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Abstract

The Namibian Portfolio for Languages (NPL) was conceived in 2013 by five Namibian educators and distributed to seven Namibian secondary schools to approximately 500 pupils learning French as a foreign language. Since its implementation, the impact of the NPL is researched both on pupils and teachers by the University of Namibia French section, in order to assess its learner-centered pretensions, its formative assessment capacity, and its support in self-assessment. This paper looks into teachers’ feedback on the NPL practicality in and outside the classroom environment after three years of implementation. Furthermore, it aims at assessing NPL’s relevance as a tool to the benefit of self-assessment and formative assessment.

Background

In 2013, seven Namibian secondary schools received the Namibian Portfolio for Languages (NPL) for their grade 8 learners of French Foreign Language (FFL). Since its implementation, Zannier and Lumbu examined the impact of the NPL on both pupils and teachers, in an attempt to assess the pedagogical efficiency of the NPL as a learner-centered tool promoting formative assessment and facilitating learners’ understanding of their French language learning skills.

From its inception, this research was conceived as an action research involving practitioners from schools to reach the salient objective of offering a contextualised material adapted to the Namibian curriculum and learners’ interests. This contextualisation has been greatly facilitated by the inputs of five teachers from secondary and tertiary Namibian institutions who contributed to the NPL elaboration. Prior to the NPL implementation, training sessions were provided to familiarise teachers with the NPL and its use. The first phase this research evaluation investigated learners’ primary impressions towards
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the NPL. Results were presented and discussed by Lumbu and Zannier (2016), who pin-pointed some successes in terms of learner-centered objectives (pp. 106-107). The NPL answered learners’ interests and created a platform for them to express their language learning individuality. Nevertheless, this first evaluation phase proved that learners and teachers were not completely comfortable with self-assessment activities. These conclusions were drafted from a cross-examination of learners’ questionnaires/interviews and teachers’ first focus group discussion held in August 2014.

In July 2016, a second evaluation phase was conducted by Zannier through a second teacher group discussion, which was hosted by the National Institute for Education Development (NIED), during which the researcher reviewed teachers’ observations and practice of the NPL during the past three years. Secondly, she questioned the efficiency of the NPL in learners’ self-assessment and learning strategies skills.

**Literature review**

**The European Portfolio for languages**

In a guideline published in 2000, revised in 2004 and in 2011, the Council of Europe presented the European Language Portfolio (ELP) principles and guidelines. The document lists detailed characteristics to “assist ELP developers”. The main requirements are expressed as follows:

- promoting multilingualism and multiculturalism;
- being the property of the learner;
- valorising the learner’s competences within and outside formal education;
- promoting the learner’s autonomy;
- supporting the learner’s language learning and recording his/her languages proficiency;
- engaging the learner in self-assessment.

The three last ones are closely related to ELP accreditation by the Council of Europe and based on European criteria. They are not applicable in the Namibian context, and have been deliberately removed from the above list.

As the content of the NPL has been thoroughly documented by Lumbu and Zannier (2016), it will not be re-explored in this article. In brief, the NPL was largely inspired from the ELP, but adapted to the Namibian context in terms of design and curriculum content. As the above-mentioned characteristics are based on general principles on language portfolios, they can still guide the NPL objectives.
Portfolio and self-assessment

The *Framework for learner-centred education in Namibia* (2003) defines a portfolio as “equated to a repository of a learner’s best productions (i.e. tests, essays, etc.) [...] and that requires a learner to collect a limited selection of the learner’s work that is used to either present the learner’s best work(s) or to demonstrate the learner’s educational growth over a given time span.” (p. 44) Nowadays, portfolios are no longer restricted to this format and function; instead they are elaborated ‘booklets’ or ‘e-portfolios’, where learners are engaged to express their individuality through pro-active activities, and where they reflect on their skills by assessing themselves (self-assessment).

Black and Wiliam (2006) state the following:

> Proponents of assessment for learning insist that self-assessment is essential to learning because students can only achieve a learning goal if they understand that goal and can assess what they need to do to reach it. Thus the criteria for evaluating any learning achievements must be made transparent to students to enable them to have a clear overview both of the aims of their work and of what it means to complete it successfully. Insofar as they do so they begin to develop an overview of that work so that they can manage and control it; in other words, they develop their capacity for meta-cognitive thinking. (p. 15)

A repository of learners’ best productions, even if analysed by teacher and learners in a formative way, can hardly achieve Black and Wiliam’s objectives. Moreover, Lumbu and Zannier (2016) recall that the Namibian education literature encourages self-assessment, especially peer-assessment, but presents limited information on formative assessment. It is thus only defined as “part of the continuous assessment” (p. 3), but authors argue that formative assessment implies a supportive guidance to learners by which, among others, they are helped to identify their strengths and weaknesses. They propose that this guidance requires immediate assistance, including teaching remediation and learning strategies. As a result, they raise the issue of “whether the current way of continuously assessing learners in Namibian schools conforms to the mentioned objectives of formative assessment” (p. 4).

The researcher and the NPL authors share the idea that the NPL could indeed facilitate and ensure more self-assessment and formative assessment in French classrooms.

Teachers’ role in NPL success

Richards and Lockhart (2001) maintain that “teachers are a reflection of what they know and believe; and teacher knowledge and ‘teacher thinking’ provide the underlying framework or schema which guides the teacher’s classroom actions” (as cited in MacDonald, Badger, & White, 2001). Teachers’ belief in,
and understanding of new material (such as the NPL) are a necessity to a successful implementation and full capacity use. Loewenberg Ball and Cohen (1996), examining the impact of materials on curriculum implementation, argue that when teachers enact curriculum in the classrooms, they “work with their own understanding of the material ... and how they focus and frame the material for students” (p. 7).

However, despite teachers’ belief and understanding, Borg (2003) also admitted: “Another central issue to emerge here is the role of context. Greater understanding of the contextual factors – e.g. institutional, social, instructional, physical, which shape what language teachers do, are central to deeper insights into relationships between cognition and practice. The study of cognition and practice without an awareness of the contexts in which these occur, will inevitably provide partial, if not flawed, characterisations of teachers and teaching.” (p. 106) Consequently, in the current study, the researcher included teachers’ training and school environment as influential factors to be considered in the questions of the second focus group discussion data analysis.

Research methodology and ethics

The research instrument used for this second evaluation phase of the NPL on teachers’ perspective was a focus-group discussion. This qualitative tool was found relevant with this small-scale case study involving seven schools, and also beneficial for the action research perspective. In addition, semi-structured group discussions facilitate interactions between participants and stimulate ideas and explanations. On the seven schools invited to participate, one teacher was excused and four finally joined the discussion organised in July 2016 at the NIED. The focus group discussion lasted one hour and thirty minutes, and was recorded and transcribed. The discussion contents were supported by a series of questions presented on PowerPoint. As this discussion was the second of its kind, the audience was very comfortable to participate in the exercise. Some questions from the first focus group discussion served as elements of comparison with the results of this second focus group discussion in order to examine the evolution of the NPL practice in schools.

The researcher assured to use data for this research only and to destroy them after completion of the study. No consent forms were distributed because this second focus group discussion was part of the NPL research initiated in 2013, for which the researcher already obtained the participants’ written consents. To provide a total confidentiality to participants in the present paper and to avoid any problems to schools, the names of schools were replaced by numbers (from 1 to 4), and the researcher opted for
the use of both genders throughout the paper (‘she/he’) because only one male person participated in the second group discussion and could easily be identified by gender.

Data analysis and interpretation

The data analysis section chronologically follows each constitutive question of the focus group discussion. This section was, hence, divided into two parts answering the two initial research questions. The first part analysed how teachers use of the NPL with their learners, and the second part focused on the efficiency of the self-assessment NLP chapter.

Part 1: Use of the NPL

The teacher trainings organised with the seven teacher-participants in 2013 and 2014 tried to transmit the fundamental concept and principles of the NPL, but remained open on its implementation requirements in class. This decision was made by Lumbu and Zannier for teachers and schools to adapt the NPL according to their needs and logistical boundaries. From the first evaluation phase conclusions, researchers learnt that the NPL had been presented and introduced in class in a very satisfactory manner. The new data inquired into obtaining a more precise picture of the teachers’ practice of the NPL with their grades after three years of implementation.

NPL Use Frequency

Question 1: How often do you use the NPL?

Among the four schools represented, three teachers reduced their use of the NPL as compared to 2014 (Table 1). The reason given by teachers to justify this decrease, was the time factor (in general, teachers could not find time to integrate the NPL within their class activities in an overloaded work environment.

The teacher who did not use the NPL in 2016, started a year later which impacted her/his organisation for the rest of the term. One of the two others who reduced their use of the NPL to ‘once a month’, instead of twice a month, explained that he/she was the only teacher at the school, and that his/her teaching situation was already a challenge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Twice a month</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Twice a month</td>
<td>Once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Twice a month</td>
<td>Once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Twice per term</td>
<td>Twice per term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Comparison of frequency of use of the NPL between 2014 and 2016
This factual observation calls for a re-thinking of the complementarity aspect of the NPL with other learning material currently used in class. Even if the NPL was designed to ‘complement’ teaching resources, a teacher training on this aspect could provide more clarity on how the NPL content could serve as a replacement of some textbook lessons. A more detailed documentation attached to work schemes could be a plus. However, these findings point out factors also linked to the overall school environment (assessment process in schools, number of learners per class, time dedicated per subject, length of one course). As for the self-assessment part, it was suggested that learners could take their NPLs home and self-assess themselves at home as they do with any other homework. This could be an occasion to engage with family about the NPL. Still, the NPL requires extra time from teachers to complete their comments and to organise face to face discussing with each learner about constructive learning and individual learning strategies.

**NPL types of use**

**Question 2:** *Do you exclusively use the NPL in your course?*

Two teachers stated that they try to alternate their methods by using the NPL during the class as an activity, a test or as homework. Another teacher exclusively uses it in class and the last one only uses it outside teaching time (during afternoon tutorial and as assignments).

**Question 3:** *Apart from these class activities, did you experience other uses of the NPL?*

One teacher found two other uses for the NPL, apart from those mentioned in the question. She/he placed some copies in the school library that pupils can consult during their ‘reading time’. The teacher noticed a great interest in his/her learners to read the NPL in general, and also at the library. He/she explained that in the process other pupils, not learning French, get curious and engaged with the French learners about the NPL. The second use was at the occasion of the Reader Thorn, which is an annual school event promoting reading and languages. Learners of French decided, with their teacher, to use some extracts from their NPLs to read aloud to the rest of the school.

Another teacher used the NPL during the parents’ meeting. She/he added that this was a “really good platform to explain to parents about learning French, as they generally do not speak this language”. A participant explained that “Some parents are eager to help their kids, but feel useless as they do not understand the language”.
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The three above-mentioned uses are very valuable and will be suggested to the rest of the teachers involved in the NPL project.

NPL at home

**Question 4: Do you allow learners to take their NPLs home?**

During the first group discussion, six of the seven teachers stated that they did not allow pupils to take their NPLs home, either because the school had rules against it, or because teachers tried and some learners lost their NPLs. This issue was long debated as the NPL was conceived as the learner’s property and as a “sharing” tool; a link between parents, teachers, principals and learners.

Therefore, three years later, the question was asked again to see if the situation had evolved differently. Results in 2016 showed shy signs of change in teachers’ approach to this particular question and only half of the interviewed still refused to let pupils taking their NPLs home. The reasons of the two teachers against it remained the same as in the first focus group discussion. The first teacher explained: “Pupils are naughty, I tried once and 3 NPL were lost and some others were damaged”. “We also have many Angolan pupils who do leave the school after one or two years so in this case, again, NPLs are lost.” The second teacher argued: “The school principal refuses any material to go to pupils’ home, even textbooks”. The last one, as mentioned in **Question 3**, does not allow pupils to go home with their NPL, but she/he rather uses it twice a semester during the parents’ meetings so in a way still uses the NPL as a ‘sharing tool’.

The European Language Portfolio Principles and Guideline (2011) clearly asserts that the ELP should be “the property of the learner” which means:

> [...] that the individual learner owns his/her ELP in both a literal and a metaphorical sense. Whatever support may be provided by educational institutions and teachers, the individual learner is responsible for maintaining his/her ELP. This entails responsibility not only for the ELP as a physical object but for all the processes that ELP use requires. In particular, the individual learner is responsible for the regular self-assessment that is fundamental to effective ELP use. This will generally require guidance appropriate to the target age group of the ELP model in question. (p. 5)

Not allowing learners to take their NPL home is a concern. It contradicts many aspects of the NPL principles that were standing as criteria to encourage the learner-centered approach, to guide learners towards more autonomy and to create a dialogue between all actors of the learning process. Restricting
the use of the NPL to the French classroom is a missed opportunity to use the NPL full pedagogical potential. On another hand, school regulations are hardly contestable, especially in a small-scaled project like the NPL involving a maximum of two teachers per school and seven schools only.

**Learners’ motivation after 3 years of NPL practice**

**Question 5:** *Do you think that your learners are as interested in the NPL as they were at the beginning?*

All participants fully agreed that learners are still highly motivated by the NPL. One teacher noted: “They are still very motivated. There are even some learners who are registered in German and who want to shift to French because of the NPL! Pupils are truly attracted by the NPL.” One teacher explained that her/his learners were still motivated and can, after three years, reflect on their progress in the French language which is, according to her/him, a motivational factor for pupils.

These statements, after three years of implementation, are certainly very encouraging, as they prove that the NPL remains appreciated by learners on a long-term run and through the various grades. This is positive evidence for the NPL as well-tailored contents and activities.

**Question 6:** *Do you think that with time your learners are more and more comfortable using the NPL?*

Teachers positively conceded that, with time, learners got more accustomed to the use of the NPL. One teacher stated that many pupils see the NPL as a “pleasure”. They enjoy checking their personal details (like their picture), and compare their skills in French language every year with a feeling of satisfaction and improvement.

However, one teacher admitted that she/he still needed to guide pupils a lot. It will be worth investigating why the NPL implementation seems more difficult in that particular school.

**Part 2: Review on the NPL self-assessment chapter**

In his book introduction, Boud (2013) stated that self-assessment was commonly “portrayed as a technique to enhance learning” but was “more transformative, elusive and confronting to conventional teaching than it is normally expedient to recognize” (p. 1). He further said: “Self-assessment is coming to be regarded as an accepted and significant part of courses because it relates to one of the central goals of a university education: enabling students to become effective and responsible learners who can continue their education without the intervention of teachers or courses” (p. 13). He summarised the role of self-assessment by stating the following: “Self-assessment is about students developing their learning skills. It is not just another assessment technique to be set alongside others. It is about engaging learn-
ers with criteria for good practice in any given area and making complex judgements. It is not primarily about individuals giving themselves marks or grades. And it is not about supplanting the role of teachers.” (p. 17) He attributes seven objectives to self-assessment practice (pp.17-18):

- for individual self-monitoring and checking progress;
- as a way to promote good learning practices and learning how-to-learn skills;
- for diagnosis and remediation;
- as a substitute for others form of assessment;
- as a learning activity designed to improve professional or academic practice;
- to consolidate learning over a wide range of contexts;
- to review achievements as a prelude to recognition of prior learning.

According to Boud’s definition, it is clear that self-assessment adds a lot of value to language learning but it also requires proper practice by teachers and learners.

Use of the self-assessment chapter

**Question 7: How do you use the NPL Chapter 2 on self-assessment?**

During the first focus group discussion 2/3 of the teachers it was revealed that they had not yet tried working with learners on Chapter 2. They justified this by saying that they did not find time to address Chapter 2. This second focus group discussion was promising as only one teacher had not used the self-assessment part with her/his pupils. Once asked about how they organised the self-assessment activities, two teachers described that they organised it collectively by going through each item to be assessed by learners without the teacher checking their answers. They did not want learners to feel “tested” while doing their self-assessment. “I did not want to control their self-assessment so that they do not feel scared”. Another teacher reported across that he/she wanted pupils to feel no boundaries and that he/she was trying to be a ‘facilitator’ in the process. The last teacher was the only one who already started Chapter 2 in 2014. He/she insisted that for him/her Chapter 2 was essential and his/her favorite part in the NPL. He/she pointed out how his/her learners loved to retrospectively review their past self-assessments and then see their learning progress. He/she organised self-assessments outside the classroom, asking learners to take their NPL home to do their self-assessments. He/she justified this practice by stating that this avoids any interference or influence in learners’ self-assessment exercises.
On point 2.7 of the EPL, the EPL is defined as a tool to: “encourage learner self-assessment and the recording of assessment by teachers, educational authorities and examination bodies” (p. 6). The authors explain this as follows:

The principle of learner ownership of the ELP means that the recording of teacher assessment should always be independent of the learner’s self-assessment. Though teachers inevitably play an important mediating role in developing learners’ self-assessment skills, teacher assessment should not be used to correct the learner’s self-assessment. (p. 5)

According to participants’ answers, it seems that teachers broadly understood the self-assessment concept in this regard.

**Learners’ reaction to self-assessment exercise**

**Question 8: How would you describe learners’ reaction to self-assessment?**

Teachers stressed that learners are very exciting about self-assessing themselves. A teacher added: “Want or not, they see it as a kind of competition, but in a positive way.” Teachers also noticed that the NPL helps learners’ understanding of the objectives and, according to the teachers, this motivates the learners to put more effort into their learning. Another teacher used Chapter 2 at the end of the second trimester with grade 10 learners while they were preparing JSC national examinations. The teacher declared that the NPL was a good tool for learners to reflect on their strengths and weaknesses just before exams to help them focussed on the right content for their revisions. In his research conclusions, Xamani (2013) also found that his students felt an improvement in their own learning process, and that “their classmates, their peers’ comments had been enriching and they had become more aware of their strengths and weaknesses” (pp. 13-14).

The last teacher, who had worked on Chapter 2 since the NPL implementation, qualified her/his learners’ reaction to self-assessment as very positive from the very beginning. She/he attributes this success to the fact that she/he always insists on the personal and individual aspect of the self-assessment exercise.

These answers endorse Little’s conclusion about the importance of the self-assessment in language portfolios that he considers as a stepping-stone towards learners’ autonomy in the learning process (2000, p. 8).

**Question 9: Do you think that self-assessment helps your learners to perform better individually?**
One teacher had no answer to this question and another one was not convinced by the reliability of the process of learners assessing themselves. She/he explained: “Self-assessment is a very good thing in itself but I know Namibian pupils. I do not trust them with self-assessment. [...] They copy from each other. We should guide them to be more honest.” This teacher’s comment contradicts the positive result of question seven and reflects expectable fears towards the question of accountability in learning.

Little (2009) explains that, since the ELP pilot was implemented, teachers’ concerns revealed to be of three types:

(i) learners do not know how to assess themselves; (ii) there is a danger that they will overestimate their proficiency; and (iii) they may be tempted to cheat by including in their ELPs material that is not their own. The first of these fears probably arises from the assumption that teaching and learning are one thing and assessment is another, so that ELP-based self-assessment should be something learners do on their own and apart from the learning process; while the second and third fears reflect the fact that in many educational contexts formal examinations determine learners’ future options, which means that learners themselves should have no part in judging their own performance. (p. 3)

Another teacher added that she/he noticed better results from Grade 10 upwards once learners are more mature to reflect on their competence. This statement echoes Blanche (1988), who explains that a “learner’s age or level of cognitive development is an important variable” (p. 84) in any future study reflecting on self-assessment. Finally, the last teacher noticed positive signs from learners’ resulting from the self-assessment smileys that eased them understanding their language level and skills. They also learnt how and where to situate themselves (in terms of abilities, programme...).

**Teachers’ individual feedback to learners**

**Question 10: How did you organise your individual interviews with learners?**

All teachers admitted that they did not organise any individual interviews. They reported that it was totally impossible to squeeze in time for these interviews with their class numbers. During the discussions, one teacher suggested that these face-to-face interviews could be conducted during their final oral exam. Another promptly objected to the idea, arguing that the examination period was already stressful enough for both teachers and learners. The last teacher reported that she/he did not organise individual interviews but filled in the teacher’s written feedback sections. Others added that teachers could possibly prepare these individual comments at home, like any other assignment correction.
These results are highly disappointing, as the NPL formative assessment aspect is not fully exploited without this teacher-learner direct dialogue. This face-to-face allows learners to express their feedback and to explain their feelings about their learning progress. They can also ask further questions to the teacher and they, as a team, can discuss strategies and set objectives.

**Remediation strategies**

The researcher wanted to inquire into teachers’ abilities to find individual remediation strategies thanks to the NPL.

**Question 11: Did you succeed in developing remediation strategies thanks to the NPL?**

Teachers’ answers to question 11 were very vague, stating that learners could devise strategies by understanding their self-assessment and progression achievement. One of the teachers maintained that the NPL was so learner-friendly that learners could easily see their weaknesses and strengths and then could deduce preferable learning strategies. Another teacher explained that she/he did not really notice these remediation strategies in learners but that she/he could see some improvement in learners’ degree of motivation and that the NPL was, in that sense, a tool encouraging them in their learning. The last teacher answered that she/he never noticed any potential remediation strategies but would be very glad to investigate this aspect.

**NPL as a platform to share**

**Question 12: Did you ever discuss about the NPL with other educational actors such as HODs, Principals or parents?**

One teacher, as mentioned earlier, used it with parents during term meetings and she/he also shared it with teachers of German who were very enthusiastic about the concept. Another teacher agreed that her/his language colleagues at school were very interested in the NPL: “They even told me that they were impressed by the NPL and that to see it was giving them courage to do one for their subject”. One teacher expressed his/her frustration about his/her school hierarchy (HOD and Principal) who both received the NPL but never gave any sign of true interest. Finally, another teacher used it with Francophone parents.

In these answers, it seems that teachers shared the NPL with their language colleagues, who showed interest in the material. However, there was little feedback and interactions from school officials. Only one teacher shared the NPL with parents and was very satisfied by the experience.
Overall, the school hierarchy’s weak support is disappointing, even if it is a known fact that innovative materials are always a challenge as they imply changes in practice and vision. Ball & Cohen’s research disclosed that, “unlike many other innovations, textbooks are already ‘scaled up’ and part of the routine of the schools. They have ‘reached’ the system.” (p. 6). The authors added: “Teachers are influenced by their views of the broader community and policy contexts in which they work and by the expressed ideas of parents, administrators, and professional organisations” (p. 7). Teacher-participants who have such a low and pessimistic perception of their school support, may jeopardise their further involvement in the project.

Way forward

Question 13: Would you like to receive more NPL for your new grade 8?

Teachers unanimously answered yes.

Question 14: Do you find the NPL teacher guide helpful and explicit?

The first teacher to answer was part of the NPL conception team, so she/he logically declared that using the teacher guide was not an issue for her/him, but that she/he realised that some new teachers were trained on the NPL but not on the teacher guide. A teacher suggested another NPL training focusing on the self-assessment use.

Conclusions and recommendations

This paper constitutes the second phase evaluation of the NPL from the teachers’ perspective. The research questions were exploring the teachers’ practice of the NPL three years of implementation and the NPL self-assessment efficiency.

For the first research question, results revealed that the NPL was not as frequently used as compared to the period 2013-2014. The reason advocated by teachers was the lack of time due to school environment. However, results underlined that teachers explored other uses of the NPL: a support for teacher-parents meetings, a revision and self-assessment document for revising exams, a reading material at the school library and a communication document with Francophone parents. All these uses uncovered by teachers are very encouraging evidences that they understood that the NPL could endorse many functions in language teaching practice.

All teachers agreed that learners easily adapted to on the NPL and they testified that learners’ motivation towards the NPL was still high. This observation demonstrates that the NPL reached the challenge
of being a long-term adapted material (from grade 8 until grade 12). The NPL attractiveness observed among learners through the first evaluation phase abides three years later.

The second focus-group discussion encountered the same debate about letting or not learners keeping their NPLs and bringing them outside the class but it witnessed an improvement towards more ownership from learners. One of reasons invoked was school regulation. This situation should be follow up because it impacts the formative assessment aspect and objective of the NPL. Therefore, the researcher suggested that the NPL should be officially reintroduced to all Principals and HODs.

Self-assessment exercise as perceived by teachers is quite positive. The way they implemented it with the learners in class displays a good understanding of its objectives. However, the fact that some do not trust their learners’ own assessment may manifest in some limitations in teachers’ self-assessment appreciation. Nevertheless, many signs from learners convinced teachers that they take pleasure in self-assessing their work.

One concern remains, namely the absence of direct oral feedback from teachers to learners. The situation truly jeopardises the formative assessment vision of the NPL. From these findings, the researcher decided to conduct a similar research with the University of Namibia students to investigate ways of enhancing the NPL full assessment potential by integrating self-assessment and formative assessment. Even if the university environment differs from secondary schools, this study will offer similar class size numbers, which seems to be the main challenge in the NPL project.

Finally, to obtain a complete picture of self-assessment efficiency, a further study should be conducted among learners and should include learners’ achievements in French language. As underlined by Blanche (1988, p. 84), many factors, such as learner’s age, learner’s experience of formal instruction, and the learner’s individual personality can influence learners’ benefits from self-assessment. This research has, therefore, many areas yet to be investigated.

References


