



A Cross-Sectional Analysis of Classroom Assessment Literacy of English Teachers in Secondary and Tertiary Levels

Tristan L. Piosang

National University, Manila

Abstract

The present study reported on the classroom assessment literacy of secondary English teachers (SET) and tertiary English teachers (TET). It specifically compared the level of assessment literacy of both groups. Classroom assessment literacy (CAL) was measured using Classroom Assessment Literacy Inventory (CALI). The results showed that teachers in basic education had higher means on assessment literacy than teachers in college, though, both have poor CAL ($M=13.78$, $M=10.87$). On the level of CAL, 85% of the SET group had poor CAL and 15% had fair CAL. For TET group, 88% had poor CAL, 5% had fair CAL, and 7% had good CAL. Results of t-test for independent samples showed that there is a significant difference between the level of classroom assessment literacy of SET and TET, $p=0.04$.

Keywords: Assessment Literacy, Language Teachers, CALI, Classroom Assessment

Introduction

Assessment plays a critical role in the 21st century educational landscape as it serves critical purposes more than just mere measurement of student achievement. Ewell (2009) has made a distinction on the two critical purposes assessments serve which he termed as *assessment paradigms* in the 21st century, namely: (1) Assessment for Improvement Paradigm and (2) Assessment for Accountability Paradigm. On the first paradigm, Ewell (2009) argues that assessment is used for the improvement of learning and instruction. The second paradigm emphasizes accountability on different levels – from classroom to national – wherein teachers, school heads, and the government are held accountable for student achievement. Accountability is dictated by the results of assessments conducted at each level. Across all levels, it is in the

classroom level that these two paradigms are greatly manifested. This is because at this level, teachers make use of assessment results to make instructional adjustments and interventions to improve student learning. At the end, teachers are held accountable for student achievement.

High quality classroom assessment, specifically on its formative assessment component, greatly accounts for improved student achievement (Black & William, 1998; Butler & Winne, 1995; Kingston & Nash, 2011; White & Frederiksen, 1998; Randel, Apthorp, Beesley, Clark, & Wang, 2016). When students are frequently assessed in the course of the learning process, teachers have the opportunity to adjust instruction and make necessary interventions to address learning deficiencies (Stiggins, 1998). This would result to better scaffolding of learners, hence improved student achievement. The concept that explains this is called formative assessment which is also a critical component of classroom assessment. Formative assessment is argued as a powerful way to improve student learning (Black & William, 1998; Magno & Lizada, 2015). Black and William (1998) has argued that an assessment strategy becomes formative when the results it yields are used to adjust instruction and make to meet students' needs. The P21 document on the 21st Century Skills Assessment (2007) has been strong on the need to balance the practice of formative assessment with the traditional use of assessment or summative. Assessments, it argues, must be regarded as both an instructional tool that is used to inform necessary adjustments in teaching to scaffold learners' current state of learning to their desired state of learning (formative), and as an accountability tool that shows quantitatively whether learning has actually occurred (summative) (P21, 2007).

One critical component of a high-quality classroom assessment is the alignment of assessment activities to learning goals (Randel et al., 2016; Ayala et al., 2008; Shepard, 2000; Stiggins & Chappuis, 2008; Valencia, 2008; Wiley, 2008). It is crucial, Randel et al. (2016) notes, that students are informed of and are made to understand these learning goals, how these classroom assessment activities are aligned with the goals, and the criteria by which progress in the achievement of goals is assessed. Studies (Fontana & Fernandez, 1994; Frederiksen & White, 1997) show that students who are aware of the learning goals learn more quickly than students who are not (Randel et al., 2016). Because the quality of assessment taking place at the classroom level greatly accounts for the quality of student achievement, teacher's accountability for assessment results is high (Magno & Piosang, 2016).

Because of the critical role classroom assessment plays in the improvement of student achievement, the literacy of teachers on classroom

assessment and on assessment in general is also critical. Assessment literacy, De Luca, McEwan, and Luhanga (2016) citing Popham (2013), has become a priority in educational systems in North America. Popham (2009) has argued that assessment is a necessary condition for competent teachers. In the United States, states have been conducting professional development programs for teachers that focus on classroom assessment. In South Carolina, for example, a professional development program on formative assessment was designed by its Department of Education which broadly addresses classroom assessment. The program specifically focuses on the increasing of teachers' skills in designing classroom assessments that improve student learning (Randel et al., 2016).

Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment of Students

An effort to improve classroom assessment literacy of teachers necessitates the presence of a specific set of standards on educational assessment which teachers will have to observe. Having a set of specific assessment standards for teachers would set better practice of proper classroom assessment (Magno, 2013). However, Magno (2013) notes these set of specific assessment standards are only present in a few countries or states like the United States, New South Wales, and New Mexico. In the United States, the National Council on Measurement and Evaluation (NCME), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and the National Education Association (NEA) jointly developed the Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment of Students or The Standards in 1990. There are seven specific standards under The Standard (AFT, NCME, & NEA, pp. 1-2):

1. Teachers should be skilled in choosing assessment methods appropriate
2. for instructional decisions.
1. Teachers should be skilled in choosing assessment methods appropriate for instructional decisions.
2. Teachers should be skilled in developing assessment methods appropriate for instructional decisions.
3. The teacher should be skilled in administering, scoring, and interpreting the results of both externally-produced and teacher-produced assessment methods.
4. Teachers should be skilled in using assessment results when making decisions about individual students, planning teaching, developing curriculum, and school improvement.

5. Teachers should be skilled in developing valid pupil grading procedures which use pupil assessments.
6. Teachers should be skilled in communicating assessment results to students, parents, other lay audiences, and other educators.
7. Teachers should be skilled in recognizing unethical, illegal, and otherwise inappropriate assessment methods and uses of assessment information.

To date, there is no set of standards on teacher competence on student assessment yet in the Philippines (Magno, 2013). This may have an effect on the level of classroom assessment literacy of Filipino teachers as it has been argued that the presence of a set of specific assessment standards for teachers would set better practice of proper classroom assessment (Magno, 2013).

The Standards has served as test blueprint for the development of instruments that measure assessment and classroom assessment literacy such as the Teacher Assessment Literacy Questionnaire (TALQ) by Plake and Impara (1992), Assessment Literacy Inventory (ALI) by Campbell et al. (2002), and the Classroom Assessment Literacy Inventory (CALI) by Mertler (2004).

Studies on Classroom Assessment Literacy

There have been several studies on both assessment literacy (general) and classroom assessment literacy of teacher (Plake, Impara, & Fager, 1993; Campbell et al., 2002; Mertler, 2003; Mertler & Campbell, 2005; Yamtim & Wongwanich, 2013).

Plake et al. (1993) conducted a national study measuring the assessment literacy of teachers in the United States. Using the TALQ, 553 teachers from a total of 98 districts in 45 states participated in the survey. Results of the study showed that teachers obtained an average score of 23 out of 35 items correct. A mean score of 3.45/5.00 was obtained on *Standard 3- Administering, Scoring, and Interpreting Assessment Results* which was the highest performance among all standards. The lowest performance occurred on *Standard 6- Communicating Assessment Results* with $M=2.70/5.00$. Plake et al. (1993) recommended inservice materials for teacher training which include standards of assessment (Magno, 2013).

While the study of Plake et al. (1993) focused on inservice teachers, the study of Campbell et al. (2002) focused on measuring the assessment literacy of undergraduate preservice teachers. This time, an instrument identical to TALQ was used – Assessment Literacy Inventory (ALI). It was administered to 220

preservice teachers taking up course on measurement. The data obtained from this study yielded higher reliability ($\alpha=.74$) than in Plake et al (1993) study ($\alpha=.74$). The average score of the preservice teachers was 21 which was two points lower than the inservice teachers in the study of Plake et al (1993). The participants in this study scored highest on *Standard 1- Choosing Appropriate Assessment Methods*. Both groups subjected in the studies of Plake et al (1993) and Campbell et al (2002) scored lowest on *Standard 6-Communicating Assessment Results*.

Mertler and Campbell (2005), in his study, compared the classroom assessment literacy of inservice and preservice teachers. It utilized the Classroom Assessment Literacy Inventory or CALI designed by Mertler (2004). The preservice teacher group (N=67) obtained an average score of 19 out of 35 items correctly. The highest performance of the preservice groups was found for *Standard 1*(M=3.25), while the lowest was obtained for *Standard 5-Developing Valid Grading Procedure* (M=2.06). For the inservice teachers (N=197), they obtained an average of 22 out 35 items correctly which is 3 points higher against the preservice group. The inservice group's highest performance was found on *Standard 3-Administering, Scoring, and Interpreting the Results of Assessments* (M=3.95). The group, on the other hand, obtained the lowest in *Standard 5-Developing Valid Grading Procedures*.

Lastly, the study of Yamtim and Wongwanich (2013) reported the classroom assessment literacy (CAL) of 19 primary school teachers in Thailand. The study used the Classroom Assessment Literacy Inventory (Mertler, 2003) to measure the classroom assessment literacy of the respondents. Findings of the study demonstrated that the mean scores of the participants (M=17.11) indicate poor assessment literacy with 78.95% of the participants who obtained scores that qualify under low level of CAL, and 21.04% who obtained scores that indicate medium level of CAL.

Classroom Assessment in the Philippines

Classroom assessment literacy, defined as the necessary knowledge and skill in compiling data on students' achievement and the effective utilization of classroom assessment tasks and outcomes to better students' achievement (Chappuis, Stiggins, Chappuis, & Arter, 2012), has gained significant attention in educational systems around the world because of the critical role classroom assessment play in the improvement of student learning. Saefurroham and Balinas (2016), in their study on the classroom assessment practices of English teachers in the Philippines and Indonesia, has noted that in the two countries,

premium importance has been accorded to classroom assessment alongside with both countries' change of curriculum paradigm to one that places students as the center of learning. In the Philippines, the passage of Republic Act 10533 or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, also known as the K to 12 Law, has brought forth the issuance of a comprehensive policy on classroom assessment by the Philippine Department of Education (DepEd). In 2015, the DepEd has issued Order no. 08, s. 2015 titled Policy Guidelines on Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program. DepEd Order no. 08 is strong on the role of classroom assessment, specifically classroom formative assessment, on the improvement of achievement of Filipino learners. While this order sets a comprehensive policy on the use of classroom assessment, there appears to be a dearth of studies that investigate the classroom assessment literacy of Filipino teachers. This is taken into serious consideration because several studies in other countries (Bol, Stephenson, O'Connell, & Nunnery, 1998; Stiggins & Conklin, 1992; Wiggins, 1989) have consistently demonstrated that teachers are inadequately trained and ill-prepared in developing, administering, and interpreting the results of various types of assessments including classroom assessment (Koh, 2011). This is aside from the observation that teachers were not good judges of the quality of the assessment tasks they develop (Black & William; Bol & Strage, 1996) is indicative of low assessment literacy (Koh, 2011). To pattern an assumption from these studies, if Filipino teachers have low classroom assessment literacy, two questions should be asked: (1) How then the mandate of DepEd Order no. 08 be effectively translated into actual classroom practice? (2) How does their level of CAL affect achievement of Filipino learners? Hence, there is pressing need for studies to be conducted focusing on the level of CAL of Filipino teachers.

CAL of English Teachers

In response to this gap, the present study reports the levels of CAL of English teachers in the Philippines in two levels, secondary and tertiary. With the aim to produce holistically developed and globally competitive Filipino graduates, the achievement of 21st century skills have become an integral part of the K to 12 basic education reform program. One of the 21st century skills that make graduates globally competitive is communicative competence in English. This puts to critical task English language teachers. As it has been argued that high quality classroom assessment greatly accounts for improved student achievement (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Butler & Winne, 1995; Kingston

& Nash, 2011; White & Frederiksen, 1998; Randel, Apthorp, Beesley, Clark, & Wang, 2016), improving on the CAL of English teachers would therefore account for improved achievement of learners in English. Hence, there is a need to report the levels of CAL of the English teachers in the country as it may serve as foundation or basis for professional development programs specifically designed for the development of teachers' classroom assessment literacy (Koh, 2011). DeLuca and Klinger (2010) has noted that in-service teachers consistently indicate their need of more professional development programs on classroom assessment as teachers often receive inadequate training on classroom assessment (Randel et al., 2016; DeLuca & Klinger, 2010; O'Sullivan & Chalnik, 1991; Schaffer, 1993). The present study reports and compares the levels of CAL of English teachers in secondary and tertiary levels. This is also because previous studies like that of Mertler (2003) have focused on reporting and comparing the levels of CAL of preservice and inservice teachers. The present study, on the other hand, reports and compares the levels of CAL of two groups of inservice teachers teaching in two different levels.

Research Questions

The present study aims to determine the levels of classroom assessment literacy of Filipino English language teachers in secondary and tertiary levels using Mertler's (2004) Classroom Assessment Literacy Inventory or CALI. The specific research questions are as follows:

1. What are the levels of classroom assessment literacy of secondary and tertiary English teachers?
2. Is there significant difference between the levels of classroom assessment literacy of secondary and tertiary English teachers?

Method

Research Design

The present study employed cross-sectional and descriptive research designs. Cross-sectional design is used to measure differences between or from among a variety of people, subjects, or phenomena (Bethlehem, 1999). By employing cross-sectional design, the present study was able to ascertain the differences between the levels of classroom assessment literacy (CAL) of secondary and tertiary English teachers both in overall CAL and in the specific standards of CAL. This study is also descriptive in nature as it determines,

describes, and identifies the levels of CAL of the both groups in overall CAL and in the specific standards of CAL.

Participants

The participants of the study are 80 English teachers (Male= 16; Female=64) randomly selected from three (3) private and four (4) public secondary schools, and five (5) private and (2) public tertiary education institutions in National Capital Region, Philippines. Of the 80 participants, 40 are teaching in the secondary level and 40 are teaching in the secondary level, 47 are MA/MS degree holder. With respect to the length of service, 14 are 1-5 years in service; 9 are 6-10 years; 6 are 11-15 years; 38 are already 16-20 years; 6 are 21-25 years; and 7 are 26-30 years in service.

Instrument

The present study utilized the Classroom Assessment Literacy Inventory or CALI developed by Mertler (2004). The CALI consists of two parts. The first part has a total of 35 items anchored on the seven (7) Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment of Students of AFT NCME, and NEA (1990). Each standard is allotted five questions in the inventory. Some of the items in the inventory are intended to measure general concepts related to testing and assessment. Some measure the use of assessment activities for assigning student grades and communicating the results of assessment. The other items measure the teacher's knowledge of standardized testing. The rest of the items measure teacher's knowledge of classroom assessment. The CALI was pilot tested two times. In the first pilot testing to 152 preservice teachers ($n=152$), the items yielded relatively sufficient psychometric values with overall KR20 (r_{KR20}) of .75, mean item difficulty was equal to .64, and the mean item discrimination was equivalent to .32 (Mertler, 2003). In the second phase of pilot testing, the items also yielded relatively sufficient psychometric values with overall KR20 (r_{KR20}) of .74, mean item difficulty was equal to .68, and the mean item discrimination of .31 (Mertler, 2003).

In order to obtain a copy of the CALI, the researchers wrote an e-mail correspondence to Dr. Craig Mertler, Associate Professor at Arizona State University, who designed the CALI. He provided the researchers a copy of the CALI, hence authorizing them of its use for the conduct of the present study.

Data Gathering Procedure

In order to obtain the necessary data, the researchers have first written letters to the school heads for the secondary schools, and to the program chair or deans of colleges for tertiary educational institutions to seek permission for administering the Classroom Assessment Literacy Inventory (CALI) to the English teachers in their respective schools.

The participants were first informed about the study being conducted. Then, informed consent was sought. They were also assured of confidentiality with regard to the reporting of scores. Then, the researcher explained the competencies or standards covered in CALI before the general instructions were read.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics in terms of frequency distribution, percentage (%), mean, and standard deviation. The levels of classroom assessment literacy were also computed. The scores of CAL could be divided into three levels, namely: (1) poor or needs improvement (lower than 60%), (2) fair (60-79%), and (3) good (80% and higher). To determine the raw number of participants that fall under whichever level, the following tables served as reference.

Table 1

Interpretation for Levels of Overall Classroom Assessment Literacy

Number	Level of Classroom Assessment Literacy	Interpretation
28 and higher	High	Good
21 to 27	Medium	Fair
20 and below	Low	Poor

Table 2

Interpretation for Levels on each Standards of Classroom Assessment Literacy

Number	Level of Classroom Assessment Literacy	Interpretation
4-5	High	Good
3	Medium	Fair
1-2	Low	Poor

For the overall CAL, the levels were computed by getting the 60%, 79%, and 80% of the total number of items which is 35. The levels of CAL on specific standards were computed by getting 60%, 79%, and 80% of the total number of items which is 5 (per standard).

T-test for independent samples were conducted for the overall classroom assessment literacy (CAL) of the secondary and tertiary English teachers to determine whether there is a significant difference between the levels of CAL of the two groups. The t-test for independent samples was also conducted for the levels of CAL of the two groups on each specific standard.

Results

The results show that for the overall mean scores, secondary English teachers (SET) obtained higher mean score of 13.75 than tertiary English teachers (TET) with 10.87. Across all standards, SET obtained higher mean scores than TET except for *standard 6: communicating assessment outcomes*. The overall standard deviation of SET was lower than TET at SD= 5.93 and SD=6.57, respectively. Though SET obtained higher mean score than TET, both mean scores indicate poor classroom assessment literacy because the mean scores are lower than 20.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

Group Standards	Secondary				Tertiary			
	M	SD	Min.	Max	M	SD	Min	Max
1. Choosing an assessment method	1.87	1.32	0	5	2.02	1.06	0	5
2. Developing assessment methods	2.15	1.21	0	5	1.92	0.87	1	4
3. Administering, assigning, and interpreting learning outcomes	2.15	1.49	0	5	1.46	1.21	0	5
4. Using assessment outcomes in decision making	2.42	1.29	1	5	1.87	0.86	1	4
5. Using assessment to determine levels of learning outcomes	1.92	1.49	0	5	1.12	1.38	0	5
6. Communicating assessment outcomes	1.00	1.28	0	5	0.84	1.50	0	5
7. Knowing unethical practices	2.25	1.53	0	5	1.61	1.06	0	4
Overall	13.78	5.93	8	27	10.87	6.57	5	31

For SET, the overall minimum score is 8 and the overall maximum score is 27. For TET, the overall minimum score was 5 and the overall maximum score was 31. It should also be noted that TET had higher maximum score (Max=31) but SET had higher minimum score (Min=8). Noticeably, SET yielded six minimum scores of 0 on 6 over 7 competencies which was comparably lower than five minimum scores of 0 obtained in the case of TET. While this was the case, SET yielded maximum scores of five (5) in all seven standards and TET yielded maximum scores of five (5) in only four (4) standards.

Table 2

Levels of Classroom Assessment Literacy of Secondary English Teachers

Standards	Classroom Assessment Literacy					
	Low		Medium		High	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Choosing an assessment method	28	70%	7	18%	5	12%
2. Developing assessment methods	28	70%	6	15%	6	15%
3. Administering, assigning, and interpreting learning outcomes	24	60%	8	20%	8	20%
4. Using assessment outcomes in decision making	24	60%	6	15%	10	25%
5. Using assessment to determine levels of learning outcomes	26	65%	9	23%	5	12%
6. Communicating assessment outcomes	36	90%	2	5%	2	5%
7. Knowing unethical practices	25	63%	4	10%	11	27%
Overall	34	85%	6	15%	0	0%

After the descriptive statistics were obtained, the levels of classroom assessment literacy (CAL) were computed for the overall CAL and for specific standards. For overall CAL, 34 (85%) of the secondary English teachers (SET)

have poor level of CAL while there were 6 (15%) who have medium level of CAL. The table also shows that none of the SETs were able to qualify as having good classroom assessment literacy (score ≥ 28).

With respect to the specific standards of CAL, *standard 6: communicating assessment outcomes* obtained the highest number of SETs which yielded low level of literacy with 36 (90%) SETs. There were 10 SETs which yielded high level of literacy on *Standard 4: using assessment outcomes in decision making*. Generally, most of the SETs demonstrated poor CAL across all standards with Standards

Table 3
Levels of Classroom Assessment Literacy of Tertiary English Teachers

Standards		Classroom Assessment Literacy					
		Low		Medium		High	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1.	Choosing an assessment method	35	88%	-	-	5	12%
2.	Developing assessment methods	35	88%	1	2%	4	10%
3.	Administering, assigning, and interpreting learning outcomes	34	85%	2	5%	4	10%
4.	Using assessment outcomes in decision making	36	90%	-	-	4	10%
5.	Using assessment to determine levels of learning outcomes	35	88%	-	-	5	12%
6.	Communicating assessment outcomes	36	90%	1	2%	3	8%
7.	Knowing unethical practices	33	83%	2	5%	5	12%
Overall		35	88%	2	5%	3	7%

On the level of CAL of tertiary English teachers (TET), there were 35 (88%) TETs who have low level of overall CAL which was a point higher than SET. There were two (5%) TETs who yielded medium level of CAL. The

remaining three (3) TETs obtained high level of CAL which was higher when compared to SET which had none or 0.

When the levels of literacy on the specific standards were analyzed, there were more TETs who yielded poor literacy compared to SET. On *standard 4: using assessment outcomes in decision making* for example, there were 24 SETs who obtained low level of literacy which was comparably lower than 34 TETs who obtained low level of literacy on the same standard. Across all standards, TET had higher numbers of low level literacies (S1=35; S2=35; S3=34; S4=36; S5=35; S6=36; S7=33) than SET (S1=28; S2=28; S3=24; S4=24; S5=26; S6=36; S7=25).

Table 4

Overall T-test for CAL of Secondary and Tertiary English Teachers

G1 vs G2	t-value	Df	F-ratio	p variances	p-value
Secondary vs Tertiary	2.06	77	1.22	0.53	0.04*

* $p < 0.05$

The t-test for independent samples was conducted in order to determine whether there is a significant difference between the CAL levels of secondary English teachers (SET) and tertiary English teachers (TET). The table shows that the variances of the two groups are equal with an F-ratio of 1.22. The p-variances of 0.53 is greater than .05. This signifies that the sample is fit for t-test.

The p-value obtained ($p=0.04$) indicates significant difference between the level of CAL of SET and TER. By looking at the mean scores, SET has higher CAL ($M=13.78$) than TET ($M=10.78$). While the difference is significant at $p < 0.05$, both mean scores indicate poor level of CAL ($\text{score} \leq 20$).

Table 5
T-test for Specific Standards

Standards	t-value	Df	F-ratio	p variances	p-value
1. Choosing an assessment method	-0.55	77	1.55	0.18	0.57
2. Developing assessment methods	0.95	77	1.93	0.04	0.34
3. Administering, assigning, and interpreting learning outcomes	2.25	77	1.52	0.20	0.02*
4. Using assessment outcomes in decision making	2.22	77	2.26	0.13	0.02*
5. Using assessment to determine levels of learning outcomes	2.46	77	1.17	0.63	0.01*
6. Communicating assessment outcomes	0.49	77	1.36	0.33	0.62
7. Knowing unethical practices	0.00	76	1.00	1.00	1.00

* $p < 0.05$

The same test was conducted to determine whether there is significant difference between the levels of literacy on each of the seven specific standards under CAL. Of the seven standards, *standard 3: administering, assigning, and interpreting learning outcomes*, *standard 4: using assessment outcomes in decision making*, and *standard 5: using assessment to determine levels of learning outcomes* yielded significant difference with p-values of 0.02, 0.02, and 0.01, respectively. By looking at the mean scores of the two groups, for standard 3, results show that SET has significantly higher literacy on administering, assigning, and interpreting learning outcomes ($M=2.15$) than TET (1.46). Also, SET obtained significantly higher literacy ($M= 2.42$) on the usage of assessment outcomes in decision making (*standard 5*) than TET ($M=1.87$). The same is the case with the

usage of assessment to ascertain levels of learning outcomes where SET obtained higher mean score ($M=1.92$) than TET ($M=1.12$). While there exists a significant difference on the literacy of both groups on these specific standards, it must be noted that all of the mean scores still indicate poor level of literacy ($\text{score} \leq 2$).

As for *standards 1, 2, 6, and 7*, the p-values obtained ($p=0.75$; $p=0.34$; $p=0.62$; $p=1.00$) indicate that there is no significant difference between the levels of literacy of SET and TET on these standards. By looking at the mean scores shown in Table 1, both groups yielded mean scores that indicate poor level of literacy on these standards ($\text{score} \leq 2$).

Discussion

The present study investigated the levels of classroom assessment literacy (CAL) of inservice English teachers in secondary and tertiary levels. Results showed that English teachers in the secondary has higher CAL ($M=13.78$) than that of the teachers in the tertiary level ($M=10.87$). Though, both mean scores indicate poor CAL of both groups. For the secondary teachers, 85% indicated poor CAL and 6% yielded fair CAL. Meanwhile, 88% of the tertiary teachers indicated poor CAL, 5% yielded fair CAL, and 7% good. Across all standards, the mean scores indicate poor literacy ($M=1.87$; $M=2.15$; $M=2.15$; $M=2.42$; $M=1.92$; $M=1.00$; $M=2.25$). The findings of the present study indicate that the level of CAL of the participants is lower than the levels of CAL of the participants in the studies of Plake et al. (1993), Campbell et al. (2002), Mertler and Campbell (2005), and Yamtim and Wongwanich (2014).

The poor classroom assessment literacy (CAL) of English language teachers in secondary and tertiary levels is telling of the inadequacy of training and ill-preparedness of teachers in the rudiments of assessment, specifically classroom assessment. This is consistent with the findings of several studies that teachers receive insufficient training and ill-preparation in inadequately trained and ill-prepared in developing, administering, and interpreting the results of various types of assessments including classroom assessment (Bol, Stephenson, O'Connell, & Nunnery, 1998; Stiggins & Conklin, 1992; Wiggins, 1989). This is a crucial finding as when English teachers have poor CAL, hence are hardly able to make use of classroom assessments for the improvement of instruction and, consequently, of student achievement. Classroom assessment becomes inutile to the improvement of student achievement. Specifically, it may fail to account for the development of

necessary English language competencies indicated in the K to 12 curriculum. This may ultimately affect the development of the learners' communicative competence in English which is the core intended outcome spelled out in the Philippine K to 12 English Curriculum.

While the Philippine Department of Education has issued a comprehensive policy on the use of classroom assessment for the improvement of student learning and achievement as spelled out in DepEd Order no. 08, s. 2015 or the Policy Guidelines on Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program, the findings of the present study indicate that teachers, especially in the secondary or basic education level, are not classroom assessment literate enough to translate the mandates and tasks of the said policy into practice. This is to say that no matter how comprehensive and elaborate the policy is on classroom assessment, it would serve inutile if teachers, similar to the findings of this study, lack the necessary knowledge and skills to successfully and appropriately make use of classroom assessment to improve student achievement.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Because the results of the study revealed an alarmingly low classroom assessment literacy (CAL) of teachers of English in both secondary and tertiary levels, the necessity for professional development programs that focus on the development of the classroom assessment literacy of not only teachers in English but teachers across disciplines in basic and tertiary levels arises as something vital and pressing. The instrumentalities of the government that are in-charge of education such as the Department of Education and Commission on Higher Education, and the education sector as a whole should take a look at recalibrating and upgrading the policy on teacher training and professional development on classroom assessment. This is to enable teachers, most especially in the basic education level, to successfully translate the comprehensive policy on classroom assessment of the DepEd into practice which would account for the improvement of student learning and achievement.

Lastly, future researchers are encouraged to conduct the same study employing a bigger and a more representative sample size in order to determine on a wider scale the classroom assessment literacy of Filipino teachers in English across regions or provinces in the country. Such may serve as a sounder empirical basis for the development of a comprehensive

educational policy on professional development and teacher training programs focused on classroom assessment.

References

- American Federation of Teachers, National Council on Measurement in Education, & National Education Association. (1990). *Standards for teacher competence in educational assessment of students*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Ayala, C. C., Shavelson, R. J., Ruiz-Primo, M. A., Brandon, P. R., Yin, Y., Furtak, E. M., & Tomita, M. K. (2008). From formal embedded assessments to reflective lessons: The development of formative assessment studies. *Applied Measurement in Education, 21*, 315–334.
- Black, P. & William, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education, 5*(1), 7-71.
- Bethlehem, J. (1999). Cross-sectional Research. In H. Ader, & G. J. Mellenbergh (Eds.), *Research Methodology in the Social, Behavioural and Life Sciences* (pp. 110-143). London, England: SAGE.
- Bol, L., Stephenson, P. L., O'Connell, A. A., & Nunnery, J. A. (1998). Influence of experience, grade level, and subject area on teachers' assessment practices. *The Journal of Educational Research, 91*, 323–330.
- Bol, L., & Strage, A. (1996). The contradiction between teachers' instructional goals and their assessment practices in high school biology courses. *Science Education, 80*, 145– 163.
- Butler, D. L., & Winne, P.H. (1995). Effects of no feedback, task-related comments, and grades on intrinsic motivation and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78*, 210-216.
- Campbell, C., Murphy, J. A., & Holt, J. K. (2002, October). *Psychometric analysis of an assessment literacy instrument: Applicability to preservice teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Columbus, OH.
- Chappuis, J., Stiggins, R. Chappuis, S., & Arter, J. (2012). Classroom assessment for student learning: Doing it right-using it well. Assessment Training Institute.
- DeLuca, C., & Klinger, D. A. (2010). Assessment literacy development: Identifying gaps in teacher candidates' learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 17*, 419–438.
- Kingston, N., & Nash, B. (2011). Formative assessment: A meta-analysis and call for research. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices, 30*(4), 28-37.

- Koh, K. H. (2011). Improving teachers' assessment literacy through professional development. *Teaching Education*, 22(3), 255-276.
- Magno, C. (2013). Standards of teacher competence on student assessment in the Philippines. *The Assessment Handbook*, 10, 42-53.
- Magno, C., & Lizada, G. S. (2015). Features of classroom formative assessment. *Educational Measurement and Evaluation Review*, 6, 23-31.
- Magno, C., & Piosang, T. L. (2016). Assessment schemes in the senior high school in the Philippine basic education. *Educational Measurement and Evaluation Review*, 7, 66-87.
- Mertler, C. A. (2003, October). *Preservice versus inservice teacher' assessment literacy: Does classroom experience make a difference?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Columbus, OH.
- Mertler, C. A., & Campbell, C. (2005, April). *Measuring teachers' knowledge and application of classroom assessment concepts: Development of the assessment literacy inventory.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, QC, Canada.
- O'Sullivan, R. G., & Chalkin, M. K. (1991). Measurement-related course work requirements for teacher certification and recertification. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 10, 17-23.
- Plake, B. S. (1993) Teacher assessment literacy: Teachers' competencies in the educational assessment of students. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 6(1), 21-27.
- Plake, B. S., Impara, J. C., & Fager, J. J. (1993). Assessment competencies of teachers: A national survey. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 12(4), 10-12, 39.
- Popham, W. J. (2013). *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Popham, W. J. (2009). Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental? *Theory and Into Practice*, 48(1), 4-11.
- Randel, B., Apthorp, H., Beesley, A. D., Clark, T. F., & Wang, X. (2016). Impacts of professional development in classroom assessment on teacher and student outcomes. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 109(5), 491-502.
- Saefurrohman, R., & Balinas, E.S. (2016). English teachers' classroom assessment practices. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 5(1), 82-92.
- Schaffer, W. D. (1993). Assessment literacy for teachers. *Theory in Practice*, 32, 118-126.

- Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of classroom assessment in teaching and learning (CSE Technical Report). Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research and Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).
- Siegel, M., & Wissehr, C. (2011). *Preparing for the plunge: preservice teachers' assessment literacy*. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 22(4), 371-391.
- Stiggins, R. J. (1998). *Classroom assessment for student success*. Student Assessment Series. Annapolis Junction, MD: NEA Professional Library
- Stiggins, R. J., & Conklin, N. F. (1992). *In teachers' hands: Investigating the practices of classroom assessment*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Stiggins, R. J., & Chappuis, J. (2008). Enhancing student learning. *District Administration*, 44, 42-44.
- Yamtim, V., & Wongwanich, S. (2014). A study on classroom assessment literacy of primary school teachers. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2998-3004.
- Wiggins, G. (1989, May). A true test: Toward more authentic and equitable assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70, 703-713.
- Wiley, C. R. H. (2008). Traditional teacher tests. In T. L. Good (Ed.), *21st century education: A reference handbook* (Vol. 1, pp. 431-442). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE
- White, B. Y., & Frederiksen, J. R. (1998). Inquiry, modeling, and metacognition: Making science accessible to all students. *Cognition and Instruction*, 16, 3-118.