

Does Teacher's Kind Of Qualification Account for Washback Intensity of An EFL Examination?

Dr. Abdulhamid Elmurabet Onaiba

Department of English, Faculty of Education, Misurata University, Misurata, Libya

Abstract: This study endeavours to investigate the kind of relationship between the washback effect induced by the exams currently implemented in Libyan schools and the kind of qualification teachers possess, i.e. how the qualification variable as an independent variable determines the dependent variables: types and intensity of washback. The study was quantitative in nature. One hundred participant teachers filled close-ended questionnaires to address the research aims. Inferential statistics were deployed to analyse the quantitative data obtained from the questionnaires by using SPSS software. The findings of the study showed that the intensity and direction of washback was shown to be influenced by the mediating variable, teacher kind of qualification: the data indicated differences between teachers' levels of educational qualification affected their response to the exam in terms of their classroom instructional practices, including teaching methods and techniques, testing practices and their choice of the teaching content from the prescribed textbooks. Indeed, the study affords detailed insight into how the factor 'teacher qualification' plays a major role in determining washback intensity, implying that washback from high-stakes tests cannot be considered as an inevitably automatic consequence of a test per se. Thus, the study suggests that other teacher-related factors such as teaching experience and gender may also come into play, and hence merit investigation.

Keywords: classroom teaching; teacher qualification variable; washback effect; washback intensity.

I. INTRODUCTION

The effect of language tests on teaching and learning is described in language education as "washback", and the degree of washback in an area or a number of areas of teaching and learning affected by an examination is referred to as *washback intensity* [1]. It has been documented in the pertaining literature that the stakeholders of highstakes EFL public examinations, especially teachers, are commonly affected by the administration of such examinations. Studies on exam influence, specifically from external tests, mention factors pertinent to the exam itself that may influence the degree of washback. These include: a) exam proximity; b) the level of stakes of an exam; c) the status of the language the exam tests; and d) exam purposes and familiarity to teachers and students. All are deemed important in determining the occurrence, degree and quality of [2], [3], [4]. Nevertheless, there seems to be a general consensus among researchers that factors other than the exam itself might intervene in determining the direction and the degree of washback [5], [6], [2], [3], [4]. For example, "the difficulty of separating out the influence of tests from the effects of other variables at work in the educational contexts" [4 pp.83-84], however, this has not been widely empirically investigated.

Teachers' characteristics are repeatedly mentioned in the literature as key factors in determining when and how washback occurs. These characteristics include: teachers' beliefs and perceptions, experience, academic qualifications and educational backgrounds and training. In his review of various empirical studies of washback from external exams conducted in the field of language education, Spratt [3] points out "how crucial a role the teacher plays in determining types and intensity of washback, and how much teachers can therefore become agents for promoting positive washback"

(5). However, this role may be contingent upon some variables relating to teachers' experience, expectations, beliefs and academic qualifications, etc. In a similar vein, "teacher factors, including personal beliefs, past education, and academic background, seemed to be more important in determining the teaching methodology a teacher employs" [6 p 352]. Likewise, Watanabe's [7 p 318] classroom observations in her washback study suggest that: "teacher factors, such as educational background, personal beliefs and teaching experience may outweigh the possible effect of the entrance examinations [a high-stakes public examination]". Thus, according to literature, it can be noted that the kind of the academic and educational qualification teachers possess, the focus of this study, is constantly mentioned in different scripts of literature as an important agent for determining the degree of influence that brought about by exams. The teacher-related factor that would likely take some account of how and why washback occurs or does not occur is teachers' academic qualifications and educational backgrounds. This independent/mediator variable—academic qualification—thus seems to have an influence on washback intensity.

To conclude, according to the literature, washback cannot be treated as a simple cause-effect systematic reaction to exams, but there are other factors that interrelate and interact with the exam that either inhibit or promote washback. The above review shows that teacher factors, among others, are more likely to influence teachers' perceptions of the impact of public examinations on their curriculum planning, implementation and practices. Thus, the overarching goal of this study is to investigate the extent to which teacher academic qualification has had an impact on teacher participants' instructional practices and curriculum use vis-à-vis the implementation of the current examination. The motive is to explore the extent to which findings of previous studies can or cannot be substantiated through the findings of this study, and to fill the gap in the literature concerning this issue.

II. RESEARCH CONTEXT

This study was carried out in Libyan schools in the city of Misrata. The study's participants are teachers of English teaching in Libyan basic education schools. The concerned examinations in this study are those exams which are currently implemented by the Ministry of Education to Grade Nine students in basic education stage schools. This exam is called the Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE) in English, and administered as a school-leaving exam.. An empirical research conducted recently in the current context revealed that Libyan EFL teachers were found to be affected by the final English examinations (i.e. BECE). The impact was induced by these exams in some areas of language teaching and learning, particularly in terms of teachers' classroom instructional practices [8]. The study found that teachers changed their way of teaching and their selection of teaching materials from the prescribed textbooks. According to the study, the congruence between the content of the textbooks and the content of the implemented exams was tenuous. Also, teachers were observed to adhere to the specifications and the content of the administered exams rather than to the objectives and the principles of the theory upon which the prescribed English curriculum is based; thus, teaching to the test.

Teaching in Libya is a popular profession among both women and men; however, it is more common among women [9], because female teachers feel more comfortable in teaching as a profession and more secure, due to social and religious reasons. The participants of this study hold different qualifications in terms of their educational and pedagogical backgrounds. The academic qualifications of teachers employed for teaching English language in Libyan basic education schools can be mainly classified into three types. The first are graduates of English departments in faculties of Arts, Bachelor of Arts holders (BA). These faculties prepare students for further studies and research but not for undertaking teaching tasks. Literature, translation and theoretical linguistics represent the core modules of the curriculum. Students in these faculties receive four years of English language study. Although the curriculum of the English departments in these faculties does not include any teaching practice or teaching methodology modules, graduates from this department represent the majority of teachers of English teaching in basic education schools because faculties of education, which are orientated more towards such purposes, have just recently been adopted in Libyan universities.

The second type is graduates of English departments from faculties of education, Bachelor of Education holders (BE). These graduates receive four years of training in TEFL. The curriculum of the English departments in these faculties is quite different from those in faculties of Arts, as it includes both theoretical and practical modules. The theoretical modules are concerned with developing student teachers' understanding of the linguistic components of English language through subjects such as grammar, phonetics, reading comprehension and writing. These modules are also concerned with introducing theories of psychology and their application into education through subjects such as general psychology,

which is taught in Arabic. The practical modules, on the other hand, are also concerned with training student teachers to implement English language teaching methods in actual teaching tasks through subjects such as teaching methodology and teaching practice, and language testing. These student teachers usually have four weeks of teacher training during which they teach English classes in a Libyan school. Graduates under this scheme are assumed to be better prepared and trained to carry out the task of teaching English in basic and secondary schools than graduates from faculties of Arts. So, considering their academic and educational background, their instructional reactions to the introduced exam may differ from other teachers (i.e. BA teachers and DT teachers).

However, a common feature shared by the majority of graduates from the English departments of Libyan universities is their undeveloped oral and aural skills. In this respect, some researchers in the context reported that English language teachers in Libya typically graduate from university with undeveloped spoken communication skills in English [10], [11], [12]. Nevertheless, teachers in Libyan schools represent the main source for providing students with information and language input.

The third kind of English instructors are teachers who hold a “Diploma of Teaching” (DT) in English, previously gained after the completion of five years of secondary education: two years studying general subjects and three years studying English specialisation. This is the oldest scheme of teacher education in the Libyan education system in basic education schools. This scheme has not existed for many years, since the opening of the English departments in faculties of Arts and Education. Some of these teachers are still teaching in basic education schools, and others are working as inspectors of English. This qualification is professionally considered the lowest among the types discussed above, particularly in terms of readiness and language competence; however, those teachers have the advantage of many years of teaching experience, in some cases more than twenty years.

In summary, to recapitulate, teacher participants of this study come from three different educational backgrounds i.e. hold three different academic qualifications: BA, BE and DT. Thus, in this study, it is to contend that this variance in qualifications among teachers, an issue that merits investigation in this study, may have an impact on their degrees of reaction to the implemented exam.

It is important to mention here that the curriculum of English prescribed in Libyan schools is communicatively based. The course-book sections are "dedicated to reading, vocabulary and grammar, functional use of language, listening, speaking and writing" [10 p]. The curriculum recommends that English be used as much as possible in class with the aim of enabling students to communicate effectively and fluently [10]. It is also important to recapitulate that the exam of concern in this study is introduced by the Ministry of Education as school-leaving exam to grade nine (the final year) of the basic education stage which comprises nine years of schooling prior to three years of secondary education.

III. RATIONALE

Many reasons account for the current state of research on washback. One is methodological. Most existing washback studies are primarily qualitative and exploratory. These studies have identified multiple factors contributing to the washback phenomenon, yet they do not assess the relations among these factors statistically. Thus, there is a need for quantitative studies of these mediating factors such as ‘teacher qualification’ to examine the relationships between them. In light of the findings of this research, more light will be shed on how the kind of washback from exams can be determined by intervening variables other than the exam per se.

As Libyan teachers of English, in the context of study, coming from different educational backgrounds i.e. having different kinds of qualification, this study is significant in that it looks at to what extent this variance among teachers may account for their reaction to the current highstakes public examinations. According to previous washback studies, teacher-related factors, especially teacher qualification, have rarely been a research focus in washback studies. The gap in research regarding the relationship that may exist between this factor and the washback impact of the implemented EFL examinations is of interest in this study. Thus this study will be an attempt to fill this gap and provide more insights on the investigated issue.

IV. PURPOSE

EFL teachers in the Libyan context are to a certain degree influenced by the implemented EFL examinations in terms of their classroom instructional practices. The degree of this influence—washback intensity—may be affected by the kind of qualification and the educational background teachers possess. Thus, the main aim of this study is to explore the degree of

impact, washback intensity, the current exams had on teachers' classroom instructional practices (dependent variables, DVs) regarding their academic qualification (independent variable, IV). In other words, it is to explore the effect of the main IV and its levels on the three main DVs as specified below in section 6. It is important to mention here that classroom instructional practices—the IVs, in this study, encompass: a) teaching methods and techniques; b) classroom testing practices; and c) the choice and selection of teaching materials teachers use from the current prescribed textbooks. Whereas the DV includes three levels namely: BA, BE and DT.

V. METHODOLOGY

5.1 Subjects:

One hundred and forty Grade 9 teachers in 162 schools were the target population of the study; 100 teachers completed and returned questionnaires in full. This sample represents the majority of the basic education stages schools in the city of Misrata where this research was conducted. This has given the research results relatively the advantage of generalizability

5.2 Data Collection:

For the purpose of the study, a quantitative approach of research design was utilized. Data were gathered through questionnaires elicited from 100 teachers teaching the final year of the basic education stage schools to which the current final examinations are administered. The questionnaire (see appendix I) consists of two parts containing 9 questions. While the first part contains six questions concerned with the demographic data of participants, the second part contains three questions including ten items. These items are intended to elicit data regarding teachers' instructional practices in response to the implementation of the current examinations. Particularly these items are respectively designed to explore teachers' teaching methods and techniques, teachers' classroom testing practices and teachers' choice, selection and use of teaching materials. These represent the three sub-dependent variables of the main dependent variable, i.e. teachers' instructional practices.

5.3. Data Analysis:

Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA): the one-way ANOVA was used to measure the effect of IVs, which have three levels (BA, BE and DT) on the DVs. The ANOVA was, firstly, run to identify overall differences between groups, i.e. significant statistics, a probability of less than 0.05 regarded as statistically significant (this paper will only report significant results and will ignore insignificant ones). Then the mean scores were compared to find out the significant differences on the dependent variable across the stated groups/levels. An effect size (i.e. eta squared) was calculated to indicate the relative magnitude of the differences between the means of the levels of each independent variable. This gives an indication of practical rather than statistical significance.

Formulaically, η^2 was calculated as follows:
$$\eta^2 = \frac{SS: \text{sum of squares effect}}{SS: \text{sum of squares total}} \quad [13]$$

The following guideline is proposed for the effect size and applied in this study: “.01 as a small effect, .06 as a medium effect and .14 as a large effect” (14 p 254). For ease of interpretation, the decimal point was moved two places to the right, and read as a percentage [13]. For this study, the higher the percentage the more effect the indicated independent variable will have on the dependent variable; conversely, the lower percentage gained the less effect that the independent variable will have on the dependent variable. Further, to identify where the differences among the different levels of each variable lie, i.e. which of the groups differ, Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD tests were conducted [15].

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Teacher academic qualification includes three levels; Bachelor of Arts (BA), Bachelor of Education (BE) and Diploma of Teaching or DT). The effect of the stated independent variable will be assessed on the following main dependent variables that are divided into sub dependent variables as specified below:

- 1- Teachers' teaching practices, teaching methods and techniques Items related to this variable are: teaching according to the test content, adopting new teaching methods; emphasizing listening and speaking skills.
- 2- Teachers' classroom testing practices and evaluation, on-going tests This variable concerns the following items: familiarizing students with the content and format of the final exam; organizing more focused activities that reflect the final exam activities.

- 3- Teachers' choice, selection and use of teaching materials and curriculum This variable comprises the following items: revising the existing teaching materials; focusing more on the reading passages in the textbooks; putting more emphasis on writing aspects, concentrating on the grammatical structures provided in textbooks; and using teaching materials other than their current textbooks.

It is important to mention here that the key aspects of the output obtained from the above procedures are presented in the ANOVAs tables preceded by the output interpretations of each table (due to space constraints the output tables of descriptives and the Tukey Post-hoc tests are stated in the indicated appendices).

6.1 Teachers' Teaching Practices, Teaching Methods and Techniques:

One-way ANOVA, as indicated below in Table 6.1, showed a statistically significant effect (at the $p < .05$ level) of "qualification" on the first dependent variable, i.e. teaching practices, particularly with reference to the three sub-dependent variables: "teaching according to the test content", $F(2,99)=7.38$, $p=0.001$, $\eta^2 = .13$ (BA=4.38; BE=4.00, DT=4.09); "adopting new teaching methods" $F(2,99)=88.91$, $p=0.000$, $\eta^2 = .65$ (BA=3.81; BE=2.00; DT=4.00); and "emphasizing listening and speaking skills" $F(2,99)=7.55$, $p=0.001$, $\eta^2 = .13$ (BA=1.40; BE=1.78; DT=1.81).

Despite reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was to some extent small (see table of descriptives in appendix 2a). The effect size, calculated using eta squared (see table 6.1), showed varied values for the three mentioned variables. The effect of qualification, under the conditions of the introduced exam, was large on the sub-dependent variable "adopting new teaching methods" (65%). This means that the type of qualification had a large effect on teachers' adoption and use of new teaching methods under the conditions of the new exam. However, as for the other two variables the effect of the independent variable was quite small, i.e. 13%, which does not seem worthy of concern/comment.

The Tukey Post-hoc test (see appendix 2b) indicated significant difference between the three levels/groups, especially between BE and BA, and between BE and DT across the three sub-dependent variables, while the difference between BA and DT was not significant. DT teachers, however, showed a higher agreement mean score compared to the BA or BE teachers. This means that the significant difference among teachers having different academic qualification is contributed by this mean difference. This indicates that teachers who earned DT appeared to be more affected by the exam, while BE teachers seemed the least affected, suggesting that BE teachers performed less exam-oriented practices compared to DT and BA teachers.

Table 6.1: Results Obtained From One-way ANOVA With Eta Squared Values for Qualification in Relation to Teaching Practices.

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	eta ²
Teaching according to the test content	Between Groups	2	1.333	7.389	.001	.132
	Within Groups	17.495	.180			
	Total	20.160	99			
Adopting new teaching methods	Between Groups	2	26.202	88.912	.000	.647
	Within Groups	28.586	.295			
	Total	80.990	99			
Emphasizing listening and speaking skills	Between Groups	2	1.683	7.559	.001	.135
	Within Groups	21.594	.223			
	Total	24.960	99			

6.2 Teachers' Classroom Testing Practices and Evaluation, On-going Tests:

Similarly, concerning teachers' classroom testing practices, the ANOVA test, as shown in Table 6.2 below, revealed a significant impact of "qualification" on this second dependent variable, relating to the main two relevant sub-dependent variables: "familiarising students with the content and format of the revised exam", $F(2,99)=17.51$, $p=0.000$, $\eta^2 = .26$ (BA=4.10; BE=4.00; DT=4.63), and "organizing more focused activities that reflect exam activities", $F(2,99)=7.37$, $p=0.001$, $\eta^2 = .13$ (BA=4.44; BE=4.00; DT=4.45). The actual statistical difference between the three groups was quite small, as indicated by the mean scores shown in the table of descriptives (see appendix 3a). However, eta squared values, as shown below, indicated practical significant difference, but to a certain degree, 26% and 13% for the two variables respectively. Tukey Post-hoc test (see appendix 3b) suggests that the three groups were affected differently according to the qualification teachers have. A significant difference appeared between BA vs. BE and between DT vs. BE. BA and DT groups did not differ significantly from each other with $p > .05$. Thus, it can be concluded that DT teachers were more affected by the exam as they seemed relatively higher in significance in comparison with the BA and BE teachers, the latter of which scored lowest.

Table 6.2: Results Obtained From One-way ANOVA With Eta Squared Values for Qualification in Relation to Teachers' Classroom Testing Practices

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	eta ²
Familiarising students with the exam content and format of the revised exam	Between Groups	3.195	2	1.597	17.516	.000	.265
	Within Groups	8.845	97	.091			
	Total	12.040	99				
Organising more focused activities that reflect exam content	Between Groups	3.041	2	1.521	7.376	.001	.131
	Within Groups	19.999	97	.206			
	Total	23.040	99				

6.3 Teachers' Choice, Selection and Use of Teaching Materials and Curriculum:

Finally, teachers' qualifications significantly affected the third dependent variable relating to teaching materials and curriculum use. As presented in Table 6.3 below and shown in appendix 4a, there was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level for the three groups of teachers, mainly relating to the five sub-dependent variables. These include "revising the existing teaching materials", $F(2,99)=83.15$, $p=0.000$, $\eta^2 = .64$ (BA =3.75; BE=2.00; DT=4.09); "focusing more on reading specifically the reading passages in the textbook", $F(2,99)=13.82$, $p=0.000$, $\eta^2 = .22$ (BA=4.42; BE=3.57; DT=4.36); "using teaching materials other than the current textbooks" $F(2,99)=24.13$, $p=0.000$, $\eta^2 = .33$ (BA=2.50; BE=1.31; TD=3.63); "concentrating on the grammatical structures provided in the textbooks", $F(2,99)=5.95$, $p=0.004$, $\eta^2 = .11$ (BA=4.35; BE=3.89; DT=4.27); and "putting more emphasis on writing aspects", $F(2,99)=4.22$, $p=0.017$, $\eta^2 = .08$ (BA=1.68; BE=1.26; DT=1.90).

Although the size of variance (eta squared) associated with most stated variables was quite small (ranging from 8% - 33%), it was practically large on the variable "revising the existing teaching materials" ($\eta^2 = .638$). This means that the kind of qualification has a nearly 64% effect that will make teachers revise the content of the curriculum under the conditions of the introduced exam. This reflects the influence of the exam on the content of the current English curriculum. Mean scores (see appendix 4a) showed different results between certain groups the significance of which was identified by running a test of multiple comparisons. While the Tukey Post-hoc test (see appendix 4b) revealed that the difference between BA and DT was not statistically significant, it showed a significant difference between BA and DT combine and BE group. This again, interestingly, indicates that DT teachers scored significantly higher than both BA and BE teachers, the latter of which registered lower scores, implying that DT teachers were more affected by the introduced exam, while other groups were minimally affected, particularly BE group.

Table 6.3: 1Results Obtained From One-way ANOVA With Eta Squared Values for Qualification in Relation to Teaching Materials and Curriculum Use.

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	eta ²
Revising the existing teaching materials	Between Groups	2	25.530	83.155	.000	.638
	Within Groups	97	.307			
	Total	99				
Focusing on reading specifically the reading passages in the textbook	Between Groups	2	5.460	13.821	.000	.221
	Within Groups	97	.395			
	Total	99				
Using teaching materials other than their current textbooks	Between Groups	2	19.925	24.113	.000	.332
	Within Groups	97	.826			
	Total	99				
Concentrating on the grammatical structures provided in textbooks	Between Groups	2	1.599	5.954	.004	.109
	Within Groups	97	.268			
	Total	99				
Putting more emphasis on writing aspects	Between Groups	2	1.815	4.225	.017	.080
	Within Groups	97	.430			
	Total	99				

According to the above results it can be concluded that the qualification variable has had a significant effect on all the three dependent variables. However, it was noted that BE teachers appeared to feel less impact of the new examination on their curriculum planning and instruction, particularly on issues pertinent to exam-based activities and tasks. DT teachers, on the other hand, had higher scores than both BA and BE teachers, and showed more impact due to the current examinations. This result may be attributed to the experience factor, as all DT teachers have long years of classroom teaching in schools (see Table 6.4 below), an issue can be a focus of future research.

Although all the three levels of teacher qualification have affected significantly teachers' teaching practices in classrooms vis-à-vis the current administered examination, the BE teachers whose qualification considered the best among others seemed the least affected. As the introduced exam has generated negative rather than positive consequences in the context [8], BE teachers are deemed the least negatively affected. This finding supports our earlier claim, stipulated in sections 2 that BE teachers (teachers who have gained better educational and pedagogical practices in their pre-service education) might be differently affected by the administered exam. BE teachers, according to this finding, thus, appeared less affected than their counterparts (i.e. BA and DT teachers) and seemed more fit in their classroom planning and instruction as far as the current English curriculum is concerned.

As summarized in Table 6.4 below, qualification factor significantly influenced the dependent variables relating to teachers teaching practices, testing practices and use of teaching materials and curriculum. However, the significance varies between the levels. As for the qualification factor, teachers who hold DT showed higher scores than those who hold BA and BE, suggesting that washback associated with the first qualification was more perceptible than that associated with the other two, although all are significantly affected.

Table 6.4: Summary of the effects of the independent variable on each of the main dependent

Independent variable and the associated levels	Dependent variables, DVs	Degree of effect of the IV on each of the DVs	Notes of variance in significance (scores between levels/IVs)	
Qualification (BA – BE – DT)	Teaching practices	Significant	DT teachers higher	BE teachers lower
	Testing practice	Significant	DT teachers higher	
	Teaching materials & Curriculum use	Significant	DT teachers higher	

Thus, it is to argue here that the kind of qualification and the educational backgrounds that teachers have can play an important role in the kind of instruction teachers implement, especially in relation to high-stakes public examinations. This result may have important implications for investigations related to whether teachers of different academic qualifications might react to testing reform and enact curriculum innovation differently, especially in the current context.

To conclude, the findings of this study corroborate the prevailing assumption that there are some factors other than the exam *per se* that may intervene in determining the washback of examinations, the most influential of which relate to teacher academic qualification and educational background. The conclusions of this research corroborate the views posed earlier in this paper, that the kind of qualification teachers obtain and the educational background they have gained can be considered intervening variables in mediating washback, and may influentially decide the direction and degree of washback effect of the implemented examinations. Thus, there seems to exist a linearly related relationship between the levels of the IV and the main DVs vis-à-vis the washback effect of the current administered examination.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Inferential statistics reported above (as synthesized above in table 4.31), showed that teacher kind of qualification as an independent variable has induced significant effects on the main dependant variables (teachers' teaching practices: teaching methods, techniques and activities; testing practices: classroom on-going tests; and teachers' selection and use of teaching materials and curriculum). Interestingly, however, the degree of effect varied between levels/sub-independent variables within independent variables. For instance, teachers who hold a Diploma of Teaching (DT) were more affected by the exam than colleagues holding Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelor of Education (BE) qualifications. This means that washback associated with the former was more perceptible than that associated with the other two types of qualification.

Although this proves that tests can dictate what and how teachers teach, but to different degrees, teachers may acclimatise and alter their instruction according to the situations and circumstances they are involved in. This finding seems to be inconsistent with the proposition: "tests will have washback on all learners and teachers" [5 p 121], but conversely, the finding is in strict conformity with the other view that "tests will have washback effects for **some** ... teachers, but **not** for others" (ibid p 121) (bold in original).

In summation, these findings support the view that "washback is not easy to predict or control, and the shape it assumes is influenced not only by tests but by the interaction of numerous factors" [4]. So, it is suggested that the kind and degree of washback is inextricably associated with other factors besides the exam *per se*; particularly the kind of qualification and educational background. Indeed, the academic qualification and the educational background teachers possess appeared to be important in determining washback.

However, the researcher suggests further research to be conducted on other teacher-related factors that might have an effect on determining the degree and kind of washback. These may include teachers teaching experience and gender. Such discussions will increase our understanding of what directions these factors, in addition to teachers' kind of qualification, push washback, and add more insights into the nature of this educational phenomenon, washback. Thus, the inquiry to be raised is whether teacher's teaching experience and gender will account for their reactions to the implemented examinations vis-à-vis their classroom instructional practices.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cheng, L, "How Does Washback Influence Teaching? Implication for Hong Kong," Language and Education, Vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 38-54, 1997.
- [2] Shohamy, E. Donitsa-Schmidt, S. and Ferman, I. "Test impact revisited: washback effect over time", Language Testing, Vol. 13, no. 3, pp 298-315, 1996.
- [3] Spratt, M, "Washback and the classroom: the implications for teaching and learning of studies of washback from exams", Language Teaching Research, Vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 5-29, 2005.
- [4] Wall, D, "Washback". In G. Fulcher and F. Davidson (eds.) "The Routledge handbook of language testing", London: Routledge, pp. 79-92, 2012.
- [5] Alderson, I. C. and Wall, D, "Does washback exist?", Applied Linguistics, Vol. 14 no. 2, pp. 115-129, 1993.
- [6] Cheng, L, "Washback, impact and consequences". In E. Shohamy and N.H. Hornberger (eds.) Encyclopaedia of language and education, V. 7: language testing and assessment, 2nd ed., New York, Springer, pp. 349-364, 2008.
- [7] Watanabe, Y, "Does grammar translation come from the entrance examination? Preliminary findings from classroom-based research", Language Testing, Vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 318-333 1996.
- [8] Abdulhamid M.E. Onaiba, "Impact of a Public Examination Change on Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes towards Their Classroom Teaching Practices," IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME), Vol. 5, no. 5. pp. 70-78, 2015.
- [9] ME (Ministry of Education) "The Development of Education, the national report of Libya presented to the international conference on education, session (48), Geneva, November," 2008, Libyan Authority of Education pp. 25 – 28, 2008.
- [10] Orafi, S.M.S. and Borg, S, "Intentions and realities in implementing communicative curriculum reform", System, Vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 243-253, 2009.
- [11] Akle, F, "An evaluation of English language secondary school teachers' qualifications", Unpublished M.A dissertation ed. Tripoli University, Department of Graduate Studies, Tripoli-Libya, 2005.
- [12] Alhmali, R, "Students Attitudes in the Context of the Curriculum in Libyan Education in Middle and High Schools", unpublished PhD thesis, University of Glasgow, UK, 2007.
- [13] Brown, J.D, "Effect size and eta squared", JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter, Vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 38-43, 2008.
- [14] Cohen, J, "Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences", Lawrence Erlbaum, 1988.
- [15] Pallant, J, "SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using the SPSS Program", 4th ed. Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press, 2010.

APPENDIX - 1

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE:

PART I

Please tick one appropriate answer or provide written answers.

- (1) Your gender: Female Male School name: _____
- (2) Your academic qualification: Bachelor of Arts Bachelor of Education
 Teacher's diploma others _____
- (3) Number of years you have been teaching English: 0 - 2 3 - 6 7 - 10 11 – 15 above 15
- (4) Number of periods you teach English per week: 8 – 12 14 – 18 20 – 24
- (5) The typical size of each class you teach in terms of student numbers
 20 – 30 31 – 40 above 40

(6) Have you taken courses specifically in testing and evaluation? yes no

PART II

In the brackets [], please mark the following on a five point scale as:

[1] Strongly disagree [2] Disagree [3] Undecided [4] Agree [5] Strongly Agree

(7) According to your teaching methods and techniques, you:

[] Teach according to the test content

[] Adopt new teaching methods

[] Emphasize listening and speaking skills

(8) Regarding the current final exams your daily classroom testing practices and evaluation tend to:

[] Familiarize students with the content and format of the revised exam

[] Organize more focused activities that reflect exam activities

(9) The most significant changes, you have made since the implementation of the current exams regarding your choice, selection and use of teaching materials and curriculum, included:

[] Revising the existing teaching materials

[] Focusing more on reading specifically the reading passages in the textbook

[] Using teaching materials other than the current textbook

[] Concentrating on the grammatical structures provided in the textbook

[] Putting more emphasis on writing

Thank you for your cooperation

APPENDIX - 2A

Table of descriptives generated from the one-way ANOVA for qualification effect in relation to teachers' classroom teaching practices.

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Max
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Teaching according to the test content	Bachelor of Arts	70	4.3857	.49028	.05860	4.2688	4.5026	4.00	5.00
	Bachelor of Education	19	4.0000	.00000	.00000	4.0000	4.0000	4.00	4.00
	Teacher's Diploma	11	4.0909	.30151	.09091	3.8884	4.2935	4.00	5.00
	Total	100	4.2800	.45126	.04513	4.1905	4.3695	4.00	5.00
Adopting new teaching methods	Bachelor of Arts	70	3.8143	.64365	.07693	3.6608	3.9678	2.00	5.00
	Bachelor of Education	19	2.0000	.00000	.00000	2.0000	2.0000	2.00	2.00
	Teacher's Diploma	11	4.0000	.00000	.00000	4.0000	4.0000	4.00	4.00
	Total	100	3.4900	.90448	.09045	3.3105	3.6695	2.00	5.00
Emphasizing listening and speaking skills	Bachelor of Arts	70	1.4000	.49344	.05898	1.2823	1.5177	1.00	2.00
	Bachelor of Education	19	1.7895	.41885	.09609	1.5876	1.9914	1.00	2.00
	Teacher's Diploma	11	1.8182	.40452	.12197	1.5464	2.0899	1.00	2.00
	Total	100	1.5200	.50212	.05021	1.4204	1.6196	1.00	2.00

APPENDIX - 2B

Tukey Post-hoc test generated by the one-way ANOVA test for qualification effect in relation to teachers' classroom teaching practices

Dependent Variable	(I) Academic qualification	(J) Academic qualification	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Teaching according to the test content	Bachelor of Arts	Bachelor of Education	.38571*	.10986	.002	.1242	.6472
		Teacher's Diploma	.29481	.13774	.087	-.0331	.6227
	Bachelor of Education	Bachelor of Arts	-.38571*	.10986	.002	-.6472	-.1242
		Teacher's Diploma	-.09091	.16090	.839	-.4739	.2921
	Teacher's Diploma	Bachelor of Arts	-.29481	.13774	.087	-.6227	.0331
		Bachelor of Education	.09091	.16090	.839	-.2921	.4739
Adopting new teaching methods	Bachelor of Arts	Bachelor of Education	1.81429*	.14043	.000	1.4800	2.1485
		Teacher's Diploma	-.18571	.17607	.544	-.6048	.2334
	Bachelor of Education	Bachelor of Arts	-1.81429*	.14043	.000	-2.1485	-1.4800
		Teacher's Diploma	-2.00000*	.20567	.000	-2.4895	-1.5105
	Teacher's Diploma	Bachelor of Arts	.18571	.17607	.544	-.2334	.6048
		Bachelor of Education	2.00000*	.20567	.000	1.5105	2.4895
Emphasizing listening and speaking skills	Bachelor of Arts	Bachelor of Education	-.38947*	.12205	.005	-.6800	-.0990
		Teacher's Diploma	-.41818*	.15303	.020	-.7824	-.0539
	Bachelor of Education	Bachelor of Arts	.38947*	.12205	.005	.0990	.6800
		Teacher's Diploma	-.02871	.17876	.986	-.4542	.3968
	Teacher's Diploma	Bachelor of Arts	.41818*	.15303	.020	.0539	.7824
		Bachelor of Education	.02871	.17876	.986	-.3968	.4542

APPENDIX - 3A

Table of descriptives generated from the one-way ANOVA for qualification effect in relation to teachers' classroom testing practices.

Descriptives										
			N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Max.
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Familiarising students with the exam content and format of the revised exam	Bachelor of Arts		70	4.1000	.30217	.03612	4.0280	4.1720	4.00	5.00
	Bachelor of Education		19	4.0000	.00000	.00000	4.0000	4.0000	4.00	4.00
	Teacher's Diploma		11	4.6364	.50452	.15212	4.2974	4.9753	4.00	5.00
	Total		100	4.1400	.34874	.03487	4.0708	4.2092	4.00	5.00
Organising more focused activities that reflect exam content	Bachelor of Arts		70	4.4429	.50031	.05980	4.3236	4.5622	4.00	5.00
	Bachelor of Education		19	4.0000	.00000	.00000	4.0000	4.0000	4.00	4.00
	Teacher's Diploma		11	4.4545	.52223	.15746	4.1037	4.8054	4.00	5.00
	Total		100	4.3600	.48242	.04824	4.2643	4.4557	4.00	5.00

APPENDIX - 3B

Table of the Tukey Post hoc test generated from the one-way ANOVA for qualification effect in relation to testing practices.

Tukey HSD "Multiple Comparisons"

Dependent Variable	(I) qualification	Academic (J) qualification	Academic	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Familiarising students with the exam content and format of the revised exam	dimension2	Bachelor of Arts	Bachelor of Education	.10000	.07812	.410	-.0859	.2859
			Teacher's Diploma	-.53636*	.09794	.000	-.7695	-.3032
		Bachelor of Education	Bachelor of Arts	-.10000	.07812	.410	-.2859	.0859
	dimension3	Teacher's Diploma	-.63636*	.11441	.000	-.9087	-.3640	
		Bachelor of Arts	.53636*	.09794	.000	.3032	.7695	
		Bachelor of Education	.63636*	.11441	.000	.3640	.9087	
Organising more focused activities that reflect exam content	dimension2	Bachelor of Arts	Bachelor of Education	.44286*	.11746	.001	.1633	.7224
			Teacher's Diploma	-.01169	.14727	.997	-.3622	.3388
		Bachelor of Education	Bachelor of Arts	-.44286*	.11746	.001	-.7224	-.1633
	dimension3	Teacher's Diploma	-.45455*	.17203	.026	-.8640	-.0451	
		Bachelor of Arts	.01169	.14727	.997	-.3388	.3622	
		Bachelor of Education	.45455*	.17203	.026	.0451	.8640	

APPENDIX - 4A

Table of the descriptives generated from the one-way ANOVA for qualification effect in relation to teaching materials and curriculum use.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Max	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Revising the existing teaching materials	Bachelor of Arts	70	3.7571	.64686	.07731	3.6029	3.9114	2.00	4.00
	Bachelor of Education	19	2.0000	.00000	.00000	2.0000	2.0000	2.00	2.00
	Teacher's Diploma	11	4.0909	.30151	.09091	3.8884	4.2935	4.00	5.00
	Total	100	3.4600	.90364	.09036	3.2807	3.6393	2.00	5.00
To focus on reading specifically reading passages in the textbook	Bachelor of Arts	70	4.4286	.57914	.06922	4.2905	4.5667	2.00	5.00
	Bachelor of Education	19	3.5789	.83771	.19218	3.1752	3.9827	2.00	4.00
	Teacher's Diploma	11	4.3636	.50452	.15212	4.0247	4.7026	4.00	5.00
	Total	100	4.2600	.70525	.07052	4.1201	4.3999	2.00	5.00
To concentrate on the grammatical structures provided in textbooks	Bachelor of Arts	70	4.3571	.56558	.06760	4.2223	4.4920	2.00	5.00
	Bachelor of Education	19	3.8947	.31530	.07234	3.7428	4.0467	3.00	4.00
	Teacher's Diploma	11	4.2727	.46710	.14084	3.9589	4.5865	4.00	5.00
	Total	100	4.2600	.54346	.05435	4.1522	4.3678	2.00	5.00
To use teaching materials other than their current textbooks	Bachelor of Arts	70	2.5000	1.00362	.11996	2.2607	2.7393	1.00	4.00
	Bachelor of Education	19	1.3158	.47757	.10956	1.0856	1.5460	1.00	2.00
	Teacher's Diploma	11	3.6364	.80904	.24393	3.0928	4.1799	2.00	4.00
	Total	100	2.4000	1.10096	.11010	2.1815	2.6185	1.00	4.00

APPENDIX - 4B

Table of the Tukey Post-hoc test generated from the one-way ANOVA for qualification effect in relation to teaching materials and curriculum use Tukey HSD "Multiple Comparisons"

Dependent Variable	(I) qualification	Academic (J) qualification	Academic	of	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Revising the existing teaching materials	dimension2	Bachelor of Arts	dimension3	Bachelor of Education	1.75714*	.14333	.000	1.4160	2.0983
				Teacher's Diploma	-.33377	.17971	.157	-.7615	.0940
		Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Bachelor of Arts	1.75714*	.14333	.000	-2.0983	-1.4160
	dimension2	Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Teacher's Diploma	-.209091*	.20993	.000	-2.5906	-1.5912
				Teacher's Diploma	dimension3	Bachelor of Arts	.33377	.17971	.157
		Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Bachelor of Education	2.09091*	.20993	.000	1.5912	2.5906
Focusing on reading specifically the reading passages in the textbook	dimension2	Bachelor of Arts	dimension3	Bachelor of Education	.84962*	.16259	.000	.4626	1.2366
				Teacher's Diploma	-.06494	.20386	.946	-.4203	.5502
		Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Bachelor of Arts	-.84962*	.16259	.000	-1.2366	-.4626
	dimension2	Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Teacher's Diploma	-.78469*	.23813	.004	-1.3515	-.2179
				Teacher's Diploma	dimension3	Bachelor of Arts	-.06494	.20386	.946
		Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Bachelor of Education	.78469*	.23813	.004	.2179	1.3515
Using teaching materials other than their current textbooks	dimension2	Bachelor of Arts	dimension3	Bachelor of Education	1.18421*	.23515	.000	.6245	1.7439
				Teacher's Diploma	-.113636*	.29483	.001	-1.8381	-.4346
		Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Bachelor of Arts	1.18421*	.23515	.000	-1.7439	-.6245
	dimension2	Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Teacher's Diploma	-.232057*	.34439	.000	-3.1403	-1.5008
				Teacher's Diploma	dimension3	Bachelor of Arts	1.13636*	.29483	.001
		Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Bachelor of Education	2.32057*	.34439	.000	1.5008	3.1403
Concentrating on the grammatical structures provided in textbooks	dimension2	Bachelor of Arts	dimension3	Bachelor of Education	.46241*	.13404	.002	.1434	.7814
				Teacher's Diploma	-.08442	.16806	.870	-.3156	.4844
		Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Bachelor of Arts	-.46241*	.13404	.002	-.7814	-.1434
	dimension2	Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Teacher's Diploma	-.37799	.19631	.137	-.8453	.0893
				Teacher's Diploma	dimension3	Bachelor of Arts	-.08442	.16806	.870
		Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Bachelor of Education	.37799	.19631	.137	-.0893	.8453

Putting more emphasis on writing aspects	Bachelor of Arts	dimension3	Bachelor of Education	.42256*	.16957	.038	.0189	.8262
			Teacher's Diploma	-.22338	.21260	.547	-.7294	.2827
	Bachelor of Education	dimension3	Bachelor of Arts	-.42256*	.16957	.038	-.8262	-.0189
			Teacher's Diploma	-.64593*	.24835	.029	-1.2371	-.0548
	Teacher's Diploma	dimension3	Bachelor of Arts	.22338	.21260	.547	-.2827	.7294
			Bachelor of Education	.64593*	.24835	.029	.0548	1.2371

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.