

Comparison Of Formative Assessment Practices By Teachers Working In Public And Private Schools Of Punjab Province

Anila¹, Dr. Shafqat Ali², Dr. Tariq Mahmood³, Dr. Safia Rehmat Ullah⁴

¹The City Public School, Pasrur, Sialkot.

²Associate Professor of Education, Minhaj University, Lahore., drshafqat.edu@mul.edu.pk

³Govt. High School Chicherwali, Sialkot.

⁴Government Girls High School Sham Ki Bhattian, Lahore.

Corresponding Author: tariq_903@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Feedback and improvement in teaching learning process is at the core of formative assessment. The main theme for this research work was to diagnose the use of formative assessment by practicing teachers at elementary grade level and to find out the comparison of assessment used by teachers at elementary grade level in public sector schools and private sector schools. Data was collected by practicing teachers working at elementary level in government schools and private schools by using a five point Likert scale questionnaire. SPSS software was used to analyze the data to address the theme of the study. Data analysis highlighted that public school practicing teachers properly use assessment practices i.e., learning targets, continuous practices and feedback for instruction. On the other side, private sector teachers also use assessment practices frequently but lesser than public schools. On further analysis, the difference found significant in all aspects of formative practices except learning targets. Keeping in view the results and findings it is suggested that formative assessment/internal assessment should also be given due importance in education system where external system is applied so that formative system may be upgraded.

Introduction

Formative assessment is known as developmental assessment as it develops learning among students by providing feedback. Evaluation for learning is a vital piece of homeroom guidance. While a lot of it is accumulated at the time, different parts are the consequence of more proper evaluation processes. With regards to learning appraisal, not the arrangement or conditions put it aside. Students who are appropriately surveyed for learning can seek after a wide scope of instructive pursuits all through their lives (Bennett, 2011).

As a feature of developmental evaluation, various parts can be incorporated, for example, educational plan based estimation, to follow and break down individual student learning for the reasons for changing guidance when fundamental (Looney, et. al. 2017). Developmental evaluation is generally seen as a method for expanding student execution through instructing. Instructors can be better ready to appreciate students' advancement and complex regions by utilizing developmental appraisal, which permits them to tailor guidance so it tends to their specific requirements.

Besides, students benefit from developmental evaluation by defining learning objectives, observing their advancement, contrasting their real execution and wanted execution, and making moves to close the accomplishment of task. Developmental assessment advances student learning. Developmental evaluation is accepted to affect students' scholarly accomplishment (Li, 2016). As an overall definition, developmental evaluation can be depicted as the utilization of proof to further develop student advancing through the examination of proof from students through formal or casual cycles.

Developmental evaluation frequently incorporates a great many parts. To guarantee students' learning, instructors and students need to comprehend what realizing assumptions. The force of developmental assessment lies in giving students suitable criticism (Kleij, Cumming, and Looney, 2018). Summarizing, summative assessments are the most well-known in schools. At the end of session or unit, assessments permit instructors to survey the advancement of students, to distinguish students for progression, to decide qualification for specific vocations. Schooling divisions and services frequently use summative assessments to guarantee that public showing foundations are giving top notch instruction to their students.

These major problems must be tended to through careful evaluation. Students' advancement can be estimated through tests and tests, which are fundamental for the responsibility of schools and the school system. "Summative evaluation" is likewise utilized by guardians and bosses to monitor their kids' advancement (Mellati and Khaademi, 2018). Developmental appraisals ought to be remembered for the method involved with assessing students' advancement. Educators lead continuous, intelligent evaluations of student

understanding in homerooms that consolidate developmental appraisal.

Students' advancement are surveyed every now and again and progressively to distinguish and address their advancing requirements. Productive input and self-learning for student's presentation would be energized by developmental assessment (Dix, 2017). This is a direct result of certain constraints in instructive strategies, changes in educational program, learning practices and view of members and synergistic environmental elements of instructive foundations that influences educators' execution of evaluation methods (Hui, Brown, and Chan, 2017).

It is feasible to all the more likely address the issues of a wide scope of students using developmental evaluation approaches and procedures that permit instructors to adjust the manner in which they show in light of their students' requirements. Instructors gain a far reaching image of mental shortages from students' learning through developmental evaluation. This permits instructors to foster new showing techniques and limit learning problems (Malik, Khan and Sadiq, 2020).

An essential objective of developmental evaluation for any educator, including one who shows dialects, is to assemble an adequate number of information to help in students' learning. However long it is utilized to make acclimations to the educating strategies. Any procedure or assessment configuration can be utilized as developmental evaluation. Developmental evaluations don't demand a lot of investment or exertion with respect to the student. Educators are not expected to save any extra time for this movement. At the point when a decent educator approves and screens the advancement of her students, she is truth be told directing a developmental evaluation.

To conduct this study a sample 400 teachers both male and female were given a questionnaire based on five-point scale. SPSS

software was used to analyze data to address the theme of the study. Data analysis highlighted following findings and results.

Table 1 Formative practices involved by practicing teachers in elementary grades of schools

Practices	Teachers, N=392	
	Mean	SD
Learning targets	3.263	.682
Continuous practices	3.319	.498
Feedback for instruction	3.575	.541
Total	3.358	.612

There are numerous methodologies that can be utilized for developmental assessment by educators in schools at elementary level. Here in this examination concentrate on simply three practices were inspected to have a relative search for public sector and private sector elementary schools. Information was gathered on five-point scale to have clearer picture. Figures highlight utilization of developmental assessment by educators at elementary level. All previously mentioned developmental evaluation practices

were utilized at practically greatest level in light of the fact that the mean is more than 3.5 (overall $M=3.358$, $SD=.612$), which features that all the teachers habitually use above noticed developmental assessment processes. Learning targets with respect to developmental evaluation ($M=3.263$, $SD=.682$), Continuous practices for developmental appraisal ($M=3.319$, $SD=.498$) and Feedback and changing guidance ($M=3.575$, $SD=.541$).

Table 2 Formative practices used by practicing teachers of government elementary schools

Practices	Public, N=392	
	Mean	SD
Learning targets	3.922	.699
Continuous practices	3.867	.811
Feedback for instruction	3.719	.681
Overall practices	3.911	.701

Above table highlights utilization of developmental appraisal practices by instructors at public schools. All previously mentioned developmental evaluation practices were utilized at practically most extreme level in light of the fact that the mean upsides than 3.5 ($M = 3.911$, $SD=.701$), which features that teachers regularly

use noticed developmental appraisal practices. Learning targets in regards to developmental evaluation ($M=3.922$, $SD=.699$), Continuous practices for developmental appraisal ($M=3.867$, $SD=.811$) and Feedback and changing guidance ($M=3.719$, $SD=.681$).

Table 3 Formative practices used by practicing teachers of private elementary schools

Practices	Private, N=392	
	Mean	SD
Learning targets	3.681	.590
Continuous practices	3.711	.598
Feedback for instruction	3.713	.612
Overall practices	3.542	.519

Above table features the utilization of developmental evaluation practices by educators at private schools. All previously mentioned developmental appraisal practices were utilized at practically most extreme level on the grounds that the mean upsides than 3.5 (M = 3.542, SD=.519), which features that all private teachers

much of the time use above noticed developmental evaluation practices. Learning targets in regards to developmental appraisal (M=3.681, SD=.590), Continuous practices for developmental evaluation (M=3.711, SD=.598) and Feedback for guidance (M=3.713, SD=.612).

Table 4 T-test results of assessment practices regarding learning targets by Public and Private School teachers

Practices	Sector	N	M	Std. Div.	t-value	Sig.
Learning targets	Public	182	3.798	.681	1.73	.121
	Private	210	3.817	.719		

Table shows the distinctions between learning targets being used of developmental appraisal use by educators of public and private schools. Investigation highlighted non-significant contrast between methods for government teachers (M=3.798, SD=.681) and private school

educators (M=3.817, SD=.719) having p=.121. Investigation shows that govt. teachers were more dedicated when contrasted with private school educators in regards to learning targets of developmental evaluation

Table 5 T-test results regarding continuous assessment by Public sector teachers and Private sector teachers

Practices	Schools	N	Mean	S. D.	t-value	Sig.
Continuous assessment	Public	182	3.981	.617	4.377	.001
	Private	210	3.421	.498		

Above showed differentiations between government educators and private teachers as for continues practices with formative assessment.

Assessment shows that there was high differentiation between technique for government instructors (M=3.981, SD=.617) and private

teachers ($M=3.421$, $SD=.498$) having $p=.001$. Additionally, assessment shows that

administration govt. instructors routinely use formative assessment practices.

Table 6 T-test results of assessment used by govt. and private teachers for feedback of learning

Practices	Schools	N	Mean	S. D.	t-value	Sig.
Feedback	Public	182	3.899	.780	4.512	.000
	Private	210	3.534	.601		

Above figures clarified differentiations between giving analysis or changing their direction as demonstrated by the obvious contribution as formative evaluation practice use by educators of public and educational cost based schools. Examination shows that there was enormous differentiation between strategy for government subsidized educators ($M=3.899$, $SD=.780$) and

educational cost based school teachers ($M=3.534$, $SD=.601$) having $p=.000$. Plus, examination shows that state financed instructors were more normal regarding getting analysis and a short time later shifting their bearings for better propelling when diverged from educational cost based school teachers.

Table 7 T-test results regarding assessment used by Public teachers and Private teachers

Practices	Schools	N	Mean	S. D.	t-value	Sig.
Formative assessment	Public	182	3.981	.710	4.191	.000
	Private	210	3.501	.511		

Table depicted a picture about qualifications between government educators and private teachers concerning use of formative evaluation in their instructive experience. Examination shows that govt. educators ($M=3.981$, $SD=.710$) were generally better for use of formative assessment when compared with teachers of the private schools ($M=3.501$, $SD=.511$). In addition, examination narrated that public educators were more committed with respect to usage of formative evaluation practices.

Above values showed that all essential instructors constantly use above noticed formative assessment practices i.e., learning targets, continuous assessment and feedback for learning. All public educators as a rule use formative examination practices. Private instructors constantly use above notice formative assessment practices. Public educators were more

committed when stood out from educational private teachers concerning making learning targets for formative assessment. Public instructors consistently use formative evaluation practices when stood out from non-government school teachers. Public instructors were getting more input in assessment. Public instructors were more devoted and normal for the usage of formative assessment practices when stood out from private teachers.

It is suggested that there should be proper weightage of internal assessment structure in school division, with the objective that formative evaluation practices may be propagated.

References

1. Bennett, R. E. (2011). Formative assessment: a critical review.

- Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 18(1), 5–25
2. Li, H. (2016). How is formative assessment related to students' reading achievement? Findings from PISA 2009. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 23(4), 473-494.
 3. Looney, A., Cumming, J., Kleij, F., & Harris, K. (2017). Re conceptualizing the role of teachers as assessors: teacher assessment identity. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 1-26.
 4. Kleij, F. M., Cumming, J. J., & Looney, A. (2018). Policy expectations and support for teacher formative assessment in Australian education reform. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 25(6), 620-637.
 5. Dix, S. (2017). The effectiveness of formative assessment. *Teachers and Curriculum*, 6(1), 29-34.
 6. Hui, S., Brown, G., & Chan, S. (2017). Assessment for learning and for accountability in classrooms: The experience of four Hong Kong primary school curriculum leaders. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 18(1), 41-51.
 7. Malik, S., Khan, A., & Sadiq, U. (2020). A comparative analysis of assessment schemes in Secondary School Certificate and Cambridge O Level English examination papers in Pakistan: Need for reform. *Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences (Pakistan)*, 28(1).
 8. Mellati, M. & Khaademi, M. (2018). Exploring teachers' assessment literacy: Effect on learners' writing achievements and implications for teacher development. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(6), 12-18.