

## تلخيص لمحاضره الرابعه من ماده اللغه وتقنية المعلومات ارجوا الدعاء لي وشكرا

**(A1)** Evaluation individually, subjectively, globally and introspectively teacher simply looks through the material an overall intuitive judgment about whether it would suit their class or what class it would suit.

When trying out a CALL program it is especially useful often to make deliberate mistakes to see how the program responds - e.g. give wrong answers and press the wrong keys etc.

- described as the global 'expert judgment' method of evaluation.
- The evaluator somehow accesses an unanalyzed notion of some users of the software, an unanalyzed impression of the software, and matches the two using often inexplicit criteria.

**(A2)** to regard evaluation as in any way systematic it is necessary at the very least to 'unpack' this armchair approach a bit.

- The teacher (or anyone else) acting alone as evaluator should break down the 'overall' or global judgment into parts.

This means

(a) looking carefully at different aspects of the materials separately.

(b) thinking of all the relevant different aspects of the learning situation, learners, potential use etc.

(c) judging aspects of (a) in respect of (b), broken down into points. This last in part resembles the process of assessing 'content validity', often talked about in language testing.

- to check on an achievement test by analyzing the aspects of language tested and comparing them with what the syllabus or the teaching course before the test covered.
- general principle of language testing also applies here: it is known that tests with more items are more reliable than shorter ones, and a set of agree/disagree items circling round some issue is more reliable than a single one targeting it.
- So here, the summary of a whole series of introspective judgments of specific aspects is more reliable than one global one.

- many published checklists strike one as a rather miscellaneous collection of points or questions, not clearly distinguishing between (a) and (b) and (c) above, and not obviously exhausting the types of point that should be considered, or organising them in a motivated way.
- the teacher can get other teachers to do the same sort of evaluation, or read reviews in journals etc. This makes it less individual, though still introspective and rather subjective.

**(A3)** the teacher may enhance the checklist approach, if he/she has the time and energy....., by doing things that in a loose sense could be called 'research'. By this I mean looking systematically with some analytic techniques.

- at aspects under the (a) or (b) not just deciding what they are on an instant introspective basis.
- This may focus more on the (a) side:
  - linguistic analysis of the structures used in the content of the program (if it is fixed).
  - checking the frequency level of the vocabulary against a standard reference list.
  - grading the exercise types that are incorporated on a recognized scale of task difficulty.
- This might be called 'materials analysis'.
- Or it may focus on the (b) side:
  - finding out what the syllabus for the current year actually says my learners should be doing.
  - doing an analysis of learners' needs or interests.
  - finding out what the school budget actually has available.

This is in effect 'analysis of the learning/teaching situation'. These are all things that might appear on a checklist and of course can all alternatively be decided by the evaluator just "off the top of his/her head".

If You have a program with certain characteristics and you want to use it with young learners Instead of just relying on one's own judgment of what is suitable, one can read up what the collective wisdom of psychologists, educators.

there is always the "danger" that supposedly 'general' research findings do not actually apply in your situation for some reason **But if you are using the checklist approach there are some key things not to forget:**

- Be explicit about where the list comes from, which existing one is being used/adapted, and have as many detailed subsections as possible. Make sure whatever system/list you use covers all three of the (a) (b) and (c) aspects.
- Cover the (a) aspect. A description of detailed aspects of how the program works, with examples of actual items, screens etc.
- what it does (a) has to be incorporated, since the reader cannot be assumed to be familiar with the software. If part of what you are evaluating is a particular task that is not part of the software itself, or some language element supplied by the teacher, make that clear. But that alone is not an evaluation.
- Cover the (b) aspect.
- Don't forget (c) i.e. explanation of how each feature of the program (a) does or doesn't fit (b). This needs to be supported wherever possible by more than your expert intuition - reference to applied linguistic concepts, research, models etc. (E.g. Chapelle 2001 pp45-51). This is the crux of evaluation.

### **Methods of evaluation (B): Empirical evaluation**

Other methods of evaluation generally require much more work, and for the materials to have been used for some time by learners/in actual classes (compare situation 3), so they are often firmly fixed in a specific teaching/learning situation (b). However, they do move away from the purely introspective approach.

These are the ones that incorporate activities that are just like those we would otherwise regard as typical of regular empirical 'research' - measurement, surveys etc. i.e. they may entail using questionnaires and interviews, systematically observing, eliciting 'think-aloud' data from software users, or testing users.

- They may mean doing 'studies' (experimental or not) comparing the success of one material against another and so forth, or indeed doing 'action research' with CALL. (See Chapelle, Jamieson and Park 1996 in ed.
- Pennington The Power of CALL for an overview of types of empirical research done on CALL classified by the kinds of methods used; and Chapelle 2001 pp66-94 for a more detailed coverage, in relation to CALL

tasks of the more communicative type, and classic SLA research issues looked at in CALL)

- these 'research' type activities are non-evaluative.
- They are best seen as scientific means of gathering facts and testing hypotheses which can then either remain.

#### **Examples are:**

- Doing a survey of teachers and/or learners who have used the material and finding out how they use it, their difficulties, attitudes to the interest and usefulness of the content, tasks.
- Observing a class using the program, taping and making systematic notes on their difficulties, actions, strategies, what they say, the teacher's involvement etc. Or one can ask learners to keep a diary of their reactions.
- Getting the computer to store records of actions performed by learners using a program and analysing them to infer learner strategies and processes. (E.g. revisions when wordprocessing, accesses made to an online glossary when reading). Example in T. Johns 1997 'Contexts' in edWichmann et al Teaching and Language Corpora (Longman).
- comparison the classic research of those using one program with those using another differing in a small or large way (or no program... just doing non-computer equivalent tasks) over a period, with before and after tests to check on how much has been learnt.

**IF:**

- A type and B type evaluation are both done.
- the connection between the two needs to be spelt out.
- the A evaluation resulted in adoption of the software.

**Then----- the B evaluation show that was a good decision?**