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Abstract: This study examined English language subject teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment in relation to demographic characteristics. The purpose was to find out the conceptions of teachers about classroom assessment in the context of Tanzania. Specifically, the study sought to find out the types of teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment in teaching and learning and to examine the relationship between teacher’s conceptions and their demographic characteristics. A mixed methods research approach specifically sequential design was employed. Teachers in schools with high teacher - pupil ratio (TPR) were a target population. A region, district and 10 schools characterized by high TPR were identified and 72 teachers were purposively sampled for the study. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected through a validated questionnaire and face to face interview. Quantitative data were analyzed by using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 23 to obtain descriptive and inferential statistics. Qualitative data were analyzed by using content analysis techniques. Results from quantitative data analysis suggested that teachers primarily conceived classroom assessment as a tool for improving teaching and learning and secondly as a tool for accountability. Further, the results suggested that there was a statistical relationship between teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment and teaching experience. On the other hand, the qualitative data suggested that teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment were shaped by teaching experience, level of teaching and in-service classroom assessment training. The findings imply that efforts by the government to improve teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment should focus on the specific shaping agents.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Classroom assessment is an important aspect in teaching and learning process. It helps to communicate teaching and learning information to stakeholders aiming at achieving the aspired educational goals (Brown, 2004; Harris & Brown, 2009). Teachers are considered as holding varied conceptions about classroom assessment which determine how they do assessment in teaching (Azis, 2014). For that matter, studying teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment is very fundamental. Studies about teachers’ conceptions of assessment have identified four teachers’ conceptions of assessment, assessment for improvement, assessment for teacher and school accountability, assessment for student
accountability, and assessment as irrelevant (Brown, 2004). The studies indicate that most teachers in schools tend to conceive assessment as a tool for improving teaching and learning (Brown, 2004; Remesal, 2011). The premise is that assessment ought to make teachers reflect their own teaching (Azis, 2014; Postareff, Virtanen, Katajavuori, & Lindblom-Ylanne, 2012). Further, a segment of teachers consider assessment as a tool for accountability of schools, teachers and pupils because they use assessment to demonstrate that they are doing a good job (Nichols & Harris, 2016). These conceptions compel teachers to assess pupils strictly on prescribed syllabi stipulations (Brown & Harris, 2010). A small segment of teachers consider assessment as irrelevant to teachers’ work because it has numerous measurement errors and therefore it may be unfair to pupils (Brown, 2004; Deneen & Brown, 2016).

Despite the general overview of teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment, studies in different contexts suggest that conceptions of assessment are unique to every setting and that the valid understanding of teacher conceptions is likely to require national or regional contextual consideration (Azis, 2014; Brown, & Harris, 2010; Calveric, 2010, Kuze & Shumba, 2011). In Tanzania, classroom assessment has created endless debates (Mosha, 2012, Tilya, 2013). Specifically, it seems that classroom assessment is not conducted appropriately (Mhando, 2015; Mosha, 2012). The root cause for inappropriate classroom assessment situation in Tanzania has been related to teachers’ external factors (Kafyulilo, Rugambuka and Ikupa, 2013; Mosha, 2013). The government of Tanzania has tried to address some of classroom assessment issues including periodical amendment of curriculum and training of teachers (Woods, 2008). Despite the government’s efforts, teachers have been featuring in debates and discussions as chief contributors of classroom assessment problems (Alphonce, 2008; Komba & Nkumbi, 2008; Kafyulilo, et al. 2013; Tilya 2013). However, research regarding classroom assessment in the context of Tanzania has hardly focused on teachers’ conceptions of assessment as a core aspect in classroom assessment (Mosha, 2012; Ndalichako, 2015). Therefore, this study investigated teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment in Tanzania by focusing on intrinsic and quasi-intrinsic factors particularly demographic characteristics. The study was guided by the following specific objectives: i) to examine the classroom assessment conceptions held by Tanzanian English language teachers and analyse the association between Tanzanian English language teachers conceptions of classroom assessment and their demographic characteristics.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Study Design

A mixed-method research approach specifically sequential design was used in which quantitative data were first collected and analysed (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). The results from the analysis paved a way to qualitative phase of the study by primarily providing the sample through nest sampling technique (Johnson & Christensen, 2008).
2.2 Study Area

The study was conducted in Geita region which is among 31 regions of Tanzania. Geita was selected because it was a Tanzanian region with high Teacher Pupil Ratio (TPR) of 1:59 (Prime Minister’s Office Regional Administration and Local Government, 2014). This meant that teachers managed large class sizes and therefore Geita was a best area for this study. Previous studies on teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment focused on small class sizes.

2.3 Study Population

The target population for this study was primary school English language teachers. They were preferred because they dealt with the primary school subject, which was the only one delivered in English in almost all public primary schools in Tanzania. In Tanzania, almost all public schools use Kiswahili as a language of instruction and communication outside the classroom. Secondly, the subject has been recording poor results in the national examinations among primary school pupils in Tanzania even more than Mathematics.

2.4 Instruments

A questionnaire for quantitative data and interview guide for qualitative data were used for data collection. The validated questionnaire by Brown (2004) was adapted to fit Tanzanian context. The questionnaire was composed on a 4-point agreement scale by avoiding the central category due to its litigious interpretations (Kulas & Stachowski, 2009). Further, Cronbach’s test of reliability was run to questionnaire items which indicated that the alpha for improvement, accountability and irrelevancy clusters were .872, .818 and .732 respectively. These results were higher than the threshold alpha (.70).

The questionnaires were mostly administered by the researcher while few were administered by English subject Departmental Heads on behalf of the researcher. The general return rate of the questionnaires was 86%. Regarding the interview guide, it contained basic questions on conceptions of classroom assessment and the feelings of teachers about their sources of conceptions were devised. The questions focused on selected teachers’ demographic characteristics.

2.5 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

Three main procedures were followed. First, Geita District Town Council (GDTC) was purposively selected being a district with highest TPR in Geita region. It had a number of schools with TPRs ranging from 1:150 to 1:200. Second, schools with highest TPRs were identified. In 2016 during data collection, Geita Town Council had 47 primary schools with 57157 pupils. Ten out of 47 schools had 27034 pupils. This means, teachers in the ten schools managed almost half of the total number of pupils in the Council. Based on this distribution of the number of pupils in the Council, the researcher sampled the 10 schools which had highest TPRs compared to other schools. Third, nested sampling (sampling from the sample) was done to obtain teachers who were involved in the qualitative phase of the study.
In the ten identified schools, all English language subject teachers were selected. The sample was obtained based on the criterion that the participants were teaching English subject at the time of data collection. Therefore, all English subject teachers (72) of different demographic characteristics were selected from the ten schools. Apart from that 10 teachers were nested sampled from the 72 teachers for interview. The criterion used was selecting all teachers who demonstrated a strongest agreement on the questionnaire items as per predetermined categories of classroom assessment conceptions by Brown 2004.

2.6 Data Analysis Procedure

The quantitative data was entered into SPSS version 23 for factor analysis to determine the factor loadings. Previously, data were tested through Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of sphericity to assess the factorability of the data (Kaiser, 1974). The KMO value was .714 and the p-value for Bartlett’s test was .000. Moreover, chi-square test was run to determine the relationship between demographic characteristics and teachers’ assessment conceptions. Some results in this test violated an expectation of 5 -10 cases per variable assumption thus Fisher's Exact Test were used for interpretation (Pallant, 2005). Regarding qualitative data, the audio recorded interviews were transcribed to obtain textual data. The textual data was read through and entered into Nvivo 10 which helped to organize them into themes.

3.0 RESULTS

3.1 Demographic Characteristics

The findings indicated that for the first phase of study 62 respondents of varied demographic characteristics were involved as indicated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and above</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class level of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Level</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Level</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or less</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom assessment in-service training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never had training</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had training</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 shows that most of the teachers were females (66.1%) and males were 33.9%. In terms of age, a large percentage of teachers (71%) were below 41 years. The table also shows that most of the teachers (71%) held a certificate in teacher education. It is also indicates that most of them (67.7%) taught in upper classes (STD IV – VII) as compared to a few (32.3%) who taught in lower classes (STD I – III). Finally, Table 1 indicates that a large percentage of teachers (67.7%) had never attended in-service classroom assessment training compared to a few (32.3%) who had attended the training.

Apart from that in the second phase of the study four teachers in the improvement cluster and six teachers in the accountability cluster of varied demographic characteristics were involved. The participants were from different schools and were teaching in different class levels as indicated in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conception Cluster</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>TCL</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>CAIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>NYZ13</td>
<td>STD VI</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Never had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NYZ14</td>
<td>STD III</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Never had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MST33</td>
<td>STD VII</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Above 20</td>
<td>Had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIN10</td>
<td>STD IV</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>Never had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>NYZ11</td>
<td>STD V</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Never had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIN21</td>
<td>STD V</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>Had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NYU26</td>
<td>STD II</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Never had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MST35</td>
<td>STD III</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Above 20</td>
<td>Never had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGL59</td>
<td>STD V</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Never had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KAL7</td>
<td>STD II</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Above 20</td>
<td>Had</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCL=Teaching class Level; AG=Age Group; EL=Education level; VT=Years of Teaching; CAIT=Classroom Assessment In-service Training

### 3.2 Teachers’ Conceptions of Classroom Assessment

The first research question dealt with English language teachers conceptions of classroom assessment. The analysis indicated most teachers rated ‘strongly agree or agree’ the items denoting accountability and improvement and rated ‘strongly disagree or disagree’ all items denoting irrelevancy as shown in Table 3.
Table 3 shows high frequency scores on agreement side in accountability and improvement clusters ranging from 21 (33.8%) of items B5 and B25 to 36 (58.1%) of items B22 and B25. It also shows high frequency scores on disagreement side ranging from 22 (35.5%) to 40 (64.5%) of item B14. This implied that teachers accepted assessment for improvement and accountability and rejected assessment as irrelevant.

The results for qualitative data were not very different from quantitative results. The major themes from the interviews were classroom assessment as tool for teacher promotion, keeping pupils responsible to learning, compliance and school marketing. Precisely, the teachers who conceived classroom assessment for accountability believed it labeled them through pupils’ performance because scores indicated what was imparted in pupils. A typical response on this was from MST35.
(15/09/2016) who said … “I can hardly defend myself against being seen as bogus teacher if pupils’ marks in my subject were poor!” They assumed that learning is a function of teacher’s transmission of contents to pupils. They maintained that subject teachers attained respect from educational stakeholders by virtue of pupils’ performance. A typical response in this was given by one of the teachers saying ‘teachers are considered great based on their pupils’ performance! Haven’t you seen a trend that, teachers who make their pupils perform well in their subject are appointed to various positions?” (MST35, 15/09/2016). This signified that classroom assessment was partly done for accountability purposes.

The accountability status for GTC teachers was for compliance than core educational goals. Teachers were more interested in being noticeable through classroom assessment. They feared to contravene the educational inspectors therefore they ensured that pupils’ workbooks were full of symbolic feedback to appear smart before inspectors. One of the teachers remarked on this that “inspectors usually concentrate on pupils’ exercise books, so I make sure that pupils’ books contain ticks to avoid disturbances from inspectors (NGL59, 10/09/2016).

Regarding improvement conception, teachers who were identified as belonging to this cluster reported that classroom assessment was a powerful tool for teaching and learning. They particularly said that learning was determined by varieties of assessments. They believed that without assessment, learning could hardly be fostered. A typical response was MST33 who said “I am teaching English subject which demands different practices like writing, speaking, reading and listening. …so I spend much of my lesson time assessing pupils because it informs me their understanding” (20/09/2016).

3.3 Teacher’s conceptions of classroom assessment by demographic characteristics

The second objective of the study was to examine the relationship between teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment and demographic characteristics. The chi-square results for determining the association is shown in Tables 4 and 5 for improvement and accountability conceptions respectively.
Table 4 shows that for teachers’ sex, age, education level, teaching level and classroom assessment in-service training \( p-value = 0.139, 0.982, 0.417, 0.433, 0.748 \) respectively and for teaching experience \( p-value = 0.047 \). The results suggest two scenarios that (1) there was no statistical significant relationship between teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment for accountability by sex, age, education level, teaching level and classroom assessment in-service training; (2) there was a statistical significant relationship between teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment for accountability and teaching experience. The reason is that \( 0.139; 0.982; 0.417, 0.433, 0.748 > 0.05 \) (meaning that \( \alpha > 0.05 \)) and \( 0.047 < 0.05 \) (meaning that \( \alpha < 0.05 \)).
Table 5 shows that teachers’ sex, age, education level, teaching level, teaching experience and classroom assessment in-service training had $p$-value=0.384, 0.404, 0.644, 0.920, 0.12, 0.471 respectively. The results suggest that there was no statistical significant association between teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment for accountability and all six demographic characteristics. The reason is that $0.384, 0.404, 0.644, 0.920, 0.12, 0.471 > 0.05$ (meaning that $\alpha > 0.05$).

However, interviews about the same demographic characteristics yielded diverse results. The interviews indicated that teachers regardless their demographic characteristics had mixed conceptions of classroom assessment although most of them 7 (70%) reported improvement conceptions as primary and few 3 (30%) reported it as accountability. This result is more or less a replica of quantitative data. A typical response regarding the status of teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment was given by one of the respondent who said:

I take classroom assessment as part of my teaching. I always do that because I want my pupils to learn English in all aspects! ...but sometimes as a teacher, I comply with what I am told to do by my bosses to safeguard my job. Do you know what I mean? ...I sometimes assess to make my bosses, especially inspectors, happy! (NY26, 17/09/2016).
The interview excerpt indicates that improvement conceptions were at the center while accountability conceptions were peripheral and mostly externally forced.

Regarding teachers’ teaching experience, teacher’s teaching level and in-service classroom assessment training featured as teachers’ conceptions shaping agent. Teachers pointed out that they have been changing their conceptions of classroom assessment year after year. For example MST35, a diploma holder, belonging to above 40 years age group and more than 20 years teaching experience said the following:

My belief about classroom assessment has not remained the same as it was at the beginning of my employment. ...at first my focus was giving tests for the sake of it! But with time and having interacted with fellow teachers, I have not only understood classroom assessment as something vital for English language learning but also for improving my teaching ...the more I assess the more I improve my teaching (21/9/2016).

The interview also indicated teachers who taught lower class level had feelings that at this level, classroom assessment which fostered meaningful learning was most appropriate. They also thought that as a pupil moves to higher class levels, classroom assessment needed less strict follow-ups. A typical response was given by NYU by saying:

I regard classroom assessment as a key for pupils’ learning. If effective assessment is not done to pupils at their initial stages of learning, expect them not to excel in future! ...you can’t compare assessment in these classes ...if I were teaching let say standard six or seven, it would have been easy for me to do classroom assessment for my pupils (19/9/2018).

The excerpt implies that the teacher’s conceptions may have been shaped by the levels they teach. Teaching lower primary required sophisticated classroom assessment skills but for higher primary levels classroom assessment was preferably loose and pupils’ responsibility than teachers’.

Further, in-service classroom assessment training featured as one of the aspects that shaped teachers conceptions. Teachers who had undergone training reported that they changed their prior beliefs about classroom assessment. The typical response on this aspect from a teacher was as follows:

I took an online course on assessing English language. It was too deep than what I learnt in college. Every language skill has its individualized assessment tasks …the training reshaped my conception about assessment but the assessment tasks aren’t easy to practice …too involving and don’t fit in our current education system (KIN21, 20/09/2016)

On the same scenario teachers who had not undergone classroom assessment maintained that their conceptions were embedded in the general methodology courses that they pursued in teacher training colleges. A typical remark was from MST35 (20/9/2016) who said: “…the primary base of my belief about classroom assessment is my college training Teachers …I was taught how to assess though I am not really practicing what I was taught but I know the importance.”
The excerpt informs the role of in-services and pre-service training towards shaping teachers conceptions of classroom assessment. Further, it appears that teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment are prone to change with context.

4.0 DISCUSSION

This study examined teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment in relation to their demographic characteristics. The findings indicated that English language subject teachers in Geita conceived assessment as a tool for improvement of teaching and learning and as a tool for accountability. The results replicated the findings of previous studies which were done in various countries (Azis, 2014; Barnes, Fives & Dacey, 2017; Brown, 2004; 2011; Remesal, 2011). In this case teachers considered classroom assessment as a fundamental aspect for teaching and learning process but did not consider it as irrelevant (Brown, 2004).

The improvement aspect of classroom assessment was primary to teachers’ conceptions while accountability aspect was secondary. This finding reiterated the previous study by Brown (2004) and Azis (2014). The two conceptions are mostly interwoven as each teacher held a certain percentages of the two conceptions disproportionately but mostly the improvement outweighed the accountability conceptions. The similar observation was given by Brown (2004, p.313) by saying that “teachers who think assessment is for improvement are likely to believe that assessment is connected to school accountability”

It is important to note that the notion of accountability for teachers in this study seemed to imply compliance. Teachers thought assessment was inevitable because authorities above them needed the assessment. This may be termed as power compliance than being responsible to teaching and learning. A similar study by Sethusha (2012) indicated that teachers were concerned with end results of assessment which reflected their quality as teachers, the quality of the school and the fate of learners. These can be equated to individual accountability as teachers, school and students.

Regarding the relationship, the quantitative data indicated that there was no statistical significant relationship between most of demographic characteristics and teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment except for years of teaching experience. The relationship between years of teaching experience and teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment was also reported in Maina (2014) and Calveric (2010). Basically, teachers believe that the more they stay in teaching profession the more they realize the fitting space of various teaching skills and tend to adjust their practices.

The qualitative interviews indicated that teachers who had undergone in-service classroom assessment of English language conceived classroom assessment more as improvement and less as accountability tool than those who had never. The similar was reported in Maina (2014) who found that teachers with extended training in classroom assessment engaged in classroom assessment for learning (AfL) and believed in its effectiveness while the teachers with no such training were handicapped in doing it and hardly believed in it. It is also noted in Hughes (2011) that training tends to update and harmonize teachers’ believes in their teaching career. On the similar aspect, Thomas (2012, p. 7) contends that “teachers’ conceptions of assessment is likely to transform positively when professional development
is integrated to equip them with contemporary approaches of assessment”. The power of in-service training is further shown in Berry, Daughtrey & Wieder (2010, p. 10) who assert that “for teacher preparation to be effective, teacher perception changing agents ought not to be a one and done activity”.

Apart from that, teachers’ teaching level featured and teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment appeared as related. The teachers who taught lower primary class levels leaned to classroom assessment for improvement than their counterpart. The finding is in line with Neibling (2014) who found that teachers’ grade level of teaching influenced their perceptions of classroom assessment. However, some studies indicate that the teacher’s teaching grade level had no influence to teachers’ conceptions of assessment (Vardar, 2010). The two standing points appear to inform that there are more contextual aspects related to teachers’ conceptions of classroom assessment. For that matter research in this part of assessment require a more individualization than universalization focus

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study indicated that teachers had innate and devised conceptions of classroom assessment. Teachers were aware of assessment entailment to teaching and learning. Given the favourable environment, teachers were likely to use their conceptions in their teaching work. However, such use was mostly impractical due to circumstantial factors such as managerial requirements of the existing education configuration. Based on such scenarios, teachers were compelled to demonstrate circumstantial devised conceptions which became the base of their classroom assessment work. They complied with the available assessment demands and archived the intrinsic conceptions which were mostly genuine. In view of the findings of this study, there is a need to retain teachers for a long period of time because the more they stay in teaching the more they gain meaningful conceptions of classroom assessment. Further, it is recommended to make in-service training a compulsory package for teachers so as to update them with newly incoming assessment techniques. The future studies could do a comparative analysis on teachers effectiveness in classroom assessment based on their conceptions and demographic characteristics.
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