

*

(8) : (28)
: (11)
(9)
(98)
(%85)
:
:

.2014/6/15 :

.2015

.2013/2/24 :

*
©

...

The Degree of Commitment of Arabic Language Teachers to the National Standards in the Construction of Language Tests in the Light of the National Strategy for Education in Jordan

Abstract

The current study aimed at investigating the degree of commitment of Arabic language teachers of primary middle stage in using national standards in the construction of language tests, through analyzing forms of the exams that were prepared by Arabic language teachers. To achieve this aim, the researcher built a questionnaire consisting of (28) items distributed into (3) dimensions, as follows: language test preparation and construction (8 items), language test content (11 items), and language test output and printing (9 items). After testing the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, the researcher analyzed (98) forms of the language tests.

The results showed that the degree of commitment of Arabic language teachers of primary middle stage in using national standards in constructing language tests were less than the educationally accepted degree, which was set at (85%). The results also showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the degree of commitment of Arabic language teachers in using national standards in the construction of language tests attributed to gender and experience.

Keywords: National Standards, language tests, analysis, Arabic language teachers.

:

.(Gronlund and Robert, 1998)

.(Byrnes 2008 2003 1995)

...

.(2010 2007)

.(2007 2002)
(Kunnan, 2004)

Leung, 2004; Lynch,2001; Lynch and)

.(Shaw, 2005

Winndschitl,)

.(2002 ; Lantolf and Poehner, 2008

.(2009 2005)

(2009)

.(Lantolf and Poehner, 2008; Black and Wiliam, 1998)

...

(Daniel and King, 1998) :

(2010)

(Boyles, 2005)

:

(Falsgraf, 2005; Stoyhoff and Chapelle, 2005; Malone, 2008)

.(Malone, 2008 1997)

(Wodfolk,1998) (1994)

(2008 Davison,)

:

: (McMillan, 2000)

:

(2007)

(2010)

(2008)

...

(Stiggins, 2001) (2003)

.(Huerta-Macias,1995 2003)

-

-

(2006)

:

...



(2010)

(2008)

(2010)

-

-

.

:

:

-1

(2008)

:
:
•
•
•
•

...

:

: -1

: -2

: -3

: -4

:

:

-1

.2012/2011

-2

()

-3

:

:

()

(161)

(15)

(22)

:

(26)

(98)

()

(1)

(%61)

(1)

%24	24	15	9	(5)
%46	45	26	19	10 – 5
%30	29	13	16	(5)
%100	98	54	44	
-	%100	%55	%45	

:

...



(2007) (2006)
(28) (2008)
(8) :
(7) : (11)
(%85)
(255 2001) "
"
.(Conceptual Methods)
:
.
(28)
.(2005)

:

(20)

: (2006) (Cooper)

$$\% 100 \times \frac{\quad}{\quad + \quad} =$$

: (2)

(2)

0.83	.
0.88	.
0.89	.
0.86	.

(2)

:

:

•

(2007)

(2006)

.(2008)

:

:

:

:

:

(3)

Z

(3)

	Z						
0.032	1.39-	%80	0.54	0.80	9		1
0.013	*2.22-	%77	0.44	0.77	8		2
0.000	*3.32-	%73	0.45	0.73	11		3
0.006	*2.49-	%76	0.43	0.76	28		

(0.05 = α)

*

(3)

...

	(%80)	(0.54)	(0.80)	
	(0.77)		()
		(%77)	(0.44)	
	(0.45)	(0.73)		
(0.43)		(0.76)		(%73)
			.(%76)	
			(3)	
		(%76)		
	(2.49-) Z		(%85)	
			(0.006)	

(Lantolf and Poehner,2008)

(Daniel and King, 1998)

(4)

: ()

(4)

()

0.72	.96	.	1
0.80	.95	.	2
0.75	.93	.	3
0.88	.82	.	4
0.71	.80	5
0.65	.79	.	6
0.60	.77	.	7
0.93	.65	.	8
0.87	.55	.	9
0.54	0.80		

...

		(4)	
"	"		
	()	
)		(0.72)	(0.96)
		(
		(0.80)	(0.95)
(0.55)	()
			.(0.87)
		(4)	
			(0.90)

(9)

.

(

)

(5)

:

(5)

()

0.45	0.94		1
0.55	0.87		2
0.65	0.80		3
0.61	0.74		4
0.74	0.73		5
0.75	0.72		6
0.78	0.70		7
0.74	0.65		8
0.44	0.77		

(5)

()

(0.78 - 0.45)

(0.65 - 0.94)

"

(0.94)

"

"

"

(0.45)

(0.55)

(0.87)

(0.65)

"

"

(0.74)

(5)

...



(2010)

(6) ()

:

(6)

()

0.67	0.89	.	1
0.78	0.87	.	2
0.81	0.86	.	3
0.79	0.80	.	4
0.74	0.78	.	5
0.77	0.77	.	6
0.93	0.76	.	7
0.93	0.76	.	7
1.03	0.71	.	9
1.07	0.51	.	10
1.09	0.30	.	11
0.45	0.73		

(6)

(0.67 - 1.09)

(0.30 - 0.89)

:

(0.89)

"

"

":

(0.67)

...

(0.78)	(0.87)	"	
"		" :	
:	(0.81)	(0.86)	
(0.30)		"	"
			.(1.09)
	(11)	(6)	

(Boyles, 2005)

:

:

:

:

(7)

(8)

(7)

			10		10 - 5		(5)		/	
%37	-	36	-	14	-	15	-	7	%85	
%8	8	-	2	-	4	-	2	-	%85	
%48		47	-	11	-	24	-	12	%85	
%7	7	-	2	-	2	-	3	-	%85	
%85		83		25		39		19	%85	
%15	15	-	4	-	6	-	5	-	%85	
%100	%15	%85	%4	%26	%6	%40	%5	%19		

*

(7)

(15)

(%85)

(83)

(%15)

(8)

(%37)

(36)

(%8)

(%48)

(47)

(%7)

(7)

...

(8)

24	0.42	0.81	15	0.41	0.83	9	0.43	0.79	5	
45	0.48	0.79	26	0.46	0.81	19	0.41	0.78	10- 5	
29	0.46	0.78	13	0.43	0.80	16	0.42	0.77	10	
98	0.54	0.80	54	0.45	0.82	44	0.42	0.78		
24	0.62	0.74	15	0.55	0.75	9	0.62	0.73	5	
45	0.55	0.77	26	0.61	0.76	19	0.55	0.77	10- 5	
29	0.51	0.81	13	0.49	0.83	16	0.42	0.78	10	
98	0.44	0.77	54	0.57	0.78	44	0.51	0.76		
24	0.47	0.70	15	0.41	0.71	9	0.48	0.69	5	
45	0.46	0.73	26	0.45	0.78	19	0.41	0.68	10- 5	
29	0.45	0.76	13	0.46	0.73	16	0.42	0.79	10	
98	0.45	0.73	54	0.44	0.74	44	0.43	0.72		
24	0.48	0.75	15	0.46	0.76	9	0.52	0.74	5	
45	0.41	0.76	26	0.51	0.77	19	0.48	0.75	10- 5	
29	0.42	0.78	13	0.47	0.78	16	0.43	0.77	10	
98	0.43	0.76	54	0.49	0.77	44	0.46	0.75		

(8)

(9) (2-Way ANOVA)
(9)

0.927	0.006	0.285	1	0.285		
0.617	0.644	29.293	2	58.587		
0112	2.251	102.431	2	204.861	×	
		45.512	92	4187.142		
			97	4450.875		
0.313	0.962	7.301	1	7.301		
0.917	0.459	3.487	2	6.97		
0.210	1.889	14.231	2	28.66	×	
		7.586	92	697.953		
			97	740.884		
0.513	0.575	13.887	1	13.887		
0.573	0.559	13.495	2	26.990		
0.415	0.963	23.262	2	46.523	×	
		24.149	92	2221.706		
			97	2309.106		
0.431	0.540	145.870	1	145.870		
0.713	0.294	79.406	2	158.811		
0.280	1.35	364.530	2	729.059	×	
		269.88	92	24829.108		
			97	25862.848		

(0.05 = α)

*

...

(9)

(9)

(0.05 = α)

(2007)

:

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

:(1995)

.(1998)

.50-46 (40)

.(2003)

.195-165 (3) 4

.(1994)

.(2002)

.(2007)

.204-171(3) 4

.(2006)

.(NCTM, 2000)

.126 – 89 (47)

...

.(2007)

.377-353 (2) 23

.(2003)

.91-66 (23)

.(2008)

.(2009)

.(2010)

.(2005)

.(2001)

.(2010)

.298-265 (2)18

()

: .3

.(2005)

.(2007)

.(2003)

.89-39 (3)

.(1997)

- : . (2006)
- : . () (2007)
- : . (2008)
- Black, P. & Wiliam, D.(1998). Inside the box: Raising standards through Classroom assessment, Phi Delta Kappan International. www.pdkintl.org/kappan.htm
- Boyles, P. (2005). Assessment literacy. In M. Rosenbusch, National Assessment Summit Papers. pp. (1-15), Ames, IA: Iow state University. <http://www.nflrc.iastate.edu/newsite>
- Byrnes, H. (2008). Assessing content and language. In E. Shohamy(Ed.). Language Testing and Assessment, Vol.(7), p. 37-52.
- Daniel, L. G. & King, D. A. (1998). Knowledge and use of testing and measurement literacy of elementary and secondary teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*,(91), (6), P. 331-343.
- Davison, C. (2007). Views from the chalk face: English language school-based assessment in Hong- Kong. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, (4), (1), P. 37-68.
- Falsgraf, C. (2005). Why a national assessment summit? New visions in action. National Assessment Summit. Meeting conducted in Alexandria, Va. <http://www.nflrc.iastate.edu/nva>
- Gronlund, N. & Robert, L.(1998). Measurement and evaluation on teaching. New York: Macmillan. Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Huerta-Macias, A. (1995). Alternative assessment: Responses to commonly asked questions. *TESOL Journal*, (5), (1), P. 8-11.
- Kunnan, A. J. (2004). Regarding language assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, (1), (1), P. 1-19.

...

-
- Lantolf, J. P. & Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment*. New York: Springer Science and Business Media.
- Leung, C. (2004). Developing formative teacher assessment: Knowledge practice and change. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, (1), (1), P. 19-41.
- Lynch, B. K. (2001). Rethinking assessment from a critical perspective. *Language Testing*, (18), (4), P. 351-372.
- Lynch, B. & Shaw, P. (2005). Portfolios, Power and ethics. *TESOL Quarterly*, (93), (2), P. 263-297.
- Malone, M. E. (2008). *Training in language assessment*. New York: Springer Science and Business Media.
- McMillan, J. H. (2000). Fundamental assessment principles for teachers and school administrators. *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation*, (7), (8), P. 123-147.
- Stiggins, R. (2001). Secondary teachers classroom assessment and grading practices. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 20, (1), 20-32.
- Stoynoff, S. & Chapelle, C. A. (2005). *ESOL tests and testing: A resource for teachers and program administrators*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL publications.
- Winndschitl, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as the negotiation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical cultural and political challenges facing teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, (72), (2), p. 131-175.
- Wodfolk, A. E. (1998). *Teaching for learning*. Needham Heights, MA., Allyh & Bacon.