JSLTE

Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English

Online ISSN: 2476-7727, Print ISSN: 2251-8541

https://jslte.shiraz.iau.ir/

12(4), 2023, pp. 35-54

Research Article

A Comparative Investigation of Iran's NUEE Washback Effects on English Language Education at High Schools: A Cross Socio-Cultural Survey

Farhad Fathinejad [1], Behdokht Mall-Amiri *[2], Hamid Marashi [3]

Department of English, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author: **Behdokht Mall-Amiri**; Email: **bmallamiri@gmail.com**

ARTICLE INFO

Submission History

Received: 2023-07-20

Accepted: 2023-09-03

Keywords

National University Entrance Exam
Washback Effects
Socio-cultural Perspective

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at investigating the washback effects of the English module of Iran's National University Entrance Exam (NUEE) on English language education at high schools of privileged and under-privileged areas as perceived by high school teachers and students. To this end, 472 high school students and 260 teachers from Tehran, Qom (privileged), Gharchak, and Varamin (under-privileged) were selected on a convenience sampling technique and were given a washback effects questionnaire to seek and compare their perspectives about NUEE washback effects. Utilizing t-tests on respondents' obtained scores, it was shown that the overall mean score obtained by teachers from privileged areas is significantly higher than that obtained by teachers from the under-privileged areas. In contrast, it was revealed that students from the under-privileged areas obtained a significantly higher mean score than those from the privileged areas. Further frequency counts and detailed content analyses revealed similarities and differences among the participants' perceptions regarding the diverse aspects of the washback effect.

Introduction

From Bailey (1996) and Mesick (1996) to Cheng and Curtis (2004) and Spratt (2005), and more recently, Wang and Huang (2020), the term washback is defined as the influence that tests have on teaching and learning. Since 1996, a variety of ways through which tests influence classroom practices are identified. For instance, Alderson and Wall (1993) concluded that when teachers and learners carry out educational practices for the sake of tests at the expense of education itself, the washback occurs. Besides, Mesick (1996) stated that washback effect encompasses test rehearsal

behavior, where teachers and learners spend a considerable time in classrooms practicing for tests in a way that the effect of high-stakes tests on the curriculum, teaching and assessment embraces learning goals, teaching objectives, teaching materials, and teachers and students' attitudes.

Among those researchers who inquired into the relationship between teaching and testing aimed at measuring or conceptualizing washback, many have reported that washback is an intricate and multidimensional phenomenon (Messick, 1989; Bachman & Palmer, 1996 and Alderson & Wall, 1993).

Bachman and Palmer (1996) underscored the intricacy of the relationship and stated that washback effects appear in different forms depending on the contextual variables of the society in which the test is used. Shohamy, et al (1996) too, argued that when the stakes of a test are high in society, its influence over the stake-holders will be strong. When this influence is very significant, such as the significance of the university entrance exams in many societies, conventional educational systems lean towards implementing a hidden curriculum aimed at ameliorating this influence. In other words, considering these effects on education, teachers are placed under pressure to equip their students with the necessary skills to gain a pass in these high-stakes exams. This means that EFL teachers tend to resort to methods that they disapprove including retaining the conventional grammar-translation methodology (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009).

The significance of this study lies in shedding light on contextual and sociological factors affecting washback effects of NUEE on English language education at Iranian high schools. Specifically, should there be any educational policy reforms, awareness of the target community's realities, attitudes and wants would be essential and attainable which may help with devising remedies for the possible negative washback effects. More specifically, compliance with the INC (Iran's National Curriculum) may necessitate attempts made by practitioners as well as the Ministry of Education to reduce negative washback effects which may require apt measures in diverse sociocultural contexts.

Literature Review

Madaus (1988) and Goertz and Duffy (2003) stated that it is testing that determines teaching and learning and their qualities rather than curriculum, because it is the assessment that possesses value and then becomes what is taught in the curriculum. Endorsing this idea, Pearson (1988) states that public examinations influence the attitudes, behaviors, and motivation of teachers, learners and parents and this affects the curriculum in a reverse and backward direction because all tests are regularly administered at the end of the curricular period. For the same reason, it is called backwash, to describe this phenomenon. This issue is elaborated on in the following sections.

Huang (2019, p. 556) asserted that irrespective of the diversity of the effects of testing on language education, what is inevitable is the washback of testing on teaching, and that, "a thorough study on the backwash effect of testing is a topic that needs to be paid attention to in order to minimize its negative effect and give full attention to its positive effect".

Dawadi (2021, p.1), in an empirical study, concluded that "several factors including economic factors, social prestige associated with the test performance" affect the essence of washback effects of high stakes tests. Other similar studies were also conducted in the Asian context. For instance, Ahmad and Rao (2012) conducted a study in Pakistan and found that the instructors' main objective for teaching is preparing students for the requirements of the test package rather than real knowledge and practice of language use because students' failure in the exam is interpreted as their teacher's inadequate practice or knowledge.

Puspitasari (2020) conducted a study in the Indonesian context and investigated the effect that washback, related to the national examination, could have on Indonesian practices in terms of the perceptions and views held by teachers, learners, and parents. It especially examined how the national examination influences instruction and learning practices in final-year classrooms. The

data obtained from the interviews uncovered three main washback themes, including emotion, perception, and practice. Also, findings showed that the exam influences the participants both positively and negatively. The results revealed the extent to which assessment impacted the role and practices of instructors, learners and parents.

A review of related studies also unveils that one cannot predict the influence of high-stakes tests on instructions and learning; moreover, such an effect is not homogenous (Fox, 2005; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004).

Ranter (2002, as cited in Lantolf & Thorne, 2007, p.197) maintained that, "Sociocultural theory argues that human mental functioning is a mental process that is organized by cultural artifacts, activities and concepts". Likewise, Wertsch (1995, p.3) stated that sociocultural perspective seeks "to explicate the relationship between human mental functioning, on the one hand, and the cultural, institutional, and historical situations in which this functioning occurs, on the other". Wertsch (1995, p.141) also said "individuals have access to psychological tools and practices by virtue of being part of a sociocultural milieu in which those tools and practices have been and continue to be culturally transmitted". It has also been argued that students' future aspirations and language proficiency and social prestige associated with the language and students' performances on the test may affect the nature of test washback (Dawadi, 2018, 2020). Tsang (2017), likewise, demonstrated that washback is not a unitary concept, but rather a function of several intrinsic and extrinsic factors including sociocultural causes.

Considering the impact of external factors on washback, this study was inspired by Shih's (2010) framework as it provides guidelines to explore how social factors may affect the washback nature of the test. Shih's (2007) model states that a test and language learning may not be directly related to each other as other factors affect the washback nature of a high-stakes test. The present researchers believe that the washback effects of the NUEE on students' learning strategies and teachers' priorities could be impacted by the sociocultural settings in which English education is applied. Thus, this study was an attempt to explore and contrast high school teachers and students' perceptions, ideas, and attitudes regarding NUEE washback effects in different socio-cultural contexts defined as privileged and underprivileged areas in this investigation. To that end, the following research questions were raised:

1. Is there any statistically significant difference between NUEE washback effects perceptions of English language teachers at high schools in privileged and under-privileged districts?

2. Is there any statistically significant difference between NUEE washback effects perceptions of high school students in privileged and under-privileged districts?

3. How do high school teachers and students in different sociocultural settings perceive the NUEE washback effects on English language education at high schools? What are the convergences and divergences?

Method

Design

This survey enjoyed an ex post facto descriptive design as firstly comparisons between two groups of participants regarding their perceptions about the NUEE washback effects were made. Secondly, descriptions of their responses were provided to arrive at an in-depth understanding of their perspectives regarding the components of the washback effects.

Participants

To conduct the study, 472 students at 10th and pre-university grades of high school from Tehran and Qom (240), Gharchak and Varamin (232) were selected based on availability. Also, 260 high school teachers of English from Tehran and Qom (160) and Varamin and Gharchak (100) were selected based on convenience sampling technique. According to Ahmadi and Esmaeilzadeh (2014), from the 11 Tehran province cities, Tehran and Qom are given rank 2 (hence privileged), and Varamin and Gharchak are categorized as rank 9 (hence under-privileged) with respect to sociocultural conditions. This

categorization corroborates the official Division of Entrance Exam Educational Districts, according to which Tehran and Qom are considered as District 1 (the most privileged) and Varamin and Gharchak are classified as districts 2 and 3 (medium to least privileged) respectively (www.blog.taraz.org).

Instruments

The NUEE Washback Effects Scale developed by Fathi et al. (in press) was used to meet the goals of this investigation. The questionnaire encompasses five factors, namely: Educational Process (including teaching, learning, and assessment issues, items 1-17), Attitude and Perception (items 18-29), Educational Policy Making (items 30-41), Emotional and Consequential (items 42-48), and Social and Cultural issues (items 49-58). The items of the questionnaire were developed based on extensive qualitative data driven from interviews with experts, teachers and learners in English education field (Fathi, et al, in press). The questionnaire, undergoing factor analyses and reliability estimation, showed to have construct validity and reliability coefficient of .903. It consists of 58 Likert-type items with 5 alternative options for each (strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree). The first two components ('educational process' and attitude and perception') as well as items 55, 56 and 57 the value points were 5 to 1 given to *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree* respectively. However, for the remaining three components (educational policy, emotional and consequential, social and cultural) items were reversely valued. The maximum score obtainable from this questionnaire is 290 and the minimum score is 58. The closer the overall score to the maximum, the higher belief in negative washback effects of NUEE on English education aspects at high schools might be interpreted (Appendix).

Procedure

The NUEE Washback Effects Scale was administered to 732 student and teacher respondents in Tehran, Qom, Varamin and Gharchak in order to explore the students' and teachers' opinions and perspectives regarding the washback effects of NUEE, the data driven from which were analyzed both statistically and descriptively. In the statistical analyses, comparisons were made between teachers' perspectives from privileged and under-privileged districts. The same comparison was made between students from the two socio-culturally distinct areas. Further inspection was carried out into the respondents' answers to the items of the questionnaire to delve into their perspectives about NUEE washback effects.

Results

The First Question

To provide an empirical answer to the first question, the corresponding null hypothesis was formulated as:

There is no statistically significant difference between the NUEE washback effects perceptions of English language teachers at high schools in privileged and under-privileged areas.

To capture the difference between the two groups of teachers regarding their total washback perception, firstly, their total scores had to be compared through a t test. As the scores turned out to be skewed, Mann-Whitney U test was sued.

Table 1.
Ranks of Teachers' Obtained Scores

	Grouping	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
washback perceptions	Prvlgd	160	165.03	26404.00
	Un-prvlgd	100	75.26	7526.00
	Total	260		

Table 1 displays that the mean rank belonging to the privileged areas is larger than that of the under-privileged areas (165.03 vs. 75.26).

Table 2.
Test Statistics[a] of Teachers' Obtained Scores

	washback perceptions
Mann-Whitney U	2476.000
Wilcoxon W	7526.000
Z	-9.380
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
a. Grouping Variable: grouping	

Table 2 reveals that the difference between the overall washback perception of teachers in privileged and under-privileged areas was significant (z=9.38, p=.000<.05) which means that the corresponding null hypothesis is rejected.
The effect size was computed using the formula suggested by Pallant (2007):

$R=\frac{Z}{\sqrt{N}}$

The result came out to be .5818, which implies that 58.18 percent of the variance was due to the difference in the grouping (geographical setting). This effect size is large according to the Cohen's (1988, as cited in Pallant, 2007, p.223) criteria.

To illuminate the discovered dissimilarity, comparisons among the mean scores of the two groups of teachers driven from each component of the questionnaire were also conducted. As there were five factors to be compared in the two groups, MANOVA analysis had to be conducted. However, the conditions of homogeneity of variances and multicolinearity were violated. Pallant (2007) maintained that with low correlations, separate univariate analysis for the dependent variables should be done. Therefore, the two groups' mean scores in each of the components were compared separately.

Firstly, scores obtained from the first component were compared. As the distribution of the scores for the first component turned out to be skewed, the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was utilized to compare the means.

Table 3.
Ranks of Teachers' Scores from the First Component

	grouping	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
first component	Prvlgd	160	157.35	24390.00
	Un-prvlgd	100	41.75	3340.00
	Total	260		

Table 3 shows that the mean rank of the privileged group was larger than the un-privileged group (157.35 vs. 41.75).

Table 4
Test Statistics[a] for Teachers' Scores from the First Component

	first component
Mann-Whitney U	100.000
Wilcoxon W	3340.000
Z	-12.394
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
a. Grouping Variable: grouping	

As revealed in Table 4, the difference between the two groups in terms of the first component was significant (z=12.394, p=.000<.05).

As for the second component, the comparison was conducted through the use of the parametric t-test. The following tables show the result thereof:

Table 5.
Group Statistics of Teachers' Scores from the Second Component

	Grouping	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
second component	Prvlgd	160	52.4323	4.18100	.33583
	Un-prvlgd	100	51.2875	3.04063	.33995

Table 5 exhibits that the mean score of the privileged group was larger than that of the under-privileged group (52.43 vs. 51.28).

Table 6

Independent Samples Test on Teachers' Scores from the Second Component

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
second component	Equal variances assumed	29.103	.000	2.170	233	.031	1.14476	.52761	.10526	2.18425
	Equal variances not assumed			2.396	207.199	.017	1.14476	.47786	.20267	2.08684

As depicted in Table 6, the variances were not homogeneous (F=29.103, p=.000<.05), hence the second row was consulted for the result of the t-test. As shown there, the difference between the two groups turned out to be significant (t=2.396, p=.017<.05).

For the third component, as the distribution of the scores was normal, an Independent Samples t-test was run:

Table 7.

Group Statistics of Teachers' Scores from the Third Component

	grouping	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
third component	Prvlgd	160	47.8387	6.15755	.49459
	Un-prvlgd	100	49.7625	3.67421	.41079

Table 7 shows that the mean score obtained by the under-privileged group was higher than the mean obtained by the privileged group (49.76 vs. 47.84).

Table 8.

Independent Samples Test on Teachers' Scores from the Third Component

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
third component	Equal variances assumed	38.301	.000	-2.567	233	.011	-1.92379	.74945	-3.40035	-.44723
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.992	228.129	.003	-1.92379	.64293	-3.19064	-.65694

As shown in Table 8, the difference between the two mean scores turned out to be significant (t=2.99, p=.003<.05).

For the fourth component, an Independent Samples t-test was conducted again, as the normalcy of the scores was ensured previously.

Table 9.
Group Statistics of Teachers' Scores from the Fourth Component

	Grouping	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
fourth component	Prvlgd	160	34.4581	3.49069	.28038
	Un-prvlgd	100	32.5125	3.07704	.34402

As presented in Table 9 the privileged group obtained a higher mean score compared with the under-privileged counterpart (34.49 vs. 32.51).

Table 10.
Independent Samples Test on Teachers' Scores from the Fourth Component

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
fourth component	Equal variances assumed	6.127	.014	4.211	233	.000	1.94556	.46203	1.03528	2.85585
	Equal variances not assumed			4.384	178.420	.000	1.94556	.44381	1.06978	2.82135

Table 10 exhibits that the difference between the mean scores came out to be significant (t=4.38, p=.000<.05).

As for the fifth component, with the normality condition being met, a parametric Independent Samples t-test was conducted on the mean scores.

Table 11.
Group Statistics of Teachers' Scores from the Fifth Component

	grouping	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
fifth component	Prvlgd	160	42.5419	3.75247	.30141
	Un-prvlgd	100	39.6000	3.46994	.38795

Table 11 depicts that the privileged group's mean score was higher than that of the under-privileged. The main result of the t-test is presented in Table 12.

Table 12.
Independent Samples Test on Teachers' Scores from the Fifth Component

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
fifth component	Equal variances assumed	7.544	.006	5.840	233	.000	2.94194	.50373	1.94948	3.93439
	Equal variances not assumed			5.988	171.161	.000	2.94194	.49128	1.97220	3.91167

As illustrated in Table 12, the difference between the means was significant (t=5.99, p=.000<.05). The summary of teachers' differences in their overall and component mean scores is presented in Table 13.

Table 13.
Comparison of Teachers' Mean Scores

Overall			
Mann-Whitney U	Z	Sig	Result
2476.000	-9.38	.000	Privileged group significantly higher

Components			
	Mann-Whitney U/t	sig	Result
First	M-W=100.00	.000	Privileged group significantly higher
Second	t=2.396	.017	Privileged group significantly higher
Third	t=2.99	.003	Under-privileged group significantly higher
Fourth	t=4.38	.000	Privileged group significantly higher
Fifth	t=5.98	.000	Privileged group significantly higher

As summarized in Table 13, teachers in the privileged group obtained a significantly higher *overall* mean score as well as higher mean scores in all *components* except for the third one in which the under-privileged counterpart gained a significantly higher mean score.

The Second Question

To answer the second question empirically, the following null hypothesis was formulated:

There is no statistically significant difference between NUEE washback effects perceptions of high school students in privileged and under-privileged districts.

To test the null hypothesis, the two groups' total mean scores were to be compared. To legitimately use a parametric t-test, the normality condition was verified primarily and it was shown that the scores were skewed. Therefore, the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the mean ranks.

Table 14.
Ranks of Students' Overall Scores

	grouping	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
washbackTotal of students	prvlgd	240	187.10	44903.50
	Un-prvlgd	232	287.61	66724.50
	Total	472		

Table 14 displays that the mean rank obtained by students in under-privileged areas was larger than that obtained by students in privileged areas (232.61, vs. 187). The following table shows the result of the Mann-Whitney U test:

Table 15
Test Statistics[a] of Students' Overall Scores

	washbackTotal
Mann-Whitney U	15983.500
Wilcoxon W	44903.500
Z	-8.005
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
a. Grouping Variable: grouping	

As shown in Table 15, there was a significant difference between the mean ranks of the two groups of students (z=8.005, p=.000<.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis is *rejected* implying that students in under-privileged areas believed in the total negative washback effect significantly

more than students in privileged areas. Using the formula for the effect size (as suggested by Pallant, 2007), the value came out to be 0.3685 which implies that 36.85 percent of the variation is due to the grouping factor. According to Cohen (1988) guidelines, this value shows a moderate effect size.

In order to locate the differences between the two groups with respect to the components of the washback questionnaire, the researchers further intended to compare their mean scores obtained from each of the five components. To run a MANOVA, firstly, the univariate normality assumption was checked, and the outliers were detected and modified. The multicolinearity condition was not met as there were low correlations among the five variables. Also, the homogeneity of variances condition was violated.

To compare the mean scores through independent samples t tests, firstly the normality condition was checked and it was revealed that distributions related to the five components were skewed. Therefore, Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted for all of them. The following tables show the results thereof:

Table 16.
Ranks of Students' Scores on the Five Components

	grouping	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
firstComp	Prvlgd	240	229.14	54993.00
	Un-Prvlgd	232	244.12	56635.00
	Total	472		
secondComp	Prvlgd	240	221.95	53267.00
	Un-Prvlgd	232	251.56	58361.00
	Total	472		
thirdComp	Prvlgd	240	195.38	46890.50
	Un-Prvlgd	232	279.04	64737.50
	Total	472		
fourthComp	Prvlgd	240	200.40	48095.50
	Un-Prvlgd	232	273.85	63532.50
	Total	472		
fifthComp	Prvlgd	240	190.21	45650.00
	Un-Prvlgd	232	284.39	65978.00
	Total	472		

Table 17.
Test Statistics[a] of Students' Scores on the Five Components

	First Comp	Second Comp	Third Comp	Fourth Comp	Fifth Comp
Mann-Whitney U	26073.000	24347.000	17970.500	19175.500	16730.000
Wilcoxon W	54993.000	53267.000	46890.500	48095.500	45650.000
Z	-1.193	-2.364	-6.675	-5.869	-7.518
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.233	.018	.000	.000	.000

a. Grouping Variable: grouping

As depicted in Table 16, the under-privileged group gained a higher mean rank than the privileged group in all components. Table 17 reveals that the differences between the two groups' mean ranks related to the first component turned out to be non-significant (z=1.19, p=.233>.05). However, the difference between the two groups regarding the second, third, fourth and fifth components were statistically significant as all the corresponding sig values (.018, and .000) turned out to be less than .05.

The Third Question

Students' Responses

The NUEE washback perceptions of respondents from different areas were expounded with a more detailed inspection as to in what specific aspects their ideas differed.

The following tables show the percentage of agreement and disagreement with the items of the five components as expressed by the students from privileged and under-privileged areas.

Table 18.
Students' Responses to the First Component: Education Process

First Component												
Items	Privileged (N=240)						Under-privileged (N=232)					
	Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Disagree		Undecided	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	116	48.33	65	27.08	59	24.58	112	48.27	45	19.39	75	32.32
2	132	54.91	45	18.75	63	26.25	140	60.34	44	18.96	48	20.69
3	100	41.66	69	28.75	71	29.58	100	43.1	65	27.15	67	28.87
4	106	44.16	60	25	74	30.83	123	53.01	49	21.12	60	25.86
5	94	39.16	71	29.58	75	31.25	130	56.03	47	20.25	55	23.7
6	102	42.5	69	28.75	69	28.75	111	47.84	48	20.68	66	28.44
7	89	37.08	93	38.75	58	24.16	69	29.74	105	45.26	58	25
8	94	39.16	71	29.58	75	31.25	79	34.05	85	36.63	68	29.31
9	123	51.25	54	22.5	63	26.25	117	50.43	44	18.96	71	30.6
10	79	32.92	94	39.17	67	27.92	76	32.75	118	50.86	38	16.37
11	70	29.17	97	40.42	73	30.42	84	36.2	78	33.62	70	30.17
12	67	27.91	107	44.58	66	27.5	46	19.82	123	53.01	63	27.15
13	103	42.91	69	28.75	68	28.33	104	44.82	65	28.01	63	27.15
14	86	35.83	80	33.33	74	30.83	105	45.25	66	28.44	61	26.29
15	94	38.17	60	25	86	35.83	46	19.82	134	57.75	52	22.41
16	93	38.75	68	28.33	79	32.91	139	59.91	39	16.81	54	23.27
17	96	40	55	22.91	89	37.08	81	34.91	67	28.87	84	36.2
Mean	40.2 %		30.07 %		29.63%		42.134 %		30.927 %		26.94 %	

Table 18 depicts that students from the privileged and under-privileged areas predominantly expressed their agreement with the first component, which implies that they believed in the existence of NUEE washback effect on the aspects of educational process: teaching, learning and testing.

Table 19.
Students' Responses to the Second Component: Attitude and Perception

Second Component												
Items	Privileged (N=240)						Under-privileged (N=232)					
	Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Disagree		Undecided	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
18	128	53.33	48	20	64	26.66	125	53.87	42	18.1	65	28.01
19	111	46.25	50	20.83	79	32.91	153	65.95	17	7.32	62	26.72
20	120	50	39	16.25	81	33.75	148	63.79	14	6.03	70	30.17
21	115	47.91	20	8.3	105	43.75	165	71.12	18	7.75	49	21.12
22	111	46.25	31	12.91	98	40.83	107	46.12	32	13.79	93	40.08
23	100	41.66	32	13.33	108	45	88	37.93	33	14.22	111	47.84
24	91	37.91	33	13.75	116	48.33	90	38.79	43	18.53	99	42.67
25	87	36.25	44	18.33	109	45.41	86	37.06	69	29.74	77	33.18
26	122	50.83	20	8.33	98	40.83	148	63.79	15	6.46	69	29.74
27	129	53.75	15	6.25	96	40	148	63.79	32	13.79	52	22.41

Second Component												
Items	Privileged (N=240)						Under-privileged (N=232)					
	Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Disagree		Undecided	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
28	121	50.41	22	9.17	97	40.41	149	64.22	14	6.03	69	29.74
29	68	28.33	74	30.83	98	40.83	63	27.15	97	41.81	72	31.03
Mean	45.24 %		14.85 %		39.91 %		52.79 %		15.3 %		31.91 %	

Table 19 shows that both groups collectively agreed with the items of the second component which indicates their belief in the existence of NUEE washback effect on attitudes and perceptions of teachers and learners.

Table 20

Students' Responses to the Third Component: Educational Policy Making

Third Component												
Items	Privileged (N=240)						Under-privileged (N=232)					
	Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Disagree		Undecided	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30	108	45	29	12.08	103	42.91	102	43.96	23	9.91	107	46.12
31	98	40.83	57	23.75	85	35.41	127	54.74	24	10.34	81	34.91
32	67	27.91	94	39.17	79	32.92	70	30.17	88	37.93	74	31.89
33	120	50	58	24.17	62	25.83	67	28.87	79	34.05	86	37.06
34	124	51.66	56	23.33	60	25	119	51.29	55	23.7	58	25
35	64	26.66	58	24.16	118	49.17	74	31.89	104	44.82	54	23.27
36	66	27.5	59	24.58	115	41.92	70	30.17	51	21.98	111	47.84
37	117	48.75	58	24.17	65	27.08	44	18.93	95	40.90	93	40.15
38	118	49.17	57	23.75	65	27.08	67	28.88	86	37.06	79	34.05
39	123	51.25	35	14.58	82	34.17	49	21.12	72	31.03	111	47.84
40	109	45.41	22	9.17	109	45.41	162	69.82	14	6.03	56	24.13
41	69	28.75	55	22.92	116	48.33	32	13.79	70	30.17	130	56.03
Mean	41.07		22.15		36.78		35.30		27.33		37.37	

As illustrated in Table 20, the frequency of the privileged group's choice for agreement with the component items exceeded that for other choices, while the under-privileged group's overriding vote was for undecided. Agreement in this component means existence of NUEE washback effect on educational policy making.

Table 21

Students' Responses to the Fourth Component: Consequential and Emotional Factors

Fourth Component												
Items	Privileged						Under-privileged (N=232)					
	Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Disagree		Undecided	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
42	52	21.66	104	43.33	84	35	41	17.67	141	60.77	50	21.55
43	55	22.91	106	44.16	79	32.91	38	16.37	142	61.20	52	22.41
44	60	25	101	42.08	79	32.91	37	15.94	133	57.32	62	26.72
45	68	28.33	72	30	100	41.66	10	4.31	124	53.44	98	42.24

Fourth Component												
Items	Privileged						Under-privileged (N=232)					
	Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
46	55	22.91	78	32.5	107	44.58	11	7.74	126	54.31	95	40.95
47	44	18.33	98	40.83	99	41.25	35	15.08	115	49.56	82	35.34
48	59	24.58	112	46.66	69	28.75	13	5.60	201	86.63	18	7.75
Mean	23.35		39.93		36.72		11.81		60.46		27.73	

Table 21 evinces that the majority of both groups disagreed with the items of the fourth component, which implies their belief in the existence of washback effect on emotions of teachers and learners.

Table 22.

Students' Responses to the Fifth Component: Social and Cultural Issues

Fifth Component												
Items	Privileged (N=240)						Under-privileged (N=232)					
	Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
49	68	28.33	95	39.58	77	32.08	34	14.65	146	62.93	52	22.41
50	66	27.5	99	41.25	75	31.25	43	18.53	138	59.48	51	21.98
51	65	27.08	74	30.83	101	42.08	38	16.37	145	62.5	49	21.12
52	62	25.83	102	42.5	76	31.66	43	18.53	139	59.91	50	22.72
53	62	25.83	69	28.75	109	45.41	11	4.74	125	53.88	96	41.37
54	103	42.91	65	27.08	72	30	37	15.95	72	31.03	123	53.02
55	117	48.75	42	17.5	81	33.75	144	62.06	9	3.88	79	34.05
56	114	47.5	40	16.66	86	35.83	125	53.88	42	18.10	66	28.44
57	112	46.66	43	17.91	85	35.41	131	56.46	11	4.74	90	38.79
58	60	25	64	26.66	116	48.33	16	6.89	135	58.19	81	34.91
Mean	34.53		28.87		36.6		26.80		41.46		31.88	

As shown in Table 22, the majority of the privileged group's votes was given to undecided, while the under-privileged group mostly disagreed with the items.

Teachers' Responses

The following tables present the percentage of the teachers' responses to the items of the five components:

Table 23.

Teachers' Responses to the First Component: Educational Process

First Component												
Items	Privileged (N=160)						Under-privileged (N=100)					
	Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	115	71.87	20	12.5	25	15.62	60	60	40	40	0	0
2	150	93.75	6	3.75	4	2.5	80	80	20	20	0	0
3	126	78.75	12	7.5	22	13.75	38	38	60	60	2	2
4	125	78.12	15	9.37	20	12.5	40	40	40	40	20	20
5	148	92.5	5	3.12	7	4.37	18	18	82	82	0	0
6	145	90.62	4	2.5	11	6.87	36	36	60	60	4	4

First Component

Items	Privileged (N=160)						Under-privileged (N=100)					
	Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Disagree		Undecided	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
7	150	93.75	4	2.5	6	3.75	61	61	36	36	3	3
8	127	79.37	21	13.12	12	7.5	10	10	90	90	0	0
9	135	84.37	14	8.75	11	6.87	98	98	2	2	0	0
10	144	90	7	4.37	8	5	37	37	60	60	3	3
11	146	91.25	6	3.75	8	5	40	40	40	40	20	20
12	149	93.12	2	1.25	9	5.62	20	20	63	63	17	17
13	151	94.37	1	0.62	8	5	64	64	20	20	16	16
14	153	95.62	1	0.62	6	3.75	60	60	32	32	8	8
15	155	96.87	1	0.62	4	2.5	5	5	80	80	15	15
16	142	88.75	5	3.12	13	8.12	80	80	18	18	2	2
17	25	15.62	93	58.12	42	26.25	23	23	60	60	17	17
Mean	78.74 %		7.97 %		13.29 %		45.29		47.23		7.48	

Table 23 demonstrates that the majority of the privileged group voted for agreement with the items of the first component, while the disagree options were more frequently chosen by teachers from under-privileged areas. So, teachers from the privileged areas believed in the existence of washback effect on aspects of educational procedure as opposed to their under-privileged counterpart.

Table 24.
Teachers' Responses to the Second Component: Attitude and Perception

Second Component

Items	Privileged (N=160)						Under-privileged (N=100)					
	Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Disagree		Undecided	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
18	157	98.12	3	1.85	0	0	75	75	25	25	0	0
19	149	93.12	0	0	11	6.87	90	90	8	8	2	2
20	136	85	12	7.5	12	7.5	55	55	44	44	1	1
21	154	96.25	6	3.75	0	0	98	98	2	2	0	0
22	150	93.75	10	6.25	0	0	73	73	3	3	24	24
23	136	85	12	7.5	12	7.5	40	40	5	5	55	55
24	155	96.87	5	3.12	0	0	40	40	3	3	57	57
25	114	71.25	0	0	46	28.75	60	60	23	23	17	17
26	57	35.62	23	14.37	80	50	96	96	0	0	4	4
27	71	44.37	9	5.62	80	50	85	85	7	7	8	8
28	103	64.37	0	0	57	35.62	80	80	20	20	0	0
29	34	21.25	57	35.62	69	43.12	5	5	80	80	15	15
Mean	73.75		7.13		19.12		66.42		18.33		15.25	

As revealed in Table 24, the majority of teachers from both areas believed in the NUEE negative washback effect on attitudes of teachers and learners.

Table 25.
Teachers' Responses to the Third Component: Educational Policy Making

Items	Third Component											
	Privileged (N=160)						Under-privileged (N=100)					
	Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30	89	55.62	19	11.87	52	32.5	80	80	20	20	5	5
31	85	53.12	18	11.25	57	35.62	80	80	15	15	2	2
32	45	28.12	72	45	43	26.87	3	3	95	95	2	2
33	47	29.37	68	42.5	45	28.12	0	0	98	98	2	2
34	103	64.37	19	11.87	38	23.75	1	1	97	97	2	2
35	57	35.62	19	11.87	84	52.5	5	5	70	70	25	25
36	82	51.22	27	16.87	51	31.87	35	35	40	40	25	25
37	47	29.37	42	26.25	71	44.37	30	30	64	64	6	6
38	82	51.5	38	23.75	40	25	20	20	45	45	35	35
39	57	35.62	30	18.75	73	45.62	10	10	55	55	35	35
40	100	62.5	12	7.5	48	30	66	66	32	32	2	2
41	42	26.25	38	23.7	80	50	20	20	60	60	20	20
Mean	43.55		20.93		35.52		29.16		57.58		13.26	

Table 25 shows that the majority of teachers from privileged areas agreed with the items of the component (non-existence of the effect), while the majority of the other group disagreed with the items (existence of the effect).

Table 26.
Teachers' Responses to the Fourth Component: Consequential and Emotional Factors

Items	Fourth Component											
	Privileged (N=160)						Under-privileged (N=100)					
	Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
42	33	20.62	84	52.5	43	26.87	20	20	75	75	5	5
43	35	21.87	83	51.87	42	26.25	5	5	65	65	30	30
44	36	22.5	82	51.25	42	26.25	18	18	80	80	2	2
45	38	23.75	52	32.5	70	43.75	20	20	80	80	0	0
46	34	21.25	53	33.12	73	45.62	15	15	80	80	5	5
47	41	25.62	57	35.62	62	38.75	38	38	45	45	17	17
48	39	24.37	73	45.62	48	30	2	2	95	95	3	3
Mean	22.85		43.21		33.94		16.85		74.28		8.87	

As shown in Table 26, both groups of teachers predominantly disagreed with the component items, implying that they almost equally disagreed with the items implying agreement with NUEE effect on emotions of teachers. However, more teachers from the under-privileged areas expressed their strong disagreement compared with teachers from the privileged areas.

Table 27.
Teachers' Responses to the Fifth Component: Social and Cultural Issues

Fifth Component												
Items	Privileged(N=160)						Under-privileged (N=100)					
	Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Disagree		Undecided	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
49	55	34.37	60	37.5	45	28.12	15	15	80	80	5	5
50	36	22.5	78	48.75	46	28.75	0	0	95	95	5	5
51	38	23.75	54	33.75	69	43.12	2	2	96	96	3	3
52	40	25	72	45	48	30	8	8	80	80	12	12
53	54	33.75	46	28.75	60	37.5	7	7	85	85	8	8
54	73	45.62	42	26.25	45	28.12	15	15	60	60	25	25
55	92	57.5	13	8.12	55	34.34	80	80	8	8	12	12
56	89	55.62	21	13.12	50	31.25	80	80	10	10	10	10
57	82	51.25	20	12.5	58	36.25	60	60	25	25	15	15
58	45	28.12	48	30	67	41.87	35	35	60	60	5	5
Mean	37.74 %		28.37 %		33.93 %		30.2 %		59.9 %		10 %	

It is disclosed in Table 27 that the privileged group of teachers mostly agreed with the items of the fifth component, while the majority of the under-privileged group expressed their disagreement with the items.

Discussion

The result of the t-tests on students' responses revealed that there was a significant difference between perceptions of learners from the two distinct areas. It was shown that learners from under-privileged areas believed in the existence of washback effect significantly more than learners from privileged areas. More specifically, they differed in their perceptions about all the components except for the first one. That is, there was no statistically significant difference between them regarding the first component, implying that both groups equally agreed that there is an NUEE washback effect on English teaching, learning and testing practices at secondary school level. However, regarding the second component, the under-privileged group obtained a significantly higher mean score. The difference may be attributed to the percentage of the votes given to the agree and disagree options which was higher on the part of the under-privileged group. As for the social and cultural factors, both groups similarly disagreed that students from various social and geographical settings have equal chances of success in NUEE because of education equality and priorities, and that students with lower social status have equal motivation for learning English conversation and testing skills. However, the percentage of disagreement with these items is much higher on the side of the under-privileged students.

Furthermore, the majority of under-privileged students also disagreed that students with lower economic status have equal chances of success in NUEE because of equality of NUEE contents with education contents, and that students with lower social status are encouraged by their parents for learning English conversation and testing skills equally. Whereas, the privileged group was mostly undecided about the ideas. Moreover, the under-privileged students overridingly disagreed with the idea that NUEE provides equal conditions for performance of test takers from lower social and economic statuses, while the privileged students mainly were undecided about the notion. One piece of argument for this discrepancy might be the assumption that students in under-privileged areas are less able to afford attending extra-curricular English language programs and schools to improve their English language proficiency, hence believing in inequality of chances that students from various social and cultural settings have for success in NUEE.

The data analyses related to the teachers' responses revealed that, collectively, teachers from privileged areas believed in the existence of NUEE negative washback effect significantly more than teachers from under-privileged areas. More specifically, the two groups were significantly different in all components except for the third component. The two groups of teachers' perceptions were significantly different in terms of the mean scores they obtained from each component, except for the third one. Overall, teachers from privileged area obtained a significantly higher mean score from the questionnaire than teachers from under-privileged areas. Specifically, the privileged group agreed that exercises and assignments are based on NUEE not on INC/course books; that teaching methods and materials and evaluations are based on NUEE contents, and that course books are marginalized because they are not compatible with the NUEE contents, and that teachers do not evaluate learners' communication skills and only focus on writing and grammar errors, whereas teachers from the under-privileged areas disagreed with the ideas. The researchers' speculation about this discrepancy is that teachers in privileged areas are under more pressure of the learners' parents to ensure their children's success at NUEE compared with teachers in under-privileged areas. Moreover, both groups disagreed that students from various social and geographical settings have equal chances of success in NUEE, because of equality of education practices and priorities and students from lower social statuses have equal motivation for English language communication and testing skills. This could be due to the assumption that students from under-privileged areas are less able to afford extra-curricular English language programs including outside-of schools English language institutes.

Furthermore, the majority of the under-privileged teachers disagreed with the idea that students with lower social status are encouraged by their parents for learning communication and testing skills equally, and that because of equality of NUEE contents with education contents students with lower economic status have equal chances of success in NUEE, and that NUEE provides equal conditions for success of test takers from lower social and economic statuses, while the majority of privileged teachers was undecided about the ideas.

O'Loughlin (2006) believes that a great part of these diverse effects is not due to failed educational theories but resides in bad understanding and skewed interpretation of testing and assessment, which is largely a social practice with strong associations with an array of complex political and ethical considerations. The findings of this study also corroborate the belief held by Farrell (2000), Fox, (2005) and Tollefson and Tsui (2004) that the effect of high-stakes test on teaching and teachers and learning and learners are neither predictable nor homogenous. This implies that the apparent failure of new Iranian National Curriculum in reducing the negative washback effect of Iranian university entrance exam is not necessarily the result of failed educational system but a larger social and managerial context.

Madaus's (1988) investigation on the logic behind the teachers' preference to teach for the test showed that this preference emerges from the attitude of teachers toward tests. Also, some of this preference is shaped by the society in which test results are used. The findings of this study also corroborate those by Dawadi (2021) who concluded that cultural and social factors affect washback effects, and "therefore, it is essential to study the social, cultural and political aspects of the society to reflect on the true nature of washback" (p.1).

Manilal (2014) also revealed that parents from both privileged and underprivileged communities are concerned and employ a variety of strategies to get involved in their children's education, both academically and socially, with the parents from the privileged schools being more involved than parents from the underprivileged schools.

The findings also resonate Tsang's (2017) conclusion that washback is an interplay of internal and external factors: "of not only human agents, but also societal factors"(p.2). Furthermore, the outcome of the present investigation confirms Shih's (2010) model encompassing social factors, and that teachers had to consider social and educational, school, and

parental and student factors before implementing their English requirement.

Conclusion

Considering the findings of the current research and the previous studies reviewed, it could be concluded that community and tests are part of an interrelated, interdependent complex that contribute to the wider impact and stakes of a test on learner actions and practices at social and individual levels.

Overall, this study revealed that both teachers and students from the privileged and under-privileged areas believed in the existence of negative washback effects of NUEE on diverse aspects of English education at high schools. However, teachers from privileged areas held a significantly higher belief in the effects, while students from the under-privileged areas believed in the existence of washback effects of NUEE significantly more than the students from the privileged areas. It was shown that the teachers in under-privileged group more frequently believed that social and cultural factors impact learners and teachers' English language practices in contrast with the collective belief of the privileged group of teachers in that regard. Likewise, the majority of the students from under-privileged areas believed in the existence of the sociocultural effects.

The outcome of this study has certain implications for English education at high schools. Based on the obtained results, and more specifically by the virtue of the finding that both groups of teachers and students in both districts believed that sociocultural factors affect washback effects, policy makers and decision making officials may use all their resources to firstly bring in modifications in English education at high schools including course book and teaching contents to make them commensurate with the Iranian National Curriculum, if applicable; and secondly to alleviate disparity among diverse districts in terms of the contents and purposes of English education. Additionally, during the 40 hours of in-service trainings per year administrated by the Ministry of Education for high school teachers, trainers may focus on mitigating negative washback effects equally in privileged and under-privileged areas complying more with the INC contents.

References

Ahmad, S., & Rao, C. (2012). Examination of washback effect: Syllabus, teaching methodology and the learners' communicative competence. *Journal of Education Practice*, *3*(15), 173-183.

Ahmadi, H., & Esmaeili, Y. (2014). Arzyabi-e sathe-e tose'ehyaftegi-e shahrestanha-ye ostan-e Tehran [An evaluation of the development levels of Tehran province cities]. *Cheshmandaz-e Joghrafiyaii Dar Motaleat-e Ensani*, *27*(9), 79-95.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford University Press.

Cheng, L. & Curtis, A. (2004). Washback or backwash: A review of the impact of testing on teaching and learning. In L. Cheng, Y. Watanabe, & A. Curtis (Eds.), *Washback in language testing: Research contexts and methods* (pp.3–17). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

Dawadi, S. (2018). The impact of the SLC examination on English language teaching and student motivation to learn English. In D. Hayes (Ed.), *English language teaching in Nepal: Research reflection and practice* (133-163*).* British Council.

Dawadi, S. (2021). Factors influencing washback of a high stakes English as a foreign language test. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, *25* (3), 1-16.

Farrell, J. (2000). Why is educational reform so difficult? Similar descriptions, different prescriptions, failed explanations. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *30*, 83–102. https://doi.org/10.1111/0362-6784.00155

Fathi, F., Mall-Amiri, B. & Marashi, H. (in press). Developing a native model for Iran's national university entrance exam washback effects on English language education at Iranian high schools. *Journal of Language and Translation.*

Fox, J. (2005). Revisiting the storied landscape of language policy over time: A case of successful educational reform. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *35*, 261–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2005.00329.x

Goertz, M., & Duffy, M. (2003). Mapping the landscape of high-stakes testing and accountability programs. *Theory into Practice*, *42*(1), 4-12. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4201_2

Huang, X. (2019). The backwash effect of language testing on professional English learning and teaching. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities*, *311*, 553-558. https://doi.org/10.2991/ecss-19.2019.113

Kikuchi, K., & Browne, C. (2009). English educational policy for high schools in Japan. *Regional*

Language Centre Journal, *40*(2), 172-191. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688209105865

Lantolf, J. & Thorne, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In B. van Patten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 201-224). Mahwah.NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Madaus, G. F. (1988). The distortion of teaching and testing: High-stakes testing and instruction. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *65*, 29–46. https://doi.org/10.1080/01619568809538611

Manilal, R. (2014). *Parental involvement in education: A comparison between a privileged and underprivileged school* [Master's thesis, University of Kawazulu-Natal]. https://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/handle/10413/12655.

Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (pp. 13–103). Washington, DC: American Council on Education & National Council on Measurement in Education.

O'Loughlin, K. (2006). Learning about second language assessment: Insights from a postgraduate student on-line subject forum. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, *1*, 71-85. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309346961_Learning_about_second_language_assessment_Insights_from_a_postgraduate_student_on-line_subject_forum

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows*. Maidenhead: Open University Press & McGraw-Hill Education.

Puspitasari, M. (2020). *Investigating the washback effect of the national examination on Indonesian practices: Perceptions of teachers, students and parents of test impact.* University of Glasgow.

Shih, C. M. (2010). The washback of the general English proficiency test on university policies: A Taiwan case study. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *7*(3), 234–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434301003664196

Shohamy, E., Donitsa-Schmidt, S., & Ferman, I. (1996). Test impact revisited: washback effect over time. *Language Testing*, *13*, 298-317. https://doi.org/10.1177/026553229601300305

Spratt, M. (2005). Washback and the classroom: The implications for teaching and learning of studies of washback from exams. *Language Teaching Research*, *9*(1), 5-29. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr152oa

Tollefson, J. & Tsui, A. B. M. (2004). *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? who's agenda?* Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.

Tsang, C. L. (2017). *Examining washback on learning from a sociocultural perspective: The case of a graded approach to English language testing in Hong Kong* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University College London, UK.

Wang, Y., & Huang, B. H. (2020). Washback of TOEFL preparation courses on students' attitudes and score improvement. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *12*(3), *83-104.* http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v12i3.16940

Wertsch, J. V. (1995). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Appendix
Washback Effect Questionnaire

به نام خدا

دستور العمل:

پاسخ دهنده گرامی، با سلام و احترام، پرسش نامه حاضر به منظور بررسی تاثیر کنکور سراسری بر جنبه های مختلف آموزش زبان در دبیرستان های ایران طراحی شده است. به همین دلیل در جدول زیر عبارت هایی در باره این تاثیر بر ابعاد گوناگون برنامه جدید آموزش زبان در ایران آمده است. لطفا در هر عبارت، از میان پنج گزینه ذکر شده، هر کدام را که بیشترین نزدیکی را به نظر شما دارد با علامت ضربدر مشخص کنید.

دسته		شرح آیتم	کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	مخالفم کاملا
فرایند آموزش تدریس، یادگیری،ارزشیابی	۱	زمان بندی و توالی تدریس بر اساس کنکور تعیین می شود و نه بر اساس برنامه (کتب) درسی					
	۲	بیشتر زمان کلاس به تدریس گرامر و کلمه اختصاص می یابد نه مهارتهای برنامه (کتب) درسی					
	۳	تمارین و تکالیف منطبق با کنکور است و نه مطابق با برنامه (کتب) درسی					
	۴	اهداف آموزشی منطبق با اهداف کنکور است و نه بر اساس اهداف برنامه (کتب) درسی					
	۵	روشهای تدریس معلم بر اساس الزامات کنکور است و نه الزامات برنامه (کتب) درسی					
	۶	مواد درسی ارائه شده در کلاس بر اساس الزامات کنکور است و نه الزامات برنامه (کتب) درسی					
	۷	به محتوای غیر کنکوری (مانند تمرین تلفظ) در برنامه (کتب) درسی اهمیت داده نمی شود					
	۸	ارزشیابی‌ها براساس معیارکنکورصورت میگیرد ونه براساس برنامه (کتب) درسی					
	۹	به آیتم های گفتاری و شنیداری زمان کمتر و به نوشتاری و خواندن متون، زمان بیشتری داده می شود					
	۱۰	کتب درسی در حاشیه قرار می گیرد چون منطبق با نیازهای کنکور نیست					
	۱۱	اقدامات کلاسی معلم در جهت پوشش ابعاد کنکور است و نه برنامه (کتب درسی)					
	۱۲	کلاس ها یکطرفه و معلم محور است (زمان صحبت به دانش آموز داده نمی شود					
	۱۳	کلاس ها بیشتر به زبان مادری برگزار می شود تا زبان خارجی					
	۱۴	تکالیف حول محور کنکور است و نه بر اساس مهارتهای ارتباطی					
	۱۵	معلم توانایی‌های ارتباطی را ارزشیابی نمی‌کند وصرفا به خطاهای نوشتاری ودستوری بازخورد می‌دهد)					
	۱۶	ارزشیابی براساس کنکورباعث می شود دانش آموزان نسبت به کسب مهارت ارتباطی بی انگیزه شوند					
	۱۷	کنکورامکان خود-ارزیابی بیشتر دانش آموزان در زبان را فراهم نمی کند					
نگرش و ادراک	۱۸	کنکور باعث می شود معلمان و فراگیران برای تقویت مهارتهای تست زنی انگیزه پیدا کنند					
	۱۹	انتظار دانش آموزان باعث می شود معلم بیشتر به سمت مهارت تست زنی تمایل پیدا کند					
	۲۰	انتظار معلم از دانش آموزان برای عملکرد خوب در کنکور باعث می شود دانش آموزان به سمت تست زنی تمایل پیدا کنند					
	۲۱	نگرش دانش آموزان به کنکور باعث می شود به جای مهارت زبانی به مهارت تست زنی متمایل شوند					
	۲۲	نگرش معلمان به کنکور باعث میشود به جای مهارت زبانی به مهارت تست زنی متمایل شوند					
	۲۳	بین معلمان برای گرفتن نتیجه بهتر در کنکور رقابت وجود دارد					
	۲۴	معلمان بر این عقیده اند که عملکردشان بر اساس نتیجه کنکور فراگیران قضاوت می شود					
	۲۵	معلمان تحت فشار مدرسه و همکاران به سمت تقویت تست زنی می روند و نه مهارتهای زبانی					
	۲۶	شخصیت معلم در انتخاب شیوه تدریس برای تقویت مهارتهای زبانی یا تدریس برای کنکور تاثیر می گذارد					
	۲۷	سابقه تدریس معلم در انتخاب شیوه تدریس برای زبان یا تدریس برای کنکور تاثیر می گذارد					
	۲۸	مهارت زبانی معلم در انتخاب شیوه تدریس برای زبان یا تدریس برای کنکور تاثیر می گذارد					
	۲۹	کنکور باعث افزایش انگیزه دانش آموزان برای یادگیری زبان می شود					

دسته		شرح آیتم	کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	مخالفم کاملا
سیاستگذاری آموزشی	۳۰	اهداف آموزشی کنکور با اهداف آموزشی جدید (کتابهای درسی جدید)متفاوت است.					
	۳۱	محتوای کنکور با محتوای آموزشی جدید (کتابهای درسی جدید) متفاوت است.					
	۳۲	عملکرد در کنکور نشان دهنده مهارت زبانی دانش آموزان است.					
	۳۳	عملکرد در کنکور شاخص مناسبی برای عملکرد موفق معلمان در آموزش زبان است.					
	۳۴	دانش آموزان برای عملکرد موفق در کنکور نیاز دارند در همه جنبه های زبان مهارت داشته باشند.					
	۳۵	در مقایسه با محتوای کتب درسی، کنکور باعث تقویت بیشتر تفکر انتقادی دانش آموزان در زبان می‌شود.					
	۳۶	درمقایسه بامحتوای کتب درسی،کنکورباعث تقویت بیشتر خود-بسندگی یادگیری دانش آموزان درزبان می‌شود.					
	۳۷	کنکور در یادگیری مهارتهای زبانی دانش آموزان اختلال ایجاد می کند.					
	۳۸	مهارتهای کنکوری ابزارمناسبی برای تعیین مسیریادگیری دانش آموزان در دانشگاه است.					
	۳۹	همانندکتب درسی، معلمی که کنکور درس می دهد به مهارتهای اصلی زبانی نیاز ندارد.					
	۴۰	سیاست‌های آموزش زبان در مدارس با سیاست های کلان کشور (برنامه درسی ملی) تطابق دارد.					
	۴۱	بازخوردکنکور برای یادگیری دانش آموزان تدریجی، به موقع وقابل جبران است.					
عاطفی و تقیبی	۴۲	کنکور یک آزمون عادلانه است چون عملکرد دانش آموز در آن با مهارتهای زبانی اش منطبق است					
	۴۳	کنکور لذت یادگیری را برای دانش آموزان زبان فراهم می کند					
	۴۴	در مقایسه با مفادکتب درسی، مفاد کنکور نیز با زندگی واقعی دانش آموزان تطابق دارد					
	۴۵	درمقایسه بامفادکتب درسی، مفادکنکور نیز باعلایق دانش آموزان تطابق دارد					
	۴۶	درمقایسه بامفاد کتب درسی، مفادکنکور نیز بانیازهای واقعی دانش آموزان تطابق دارد					
	۴۷	کنکور بر خلاقیت زبانی فردی و نوآوری زبانی آموزشی می افزاید					
	۴۸	کنکوراضطراب یادگیری دانش آموزان را افزایش نمی دهد					
اجتماعی و فرهنگی	۴۹	دانش آموزان در گروههای اجتماعی و جغرافیایی به دلیل یکسان بودن کیفیت آموزش، شانس مساوی برای کنکور دارند					
	۵۰	دانش آموزان گروههای اجتماعی وجغرافیایی به دلیل یکسان بودن اولویتهای آموزش، شانس مساوی برای کنکور دارند					
	۵۱	به دلیل یکسان بودن محتوای آموزش درسی با کنکور، افراد با توان مالی پایین تر، شانس برابری موفقیت دارند					
	۵۲	دانش آموزان از سطوح اجتماعی ضعیف تر، برای یادگیری مکالمه و یادگیری تست زنی در کنکور انگیزه برابری دارند					
	۵۳	دانش آموزان از سطوح اجتماعی ضعیفتر،برای یادگیری مکالمه وتست زنی به یک اندازه از سوی خانواده تشویق میشوند					
	۵۴	رضایت والدین از یادگیری توانش ارتباطی زبانی، با رضایت آنها نسبت به عملکرد موفق در کنکور یکسان است					
	۵۵	از منظر خانواده کنکور مهمتر از یادگیری توانش ارتباطی زبانی است چون تنها راه تامین آینده شغلی فرزندان است					
	۵۶	خانواده ها با سطوح فرهنگی بالاتر، به یادگیری توانش ارتباطی زبانی بیش از عملکرد کنکور، اهمیت می‌دهند					
	۵۷	از منظر دانش آموزان، کنکور مهم تر از یادگیری توانش ارتباطی زبان است زیرا تنها مسیر انتخاب علائق تحصیلی است					
	۵۸	شرایط کنکور به گونه‌ای است که انتظار می‌رود افراد با سطوح اجتماعی و اقتصادی پایین، یکسان عمل کنند					