INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN BUSINESS & SOCIAL SCIENCES
HRMARS MANAGEMENT ACADEMIC RESEARCH SOCIETY EXPLORING INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL
www.hrmars.com
ISSN: 2222-6990

Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA) among Lecturers during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Muhammad Hakimi Tew Abdullah, Norwati Roslim, Nur Faathinah Mohamad Roshdan & Muhammad Nabihan Abu Bakar

To Link this Article: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v13-i1/16181 DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v13-i1/16181

Received: *07* November *2022,* ***Revised:*** *11* December *2022,* ***Accepted:*** *26* December *2022*

Published Online: *10* January 2023

In-Text Citation: (Abdullah et al., 2023)

To Cite this Article: Abdullah, M. H. T., Roslim, N., Roshdan, N. F. M., & Bakar, M. N. A. (2023). Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA) among Lecturers during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *13*(1), 308 – 321.

Vol. 13, No. 1, 2023, Pg. 308 – 321

http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/IJARBSS | **JOURNAL HOMEPAGE**

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/publication-ethics

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN BUSINESS & SOCIAL SCIENCES
HRMARS MANAGEMENT ACADEMIC RESEARCH SOCIETY EXPLORING INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL
www.hrmars.com
ISSN: 2222-6990

Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA) among Lecturers during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Muhammad Hakimi Tew Abdullah[1], Norwati Roslim[2], Nur Faathinah Mohamad Roshdan[2] & Muhammad Nabihan Abu Bakar[1]

[1]Communication and Media Studies, College of Computing, Informatics and Media, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Negeri Sembilan, Rembau Campus, Malaysia, [2]Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Negeri Sembilan, Rembau Campus, Malaysia
Email: norwati@uitm.edu.my

Abstract

This study aimed to describe the Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA) among lecturers during the COVID-19 pandemic. It involved a total of 439 samples from the three campuses (Kuala Pilah, Seremban and Rembau) in UiTM Negeri Sembilan. Data were collected via online surveys and were descriptively and inferentially analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Findings showed that most of the lecturers (73.8%) has more than 6 years of teaching experience. Results showed that there was a significant difference in content delivery between gender at 0.5 level of significant. ANOVA test was also conducted to test the difference between lecturers' teaching effectiveness self-assessment with position grade and teaching experience. Four TESA's constructs: engagement, motivation empathy, support feedback and reflective were at a significant difference with position grade. However, none of the constructs under TESA has a significant difference with teaching experience. Thus, lack of experience in conducting ODL and not being technology savvy could be the prominent reasons.

Keywords: Open and Distance Learning, Teaching Effective Self- Assessment (TESA), COVID-19

Introduction

Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), a public university in Malaysia, started online learning on 12 April 2020. The university has taken an approach of Open and Distance Learning (ODL) system to ensure continuity of education during the COVID-19 pandemic. This transformation leads to various challenges in teaching and learning (Abdullah et al., 2022). The university has actively come out with efforts and initiatives to provide and assist both lecturers and students with effective teaching and learning environments. One of the crucial ways is UiTM has introduced Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment which is known as TESA. It is the University's mechanism for all faculties, academic centres and campuses to self-assess the teaching activities and professionalism of academic staff. It has been proposed due to

Covid-19 pandemic in Malaysia on 18 March 2020 to replace Lecturer's Professionalism Monitoring (PRO-PENS) which was practised before.

Self-assessment is described as "… a process of continuous reflection, self-monitoring, and self-judgment, to review an individual's strengths and weaknesses and helps to discover areas which need improvement" (Quddus et al., 2019). It is said to play a role as professional development strategy to bring about continuous professional development (Warsi & Khurshid, 2022). This enhances the importance of self-assessment for quality teaching and personal development mentioned in (Masuwai et al., 2021).

Studies on self-assessment among educators have discussed on reflections of instructional effectiveness. Davis and McDonald (2018) explored reflections on lessons and found that the self-evaluative reflection process had a greater influence on professional development. This supports Centra (1993) that presented significant findings and approaches in enhancing teaching effectiveness. Hassan et al (2015) also described there was a positive and significant relationship between overall emotional intelligences skills and overall teaching effectiveness. Hence, evaluating teaching effectiveness by self-assessment could potentially encourage professional growth (Tirri, 1993).

Sahin (2021) described self-assessment may be beneficial for researchers interested in teacher assessment and development process. Interests are seen in Masuwai et al. (2021) who conducted systematic literature review on self-assessment inventory among Islamic Education Teachers. This review looked at aspects of teaching behaviour, teaching quality and self-assessment in the teaching profession which could help to cultivate quality teaching behaviour and to perform reflective practice for personal development.

Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment

Studies found have revealed issues on lecturers' teaching effectiveness self-assessment in relation to gender, position grade and teaching experience.

Studies on lecturers' teaching effectiveness self-assessment have mentioned issues on gender which can be rather significant. It was found that there were significant differences between the lecturers in terms of gender in two areas, which were male lecturers had more knowledge of the technology tools, and female lecturers made more use of them. For instance, male lecturers performed well in creating class materials with hypertext or hypermedia while female lectures were more inclined in creating podcasts for students (Tena et al., 2016). Other studies reported that female teachers are more engaged in providing their students with distant learning education as they are more equipped with technology literacy (Alea et al., 2020). In a study conducted by Ekunola et al (2021) similarly reported that female teachers are more enthusiastic about using virtual classrooms while male teachers however showed no significant difference in terms of using virtual classroom for instructions. Al-Talhouni (2021) reported otherwise whereby both genders indicate no significant difference in terms of errors in using the online platform as well as difficulties and challenges in online distant learning.

As for teaching effectiveness and self-assessment in relation to position grade, Garcia-Rivera et al (2022) described that lecturers with higher position grade have stronger academic

resilience in which they can handle stress and burnout easily compared to lecturers from lower position grade. Furthermore, lecturers with higher position grade are more enthusiastic and passionate in teaching.

In terms of teaching experience, the use of online platforms has been practised before the Covid-19 pandemic and it has generally been accepted by lecturers. In a study conducted by Tena et al (2016), 1302 lecturers demonstrated positive attitudes and the use of different platforms was not considered a problem to deliver contents. The success of the lecturers' teaching experience was dependant on the support and attitudes of the university. However, an attempt to study teaching effectiveness and self-assessment which was carried out by Rapanta et al (2020) found some main difficulties reported by university teachers. The study focused on the pedagogical preparedness of university teachers with no or little experience in online teaching. As a result, the university teachers had no idea which tools and materials that they could use to replace their face-to-face classes. This is supported in a study by Barton (2020) which focussed on field activities of 117 faculty conducted during spring 2020. The survey generally revealed negative instructor views on many remote teaching substitutions despite potential challenges during the pandemic.

Due to challenges for content delivery, studies have suggested the need to provide several models to have better learning environments. Barton (2020) suggested several models of remote substitutions for traditional field teaching of identification, field techniques, data collection, and study design in the context of field activities. Rapanta et al (2020) suggested some broader-based pedagogical guidance for teachers based on research and years of experience in online learning and teaching. This is due to hundreds of 'tips and tricks' offered to them were mostly without the knowledge of which teaching tactic is likely to work. This study further reported that 'teacher presence' is one of the important elements in online learning as the teacher or lecturer's experience in teaching would create better learning experience.

The present study has intentionally highlighted Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment which is known as TESA. Having looked at previous studies and gained perspectives on Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA), this study could add to the body of knowledge in view of gender, position grade and teaching experience.

Problem Statement

Self-assessment, undeniably, has its important role in improving education in terms teaching quality and professional growth. However, studies on self-assessment are still scarce. In view of the COVID-19 situation and due to the limited number of previous studies, this study on the Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA), thus intends to add to the body of knowledge on self-assessment and professional growth of lecturers. Hence, this study is intended to answer the following hypothesis

1. Is there a significant difference between lecturers' teaching effectiveness self-assessment and gender?
2. Is a significant difference between lecturers' teaching effectiveness self-assessment and position grade?
3. Is there a significant difference between lecturers' teaching effectiveness self-assessment and teaching experience?

Methodology

This research utilized quantitative method which aimed to describe the lecturers' Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA) during the COVID-19 pandemic. The data were collected using online survey forms.

The respondents were amongst the lecturers from seven different faculties in Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Negeri Sembilan. A total of 439 lecturers during March-August 2020 semester in UiTM Negeri Sembilan participated in this study.

A questionnaire was devised and consisted of 40 items. Each item was measured using a five-point Likert scale range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questionnaire had been reviewed for face validity by the experts in ODL from the Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM). Reliability test was conducted and the results showed that Cronbach Alpha value for TESA was at (.96). The data from the questionnaire were descriptively and inferentially analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26.

Findings and Discussion

Lecturers' Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA)

Table 1 shows majority of the respondents participated in the online surveys on the lecturers' Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA) came from female lecturers (80.2%) and only 19.8% from the male lecturers. In terms of position grade, majority of them came from lecturers of grade DM51/52 (55.8%), the senior lecturers from the total of 439 lecturers. This was then followed by the lecturers of grade DM45/46 (25.7%). The lowest grade came from grade DM41 (2.7%) while others came from the Part Time/Full Time (PTFT) lecturers (12.5%).

Based on teaching experiences, most respondents had more than 6 years of teaching experience (36.0%) and less than 5 years teaching experience (26.2%). Respondents of 11-15 years of experience were 21.9% and the others with more than 16 years were 15.9%. This showed that most of the lecturers in Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Negeri Sembilan came from the range of 6 – 10 years of teaching experiences.

Table 1
Demographic Profile of Lecturers (N=439)

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	87	19.8%
Female	352	80.2%
Position Grade		
DM41	12	2.7%
DM45/46	113	25.7%
DM51/52	245	55.8%
DM53/54	14	3.2%
Others	55	12.5%
Teaching Experience		
Less than 5 years	115	26.2%
6 - 10 years	158	36.0%
11 – 15 years	96	21.9%
16 – 20 years	34	7.7%
More than 20 years	36	8.2%

There were 7 constructs in measuring TESA: i. Content delivery, ii. Universal design, iii. engagement, iv. Task assessment, v. Motivation empathy, vi. Support feedback and vii. Reflective. Table 3 shows the result of independent sample t-test conducted in comparing the lecturers' teaching self-assessment with gender. A study was done separately which began with the 1st construct, content delivery. Results showed that since sig-*t* Content Delivery (.021) < α (.05), it can be concluded that there was a significant difference in content delivery between gender at .05 level of significant.

The 2nd test was done to compare universal design between gender. Results showed that sig-*t* (.450) > α (.05) and thus, it can be concluded that there was no significant difference in universal design between gender. The following test was done separately to compare engagement, task assessment, motivation empathy, support feedback and reflective between gender. Results showed that sig-*t Engagement* (.182) > α (.05), sig-*t Task Assessment* (.603) > α (.05), sig-*t Motivation Empathy* (.965) > α (.05), sig-*t Support Feedback* (.935) > α (.05), sig-*t Reflective* (.831) > α (.05). This can be concluded that there was no significant difference in engagement, task assessment, motivation empathy, support feedback and reflective between gender at .05 level of significant. This clearly showed that only one construct under TESA which was content delivery that had a significant difference between gender. This might be due to different gender may have different style of content delivery in teaching and learning during the pandemic of Covid-19 in order to fulfil the needs and the request from the students. Various mediums could be used to deliver the content to the students such as Google Meet, Zoom, Microsoft team, WhatsApp, Fb lives, Telegrams, Webex and others.

Table 2
Comparison of lecturers' teaching effectiveness self-assessment with gender

TESA	Gender	*n*	*Mean*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Content Delivery*	Male	87	3.29	.43	1.350	.021
	Female	352	3.21	.51		
Universal Design	Male	87	3.34	.45	-.565	.450
	Female	352	3.38	.47		
Engagement	Male	87	3.37	.56	.673	.182
	Female	352	3.33	.51		
Tasks Assessment	Male	87	3.39	.49	-.572	.603
	Female	352	3.42	.52		
Motivation Empathy	Male	87	3.46	.48	1.390	.965
	Female	352	3.38	.50		
Support Feedback	Male	87	3.36	.45	1.315	.935
	Female	352	3.29	.48		
Reflective	Male	87	3.43	.49	1.180	.831
	Female	352	3.36	.50		

Note: P > 0.05 is no significant. Mark (*) is significant.

One-way ANOVA test was shown in Table 2. It was conducted to explore the difference at 95% confidence level through the effect size of Eta squared, η^2, used to test the main effects of TESA between each of the position grade. The commonly used endpoints for η^2 are < .01 is very small, .01 is small, .06 is medium and .14 is large. If there is a significant difference in value between any of the TESA's construct, then a Post-Hoc test will be performed to determine which group of groups have significant differences and the granting of category title in one independent variable will be made.

Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of the mean and standard deviation as well as the *f* values and significant *f*. The results of study showed that almost all the constructs under TESA was at a level of mean score above 3.00. This means that the lecturers did well and had consistent positive effects in their teaching and learning classes no matter in what position grade they are. In other words, the lecturers were responsible on what they did during the Open and Distance Learning sessions throughout the semester due to Covid-19. The five constructs which were content delivery, universal design, engagement, motivation empathy and support feedback in the position grade DM41 showed the mean score below than 3.00. The reason might be due to lack of experience to conduct ODL and not being technology savvy.

Table 3
Comparison of lecturers' teaching effectiveness self-assessment with position grade

TESA	*n*	*Mean*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Content Delivery				1.460	.213
DM41	12	2.917	.511		
DM45/46	113	3.197	.553		
DM51/52	245	3.241	.464		
DM53/54	14	3.194	.692		
Others	55	3.273	.432		
Universal Design				2.193	.069
DM41	12	2.990	.490		
DM45/46	113	3.362	.523		
DM51/52	245	3.383	.424		
DM53/54	14	3.339	.735		
Others	55	3.411	.416		
Engagement*				2.480	.043
DM41	12	2.917	.452		
DM45/46	113	3.333	.555		
DM51/52	245	3.348	.489		
DM53/54	14	3.524	.663		
Others	55	3.315	.542		
Tasks Assessment				2.314	.057
DM41	12	3.028	.481		
DM45/46	113	3.384	.581		
DM51/52	245	3.442	.491		
DM53/54	14	3.571	.546		
Others	55	3.406	.457		
Motivation Empathy*				2.374	.051
DM41	12	2.967	.602		
DM45/46	113	3.418	.553		
DM51/52	245	3.400	.447		
DM53/54	14	3.414	.649		
Others	55	3.407	.467		
Support Feedback*				2.463	.045
DM41	12	2.952	.507		
DM45/46	113	3.273	.521		
DM51/52	245	3.316	.455		
DM53/54	14	3.490	.426		
Others	55	3.338	.423		
Reflective*				4.064	.003

DM41	12	3.028	.531
DM45/46	113	3.322	.590
DM51/52	245	3.387	.458
DM53/54	14	3.762	.251
Others	55	3.391	.441

Note: P > 0.05 is no significant. Mark (*) is significant.

Results of the ANOVA test as per table 3 indicated that three TESA's constructs showed no significant difference between position grade with FContentDelivery.PositionGrade (4,434)=1.460, p=.213, FUniversalDesign.PositionGrade (4,434)=2.193, p=.069 and FTaskAssessment.PositionGrade (4,434)=2.314, p=.057.

There were only four TESA's constructs: engagement, motivation empathy, support feedback and reflective which were at a significant difference with position grade. Test results for engagement were as follows: F Engagement.PositionGrade (4,434)=2.408, p=.043, η2=0.023. The results of this test showed a significant difference from the engagement among position grades. The effect size was small. The Post Hoc test produced two groups as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4
Post Hoc Test on engagement between position grades

Position Grade	**Group 1**	**Group 2**
DM53/54	3.524	
DM51/52	3.348	
DM45/46	3.333	
Others	3.315	
DM41		2.917

Based on Table 4, the lecturers in position grade DM53/54 were at the highest category in engagement followed by position grade DM51/52, DM45/46 and Others. They belonged to the same group. The lowest category falls under position grade of DM41. There was a significant difference from the motivation empathy between position grade with *F*MotivationEmpathy.PositionGrade (4,434)=2.274, p=.051, η^2= 0.021. The effect size was small and Post Hoc test produced two groups as shown in Table 6 below. The lecturers in position grade DM45/46 were at the highest category followed by position grade DM53/54, Others and DM51/52. Lecturers in position grade DM41 was grouped at the 2nd and lowest category in the group.

Table 5
Post Hoc Test on motivation empathy between position grade

Position Grade	**Group 1**	**Group 2**
DM45/46	3.418	
DM53/54	3.414	
Others	3.407	
DM51/52	3.400	
DM41		2.967

A significant difference occurs at support feedback with position grade. The statistics obtained from the ANOVA test are *F*SupportFeedback.PositionGrade (4,434)=2.463, p=.045, η^2=0.022. This time around, the effect size level was small as well and Post Hoc test produced two groups as shown in Table 7.

Table 6
Post Hoc Test on support feedback between position grade

Position Grade	Group 1	Group 2
DM53/54	3.490	
Others	3.338	
DM51/52	3.316	
DM45/46	3.273	3.273
DM41		2.952

If position grade of DM53/DM54 have been identified and placed at top place in engagement previously, again it remains at the top place in the group of support feedback. Position grade DM45/46 was at the same level where the two groups were located at intermediate levels while position grade DM41 was placed in the lowest position in the group.

Reflective was another construct under TESA which was at a significant difference level with position grade. The result was also at the level of small effect size through statistical test FReflective.PositionGrade (4,434)=4.064, p=.003, η2=0.036. Post Hoc test was conducted and produced two groups as shown in Table 7. Again, position grade for DM53/54 was grouped independently and became the highest score category. The other four categories were grouped under the 2nd group with position grade DM41 which was at the lowest category the group.

Table 7
Post Hoc Test on reflective between position grade

Position Grade	Group 1	Group 2
DM53/54	3.762	
Others		3.391
DM51/52		3.387
DM45/46		3.322
DM41		3.028

In evaluating the lecturers' teaching effectiveness self-assessment with teaching experience, again, one-way ANOVA test was shown in Table 8. It was conducted to explore the difference at 95% confidence level through the effect size of Eta squared, η^2, used to test the main effects of TESA between teaching experience. The commonly used endpoints for η^2 are < .01 is very small, .01 is small, .06 is medium and .14 is large. If there is a significant difference in value between any of the TESA's construct, then a Post-Hoc test will be performed to determine which group of groups have significant differences and the granting of category title in one independent variable will be made.

One away anova test was conducted and results showed that non of the construct under TESA has a significant different between teaching experience. The statistics obtained from the

anova test are FContentDelivery.TeachigExperience (4,434)=.307, p=.873, FUniversalDesign.TeachigExperience (4,434) =.457, p =.768, FEngagement.TeachigExperience (4,434)=1.297, p=.270, FTaskAssessment.TeachigExperience (4,434)=.841, p=.500, FMotivationEmpathy.TeachigExperience (4,434)=.728, p=.573, FSupportFeedback.TeachigExperience (4,434)=1.477, p=.208, FReflective.TeachigExperience (4,434)=2.245, p=.063. By looking at the results, it was clear that lecturers' teaching self-assessement had no significant difference with teaching experience. This means that teaching experience did not reflect anything on TESA regardless of which category the lecturers belonged to.

Table 8
Comparison of lecturers' teaching effectiveness self-assessment with teaching experience

TESA	***n***	***Mean***	***SD***	***F***	***p***
Content Delivery				.307	.873
Less than 5 years	115	3.208	.463		
6 - 10 years	158	3.222	.501		
11 – 15 years	96	3.208	.518		
16 – 20 years	34	3.240	.535		
More than 20 years	36	3.306	.489		
Universal Design				.457	.768
Less than 5 years	115	3.360	.486		
6 - 10 years	158	3.359	.469		
11 – 15 years	96	3.384	.411		
16 – 20 years	34	3.313	.512		
More than 20 years	36	3.451	.502		
Engagement				1.297	.270
Less than 5 years	115	3.310	.568		
6 - 10 years	158	3.289	.526		
11 – 15 years	96	3.368	.468		
16 – 20 years	34	3.363	.547		
More than 20 years	36	3.491	.447		
Tasks Assessment				.841	.500
Less than 5 years	115	3.377	.540		
6 - 10 years	158	3.401	.513		
11 – 15 years	96	3.451	.521		
16 – 20 years	34	3.382	.486		
More than 20 years	36	3.537	.473		
Motivation Empathy				.728	.573
Less than 5 years	115	3.398	.512		
6 - 10 years	158	3.379	.499		
11 – 15 years	96	3.360	.469		
16 – 20 years	34	3.418	.567		

More than 20 years	36	3.517	.387		
Support Feedback				1.477	.208
Less than 5 years	115	3.268	.485		
6 - 10 years	158	3.274	.475		
11 – 15 years	96	3.310	.486		
16 – 20 years	34	3.378	.441		
More than 20 years	36	3.456	.394		
Reflective				2.245	.063
Less than 5 years	115	3.357	.506		
6 - 10 years	158	3.351	.507		
11 – 15 years	96	3.337	.504		
16 – 20 years	34	3.382	.485		
More than 20 years	36	3.607	.372		

Note: P > 0.05 is no significant. Mark (*) is significant.

This study further highlighted that there was a significant difference between engagement, motivation empathy, support feedback and reflective with lecturer's position grade during the ODL session. The study also found that lecturers of grade DM41 was the lowest group in engagement, motivation empathy, support feedback and reflective. Lack of experience in conducting ODL and not being technology savvy could be the prominent reasons as also found in previous studies (Rapanta et al., 2020; Barton, 2020). As the university is currently heading towards the digital Edu 5.0., hence, this particular group should improve their teaching and learning for Open and Distance Learning constantly in order to close the gap with the other lecturers of higher grades as well as to improve the academic achievement of students in the future.

Conclusion

To conclude, this study has revealed findings on Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA) regarding gender, position grade and teaching experience.

Firstly, it was revealed that only one TESA component which is content delivery, indicated a significant variation between gender. This might be since different genders may have varied styles of material delivery in teaching and learning during the Covid-19 pandemic to match the learning outcomes and students' learning environment. This finding is contrary to Alea et al (2020); Ekunola (2021) where both viewed gender difference in terms of attitude towards online learning which recorded female teachers to be more ready and engaged compared to male teachers in providing their students with distant learning education.

The results of the second part of this study showed that lecturers with higher position grade performed better compared to the lecturers from the lower position grade. This is in line with the findings from Garcia-Rivera et al (2022) as senior lecturers were perceived to have better ability in terms of managing stress as well as in handling students and classes as the reason being could be because of their years of teaching experience.

Finally, the third part which investigated lecturers' teaching effectiveness self-assessment with teaching experience discovered that regardless of which group the lecturers belonged to, their teaching experience had no impact on TESA. This differs from Rapanta et.al

(2020) where it stated lecturers' experience plays an important part in ensuring the effectiveness of lesson delivery.

Based on these findings, the university academic management could enhance professional growth among lecturers by equipping them with adequate technology exposure in achieving the goals created. In the field of research and education, it is suggested that more research could be done on Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA) in the endemic era of COVID-19 to add to the body of knowledge on self-assessment among lecturers in higher education and to develop its contributions towards theoretical knowledge of self-assessment possibly within the broader framework of social cognition theory.

This study has so far highlighted its contributions theoretically and contextually through its Teaching Effectiveness Self-Assessment (TESA). In view of gender, position grade and teaching experience, several factors tend to fit within the components of social cognition theory. These factors include varied teaching styles, readiness and teaching performance found in TESA results. TESA subsequently is seen as a contribution towards lecturers' professional growth in higher education within online and traditional classroom contexts.

Acknowledgements
The authors gratefully acknowledge the support given by Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Negeri Sembilan Branch.

Corresponding Author
Associate Professor Dr Norwati Roslim
Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Negeri Sembilan Branch, Rembau Campus, Jalan Pilin, 71300 Rembau, Malaysia.
Email: norwati@uitm.edu.my

References

Alea, L. A., Fabrea, M. F., Roldan, R. D. A., & Farooqi, A. Z. (2020). Teachers' Covid-19 awareness, distance learning education experiences and perceptions towards institutional readiness and challenges. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *19*(6), 127-144.

Al-Talhouni, M. H. (2021). The Perceptions of the Teachers of Islamic Education in Jordan Concerning the Use and the Challenges of Darsak Platform. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *10*(6), 23-37.

Barton, D. C. (2020). Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on field instruction and remote teaching alternatives: Results from a survey of instructors. *Ecology and evolution*.

Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective Faculty Evaluation: Enhancing Teaching and Determining Faculty Effectiveness. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series*. Jossey-Bass Inc., 350 Sansome St., San Francisco, CA 94104.

Davis, A., & McDonald, D. (2019). Teachers' reflections of instructional effectiveness: self-assessment through a standards-based appraisal process. *Reflective Practice*, *20*(1), 125-141.

Ekunola, G. T., Onojah, A. O., Talatu, A. F., & Bankole, M. O. (2021). Colleges of Education Lecturers' Attitude Towards the Use of Virtual Classrooms for Instruction. *Indonesian Journal of*
Multidisciplinary Research. 2 (1). 187-194.

Garcia-Rivera, B. R., Mendoza-Martinez, I. A., Garcia-Alcaraz, J. L., Olguin-Tiznado, J. E., Wilson, C., Aranibar, M. F., & Garcia-Alcaraz, P. (2022). Influence of Resilience on Burnout Syndrome of Faculty Professors. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(2), 910.

Hassan, N., Jani, S. H. M., Som, R. M., Abd Hamid, N. Z., & Azizam, N. A. (2015). The relationship between emotional intelligence and teaching effectiveness among lecturers at Universiti Teknologi MARA, Puncak Alam, Malaysia. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, *5*(1), 1.

Masuwai, A., Zulkifli, H., & Tamuri, A. H. (2021). Systematic Literature Review on Self-Assessment Inventory for Quality Teaching among Islamic Education Teachers. *Sustainability*, *14*(1), 203.

Quddus, L., Khalid, M., & Khan, M. W. A. (2019). Teachers' Self-Assessment of Their Teaching Effectiveness at Higher Secondary Level in Pakistan: A Case Study. *KnE Social Sciences*, 807-817.

Rapanta, C., Botturi, L., Goodyear, P., Guardia, L., & Koole, M. (2020). Online university teaching during and after the Covid-19 crisis: Refocusing teacher presence and learning activity. *Post digital Science and Education*, *2*(3), 923-945.

Sahin, T. (2021). Self-evaluated teacher effectiveness in physical education and sports during schools closedown and emergency distance learning: Teacher effectiveness in physical education. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *13*(2), 1493-1507.

Tena, R. R., Almenara, J. C., Osuna, J. B. (2016). E-Learning of Andalusian University's Lecturers. Gender. The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology. 15 (2). 25-37.

Tirri, K. (1993). *Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness by Self-Assessment: A Cross-Cultural Study. Research Report 122*. Department of Teacher Education, Research Reports, PO Box 38 (Ratakatu 6A) 00014 University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.

Warsi, L. Q., & Khurshid, K. (2022). The Role of Self-Assessment in English Language Teachers' Professional Development in Pakistan. *Education Research International*, *2022*.