

مجله علوم اجتماعی و انسانی دانشگاه شیراز
دوره بیست و یکم، شماره اول، بهار ۱۳۸۳ (پیاپی ۴۰)
(ویژه نامه زبان انگلیسی و زبان شناسی)

تاثیر آزمون انگلیسی کنکور سراسری بر روش تدریس دبیران مراکز پیش دانشگاهی

سید آیت اله رزمجو

دانشگاه شیراز

چکیده

هدف از این تحقیق اولاً بررسی تاثیر آزمون انگلیسی کنکور سراسری بر روش تدریس دبیران مراکز پیش دانشگاهی می باشد. دومین هدف آن مقایسه نظرات دبیران و دانش آموزان این مراکز در این زمینه می باشد. و بالاخره اینکه، بر اساس نتایج به دست آمده پیشنهادهای کاربردی برای بهبود کیفیت امر آموزش زبان در مراکز پیش دانشگاهی ارائه شود. بنابراین، دو پرسش نامه که کاملاً از نظر محتوا شبیه هم بودند در بین ۴۰ دبیر و ۸۰ دانش آموز مراکز پیش دانشگاهی نواحی چهارگانه شهر شیراز توزیع شد. تمامی داده های به دست آمده با استفاده از درصد، بسامد، میانگین و انحراف استاندارد مورد تجزیه و تحلیل قرار گرفت. علاوه بر این، با استفاده از آزمون مربع خی و آزمون تی مستقل داده ها تجزیه و تحلیل شدند. نتایج پژوهش نشان داد که الف. دبیران مراکز پیش دانشگاهی بیشترین اهمیت را به مهارت خواندن، ترجمه از انگلیسی به فارسی، دستور زبان و واژگان می دهند. ب. مهارت گفتاری، مهارت شنیداری و تلفظ و آهنگ کلام نادیده گرفته می شوند. ج. دبیران تلاش می کنند تا روش تدریس خود را متناسب با آزمون انگلیسی کنکور سراسری ارائه دهند. د. آزمون تی مستقل نشان داد که اختلاف معناداری میان نظرات دبیران و دانش آموزان در رابطه با روش تدریس دبیران بطور کلی و میان نقطه نظرات آنها در مورد عامل اول (مهارت ها و عناصر زبان) و عامل چهارم (روش تدریس و ایجاد انگیزه) وجود دارد. و بالاخره اینکه به نظر می رسد که دبیران مراکز پیش دانشگاهی از شاخص هایی بهره می گیرند که متناسب با روش های سنتی از جمله گرامر- ترجمه و خواندن هستند.

The Impact of the English Section of the University Entrance Exam On the Teaching of English in Pre-University Centers in Shiraz

S. A. Razmjoo*
Shiraz University

Abstract

This study is an attempt to investigate the impact of the English section of the University Entrance Exam (UEE) on the teaching of English from the pre-university teachers' and students' viewpoints. It also seeks to compare and contrast the views held by teachers and students in this respect. To this end, two questionnaires were administered to 40 teachers and 80 students of the four Educational Districts in Shiraz. The data gathered were, first, subjected to descriptive statistics and then to inferential statistics utilizing the Chi-square test. In addition, independent t-tests were run to see if there was any significant difference between teachers' and students' viewpoints with respect to the teachers' methodology. The most important findings of the study were as follows: a) the teachers gave priority to reading skill, translation from English into Persian, grammar and vocabulary. b) speaking, listening and pronunciation were overlooked. c) the teachers tried to adapt their methodologies on the basis of UEE. d) there was a significant difference between teachers' and students' viewpoints in general and with respect to factors 1 (language skills and components) and 4 (teaching and motivation) in particular and e) finally, it seemed that the overall methodology of Pre-university English was in line with some indices of Grammar-Translation Method (GTM). Moreover, some suggestions were offered to help the Ministry of Education in general and the Department of Education of Shiraz in particular to improve the quality of English in the educational system.

Key words: 1. English teaching 2. Teaching methodology 3. University Entrance Exam 4. Test impact 5. Washback 6. Factor Analysis

1. Introduction

Testing and teaching are like two sides of a coin; that is, testing independent of teaching is unimaginable (Hughes 2003). "Both testing and teaching are so closely interrelated that it is virtually impossible to work in either field without being constantly concerned with the other" (Heaton 1990: 5). Testing must be seen as a method of providing information that may be used for teaching and other purposes. However, the reality, as Davies (1990) puts it, is that "testing is always used in teaching, in the sense that much teaching is related to the testing which is demanded of the students" (24).

The fact that testing affects the four most important factors of the curriculum--teacher, learner, content and context--is commonplace in the educational and applied linguistics literature (Farhady et al. 1998; Hughes 2003; Alderson & Wall 1993). A

* Ph.D. student of TEFL, Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics.

great deal of research has been conducted about the effect of examinations on what takes place in the classroom. Pearson (cited in Alderson & Wall, 1993) states, "it is generally accepted that public examinations influence the attitudes, behavior, and motivation of teachers, learners, and parents" (115).

Every year, almost all Iranian pre-university graduates take a nation-wide one-stage examination for admission to state universities. The one-stage examination system involves both selection and placement decisions. Some applicants are selected and then placed in the universities while some others are rejected. The main objective of UEE is to select and place the students with a high academic aptitude in the higher education institutions of their choice. Although this exam has certain features that deserve credit, it suffers from some major shortcomings. These are detected and shown by some of the studies reviewed here, but the main concern of the present research is to show how this exam may have an effect on the teaching of English at pre-university schools. For this purpose, the terms impact and washback have to be defined and clarified first.

1.1 Impact and washback

Different key figures in TESL/TEFL have provided us with the definition of the terms impact and washback. Shohamy *et al.* (1996) define washback as "the connection between testing and learning" (289). Brown (1997) expands the definition proposed by Shohamy *et al.* and states that "washback refers to the connections between language testing and learning, and the consequences of those connections" (65). Hughes (2003, 1) uses the term backwash instead of the two terms washback and impact and defines it as "the effect of testing on teaching and learning" which can be beneficial or harmful. Furthermore, Messick (1996) presents a more comprehensive definition as he writes "washback, a concept prominent in applied linguistics, refers to the extent to which the introduction and the use of a test influences language teachers and learners to do things they would not otherwise do that promote or inhibit language learning" (241).

Although a great deal of research has been carried out on the effects of testing on teaching, there is a confusing point which originates from the fact that several terms such as washback, backwash, impact and test feedback (to name only a few) are used to refer to the connection between testing and learning (Brown 1997; Andrews & Fullilove 1993; Hamps-Lyons 1997 and Davies 1990). According to Brown (1997), in the general education literature the concept is referred to as backwash, whereas in language education there seems to be a preference for washback (Hamps-Lyons 1997). Bachman and Palmer (1996) indicate that impact is one of the test features operating at both micro and macro levels. Furthermore, they state that washback is "an aspect of impact which is of particular interest to language testing researchers and practitioners" (30). Despite this, researchers such as Brown (2000) and Cheng (1999) make no distinction between impact and washback and use them interchangeably.

1.2. Studies related to the UEE

In a critical review of the English section of UEE administered in 1986, Yarmohammadi (1365/1986) states the following points. This section and similar ones concentrate on just reading comprehension among language skills and vocabulary and grammar among the language components. In other words, the role of communication is neglected. Most of the important components of grammar including simple and compound sentences are not tested. Most of the items, especially those related to grammar, just focus on memorization of rules.

Jafarpur (1381/2002) investigates the problems of the English section of UEE. He divides the shortcomings into two types: a) face problems, and b) statistical problems. Finally, he introduces the features of a good test and makes suggestions as how the items could be improved.

Jafarpur (1375/1996) also reviews the English section of MA Entrance Examination for TEFL held in 1996. He states that although many different critics have written about the shortcomings of UEE, especially the English section, the problems still persist and no changes have been noticed.

Farhady (1364/1985) investigates the English section of UEE from 1983 to 1985. He states that there is a low correlation between the content which the students are taught and the manner they are evaluated in the University Entrance Examination.

1.3. Statement of the Problem

The aim of the present study is two-fold. First, it investigates the impact of the English section of UEE on the teaching of English in pre-university centers from teachers' and students' viewpoints. Second, it examines the differences between the teachers' and the students' viewpoints in this respect. Finally, some suggestions are offered on the basis of the findings of the study.

1.4. Research Questions

Regarding the purpose of the study, the following research questions are posed:

1. Does the English section of UEE have any impact on the teaching of English in pre-university centers?
2. Is there any significant difference between teachers' and students' viewpoints regarding the impact of the English section of UEE on the teaching of English?

2. Methodology

2.1. Participants

The participants of this study consisted of forty male EFL teachers and their eighty male students from state pre-university centers selected from the four Educational Districts in Shiraz, Iran on the basis of their availability. The teachers ranged in age from 27 to 47 years with a mean age of 33. Their teaching experience ranged from 7 to 27 years with an average of 11 years. Twenty-four of them held a B A degree and 16 had an M A in Linguistics or Teaching English or English Literature. The eighty students had already passed pre-university English Book 1. They ranged in age from 17 to 21 years with a mean age of 19. Forty-five of them were studying Mathematics, 27 were studying Literature and Humanities and the rest were studying Practical Sciences. Female participants were excluded because the researcher did not have access to them.

2.2. Instruments

Two sets of questionnaires served as the instruments of the study, one for the teachers and the other for the students. These questionnaires consisted of exactly the same number of factors and the same number of questions; i.e., they included four factors with 25 (6 + 5 + 6 + 8) items in the Likert scale. The questionnaires were prepared in Persian to make sure that the students did not have any difficulty answering them.

2.2.1. Validity and Reliability of the Questionnaire: In order to determine the validity of the instrument, the researcher randomized the 28 items of the questionnaire and distributed them among 50 teachers and students of pre-university centers. After the pilot study, three items were discarded because they did not contribute to any of the four factors, and had low internal togetherness with the total. Tables 1 and 2 present validity coefficients in terms of Factor Analysis and Internal Consistency respectively. The factors of the questionnaire are as follow:

Factor 1: Language skills and components

Factor 2: Grammar, translation and supplementary materials in this respect

Factor 3: Samples of the UEE tests and their content

Factor 4: Methodology and motivation

Table 1: The factor analysis with Varimax Rotation

Factors Items	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
1	.829			
2	.598			
3	.796			
4	.869			
5	.608			
6	.493			
7		.665		
8		.732		
9		.539		
10		.586		
11		.500		
12			.579	
13			.520	
14			.684	
15			.554	
16			.545	
17			.747	
18				.549
19				.616
20				.623
21				.789
22				.538
23				.585
24				.800
25				.557

As the table indicates, the factor analysis of the questionnaire yielded four main factors and all the items delineated acceptable go-togetherness (Table 2 below).

Table 2: The internal consistency of the questionnaire

Factors Items	Total Factor 1	Total Factor 2	Total Factor 3	Total Factor 4	Total Factors
1	.780				.369
2	.693				.605
3	.796				.447
4	.865				.466
5	.689				.551
6	.668				.742
7		.666			.331
8		.769			.482
9		.614			.301
10		.644			.494
11		.655			.503
12			.609		.332
13			.578		.350
14			.683		.364
15			.653		.511
16			.635		.553
17			.732		.635
18				.614	.485
19				.684	.570
20				.655	.564
21				.812	.639
22				.585	.482
23				.665	.617
24				.798	.698
25				.609	.552

In addition, Table 3 indicates the reliability in terms of Cronbach alpha. According to Ary *et al.* (1996) "Cronbach alpha is used when measures have items that are not scored simply as right or wrong, such as attitude scales or essay tests" (285).

Table 3: Coefficient Alpha or Cronbach Alpha (CA) of the questionnaire

Factors	CA Index
Factor 1	.8441
Factor 2	.6922
Factor 3	.6198
Factor 4	.8579
Total	.8712

Cronbach Alpha depicts the fact that each of the factors by itself and the combination of all factors have acceptable reliability indices.

As a result, the final version of the questionnaires consisted of 25 items which were distributed among four factors.

2.3. Procedure

The teachers' questionnaire was administered while they were in their offices and they were asked to fill it on the spot whereas the students' questionnaire was distributed while they were in their classes. The researcher attended the classes while the students were filling out the questionnaire and answered their questions. In order to reduce the participants' anxiety, they were not required to write their names on the questionnaires.

4. Results and Discussion

Data analysis was done at two levels. Firstly, the data were subjected to descriptive statistics utilizing frequency and percentage in order to pave the way for running the Chi-square test. Secondly, independent t-tests were run to find out whether there was any significant difference between teachers' and students' viewpoints.

The items of the teachers' questionnaire were examined in terms of their percentage so as to see which items they put more emphasis on in their English classes while teaching. To illustrate better the pattern of the respondents' answers to the questionnaires, the first two alternatives (Very Much and Much) and the last two (A Little and Very Little) were combined. Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7 present the results.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics of the teachers' questionnaire

Factors	Items	Percentage		
		VM + M	AV	L + VL
Factor 1. Language skills and components	1. How much importance do you give to conversation?	65.50	25.50	10.00
	2. How much importance do you give to vocabulary and idiomatic expressions?	85.00	12.5	2.50
	3. How much importance do you give to speaking?	55.00	30.00	15.0
	4. How much importance do you give to pronunciation and intonation	62.50	20.00	17.5
	5. How much importance do you give to listening?	30.00	30.00	40.0
	6. How much importance do you give to reading comprehension?	92.50	5.00	2.50
Factor 2. Grammar, translation and supplementary materials	7. How much importance do you give to translation from English into Persian?	67.50	200.0	12.5
	8. How much importance do you give to translation from Persian into English?	10.00	17.50	72.50
	9. Do the textbooks make your students ready for UEE?	35.00	55.00	10.00
	10. How much importance do you give to grammar?	70.00	27.50	2.50
	11. Do you think that your training makes the students ready for UEE?	70.00	25.50	5.00
	12. Is there any correlation between the patterns of UEE tests and mid-term & final?	17.50	37.50	45.50

Factor 3. Samples of UEE tests and their content	13. Is there any correlation between the UEE tests and contents of the textbooks?	25.00	65.00	10.00
	14. Is there any correlation between UEE tests and the class tests in terms of time?	20.00	17.50	62.50
	15. Is there any correlation between UEE tests and the class tests in terms of content?	57.50	32.50	10.00
	16. Is the manner of teaching in line with UEE tests?	55.50	32.50	12.50
	17. Do you use the sample of UEE tests in mid-term and final?	52.50	37.50	10.00
Factor 4. Teaching and Motivation	18. Do you prepare students for UEE through supplementary materials?	35.50	47.50	17.50
	19. Do you make the students familiar with UEE?	90.00	5.00	5.00
	20. Do you try to provide scientific competition among the students?	22.50	70.00	7.50
	21. Do you train the students how to answer the tests correctly?	75.50	17.50	7.50
	22. Is the purpose of teaching English just preparing the students for UEE?	10.00	20.00	70.00
	23. Do you use UEE tests to improve your teaching?	55.00	37.50	7.50
	24. Do you train the students how to study appropriately?	80.00	15.00	5.00
	25. Is there any correlation between the manner of rating UEE tests and the class tests?	10.00	5.00	85.00

Table 4 indicates that the teachers give priority to all the items of factor 1 except the fifth item; that is, 65.50%, 85.00%, 55.00%, 62.50%, and 92.50% of the teachers believe that they give importance to conversation, vocabulary and idiomatic expression, speaking, pronunciation and intonation, and reading comprehension respectively but ignore listening.

Most of the teachers (67.5 % and 70.00 %) state that grammar and translation from English into Persian are very important in their classes. In addition, they believe that their training will definitely make the students ready for the UEE. Furthermore, they emphasize the fact that the English textbooks do not prepare the students for UEE; that is why they focus on the supplementary materials instead. Finally, the teachers say that they do not concentrate on translation from Persian into English. This fact is also supported by the students' views. This last point is in line with Green's (1998) opinion that the translation task L1 → L2 is likely to be more difficult than the task of translating from L2 → L1 since the former requires the generation of vocabulary and sentence structure in L1, whereas the latter requires the recognition of the counterparts of L2 words in the native language. Recognition is usually considered an easier task than the generation of the same information. (29)

The items of factor 3 indicate that teachers attach more importance to just those factors which are under their own control such as trying to make a balance between the content of students' mid-terms and finals and UEE, trying to base their methodology on UEE and using samples of UEE tests in their classes. But they believe that they can not match the patterns, and time of their formative and summative evaluations with UEE. The majority also indicate that there is no one to one correspondence between the content of English textbooks and the UEE tests.

Finally, the analysis of data obtained from factor 4 indicates that the teachers try to make their students familiar with UEE, instruct them how to answer the tests, use UEE tests to improve their own teaching and equip the students with appropriate techniques of studying. But they emphasize that the manner of correcting students' mid-terms and finals do not correspond to UEE and the only purpose of teaching English in Pre-university centers is not to prepare the students for UEE.

However, there is a need to validate the results on the basis of inferential statistics (Hatch & Farhady 1981). To this end, the Chi-square test is applied to the available data of the questionnaire. Table 5 demonstrates the results of the Chi-square. It shows that the observed frequencies for all the items in factor 1 are significant at .05 level except for the fifth item. With respect to factor 2 the results of all items are significant. Except for item 12, the Chi-square test shows that the results of the rest of the items of factor 3 are significant. Finally, Table 5 shows the results of all items of factor 4 except number 18 are significant. In general, these significant indices indicate that the high frequencies whether positive (Very Much and Much) or negative (A Little and Very Little) are meaningful and show that the teachers either give importance to the items or ignore them while teaching.

Table 5: Frequency and the Chi-square results of the teachers' questionnaire

Item	Frequency			X ²	Sig.	Item	Frequency			X ²	Sig.
	VM +M	AV	L+V L				VM +M	AV	L+VL		
Factor 1 of the questionnaire						13	10	26	4	19.400*	.000
1	26	10	4	19.400*	.000	14	8	7	25	15.350*	.000
2	34	5	1	48.650*	.000	15	23	13	4	13.550*	.001
3	22	12	6	9.800*	.007	16	22	13	5	10.850*	.004
4	25	8	7	15.350*	.000	17	21	15	4	11.150*	.004
5	12	12	26	.800	.670	Factor 4 of the Questionnaire					
6	37	2	1	63.050*	.000	18	14	19	7	5.450	.066
Factor 2 of the Questionnaire						19	36	2	2	57.800*	.000
7	27	8	5	8.150*	.017	20	9	28	3	25.550*	.001
8	4	7	29	27.950*	.000	21	30	7	3	31.850*	.000
9	14	22	4	12.200*	.002	22	4	8	28	24.800*	.000
10	28	11	1	27.950*	.000	23	22	15	3	13.850*	.001
11	28	10	2	26.600*	.004	24	3	6	2	39.800*	.000
Factor 3 of the Questionnaire						25	4	2	34	48.200*	.000
12	7	15	18	4.850	.088	df = 2			*P < .05		

The results of students' questionnaires in terms of percentage, frequency and the Chi-square test are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6: Descriptive statistics of the items of the students' questionnaire

Factors	Items	Percentage		
		VM + M	AV	L + VL
Factor 1. Language skills and components	1. How much importance does your teacher give to conversation?	21.25	21.25	57.5
	2. How much importance does your teacher give to vocabulary and idiomatic expressions?	63.75	33.75	2.5
	3. How much importance does your teacher give to speaking?	27.5	12.5	60.00
	4. How much importance does your teacher give to pronunciation and intonation?	32.5	17.5	50.00
	5. How much importance does your teacher give to listening?	15.00	32.50	52.50
	6. How much importance does your teacher give to reading comprehension?	61.25	35.00	3.75
Factor 2. Grammar, translation and supplementary materials	7. How much importance does your teacher give to translation from English into Persian?	58.75	20.00	21.25
	8. How much importance does your teacher give to translation from Persian into English?	32.50	22.50	45.00
	9. Do the textbooks make you ready for UEE?	43.75	26.25	30.00
	10. How much importance does your teacher give to grammar?	71.25	23.75	5.00
	11. Do you think that your teacher's training make you ready for UEE?	28.75	46.25	25.00
Factor 3. Samples of UEE tests and their content	12. Is there any correlation between the patterns of UEE tests and mid-term & final?	20.00	31.25	48.75
	13. Is there any correlation between UEE tests and contents of the textbooks?	28.75	52.50	18.75
	14. Is there any correlation between UEE tests and the class tests in terms of time?	25.00	42.50	32.50
	15. Is there any correlation between UEE tests and the class tests in terms of content?	48.75	40.00	11.25
	16. Is the manner of teaching in line with UEE tests?	52.50	40.00	7.50
	17. Does your teacher use the sample of UEE tests in mid-term and final?	42.50	23.75	33.75
Factor 4. Teaching and Motivation	18. Does your teacher prepare you for UEE through supplementary materials?	33.75	22.50	43.75
	19. Does your teacher make you familiar with UEE?	48.75	32.50	18.75
	20. Does your teacher try to provide scientific competition among you?	26.25	47.50	26.25
	21. Does your teacher train you to answer the tests correctly?	36.25	31.25	32.50
	22. Is the purpose of teaching English just preparing you for UEE?	42.50	25.00	32.50
	23. Does your teacher use UEE tests to improve his teaching?	51.25	25.00	23.75
	24. Does your teacher train you how to study appropriately?	42.50	23.75	33.75
	25. Is there any correlation between the manner of rating UEE tests and the class tests?	26.25	17.50	56.25

Based on the results of Table 6, more than 60 % of the students state that their teachers just focus on vocabulary and idiomatic expressions and reading comprehension. This is in contrast with the viewpoints of the teachers who believe that they attach importance to all language skills and components except for listening.

The students' viewpoints with respect to the items of factor 2 are in line with the teachers' ideas except for the fact that the students believe that the English taught to them does not prepare them for UEE while the teachers say that their training does so.

The students' views with respect to factor 3 are in complete agreement with their teachers'; that is, whenever there is room for teachers to maneuver on the basis of UEE, they do so. Finally, the students say that their teachers spend time on giving information about UEE, making them familiar with the appropriate techniques of studying. They

point out that the teachers do not give noticeable attention to the other items of factor 4. One major difference between teachers' and students' viewpoints is that only 10 % of the teachers agree with the fact that the only purpose of teaching English is to prepare the students for UEE whereas 42.50% of the students state that the aim is so. Table 7 verifies the significance of frequency of the items at .05 level. As the table indicates, the observed frequencies of all items of factor 1 are significant. The results of all items of factor 2 except the ninth item are also significant. Moreover, the observed frequency of items 14 and 17 of factor 3 are not significant whereas the rest are. Finally, the results of item 25 of factor 4 are both significant and meaningful. Items 19, 20, and 13 of the fourth factor are significant but may not be meaningful. The results of the rest of the items are not significant with respect to the Chi-square test.

Table 7: Frequency and the Chi-square results of the students' questionnaire

Item	Frequency			X ²	Sig.	Item	Frequency			X ²	Sig.
	VM+M	AV	L+VL				VM+M	AV	L+VL		
Factor 1 of the questionnaire						13	23	42	15	14.425*	.001
1	17	17	46	21.025*	.000	14	20	34	26	3.700	.157
2	51	27	2	45.025*	.000	15	39	32	9	18.475*	.000
3	22	10	48	28.300*	.000	16	42	32	6	25.900*	.000
4	26	14	40	12.700*	.000	17	34	19	27	4.225	.121
5	12	26	42	16.900*	.000	Factor 4 of the Questionnaire					
6	49	28	3	39.775*	.000	18	27	18	35	5.425	.066
Factor 2 of the Questionnaire						19	39	26	15	10.825*	.004
7	47	16	17	23.275*	.000	20	21	38	21	7.225*	.027
8	26	18	36	6.100*	.047	21	29	25	26	.325	.850
9	35	21	24	4.075	.130	22	34	20	26	3.700	.157
10	57	19	4	55.975*	.000	23	41	20	19	11.575*	.003
11	23	37	20	6.175*	.046	24	34	19	27	4.225	.121
Factor 3 of the Questionnaire						25	21	14	45	19.825*	.000
12	16	25	39	10.075*	.006	Df = 2			*P < .05		

Because the results of the Chi-square test do not clarify the difference between teachers' and students' viewpoints, five independent t-tests (one among the total scores of both participants and 4 among the scores of the four factors) were run to see whether there was a significant difference between their viewpoints or not.

Table 8: Independent T-tests for the difference between the participants' responses (df: 118)

Factors	Subjects	Mean	SD	t-value	Significance (2-tailed)
1	Students teachers	11.9500	3.1012	-6.049	*.000
		15.0750	2.4220		
2	Students teachers	11.0875	2.3123	-.838	.404
		11.3750	1.4266		
3	Students teachers	10.8000	2.1132	1.129	.261
		10.3500	1.9421		
4	Students teachers	18.4875	5.5802	-2.669	*.009
		20.4000	2.2280		
Total	Students teachers	52.3250	9.5079	-3.812	*.000
		57.2000	4.4962		

*P < .05

The results indicate that the teachers' and students' responses are significantly different with respect to factor 1 (language skills and components), factor 4 (teaching and motivation) and the combination of all factors (total).

6. Conclusion

The results of the present study are in line with the fact that tests are powerful determiners of what happens in the classroom and with the notion of "washback" (Alderson, & Wall 1993). The findings demonstrate that the teaching of Pre-university teachers benefits from indices which seem to be in line with traditional methods and approaches such as Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and Reading approach despite the fact that the current theories of language teaching and testing emphasize Communicative Language Teaching and Testing methods (Brown 2000; Wier 1990). The findings also indicate that in general there is a significant difference between teachers' and students' viewpoints with respect to the "what" of teaching and the "how" of teaching. As an example, the majority of the teachers claim that they give importance to speaking skill whereas the majority of the students believe that this skill is ignored by the teachers. As a teaching director in the educational group of the Department of Education of Shiraz and as an observer in this Department for more than three years, the researcher agrees with the students' viewpoints that the teachers focus on three skills and components, namely reading comprehension, grammar, and vocabulary which are tested in UEE and forget about the other aspects of language teaching and testing. Since this study is small in scale, the above tentative conclusions await further research.

7. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are put forward to improve the quality of English instruction in the Education Organization.

1. English tests in UEE just concentrate on reading comprehension, vocabulary, and grammar. Due to the practicality problem of including speaking, listening, and pronunciation tests in the content of the UEE, the teachers should put more emphasis on these skills and components while teaching.
2. Traditional methods and approaches such as GTM and Reading approach are not beneficial anymore. The teachers should try to follow the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) which, according to Brown (2000, 266-267), has the following four interconnected characteristics:
 - a. Classroom goals are focused on all of the components of communicative competence and not restricted to grammatical or linguistic competence
 - b. Language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes.
 - c. Fluency and accuracy are seen as complementary principles underlying communicative competence.
 - d. In the communicative classroom, students ultimately have to use the language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my greatest indebtedness to Professor Jafarpur for his constant suggestions, helpful guidance, constructive criticisms and patience throughout this study. I also thank him for teaching me how to do research. The researcher is also grateful to the anonymous referees of the *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities of Shiraz University* for their meticulous comments.

References

- Alderson, J. C. & Wall, D. (1993). *Does washback exist?* **Applied Linguistics**, 14, 2, 115-129.
- Andrews, S. J. & Fullilove, J. P. (1993). *Backwash and the use of English oral speculations on the impact of a new examination upon the sixth form English language teaching in Hong Kong*, **New Horizons**, 34, 46-52.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C. & Razavieh, A. (1996). **Introduction to Research in Education**, (5th ed.) Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Bachman L. F. & Palmer, A. S. (1996). **Language Testing in Practice: Designing and Developing Useful Language Tests**, Oxford: OUP.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). **Principles of Language Learning and Teaching**, (4th ed.) White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, J. D. (1997). *Testing washback in language education*, **PASAA**, 27, 64-79.
- Brown, J. D. (2000). *University Entrance Examinations: Strategies for creating positive washback on English language teaching in Japan*, **The Official Newsletter of TEVAL**, 3, 2, 4-8.
- Cheng, L. (1999). *Changing assessment: Washback on teacher perceptions and actions*, **Teaching and Teacher Education**, 15, 253-257.
- Davies, A. (Ed.) (1990). **Principles of language Testing**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Farhady, H. (1364/1985). *barrasi-e-azmoon-e-eenglisi-e-konkur-e-sarasari [A survey of English tests of University Entrance Examination]*, **Roshd Language Teaching Journal**, 31, 15-17.
- Farhady, H., Jafarpur, A., & Birjandi, P. (1998). **Testing language skills: From theory to practice**, Tehran: SAMT.
- Green, A. (1998). **Verbal Protocol Analysis in Language Testing Research: a Handbook**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamps-Lyons, L. (1997). *Washback, impact, and validity: Ethical concerns*, **Language Testing**, 14, 3, 294-303.
- Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. (1981). **Research Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics**. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Heaton, J. B. (1990). **Writing English Language Tests**, London: Longman.
- Hughes, A. (2003). **Testing for Language Teachers**, (2nd ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jafarpur, A. (1381/2002). *Barkhi kastihaye- azmmone zabane englisi va pishnahad baraye rafe an*, [Some shortcomings of UEE English tests and suggestions for solving them]. **Majmooe Maghalate Seminare Barrasi Raveshha Vamasaele Azmoonhaye voroodi daneshgahha**, Esfahan: Esfahan Industrial University Press.
- Jafarpur, A. (1376/1997). *naqdi bar azmoon-e englisi verodi tahsilate takmili (majmoo?ye- zabane englisi)*, [A survey of English Entrance Exam of Graduateschool]. **Majaleh-e- Pajooeshi Daneshgah-e-Esfahan**, 8, 1-2, 15-22.
- Jafarpur, A. (1365/1986). *naqdi bar yaki az azmoonha-ye-englisi-ye-emtahamnat-e-naha?ii-e-vezarat-e-amoozesh va parvarash*, [A survey of one of the final tests of

English of the Ministry of Education,] **Majaleh-e-Ulum-e-Ejtemai va Ensani-e-Daneshgah-e-Shiraz**, 2,1, 92-105.

Messick, S. (1996). Validity and washback in language testing, **Language Testing**, 13, 3, 241-256.

Shohamy, E. et al. (1996). *Test impact revised: Washback effect overtime*, **Language Testing**, 13, 3, 298-317.

Wier, C. J. (1990). **Communicative Language Testing**, Hemel Hempstead, UK: Prentice Hall.

Yarmohammadi, L. (1364/1986). *barrasi-e-azmoon-e-englisi-e-konkur-e-sarasari dar sale 1365 [A survey of English tests of University Entrance Examination in 1365]*, **Majaleh-e-Ulum-e-Ejtemai va Ensani-e-Daneshgah-e-Shiraz**, 2,1, 80-91.