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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine curriculum implementation practices regarding formative assessment carried out by English teachers at elementary level in Punjab, and to see their relationship with their self-efficacy beliefs. The researcher used explanatory correlational research design to conduct this study. Data were collected from 576 English teachers of 288 elementary and secondary schools that were selected through multistage sampling technique. For this purpose, Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and a self-developed Questionnaire on Curriculum Implementation Practices of Teachers (QCIPT) were used. Data were analyzed by using frequency percentages, means and Spearman correlation coefficient. The mean value revealed that implementation practices of English teachers regarding formative assessment were lesser than the optimal level. English teachers were found moderately confident in their capabilities regarding their classroom practices. A significant relationship was found between English teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs and their formative assessment practices. It was recommended that more practical work may be included in the programs to enhance their competence of curriculum implementation practices in formative assessment.
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1. Introduction

Language is an essential source of communication. An essential part of educational life is the learning of foreign language (Tosun, 2013). English is used as second and an official language in Pakistan. It is being used as instruction medium for different subjects. English subject is taught as a compulsory subject in educational institutions of the Punjab (Government of Pakistan, 2006).
Curriculum is the totality of all learning experiences that are achieved by the students and the direction of these experiences is determined by the goals of education (Lee and Chue, 2013; Talla, 2012). Curriculum include subject matter like math, science and English and covers objectives, content, teaching methods and assessment (Ornstein and Hunkins, 2014; Wiles and Bondi, 2014). National curriculum for English language 2006 has been designed is to enhance the quality of learning opportunities through formal instruction and provide opportunities to students for the language development. It develops competencies in learners to use English language as an effective communication tool in academic and social contexts enabling students to become a lifelong and independent learner (Government of Pakistan, 2006).

Assessment is a systematic process in order to gather data about students’ achievement which is considered vital to teaching (Dhindsa, Omar, and Waldrip, 2007). Assessment answers about individuals’ performance (Linn and Gronlund, 2000). Assessment of student learning is an orderly process (Linn and Miller, 2005). Assessment is used to finds out strengths and weaknesses of students and reasons of weakness. Students’ knowledge and ability is checked in it (Government of Pakistan, 2006). Assessment has an important role in improving teaching and learning process (Goodrum, Rennie, and Hackling, 2001; Pellegrino and Goldman, 2017) and is concerned with organizational decisions (Wiliam and Thompson, 2008). Assessment of students is regarded as an important element of curriculum implementation that enhances educational quality and has effects on teaching as well as learning process (Hancock, 2007). Students improve their learning and performance through assessment (Delandshere, 2002). Assessment techniques include evaluations, classroom observations and testing (Clark, 2015). Formative assessment is part of English national curriculum (Government of Pakistan, 2006).

Formative assessment is ongoing process to evaluate students learning and feedback is provided for learning and instructional adjustment (Wiliam and Thompson, 2008). Formative assessment takes place during instruction and is a part of teaching rather than separate activity (Wiggins and McTighe, 2007). Different activities like quizzes, peer feedback and questioning are included in formative assessment. It is future oriented since its focus is on future performance and feedback of students (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). Formative assessment highlights strengths and weaknesses of students and suggestions are provided to overcome it (Black and Wiliam, 1998). Formative assessment has impacts on teaching and learning quality and students are engaged in self-directed learning environment (Chappuis and Stiggins, 2002). Construction of test, student activities, feedback and affective traits are part of formative assessment as highlighted in English curriculum document (Government of Pakistan, 2006).

Tests are used to measure sample of behavior (Linn and Miller, 2005). Achievement test comprised of different forms of items as multiple choices, completion items, and true-false items, matching column items, short answer and essay type questions (Wiggins, 1998; Government of Pakistan, 2006). Co-curricular activities are also termed as student activities that enrich consistent curriculum activities (Tan and Pope, 2007). Teacher has a mentoring role in student activities (Stevens, 1999). Students get academic success by using these activities (Huang and Chang, 2004; Hunt, 2005). Writing competition, speaking and debate competition are part of student activities (Government of Pakistan, 2006).

Feedback is an important component of formative assessment to give information to stakeholders to achieve learning goals in classroom. An understanding and clarity is required for effective written feedback (Brookhart, 2017). Feedback is provided to all students to make them
understand that they are in line with the goal to achieve likely results. Feedback is a source of success and students' learning. Students learning outcomes are achieved through feedback (Marzano, 2007). Feedback becomes effective when it is timely and in formative manner whereas delayed feedback affects learning process of students (Stronge, 2007). Teacher provides feedback to students and they enhance their performance by frequent and constructive feedback (Hyland, 2006). Feedback plays an important role in writing skills (Weigle, 2007). Feedback enables students to identify their strengths and weaknesses and promotes their individual and professional growth (Klimova, 2015). Efficacious teachers give formative and timely feedback. They use information for guidance rather than increment in their grades (Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock, 2001).

An affective part of classroom environment is established with staff and students and constructive environment is created for excellent teaching (Muijs and Reynolds, 2015). English teachers play an important role in academic achievement of learners. Teachers deliver effective learning by their actions that take in classrooms (Markley, 2004).

Implementation is termed as the process of involving set of activities or putting an idea into practice (Tumposky and Adam, 2008). Implementation is vital to regulate habits of learners, their actions, programs, and current curricula (Ornstein and Hunkins, 2014). Curriculum implementation means transformation of planned curriculum into working curriculum (Fullan, 2006) that is concerned with the process of innovation and change. Its objective is to improve students’ learning (Dufour, 2002). Curriculum implementation increases management quality and make educational process better for the improvement of learning and education (Rusman, 2015).

Curriculum implementation needs to understand organizational change. Planning and reorganization of department is required for successful implementation of curriculum. Teachers try to enable students to change their habits to fulfill the objectives defined through school programs (Ornstein and Hunkins, 2014). Teachers have an important role to develop, implement and evaluate the curriculum effectively (Maphosa and Mutopa, 2012; Oliva, 1997). Successful curriculum implementation is related to teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs (SEBs) (Cerit, 2013; Ghaith & Yaghi, 1997).

Teachers have an effective role for curriculum implementation. Innovations require changes in beliefs in order to understand instructional practices of teachers (Hardman and A-Rahman, 2014). Teachers’ instructional decisions, their positions about new ideas, and their teaching attitude are affected by beliefs of teachers that have significant impact on teachers’ practices of curriculum. Teachers’ self- efficacy beliefs are the strong predictor of their behaviors that have effects on efforts teachers put for teaching, the goals they establish, their willpower of handling challenges, and on their enthusiasm (Alvarez-Nunez, 2012).

Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy as belief in one’s abilities to perform the tasks, which are required to attain objectives. Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, and Hoy (1998) take self-efficacy as a cognitive process through which beliefs are established to perform the tasks according to their competence. Teachers’ SEBs are the assessment of their abilities to bring about required learning outcomes from all types of students (Tschannen-Moran &Hoy, 2001).

Mastery experience as the term suggests is related to successful accomplishment of some special task. Vicarious experience is related to observe someone’s performance which is being modeled. Verbal feedback plays an important role in developing SEBs in completing some task. Happiness, pride, anxiety are those affective states which effect individuals' beliefs in their abilities (Bandura, 1997).
SEBs are individual’s beliefs in their abilities to accomplish those tasks which affect their lives. It determines the feelings and thoughts of people (Bandura, 1994). On the basis of these beliefs future of the individual can be predicted. They predict the resistance ability of individuals in case of any problem and their behavior in case of failure or any difficult situation (Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy is the assessment of one’s ability to perform beside the skills and knowledge they possess (Zimmerman, 2000). The belief of a teacher to affect the lives of students is personal efficacy (PE). It is the belief about one’s abilities to affect students’ learning. The assessment of teachers about their own capabilities, which are necessary to bring change in students’ learning, is termed as personal teaching efficacy (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Poulou, 2007).

SEBs effect not only teaching practices of teachers towards their teaching but their attitude towards the overall teaching-learning process and quality also (Achurraa and Villardónb, 2012). These beliefs help teachers in evaluating their capacity to bring change in their students (Gibson and Dembo, 1984). Emotional reactions and thinking of individuals also get effected by these beliefs. Those individuals, who are productive have high level of self-efficacy and they are more capable to perform difficult tasks. People with lower level of beliefs in self-efficacy feel uneasy to perform difficult tasks (Pajares, 2002).

Dellinger, Bobbett, Olivier and Ellett (2008) opine that teachers’ efficacy beliefs are actually their individual beliefs about their potential to help students in in executing difficult tasks. It is their confidence in their competence to improve the teaching-learning process (Bandura, 1997). It indicates teacher’s beliefs in their capacity to bring about required learning outcomes (Woolfolk, Rosoff, and Hoy, 1990). Teachers’ self-efficacy is not something, which is performed in exclusion rather it is context as well, subject specific and has a positive effect on students’ performance (Henson, 2002). It is the estimate of teachers’ ability rather than their output (Denzie, Cooney, and McKenzie, 2005).

As teachers’ self-efficacy is subject specific so different subjects and available resources require different beliefs. Different subject teachers have to depend different sources to teach self-efficacy. In past, success was related to Social science, English and art teachers and readiness to teach and accept all the responsibility of teaching-learning process matters a lot (Ross, Cousins, Gadalla, and Hannay, 1999).

Self-efficacy of teachers effect learning environment, motivation and satisfaction of learners and ultimately affects the process of teaching learning. If teachers with higher level of SEBs participate in professional growth programs, their effect can be seen in curriculum design, methods of teaching and assessment procedures. Teachers who possess high level in SEBs have more positive impact in classroom as compared to the teachers with lower level of self-efficacy belief (Gibson and Dembo, 1984).

Teachers’ self-efficacy is effective in designing positive learning environments and academic success. Classroom management techniques, teaching methodology and students’ participation in classroom activities are directly related to teacher self-efficacy beliefs. Efficacious teachers devise such type of teaching strategies which address learners’ needs. They find out the ways to engage their students in teaching-learning process (Yeo et al., 2008). These beliefs are also important to develop a positive teacher-student and parent-teacher relationships (Wertheim and Leyser, 2002).

In implementation phase teachers’ SEBs have impact on process of attribution. Teachers who
have higher level of self-efficacy show different concerns while implementing innovation. They put emphasis on hard work rather than luck (McKinney, Sexton, and Meyerson, 1999). They take difficult task as a challenge and do not avoid them. They like to perform difficult tasks and have high level of commitment. They feel themselves more committed and enthusiastic than the teachers who have lower level of self-efficacy (Zimmerman, 2000).

When implementation of any innovation is in process then SEBs are more required. The teachers with high beliefs accept those innovations more willingly (Evers, Brouwers, and Tomic, 2002). They implemented the subject matter with higher determination and tried to minimize the barriers which they faced during implementation process (Cantrell and Callaway, 2008). They tried to find out the way to keep their students engaged (Yeo, et al. 2008).

Teachers with high level of self-efficacy give more time to their teaching learning process. They are always ready to help their students in coping up the difficult tasks (Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Tucker et al., 2005). They feel confident about their abilities and about achieving the targets and try to overcome all the difficulties which come into their way (Onafowara, 2005). People expect very high towards them in accomplishing the task (Chong, et al., 2010). Their perception about the innovation is very clear and they implement it easily. They are committed towards their practices (Ghaith and Yaghi, 1997).

Teachers with low self-efficacy put little effort to find material related to their teaching and make their teaching activities effective for students (Ashton and Webb, 1986). They have very little connections with students (Tucker et al., 2005). They have limited approach, which lowers their motivation level and increases stress level (Henson, 2002).

Those students who were exposed with teachers having low level of self-efficacy and then moved towards teachers with high level of self-efficacy performed better (Ross, Hogaboam-Gray and Hannay, 2001).

Teaching efficacy affects overall quality of formative assessment implementation. Efficacious teachers implement maximum number of components of new practices in education (Smylie, 1988). Efficacious teachers develop thought provoking activities to help students having trouble in learning. Motivation improve student learning. Self-efficacy has relationship with teaching behaviors that have better skills of instruction. Efficacious teachers maintain students on task and create a respectful relationship with them (Langer, 2000).

Eufemia (2012 found that efficacious teachers use formative assessment practices. He found that there was positive significant relationship between teachers' SEBs and their formative assessment practices. Hartley (2016) concluded that there is a significant positive relationship between teachers' SEBs and their formative assessment practices.

2. Objectives of the Study
The objectives of the study were to:
- Find out English teachers implementation practices of formative assessment at elementary level.
- Examine English teachers self-efficacy beliefs teaching English at elementary level.
- Find out the relationship between English teachers self-efficacy beliefs and their formative assessment practices at elementary level.
3. Research Questions

The research questions are:
- To what extent implementation practices of formative assessment are carried out by English teachers at elementary level?
- To what extent self-efficacy beliefs exist in English teachers for teaching English at elementary level?
- To what extent relationship exists between self-efficacy beliefs of English teachers and their formative assessment practices at elementary level?

4. Research methodology

Explanatory correlational quantitative research design was used. Population of this study comprised of all the English teachers teaching English at elementary level in public elementary and secondary schools of Punjab.

The Punjab province has been administratively divided into nine divisions 36 districts. Multistage sampling technique was used. At first stage, two districts were randomly selected from each administrative division (9*2=18 districts). At second stage, sixteen schools from each district were taken randomly with equal bifurcation on the basis of their gender and locale (18*16=288 schools). At third stage, two English teachers were selected from each school by using purposive sampling technique as sample of the study. Thus, the total sample of the study consisted of (288*2=576) teachers. Two data collection instruments as Teachers' Self-efficacy Scale (TSES) developed by Anita Woolfolk Hoy (2001) and self-developed Questionnaire on Curriculum Implementation Practices of Teachers (QCIPT) were used for this study. The reliability was calculated at the Chronbach's value for TSES was .815 and for QCIPT was .812. Data were analyzed by using frequency percentages, mean scores, and standard deviation Spearman’s correlation co-efficient.

Mean values were categorized into three levels i.e. 'Low (1.00-2.33)', 'Moderate (2.34-3.67)' and 'High (3.68-5.00)' adopted from (Hürsen, Özçınar, Özdamlı, and Uzunboylu, 2011).

5. Data Analysis and Interpretation

5.1 Research Question 1: To what extent formative assessment practices are carried out by English teachers at elementary level?

Table 1: Formative assessment practices

| Sr. No. | Items                        | Always % | Often % | Sometimes % | Rare % | Never % | Mean | S.D  |
|---------|------------------------------|----------|---------|-------------|--------|---------|------|------|
| 1       | Test construction            | 48.82    | 16.78   | 15.53       | 12.47  | 6.38    | 3.89 | 1.27 |
| 2       | Co-curricular activities     | 18.37    | 17.43   | 22.53       | 24.13  | 17.60   | 2.95 | 1.36 |
| 3       | Feedback                     | 58.65    | 14.42   | 12.87       | 9.92   | 4.67    | 4.13 | 1.21 |
| 4       | Affective traits             | 65.18    | 13.62   | 11.20       | 6.40   | 3.64    | 4.30 | 1.09 |
| Overall |                              | 47.76    | 15.56   | 15.53       | 13.23  | 8.07    | 3.82 | 1.23 |

Table 1 shows English teachers’ formative assessment practices. Data in the table show that,
overall, implementation practices regarding formative assessment of teachers ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 1.23$) were at moderate level. The factors such as feedback ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 1.21$), affective traits ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 1.09$) and test construction ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 1.27$) were at high level, whereas, teachers’ practices regarding co-curricular activities ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.36$) were calculated at moderate level.

5.2 Research Question 2: To what extent self-efficacy beliefs exist in English teachers for teaching English at elementary level?

Table 2: Self-efficacy

| Sr. No. | Factors                  | A Great Deal | Quite a Bit | Some Influence | Very Little | Nothing | Mean | SD |
|---------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|---------|------|----|
| 1       | Student Engagement       | 30.78        | 25.60       | 22.99          | 15.28       | 5.38    | 3.61 | 1.21|
| 2       | Instructional Strategies | 30.59        | 29.86       | 21.08          | 13.80       | 4.66    | 3.68 | 1.18|
| 3       | Classroom Management     | 32.15        | 26.25       | 22.44          | 12.55       | 6.65    | 3.65 | 1.25|
| Overall |                          | 31.17        | 27.24       | 22.17          | 13.88       | 5.56    | 3.65 | 1.21|

N=576, Low level (1.00-2.33), Moderate level (2.34-3.67), High level (3.68-5.00)

Table 2 indicates SEBs of elementary level English teachers. Data in the table show that, overall, SEBs of teachers ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.21$) were calculated at moderate level. English teachers’ SEBs regarding instructional strategies ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.18$) were moderately calculated at high level while their efficacy beliefs regarding student engagement ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.21$) and establishing classroom management ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.25$) were found at moderate level.

5.3 Research Question 3: To what extent relationship exists between SEBs of English teachers and their formative assessment practices at elementary level?

Table 3: Relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and formative assessment practices

| Factors               | Mean | N  | Spearman ‘rs’ | Sig (2-tailed) |
|-----------------------|------|----|---------------|----------------|
| Self-efficacy         | 3.65 | 576| .362**        | .000           |
| Formative Assessment  | 3.77 | 576|               |                |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 illustrates the relationship between English teachers’ SEBs and formative assessment practices as measured by the Spearman’s correlation coefficient. The correlation value (.362**) shows significant relationship between English teachers’ SEBs and their implementation practices of formative assessment.

6. Discussion

Findings of the study reveal that curriculum implementation practices of English teachers regarding formative assessment were calculated, although, at high level however the overall mean value ($M=3.82$)
was lesser than the optimal level ($M=5.00$). It follows there are some gaps in implementation of curriculum that supports the findings of several other studies. Hardman & A-Rahman, (2014) stressed teachers’ role to improve their instructional knowledge and content presentation. Yan & He (2012) has pointed out gaps like teacher ignorance, learners’ unwillingness to do something and pedagogical irregularities to implement the curriculum. Gunal and Engin-Demir (2012) found that teachers are unable to implement curriculum effectively due to inadequate material, crowded classes and insufficient guidance. Ornstein and Hunkins (2014) highlighted that curriculum is unable to implement properly due to insufficient planning. Yu and Wang (2009) identified a mismatch between current practices and planned curriculum. Hu (2002) stressed the need for minimization of gaps. Black and Wiliam (1998) reported that proper assessment strategies increase student achievement and teachers’ confidence may be enhanced by this way.

English teachers were found moderately confident in their abilities and a significant relationship was found between teachers’ SEBs and curriculum implementation practices. Results of various studies authenticated similar significant relationship. Ross, Hogaboam-Gray, and Hannay (2001) emphasized that teachers having confidence in their abilities used various teaching techniques, showed responsibility to ensure quality learning and extended extra support to teach students in the class. Deemer (2004) identified that highly efficacious teachers emphasized on creativity and meaningfulness. Fogleman, McNeill, and Krajcik, (2011) reported teachers’ self-efficacy as predictor of successful curriculum implementation. Teaching goals can be achieved by implementation of innovations in classrooms. Gibson and Dembo (1984) concluded that efficacious teachers can teach unmotivated students by putting extra effort and using appropriate techniques. Ashton and Webb (1986) found that efficacious teachers provide feedback to students and keep them on task. Henson (2002) found that teachers who are confident in their abilities have outstanding behaviors. Eufemia (2012) found positive significant relationship between English teachers’ SEBs and formative assessment practices. Hartley (2016) concluded that there was significant positive relationship between SEBs of teachers and their formative assessment practices. These findings coincide with the current study.

7. Conclusion
Curriculum implementation practices of English teachers with respect to formative assessment were calculated, although, at high level however the overall mean value ($M=3.82$) was lesser than the optimal level ($M=5.00$).

English teachers’ SEBs were found at moderate level that indicates they were moderately confident in their abilities.

A significant relationship was found between Elementary level English teachers’ SEBs and their ‘formative assessment practices’.

8. Recommendations
On the basis of the findings of the study it was recommended that:
- Curriculum implementation practices of formative assessment were, although, found at high level however the overall mean value ($M=3.82$) reasonably lesser than the optimal level ($M=5.00$) which indicates that the curriculum is not being implemented at optimal level. It might be due to the incompetence of English teachers in practical implementation of the curriculum. Hence, it is recommended that the teacher training programs should pay more attention on enhancing English teachers competence by including more practical in teacher training programs.
English teachers were found moderately confident in their abilities to devise classroom activities effectively for unknown reasons. To this end, a rigorous exploratory study is recommended with the aim to explore underlying reasons of their perceived incapability.
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