

Research Article

The Role of Self-Assessment in English Language Teachers' Professional Development in Pakistan

Lubna Quddus Warsi  and Khalid Khurshid 

Department of Education, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Bosan Road, 60000 Multan, Pakistan

Correspondence should be addressed to Lubna Quddus Warsi; lubnasubzwari@gmail.com

Received 11 February 2022; Accepted 26 March 2022; Published 8 April 2022

Academic Editor: Mehdi Nasri

Copyright © 2022 Lubna Quddus Warsi and Khalid Khurshid. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

This research attempted to explore the role of self-assessment (SA) as a professional development (PD) strategy to bring about continuous professional development of English language teachers in job-embedded environment. The crux of this research lies in the fact that teachers' professional development is usually influenced by many external factors, but its desire gusts from inner self. If a teacher does not have a keen desire for self-development, he/she cannot grow professionally, no matter how perfect and supportive the external environment and supervising measures are. In this sense, self-development is the basic motive which brings about professional development, and self-assessment paves the way towards it. The researchers adopted a pragmatic paradigm and explanatory sequential design. To collect data, the Self-assessment Instrument of Teaching Practice (SAITP) was designed to make English language teachers (ELTs) self-assess their teaching practice. After that, ELTs were made to express their views regarding this self-assessment practice on an ELTs' attitude survey designed by the researchers. In the next stage, a semistructured interview session was conducted with the selected ELTs who have already given their responses on SAITP and attitude survey, to get a detailed picture of their mind. For analyses of quantitative data, descriptive and inferential statistics were applied; for qualitative data, a content analysis technique was used. At the end, both quantitative and qualitative data were triangulated to draw conclusions. Findings showed that self-assessment plays an important role in the professional development of English language teachers. It is more effective than traditional professional development programs. This study paves the way for self-assessment and self-development culture in teacher community.

1. Introduction

Nowadays, professional development of teachers is regarded as an essential part of the educational policies to raise the quality of teaching as well as learning processes [1]. The researchers all over the globe agreed upon the significance of the self-assessment (SA) as one of the powerful tools for the professional development [2]. As rapidly changing world establishes new paradigms for the teachers' competencies, self-improvement receives the major focus in this regard and it always begins with self-assessment (SA) and self-assessment skills [3] which are based on their reflection, enabling teachers to resolve the issues they face. A reflective teacher is said to be a good teacher. Each time he teaches a lesson, he learns it himself; he self-assesses his work done as well as progress achieved. In this regard, Wu [4] opines

though many external factors usually influencing professional development of teachers; basically, it is internal and involves oneself. If the teacher does not possess earnest desire for self-development, even a perfect external environment will not make any difference. Similarly, in their study, Davis and McDonald [5] stated that PD becomes influential when teachers identify their personal needs by taking the responsibility of their own continuous professional growth. As stated by Somantri and Harris [6], teachers are to be held responsible for their professional growth. They must be keen enough as to how to grow professionally, if they want to get free from the traditional passive approach which has deprived them of their creativity, empowerment, and effectiveness. Teachers' capability to steer their students towards optimum learning prospects is dependent on their personal professional development.

In Pakistan, teachers' professional development (PD) is neither standardized nor based on satisfactory professional standards [7]. In this connection, Khan [8] after reviewing literature on teachers' professional development in Pakistan claimed that the traditional PD opportunities for teachers rarely enhance their teaching practice and professional learning. By and large, they are formal/traditional programs, in which participants remain passive listener, most of the time. Moreover, they are arranged few and far between and are unable to satisfy teachers' need. Hargreaves [9] in his review study based on a four-year project titled "Trust for the Advancement of Knowledge and Education" (TAKE) challenged that teachers' professional development (TPD) in Pakistan holds no practical role.

According to the Government of Pakistan [10], these ineffective professional development programs resulted in low quality of English language teachers (ELTs). This has always been remained a great issue not only in Punjab but also in other provinces. Further, quality of ELTs at the secondary and higher secondary level in Pakistan is not as per international standards and is worsening day by day. It is an accepted fact that quality of ELTs has a direct connection with quality of students' learning. The latest education policy (2009) lays emphasis on improving the quality of ELTs. To enhance teacher quality, national accreditation council for teacher education is established and professional standards for teachers are set which emphasized on the significance of quality of teacher education and teachers' PD.

Now, almost thirteen years have passed since the educational policy of the Government of Pakistan (2009) was proposed; there is no considerable improvement in English language teaching and learning. In addition to it, quality of English language teachers is directly related to the quality of students' learning. According to the study in [11], performance of Pakistani students in the subject of English has always been a debatable matter since the creation of Pakistan. The performance of intermediate students in the subject of English is not up to the required standards. The majority of students do not have required grip in reading, listening, writing, and speaking skills. Many factors are responsible for this poor standard of English: students' weak base in English, the root cause of which is connected with their schooling; traditional style of teaching and learning in schools and colleges; exam-oriented approach on the part of teachers and students; and above all the teaching methodology used for teaching English. Another important factor is lack of effective professional development of English language teachers as no doubt the quality of ELTs is directly related to the quality of students' learning in the subject of English. Effective teaching, which can bring about students' learning in true sense, claims for professional competence of high levels [12].

Hence, it is the need of the hour to use an innovative or creative approach for teaching English in an effective way. Sancar et al. [13] claimed that it is urgently required to shift focus from the traditional professional development approach to in-class practice of teachers. Effective teacher professional development programs can definitely provide such measures needed to improve this situation. Quality of

English language teachers (ELTs) at the intermediate level in Pakistan is not as per international standards and is facing a continuous downfall. Keeping in view this situation, the researcher attempted to study the role of SA as an informal PD strategy to support teachers in their attempt to improve and update their teaching practice, in job-embedded context. As in [14], teachers' PD can occur in a formal as well as informal manner. The formal way of PD includes attending PD workshops and courses, and the informal way of PD includes interaction with colleagues/peers, book reading, and reflections on teaching on a daily basis. SA, being an informal PD strategy, can help language teachers to improve their performance by reflecting on their own practice, getting their weaknesses fixed, and improving it.

2. Theoretical Framework

The researchers modelled their research on a professional development approach, titled 'Teaching for Success' designed by [15]. It proposes a global continuing professional development framework (CPDF) which offers a self-assessment tool (SAT). Further, Borg and Edmett [16] evaluated the SAT, with specific focus on its design and how English language teachers responded to it. The researchers of this study further modified SAT proposed by the British Council and modified by Borg and Edmett [16] for English language teachers, in the light of National Professional Standards for Teachers [10], and designed Self-assessment Instrument of Teaching Practice (SAITP) to make ELTs self-assess their teaching practice.

3. Literature Review

3.1. Historical Perspective of Self-Assessment (SA). This section offers a brief review of self-assessment literature till to date. Teacher self-assessment (SA) became prominent as a distinctive area of research because of Flanders' [17] work on interaction analysis [18]. In this research work, teachers are involved in examining their own recorded teaching sessions being recorded by using Flander's Interaction Analysis System (FIAS) [19]. Further, during the late 1960s and 1970s and early 1980s, a lot of researchers investigated teaching behaviors and students' behaviors that could direct towards better results in students' learning. Hence, in that period, the main focus of SA was improving classroom instruction by taking in account classroom behaviors. This SA procedure comprised of rating scales, coding guides, checklists, and audio/visual equipment to help teachers focus on their performance in order to improve teaching performances. Further, teachers used instruments to identify objectively students' behaviors to judge their own teaching practice [20]. Allen et al. [21] and Bailey [22] gave detailed instructions regarding "how to" of SA and provided the list of the instruments which could be used for assessing teachers' as well as students' behaviors in the classroom. He outlined SA as a process that involves self-analysis of teaching practice for self-improvement. Centra [23] outlined SA as a process which enables teachers to rank their teaching efficacy on some

scale or provide the concise written appraisal related to teaching behavior. In this connection, Schön [24] regarded teachers' SA as the part of some ongoing process related to teachers' effort for evaluating level of effectiveness of their performance, skills, methods, and attitudes required for adjusting themselves. It is a formative evaluation process that all teachers should perform to develop their personal as well as professional knowledge for assessing their instructional effectiveness on a daily basis. Moreover, allocating certain responsibilities to the teachers to evaluate their own work is a suitable technique to acknowledge their position as professionals [25]. Self-assessment is regarded as an indicator for self-awareness that helps in knowing one's own capabilities regarding strengths and weaknesses [26, 27]. Similarly, as suggested in [28], SA comprises of three basic components: recognition of the preferred goal and verification of the current position, along with recognizing as to how to bridge the gap in two of them. Teachers' self-assessment makes them aware of their own strengths and deficiencies and encourages mutual interactions with their colleagues which adds to their professional growth. It also helps administrators make decisions regarding teaching responsibilities [29]. SA includes three domains of the self-regulated learning, i.e. cognitive, affective, and motivational [30]. Moreover, SA is vital for autonomous learning and serves as the regulatory practice which contributes to the metacognitive growth [31]. It is closely linked with self-monitoring, by which an individual compares the outcome with standards to determine whether objectives are met or further work is required [32]. In addition to it, reliable SA enables to construct a significant picture of an individual's eagerness to boost his knowledge, ability, skill, and practice to support decision-making for future development [33]. As suggested in [34], SA incorporates three processes; i.e., self-observation is concerned with the conscious consideration of teaching attributes, self-judgment signifies judging the performance against established goals, and self-reactions are concerned with the teacher's belief regarding his achievements/progress. Krebt [35] defined SA as a method of the formative assessment in which teachers do reflect on as well as assess quality of their own work as per some criteria and identify their strengths and weaknesses of their performance and revise it accordingly. It assists new teachers to learn and improve gradually, and for veterans, it serves as a source to enhance career opportunities [36]. In this connection, Bakhmat [2] considered SA as the continuing process for evaluating effectiveness of performance to determine the required improvements. SA is a pervasive notion in education [16]. SA and self-reflection are prerequisites to ensure teachers' quality. Teachers' SA is vital for making teachers more conscientious regarding their competence and quality of their performance [37]. Similarly, the study in [38] recommended SA as an effective and cost-effective technique for teachers' self-evaluation which kindles in them a desire for self-improvement. It makes teachers judge their performance. In the metareview, conducted by Harrison et al. [39], SA was promoted as a significant mechanism for reflecting on and enhancing teaching practice.

3.2. Self-Assessment Tools. To enable teachers to self-assess, various SA tools are in practice worldwide. These tools are based on some predetermined criteria or standards which support the user to compare his existing practice with that of the standard and identify by himself where does he stand, what is lacking, and what is needed to get improved. Borg and Edmett [16] designed SAT for English teachers and got responses of 1,716 teachers from all over the world. SAT consists of nine elements of teaching proficiency such as lesson planning, subject matter knowledge, lesson management, resource management, empathy towards students, assessment of students' learning, the usage of technology for effective teaching practice, the usage of inclusive techniques, and the promotion of leadership approach, critical thinking, digital literacy, and citizenship. Teachers gave their feedback for SAT, and their comments about its relevance, clarity, and significance were mostly positive. Anwar et al. [40] used this SAT proposed in [16] to explore the qualities of an effective English language teacher being conceived by ELTs at institutes of higher education in Pakistan. Further, in the area of English teachers' evaluation, many frameworks have been developed which include self-assessment practice, in the recent years. These frameworks claim that teachers can judge what they need and how they can improve themselves to get the desired results by reflecting in some systematic manner [16]. In this context, the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL2) is developed with a self-assessment section having 193 descriptors to measure competences required for language teaching. These descriptors are basically core competencies that English teachers should endeavour to achieve [41]. The British Association of Lecturers in English for Academic Purposes (BALEAP) offers the Competency Framework for Teachers of English for Academic Purposes; a number of purposes are listed, and the important one is self-monitoring of PD. Similarly, Cambridge Assessment English offers a framework to help teachers see where they stand in their development process and think as to where they want to move next. Similarly, European Profiling Grid offers SA criteria for a number of the latest language teaching competencies and skills to help ELTs grow professionally sounder [42]. Further, the British Council offers the SA framework for PD of English teachers, titled as "Teaching for Success." It comprises of the international continuing professional development (CPD) framework with 12 professional skills; each of them is divided into more comprehensive "elements" describing what a teacher should know as well as do to be professionally strong [43]. Similarly, as described by Kyrgiridis et al. [44], there are subject-specific examples of self-evaluation of teachers' effectiveness such as the questionnaire for SA in the subject of physical education. In the same connection, Marzano and Toth [45] presented a tool including 41 teaching strategies as well as behaviours. A widely used framework for teaching [46] is structured having four domains and 22 components as well as 76 less important elements.

In the same way, Alena et al. [47] in their study presented the assessment tools and the methodology for teachers' SA which is implemented at the Faculty of

Education at Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra. They used both qualitative and quantitative research methods. The findings showed that introducing teachers' SA into internal mechanism of quality management exerts a positive impact on the teacher's professional performance. Costea and Golu [48] developed and validated a tool for assessment of the perceived competences in didactic activity for the group of teachers of Romania. King [49] developed a teachers' SA instrument having six factors within two principal constructs, giving rise to a single positive relationship scale having three factors, as well as three interrelated, but distinct, scales measuring the elements of classroom environment. In addition to it, Schmidt et al. [50] proposed steps to design and validate the SA tool to measure preservice teachers' SA of their technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) as well as interrelated knowledge domain as comprised in the given framework. Akram and Zepeda [36] developed and validated a Self-assessment Instrument for Teacher Evaluation (SITE II) grounded in five National Professional Standards for Teachers proposed by the Ministry of Education, Pakistan. Longoria [51] carried out quantitative causal-comparative research to assess differences between mentored and nonmentored teachers of high school who are newly hired by using SA Instrument for Teacher Evaluation II (SITE II) and Professional Practice Ratings [52].

3.3. Theoretical Background of Self-Assessment. The theories guiding this research include Albert Bandura's social cognitive theory, metacognitive theory, self-efficacy theory, self-regulated learning theory, and Knowles' theory of andragogy. According to Bandura and Walters [53], social cognitive theory (SCT) describes that people usually develop their perceptions regarding their characteristics and abilities that consequently monitor their behavior by defining what an individual tries to attain as well as how much endeavor he puts into his performance. SA is a vital component of cognitive as well as constructivist theories of learning and motivation. Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934), a Russian psychologist, is thought of as the father of the social constructivist theory. He followed John Piaget—who is credited to offer bases of constructivism. Woolfolk [54] argues that constructivism can be best understood by knowing as to how individuals make use of resources, information, and support from others in order to build and develop their own mental models as well as problem solving approaches. "Scaffolding" is regarded as one of the major constructivist pedagogies. SA and peer assessment are the familiar paradigms of scaffolding. Metacognition literature offers theory as well as empirical evidence to support self-evaluation and self-monitoring as the feasible metacognitive skills. Researches in metacognition field began with Flavell [55] who suggested that people learn to regulate their thinking by monitoring what they know about themselves and others about tasks as well as strategies. He theorized metacognition as "thinking about thinking." Spady [56] claims that metacognition theory provides the basis for formative SA. Albert Bandura is

the pioneer of self-efficacy theory. Bandura's [57] social cognitive theory regards self-efficacy as the most significant capability for determining the human future behavior. This capacity helps people judge their own capabilities of organizing and executing actions to get the desired performance level. Self-efficacy is an important mediator of self-reflection. By doing self-reflection or through reflecting on motives and beliefs, people may self-assess and interpret their behaviors, thought, and personal motivation. The current phenomenological study also implements Knowles' [58] theory of andragogy. Knowles emphasized that adults are self-directed and expect to take responsibility for decisions [59]. There appears to be a connection between andragogy and constructivism. Like andragogy, constructivism entails active engagement and involvement of students in the teaching-learning encounter. In andragogy and constructivism, students coconstruct and cocreate, rather than passively receiving knowledge. The same principle is applied in self-assessments [60, 61]. Self-assessment as a reflective practice for the self and professional development of teachers is equally supported by all the given theories.

3.4. Self-Assessment and Teachers' Professional Development.

The researchers, worldwide, agreed upon the significance of SA as a powerful tool for PD. It brushes up knowledge, brings satisfaction, and kindles a desire to achieve career goals through self-improvement. With the dawn of the new era, new standards for teachers' competencies have been set. Self-improvement has been seen as a glaring aspect of quality teaching. Reflective teachers are considered good teachers as every time they teach a lesson, they also learn a lesson for themselves by reflecting and evaluating their performance. Moreover, critical self-evaluation always brings improvements by making teachers review their techniques for better outcomes next time [2]. This will occur only when reflective practices are integrated with assessment reviews. Sharma and Pandher [62] suggested that teachers should often undergo the processes of SA and self-reflection. This involves a profound commitment towards their profession as well as a strong desire of making the difference. Borgmeier et al. [63] suggested that teachers' self-assessment can be used as a device to bring about professional development of teachers in schools.

After an extensive literature review, it is clear that there exists a positive connection between ELTs' self-assessment and their PD as improvement in teaching practice starts with the effective self-assessment which enables teachers to understand their mistakes and get them fixed to ensure quality education. Self-assessment is a necessary step in personal and professional development, as literature suggests that traditional PD programs in Pakistan do not instill reflective practice as well as critical thinking. In Pakistan, teachers' professional development is based on a traditional formal perspective which hardly contributes to teachers' PD. There is dire need to change this mode. Hence, research is required to examine the role of self-assessment as an informal professional development strategy which is bound to promote

reflective practice and critical thinking. The following research questions guide the current study:

RQ1. How do English language teachers self-assess their teaching practice on Self-assessment Instrument of Teaching Practice (SAITP)?

RQ2. What is the relationship between English language teachers' self-assessment (SA) and their professional development?

4. Methodology

4.1. Research Design. The researchers adopted a pragmatic paradigm which strongly recommends mixed method research design. Therefore, explanatory sequential design was used. It follows the quantitative → qualitative strand. The researchers administrated Self-assessment Instrument of Teaching Practice (SAITP) first, to get views of ELTs. In the next stage, semistructured interviews were conducted. The interviews helped to provide details of factors identified in SAITP and helped to interpret the individual ELT's perspective regarding the research phenomenon. Next, according to Creswell [64], quantitative and qualitative data can be triangulated at a number of stages. In this research, qualitative data set complemented the analysis of the quantitative data set; qualitative and quantitative data were triangulated during the analysis and interpretation phase. The findings of the research were given in a thematic sequence which is related to research questions. Qualitative and quantitative data were separately analysed; discussions and conclusions were made incorporating these data groups.

4.2. Population and Sampling. The researchers used the stratified random sampling technique for drawing a sample of 341 ELTs (from the most populated province of Pakistan, i.e., Punjab) for generating data for quantitative analysis. A sample of 169 ELTs from the public sector and 172 ELTs from private sectors were taken. In addition to it, a purposive sampling technique was used for drawing a sample of 20 ELTs for semistructured interviews.

4.3. Instrumentation. To address the purpose of the study, two quantitative instruments and one qualitative instrument were designed.

4.3.1. Self-Assessment Instrument of Teaching Practice (SAITP). SAITP was designed to get the response of ELTs' self-assessment of their teaching practice. The researchers of this study adapted the tool which is part of an approach to the professional development of English language teachers called "Teaching for Success" developed by the British Council. It includes a global continuing professional development (CPD) framework which offers professional practices that teachers are required to know and do as part of their professional practice [16]. In addition to it, the researchers also consulted the National Professional Standards for Teachers (2009) in Pakistan. Seven professional standards which are common in "Teaching for Success" developed by the British Council and National Professional Standards for Teachers (2009) developed by the Pakistan Education Commission were selected for SAITP. These

included knowing the subject (KnS), planning lessons and courses (LP), managing the lessons (ML), understanding learners (UL), learning environment (LE), assessing learning (AL), and integrating information and communications technology (IICT). Regarding the details of items included in SAITP, items 1 to 6 are demographic variables; items ranging from 7 to 60 measure ELTs' response for various teaching competences.

4.3.2. Teachers' Attitude Survey. In order to know the ELTs response regarding Self-assessment Instrument of Teaching Practice (SAITP) and professional development (PD), teachers' attitude survey was developed. It possessed 12 items.

4.3.3. Interview Protocol. In order to collect the qualitative data, a semistructured interview protocol having 12 questions was designed.

4.3.4. Validity and Reliability of Instruments. To establish the validity of instruments designed for this study, the researcher discussed with a number of experts and educationists and got their point of view regarding the scale. In the light of their feedback, tools were modified before and after piloting the study. Items included in SAITP were previously used by other researchers, as those were already established to be valid items; the researchers attempted to make them culture friendly. A pilot survey was conducted to refine the contents and lessen the ambiguity or doubt in overall impact of validity of data. By using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, internal consistency coefficient of SAITP was determined to be 0.918 for all the items while internal consistency coefficient of teachers' attitude survey was determined to be 0.959 for all.

4.4. Data Analyses. To analyse the quantitative data, the researchers used SPSS version 23. Descriptive statistics including mean, percentage, and standard deviation were used. Inferential statistics including *t*-test and ANOVA were used. For analysing qualitative data, content analysis was done.

4.5. Triangulation of Qualitative and Quantitative Data. Findings of qualitative and quantitative data were triangulated to draw the final conclusions.

5. Findings

The following findings are detailed w. r. t. research questions of this study.

5.1. RQ1: How Do ELTs Self-Assess Their Teaching Practice on Self-Assessment Instrument of Teaching Practice (SAITP)? To get the answer of this question, ELTs were made to give their response on SAITP. Analysis, findings, and triangulation of quantitative as well qualitative data are given as follows.

5.1.1. Quantitative Analysis: SAITP Consisted of 60 Items. The items 1-6 focus on demographics. An independent sample *t*-test was applied to identify differences between ELTs of

TABLE 1: *t*-test for the college sector (public/private).

	College	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Sig
SAITP	Public sector	169	185.6213	23.80023	0.094
	Private sector	172	181.0407	26.53264	

TABLE 2: *t*-test for gender.

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Sig
SAITP	Male	165	181.9515	25.16041	0.337
	Female	176	184.5852	25.40222	

public sector colleges and private sector colleges (Table 1) as well as gender (Table 2), regarding their self-assessment ratings on SAITP. There exists an insignificant difference between responses of English language teachers of public and private sectors on SAITP as the value of $p = 0.094$ which is more than 0.05. Similarly, there exists an insignificant difference between responses of male and female English language teachers of public and private sectors on SAITP as the value of $p = 0.337$ which is more than 0.05. In the same way, the one-way ANOVA test was used to identify differences among ELTs' self-assessment ratings on SAITP in view of their demographic variables, i.e., age group, experience, qualification, and professional qualification (Table 3). For age groups, respondents were divided into six groups (26-30, 31-35, 36-40, 41-45, 46-50, and above 50); for experience, respondents were divided into three groups, i.e., low (0-5), average (6-15), and high (16+). For qualification, respondents were divided into four groups, i.e., B.S, M.A/M.Sc., M.S/M.Phil., and Ph.D. For professional qualification, respondents were divided into five groups, i.e., B.Ed., B.S Ed., M.Ed., M.Phil. Ed., and Ph.D. Ed. Results showed the p values for the age group ($p = 0.522$), qualification ($p = 0.857$), and professional qualification ($p = 0.993$), which are greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$), showing statistically insignificant difference in ELTs' ratings on SAITP. However, the p value for experience ($p = 0.035$) is less than 0.05 which shows statistically significant difference in ELTs' ratings on SAITP on the basis of experience.

The items from 7 to 60 are grouped in seven subcategories, each focusing on one competency of ELTs. These subcategories of SA include knowing the subject (KnS), planning lessons and courses (LP), managing the lessons (ML), understanding learners (UL), learning environment (LE), assessing learning (AL), and integrating information and communications technology (IICT). The detail of responses of ELTs is given in Table 4.

Findings of descriptive analysis (mean, percentage, and standard deviation) for knowing the subject (KnS) showed that by and large, ELTs hardly use core competencies of their subject. They do not use a skill-based approach in language teaching. However, they focused on teaching of grammar. Overall, they use a traditional approach to teaching with the prime focus on rote learning. Similarly, for planning lessons and courses (LP), it was found that they link their contents with students' previous learning and their teaching

goals reflect high hopes. They follow a course outline. But they do not use students' learning data to guide lesson planning nor do they think about merits and demerits of teaching and difficulty level of classwork. Next, for managing the lessons (ML), it was found that ELTs possess a very positive attitude. They manage to make their class enjoyable and friendly, and they communicate content in ways that students can understand. They manage classroom discipline, engage, and motivate students and create climate of mutual trust. They also manage to anticipate problems, minimize disturbance, tackle with learning difficulties, and satisfy majority of their students. They also change their teaching methodology to make it topic relevant. For understanding learners (UL), it was found that ELTs understand general behavior of students, their level of English, and their individual needs and teach them accordingly. They also motivate students who show low interest in learning English. Likewise, for learning environment (LE), it was found that ELTs respond to students' questions, create friendly and supportive classroom environment, and ensure their participation in the class. They also promote critical thinking and problem solving attitude and remain positive. For assessing learning (AL), it was found that ELTs check learners' understanding during the lesson, conduct short class tests, and guide students about improving their performance. They also use assessment results to improve subsequent teaching. On the other hand, checking of students' test and assignment, maintaining students' results, contact with students' parents, and reflecting on the effectiveness of the assessment used are somewhat weak areas of ELTs. Regarding integrating information and communications technology (IICT), it was found that the overall majority of teachers have been ignoring integration of information and communications technology (IICT) with their teaching methodology. It demands their immediate focus and consideration.

5.1.2. Qualitative Analysis. According to the content analyses of qualitative data collected via semistructured interviews of ELTs, SAITP is helpful in self-assessing the core competencies which an English teacher needs for quality teaching. It can make them reflect, as up to what extent they are expert in using them. It will decidedly improve their performance. SAITP is very helpful as it helps ELTs to self-assess not only their subject competencies but also their general behavior as a teacher. It portrays in a very comprehensive way their whole personality as a teacher. They further think that teachers tend to ignore many of the competencies or if they implement, they do it not in an effective way. There are many reasons behind: time constraint, lack of interest on the part of the students, their exam-oriented approach, etc. SAITP seems quite difficult to get implemented in our traditional teaching setup of colleges. Many reasons such as hectic routines, lack of time, and above all lack of interest in diagnostic approaches for the sake of improvement are the main hindrances in its way to get implemented. Teachers may give inflated response and hence may overestimate their performance. Such self-assessment will be useless and futile to get the desired outcome of it. ELTs also suggested that SAITP should be specifically designed as a rubric for a

TABLE 3: ANOVA for ELTs' ratings on SAITP.

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Age group	Between groups	229.839	105	2.189	0.975	0.552
	Within groups	527.586	235	2.245		
	Total	757.425	340			
Experience in years	Between groups	35.849	105	0.341	0.608	0.035
	Within groups	88.333	235	0.376		
	Total	124.182	340			
Qualification	Between groups	36.230	105	0.345	0.833	0.857
	Within groups	97.348	235	0.414		
	Total	133.578	340			
Professional qualification	Between groups	27.021	105	0.257	0.655	0.993
	Within groups	92.322	235	0.393		
	Total	119.343	340			

specific duration to help teachers self-assess their classroom performance after regular intervals. It may be organized after the completion of every term (three/four months) to make teachers self-assess their teaching practice.

At the end, the findings of quantitative and qualitative data were triangulated. It was found that the qualitative strand complemented the quantitative strand and provided an in-depth understanding of the relationships being studied.

5.2. RQ2: What Is the Relationship between English Language Teachers' Self-Assessment (SA) and Their Professional Development (PD)? Answering this question involved testing the proposed hypothesis, i.e., H_0 : there exists no significant relationship between English language teachers' self-assessment (SA) and their professional development. For this, an attitude survey consisting of 12 items was designed to get ELTs' responses.

5.2.1. Quantitative Analysis. Findings of descriptive analysis showed a very positive response of ELTs showing that they strongly agree that SA paves the way towards their professional development. The details of their responses are given in Table 5.

5.2.2. Regression Analysis on Self-Assessment (SA) and Professional Development (PD). Table 6 shows the model summary of self-assessment (SA) and professional development (PD). The R^2 value = 0.507 shows that "SA" explains nearly 51% of the variation in PD which determines that self-assessment increased 51% chances of professional development of English language teachers. Value of the Durbin-Watson test was 1.71 ranging from 1.5 to 2.5. It indicates absence of the autocorrelation in data. Next, Table 7 provides the ANOVA summary of SA and PD: findings of ANOVA showed that the F value was highly significant showing that the independent variable SA included in the model significantly contributes towards PD of English language teachers. For regression analysis on the dependent variable PD and independent variable SA, the model summary and summary of ANOVA and coefficient are given.

Table 8 gives the summary of ANOVA, and the F value was greatly significant indicating that SA highly contributes to PD of English language teachers. Therefore, H_0 was rejected which states that there exists no significant relationship between English language teachers' self-assessment (SA) and their professional development.

Further, the summary of coefficients of self-assessment and professional development also confirms a significant relationship between them. Table 8 gives the coefficient summary of SA and PD. The value of $\beta = 0.712$ has the t value of 18.689 which was greatly significant. It also confirms that SA significantly contributed to the PD.

5.2.3. Qualitative Analysis. Findings of content analyses of qualitative data collected via semistructured interviews of ELTs also confirmed that SA promotes professional development of teachers. They considered SA an apt strategy for brushing up on the knowledge. It enables ELTs to review their teaching performance, and SA, if done properly, can help them to reflect on their weak or neglected areas for the sake of improvement. It can be a driving force for PD. SA should be an integral and frequently used component of their teaching routine and should happen off and on, throughout the year for better guiding and scaffolding actions towards pedagogical improvements. ELTs declared that they self-assess their teaching practice but in a casual or informal way. Sometimes they improve the subsequent area as a result of it, but often they ignore or forget to rethink on their performance in the light of their self-assessment. Moreover, they claimed that it is quite difficult to admit one's own weakness. ELTs may overestimate their performance. Hence, it is not easy to get desired results from their SA. Moreover, ELTs considered that it is quite difficult to implement it in their traditional teaching setup of colleges. Many reasons such as hectic routines, lack of time, and above all lack of interest in diagnostic approaches for the sake of improvement are the main hindrances in its way to get implemented. The majority of ELTs have reservations that their SA practice may not be used for their accountability by college administration. They suggested that the only focus of SA should be the professional development of

TABLE 4: SAITP.

	Never used (1)	Rarely used (2)	Used sometimes (3)	Used often (4)	Used very often (5)	Mean score	Std. deviation
Knowing the subject (KnS)							
7. Communicating in English	24.93%	34.02%	31.96%	7.33%	1.76%	2.27	0.975
8. Encouraging student for English communication	19.06%	28.15%	34.90%	10.26%	7.62%	2.59	1.135
9. Teaching speaking skills	20.53%	34.02%	32.26%	7.92%	5.28%	2.43	1.065
10. Teaching reading skills	21.99%	29.03%	28.45%	11.44%	9.09%	2.57	1.210
11. Teaching listening skills	29.62%	34.90%	25.51%	6.74%	3.23%	2.19	1.038
12. Teaching writing skills	30.79%	32.55%	22.29%	8.80%	5.57%	2.26	1.150
13. Teaching grammar	0.59%	1.47%	10.26%	39.59%	48.09%	4.33	0.766
14. Techniques for learning synonyms	14.37%	19.35%	14.37%	34.02%	17.89%	3.22	1.335
15. Techniques for teaching pronunciation	20.82%	23.75%	17.30%	24.93%	13.20%	2.86	1.354
16. Developmental material to supplement the course	15.84%	23.17%	8.50%	34.31%	18.18%	3.16	1.384
17. Using traditional methods of teaching	7.62%	7.92%	5.57%	22.58%	56.30%	4.12	1.270
18. Preferring rote learning	1.47%	2.93%	5.87%	28.45%	61.29%	4.45	0.848
19. Using an innovative approach	33.14%	33.72%	17.60%	10.56%	4.99%	2.21	1.158
20. Focusing in-depth and conceptual learning	30.21%	45.75%	9.38%	9.09%	5.57%	2.14	1.116
Planning lessons and courses (LP)							
21. Using students' learning data	17.30%	34.02%	16.42%	25.51%	6.74%	2.70	1.214
22. Linking contents	13.49%	31.09%	13.20%	21.99%	20.23%	3.04	1.372
23. Teaching goals reflecting high hopes	1.47%	4.69%	4.40%	26.98%	62.46%	4.44	0.891
24. Thinking about merits and demerits of teaching	25.22%	34.90%	25.51%	8.50%	5.87%	2.35	1.121
25. Thinking about difficulty level of classwork	15.54%	29.03%	20.23%	23.75%	11.44%	2.87	1.262
26. Following course outline	9.68%	20.82%	25.22%	28.45%	15.84%	3.20	1.216
Managing the lessons (ML)							
27. Making English class enjoyable	0.00%	4.99%	26.10%	41.35%	27.57%	3.91	0.855
28. Making classroom friendly	0.59%	2.64%	28.45%	43.11%	25.22%	3.90	0.829
29. Communicating contents	0.88%	0.59%	2.64%	51.91%	43.99%	4.38	0.655
30. Engaging and motivating students	1.17%	0.59%	10.85%	41.94%	45.45%	4.30	0.777
31. Creating climate of mutual trust	0.29%	0.00%	1.17%	21.41%	77.13%	4.75	0.496
32. Classroom discipline	0.59%	1.76%	0.88%	25.81%	70.97%	4.65	0.650
33. Anticipating problems	4.99%	7.04%	23.75%	36.36%	27.86%	3.75	1.090
34. Minimizing disturbance	9.97%	18.48%	26.10%	30.79%	14.66%	3.22	1.198
35. Tackling with learning difficulties	2.64%	18.48%	26.69%	38.12%	14.08%	3.43	1.028
36. Satisfying majority of students	4.99%	13.20%	23.46%	32.84%	25.51%	3.61	1.147
37. Changing teaching methodology	9.68%	15.25%	26.69%	25.22%	23.17%	3.37	1.260
Understanding learners (UL)							
38. Understand general behavior of students	0.00%	1.47%	5.57%	26.10%	66.86%	4.58	0.666
39. Understanding students' level of English	3.23%	10.56%	23.75%	33.14%	29.33%	3.75	1.088
40. Understanding individual needs of students	2.05%	8.21%	31.38%	28.45%	29.91%	3.76	1.035
41. Motivating students	0.59%	0.00%	6.16%	30.79%	62.46%	4.55	0.665
Learning environment (LE)							
42. Responding students' questions	0.00%	0.00%	0.29%	29.91%	69.79%	4.70	0.467
43. Creating friendly and supportive classroom environment	0.00%	0.00%	3.81%	41.94%	54.25%	4.50	0.572
44. Ensuring students' participation	2.64%	1.17%	16.42%	39.30%	40.47%	4.14	0.915
45. Promoting critical thinking and problem-solving attitude	16.72%	25.51%	23.75%	24.63%	9.38%	2.84	1.235

TABLE 4: Continued.

	Never used (1)	Rarely used (2)	Used sometimes (3)	Used often (4)	Used very often (5)	Mean score	Std. deviation
46. Remaining positive and constructive	0.00%	0.00%	2.35%	29.33%	68.33%	4.66	0.522
Assessing learning (AL)							
47. Checking learners' understanding	0.00%	0.00%	0.29%	29.91%	69.79%	4.70	0.467
48. Conducting short class tests	13.20%	14.66%	6.74%	27.27%	38.12%	3.62	1.445
49. Checking students' tests and assignments	29.33%	19.65%	16.42%	16.42%	18.18%	2.74	1.484
50. Guiding students about improving performance	2.93%	4.40%	12.02%	30.50%	50.15%	4.21	1.011
51. Maintaining students' results	23.17%	27.27%	24.93%	13.20%	11.44%	2.62	1.286
52. Contact with students' parents	33.43%	38.12%	12.32%	6.45%	9.68%	2.21	1.244
53. Reflecting on effectiveness of the assessment used	13.20%	24.93%	29.33%	21.41%	11.14%	2.92	1.198
54. Using assessment results to improve subsequent teaching	8.80%	24.05%	29.33%	23.17%	14.66%	3.11	1.184
Integrating information and communications technology (IICT)							
55. Promoting digital literacy in English	20.53%	20.53%	24.93%	23.46%	10.56%	2.83	1.288
56. Using ICT for designing teaching and learning materials	16.13%	30.79%	25.51%	17.89%	9.68%	2.74	1.207
57. Locating appropriate digital content	17.89%	27.57%	25.81%	19.65%	9.09%	2.74	1.221
58. Motivating students to use digital tools	8.50%	25.51%	34.02%	23.17%	8.80%	2.98	1.087
59. Students using ICT to become more independent learners	13.78%	28.74%	19.35%	18.77%	19.35%	3.01	1.344
60. Helping students having difficulty regarding the use of ICT	17.89%	28.45%	26.39%	17.01%	10.26%	2.73	1.230

N = 341.

TABLE 5: ELTs' attitude survey.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Undecided (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)	Mean score	Std. deviation
1. Rethinking on performance	4.99%	14.96%	22.29%	35.19%	22.58%	3.55	1.140
2. Regulating direction of efforts	5.87%	19.65%	18.48%	39.00%	17.01%	3.42	1.154
3. Determining the necessary steps	9.09%	15.54%	26.10%	28.45%	20.82%	3.36	1.228
4. Tackling with the obstacles	6.45%	13.78%	23.75%	32.84%	23.17%	3.52	1.175
5. Growing in capabilities	8.50%	13.78%	26.10%	32.55%	19.06%	3.40	1.188
6. A way of enhancing professional approach	12.61%	17.01%	12.61%	31.67%	26.10%	3.42	1.366
7. Opening new horizons of teaching creatively	21.99%	3.23%	15.84%	24.34%	34.60%	3.46	1.527
8. An effective way to improve teaching performance	16.42%	12.02%	10.56%	27.86%	33.14%	3.49	1.465
9. Better than formal professional development programs	9.68%	14.96%	15.54%	27.86%	31.96%	3.57	1.330
10. Need of English teachers	12.61%	10.26%	14.08%	28.74%	34.31%	3.62	1.375
11. Better understanding	9.38%	19.35%	14.96%	27.86%	28.45%	3.47	1.332
12. Strategy to grow professionally	10.26%	16.72%	13.20%	30.21%	29.62%	3.52	1.341

N = 341.

TABLE 6: Model summary of self-assessment (SA) and professional development (PD).

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.712 ^a	0.507	0.506	6.74616	1.71

^aPredictors: constant and SA. ^bDependent variable: PD.

TABLE 7: ANOVA summary of SA and PD.

Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	15896.132	1	15896.132	349.284	.000 ^b
1 Residual	15428.114	339	45.511		
Total	31324.246	340			

^aDependent variable: PD. ^bPredictors: constant and SA.

teachers. Hence, teachers must be taken in confidence for this issue, so that they may feel free to admit their weak areas.

At the end, the findings of quantitative and qualitative data were triangulated. It was found that the qualitative strand complemented the quantitative strand and provided an in-depth understanding of the relationships being studied.

6. Discussions

The researchers aimed to study the relationship between SA and professional development of ELTs. For this purpose, ELTs were made to respond on Self-assessment Instrument of Teaching Practice (SAITP) and teachers’ attitude survey, designed for this research. Semistructured interviews were also conducted to get a comprehensive picture of ELTs’ minds. In this section, the results obtained from quantitative as well as qualitative data sets are discussed in comparison with other similar studies to draw an overall picture of the matter.

As already discussed, SAITP has subcategories: knowing the subject (KnS), planning lessons and courses (LP), managing the lessons (ML), understanding learners (UL), learning environment (LE), assessing learning (AL), and integrating information and communications technology (IICT). Knowing the subject (KnS) was the most important aspect of SAITP as it measured ELTs’ competencies to use various English language teaching skills. Findings for knowing the subject (KnS) showed that by and large, ELTs hardly use core competencies of their subject. They do not use a skill-based approach in language teaching. However, they focused on teaching of grammar. It was found that mostly they used traditional methods for teaching English, i.e., cramming based instead of teaching them basic skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. And ELTs’ traditional style of teaching is reflected in their students’ performance as Dar and Khan [65] claimed that students learning English find problems in reading, writing, speaking, listening, grammar, vocabulary etc. Similarly, Khan [66] claimed that at present, ELTs lack teaching skills, determina-

tion, and motivation to bring changes in teaching practice. They generally use traditional teaching methods with sole focus on the lecture method. They ignore hands-on learning; as a result, students hardly get comprehensive understanding of the language pattern. In this connection, Fareed et al. [67] opined that lack of skill-based English language teaching at the secondary school level is a major cause of students’ poor performance in the subject of English. Four teaching practices, namely, knowing the subject (KnS), planning lessons and courses (LP), learning environment (LE), and assessing learning (AL), were also the part of SITE II designed by [36]. This SA tool was used in a number of studies [51, 68, 69]. The results of these practices on SAITP (designed for this research) showed more or less the same results as in the above-mentioned studies. Similarly, Ali et al. [70] studied subject matter knowledge, instructional strategies, and planning as well as learning environment, and their results also aligned with this study. Furthermore, the results of this study correspond to a large extent with the study in [16] who used SAT developed by the British Council in the context of measuring responses of English teachers. Moreover, Anwar et al. [40] used this SAT proposed in [16] to explore the qualities of an effective English language teacher being conceived by ELTs at institutes of higher education in Pakistan. They used seven professional practices of SAT, namely, for teachers’ self-assessment: planning lessons and courses, managing lessons, assessing the learning, knowing the subject, managing the resource, using inclusive practice, and understanding learners. First five practices of SAT used in the study [40] were the same as used by the researchers in SAITP, and they yielded almost similar results.

Regarding “whether self-assessment can be a strategy to enhance teachers’ professional development,” the current study has proven that SA is a strategy to enhance teachers’ professional development. A number of studies supported this role of SA as Dhillon and Kaur [37] claimed that SA and self-reflection are prerequisites to ensure teachers’ quality. Teachers’ SA is vital for making teachers more conscientious regarding their competence and quality of their performance. It assists new teachers to learn and improve gradually, and for veterans, it serves as a source to enhance career opportunities [36]. Teachers’ SA serves as one of the most powerful tools for the purpose of teachers’ improvement [71]. Akram et al. [38] recommended SA as an effective and cost-effective technique for teachers’ self-evaluation which kindles in them a desire for self-improvement. It makes teachers judge their performance. The results are also aligned with studies [2, 62, 63]. The study also corroborates the findings in the study [72] which claim that teachers who keep on monitoring and reflecting on their performance regularly and repeatedly can focus on their needs and improve their performance.

Next, it was found that teachers may overestimate their enactment while self-assessing, and this approach will impede their professional growth, because unless and until one does not realize one’s weaknesses, one will not be able to improve them. In this regard, Borg and Edmett [16] have the same opinion that there are doubts about validity of

TABLE 8: Summary of coefficients of assessment and professional development.

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	<i>t</i>	Sig.
		<i>B</i>	Std. error	Beta		
1	Constant	-0.746	1.402		-0.532	0.595
	SA	0.258	0.014	0.712	18.689	0.000

^aDependent variable: PD.

teachers' SA, as they may incline to rate their performance in an overly positive way. The solution to this problem was offered by Borg [73] who suggested that teachers' SA can be combined with some other parameters or indicators such as teachers' portfolio, classroom observation, and peer observations. In the same connection, Ross and Bruce [74] claimed that SAT should be supported by other professional development strategies such as peer input and influence of external change agents. Without such consistency checks as offered by peers' or others' feedback, teachers may happen to produce inflated SA feedback, hence reducing teachers' stimulus to change. Bakhmat [2] commenting on the results of Ross and Bruce's study [74] agreed that SA is productive but insufficient to bring about improvement in true sense; it should be reinforced with other PD strategies, i.e., peer observations/coaching and external change agents.

7. Conclusion

Keeping in view analyses, findings, and discussions, it can be concluded that self-assessment plays an important role in the professional development of English language teachers. It is far better and effective than traditional PD programs. It was found that both teachers and principals agreed on the role of SA as an informal professional development strategy. They believed that it can help college teachers to improve their instructions. They consider it very helpful not only to identify the weaknesses and strengths of English teachers but also a productive activity for their professional development. Moreover, they believed that it will create a learning environment and develop a learning culture in teacher community.

7.1. Limitations. Some limitations regarding SA practice are that it may not be used for accountability of teachers by college administration. ELTs suggested that the only focus of SA should be the professional development of teachers. Hence, teachers must be taken in confidence for this issue, so that they may feel free to admit their weak areas. Though it is very difficult to maintain an atmosphere of mutual trust and cooperation among the teachers as sometimes negative attitude like professional jealousy and leg-pulling may also spoil its effectiveness. But if implemented in an organized way under the supervision of college administration, this informal continuous professional development program is far better than the traditional PD programs. Administration can make it effective by motivating teachers to self-assess their performance on a regular basis and by creating an atmosphere of mutual trust and cooperation. Only a positive role of administration can initiate a culture of learning community within their faculty. It is suggested that principal and

administration should play a key role in creating cooperative, considerate, and biasness free culture for teacher. The role of administration is also very vital in planning, organizing, and implementing such a practice. Without their interest, projection, and involvement, it will not work.

7.2. Implications of the Study. The study offers manifold implications of self-assessment (SA). The study generates awareness in ELTs to self-assess their teaching practice to know how they teach. It provides an input which makes them reconsider what is their current practice as well as what needs to be improved. The current research suggests as to how SA can be utilized as a process of continuous professional development (CPD) by offering constant reflection, self-monitoring, and self-judgment, for reviewing an individual's personal strengths and weaknesses and helping him discover the areas that need improvement. The study also recommends that assigning some responsibilities to teachers to evaluate their performance is an apt way to identify their status as professional. Teachers must realize that the difference really exists between just doing and creating the difference. SA assists new teachers, makes them take more responsibility of their own competence, and increases career prospects for veterans. Last but not least, findings of this study pave the way for self-assessment and self-development culture in teacher community.

7.3. Suggestion for Future Researchers. The conceptual model of this research ought to be analysed using SEM and AMOS as these statistical packages would throw light in a more explicit way on the relationships being studied by the researchers. Moreover, the researchers designed Self-assessment Instrument of Teaching Practice (SAITP) which is based on the competencies and skills required for English language teachers. It is suggested that such a self-assessment tool based on the competencies and skills for other subjects should be designed to broaden its range. Moreover, this study was conducted in Southern Punjab and focused on English teachers at the intermediate level; further research is desirable for testing generalizability of the results in other subjects as well as academic levels.

Data Availability

The details of data collected are available within the article.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] F. Mushtaq, I. A. Baig, and N. Munir, "A study of stimulating factors in self-motivated professional development among teachers at university level," *Global Social Sciences Review*, vol. IV, no. II, pp. 73–79, 2019.
- [2] L. Bakhmat, "Self-assessment as a powerful tool for professional growth of teachers and professional standards," *Bulletin of the Cherkasy Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University. Series" Pedagogical Sciences"*, vol. 11, 2017.
- [3] A. S. Arslan, A. Aslan, and S. Arslan, "Investigating pre-service mathematics teachers' self-assessment process," *Education*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 137–150, 2022.
- [4] J. Wu, "Establishment of an autonomous development model for college english teachers' professional development in China," in *2018 8th International Conference on Education and Management (ICEM 2018)*, pp. 25–27, Atlantis Press, 2019.
- [5] A. Davis and D. McDonald, "Teachers' reflections of instructional effectiveness: self-assessment through a standards-based appraisal process," *Reflective Practice*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 125–141, 2019.
- [6] C. Somantri and H. Iskandar, "The impact of CPD in teaching, and the role of pincipal in promoting CPD," in *4th International Conference on Research of Educational Administration and Management (ICREAM 2020)*, pp. 336–343, Atlantis Press, 2021.
- [7] Government of Pakistan, *National Education Policy*, Ministry of Education, Islamabad, 2009, http://itacec.org/document/2015/7/National_Education_Policy_2009.pdf.
- [8] A. Khan, "Pakistani teachers' professional learning experiences: comparing face-to-face versus online learning," *TEFLIN Journal*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 72–89, 2018.
- [9] E. Hargreaves, "Using action research to explore the role of the international academic consultant: drawing on participants' perceptions in a teacher development project in Pakistan," *Teacher Development*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2018.
- [10] Government-of-Pakistan, "National professional standards for teachers in Pakistan. Islamabad: policy and planning wingteacher development project in Pakistan," *Teacher Development*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2009.
- [11] F. Yasmin and M. Islam, "Academic roles of English language teachers: a study of the perceptions of Pakistani teachers and students," *Journal of Foreign Languages*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 13–24, 2018.
- [12] L. Kyriakides, B. P. M. Creemers, A. Panayiotou, and E. Charalambous, *Quality and Equity in Education: Revisiting Theory and Research on Educational Effectiveness and Improvement*, Routledge, London and New York, 2021.
- [13] R. Sancar, D. Atal, and D. Deryakulu, "A new framework for teachers' professional development," *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 101, article 103305, 2021.
- [14] N. Qureshi, *Professional Development of Teacher Educators: Challenges and Opportunities*, PhD diss., University of Warwick, 2016.
- [15] Council, British, "Our organization," 2015, The United Kingdom's International Organization for Cultural Relations and Educational Opportunities, (<https://www.britishcouncil.org/organisation>, accessed on March 14, 2018).
- [16] S. Borg and A. Edmett, "Developing a self-assessment tool for English language teachers," *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 655–679, 2019.
- [17] N. A. Flanders, "Interaction analysis and inservice training," *The Journal of Experimental Education*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 126–133, 1968.
- [18] J. B. Anderson and H. Jerome Freiberg, "Using self-assessment as a reflective tool to enhance the student teaching experience," *Teacher Education Quarterly*, pp. 77–91, 1995.
- [19] E. J. Amidon, N. A. Flanders, and I. G. Casper, *The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom*, Paul S. Amidon & Associates, St. Paul, MN, 1985.
- [20] A. J. Madsen, *Where Is the "Self" in Teacher Self-Assessment? An Examination of Teachers' Reflection and Assessment Practices in Relation to Their Teaching Practices*, Iowa State University, 2005.
- [21] P. M. Allen, W. D. Barnes, J. L. Reece, and E. W. Roberson, *Teacher self-appraisal*, Charles A, Washington, Ohio, 1970.
- [22] G. D. Bailey, "Teacher self-assessment: a means for improving classroom instruction," *Analysis and Action Series*, 1981.
- [23] J. A. Centra, "Determining faculty effectiveness," *Assessing Teaching, Research, and Service for Personnel Decisions and Improvement*, 1979.
- [24] D. A. Schön, *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions*, Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- [25] M. C. Pennington and A. L. Young, "Approaches to faculty evaluation for ESL," *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 619–646, 1989.
- [26] D. Goleman, "Emotional intelligence: why it can matter more than IQ," *Bantam*, 2012.
- [27] M. Bipath, *The Dynamic Effects of Leader Emotional Intelligence and Organisational Culture on Organisational Performance*, PhD diss., University of South Africa, 2007.
- [28] P. Black and D. Wiliam, "Assessment and classroom learning," *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 7–74, 1998.
- [29] K. D. Peterson, *Teacher Evaluation: A Comprehensive Guide to New Directions and Practices*, Corwin Press, 2000.
- [30] S. G. Paris and A. H. Paris, "Classroom applications of research on self-regulated learning," *Educational Psychologist*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 89–101, 2001.
- [31] D. Desautel, "Becoming a thinking thinker: metacognition, self-reflection, and classroom practice," *Teachers College Record*, vol. 111, no. 8, pp. 1997–2020, 2009.
- [32] R. Azevedo, A. Johnson, A. Chauncey, and C. Burkett, "Self-regulated learning with MetaTutor: advancing the science of learning with MetaCognitive tools," in *New Science of Learning*, pp. 225–247, Springer, New York, NY, 2010.
- [33] S. K. Woods, "10. Interpersonal and communication skills," *Graduate Medical Education*, vol. 87, 2011.
- [34] K. M. Zeichner and D. P. Liston, *Reflective Teaching: An Introduction*, Routledge, 2013.
- [35] D. M. Krebt, "Investigating self-assessment of teaching profession of Iraqi EFL teachers," *ALUSTATH JOURNAL FOR HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES*, vol. 214, no. 2, pp. 117–128, 2015.
- [36] M. Akram and S. J. Zepeda, "Development and validation of a teacher self-assessment instrument," *Journal of Research & Reflections in Education (JRRE)*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2015.
- [37] N. Dhillon and G. Kaur, "Self-assessment of teachers' communication style and its impact on their communication effectiveness: a study of Indian higher educational institutions," *SAGE Open*, vol. 11, no. 2, p. 215824402110231, 2021.

- [38] M. Akram, F. Munir, and A. Bilal, "Effect of teacher performance evaluation on school effectiveness," *sjesr*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 431–439, 2021.
- [39] R. Harrison, L. Meyer, P. Rawstorne et al., "Evaluating and enhancing quality in higher education teaching practice: a meta-review," *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 80–96, 2022.
- [40] R. H. Anwar, S. Zaki, and N. Memon, "Augmenting the teacher effectiveness construct: voices of the effective english language teachers from universities in Pakistan," *Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2021.
- [41] D. Newby, *European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages: A reflection Tool for Language Teacher Education*, Council of Europe, 2007.
- [42] G. Mateva, A. Vitanova, and S. Tashevska, *The European Profiling Grid: A User Guide*, 2011, Available at: http://www.epg-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/The-EPG-PDF-publication_EN.pdf (accessed January 2018).
- [43] E.-S. Prince and A. Barrett, "Continuing professional development in action: an Indian experience," *Innovations in the continuing professional development of English language teachers*, pp. 19–44, 2014.
- [44] P. Kyrgiridis, V. Derri, K. Emmanouilidou, E. Chlapoutaki, and E. Kioumourtzoglou, "Development of a questionnaire for self-evaluation of teacher effectiveness in physical education (SETEQ-PE)," *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 73–90, 2014.
- [45] R. J. Marzano and M. D. Toth, "Teacher evaluation that makes a difference: a new model for teacher growth and student achievement," *ASCD*, 2013.
- [46] Danielson Group, *Framework for Teaching*, Danielson Group, Princeton, NJ, 2013, Available at: <http://www.danielsongroup.org/framework> (accessed January 2018).
- [47] H. Alena, L. Danka, and N. Henryk, "Teacher's self-assessment as a part of quality management," *Science for Education Today*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 156–169, 2019.
- [48] A. Costea and F. Golu, "Development and validation of an instrument for assessing perceived competences in didactic activity," *Psychology*, vol. 8, no. 12, pp. 577–586, 2018.
- [49] H. M. King, *Teacher Affective Attitudes Inventory: Development and Validation of a Teacher Self-Assessment Instrument Doctoral Dissertation*, Antioch University, 2017.
- [50] D. A. Schmidt, E. Baran, A. D. Thompson, P. Mishra, M. J. Koehler, and T. S. Shin, "Technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK)," *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 123–149, 2009.
- [51] A. L. Longoria, *Differences in Teacher Performance between Mentored and Non-mentored High School Teachers*, PhD diss., Grand Canyon University, 2019.
- [52] C. Danielson, "Enhancing professional practice: a framework for teaching," *ASCD*, 2007.
- [53] A. Bandura and R. H. Walters, *Social Learning Theory*, vol. 1, Prentice Hall, Englewood cliffs, 1977.
- [54] A. Woolfolk, *Educational Psychology (Tenth Edition)*, 2007.
- [55] J. H. Flavell, "Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: a new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry," *American Psychologist*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 906–911, 1979.
- [56] R. Spady, *Correlating Formative Self-Assessment of Education Graduate Online Programs*, PhD diss., Concordia University Irvine, 2018.
- [57] A. Bandura, "Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change," *Psychological Review*, vol. 84, no. 2, pp. 191–215, 1977.
- [58] M. S. Knowles, *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy (Revised and Updated)*, Cambridge Adult Education, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1980.
- [59] M. S. Knowles, E. F. Holton III, and R. A. Swanson, *The Adult Learner: The Definitive Classic in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, Routledge, 2014.
- [60] L. S. Vygotsky and M. Cole, *Mind in Society: Development of Higher Psychological Processes*, Harvard university press, 1978.
- [61] J. Dewey, "Experience and education," in *The Educational Forum*, vol. 50, no. 3pp. 241–252, Taylor & Francis Group, 1986.
- [62] P. Sharma and J. S. Pandher, "Teachers' professional development through teachers' professional activities," *Journal of Workplace Learning*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 613–625, 2018.
- [63] C. Borgmeier, S. L. Loman, and M. Hara, "Teacher self-assessment of evidence-based classroom practices: preliminary findings across primary, intermediate and secondary level teachers," *Teacher Development*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 40–56, 2016.
- [64] J. W. Creswell, *Steps in conducting a scholarly mixed methods study*, 2013.
- [65] M. F. Dar and I. Khan, "Writing anxiety among public and private sectors Pakistani undergraduate university students," *Journal of Gender Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 157–172, 2015.
- [66] A. W. Khan, "School-based teachers' professional development policies: learning from the practices of English classroom at public secondary school in Northern Pakistan," *IPS Policy Brief*, 2021.
- [67] M. Fareed, S. Jawed, and S. Awan, "Teaching English language at SSC level in private non-elite schools in Pakistan: practices and problems," *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 80–95, 2018.
- [68] S. Dowpiset and S. Eamoraphan, "A comparative study of teacher self-assessment on teacher quality among demographic factors in Saint Gabriel Foundation's schools," *Scholar: Human Sciences*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 214–214, 2018.
- [69] L. Quddus, M. Khalid, and M. W. A. Khan, "Teachers' self-assessment of their teaching effectiveness at higher secondary level in Pakistan: a case study," *KnE Social Sciences*, pp. 807–817, 2019.
- [70] M. Q. Ali, M. A. J. Al-Azhari, and M. Imran, "An analysis of the teachings of Muhammad (SAW) to conceptualize national professional standards for teachers: a contemporary issue," *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization*, vol. 10, no. 101, pp. 348–363, 2020.
- [71] M. Akram, S. J. Zepeda, and S. J. Zepeda, "Correlating teacher self-assessment score with student achievement in English and mathematics," *Journal of Education*, vol. 30, no. 2, 2013.
- [72] A. Aslan, İ. H. Erten, and K. Dikilitaş, "In-service EFL teachers' engagement in reflexive practice via video enhanced observation," *Reflective Practice*, pp. 1–15, 2022.
- [73] S. Borg, *Teacher Evaluation: Global Perspectives and Their Implications for English Language Teaching. A Literature Reviews*, British Council, Delhi, 2018.
- [74] J. A. Ross and C. Bruce, "Teacher self-assessment: a mechanism for facilitating professional growth," *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 146–159, 2007.