On the effect of raters' personalities on the evaluation of students' writing

Nasser Rashidi and Farzaneh Mozaffari

Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

ABSTRACT

The writing assessment has long been considered a problematic area for educational assessment professionals and TEFL practitioners in particular. Due to a significant growth in the number of language learners in the past two decades, fairness issues in ESL writing assessments have been of growing interest and importance and have given birth to a great deal of theoretical and empirical research which have been examining the effect of various factors on the evaluation of students' writing. The result of such studies leads us to question the accuracy and the raters' fairness in rating learners' written works. Hence, the rater variable, affected by various factors, has always been an important issue in the literature of writing assessment. This paper aims at investigating the impact of raters' personality traits on the analytic evaluation of the students' writings, encapsulating the probable effect of the genre too. In order to measure the personality traits of raters, NEO FFI developed by Costa and McCrae has been applied. A group of language instructors rated an expository essay and an argumentative one based on Jacobs' rating scale. The results of the study indicate that there is a relationship between the raters' personalities and the score they have assigned to the students' writing. The genre of the essay has also been significant in the process of rating.

Introduction

Research in language teaching and testing is a dynamic process every now and then undertaking a specific aspect of the complex system of language. If we briefly go over the literature in the field of language teaching and testing, we easily find the diversity of issues and areas investigated in different era of language research. Initially, the researchers were concerned with how to teach the language but in order to evaluate the effectiveness of different methods they had to assess students' achievements. As a result, conducting studies on language testing arouse interests in researchers.

For decades now, questions about the validity and reliability of tests have been hotly debated, spawned a great deal of theoretical and empirical research. Language researchers and practitioners have been constantly bewildering how to increase the validity and reliability of the tests. In this vein, lots of studies have been devoted to examine the impact of different variables on language test. One of the sources of errors in language testing is the inconsistency in ratings (Bachman, 1990). Since the students' performances are evaluated based on the scores that are assigned to them, this source of error is of high significance in the domain of language testing. In this line, a number of researches have been focused on what may affect the score that a rater might assign to test takers.

Since writing is a culturally specific and learned behavior (Lenneberg, 1967; as cited in Brown, 2001), teaching and testing it is one of the most controversial issues in the realm of language teaching. Writing assessment is an integral part of any performance testing in SLA which has been highlighted by the emergence of English for specific purposes. Nowadays, student writing is assessed by raters using some kind of rating scale. Hence, attention has turned to raters themselves, and what they do when they rate. To have a reliable score which reflects student ability, raters should rate consistently and objectively.

To borrow Schaefer's (2008) words "although they are trained to use and interpret rating scales in similar ways, it is also true that essay rating is a complex and error-prone cognitive process which introduces systematic variance in performance ratings, and that rater effects need to be studied (Myford & Wolfe, 2004a)." (p. 466). One of these effects is the raters' personality traits. This paper attempts to shed light on any possible relationship that might exists between raters' personality traits as well as genre of the essays and the score assigned to student's writing.

Statement of the Problem

Assessment of learners' performance is a complex process with many implications and peripheral outcomes which always mystify researchers as well as instructors. For decades, practitioners questioned the way the learners are assessed in terms of their achievements especially in case of oral proficiency, wondering how raters assign them scores. Moreover, studies on personality types and their relationships with language learning (e.g., Oxford & Ehrman, 1990; Wilz, 2000) elucidated why each individual approaches tasks differently. But very few studies have examined the influence of raters' personality traits on language assessment. Hence, this paper aims at investigating how raters' personality factors might impact the way they score students' writing, encapsulating the effects of the genre of the essay too.

Significance of the Study

As learning a second language is now a worldwide concern, the necessity of conducting research in this realm is crystal clear. Since the usability and effectiveness of different methods and materials are assessed based on learners' achievement, TEFl practitioners notified the momentous role of language testing and delved into this issue, examining the validity and reliability of tests. Among factors which may affect the reliability of the testing, raters and their individual characteristics haven't been

Tele:
E-mail addresses: nrashidi@rose.shirazu.ac.ir

fully investigated. While by probing the raters' characteristics, some sources of the errors can be detected. Making raters aware of their personality traits can direct them to find out "sources of their biases, and their tendencies to respond in certain ways to texts" (Carrell, 1995, p. 188).

Objectives of the Study

This study seeks to portray the current impact of raters' personality on the evaluation of students' writing in order to find one possible source of errors in measurement and, in addition, examine the extent to which the genre of the essay might influence the assigned score.

Regarding the purpose of the study and the studies reviewed, the following questions are posed:

1. Is there any significant relationship between raters' personality traits and evaluation of students' writing?
2. What role, if any, do raters' personality traits play in the evaluation of different genres of writing?

Literature Review

Through writing we explore our understanding of the world and discover the meaning of our experience. The social and political nature of writing products has been increasingly supported (Kress, 1993, as cited in Casanave, 2003). By the introduction of Flower and Hayes' (1977, 1981) cognitive model of writing, an increasing number of studies have been devoted to examine the cynical nature of writing process (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Berninger, Whitaker, Feng, Swanson, & Abbott, 1996; Fayol, 1991; Kellogg, 1996; McCutchen, 1996; Raimes, 1987; Zamel, 1983; as cited in Cho, 2003). The results of these studies proposed that good writers use multiple revisions in order to enhance their texts whereas poor ones seek to finalize it on the first attempt. The results also lend support to process-oriented approach of writing (Cho, 2003). Considering writing a cognitively demanding task, Cho (2003) questioned the fairness of traditional essay test which requires test takers to compose a well-organized essay in short amount of time on a topic that might not be familiar to them.

Postcultural literary theories (Fish, 1980; Iser, 1974; as cited in Carrell, 1995) argue that meaning, social contexts and reader response are interrelated. According to these views of reading, "readers are interactive and transactive participants in the reading process" (Carrell, 1995, p. 154) who construct meaning with the texts as well as with their own beliefs and experiences. Applying the same approach to writing assessment by considering raters as readers who are involved in the process of meaning construction, Barritt, Stock, and Clark (1986) opined that teachers brought their teaching experience to the task of judging and "were engaging themselves as active readers trying to make common sense with students authors" (p. 320). There is a good amount of literature on this issue (e.g., Connors & Lunsford, 1993; Hout, 1993) which scrutinized raters' behaviors to detect if they are behaving more like an individual reader, personally engaged with the text or as a rater whose judgment is strictly based on a set of predetermined criteria without being personally involved.

Naturally, any cognitive operation is integrated with emotions and personalities, therefore personality traits are an important factor in language learning and language assessment (Birjandi & Siyyari, 2010). Hence, personality traits of raters can be one of the factors that might cause the raters to be personally engaged in the process of writing assessment (Carrell, 1995; Grown, 1984; Hatch, Hill, & Hayes, 1993; Jensen & DiTiberio, 1989; Walter, 1984).

Due to the abstract nature of affective side of human being, specifically personality traits, defining it operationally is unwieldy (Birjandi & Siyyari, 2010). Consequently, many definitions and classifications have been introduced and later discarded for better ones (Brown, 2007). This issue has been studied according to various approaches namely the psychoanalytic approach, the behavioral approach, the cognitive approach, the humanistic, the biopsychological approach, and the dispositional approach (Birjandi & Siyyari, 2010). A convincing stockpile of research on personality strongly favors dispositional approach (Sdorow, 1998) according to which several personality inventories have been designed namely Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, 16 Factor questionnaire, Eysenck's three-factor personality questionnaire, and the most recent one Costa and McCrae's NEO-PR-I and NEO-FFI based on the five-factor personality theory.

Costa and McCrae's five-factor theory is the most celebrated inventory among personality psychologists due to its cross-cultural support and stability over time (Feist & Feist, 2006). This inventory encapsulates the five big traits Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992) whose roles have not been fully investigated in language learning and assessment (Birjandi & Siyyari, 2010). Table 1 summarizes the facets that each of these factors measures.

Generally, rater variable, due to its direct relationship to assigned scores and decisions about test takers writing ability, is one of the significant issues in the literature of writing assessment. The impact of raters' knowledge about the writing courses as well as the use of different types of rating scales have been examined by Smith (1993, as cited in Carrel,1995). Lumley (2002) also probed raters' decision-making processes while rating texts written by ESL learners.

Though lots of studies have delved into the personality traits of learners, and examined its relationship with SLA (e.g., Bailey, Onwuegbuzie, & Daley, 2000; Callahan, 2000; Ehrman & Oxford, 1990, 1995), the impact of raters' individual differences has been probed with very few remarkable researchers (e.g., Carrell, 1995; Mareft, 2006; Wigglesworth, 1994). Thompson (1991) examined how distinguishing teachers with different personality types respond to student writing. He applied Myers- Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to measure teachers' personality preferences. For data analysis, he tried to find "patterns in mode and focus of teachers' responses within and between groups" (p. 4). The results suggested that teacher's personality type, their background, and the treatment they received can affect their responding styles.

Carrell (1995) investigated the effect of writers' personalities and raters' personalities on the evaluation of holistic writing. Beside personality traits, she considered the genre of the writing as another independent variable. The sample she used consisted of 43 writers, all native speakers of English, from two sections of a freshman composition class and twenty English composition instructors. The results of her study revealed that raters with different personality types tend to assess writing differently. It also indicated that a significant statistical relationship exists between genre and the holistic rating of essays, with narrative essays receiving higher ratings.

Callahan (2000) conducted a study with student teachers to probe the relationship between students' reflective writing and teacher feedback. He argued that, as writers, students need to go beyond their own preferences and get their bearings with other

options. He continued that the raters can have a vital role in helping students "build upon their own preferences and develop their less preferred approaches" (Callahan, 2000, p. 72).

Marefat (2006) attempted to discover the relationship between learner personality type and his writing ability as well as between rater personality and her rating procedure. She detected a link between rater personality and her rating procedure and claimed that the only dimension of students' personalities that showed significant impact across writing ability was the S/N preference.

Besides rater variable, another controversial issue in writing assessment is approaches to scoring. Holistic scoring and analytic scoring are two common approaches used to assess students' writing. The former is based on a single integrated score of writing behavior while the latter judges a text according to a set of criteria required for a good writing (Hyland, 2003). Holistic approach assesses global impression rather than a single ability and emphasis on achievement rather than deficiencies. On the minus side, it fails to provide diagnostic information and might overlook different abilities in subskills (Cohen, 1994). Furthermore, longer essays may get higher scores which reduce the reliability of the score. Analytic scoring has its own advantages and disadvantages too. Since analytic methods are more accurate in defining the features to be assessed through highlighting individual components, "they are more effective in discriminating between weaker texts" (Hyland, 2003, p. 229). Moreover, they are useful tool to train raters since they encourage them to address the same features (Cohen, 1994). This scoring method also reciprocates for some shortcomings of holistic approach by providing diagnostic information and underlining the subskills. However, while using this approach, raters should be cautious about halo effect "where results in rating one scale may influence the rating of others, while the extent to which writing can be seen as a sum of different parts is controversial" (Hyland, 2003, p. 229).

Another approach to scoring is trait-based methods which their being context-sensitive distinguished them from holistic and analytic methods (Hyland, 2003). This method aimed at designing criteria for writing that are distinctive and unique to each prompt and the produced writing in its response by using primary-trait or multiple-trait systems.

As reviewing the related literature revealed, though lots of studies have examined the rating consistency, few delved into the impact of raters' personality traits on the process of rating in the domain of language testing regarding the analytic assessment of students' writing. The reviewed studies mostly dealt with rater's personality styles and their impact on holistic evaluation of students' writing.

Method

Participants

Twenty two TEFL practitioners who hold PhD or an MA related to the field of language teaching served as raters in this study. They all have at least one year teaching experience of advanced writing and essay writing in university or IELTS classes.

Instruments

In order to measure the personality factors of raters NEO FFI (Appendix A) developed by Costa and McCrae has been applied. It consists of 60 items, 12 items for each of the personality dimensions and designed to take 10-15 minutes administer. This test was revised in 2004. The rationale behind the application of this test is the wide scope of different personality traits that the questionnaire encapsulates. This questionnaire is a cut-down version of NEO PI-R which has 240 items, but since the time is an issue and global information about personality is required the researcher chooses this one.

Two essays, an argumentative one (Appendix B) and an expository one (Appendix C), written down by two undergraduate students of English literature, have been given to the raters to be assessed. To keep the procedure of rating consistent, the raters have been also provided with Jacobs' writing rating scale (Appendix D) to follow.

Procedure

The first phase of the survey was completed after the participants filled the NEO FFI. As they live in different cities, the inventory has been sent to them via email along with a letter giving them some tips as to how to fill out the questionnaire. They have been assured that the information about their character type will be treated as confidential. After they sent back the inventory, the questionnaires were examined and their personality traits were determined following the procedure that is mentioned in the NEO-FFI manual. In addition, the raw scores of each five dimensions (Neuroticism, Extroversion Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness) of their personality were recorded in a separate table.

For the second phase, the raters were asked to rate two essays of BA students (Appendix A & B). Due to limitations, we had not been able to train them regarding scoring procedure. Hence, the researcher provided all of them with Jacob's scale of writing assessment in order to guarantee consistency.

To analyze the data, each rater was given a code from 1 to 22 and their personality traits' scores along with the scores which they have assigned to each essay were recorded in front of their codes. Then two separate correlations were run. One to determine the extent to which their personality traits are correlated with the assigned score to argumentative essay, and one to determine the degree to which their personality types are correlated with the assigned score to expository essay. Moreover, each score that has been assigned to different sections of essays, based on the Jacob's rating scale, were recorded. Pearson correlations was conducted to identify whether there is any significant relationship between different dimensions of raters' personality factors and the score assigned to each section of Jacobs' scheme. A paired t-test was also used to detect the significance of the genre.

Results and Discussion

The results indicated that there is a positive correlation between the scores assigned to expository essay and the raters' level of agreeableness ($\rho=0.03$, = .462). Another significant high positive correlation has also been detected ($\rho=.00$, r = .694) between the content of the scores assigned to expository essay and raters' level of agreeableness. "Agreeableness is primarily a dimension of interpersonal tendencies" (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 15). Agreeable people are highly altruistic and considerate. They are usually characterized as sympathetic and helpful individuals who tend to concur with others. As a result, they might be willing to accept the argument that students set forth concerning the topic. It could be stated that raters with low scores on agreeableness tend to score students' writing low while the content might be of satisfactory adequacy. On the other hand, agreeable raters tend to score the expository essay higher even if they don't benefit from an acceptable content. The researcher also expected to find the same correlation and even a more intensifying one between the scores assigned to

argumentative essay and raters' level of agreeableness, but no correlation was found which might be due to the limitations of the study.

The results also indicate a high significant negative correlation ($\rho= .002$, $r= -.625$) between the raters' level of openness and scores assigned to mechanic part of the argumentative essays. The openness is not as well known as other Neuroticism or Extroversion. Individuals who score high on openness are "curious about the inner and our worlds… and are willing to entertain novel ideas and unconventional values…" (Costa and McCrae, 1992, p. 15).But those score low on openness "tend to be conventional in behavior and conservative in outlook... and prefer the familiar to the novel…" (Costa and McCrae, 1992, p. 15). The researcher expects to find a positive correlation between the mechanics and the level of openness since open people are in favor of brand new ideas and may not pay attention to conventional punctuations. In spite of what has been assumed, there is high negative correlation between these two aspects of personality and assessment. However, this negative correlation can be justified by posing the fact that open raters might devote more scores to other parts of scale due to the fact that they are not stick to conventional features like mechanics and overlook this part.

The participants differed in their level of neuroticism. Based on the manual, 10 of them were classified as being highly neurotic and 12 as being very highly neurotic. An independent t-test was run to detect any probable significant differences. But no significant difference was reported. However, a significant difference might be found among raters who fall at the two ends of the neuroticism spectrum

As can be seen from Table 3, the results of the study reveal that genre was also significant across the board ($\rho=.00$); that is the raters tended to score the argumentative essay more highly and consistently while the scores assigned to the expository essay are lower and its standard deviation is higher. It can be stated that the raters that expect students to provide more strong argument in expository essays rather than argumentative one. Such a result can also be attributed to the correlation found between expository essay and the level of agreeableness while this correlation was not found between the argumentative essay and being agreeable.

Also, interestingly, the result did not reveal any statistically significant effects for extroversion and conscientiousness. However, it cannot be firmly claimed that these traits do not impact the evaluation of learners' writing, since all of the participants in this study did not differ widely in these two domains; that is were highly extravert and conscientious. While in more heterogeneous group, probable impact might be found out regarding these domains of personality. One can propose that a probable relationship might be detected between conscientiousness and scores assigned to organization of the essays. Being well-organized is one of the main facets of conscientiousness; that is conscientious people are usually neat, tidy and orderly (Costa and McCrae, 1992). Hence, they may tend to focus more on the organization of essays rather than other parts.

Generally, as the results signified the raters are personally engaged in the process of rating, and act as individual readers rather than impartial raters. In other words, raters with different personality types may tend to evaluate writing differently. This is also in line with studies done on this issue (e.g., Connors & Lunsford, 1993; Hout, 1993) as well as the literature on rater variable (e.g., Carrell, 1995; Grown, 1984; Lumley, 2002; Marefat, 2006) which revealed some hidden layers of factors affecting writing assessment.

Conclusion and Further Directions

Previous researches on the relationship of raters' personalities to writing assessment have focused on raters' personality types and holistic evaluation of students' writing, and mostly overlooked the impact of personality dimensions on the analytic evaluation of writing products. The main objective of the present study was to investigate the relationship between some personality traits and the accuracy of writing assessment which is a multifaceted process affected by a number of factors.

As the result indicates the traces of probable impacts of raters' personality traits on analytic evaluation of students' writing have been detected. Regarding the first question posed, the results signified that there is a positive correlation between the scores assigned to expository essay and the raters' level of agreeableness as well as between the content of the scores assigned to essay of this genre and raters' level of agreeableness; that is agreeable raters tend to rate expository essays more highly than do raters on the other end of the continuum. A negative correlation was also found between the raters' level of openness and scores assigned to mechanic part of the argumentative essays. Investigating the second question, the researcher found that raters' personality traits impact the scores they assign to expository essay rather than the argumentative one.

Of course, generalizing the findings of this research to the population has its own limitations and any attempt to do so should be done cautiously. One of the limitations was the small number of raters. Additionally, one may refer to the homogeneity of the participants. In this study, the knowledge of raters has not been examined and one may consider their teaching experience as a significant factor in the process of writing assessment. Moreover, as Marefat stated (2006) other essay genre could be added since it might just be the case that different genre applying different rhetorical organizations could introduce different impacts. The comparison of two completely different genres like argumentative and narrative or descriptive essays might lead to a more significant result. However, the result of the study implied that making teachers aware of their personality traits and their probable impact on the evaluation of students' writing may increase the accuracy and fairness of the scoring by decreasing the bias that might be due to their personalities.

References

Bachman, L. F. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bailey, P., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daley, Ch. E. (2000). Correlates of anxiety at three stages of the foreign language learning process. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 19, 474–490.

Barritt, L, Stock, P.L., & Clark, E. (1986). Researching practice: Evaluating assessment essays. College Composition and Communication, 37,315- 327.

Birjanid, P. & Siyyari. M. (2010). The Big five personality traits: A new horizon of research in language learning and applied linguistics. Paper presented at the 8th TELLSI conference, Al-Zahra University, Tehran, Iran.

Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd ed). NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching. New York: Pearson Longman.

Callahan, S. (2000). Responding to the invisible student. Assessing Writing, 7 (1), 57-77.

Carell, P.L. (1995). The effect of writers' personalities and raters' personalities on the holistic evaluation of writing. Assessing Writing, 2(2), 153-190.

Casanave, C.P. (2003). Looking ahead to more sociopolitically-oriented case study research in L2 writing scholarship (But should it be called ''post-process''?). Journal of Second Language Writing, 12, 85–102.

Cho, Y. (2003). Assessing writing: Are we bound by only one method? Assessing Writing, 8, 165–191.

Cohen, A. (1994). Assessing language ability in the classroom (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Connors, R.J., & Lunsford, A.A. (1993). Teachers' rhetorical comments on student papers. College Composition and Communication, 44, 200-223.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R.(1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO–PI- R) and NEO Five-factor Inventory (NEO–FFI): Professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources Inc.

Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. Modern Language Journal, 74 (3), 311-27.

Ehrman, M.E. & Oxford, R. (1995). Cognition plus: correlates of language learning success. Modern Language Journal, 79 (1), 67- 89.

Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2006). Theories of personality (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1977). Problem-solving strategies and the writing process. College English, 39 (4), 449–461.

Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32 (4), 365–387.

Gowen, S. (1984, April). Writing, rating, and personality type. Paper presented at the ninth annual University System of Georgia Developmental Studies Conference, Athens.

Hatch, J.A., Hill, CA., & Hayes, J.R. (1993). When the messenger is the message. Written Communication, 10, 569-598.

Huot, B. (1993). The influence of holistic scoring procedures on reading and rating student essays. In M. Williamson & B. Huot (eds). Validating holistic scoring for writing assessment: Theoretical and empirical foundations. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Hyland, K. (2003). Second Language Writing. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Jensen, G.H., & DiTiberio, J.K. (1984). Personality and individual writing processes. College Composition and Communication, 35, 285-300.

King, C. (1998). Battling the six evil geniuses of essay writing. Political Science & Politics, 30 (1), 59–63.

Lumley, T. (2002). Assessment criteria in a large-scale writing test: What do they really mean to the raters? Language Testing, 19 (3), 246–276.

Marefat, F. (2006). Student writing, personality type of the student and the rater: Any interrelationship? Reading Matrix, 6(2), 116-124.

Schaefer, E. (2008). Rater bias patterns in an EFL writing assessment. Language Testing. 25(4), 465-493.

Sdorow, L. M. (1998). Psychology (4 ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Thompson, T. (1991, March). Personality type and responding to students' writing: Directions for Study. Paper presented at Annual meeting of the conference on college composition and communication, Boston, MA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED 332 208)

Walter, K.M. (1984). Writing in three disciplines correlated with Jungian cognitive styles. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, USA.

Wilz, B. (2000). Relationship between personality type and Grade Point Average of technical college students. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Wisconsin-Stout.

Wigglesworth, G. (1993). Exploring bias analysis as a tool for improving rater consistency in assessing oral interaction. Language Testing, 10, 305-335.

Appendix A

NEO-FFI

NEO Five Factor Invetory

Test Booklet-Form S (Adult)

Paul T, Costa. Jr

Instructions

Write only where indicated in this booklet. Carefully read all of the instructions before beginning. This questionnaire contains 60 statements. Read each statement carefully. For each statement fill in the circle with the response that best represents your opinion. Make sure that your answer is in the correct box.

Fill in the SD if you *strongly disagree* or the statement is definitely false.

Fill in the D if you *disagree* or the statement is mostly false.

Fill in N if you are *neutral* on the statement, if you cannot decide, or if the statement is about equally true and false.

Fill in A if you *agree* or the statement is mostly true.

Fill in SA if you *strongly agree* or the statement is definitely true.

For example, if you strongly disagree or believe that a statement is definitely false, you would fill in the SD for that statement.

Fill in only one response for each statement. Respond to all of the statements, making sure that you feel in the correct response. DO NOT ERASE! If you need to change an answer, make an "X" through the incorrect response and then fill in the correct response.

Note that the responses are numbered in rows. Before responding to the statements, turn to the inside of the booklet and enter your name, age, gender, and today's date.

Name--   Age-------------

Gender--------   Today's date-------------

1. I'm not a worrier.

2. I like to have a lot of people around me.

3. I don't like to waste my time daydreaming.

4. I try to be courteous to everyone I meet.

5. I keep my belongings neat and clean.

6. I often feel inferior to others

7. I laugh easily.

8. Once I find the right way to do something, I stick to it.

9. I often get into arguments with my family and co-workers.

10. I'm pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time.

11. When I'm under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel I'm going to pieces.

12. I don't consider myself especially "light-hearted".

13. I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature.
14. Some people think I'm selfish and egotistical.
15. I am not a very methodical person.
16. I rarely feel lonely or blue.
17. I really enjoy talking to people
18. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them.
19. I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them.
20. I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me consciously.
21. I often feel tense and jittery.
22. I like to be where the action is.
23. Poetry has little or no effect on me.
24. I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others' intentions.
25. I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion.
26. Sometimes I feel completely worthless.
27. I usually prefer to do things alone.
28. I often try new and foreign foods.
29. I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them.
30. I waste a lot of time before settling down to work.
31. I rarely feel fearful or anxious.
32. I often feel as I'm bursting with energy.
33. I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environment produce.
34. Most people I know like me.
35. I work hard to accomplish my goals.
36. I often get angry at the way people treat me.
37. I am cheerful, high-spirited person.
38. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues.
39. Some people think of me as cold and calculating.
40. When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through.
41. Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up.
42. I am not a cheerful optimist.
43. Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement.
44. I'm hard-headed and tough minded in my attitudes.
45. Sometimes I'm not dependable or reliable as I should be.
46. I'm seldom sad or depressed.
47. My life is fast-paced.
48. I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.
49. I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.
50. I am a productive person who always gets the job done.
51. I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems.
52. I am a very active person.
53. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity.
54. If I don't like people, I let them know it.
55. I never seem to be able to get organized.
56. At times I have been so ashamed I just wanted to hide.
57. I would rather go my own way than be a leader of others.
58. I often enjoy playing with theories or abstracts of ideas.
59. If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want.
60. I strive for excellence in everything I do.
Enter your response here- remember to enter responses ACROSS the rows.

SD= Strongly Disagree; D= Disagree; N= Neutral; A=Agree; SA= Strongly Agree
Have you responded to all of the statements?--- Yes ------ No
Have you entered your responses in the correct boxes?---------
Yes   ----------- No
Have you responded accurately and honestly?-----Yes ------ No
Appendix B

Class participation is mostly obligatory in many universities. However, nowadays it's seen that some students don't go to the classes regularly so it arouses the question wether going to the classes should be optional for university students or not. While some believe that participation should be obligatory because otherwise it can harm the process of learning, others think that it's better to take it optional.

Unfortunately most of people say that students should take part in all classes because if they don't, their level of learning may decline. They believe that classes give them a fixed schedual for studying and if they don't take part, after a while, they will be in active. But they don't consider that they can have their own personal plan in a much more appropriate way, because they know themselves better than anyone else. Also they don't feel the stress and the pressure being in a class so they can be relax at home and study their lessons well by themselves. If the student is really eager enough to finish a task in time so he will do it whether he goes to classes or not.

Moreover, there are other participation. It's probable that after a while some students may lose their interests in the field they're studying and they just want to finish the terms and get the degree, so if that becomes optional they can decide not to go to the classes. The other positive consequence of that would be that the other students who are not interested and just make noise or disturb others will not go then other group can benefit the classes completely. Practitioners can also benefit from having optional attendance; even if it will give the opportunity to those who want to go to work. Also, some cannot understand a specific way of teaching by a professor therefore, they can study by themselves; even they are able to study other related materials since they have much time because they don't need to travel to and from the university several days a week.

To conclude, it can be said that optional participation is much more acceptable by both students and professors. It can be fruitful to three groups of students, those who are not interested and those who are and the others who have special way of learning. By trying to gather and record all the positive consequences of optional participation the idea can be widespread so all the students are able to get what they want.
Appendix C

Due to the financial and social problems, universities are accepting a large number of students. In what ways does it affect the quality of education?

Recently different important events have taken place in the financial and social arenas which have caused some problems in various aspects of society including education and universities. Universities as one of the most important sectors of the society have the important role of educating and training the future generation and to do so they need organized financial plans. However, due to the financial and social problems, universities are now accepting a larger number of students to cope with their own economical problems. This has affected the quality of education in different ways among which are the little facilities comparing to the number of students and lower quality of learning due to the crowded classes.

As you know, universities offer different facilities and services to their students. These facilities are usually fixed and the quantity is in accordance with a definite number of students. As the universities increase the number of their students they often neglect the facilities increase. Consequently all the students cannot be with the provided with the facilities which are sometimes crucial to the education process. In this way most of the students lack the sufficient learned material which decrease their merit to perform their jobs accurately.

Many students when asked are really complaining about the crowded classes and campus of their university. More over the dense population of the students in the classroom, which really affects the learning quality, usually the low number of professors has made the faculties to have them teach courses which are not specialized field. Also this dense population brings with it a variety of culture which has caused the students to have serious problems in getting a long with each other.

What mentioned above is just a token of the ways education is affected. Universities are the now losing their functionality indeed. It's time for the authorities to come up with a real solution to this problem and stop this "the more, the merrier" slogan. This process can really affect the future opportunities if not stopped and may cause serious irritable results.

Appendix D
Jacob's Rating Scale

SCORE RANGE	CONTENT CRITERIA
30-27	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • thorough development of thesis • relevant to assigned topic
26-22	GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail
21-17	FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development of topic
16-13	VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR not enough to evaluate

SCORE RANGE	ORGANIZATION CRITERIA
20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression • ideas clearly stated/ supported • succinct • well-organized • logical sequencing • cohesive
17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy • loosely organized but main ideas stand out • limited support • logical but incomplete sequencing
13-10	FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent • ideas confused or disconnected • lacks logical sequencing and development
9-7	VERY POOR: does not communicate • no organization • OR not enough to evaluate

SCORE RANGE	VOCABULARY CRITERIA
20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register
17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured
13-10	FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage • meaning confused or obscured
9-7	VERY POOR: essentially translation • little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR not enough to evaluate

SCORE RANGE	LANGUAGE USE CRITERIA
25-22	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions
21-18	GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex constructions • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured
17-11	FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/complex constructions • frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions • meaning confused or obscured
10-5	VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR not enough to evaluate

SCORE RANGE	MECHANICS CRITERIA
5	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing
4	GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured
3	FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • poor handwriting • meaning confused or obscured
2	VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • handwriting illegible • OR not enough to evaluate

Table 1: The Big Five Dimensions & Facets, adapted form Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO–PI- R) and NEO Five-factor Inventory (NEO–FFI): Professional manual. By P.T. Costa, & R. McCrae, 1992. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources Inc.

Dimensions	Neuroticism	Extraversion	Openness	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness
	Anxiety	Warmth	Fantasy	Trust	Competence
	Hostility	Gregariousness	Aesthetics	Straightforwardness	Order
Facets	Depression	Assertiveness	Feelings	Altruism	Dutifulness
	Self-Consciousness	Activity	Actions	Compliance	Achievement Striving
	Impulsiveness	Excitement Seeking	Ideas	Modesty	Self-Discipline
	Vulnerability to Stress	Positive Emotion	Values	Tender mindedness	Deliberation

Table 2. Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Expository	75.1818	22	7.47463	1.59360
	Argumentative	81.5227	22	5.49129	1.17075

Table.3. Paired Sample test

	Paired Differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
-6.34091	7.21999	1.53931	-9.54207	-3.13975		-4.119	21	.000

Appendi x-I

1	SD	D	N	A	SA	2	SD	D	N	A	SA	3	SD	D	N	A	SA	4	SD	D	N	A	SA	5	SD	D	N	A	SA
6	SD	D	N	A	SA	7	SD	D	N	A	SA	8	SD	D	N	A	SA	9	SD	D	N	A	SA	1	SD	D	N	A	SA
1	SD	D	N	A	SA	12	SD	D	N	A	SA	13	SD	D	N	A	SA	14	SD	D	N	A	SA	15	SD	D	N	A	SA
1	SD	D	N	A	SA	17	SD	D	N	A	SA	18	SD	D	N	A	SA	19	SD	D	N	A	SA	20	SD	D	N	A	SA
2	SD	D	N	A	SA	22	SD	D	N	A	SA	23	SD	D	N	A	SA	24	SD	D	N	A	SA	25	SD	D	N	A	SA
2	SD	D	N	A	SA	27	SD	D	N	A	SA	28	SD	D	N	A	SA	29	SD	D	N	A	SA	30	SD	D	N	A	SA
3	SD	D	N	A	SA	32	SD	D	N	A	SA	33	SD	D	N	A	SA	34	SD	D	N	A	SA	35	SD	D	N	A	SA
3	SD	D	N	A	SA	37	SD	D	N	A	SA	38	SD	D	N	A	SA	39	SD	D	N	A	SA	40	SD	D	N	A	SA
4	SD	D	N	A	SA	42	SD	D	N	A	SA	43	SD	D	N	A	SA	44	SD	D	N	A	SA	45	SD	D	N	A	SA