Teachers' Perceptions Regarding Multiple Assessment Paradigms in English Teaching and Its' Influence on Learning Achievement of Secondary Class Students

Nasreen Akhter[*]

Shahzadi Iqra Naz Malik[**]

Abstract

Teachers' assessment practices are pre-dominated by their perceptions, beliefs and attitudes. Review of literature on assessment indicates five assessment paradigms in relation to aims of assessment in teaching. The present study discovers the English teachers' paradigm preference of multiple assessments to explore the purposes of assessment of English teachers in searching most suitable assessment paradigm for improvement of students' achievement scores in examinations. The participants of the study were 344 English teachers working in secondary level of federal and provincial schools in Pakistan. A five-point Likert scale based on 20 items was used for collecting the data of this study. The descriptive analysis revealed that teachers give the maximum importance to the communicative function of assessment. It was derived that English teachers' first priority of using assessment was to inform which was followed by assessment for learning as their second priority, assessment as learning at the third grade, and assessment of learning at fourth level. The least importance teachers give is to assessment as instruction. The inferential analysis explored that gender of teachers has no effect in relation to their assessment approach except the approach assessment for learning that displays the significant difference of assessment for learning. Provincial and federal teachers showed the significant difference of all multiple assessment areas that suggested their diverse preference of all assessment areas. Teaching experience had insignificant impact upon four assessment dimensions except "assessment to inform" that suggested that teaching experience effects on communicative purpose of assessment. Students' strength in class had a significant influence on assessments as learning, of learning, for learning and as instruction areas except assessment to inform dimension. On the whole, a positive and strong relationship was found between teachers' assessment to inform paradigms and students' grades in English in Board examinations but unfortunately, teachers in majority used to prefer this paradigm in their perceptions.

Keywords: Multiple assessment paradigms, English teaching, learning achievement, secondary education

---

[*] Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Islamia University of Bahawalpur.
   Email: drnasreenakhtar01@gmail.com

[**] Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Education, Islamia University of Bahawalpur.

Introduction

Assessment is an essential part of educative planning and instruction that requires to reflect; how significant development at the theoretical level can be raised across time and circumstances and how it constructs its connection with previous information, methods and procedures. At local and global contexts, researchers have tried to find applicable and valid assessment methods for gauging and prizing learners' development in language learning (Chen, 2008).

In the early 1990s there was a significant change from industrial to information age which demanded the man to gain, understand, examine and use knowledge for useful objectives. In 2008, this trend has become increasingly evident. Binkley et al (2012) states that 21st century demand creativity, critical thinking, problem solving approach, leaning to learn, collaboration and information literacy skills. Christie (2008) explains that the challenges of globalization in the modern civilization are so diverse that they call for innovative comprehension and advanced academic tactics.

Teachers are required to prepare learners to face this multifaceted, cooperative technological world. The growing expectation of academic contest is demanding to increase the thoughtful, imaginative and theoretically receptive thoughts. Pink (2005) identifies the growing significance of innovative thinking and the capability to draw one's own sense for novel ideas to answer complexities of socio-economic technological life. This creative thinking includes metacognitive assessment which reinforces the idea of establishing understanding at the conceptual level, understanding is moved across time and conditions and how the assessment accepts the connection with prior familiarity. The World Bank (2008) reported the new insight in social scenario that demands learners to construct knowledge themselves instead of just reproduction of the things. The higher order skills, abilities and realization are required to cope with the world. The change in the concept of learning brought change in the perception of assessments in teaching field.

The traditional concept of assessment as the behaviorist learning philosophy, unbiased and standardized measurement (Shepard, 2000), and measurement being detached from teaching shifted to a constructivist learning paradigm which brought the new learning environments that influenced the role of assessment, making learning the core issue and defining instruction as enhancing the learning procedure (Van de Watering, Gjibels, Dochy & Van de Rijt, 2008). Constructivist method assists learning by associating the recently learned material with already learnt knowledge (Arslani, 2007). It influenced the concept of learning and assessment. Constructivism defines that knowledge is an internal process. Every learner has its own way of constructing learning and grasping the things. Cheng (2008) narrates that people have different ways of understandings of their learning and create their own meanings accordingly. So, constructivists emphasize that assessment should be diverse; authentic tasks should be devised to focus on an interactive

language. It should address learning process and outcomes, which are integrated with instruction for student learning (Shepard, 2000). The basic object of constructivist approach is not to assess student's knowledge rather to evaluate; how the learning process has reformed the student? (Arslani, 2007).

With the amalgamation of instruction and assessment, Earl and Katz (2006) described distinguishing but interconnected assessment pattern about objectives of assessment that included; assessment for learning, assessment of learning, and assessment as learning. Later on, Stiggins (2008) worked on the assessment paradigm; assessment for learning and Bennet and Gitomer (2009) also recognized the paradigm "assessment of learning" in their studies. But, Biggs (1995) had previously focused the utilization of assessment paradigm; assessment as learning in his study. Chong (2017) also studied Earls' three paradigms of assessments.

Assessment of learning aims to confirm learning and report to families and pupils regarding performance of students in school, usually by reporting students' relative position in contrast to their fellows (Earl & Katz, 2006). Assessment for Learning is learning-oriented dimension which provides feedback to teachers to generate well-organized learning by adjusting teaching and learning events in teaching process (Gonzales & Aliponga, 2012). The notion of assessment for learning was introduced by a meta-analysis of 250 studies synthesized by Black and William (1998) associating assessment and learning and drew the conclusion that deliberate assessment promotes learning and enhance students' achievements. Assessment as Learning is a method of evolving and aiding metacognition for students, guiding students to perform as the grave connector between assessment and learning, and improves students' self-learning. Students screen their own learning and use the advice from this monitoring to design, revisions, and even key changes in what they comprehend (Earl & Katz, 2006). Later Assessment as Instruction was included as assessment paradigm which is concerned with teachers' assessment results for examining and improving the continuing instructional development (Sheppard, 2000) and provide descriptive feedback for his learning (Earl & Katz, 2006). Lastly, assessing to inform emphases on communicative function of assessment regarding communicating and applying marks or grades for users (Jones & Tanner, 2008) was introduced.

Assessment has never been a sign of interest for students at any stage. Announcement of schedules of examinations, class tests and even a surprise test produce unhappy and bad feelings among students. But, teachers and institutions never accept to exclude the assessment component from educational process. A significant reading about the assessment is that teachers always look busy in assessment framing and assessment results preparations activities during academic sessions but academic standards in English teaching is falling down day by day in Pakistan. Therefore, need of the day is to study the reasons behind down fall of passing ratio of students in public examinations at school level

in Pakistan. In fact, there is need to explore; why students show low performance in examinations in English? And what are purposes behind the assessment activities of teachers in Pakistan? In fact, implementation of excessive assessments in the form of class tests, weekly tests, monthly tests and term tests before final examinations should be a security for good results in final examinations.

Assumptions

English teachers have no clear perception regarding the multiple assessment paradigms. They mostly conduct assessment activities during and after teaching just to inform stake holders about the performance of students and neglect other paradigms of assessment. Teachers do not focus to apply multiple assessment paradigms strategy in their practice because of multiple reasons. They are not clear about the effects of assessment paradigms on the learning achievement of students in English teaching.

Objectives

The study focused English teachers' perceptions of multiple assessments in term of their preferences in teaching. This study particularly focused following objectives.

1. To explore English teachers' perceptions of multiple assessment paradigms.
2. To evaluate effects of teachers' gender, school type, number of students in class and teachers' experience in years on teachers' perceptions regarding the assessment paradigms.
3. To find out most suitable assessment paradigm for improving the academic scores of students in English learning.

Research Questions

The study aimed to answer following three research question:

1. What are perceptions of teachers regarding the assessment paradigms?
2. Does teacher's gender, school type, number of students in class and teachers' experience in years affect the teachers' perceptions for adopting different assessment paradigms in their perceptions?
3. Which assessment paradigms of teachers have most positive impact on learning English?

Methodology

Population

Present study was conducted in Pakistan and data of the study was required from secondary school teachers who were teaching the subject of English. Keeping in view the hurdles and resources in data collection, the study was delimited to the federal and provincial government schools situated in the Punjab province of Pakistan. Therefore, population of the study was teachers teaching the subject of English to secondary classes

in all federal and provincial government schools of Punjab, Pakistan. According to data of Punjab school education department, 230 federal government and 6302 provincial government schools were working in Punjab during the year 2018.

Sample size and sampling procedure

The sample of the study was selected opting the procedure of multistage cluster random sampling giving equal representation to each sub cluster in the sample. Firstly, list of federal schools and provincial government schools were prepared. In the next stage, 172 federal and 172 provincial schools were randomly selected from the respective clusters to select one teacher of English for secondary classes in the selected schools. Keeping in view the diversity of gender of teachers, equal representation was given to male and female teachers in the sample. Total sample of the study comprised of 86 male federal teachers, 86 provincial male teachers, 86 federal female teachers and 86 provincial female teachers. But, variation in relation to other sub characteristics of sample like as qualification, experience and age of teachers including total number of students in a class could not be controlled by the researchers. Table 1 shows a summary of sub characteristics of the sample of study.

Table 1   *Sample of the study*

Factors	Sub groups	n	%
Academic qualification	Graduation	52	15
	MA/ MS.C	256	74
	M.Phil	6	11
Professional qualification	B.Ed.	119	35
	M.Ed.	225	65
Teaching experience	1-5 Years	21	06
	6-10 Years	42	12
	11-15 Years	77	22
	16-20 Years	100	29
	21-25 Years	85	25
	26-30 Years	19	06
Number of students per class	21-30 Students	12	03
	31-40 Students	154	45
	41-50Students	178	52
Age of teacher in years	26-30 Years	25	07
	31-35 Years	33	10
	36-40 Years	58	17
	41-45 Years	66	19
	46-50 Years	75	22
	51-55 Years	56	16
	55-60 Years	31	09

Research tool

The data collection tool was a questionnaire that was finalized after reviewing the version from TCOA-IIIA (Brown, 2006) and the tool used by Chan (2006) to study English

Teachers' beliefs and practices of multiple assessments. Some changes in the tool were made keeping in view the culture and language understandability of users of this study. It contained twenty items on five-point Likert scale regarding five assessment paradigms (to examine English teachers' perceptions regarding their preferences for usage). These were: Assessment as Learning; Assessment of Learning; Assessment for Learning; Assessment for Instruction and Assessment to Inform. Moreover, a list of demographic variables regarding the teacher, school type and average result of teacher in previously announced result by respective board was added to the questionnaire. The validity of tool was determined through expert opinion method. A pilot study was also conducted on the sample of 47 to confirm tool's understandability for respondents. Reliability of the tool was estimated through Cronbach's Alpha value that was noted 0.63 for the sample of 47.

Data Analysis

Data of the study was analyzed applying mean, standard deviation, t-test, ANOVA and Pearson correlation statistics on data. Mean score 2.50 and above was taken to explain the respondents' agreement to the items. For, mean comparison while applying t-test and ANOVA on data, 0.05 level of significance was opted.

Results

This study aimed to answer three question inline to the objectives of the study. So, analyzed data was arranged under three headings in relation to each research question of the study. Results with interpretation have been discussed as following.

English teachers' perceptions of multiple assessment paradigms

Perceptions of English teachers were investigated through teachers' questionnaire. They were asked to tell their perceptions behind selection of each paradigm in assessment process. So, mean score of each group of items' mean related each assessment paradigm was computed. The results have been discussed in table 2. Data of items was on five-point Likert scale. So, mean score of 2.50 was decided to accept the criterion of acceptance.

Table 2   *Descriptive statistics of teachers' perception of multiple assessments*

Assessment Paradigms	Mean score	Rank order	SD
Assessment as learning	2.39	3	0.605
Assessment of learning	2.36	4	0.482
Assessment for learning	2.53	2	0.500
Assessment as instruction	2.12	5	0.481
Assessment to inform	2.64	1	0.480

The mean score of the five dimensions of teachers' multiple assessment perception have been reported in the table 1. The results have given to explain teachers' preference regarding the five paradigms in their perception. On the whole, mean scores related to multiple assessment to inform (2.64, SD 0.48) and assessment for learning (2.53, SD 0.500)

indicate teachers' strongest perception about their perception regarding the assessment paradigms. But, mean scores related to other three paradigms; assessment as learning (2.39, SD 0.60), assessment of learning (2.36, SD 0.48) and assessment as instruction (2.12, SD 0.48) are even less than mid-point of the scale (2.50). This also indicates that teachers have weak perception regarding their preference to these three assessment paradigms. This indicates that teachers think that assessment is most important for informing others regarding the performance of learners and assessment for learning. This also unveils that assessment as learning, assessment for learning and assessment as instruction are less important in thinking of teachers in English teaching to secondary class students.

Teacher's gender, school type, teacher's age and class strength related factors and teachers' perceptions regarding multiple assessment paradigms

The second objective of the study was to search out the factors that build perceptions of English teachers for application/ preference of multiple assessment paradigms? Therefore, teachers' gender, school type, teachers' age and class strength related data was analyzed and mean differences between groups were investigated in relation to scores of teachers' perception regarding each assessment paradigm. Researchers applied t- test (in case of two groups) and ANOVA (in case of more than two groups) on data. Each demographic information regarding teachers was dealt as independent variable. The mean score of perceptions of each teacher regarding each assessment paradigm explored through questionnaire on five-point Likert scale was dealt as dependent variable. The results have been given in table 3 to 6.

Table 3   *Comparison of male and female teachers' perception of multiple assessments paradigms*

Assessment Paradigms	Male teachers (n=172)			Female Teachers (n=172)			t- test results		
	M	Rank order	SD	M	Rank order	SD	t-score	Sig.	MD
Assessment as learning	2.38	3	.614	2.40	3	.598	-.267	.790	-0.02
Assessment of learning	2.33	4	.472	2.40	3	.490	-1.232	.219	-0.07
Assessment for learning	2.46	2	.500	2.60	2	.490	-2.723	.007	-0.14
Assessment as instruction	2.16	5	.438	2.08	5	.519	1.573	.117	0.08
Assessment to inform	2.60	1	.490	2.68	1	.468	-1.463	.144	-0.08

Note M= mean score, SD= standard deviation, level of significance 0.05

Table 3 shows gender wise mean comparison of English teachers' perception regarding the five paradigms of assessment. The analysis communicates that there is

insignificant mean difference of English teachers' perception related to four paradigms mentioned in table i.e. assessment as learning (t -.267, p 0.790), assessment of learning (t -1.23, p 0.219), assessment as instruction (t 1.57) and assessment to inform (t -1.46, p 0.14). But, significant mean difference was found in case of paradigm assessment for learning (t -2.723, p 0.007). Here, the mean score of females is higher than that of male teachers (MD 0.14). This explores that all teachers have same perception about choosing and using the assessment paradigms; assessment as learning, of learning, as instruction and to inform but not about assessment for learning. Female teachers show greater emphasis on assessment for learning as compared to male teachers.

Table 4   *Comparison of Provincial and Federal teachers' perception of multiple assessment paradigms*

Assessment Paradigms	Provincial Teachers (n=172)			Federal Teachers (n=172)			t- test results		
	M	Rank order	SD	M	Rank order	SD	t- score	Sig.	MD
Assessment as learning	2.06	4	.531	2.71	2	.492	-11.682	.000	-0.65
Assessment of learning	2.24	3	.427	2.49	4	.501	-4.977	.000	-0.25
Assessment for learning	2.33	2	.470	2.74	1	.441	-8.402	.000	-0.41
Assessment as instruction	2.05	5	.475	2.18	5	.480	-2.485	.013	-0.13
Assessment to inform	2.58	1	.499	2.71	2	.455	-2.605	.010	-0.13

Note M= mean score, SD= standard deviation, level of significance 0.05

Table 4 reveals provincial and federal employment-based teachers' mean score comparison about their preference regarding the assessment paradigms. The data indicates that there is significant difference between both groups' perceptions of assessment on all five assessments paradigms (see t-score and p-value in t-test results).

Group comparison also indicates that mean score of provincial teachers is lower than of federal employed teachers regarding all assessment paradigms; assessment as learning (MD 0.65), assessment of learning (MD 0.25) assessment for learning (MD 0.41), assessment as instruction (MD 0.13), and assessment to inform (MD 0.13). This explores that federal employed teachers have strong perceptions regarding all the assessment paradigms than those of provincial teachers.

Minute observation of mean values regarding preferences of federal and provincial teachers within paradigms indicates that provincial teachers prefer the communicative paradigm (mean 2.58, SD 0.49) on other four paradigms; assessment as learning (mean 2.06, SD 0.53), assessment of learning (mean 2.24, SD 0.427), assessment for learning (mean 2.33, SD 0.47) and assessment as instruction (mean 2.05, SD 0.47).

Federal employed teachers prefer the assessment for learning paradigm (mean 2.74, SD 0.44) on other four paradigms; assessment as learning (mean 2.71, SD 0.49),

assessment of learning (mean 2.49, SD 0.50), assessment as instruction (mean 2.18, SD 0.48) and assessment to inform (mean 2.71, SD 0.45). On the whole, it is evident that both groups showed least preference for assessment as instruction paradigm (see rank order in table 4).

Table 5   *ANOVA statistics of teachers' perception of multiple assessments based on teaching experience*

P	Descriptive statistics in relation to teaching experience (in years)												ANOVA results	
	1-5 years		6-10 years		11-15 years		16-20 years		21-25 years		26-30 years			
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F	Sig.
1	2.40	0.68	2.40	0.69	2.49	0.56	2.40	0.60	2.32	0.59	2.32	0.57	0.735	0.605
2	2.45	0.51	2.35	0.48	2.40	0.49	2.34	0.48	2.34	0.48	2.37	0.49	0.318	0.902
3	2.70	0.470	2.56	0.50	2.51	0.50	2.54	0.50	2.55	0.50	2.39	0.49	1.089	0.366
4	2.10	0.45	2.19	0.59	2.13	0.41	2.13	0.49	2.09	0.47	2.05	0.52	0.388	0.857
5	2.35	0.49	2.67	0.47	2.61	0.49	2.54	0.50	2.75	0.44	2.79	0.41	4.081	0.001

Note: P= Assessment paradigms, M= mean score, SD= standard deviation 1= assessment as Learning, 2= assessment of Learning, 3= assessment for Learning, 4= assessment as instruction, 5= assessment to inform

Table 5 indicates ANOVA analysis in terms of teaching experience that reflects insignificant difference of four multiple assessment perception on four factors; assessment as learning (F 0.735, p- 0.605), assessment of learning (F 0.318, p- 0.902), assessment for learning (F 1.089, p- 0.366), and assessment as instruction (F 0.388, p- 0.857). In case of English teachers, the study showed a non-significant impact of the length of teaching experience on multiple assessment paradigms such as assessment as learning, assessment of learning, assessment for learning and assessment as instruction. The only significant difference was found in assessment to inform perception (F 4.08, p- 0.001). On the whole, most experienced teachers with 26 to 30 years of experience (mean 2.79, SD 0.41) have most strong perception about the paradigm assessment to inform.

The analysis of teaching experience groups reveals that the English teachers having 1-5 years of teaching experience had the highest mean score of assessment for learning (mean 2.70, SD 0.470) while the other five teaching experience groups from 6-30 years had the highest mean score of the perception to inform (see mean score of assessment to inform in the table). This indicates that the English teachers having 1-5 years of teaching experience prefer assessment for learning while the other all groups give preference of assessment to inform.

Table 6   *ANOVA statistics of teachers' perception of multiple assessments and class strength*

Assessment Paradigm	Descriptive statistics related to number of students in class						ANOVA statistics	
	21-30		31-40		41-50			
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F	P
Assessment as learning	2.67	0.492	2.53	0.596	2.25	0.588	10.664	0.000
Assessment of learning	2.08	0.289	2.47	0.501	2.29	0.453	8.735	0.000
Assessment for learning	2.92	0.289	2.66	0.474	2.39	0.490	17.127	0.000
Assessment as instruction	2.25	0.452	2.20	0.553	2.03	0.396	5.641	0.004
Assessment to inform	2.67	0.492	2.66	0.474	2.62	0.486	0.284	0.753

Note: M= mean, SD= standard deviation, 1= assessment as learning, 2= assessment of learning, 3= assessment for learning, 4= assessment as instruction, 5= assessment to Inform

In table 6, the English teachers multiple assessment perception preference was calculated in terms of class strength. ANOVA analysis displays the significant difference of class size groups on the four perception of multiple assessments; assessment as learning (F 10.664, p- 0.000), assessment of learning (F 8.735, p- 0.000), assessment for learning (F 17.127, p- 0.000), and assessment as instruction (F 5.641, p- 0.004). This explores that class size affects teachers' assessment perception except for one factor that is assessment to inform (F 0.284, p- 0.753).

The examination of within group mean comparison indicates that teachers with a class of 21 to 30 students perceive that their student prefer assessment for learning paradigm the most (mean 2.92, SD 2.89). Teachers with the class of 31 to 40 students perceive that students equally prefer assessment for learning (mean 2.66, SD 0.47) and assessment to inform (mean 2.66, SD 0.47). But, teachers with 41 to 50 students in class think that students prefer assessment to inform paradigm (mean 2.62, SD 0.48).

Most useful assessment paradigm linked with the academic scores of students in English

The third objective of the study was to explore most suitable assessment paradigm for improving academic scores of students in English examinations. For this purpose, average class scores of students of each teacher included in the sample and those scores were taken from the school records of board examinations. Then correlation between students' scores and mean score of each assessment paradigm of teachers' perceptions was calculated applying Pearson correlation formulae using SPSS. The results have been given in table 7.

Table 7   *Pearson correlation between teachers' assessment paradigm and average score of students in English*

Assessment paradigm	Assessment as learning	Assessment of learning	Assessment for learning	Assessment as instruction	Assessment to inform
r	0.309**	0.084	0.324**	0.095*	0.045
Sig. (1-tailed)	0.000	0.061	0.000	0.040	0.201

Table 7 exhibits results about the relationship between teachers' perception of assessment paradigms and academic scores of students in examination in English. Findings showed a significant relationship is between teachers' perception of assessment as learning (r=0.309**, p- 0.000) and assessment for learning (r 0.324**, p- 0.000) at 0.01 level of significance. However, a non-significant relationship was found between the assessment to inform paradigm (r 0.045, p- 0.201) and assessment of learning paradigms (r 0.084, p- 0.061). But, unfortunately English teachers in Pakistan perceive that they prefer assessment to inform paradigm most often (see table 2). Moreover, results also indicates a positive significant relationship between assessment as instruction paradigm and students' scores in examinations (r 0.095, p- 0.040) at 0.05 level of significance. On the other hand, results indicate poor correlation between assessment to inform and students' academic scores in examinations that is on top priority in perception of English teachers. This clues for the reason of students' poor performance in English in relation to teachers' assessment paradigms. This also guides English teachers in Pakistan to change their priorities and adopt the assessment paradigms that are favorable for improvement in learning standards and academic grades of students.

Discussion and Conclusion

The study encompasses the English teachers' paradigm preferences for multiple assessments regarding five areas of assessment purposes. The findings of the study reveal that English teachers in Pakistan give preference to assessment to inform paradigm (communicative function of assessment). Comparing these results with the previous studies indicates that Japanese language teachers give least preference to this paradigm in Japan while the English language teachers in Japan counted significantly higher in communicative function of assessment paradigm (Gonzales & Aliponga, 2012). The results of English language teachers in Japan's preference for assessment to communicate is consistent with the results of this study. Therefore, the English language teachers in Japan as well as in Pakistan are more concerned with the communicative roles of assessment in teaching English.

In the present study, the second priority was found assessment for learning paradigm used by Pakistani teachers. Findings are in line with earlier studies i.e. an Indonesian study found that teachers preferred this method but keeping it at third priority

(Saefurrohman, 2015) as it focuses on formative assessment. The study revealed assessment as learning, a meta cognitive process of learning and assessment (Earl & Katz, 2006), at the third preference by English teachers in Pakistan. This result is also consistent with the earlier study of Saefurrohman (2015) but different from Han and Kaya (2014) study which revealed assessment as learning at the first preference by teachers in Turkey.

The gender comparison indicates the similar approach of male and female towards multiple assessments perception about all assessment paradigms except the assessment for learning. Non-significant mean score of both genders revealed their preference for assessment to inform i.e., communicative and managerial role of assessment which means both genders emphasize on the communicative purpose of assessment.

The results of the study communicate the difference in provincial and federal teachers' perception of multiple assessments. It revealed that provincial teachers focus on assessment to inform. They emphasis on communicative purpose of assessments while federal teachers prefer assessment for learning. Black and William (1998) stated that the priority of assessment for learning is promoting learning. The difference of both groups' preference perceptions reflect their purpose of assessment as provincial teachers focus on communication while federal teachers emphasize on learning. The comparison of result of federal and provincial employed teachers (see table 7 & 8) clearly shows that perception of federal employed teachers is more beneficial for students in attaining better scores in English examinations. Perhaps, this is because of preferred assessment paradigm difference showed by the provincial and federal employed teachers.

Table 8   *Mean comparison of provincial and federal school students in English*

School clusters	Mean of English scores	SD	t	Sig. (2-tailed)	MD
Provincial	54.55	4.341			
Federal	59.60	3.034			
Total	57.08	4.512	-12.488	0.000	-5.043

Note: Analysis of data reported in the table is based on average scores of students of federal and provincial employed teachers in board examination of a year included in the sample of the study.

In terms of teaching experience, the findings of the study reveal non-significant difference of English teachers' perception of multiple assessments areas i.e. assessment as learning; of learning; for learning; and as instruction which displayed that the length of teaching experience did not have any impact on teachers' assessment perceptions. However, significant differences emerged on assessment to inform factor between all the teaching experience groups.

The study also focused on teachers' preference of multiple assessment paradigms that differed on the size of the class. The results reveal that number of students in class impacts on teachers' perception of multiple assessments as significant difference for the

factors of assessment; as learning, of learning, for learning and as instruction were found. These findings are also supported by the preceding researches (i.e., Gonzales & Aliponga, 2012) in which assessment for instruction and assessment to inform were found significantly different. Danielson (2007) noted that teachers tend to add assessment for learning in classes with fewer students. Jones and Tanner (2008) cited in Gonzales and Aliponga, (2012) that teachers prefer assessment to inform for communicative function of assessment in handling results of crowded classes but non-significant difference were revealed in terms of class sizes regarding assessment to inform either crowded or less crowded class which suggests that number of students did not influence the perception of assessment to inform. The results show that class size did not influence the communicative dimension of assessment only.

English teachers need to adopt ways which are more suitable for quality teaching and improvement of students' scores in examinations. But this study has explored that English teachers have adopted such paradigm of assessment which is least suitable in relation to produce better results in English. This suggests to conduct a further study and search out reasons for teachers' preference for assessment to inform paradigm while teaching the English.

References

Arslani, M. (2007). Constructivist approaches in education. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, *40*(1), 41-61.

Bennett, R. E., & Gitomer, D. H. (2009). Transforming K-12 assessment: Integrating accountability testing, formative assessment, and professional support. In C. Wyatt Smith & J. Cumming (Eds.), *Educational Assessment in the 21st Century*. New York: Springer. pp. 43–61

Biggs, J. (1995). Assessing for learning: some dimensions underlying new approaches to educational assessment. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *41*(1), 1-17.

Binkley, M., Erstad, O., Herman, & Rumble, M. (2012). Defining twenty-first century skills. In P. Griffin, B. McGaw & E. Care (Eds.), *Assessment and Teaching of 21st Century Skills*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappa.* Retrieved from, https://www.rdc.udel.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/InsideBlackBox.pdf

Brown, G.T. L. (2002). Teachers' Conception of Assessment. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.* University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Brown, G.T.L (2006). Teachers' conceptions of assessment: Validation of an abridged version. *Psychological Reports*, *99*(1), 166-70.

Cheng, X. Y. (2008). *Attitudes towards Mediation among EFL Teachers in China and Constraints in their Classroom Practices*. Kaifeng: Henan University Press.

Chong, S. W. (2018). Three Paradigms of Classroom Assessment: Implications for Written Feedback Research, *Journal of Language Assessment Quarterly*, *15*(4), 330-347.

Christie, P. (2008). *Opening the doors of learning: Changing Schools in South Africa*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Heinemann Publishers.

Danielson, C. (2007). Assessment for learning: For teachers as well as students. In C.A. Dwyer (Ed.). *The Future of Assessment: Shaping Teaching and Learning*. New York: Taylor & Francis. PP. 191-214

Earl, L. & Katz, S. (2006). *Rethinking Classroom Assessment with Purpose in Mind: Assessment for Learning, Assessment as Learning, Assessment of Learning*. Canada: Manitoba Education, Citizenship, and Youth.

Erikson, H. L. (2007). *Concept-based Curriculum and Instruction for the Thinking Classroom*. Washington, DC: Corwin Press.

Gonzales, R., & Aliponga, J. (2012). Classroom Assessment Preferences of Japanese Language Teachers in the Philippines and English Language Teachers in Japan. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *36*(1), 1-19.

Han, T. & Kaya, H. İ. (2014). Turkish EFL Teachers' Assessment Preferences and Practices in the Context of Constructivist Instruction. *Journal of Studies in Education*, *4*(1), 77-93

Jones, S. & Tanner, H. (2008). *Assessment: A Practical Guide for Secondary Teachers*. (2nd Ed.). London: Continuum.

Pink, D. H. (2005). *A Whole New Mind: Moving from the Information Age to the Conceptual Age*. New York: Riverhead Books.

Saefurrohman, (2015). Classroom Assessment Preference of Indonesian Junior High School Teachers in English as Foreign Language Classes. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(36), 104 –110.

Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher, 29* (7), 4-14. Retrieved from, http://www.jstor.org/stable/1176145

Stiggins, R. J. (2008). *An Introduction to Student-Involved Assessment FOR Learning.* New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Van de Watering, G., Gjibels, D., Dochy, F., & Van der Rijt, J. (2008). Students' assessment preferences, perceptions of assessment and their relationships to study results. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, 56, 645–658.

World Bank, (2008). *Curricula, Examinations and Assessment in Secondary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa.* World Bank Working Paper no. 128. African human development series. Washington DC: World Bank.