Al-Farahati (2011) and Al-Thimiri & Hamdi (2015).

### **5.5. Faculty's Practices as Perceived by Students:**

Although the focus of this study is the evaluation practices used by English faculty members, the researcher wanted to include students' perceptions and attitudes regarding evaluation which has a crucial effect on their future. They are major stakeholders in the evaluation process and can provide their instructors and other decision makers with valuable feedback.

### **A- Faculty Members' Instructional Practices as Perceived by the Students:**

Statistical analysis shows that the students at ANU and AAU have moderate degrees of views about instructional practices which mean that they see distinct inadequacies in their instructors' performance. Their responses also suggest that students are more satisfied by learner-centered instruction than the teacher-based practices. These trends in students' views are further confirmed by Afaneh (1998), Umbach & Wawrzynski (2005), Scot (2006), Norzila et al., (2007) Vo, (2012) and Gavino (2013).

The students confirm the quality of instructional practices reported in the instructors' responses. Most of them (69%) confirm that lecturing is the most common instructional practice. Similarly, the use of PowerPoint presentations, as another teacher-based practice, is confirmed by (62.8%) of students. This is in line with Bates (2015) and Mann & Robinson (2010) who pointed out that PowerPoint presentations are traditionally-used because they are less-student centered. He stressed that modern pedagogical research calls for smarter use of rich media in the classroom.

As previously pointed out, in lecturing as a teacher-based practice, less students' engagement is expected. Many students (75-78%) use most of the lecture time to take notes to help them review for tests. This result is supported by studies such as Kiewra et al., (1991). Other responses indicate that the students preserve their rights to ask questions as (67%) report that they have sufficient time to ask questions at the end of lecture (although

(66%) report that class size affect their chances in class participation). However, the researcher tackles this result with care, especially in regard to the time allocated for discussions and the quality of questions as well. Furthermore, (69%) of students prefer their classes to have more discussions and brainstorming.

The researcher would like to draw attention to the contradiction in the students' responses regarding classroom discussions. The researcher considers this contradiction a result of their average satisfaction. They prefer to contribute more, but apparently due to the common conventional practices and class size, they are given less opportunities. This result is supported by Orata (1999) and Bligh (2000). Further, the limited time set for asking questions especially the "any question" practice at the end of the lecture. Instructors are called upon to make a better use of questions and discussions through all the stages of the classroom presentation to create a more intellectual classroom atmosphere (Felder, 1994; Pennell, 2000; Nilson, 2010).

On the other hand, there are two positively- viewed instructional practices. A high rate of responses (70%) indicates that clear aims and good examples are usually provided by lecturers. The other high responses reflect the students' preferences. A good percentage of students like to conduct research with classmates which can be considered as a sign of their preference for co-operative learning. They display confidence about their academic self-image since (72%) responded that they can contribute to the

lecture and give presentations. Another high rate (75.4%) responded that they can use the net resources well to help them in learning.

Conventional instruction usually limits students' opportunities in giving classroom presentations and other contributions in fear of plagiarism and consuming of course time. In contrast, modern research stresses the significance of developing real word communication, integrating language skills, enhancing team work and engaging students in their own learning process as active participants (King, 2002; Zovkovic, 2014).

It is worthy to mention that the students' positive academic self-image is in contrary with the instructors' general view about them. This finding is supported in the work of Spaight, Kenner & Dixon (2010) and Salli-Copur (2008). When instructors consider students less competent, conventional instructional practices will continue to waste students' learning potentials, ignore high-order thinking and reduce motivation. Thus, lecture time is transferred into a routine session aiming at preparing for tests and content coverage.

#### **B- Faculty Members' Evaluation Practices as Perceived by the Students:**

Statistical analysis shows that the students' views at ANU and AAU about evaluation practices are moderate. Naturally, testing as it is currently applied is a trigger of tension among students. However, an average percentage of students (62.8%) think they usually do well on finals. Still,



most of them prefer short tests to high stakes exams. Despite the fact that they are more familiar with tests as the only form of evaluation, they find them more demanding than research and written work. This indicates that written work is usually assigned much less grades than it deserves. More evidence is found in their response as (67.4%) of respondents find long written answers more challenging. Definitely, long written answers need multi-skills of high order thinking and organization. Obviously, students feel that exams are very demanding since they are one-shot attempt that can have a detrimental effect on their formal achievement. Bangert-Drowns, et al., (1991), Kikuchi (2005) and Shishavan & Sadeghi (2009) support the finding about students' preference of shorter frequent tests rather than big tests of irreversible effects.

In addition, the students' responses about the quality of questions format contribute to this research finding about the faculty's conventional practices. Most students (65.2%) confirm the conventionality of the questions formats and (72.4%) of them further confirm that their tests mainly depend on information recall. This explains why (67.4%) find long written answers challenging. Similarly, faculty's responses suggest less frequent use of open-ended questions since (70%) of instructors agree that open-ended questions are not easy to grade. According to Andrews (2003), Badke (2014) and Rafidi (2013), writing difficulties are referred to under-training of writing skills and lack of training in high order thinking. However, the use of essay in question format is considered central to

assessment in higher education especially for English majors. Andrews stressed it as a major manifestation of the argumentative persuasive style in using a foreign language. Similar results are reported in Rafidi's study (2013).

Equally important, the researcher would like to address the faculty members' concerns about plagiarism in the students' written work. A moderate rate of the students' responses (60%) confirms that they mainly depend on the internet resources to quickly prepare written assignments. In another response, (75.4%) of students agree that they use the internet resources to improve their learning. Concerning students' possible misuse or over-dependence on internet resources for written work, the finding is supported by Badke (2012, 2014). He tackled the problems of undergraduate writing and research in the information age. He claimed that instructors do not teach sufficient and consistent research or writing skills. He argued that plagiarism can be avoided when instructors design topic-specific activities and carefully-constructed divergent questions that can encourage students to think more creatively.

The result about the students' preferences for short quizzes and tests instead of longer exams (68.6%) is quite in harmony with their general attitudes of anxiety and rejection of high-stakes conventional. These exams usually have irreversible effects on the course evaluation. This finding is supported by Scot (2006) and Vo (2012) who criticized conventional testing as being irrelevant to higher standards. They called

for more focus on testing of higher order thinking through integrated authentic assessment tasks. These findings are also supported by Sambell et al., (1997), Herrera et al. (2007) and Campell (2008). They reported how students negatively criticized effects of conventional evaluation on their learning because it depends more on information recall.

One major result in the students' responses is their general perception about the function and significance of tests which the researcher considers enlightening. Fewer students consider tests as the only form of evaluation. Similarly, they do not agree that all language skills can be evaluated by tests. This is a striking contrast with their instructors' views who consider testing as the most valid and effective form of evaluation. The researcher thinks that this wide gap needs to be bridged between students and their instructors about the function and significance of testing. Researchers such as Waters et al., (2004) and Musawy (2009) addressed students' criticism of conventional testing and draw the attention to their assessment preferences. Similarly, more findings in Sambell et al., (1997), Gayton,( 2007) and Kvale( 2007) pointed out that conventional testing from the students' perspective lacks fairness and accuracy because it is one-shot attempt.

Regarding the discussion above about the gap between faculty's views and students views, the researcher finds it in line with international research which confirms the existence of this gap. Horwitz (1990), Kern (1995), Moore (1996) and Schulz (1996) Brown (2009), McCollin (2000)

Cothran, and Ward (2000) and Rashidi and Moghdam (2014) discussed the discrepancies between students' perception and faculty's perceptions in regard to instruction and evaluation practices.

Involving students in assessment can boost their learning and make them more active and responsible. An evidence of this attitude is suggested by their high responses which demonstrate their confidence in their ability to contribute to the course plan. The researcher finds this result a very significant finding. It is regarded as a sign of confidence and responsibility. This significant result is supported by Drew (2001) and Mostafa (2010).

Concerning students' views on feedback, their responses suggest that they still prefer more individualized feedback than the general whole-class, or the test-based feedback provided by their instructors. A higher rate of response (74%) indicates their strong need for more feedback from their instructors. However, the researcher regards this result as a sign of 'deficit' in adult students' self-evaluation skills. As (73.8%) of students need their instructors' evaluation to know where they stand in a course means that students are not aware of the criteria of good work, apparently because they are not trained. This also confirms one of the research assumptions regarding the faculty's view about evaluation as an exclusive teacher-based practice. The findings about the quality of feedback are supported by Abu Shawish & Abd Al-Raheem (2015). They pointed out that language majors prefer specific, individual feedback so that they can make progress in their work. Students preferred this kind of feedback

because it is more supportive than the general test-based feedback provided to them by their instructors. Similar results were reported by McGivney (1996), Ferris (1995), Bangert-Drowns et al., (1991), Truscott (1999) and Seedhouse (2001).

In conclusion, students' responses confirm the major finding of this study about the practices of conventional testing and traditional question formats as the most common forms of evaluation utilized by the English language faculty members at Palestinian universities. This is also confirmed in the faculty members' responses about the use of question format which has limited, active high-order thinking. Accordingly, Yahiya (2013) confirmed that tests still play an important role in the Palestinian educational system; grades have crucial effects on students' evaluation while presentations, discussions or research projects still have a minor role.

### **C: Total Score of the Domains in the Students' Questionnaire:**

The total degree of students' views about instruction and evaluation practices means that students have moderate views about instruction and evaluation practices. This indicates that students are not fully satisfied with the faculty members' services.

## **5.6. Discussion of the Results Related to the Students' Hypotheses:**

### **A- Discussion of the Results Related to the First Hypothesis:**

Statistical analysis shows that there are significant differences in the students' views about evaluation practices due to university in favor of private universities over public universities. The researcher refers this difference to the institutional policies in private universities where faculty usually enjoy more academic freedom than in public universities. Another reason is that the class size in private universities is expected to be smaller than in public universities. Findings in Scarboro (2012) and Mazumder (2013) reported that students at private universities have higher levels of satisfaction than public universities, however, lower levels of differences were found in Naidu & Derani (2016). According to Jones (2003), and Telford & Masson (2005) the quality assurance influence in higher education has become a focus of attention for private universities. Consequently, more monitoring and developing of practices are expected.

### **B. Discussion of Results Related to the Second Hypothesis:**

Statistical analysis indicates that there are significant differences in the students' views about evaluation practices due to major (whether it is Language and Literature, TEFL or Translation). The most important finding shows that there are significant differences in the perceptions of Translation, English Language and Literature majors over TEFL majors. In the total degree of students' views, there are significant differences

between English Language, TEFL and Translation majors in favor of Translation.

The English Language major disciplines in Palestinian universities are: Translation, English Language & Literature (Humanities) and TEFL (Faculty of Education). The results show that the TEFL majors who belong to the Faculty of Education have less moderate views about the evaluation practices. Findings in Vo (2012) reflected TEFL students' dissatisfaction due to the conventional practices in teaching.

However, the researcher is aware of the fact that drawing comparisons among disciplines should be handled with care (Cashin, 1995; Neumann, 2001). The researcher thinks that the differences in translation majors' perceptions can be referred to disciplinary, instructional and evaluation practices. The results of the instructional practices of translation majors showed more significant differences over majors of English and TEFL. In addition, the nature of translation as a linguistic discipline requires more applicable and student-centered activities. The major finding about differences in students' perceptions related to major (the faculty of arts and the faculty of education) is supported by Afane (1998) who reported significant differences in students' views attributed to college among other variables. Moreover, a good deal of research indicated that Humanities' instructors usually get more positive evaluation from students (Franklin & Theall 1995; Wachtel, 1998; Neumann, 2000).

### **5.7. Summary of Results:**

1. Lecture-based instruction and test-based evaluation are common among English faculty members at Palestinian universities. Conventional teaching leads to conventional evaluation.
2. Traditional instruction and evaluation narrow down curriculum towards content coverage and teaching to the test.
3. Faculty members agree that the traditional question formats they use usually over-look complex thinking and problem solving.
4. They consider evaluation a formal, exclusive practice confined to teachers and directed towards students.
5. Since traditional classroom instruction is teacher-based, the students' effective participation and discussions are limited. Consequently, students try to use the lecture time for note-taking.
6. The results suggest that faculty members demonstrate general interest in written work although it usually contributes less to the general course evaluation.
7. They consider non-test-based evaluation inapplicable in the Palestinian context.
8. Instructors' responses suggest that institutional policies are restrictive in terms of evaluation practices.



9. The feedback provided to students is a general, test-based practice.
10. Faculty members consider current generations of students not sufficiently motivated or competent.
11. Faculty instructors claim they have a very good interest in modern pedagogy. They also express their tendency to reconsider their evaluation practices in addition to their reported high interest in pursuing modern pedagogies. However, when they were asked to freely rank different tools of evaluation, their first choice was formal testing. The interest in modern pedagogy does not have a significant effect in their practices.
12. In evaluation practices, there are significant differences among faculty attributed to PH.D rank, gender, age, years of experience. However, no significant differences are attributed to interest in modern pedagogy.
13. The majors of English at ANNU and AAU demonstrate moderate views about instructors' instructional and evaluation practices.
14. In general, students confirm the conventional quality of practices in instruction and evaluation. Their responses suggest they prefer less-teacher –centered instruction. More interestingly, they confirm that formal testing should not be the main form of evaluation.

15. They report they generally do well on finals, however, they prefer short tests to the high stakes exams.
16. They express the need for more individualized feedback demonstrating a deficit of self-evaluation.
17. Their responses suggest that they get more involved in note-taking to review for tests.
18. A good percentage of students consider the internet a good resource of their learning (however, lower percent of responses are reported for depending on internet resources for written work). Asking students about using the internet as a main resource for written work was intended to explore students' attitudes towards plagiarism (as reported by instructors).
19. Contrary to their instructors' general impression about them, students' responses suggest a positive academic self-image. They think they do well on finals. They also think that they can contribute more in classroom activities and provide their instructors with more ideas for the course.
20. There are significant differences in students' responses related to the type of university whether private or public. The difference is in favor of the private university. Another significant difference is attributed to the major discipline of English in favor of majors of Translation and English Language & Literature over the TEFL major.

## **5. 8. Conclusions:**

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher has reached these conclusions:

1. It is important to remember that evaluation overlaps with instruction, and both of them are interrelated in the broader teaching-learning process. Therefore, instead of heavily depending on traditional testing, faculty can think of more forms of evaluation that can go together to respond to the students' demands and the challenges of their times. New forms of assessment are needed to make a better use of students' potentials to build better competences. Examples of new forms of assessment are like team projects, performances, presentations, creative projects, critiques, papers, research, portfolios and other student-based tasks which can demonstrate better evidence of learning other than pen and paper tests.
2. Assessment culture plays a crucial role in establishing and shaping evaluation practices. Instructors' responses suggest that they feel restricted by the established system of evaluation. More academic freedom is expected to foster more creativity in the high education institutions.
3. Away from the established institutional policies, the faculty members' responses imply a distinct gap between theory and

practice. A discrepancy has been found between what they do and what they ideally believe in.

4. Faculty members need more training in modern pedagogy (based on their responses).
5. Reflective practice seems to be less effective in terms of instruction and evaluation practices.
6. There is a considerable discrepancy between students' perceptions and faculty's perceptions. It is important to make the best use of students' evaluation of their instructors' practices. When faculty members, students and administrators try to better understand each other's perspectives regarding the effectiveness of the teaching – learning practices, then positive gains can be made in different fields of language pedagogy.
7. Since students declare their rejection of testing as it is currently applied, it is imperative that decision makers respond to them. They want to claim their rights as major stakeholders in evaluation and the teaching-learning process as a whole.
8. To better invest students' positive academic- self image, instead of surface learning and basic knowledge and facts teaching, students need to be trained to explore the possibilities inherent in problem-solving, open-ended questions and more realistic tasks that can generate more personalized, genuine responses and performances.

Finally, the researcher would like to confirm that there is no one particular, ideal or a well-defined form of instruction or evaluation. Instruction and evaluation can be adapted to goals, class size, students' needs, modern pedagogies, cultural context and professional competence. The most important is to be aware of students' needs for developing high order thinking and problem solving skills. As professional practitioners put their practices into reflection, they can monitor and assess teaching and learning in a continuous improvement cycle. Professional reflective practice can find an equitable balance to move from teacher-assisted, to active learning and to more complex instruction. Instructors can experiment with new pedagogies and expose students to various techniques of evaluation. When traditional practices are reversed, students' initiatives, free choices and personalized learning are stepped forward.

### **5. 9. Recommendations:**

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher recommends the following:

#### **First for English Language faculty members:**

Faculty instructors are invited to:

1. Reconsider their instructional and evaluation practices to promote a better professional reflective practice that can face up to the challenges in the teaching –learning process. To continue to teach and evaluate students in the same ways means to continue to get the

same results. As there is a continuing pressure to develop and improve instruction and methods of teaching, it is equally important to develop and improve evaluation of language learning as well. There is a need to move from evaluation of knowledge to assessment of learning.

2. Embrace training and experimenting with modern pedagogies to tailor them according to local needs. These may involve use of projects, research, and creative written work, critiques, reports, portfolios, paper presentations, exhibitions and different kinds of tests and question formats.
3. Open lines of communication with students and listen to their suggestions and criticism.
4. Involve students in the different aspects of the teaching-learning process including evaluation. Students can be involved when they are trained in giving presentations, basic skills in writing, reading and communication, rubrics, team work and by providing them with specific, individual feedback.
5. Develop students' creative and critical thinking skills, including innovation in their academic specialization. Open-ended questions, non-conventional writing tasks and welcoming students' initiatives can help them become more critical and creative.

6. Attempt a balance between institutional restrictions and students' best interests. Formal high-stakes exams have irreversible effects on students' achievement. In addition, students can be required to submit non-test based work to make up for their poor test-based achievement.
7. Establish department culture that can put together various efforts of academics to respond to the highly diverse educational needs.

**Second: For the Ministry of Higher Education:**

1. The Ministry of Higher Education is invited to promote more enlightened assessment culture that can nurture more academic freedom concentrating on the quality of learning and seeking more valid and inclusive forms of assessment to provide more reliable evidence of students' competences and skills.
2. The Ministry of Higher Education is invited to introduce non-conventional assessment to schools so that college students get the necessary preparation and training to build better competences in higher education.
3. The Ministry of Higher Education is invited to transfer quality assurance procedures in higher education institutions into more applicable practices.

**Third: For Further Studies:**

1. Faculty members' views, perceptions, beliefs, instructional practices, assessment, testing, marking, grading and feedback continue to be under-researched. There is a particular need for studies in language teaching at the university level.
2. Academics are also invited to conduct action research to inspire changes in pedagogical practices.



## References

- Abrami, P. C., Rosenfield, S. and Dedic, H. (2007). The dimensionality of student ratings and instruction: An update on what we know, do not know, and what we need to do. *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: An Evidence-Based Approach*. Springer, 446-456.
  
- Abu Shawish, Jaber. Abd-Al-Raheem, M, A. (2015). *Palestinian university writing professors' feedback practices and students' reactions towards them*, **Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education**. Retrieved January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 from <http://journals.uob.edu.bh>.
  
- Airasian, P.W. (2002). **Classroom Assessment**. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
  
- Algozzine, B., Gretes, J., Flowers, C., Howley, L., Beattie, J., Spooner, F. & Bray, M. (2004). *Student evaluation of college teaching: A practice in search of principles*. **College teaching**, 52(4), 134-141.
  
- Al-Rashdan, Abdul Fattah Ali (2010). **Higher Education in the Arab World: Hopes & Challenges**. Retrieved February 13, 2016 from: [www.ties-project.cu](http://www.ties-project.cu).

- Andrews, R. (2003). ***The end of the essay? Teaching in Higher Education***, 8(1), 117-128.
- Angelo, T & Cross, K.P. (1993). **Classroom assessment techniques a handbook for college teachers**. Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint, San Francisco, CA. Pp 427.
- Aquino, A. B., Ramos, N. P., & Nolasco, C. J. (2015). **Faculty Perceptions, Skills and Problems on Assessment in Undergraduate Programs in a State University Extension Campus in the Philippines**. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(3).. Retrieved Feb 10<sup>th</sup>, 2016 from <http://oaji.net/journal-archive-stats.html?number=1543&year=2015>.
- Archer, L., Hutchings, M., & Ross, A. (2005). **Higher education and social class: Issues of exclusion and inclusion**. Routledge.
- Arreola, R. (2000). **Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: A handbook for college faculty and administrators on designing and operating a comprehensive faculty evaluation system**. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Ascher, C. (1990). **Can performance-based assessments improve urban schooling?** New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 327612).

- Ashwin, P., Lindblom-Ylänne, S., Trigwell, K., Nevgi, A., (2006). *How approaches to teaching are affected by discipline and teaching context*. **Studies in Higher education**, 31(03), 285-298.
- Aydin, S. (2007). *How can teachers reduce test anxiety of L2 learners*. **Humanising Language Teaching**, 9(4). Retrieved Feb 22, 2016 from <http://hltmag.co.uk/jul07/sart05.htm>.
- Ayyash, A. I. (2011). *Towards a Class-centered Approach to EFL Teaching in the Palestinian Context*. **English Language Teaching ELT**, 4(4).
- Badke, W. (2014). **Research strategies**. Inspiring Voices.
- Bangert-Drowns, R. L., Kulik, J.A. & Kulik, C. (1991). *Effects of frequent classroom testing*, **Journal of Educational Research**, 85, pp. 89-99.
- Bates, T. (2015). **Teaching in a digital age: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning** for a digital age. Retrieved April 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016. from [www.openeducationeuropa.eu/sites/default/files/asset/Teaching\\_Digital-Age.pdf](http://www.openeducationeuropa.eu/sites/default/files/asset/Teaching_Digital-Age.pdf).
- Berk, R. A. (2012). *Top 10 evidence-based, best practices for PowerPoint® in the classroom*. **Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning e Journal**, 5(3), 1-7.

- Birenbaum, M. (1996). Assessment 2000: Towards a pluralistic approach to assessment. In *Alternatives in assessment of achievements, learning processes and prior knowledge* (pp. 3-29). Springer Netherlands.
- Bligh, D. A. (2000). *What's the use of lectures?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borg, S. (2006). **Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice.** London: Continuum.
- Brookfield, S. (1987). **Understanding and facilitating adult learning.** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, A. V. (2009). *Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals.* **The Modern Language Journal**, 93(1), 46-60.
- Campbell, S. (2008, September). **Assessment reform as a stimulus for quality improvement in university learning and teaching: an Australian case study.** OECD conference Outcomes of Higher Education: Quality Relevance and Impact. Paris, France.
- Carless, D. (2006). *Differing perceptions in the feedback process,* **Studies in Higher Education**, 31,2, 219-233.
- Cashin, W. E. (1995). **Answering and asking questions.** Center for Faculty Evaluation & Development, Kansas State University.

- Chen, J., Berry, R. A., & Honig, M. L. (2008). *Limited feedback schemes*. **Journal on Selected Areas in Communications**, 26(8), 1451-1461.
  
- Cherif, A., F. Movahedzadeh, G. Adams, and J. Dunning (2013). Why do students fail? In *A collection of papers on self-study and institutional improvement*, 2013, 35–51.
  
- Choi, S, L (2014). *An analysis on the relationship between lecturers competencies and students satisfaction*. **International Education Studies**, 7 (1). pp. 37-46.
  
- Coffey, M., & Gibbs, G. (2002). *Measuring teachers' repertoire of teaching methods*. **Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education**, 27, 383–390.
  
- Cooper, J. L., & Robinson, P. (2000). Getting Started: Informal Small-Group Strategies in Large Classes. **New Directions in Teaching and Learning**, 81, 17-24.
  
- Cothran, D., Kulinna, P. H., & Ward, E. (2000). *Students' experiences with and perceptions of teaching styles*. **Journal of Research and Development in Education**, 34(1), 93-103.
  
- Cotterall, S. (1999). *Key variables in language learning: what do learners believe about them?* **System**, 27(4), 493-513.

- Dassa, C. (1990). *From a horizontal to a vertical method of integrating educational diagnosis with classroom assessment*, *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 36, pp. 35-44.
- Davis, B. G. (2009). **Tools for teaching**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Diyen, H.(2010). *An Overview Of Quality In Higher Education In The West And Recommendations For Arab Universities*. **The Journal of Quality in Education**. Vol(1)p.1. Retrieved from: [journal.amaquen.com/index.php/JQE/article/view/4](http://journal.amaquen.com/index.php/JQE/article/view/4). June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016.
- Douglas, J. Douglas, A. (2006). *Evaluating teaching quality*. **Quality in Higher Education**, 12 (1). pp. 3-13.
- Drew, S. (2001). Perceptions of what helps learn and develop in education, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(3), 309–331.
- Ebert-May, D., Derting, T. L., Hodder, J., Momsen, J. L., Long, T. M., & Jardeleza, S. E. (2011). *What We Say Is Not What We Do: Effective Evaluation of Faculty Professional Development Programs*. **BioScience**, 61(7).
- Eison, J. (2010). **Using Active Learning Instructional Strategies to Create Excitement and Enhance Learning**. Retrieved April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2016 .<http://www.cte.cornell.edu/documents/presentations/Eisen-Handout.pdf>.

- Ellis, R. (2001). **Form-focused instruction and second language learning**. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Eraut, M. (1994). **Developing professional knowledge and competence**. London: The Falmer Press.
- Fautley, M. & Savage, J. (2008). **Assessment for Learning and Teaching in Secondary Schools**. Exter. Learning Matters.
- Felder, R.M. (1994). *“Any Questions?”* **Chemical Engineering Education**, 28(3), 174–175.
- Fink, L. D. (2003). **Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses**. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fredericks, Anthony D. **The Complete Idiot's Guide to Success as a Teacher**. Alpha Books, 2005. *Teacher Vision*. Web. 18 May. 2016.  
<https://www.teachervision.com/new-teacher/teaching-methods/48337.html>.
- Fung, L., & Chow, L. P. (2002). *Congruence of student teachers' pedagogical images and actual classroom practices*. **Educational Research**, 44(3), 313-321.
- Gardner, H. (1993). **Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice**. New York, NY: Basic Books.

- Gasparro, J. (1997). **Comparing traditional and performance-based assessment.** In A paper presented by Dr. Judith Gasparro at the Symposium on Spanish Second Language Acquisition held at the University of Texas Austin. Retrieved April 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016 from [http://www.sedl.org/loteced/comparing\\_assessment.html](http://www.sedl.org/loteced/comparing_assessment.html)
- Gavino,Z.(2013). *The teaching performance in the higher institutions in Kalinga, Philippines: A bench mark for quality education.* **International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences**, 2(10).
- Gayton, E. (2007). **Introduction: Why these assessment opportunities make sense in a world where assessment of factual knowledge has taken hold (16-24).** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gess-Newsome, SA Southerland, A Johnston (2003). *Educational reform, personal practical theories, and dissatisfaction: The anatomy of change in college science teaching.* **American Educational Research Journal**. Vol (4) 731-767.
- Gipps, C. (1994). **Beyond Testing.** Washington, DC, Falmer Press.
- Grunewald, H., & Peterson, M. W. (2003). *Factors that promote faculty involvement in and satisfaction with institutional and classroom student assessment.* **Research in Higher Education**, 44(2), 173-204.



- Hansen, E. J., & Stephens, J. A. (2000). *The ethics of learner-centered education: Dynamics that impede the process*. **Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning**, 32(5), 40-47.
- Harris, A. (1998). **Effective teaching: practical outcomes from research**. In F. Banks and Shelton. A.
- Haywood, A. M., Shaw, M. D., & Laird, T. F. N. Assessment for Improvement: Faculty Perceptions of Institutional Participation in Assessment by Field. *Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Conference, Indianapolis, IN, 2010, November*.
- Herman, J. L., P.R. Aschbacher & L.Winters. (1992). **A Practical Guide to Alternative Assessment**. (Alexandria, VA, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development).
- Herrera, S.G., Murry, K. G., & Cabral, R.M. (2007). **Assessment accommodations for classroom teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse students**. Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Hills, J. R. (1991). *Apathy concerning grading and testing*. **Phi Delta Kappa**, 72(7), 540–545.
- Hoffman, J. V., L. C. Assaf, and S. G. Paris. (2001). *High-stakes testing in reading: Today in Texas, tomorrow?* **The Reading Teacher** 54(5): 482–92.

- Horwitz, E. K. & Young, D. J. (1991). **Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications**. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Hubball, H., Collins, J., & Pratt, D. (2005). *Enhancing reflective teaching practices: Implications for faculty development programs*. **The Canadian Journal of Higher Education**, 35(3), 57.
- Huberty, T. J. (2009). *Test and performance anxiety*. **Principal leadership**, 10(1), 12-16.
- Hutchings, P. (2010). Opening doors to faculty involvement in assessment (NILOA Occasional Paper No. 4). Champaign, IL: National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment.
- Johnson, K., & Swain, M. (1998). **Immersion education: International perspectives**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, S. (2003). *Measuring the quality of higher education: Linking teaching quality measures at the delivery level to administrative measures at the university level*, **Quality in Higher Education**, Vol. 9, No. 3.
- Kassim, M. A., Hanafi, R. M., & Hancock, D. R. (2008). *Test anxiety and its consequences on academic performance among university students*. **Advance in Psychology Research**. 53, 75-95.

Retrieved June 06, 2016, from <http://www.books.google.com.pk/books>.

- Kern, R., & Warschauer, M. (Eds.). (2000). **Network-based Language Teaching: Concepts and Practice** (pp. 1-19). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Khader, T. Khader. Shaat, Mohammad (2010). **Reasons Behind Non-English Major University Students' Achievement Gap in English Language in Gaza Strip from Students' Perspectives**. Al-Aqsa University, Palestine.
- Khan, M.S. & Akbar, S.R. (1997). **School Teaching**. New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing Corporation.
- Kikuchi, K. (2005). **Student and teacher perceptions of learning needs: A cross analysis**. Shiken: JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter Vol. 9. No. 2. (p. 8 - 20). Retrieved Feb10th, 2016 from [http://jalt.org/test/kik\\_1.htm](http://jalt.org/test/kik_1.htm).
- Killen, R. (2007). **Teaching strategies for outcomes-based education**. Juta and Company Ltd.
- King, J. (2002). *Preparing EFL learners for oral presentations preparing*. **Journal of Humanistic Studies**, (4), 401-418.

- Knight, P. T. (2002). *Summative assessment in Higher Education: practices in disarray*. **Studies in Higher Education**, 27(3) pp. 275–286.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). **Principles and practice in second language acquisition**. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kreber, C., & Castleden, H. (2009). *Reflection on teaching and epistemological structure: reflective and critically reflective processes in ‘pure/ soft’ and ‘pure/ hard’ fields*. **Higher Education**, 57(4), 509-531.
- Kvale, S. (2007). Contradictions of assessment for learning in institutions of higher learning. **Rethinking assessment in higher education: Learning for the longer term**. New York: Routledge.
- Kwako, J. (2003). **A brief summary of traditional and alternative assessment in the college classroom** /online/. Retrieved February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 from [http://www.stat.wisc.edu/~nordheim/Kwako\\_assessment4.doc](http://www.stat.wisc.edu/~nordheim/Kwako_assessment4.doc).
- Kwan, K.P. (1999). *How fair are student rating in assessing the teaching performance of university teachers?*. **Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education**, Vol (.24), No.2, pp.181-195.

- Lacy, F. J, & Sheehan, B, A. (1997). *Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff: An International Perspective*. **Higher Education**. Vol. 34, No.(3) pp. 305-322.
- Lamine, Bachir. (2010). **A Decade of Higher Education in the Arab States (1998 - 2009)**. Regional report presented at Towards an Arabic Higher Education Space: International Challenges and Social Responsibilities, (co-editor) UNESCO Office Beirut.
- Linda B. Nilson (2010). **Teaching at Its Best**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Machemer, P. L., & Crawford, P. (2007). *Student perceptions of active learning in a large cross-disciplinary classroom*. **Active learning in higher education**, 8(1), 9-30.
- Maclellan, E. (2001). *Assessment for learning: the differing perceptions of tutors and students*, **Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education**, 26,4, 307-318.
- Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (2000). *Effects of grading leniency and low workload on students' evaluations of teaching: Popular myth, bias, validity, and innocent bystanders*. **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 92, 202-22.
- Marton, F. & Säljö, R. (1997). **Approaches to learning**, in: F. Marton, D. Hounsell & N. Entwistle. (Eds) *The experience of*

*learning. Implications for teaching and studying in higher education* (Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press), 39–59.

- Mathison, S. (1997). Assessment in social studies: Moving toward authenticity. *The Social Studies Curriculum: Purpose, Problems, and Possibilities* (Albany, 1997), 213-224.
- Mazumder, Q. H. (2013). ***Student satisfaction in private and public universities in Bangladesh***. **International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)**, 2(2).
- McCollin, E. (2000). **Faculty and student perceptions of teaching styles: Do teaching styles differ for traditional and nontraditional students?** Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Bowling Green, KY.
- McGivney, V. (1996). **Staying or Leaving the Course: Non-Completion and Retention of Mature Students in Further and Higher Education**. National Institute of Adult Continuing Education. Leicester, England, UK.
- McKeachie, W. J. & Svinicki, M. (2006). **McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers**. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

- Meisels, S.J. (1993). *Remaking classroom assessment with the work sampling system*. **Young Children**, 48(5), 34-40.
- Metin, Mustafa. (2011). *The examinations of teachers' attitude towards performance assessment with respect to the different variables*, **Energy Education Science and Technology Part B: Social and Educational Studies**, 3 (3), 269-284.
- Mojares, J. G., (n.d). **Teaching Strategies in English: The Case of Batangas State University- Malvar, Batangas, Philippines**. A thesis, Graduate School, Batangas State University. Retrieved Feb 18th, 2016 from <http://www.litu.tu.ac.th/journal/FLLTCP/Proceeding/564.pdf>.
- Moore, M.S. (1996). **Assessing college teaching effectiveness: A comparison of graduate teaching assistants and their students**. *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 57, no. 05A, University of Auburn.
- Murphy, Roger, and Namrata Sharma. *What don't we know about interactive lectures*, **International Journal of Media, Technology and Lifelong Learning**, Vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 111-119. 2010.
- Murray, H. G., & Renaud, R. D. (1995). *Disciplinary differences in classroom teaching behaviors*. **New directions for teaching and learning**, 1995(64), 31-39.

- Mussawy, S. A. J. (2009). **Assessment Practices: Student's and Teachers' Perceptions of Classroom Assessment**. Retrieved April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2016 from [http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cie\\_capstones/9](http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cie_capstones/9).
- Naidu, P., & Derani, N. E. (2016). *A Comparative study on quality of education received by students of private universities versus public universities*. **Procedia Economics and Finance**, 35, 659-666.
- Neumann, Ruth. (1994). *The Teaching-Learning Nexus: Applying a Framework to University Students' Learning Experiences*. **European Journal of Education** 29(3): 323.
- Noordin, F., & Jusoff, K. (2009). *Levels of job satisfaction amongst Malaysian academic staff*. **Asian Social Science**, 5(5), 122.
- Norton, L, Aiyegbayo, O., Harrington, K., Elander, J. and Reddy, P. (2010). *'New lecturers' beliefs about learning, teaching and assessment in higher education: the role of the PGCLTHE programme'*, **Innovations in Education and Teaching International**, 47: 4, 345 — 356.
- Norton, L. Harrington, K., Norton, B., and Shannon, L. (2006). **Challenging Traditional Forms of Assessment: University teachers' views on examinations**. Conference paper, ISSOTL, Washington. Retrieved May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2016 from <http://oro.open.ac.uk/42630/1/PedRIO%20Paper%207.pdf>.



- Norton, L., Richardson, J. T. E., Hartley, J., Newstead, S., & Mayes, J. (2005). **Teachers' beliefs and intentions concerning teaching in higher education**. *Higher Education*, 50, 537–571.
- Norzila, A. R., Fauziah, A., & Parilah, M. S. (2007). *Perceived and preferred teaching styles of English for specific purposes (ESP) students*. *Jurnal e-Bangi*, 2(2), 1-20.
- O'Sullivan, R. G., & Chalnack, M. K. (1991). *Measurement-Related course work requirements for teacher certification and recertification*. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices*, 10(1), 17–19.
- OECD (2009b). **Creating effective teaching and learning environments**: First results from TALIS, OECD, Paris.
- Orata, P.T. (1999). *The problem professor of education*. *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. (70) 89-98.
- Pajares, M. (1992). *Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Clearing up a messy construct*. *Review of Educational Research*, 62, 307–332.
- Pellegrino, J., Chudowsky, N., & Glaser, R. (2001). **Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment**. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

- Pennell, M, L. *Improving student participation in history lectures: suggestions for successful questioning*. **Teaching History: A Journal of Methods**, 2000, 25 (1), 25-35.
- Peterson, M. W., & Einarson, M. K. (2001). *What are colleges doing about student assessment? Does it make a difference?* **Journal of Higher Education**, 72, 629-669.
- Quesada-Serra, V., Rodríguez-Gómez, G., & Ibarra-Sáiz, M. (2014). *What are we missing? Spanish lecturers' perceptions of their assessment practices*. **Innovations in Education and Teaching International**, 53(1), 48-59.
- Race, P (2010). **Making Learning Happen: 2nd edition**. London: Sage Publications.
- Rahman, F. (2011). *Impact of Discussion Method on Students Performance*. **The International Journal of Business and Social Science**, Vol. 2 No. 7, 84-94.
- Rashidi, N. & Moghadam, M. (2014). *The effect of teachers' beliefs and sense of selfefficacy on Iranian EFL learners' satisfaction and academic achievement*. **The Electronic Journal for English asaSecondLanguage**, 18(2), 1-23. Retrieved April 24, 2016.: <http://www.teslej.org/wordpress/issues/Vol18/ej70/ej70a3>.

- Reeves, T. C. (2006). *How do you know they are learning? The importance of alignment in higher education*. **International Journal of Learning Technology**, 2(4), 294-309. Retrieved January, 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017. <https://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/eli08105a.pdf>.
- Retrieve April 10, 2016. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001892/189272m.pdf>.
- Rieg, S. A., & Wilson, B. A. (2009). *An investigation of the instructional pedagogy and assessment strategies used by teacher educators in two universities within a state system of higher education*. **Education**, 130(2), 277.
- Robinson, D. (2010). **The Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel in Israel, the West Bank and Gaza**, Canadian Association of University Teachers. Retrieved March 25, 2016. <http://download.eiie.org/Docs/WebDepot/The%20Status%20of%20Higher%20Education%20Teaching%20Personnel%20in%20Israel,%20the%20West%20Bank%20and%20Gaza.pdf>.
- Rudner, L.M. (1991). **Assessing civics education**. College Park, MD: ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation. (ERIC No. ED 338698).
- Rust, C (2007). *Towards a scholarship of assessment*. **Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education** 32, 2, 229-237.

- Sabagh, Z., & Saroyan, A. (2014). *Professors' perceived barriers and incentives for teaching improvement*. **International Education Research IER**, 2(3), 18-40.
- Şallı-Çopur, D. (2008). **Teacher effectiveness in initial years of service: a case study on the graduates of METU Foreign Language Education Program**. Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. Retrieved May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2016 from <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1461&context=ajte>.
- Sambell, K., McDowell, L., & Brown, S. (1997). *'But is it fair?': an exploratory study of student perceptions of the consequential validity of assessment*. **Studies in Educational Evaluation**, 23 (4), 349-371.
- Samuelowicz, K. & Bain, J. D. (2002). *Identifying academics' orientations to assessment practice*, **Higher Education**. 43 (2), 173-201.
- Scarboro, Allen (2012). *Perceptions of good teaching*: **International Journal of New Trends in Arts, Sports & Science Education**, Vol.1, No.1.
- Schmidt, H. G., Wagener, S. L., Smeets, G. A., Keemink, L. M., & van der Molen, H. T. (2015). *On the use and misuse of lectures in higher education*. **Health Professions Education**, 1(1), 12-18.

- Schulz, R. A. (1996). *Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar*. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 343–364.
- Scott, G. (2006). **Accessing the student voice: Using CEQuery to identify what retains students and promotes engagement in productive learning in Australian higher education**. Retrieved May 18, 2016, from <http://www.dest.gov.au>.
- Seedhouse, P. (2001). *The case of the missing “no” The relationship between pedagogy and interaction*. *Language Learning* 51, Supplement 1, 347-385.
- Shaffett, J. E. (2012). **Teaching Research Processes: The Faculty Role in the Development of Skilled Researchers**. By William B. Badke. Cambridge, UK: Chandos.
- Shepard, L. (2000). *The role of assessment in a learning culture*. *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 29 (7). pp. 4–14.
- Shishavan, H. B., & Sadeghi, K. (2009). *Characteristics of an effective English language teacher as perceived by Iranian teachers and learners of English*. *English Language Teaching*, 2(4), 130.
- Simmons, W., & Resnick, L. (1993). *Assessment as the Catalyst of School Reform*. *Educational Leadership*, 50 (5), pp. 11-15.

- Skehan, P. (1998). **A cognitive approach to language learning.** Oxford University Press.
- Snell, Y. S., Steinert Y. (1999). ***Interactive lecturing: Strategies for increasing participation in large group presentations.*** *Medical Teacher*, 21(1), 37-42.
- Spaights, E., Kenner, D., & Dixon, H. (2010). ***Academic success of black students in white institutions of higher education.*** *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 21(2), 101-111.
- Stiggins, R. J., Arter, J. A., Chappuis, J., & Chappuis, S. (2004). **Classroom assessment for student learning: doing it right--using it well.** Assessment Training Institute. Portland.
- Struyven, K., Dochy, F., & Janssens, S. (2005). ***Students' perceptions about evaluation and assessment in higher education: A review.*** *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(4), 325-341.
- Sullivan, J.H. (2002). **The second language educators' challenge: learning about literacy.** In: J. H. Sullivan (Ed.), *Literacy and the Second Language Learner* (pp. 85-109). Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.
- Swain, M. (1995). **Three functions of output in second language learning.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Telford, Ronie.Mason, Ron. (2005). *The congruence of quality values in higher education*, **Quality Assurance in Education**, Vol. 13. No. 2, pp.107 – 119.
- Theall, M. & Franklin, J. (2001). **Looking for bias in all the wrong places: A search for truth or a witch hunt in student ratings of instruction**. In M. Theall, P. Abrami, & L. Mets (Eds.), *The student ratings debate: Are they valid? How can we best use them?* **New Directions for Institutional Research**, no.109, (pp. 45-56).
- Tina, J. Rafidi.(2013). **Critical thinking and Cooperative Learning in Teaching Essay Writing to TEFL University Students**. Birzeit University, Palestiine.
- Toker, B. (2011). *Job satisfaction of academic staff: an empirical study on Turkey*. **Quality Assurance in Education**, 19(2), 156-169.
- Umbach, P. D., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2005). *Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement*. **Research in Higher Education**, 46(2), 153-184.
- Vo, Tam Thi Thanh, "English as a Second Language (ESL) Students' Perception of Effective Instructors in the LEAP Program at Marshall University" (2012). **Theses, Dissertations an Capstones**. Retrieved May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016 from: <http://mds.marshall.edu/etd/209>.

- Vogel, H. L., & Collins, A. L. (2002). **The relationship between test anxiety and academic performance**. Retrieved June 24, 2016, from <http://clearinghouse.missouriwestern.edu/manuscripts/333.php>.
- Wachtel, H. (1998). *Student evaluation of college teaching effectiveness: a brief review*. **Assessment and Education in Higher Education**, Vol, 32, No, 2.pp191-211.
- Walker, M. (Ed) (2001). **Reconstructing Professionalism in University Teaching**. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Waters, F.H., Smeaton, P.S., & Burns, T. G. (2004). *Action research in the secondary science classroom: Student response to differentiated, alternative assessment*. **American Secondary Education**, 32(3), 89-104.
- Weiman, C.E., (2014). *Large-scale comparison of science teaching methods sends clear message*. **Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)**, 111 (23).
- Whitchurch, C. (2006). *Who do they think they are? The changing identities of professional administrators and managers in UK higher education*. **Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management**, 28(2), 159-171.



- Wiggins, Grant (1990). *The case for authentic assessment. Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 2(2). Retrieved Feb 13, 2016 from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=2&n=2>
- Wilcox-Herzog, A. (2002). *Is there a link between Teachers' Beliefs and Behaviours? Early Education and Development*, Vol (13), No. 1, pp. 81-106.
- Wiliam, D., & Thompson, M. (2007). *Integrating assessment with instruction: what will it take to make it work? The future of assessment: shaping teaching and learning* (pp. 53-82). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers. A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, B. M., Pollock, P. H., & Hamann, K. (2007). *Does active learning enhance learner outcomes? Evidence from discussion participation in online classes. Journal of Political Science Education*, 3(2), 131-142.
- Woodbury, S. and Gess-Newsome, J. (2002). *Overcoming the paradox of change without difference: A model of change in the arena of fundamental school reform. Educational Policy*, 16(5), 763-782.

- Woods, D. (1996). **Teacher cognition in language teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yahya, M. (2013). *Measuring speaking anxiety among speech communication course students at the Arab American University of Jenin (AAUJ)*. **European Social Sciences Research Journal**, 1(3), 229-248.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2007). *Teacher and student attitudes toward teacher feedback*. **RELC Journal**, 38(1), 38-52.
- Živković, S. (2014). *The Importance Of Oral Presentations For University Students*. **MJSS Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences**.V (5). No(19) p.468.

#### المراجع العربية:

- الثميري، عبير خالد. حمدي، نرجس عبد القادر (2015): درجة توافر معايير تصميم التدريس الجامعي في المساقات التدريسية في الجامعة الأردنية من وجهة نظر أعضاء هيئة التدريس، دراسات العلوم التربوية. (42)، 423-441 .
- الحكمي، إبراهيم الحسن (2004): *الكفاءات المهنية المتطلبة للأستاذ الجامعي من وجهة نظر طلابه وعلاقتها ببعض المتغيرات*، مجلة رسالة الخليج العربي، مكتب التربية العربي لدول الخليج، الرياض - المملكة العربية السعودية، العدد التسعون، السنة الرابعة والعشرون، 1424هـ/2004م، 13-56.

- خير الله، سيد (1998): بحوث نفسية وتربيه، القاهرة : مكتبة الانجلو المصرية.
- السر، خالد خميس (2003): تقويم جودة مهارات التدريس الجامعي لدى أساتذة جامعة الأقصى في غزة Retrieved: May, 24, 2016 (file:///C:/Users/iCloud%20Tech/Desktop/start-work/25.pdf)
- شحاده، نعمان (2009م): التعلم والتقويم الأكاديمي، دار صفاء للنشر والتوزيع، عمان.
- العبسي، محمد مصطفى (2010): التقويم الواقعي في العملية التدريسية، دار المسيرة.
- عفانة، عزو اسماعيل (1998): الكفايات التدريسية التي يمارسها أساتذة الجامعة الإسلامية بغزة كما يراها طلبتهم، دراسات في المناهج وطرق التدريس، العدد السادس والأربعون، 37-82.
- القفاس، وليد. الفرحاتي، السيد (2011): علاقة المؤهل التربوي وخبرة المعلم بأساليب تقويم المتعلمين.
- <http://www.nceee.edu.eg/index.php/ar/2013-03-09-11-23-47/76-2016.2013-03-20-12-28-00/37>. Retrieved February 18
- المجاهد، سالم (2006): الاتجاهات الحديثة في التقويم المدرسي ودورها في اكتشاف الموهوبين، ورقة بحث قسم علم النفس، كلية الاداب جامعة الفاتح، طرابلس، ليبيا.
- مصطفى، نوال (2010): استراتيجيات التقويم في التعليم، دار البداية، عمان.
- الناقه، صلاح أحمد. عيسى، زكي حازم (2009): تقويم الكفاءات المهنية التي يمتلكها أعضاء هيئة التدريس في كلية التربية بالجامعة الإسلامية من وجهة نظر طلبتهم وفق معايير الجودة: كلية التربية، الجامعة الإسلامية، فلسطين.

**Appendix A**  
**Questionnaire Validity Committee**

1.	Dr. Nidal Jayousi	<b>Associate Professor Ramallah</b>
2.	Dr. Soheil Abu Salha	<b>An-Najah University- Nablus</b>
3.	Dr. Sameer Essa	<b>An-Najah University- Nablus Assistant Professor</b>
4.	Dr. Mohamad Ateya	<b>Al-Aqsa University- Gaza Assistant Professor</b>



The collected data will be kept strictly confidential for educational research purposes.

**Please, mark an X in the place that suits your case :**

( ) a- average ( ) b- good ( ) c- very good

**II. Part Two: Kindly underline the response(s) that best suits your case:**

**1- As a faculty instructor, I practice lecturing as a favorable instructional method because**

- a- it can cover a lot of material.
- b- it is part of the instructor's responsibility.
- c- Information is inaccessible.
- d- students like lectures.
- e- This statement does not apply to my case.

**2- As a faculty instructor, I can't specify skills (speaking & writing..etc) which students should develop because**

- a- there is no time to specify all skills requirements.
- b- there are many students.
- c- three formal tests are sufficient to examine skills.
- d- skills are observable by the faculty instructor.
- e- This statement does not apply to my case.

**3- I utilize PowerPoint presentations as an alternative to lecturing because**

- a- I like to use technology.
- b- they help me present more information.
- c- they enable students to take notes.
- d- they impress students.
- e- This statement does not apply to my case.

**4- I depend on tests more than students' presentations because**

- a- students are not trained to give them.
- b- presentations waste course time.
- c- they are demanding to their levels.
- d- students are usually shy.
- e- This statement does not apply to my case.

**5- I assign less grades to students' presentations, projects and term papers because**

- a- they are usually plagiarized from the internet.
- b- they are hard to grade.
- c- there is not enough time for these.
- d- they need more following up.
- e- This statement does not apply to my case.

**6- As a faculty instructor, I think testing is taken for granted because it is**

- a- an administrative procedure.
- b- it is most effective and reliable for evaluation.
- c- other evaluation techniques are not suitable for our students.
- d- tests are easy to administer.
- e- This statement does not apply to my case.

### III. Part Three (Instructional Practices)

**As an instructor, to what extent are you satisfied with the following practices ?**

	<b><u>Item</u></b>	<b>Never 1</b>	<b>Rarely 2</b>	<b>Sometimes 3</b>	<b>Always 4</b>
<b><u>1</u></b>	I find classroom tasks, which represent meaningful instructional activities, demanding.				
<b><u>2</u></b>	When I teach extra courses, I depend on formal testing as a reliable evaluation technique.				
<b><u>3</u></b>	I collect data about my effective teaching from different sources (from other instructors and students, for example).				
<b><u>4</u></b>	I use brainstorming because it is better than audience listening and note-taking.				
<b><u>5</u></b>	I prefer to discuss students' questions at the end of the class to help achieve more instructional goals first.				
<b><u>6</u></b>	It is time-consuming to provide student-based tasks in classroom for every lecture.				
<b><u>7</u></b>	I think all language skills can be evaluated by testing because it is a reliable rating process.				
<b><u>8</u></b>	I have noticed that the current generations of our students might not be sufficiently motivated to perform, create or produce.				
	<b>Evaluation Practices</b>	<b>Never 1</b>	<b>Rarely 2</b>	<b>Sometimes 3</b>	<b>Always 4</b>
<b><u>1</u></b>	I hesitate to allow students to take part in evaluation because it is a formal administrative procedure.				

<u><b>2</b></u>	I expect experimenting with non- test based evaluation requires time, effort and training which the teaching staff cannot afford.				
<u><b>3</b></u>	The administrative instructions related to tests affect the quality of testing practices as adopted by the faculty staff.				
<u><b>4</b></u>	I depend on test scores because they represent improvement or decline in teaching and learning.				
<u><b>5</b></u>	I have found that testing, as it is currently applied, overlooks high-order thinking.				
<u><b>6</b></u>	I find that multiple – choice testing format is very helpful even if it has a limited relevance to real-world learning.				
<u><b>7</b></u>	I find open- ended questions hard to mark and grade.				
<u><b>8</b></u>	Writing notes on test papers is unnecessary because the test grade can provide the necessary feedback to the student.				
<u><b>9</b></u>	I use essays as a better choice than open-ended questions.				
<u><b>10</b></u>	I use multiple - choice tests because they are more efficient in determining how well facts and concepts have been acquired.				
<u><b>11</b></u>	I expect giving students additional tasks to improve their performance in formal tests, is against faculty instructions and policy.				
<u><b>12</b></u>	I like to go over the exam questions with students after handing in their papers to let them learn from their mistakes.				



<b><u>13</u></b>	I avoid non- test based evaluation techniques because they do not apply in our case.				
<b><u>14</u></b>	Since I want my students to possess meaningful learning, it is important to reconsider my evaluation practices.				
<b><u>15</u></b>	I try to think of different techniques for evaluations other than testing.				
<b><u>16</u></b>	I keep up to date with new developments in evaluation and assessment.				

#### **IV. Part Four (Preferences among evaluation tools)**

**1- Based on your own perspective as a faculty instructor, what are the best tools you prefer to use for evaluation according to you own interest and priority?**

**Please, order from 1- 6:**

- (     ) Student-proposed projects
- (     ) Drama and performances
- (     ) Students' writing of critiques
- (     ) Annotated portfolio of students' work throughout the term
- (     ) A series of quizzes or chapter tests instead of comprehensive, high- stakes tests
- (     ) Student-designed tests
- (     ) Utilizing self-assessment and rubrics
- (     ) Conducting research
- (     ) Students making films & videos
- (     ) Creative papers
- (     ) Formal tests & exams
- (     ) Collective projects
- (     ) Students' writing of journals
- (     ) Interviews & questionnaires

**Thank you for your cooperation.**

## Appendix C

An-Najah National University  
Faculty of Graduate Studies  
Methods of Teaching Department



Dear Respondent,

The following questionnaire has been developed to collect the necessary information about the English instructors' current evaluation practices in Palestinian higher education institutions. It explores students' attitudes towards them. This questionnaire is administered in fulfillment of the requirements of my MA thesis.

This questionnaire consists of two parts: the first part comprises personal data whereas the second part includes the items of the questionnaire. The collected data will be kept strictly confidential for academic research purposes.

### I. Part One: Personal Information

**Please, mark an X in the place that suits your case :**

#### 1. Governorate:

(       ) a- Nablus                      (       ) b - Jenin

#### 2. University :

(       ) a- Public                              (       ) b- Private

#### 3. Major:

(       ) a- English language & literature  
(       ) b-English language methodology      (       ) c- Translation

## II. Part Two: (Views about Instructional Practices)

**Being a student of English, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements ?**

	<b><u>Statement</u></b>	<b>Strongly disagree 1</b>	<b>Disagree 2</b>	<b>Neutral 3</b>	<b>Agree 4</b>	<b>Strongly Agree 5</b>
<b><u>1</u></b>	In my courses, lecturing is the most common way of teaching.					
<b><u>2</u></b>	I try to take many notes while the instructor is lecturing.					
<b><u>3</u></b>	Students are given sufficient time to ask questions at the end of the lecture.					
<b><u>4</u></b>	I hesitate to ask questions because I prefer to listen.					
<b><u>5</u></b>	In my classroom, chairs do not allow group work and free movement.					
<b><u>6</u></b>	When there are more students in my class, I feel I have a less chance to participate.					
<b><u>7</u></b>	The instructor explains the general and specific aims of the lecture.					
<b><u>8</u></b>	The explanations which the instructor presents during the lecture are meaningful and understandable.					
<b><u>9</u></b>	I think Power Point presentations are similar to lectures because they give more time to the instructor.					
<b><u>10</u></b>	I think the lecture is better and more interesting than listening and note-taking when the instructor first discusses the topic with us.					
<b><u>11</u></b>	I prefer to take notes because I expect they will be included in the test.					
<b><u>12</u></b>	I like to take part in research and projects with my classmates.					
<b><u>13</u></b>	I think I can prepare and give a Power Point presentation in front of my class.					
<b><u>14</u></b>	I can use the internet resources well to improve my learning.					

	<b>Evaluation</b>					
	<b><u>Statement</u></b>	<b>Strongly disagree 1</b>	<b>Disagree 2</b>	<b>Neutral 3</b>	<b>Agree 4</b>	<b>Strongly Agree 5</b>
<b><u>1-</u></b>	I prefer to have quizzes and short tests instead of longer exams.					
<b><u>2</u></b>	I think I do well on finals.					
<b><u>3</u></b>	I think it is more practical if my total grade does not depend mainly on written exams.					
<b><u>4</u></b>	I wish I could suggest more ideas to my instructor to improve the course.					
<b><u>5</u></b>	I like to discuss my progress with my instructor.					
<b><u>6</u></b>	I can prepare a research paper quickly because I mainly depend on internet resources.					
<b><u>7</u></b>	My instructor gives me clear instructions about conducting research and written assignments.					
<b><u>8</u></b>	Exams and tests focus on certain skills but neglect others.					
<b><u>9</u></b>	I am more used to taking tests and exams than to writing papers and giving presentations.					
<b><u>10</u></b>	Taking exams is easier for me than having to conduct research and write papers.					
<b><u>11</u></b>	My instructor comments on my answers in tests.					
<b><u>12</u></b>	I need my instructor's evaluation to understand where I stand in the course.					
<b><u>13</u></b>	I think tests are the best way to determine who can pass the course and who cannot.					
<b><u>14</u></b>	I think I should discuss with my instructor what I can do to score higher grades.					
<b><u>15</u></b>	The tests I take depend more on remembering information.					
<b><u>16</u></b>	Questions like multiple choice, matching, filling blanks are very common in my tests.					
<b><u>17</u></b>	I think all language skills (listening, speaking, writing and reading) can be evaluated through testing.					
<b><u>18</u></b>	I find questions which need long written answers challenging to me.					

**Thank you for your cooperation.**

جامعة النجاح الوطنية  
كلية الدراسات العليا

## تحديد استراتيجيات التقويم كما يوظفها معلمو اللغة الانجليزية في الجامعات ومؤسسات التعليم العالي الفلسطينية

اعداد  
غادة حمدان

إشراف  
د. نضال جيوسي

قدمت هذه الأطروحة استكمالاً لمتطلبات الحصول على درجة الماجستير في أساليب  
تدريس اللغة الانجليزية، كلية الدراسات العليا، جامعة النجاح الوطنية، نابلس،  
فلسطين.

2017

## تحديد إستراتيجيات التقويم كما يوظفها معلمو اللغة الانجليزية في الجامعات ومؤسسات التعليم العالي الفلسطينية

اعداد

غادة حمدان

إشراف

د. نضال جيويسي

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحديد ممارسات التقويم الشائعة التي يوظفها معلمو اللغة الانجليزية في الجامعات الفلسطينية بالضفة الغربية وغزة. كما تحرت الدراسة عما يفضلهُ الأساتذة الجامعيون من أدوات التقويم المختلفة. ويتوافق مع دراسة ممارسات التقويم استعراضاً لممارسات التدريس التي يُبنى عليها التقويم لتتبع أثرها على التقويم. وبالإضافة الى ذلك، تم استطلاع آراء الطلبة في ممارسات التدريس والتقويم بناءً على حق الطلبة ودورهم الهام في عملية التقويم. كما فحصت الدراسة أثر المتغيرات على ممارسات المعلمين الجامعيين (المؤهلات، الخبرة، الجنس، العمر، ودرجة الاهتمام بأساليب التدريس الحديثة). وبالنسبة للطلبة، تم فحص اثر متغير فرع التخصص (إذا كان تخصص اللغة الانجليزية وآدابها الترجمة أو أساليب تدريس اللغة الانجليزية) ونوع الجامعة (إذا كانت خاصة أو حكومية).

تم تطبيق هذه الدراسة في جميع الجامعات الفلسطينية في الضفة الغربية وغزة في السنة الدراسية 2015-2016. واختيرت عينة الدراسة بطريقة طبقية عشوائية وتكونت من (166) معلم جامعي و(400) طالب من مجتمعي الدراسة. وبلغت نسبة عينة المعلمين (75.4%)، أما عينة الطلبة فبلغت نسبتها (26.6%) وقد تم توزيع استبانة للمعلمين وأخرى لطلبة اللغة الانجليزية وآدابها وطلبة الترجمة وأساليب تدريس اللغة الانجليزية في جامعة النجاح الوطنية بنابلس، وطلبة اللغة الانجليزية وآدابها وطلبة الترجمة وأساليب تدريس اللغة الانجليزية في الجامعة العربية الأمريكية في جنين.

تشير نتائج الدراسة إلى وجود ممارسات تقليدية في التدريس والتقييم بين المعلمين الجامعيين. أما بخصوص ممارسات التقييم المفضلة لديهم فكانت الامتحانات الرسمية هي الأعلى تصنيفاً. كما أظهرت النتائج وجود فروق دالة إحصائية بين المعلمين تعزى لمتغيرات المؤهلات والخبرة والعمر والجنس باستثناء متغير درجة الاهتمام بأساليب التدريس الحديثة. وتبين من الدراسة أن آراء طلبة اللغة والترجمة وأساليب التدريس في الجامعتين متوسطة فيما يتعلق بأداء معلمهم في التدريس والتقييم، ولكن كان هناك فروق دالة إحصائية بين الطلبة تعزى لمتغير نوع الجامعة لمصلحة الجامعة الخاصة وكذلك متغير فرع التخصص لمصلحة تخصص الترجمة.

في ضوء نتائج الدراسة، فإن المعلمين الجامعيين مدعوون لإعادة النظر في ممارساتهم والاقبال على التدريب وتجريب أساليب التقييم الحديثة وملائمتها لحاجات الطلبة. وهم أيضاً مدعوون لإحداث التوازن بين مصلحة الطلبة و المحددات الرسمية في مجال التقييم، وفتح قنوات التواصل مع الطلبة والاستماع الى اقتراحاتهم وانتقاداتهم وإشراكهم في عملية التقييم، وإرساء ثقافة إدارية للتقييم وتضافر جهود الأكاديميين للاستجابة للحاجات التربوية المختلفة في تدريس اللغة الأجنبية.