



THE UNIVERSITY
of ADELAIDE

**Teacher Assessment Literacy and Student
Outcomes in the Province of Tawi-Tawi,
Philippines**

Wilham M. Hailaya

This thesis is submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in the

School of Education
Faculty of the Professions
University of Adelaide

September 2014

Table of Contents

List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	xvi
Abstract	xix
Declaration	xxi
Acknowledgements	xxii
Chapter 1: The Problem and Its Scope	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	3
1.2.1 Overview of the Philippine Education Systems	3
1.2.2 The State of Basic Education in the Philippines	6
1.2.3 Relevant Education Reforms	9
1.3 Research Questions	14
1.4 Aims/Objectives of the Study	14
1.5 Significance of the Study	15
1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study	16
1.7 Summary	18
Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature	19
and Studies	19
2.1 Introduction	19
2.2 Assessment and Its Role in the Teaching-Learning Process	20
2.3 Teacher Assessment Literacy	26
2.4 Assessment Practices	36
2.5 Teaching Practices	39
2.6 The Student Outcomes	43
2.7 Proposed Model	45
2.8 Summary	49
Chapter 3: Research Design and Methods	50
3.1 Introduction	50
3.2 Planning Stage	50
3.2.1 Focus of the study	50
3.2.2 Design and Methods	52

3.2.3	Ethics Clearance/Approval	53
3.3	Sampling and Data Collection	54
3.3.1	Identification of Schools and Participants	55
3.3.2	Research Locale	57
3.3.3	Data Collection Methods	60
3.4	Survey Instruments	61
3.4.1	Adoption/Modification/Development of Instruments	61
3.4.2	Development of Interview Questions	64
3.4.3	The Pilot Study	65
3.4.4	Instruments for the Main Study	66
3.4.5	Validity and Reliability of the Instruments	66
3.4.6	Validation of the Scales	68
3.5	The Survey	69
3.5.1	Administration of the Instruments	70
3.5.2	Administration of the Interviews	71
3.5.3	Collection of Secondary Data	72
3.6	Statistical Procedures Employed in the Study	72
3.6.1	Statistical Procedures Employed in Validating the Instruments	73
3.6.2	Statistical Procedures Employed in Data Analysis	81
3.7	Data Analysis	81
3.7.1	Preparation of Data	82
3.7.2	Data Analysis Techniques	82
3.8	Summary	83
Chapter 4:	The Assessment Literacy Inventory	85
4.1	Introduction	85
4.2	The Assessment Literacy Inventory (ALI)	86
4.3	Previous Analytic Practices	87
4.4	ALI Modification to Suit the Tawi-Tawi Context	90
4.5	Current Validation of the ALI	91
4.6	Item Analysis of the ALI using the Rasch Model	92
4.7	Analysis of the ALI Structure using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)	99
4.7.1	Structural Analysis using CFA	100
4.8	Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Alternative Model	104

4.8.1. Structural Analysis of the Alternative Model using CFA	104
4.9 Model Used in the Study	108
4.10 Summary	108
Chapter 5: The Assessment Practices Inventory	109
5.1 Introduction	109
5.2 Development of the Assessment Practices Inventory (API)	110
5.3 Pilot Test of the API	114
5.4 Calibration of the API	115
5.4.1 The Rating Scale Model	115
5.4.2 Item Analysis Using the Rating Scale Model	116
5.4.3 Structural Analysis Using CFA	122
5.4.4 CFA of the Alternative Models	125
5.4.5 Model Used in the Study	133
5.5 Summary	133
Chapter 6: The Teaching Practices Scale	134
6.1 Introduction	134
6.2 The TPS: Its Development, Previous Validation, and Description	135
6.3 Modification and Pilot Test of the TPS in the Current Study	138
6.4 Examination of the Item and Model Fit of the TPS	140
6.4.1 Item Analysis Results Using the Rating Scale Model	140
6.4.2 Structural Analysis Using CFA	146
6.4.3 The Second-Order Three-Factor Structure of the TPS	147
6.4.4 The CFA of the Alternative Models	150
6.4.5 Model Used in the Study	158
6.5 Summary	159
Chapter 7: The Student Perceptions of Assessment Scale	160
7.1 Introduction	160
7.2 The SPAS: Its Modification and Description	162
7.3 Pilot Test of the SPAS	164
7.4 Item Analysis Using the Rating Scale Model	167
7.4.1 Rasch Analysis Results of the SPAS Items under the 'Perceptions of Test (PTEST) Construct	168

7.4.2	Rasch Analysis Results of the SPAS Items under the ‘Perceptions of Assignment (PASS)’ Construct	169
7.4.3	Rasch Analysis Results of the SPAS Items under a Single/Dominant Dimension	170
7.5	Examination of the Structure and Item Loadings of the SPAS Items	171
7.5.1	Structural Analysis Using CFA	172
7.5.2	The CFA of the Alternative Model	176
7.5.3	Model Used in the Study	179
7.6	Summary.....	180
Chapter 8:	The Student Attitude Towards Assessment Scale	181
8.1	Introduction	181
8.2	The SATAS: Its Development and Description.....	183
8.3	Pilot Test of the SATAS	184
8.4	Examination of the Item and Structural Fit of the SATAS.....	186
8.4.1	Item Analysis Results Using the Rating Scale Model.....	187
8.4.2	Structural Analysis Using CFA	188
8.5	Model Used in the Study	190
8.6	Summary.....	191
Chapter 9:	Descriptive and Some Inferential Results	192
9.1	Introduction	192
9.2	Descriptive Information about the Sample	194
9.2.1	Student Gender.....	194
9.2.2	Teacher Gender	197
9.2.3	Age Range of the Teacher Sample	198
9.2.4	Academic Qualifications of the Teacher Sample.....	200
9.2.5	School Type	202
9.2.6	School Level.....	203
9.2.7	Years of Teaching Experience of the Teacher Sample	205
9.3	The Data	206
9.3.1	The Scaling Process	207
9.3.2	Addressing Missing Values and Missing Data.....	208
9.3.3	Level of Analysis	209
9.4	Descriptive Analysis Results	210
9.4.1	Mean Score Distribution: ‘Assessment Literacy’.....	210

9.4.2	Mean Score Distribution: ‘Assessment Practices’	215
9.4.3	Mean Score Distribution: ‘Teaching Practices’	218
9.4.4	Mean Score Distribution: ‘Student Perceptions of Assessment’	220
9.4.5	Distribution of Mean Responses on ‘Student Attitude towards Assessment’	221
9.4.6	Academic Achievement Data: NAT Standardised Scores	221
9.4.7	Aptitude Data: NCAE Standardised Scores	222
9.5	Inferential Results	222
9.5.1	T-test Results of Significant Differences on the Levels of Teacher Respondents’ Mean Responses	222
9.5.2	ANOVA Results of Significant Difference on the Levels of Teacher Respondents’ Mean Responses	224
9.6	Summary.....	227
Chapter 10: Path Analysis of the Teacher-level and Student-level Factors		229
10.1	Introduction	229
10.2	The Structural Equation Modeling (SEM).....	231
10.3	The Use of LISREL 8.80 Software	235
10.4	Models and Representation in Quantitative Research	237
10.5	Testing for Normality of Data and Multicollinearity	238
10.6	Model Specification	240
10.7	Model Trimming	240
10.8	Univariate Regression Analysis.....	240
10.9	Results of Regression Analysis.....	244
10.9.1	Teacher-level Factors (Model 1)	244
10.9.2	Teacher-level Factors (Model 2)	248
10.9.3	Student-level Factors (Model 1 for Grade 6 and Second Year high school students)	254
10.9.4	Student-level Factors (Model 2 for Grade 6 and Second Year high school students)	256
10.9.5	Student-level Factors (Model 1 for Fourth Year High School Students).....	256
10.10	Path Analysis	258
10.10.1	Results of Path Analysis.....	259
10.11	Summary	279
Chapter 11: Multilevel Analysis of the Tested Factors		282

11.1 Introduction	282
11.2 Overview of HLM.....	284
11.3 Assumptions of HLM	286
11.4 Model Building in HLM	287
11.5 HLM 6.08 Software	291
11.6 Data and Variables Analysed in HLM.....	292
11.6.1 Dummy Variables and Coding.....	293
11.6.2 Mediating and Moderating Variables	295
11.7 The Model and Analysis Framework	297
11.8 Model Building and Analysis Using HLM 6.08 Software.....	300
11.9 The Results of the Two-level Model	303
11.9.1 Group 1 (Grade 6 and 2 nd Year Students) Results	305
11.9.2 Group 2 (Fourth Year Students) Results	321
11.10 Summary	330
Chapter 12: Conclusion	332
12.1 Introduction	332
12.2 The Design of the Study.....	332
12.3 Summary of the Findings	334
12.3.1 Assessment literacy	335
12.3.2 Assessment practices	335
12.3.3 Teaching practices	336
12.3.4 Perceptions of assessment	336
12.3.5 Attitude towards assessment	337
12.3.6 Academic achievement	337
12.3.7 General aptitude.....	337
12.3.8 Significant mean differences	338
12.3.9 Relationships among tested factors	339
12.4 Theoretical Implications	342
12.5 Methodological Implications	345
12.6 Implications for Policy, Teacher Education Curriculum, Teacher Professional Development, and Assessment Reform and Research.....	348
12.7 Limitations of the Study and Implications for Further Research	351
12.8 Concluding Remarks.....	353

References	355
Appendices	370

List of Tables

Table 1.1	
The NAT achievement rates in MPS of Grade 6, Second Year and Fourth Year high school students in S.Y. 2006-2010.....	7
Table 1.2	
Science and Mathematics scores of Filipino students in the 2003 and 2008 TIMSS	8
Table 3.1	
The study participants.....	55
Table 3.2	
Number of participating elementary schools by type	55
Table 3.3	
Number of participating secondary schools by type.....	56
Table 3.4	
Distribution of Schools by municipality and school level.....	56
Table 3.5	
Number of teacher participants by level and school type.....	57
Table 3.6	
Number of student participants by level and school type.....	57
Table 3.7	
Summary of model fit indices and their corresponding permissible values.....	81
Table 4.1	
Sample original and modified ALI items.....	91
Table 4.2	
Results of the initial and final item analysis of the ALI items under Standard 1.....	93
Table 4.3	
Results of the initial and final item analysis of the ALI items under Standard 2.....	94
Table 4.4	
Results of the initial and final item analysis of the ALI items under Standard 3.....	94
Table 4.5	
Results of the initial and final item analysis of the ALI items under Standard 4.....	95
Table 4.6	
Results of the initial and final item analysis of the ALI items under Standard 5.....	95

Table 4.7	Results of the initial and final item analysis of the ALI items under Standard 6.....	96
Table 4.8	Results of the initial and final item analysis of the ALI items under Standard 7.....	96
Table 4.9	Results of the initial analysis of the ALI items.....	97
Table 4.10	Results of the final item analysis of the ALI items.....	99
Table 4.11	Summary results of fit indices for the seven-factor ALI structure.....	102
Table 4.12	Factor loadings of ALI items under the seven-factor model.....	103
Table 4.13	Summary results of fit indices for the one-factor ALI structure.....	106
Table 4.14	Factor loadings of ALI items under the one-factor model.....	107
Table 5.1	The API items.....	114
Table 5.2	Results of the initial analysis of the API items under the assessment purpose.....	117
Table 5.3	Results of the final item analysis of the API items under assessment purpose.....	118
Table 5.4	Results of the initial and final item analysis of the API items under assessment design.....	118
Table 5.5	Results of the initial item analysis of the API items under assessment communication.....	119
Table 5.6	Results of the final item analysis of the API items under assessment communication.....	120
Table 5.7	Results of the initial item analysis of the API items under assessment practices.....	120
Table 5.8	Results of the final item analysis of the API items under assessment practices.....	121

Table 5.9	Summary results of fit indices for the three-factor API structure.....	124
Table 5.10	Factor loadings of API items under the three-factor model.....	125
Table 5.11	Summary results of fit indices for the one-factor API structure.....	126
Table 5.12	Factor loadings of API items under the one-factor model.....	128
Table 5.13	Summary of fit indices for the API hierarchical structure.....	131
Table 5.14	Factor loadings of API items under the hierarchical model.....	132
Table 6.1	The original and modified teaching practices scale.....	139
Table 6.2	Results of the initial item analysis of the 'structure construct' of the TPS.....	141
Table 6.3	Results of the final item analysis of the 'structure construct' of the TPS.....	142
Table 6.4	Results of the initial item analysis of the 'student-oriented activity construct' of the TPS.....	143
Table 6.5	Results of the final analysis of the 'student-oriented activity construct' of the TPS.....	143
Table 6.6	Results of the initial and final item analyses of the 'enhanced activity construct' of the TPS.....	144
Table 6.7	Results of the initial items analysis of the 'combined teaching practices construct' of the TPS.....	145
Table 6.8	Results of the final item analysis of the 'combined teaching practices construct' of the TPS.....	146
Table 6.9	Summary results of fit indices for the hierarchical structure of the TPS.....	149
Table 6.10	Factor loadings of the teaching practices items under hierarchical model.....	150

Table 6.11	Summary of fit indices for the three-factor structure of the teaching practices.....	153
Table 6.12	Factor loadings of the teaching practices items under the three-factor model.....	154
Table 6.13	Summary results of fit indices for the one-factor structure of the teaching practices.....	157
Table 6.14	Factor loadings of teaching practices items under one-factor model.....	158
Table 7.1	The original and modified versions of the SPAS items.....	163
Table 7.2	Face and content validity of the SPAS.....	166
Table 7.3	Results of the initial and final item analyses of the 'PT construct' of the SPAS.....	169
Table 7.4	Results of the initial and final item analyses of the 'PTA construct' of the SPAS.....	170
Table 7.5	Results of the initial and final item analyses of the SPAS items under a single/dominant dimension.....	171
Table 7.6	Summary of fit indices for the first-order Two-Factor structure of the SPAS.....	174
Table 7.7	Factor loadings of the SPAS items under the first-order two-factor model.....	175
Table 7.8	Summary of fit indices for the one-factor structure of the SPAS.....	178
Table 7.9	Factor loadings of the SPAS items under one-factor model.....	179
Table 8.1	Source and developed SATAS items.....	184
Table 8.2	Face and content validity of the SATAS items.....	186
Table 8.3	Results of the initial and final items analyses of the SATAS items under a single/dominant dimension.....	188

Table 8.4	Summary results of fit indices for the one-factor structure of the SATAS.....	190
Table 8.5	Factor loadings of the SATAS items under the one-factor model.....	190
Table 9.1	Distribution of student respondents by gender.....	195
Table 9.2	Gender distribution of students by schooling level.....	196
Table 9.3	Distribution of teacher respondents by gender.....	197
Table 9.4	Age distribution of teacher respondents.....	199
Table 9.5	Distribution of teacher respondents by academic qualification.....	201
Table 9.6	Distribution of teacher respondents according to school type.....	202
Table 9.7	Distribution of teacher respondents according to school level.....	204
Table 9.8	Distribution of teacher respondents according to years of teaching experience.....	205
Table 9.9	Levels of assessment literacy of elementary and secondary school teachers (Distribution of mean W-scores on assessment literacy by school level and standards tested).....	215
Table 9.10	Levels of assessment practices of elementary and secondary school teachers (Distribution of mean W-scores on assessment practices by school level and sub-factors tested).....	217
Table 9.11	Levels of teaching practices of elementary and secondary school teachers (Distribution of mean W-scores on teaching practices by school level and sub-factors tested).....	220
Table 9.12	Levels of assessment perception of student respondents (Distribution of mean W-scores on student perception of assessment by sub-factors).....	221
Table 9.13	Levels of attitude toward assessment of student respondents (Distribution of W-scores of attitude toward assessment of student respondents).....	221

Table 9.14	Levels of academic achievement of Grade 6 and Second Year high school students and of aptitude of Fourth Year high school students (Distribution of W-scores on academic achievement (NAT) of Grade 6 and Second Year high school students and on aptitude (NCAE) of Fourth Year High School students).....	222
Table 9.15	t-Test results of significant differences on the variables tested by selected demographic factors at the teacher level.....	224
Table 9.16	One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results of significant difference on assessment literacy (Standard 2) by age range.....	225
Table 9.17	Post Hoc Tests (Tukey) results of significant difference on assessment literacy (Standard 2) by age range.....	225
Table 9.18	One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results of significant difference on assessment literacy (ASLIT, Standards 2, 5, and 7) by years of teaching experience.....	226
Table 9.19	Post Hoc Tests (Tukey) results of significant difference on assessment literacy (ASLIT, Standards 2, 5, and 7) by years of teaching experience.....	226
Table 9.20	One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results of significant difference on teaching practices (STUDOR) by years of teaching experience.....	227
Table 9.21	Post Hoc Tests (Tukey) results of significant difference on teaching practices (STUDOR) by years of teaching experience.....	227
Table 10.1	Standardised regression coefficients and t-values from regression analysis on the influence of demographic factors on the main variables of the study at the teacher level.....	244
Table 10.2	Standardised regression coefficients and t-values from regression analysis on the relationships among the main factors at the teacher level.....	248
Table 10.3	Standardised regression coefficients and t-values from regression analysis on the relationships among sub-factors of teacher assessment literacy.....	248
Table 10.4	Standardised regression coefficients and t-values from regression analysis on the relationships among sub-factors of assessment practices.....	249

Table 10.5	
Standardised regression coefficients and t-values from regression analysis on the relationships among sub-factors of teaching practices.....	251
Table 10.6.	
Standardised regression coefficients and t-values from regression analysis indicating the relationships among sub-variables at the teacher level.....	252
Table 10.7	
Standardised regression coefficients and t-values from regression analysis indicating the relationships among variables at the student level (Grade 6 and Second Year high school).....	255
Table 10.8	
Standardised regression coefficients and t-values from regression analysis indicating the relationships among main and sub-variables at the student level (Grade 6 and Second Year high school students).....	256
Table 10.9	
Standardised regression coefficients and t-values from regression analysis indicating the relationships among main factors at the student level (Fourth Year high school students).....	257
Table 10.10	
Standardised regression coefficients and t-values from regression analysis indicating the relationships among main and sub-variables at the student level (Fourth Year high school students).....	257
Table 10.11	
Summary of direct effects on teaching practices.....	260
Table 10.12	
Summary of indirect effects on teaching practices.....	261
Table 10.13	
Direct and indirect effects on sub-factors of teaching practices (Model 2 for Teachers).....	262
Table 10.14	
Summary of direct effects of teacher-level demographic sub-factors on the sub-variables of teaching practices.....	263
Table 10.15	
Summary of indirect effects of teacher-level demographic and sub-factors on sub-variables of teaching practices.....	265
Table 10.16	
Direct effects of student-level demographic and main factors on academic achievement (Model 1 for Grade 6 and Second Year high school students).....	271
Table 10.17	
Direct effects of student-level factors on academic achievement (Model 2 for Grade 6 and Second Year high school students).....	273

Table 10.18	Direct effect of student-level main factors on aptitude (Model 1 for Fourth Year high school students).....	275
Table 10.19	Indirect effects of student-level main factors on aptitude (Model 1 for Fourth Year high school students)..	276
Table 10.20	Direct effects of student-level factors on aptitude under Model 2 (Fourth Year high school students).....	278
Table 10.21	Indirect effects of student-level factors on aptitude under model 2 (Fourth Year high school students).....	278
Table 11.1	List of variables used in the two-level HLM.....	297
Table 11.2	Null model results for the 2L/HLM for Group 1 (Grade 6 and 2 nd Year Student Sample).....	306
Table 11.3	Results of the 2L/HLM analysis for Group 1 (Grade 6 and 2 nd Year Student Sample).....	308
Table 11.4	Results of interaction effects between level-1 and level-2 predictors for Group 1 (Grade 6 and 2 nd Year Student Sample).....	311
Table 11.5	Estimation of variance components for the final Two-level Model for Group 1 (6 th Grade and 2 nd Year Student Sample).....	320
Table 11.6	Null Model results for the 2L/HLM for Group 2 (4 th Year Student Sample).....	321
Table 11.7	Two-level model (2L/HLM) for Group 2 (4 th Year Student Sample).....	322
Table 11.8	Interaction effect results between level-1 and level-2 predictors for Group 2 (4 th Year Student Sample)...	324
Table 11.9	Estimation of variance components for the final Two-level Model for Group 2 (4 th Year Student Sample).	329

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 The Philippine education system.....	4
Figure 2.1 TALIS Theoretical Framework.....	45
Figure 2.2 Bigg's 3P Model of classroom learning.....	47
Figure 2.3 Proposed Theoretical Model.....	48
Figure 3.1 Map of Tawi-Tawi, Philippines.....	58
Figure 3.2 Scales/instruments employed in the study.....	64
Figure 3.3 Validity and reliability of the employed scales.....	69
Figure 4.1 Effects of teacher assessment literacy on academic achievement and aptitude through the intervening factors at the teacher and student levels.....	85
Figure 4.2 Structure of the Seven-Factor Model for the ALI.....	101
Figure 4.3 Structure of one-factor model for ALI.....	105
Figure 5.1 The relationship among teacher assessment literacy, assessment practices, and student outcomes	109
Figure 5.2 Structure of the three-factor model for API.....	123
Figure 5.3 Structure of one-factor model for the API.....	127
Figure 5.4 Structure of the hierarchical model for the API.....	130
Figure 6.1 The relationship among teacher assessment literacy, teaching practices, and student outcomes	134

Figure 6.2	Structure of the three-factor model of the teaching practices.....	148
Figure 6.3	The structure of the hierarchical model of the teaching practices.....	152
Figure 6.4	Structure of one-factor model of the teaching practices.....	156
Figure 7.1	The relationship among teacher assessment literacy, assessment practices, teaching practices, student perceptions of assessment, and student outcomes in this study.....	161
Figure 7.2	Structure of the two-factor model of the SPAS.....	173
Figure 7.3	Structure of the one-factor model of the SPAS.....	177
Figure 8.1	The relationship among teacher assessment literacy, assessment practices, teaching practices, student attitude towards assessment, and student outcomes in this study.....	182
Figure 8.2	Structure of the one-factor model of the SATAS.....	189
Figure 9.1	Distribution of student respondents by gender.....	196
Figure 9.2	Gender distribution of students by schooling level.....	197
Figure 9.3	Distribution of teacher respondents by gender.....	198
Figure 9.4	Distribution of teacher respondents by age.....	200
Figure 9.5	Distribution of teacher respondents by academic qualification.....	201
Figure 9.6	Distribution of teacher respondents according to school type.....	203
Figure 9.7	Distribution of teacher respondents by schooling level.....	204
Figure 9.8	Distribution of teacher respondents according to years of teaching experience.....	206

Figure 10.1	
Basic steps in SEM.....	235
Figure 10.2	
Direct and indirect effects of teacher-level factors on teaching practices (Model 1 for Teachers).....	260
Figure 10.3	
Direct and indirect effects of student-level demographic and main factors on academic achievement (Model 1 for Grade 6 and Second Year high school students).....	271
Figure 10.4	
Direct and indirect effects of student-level demographic, main and sub-factors on academic achievement (Model 2 for Grade 6 and Second Year high school students).....	272
Figure 10.5	
Direct and indirect effects of student-level demographic and main factors on aptitude (Model 1 for Fourth Year high school students).....	275
Figure 10.6	
Direct and indirect effects of student-level demographic, main, and sub- factors on aptitude (Model 2 for Fourth Year high school students).....	277
Figure 11.1	
Two-level HLM with academic achievement as the outcome variable.....	299
Figure 11.2	
Two-level HLM with aptitude as the outcome variable.....	299
Figure 11.3	
Final Two-level Model for Group 1 (6 th Grade and 2 nd Year Student Sample).....	313
Figure 11.4	
Cross-level interaction effect of school type on the slope of student gender on academic achievement...	315
Figure 11.5	
Cross-level interaction effect of school type on the slope of student perceptions of assessment on academic achievement.....	316
Figure 11.6	
Cross-level interaction effect of school type on the slope of student attitude towards assessment on academic achievement.....	318
Figure 11.7	
Final Two-level Model for Group 2 (4 th Year Student Sample).....	326
Figure 11.8	
Cross-level interaction effect of academic qualification on the slope of student attitude towards assessment	328

Abstract

This study examined teachers' assessment literacy and its probable impact on student achievement and aptitude (the outcome variables) through the intervening variables at the teacher and student levels. It likewise explored the effects of demographic variables on factors at the two levels and on the outcome variables. The study had 582 teacher samples and 2,077 student samples taken from Grade Six, Second Year and Third Year high school classes in the province of Tawi-Tawi, Philippines. It employed a mixed-methods design using quantitative method as a primary approach and qualitative method as a supporting approach. It utilised a number of statistical techniques, including Rasch modeling, structural equation modeling and hierarchical linear modeling, thematic analysis, and through the use of a number of software applications and include SPSS 16.0, LISREL 8.80, and HLM 6.08 to analyse the data.

The results revealed that the elementary and secondary school teachers in Tawi-Tawi, Philippines possessed relatively low assessment literacy. In terms of the specific assessment areas, the teachers performed highest on "choosing assessment methods appropriate for instructional decisions" and lowest on "developing assessment methods appropriate for instructional decisions". The qualitative finding concerning teachers' knowledge on validity and reliability supported the low assessment literacy results. Moreover, teachers generally indicated that they practised "assessment purpose", "assessment design", and "assessment communication" frequently, and "direct transmission method" and "alternative approach" of teaching in more than half of their lessons. Furthermore, the Grade Six, Second Year, and Fourth Year high school students generally exhibited positive "perceptions of assessment" and positive "attitude towards assessment". Besides, the Grade Six and Second Year high school students obtained below average "academic achievement", and Fourth Year high school students obtained below average "aptitude".

The results further revealed that teachers' assessment literacy negatively influenced their teaching practices while their assessment practices positively impacted on their teaching practices. No relationship was evident between their assessment literacy and assessment practices. However, analysis of

relevant sub-variables showed some degree of positive effect of assessment literacy on assessment practices. Additionally, the students' "perceptions of assessment" appeared to positively influence their "attitude towards assessment". The Grade Six and Second Year high school students' "perceptions of assessment" and "attitude towards assessment" likewise showed significant positive effects on their "academic achievement". The Fourth Year high school students' "perceptions of assessment" and "attitude towards assessment" exerted negative and positive effects, respectively, on their "aptitude".

Some demographic factors had moderating effects on the variables tested. Teachers' age range (60 years and above), school type, and gender appeared to moderate effects on "academic achievement" while teachers' age range (below 25 years), academic qualification, and years of teaching experience (16-20 years) had moderating effects on "aptitude".

The study's results generally serve as empirical evidence and additional information on in-service teachers' assessment literacy and its relations with other relevant variables. The results have implications for further research using other contextual variables and for the formulation of relevant policies, launching of assessment reform, development of assessment and research programs, and re-examination of assessment component of the Licensure Examination for Teachers. Furthermore, the findings in this study are relevant to pre-service teacher education programs and professional development of elementary and secondary school teachers, especially those from rural communities like Tawi-Tawi in the Philippines.

Declaration

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Signature:

.....Date: 15 September 2014.....

Acknowledgements

The contributions of a number of institutions and the many people have been so instrumental in the accomplishment of my PhD research and in the successful completion of my PhD program. For these, I'm deeply indebted that words of thanks are not sufficed to express my gratitude to them. Indeed, they greatly helped me achieve a milestone that should have been impossible without their invaluable support, advice, and guidance. In particular, I'm incredibly grateful to the following:

The Australian Government, through the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and the Philippines-Australia Human Resource and Organisational Development Facility, for the Australian Leadership Awards (ALA) Scholarship, which made my PhD study in Australia possible. The scholarship afforded me a great opportunity to pursue the highest degree in my field, and to be more contributory to the future development of my community/country;

Associate Professor Sivakumar Alagumalai, my principal supervisor, for seeing me through in my entire PhD journey. The road was so bumpy that without his guidance the journey could have certainly been a failure. Moreover, his many pieces of advice beyond my PhD work served to enlighten me on the way I conduct myself towards my profession and life in general. These provided essential lessons that when combined with my PhD experiences constitute a truly meaningful journey. A well-principled educator, he is indeed a role model that deserves emulation;

Dr. I Gusti Darmawan, the former postgraduate research coordinator of the University of Adelaide's School of Education and my co-supervisor, for his valuable advice, especially on the methodology section of my research study. His insightful suggestions contributed a lot to the success of this research work;

Dr. Francisco Ben, also my co-supervisor, who had been so kind and patient in entertaining my concerns even beyond his official consultation time. His guidance in the statistical treatment of my data using specialised statistical software and in organising some chapters in my thesis had been enormously helpful. Moreover, his family had been so generous in extending help whenever I needed it during my stay

in Adelaide. They have been my family away from home for which I'll be forever grateful. Francis, Ivey, and Nikolai, you are all part of my success!

The Philippine Department of Education (DepEd) Secretary, Br. Armin B. Luistro, through his Undersecretary Rizalino D. Rivera of the DepEd National Office, former Regional Secretary Atty. Baratucal L. Caudang of the DepEd Regional Office in the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM), and Superintendent Dr. Kiram Irlis of the DepEd Tawi-Tawi Division, for the permission to administer my research study in the Division of Tawi-Tawi, Philippines and to access the National Achievement Test (NAT) and the National Career Assessment Examination (NCAE) results;

The DepEd National Educational Testing and Research Center under the directorship of Dr. Nelia V. Benito for the references/information in relation to NAT and NCAE;

The Mindanao State University Tawi-Tawi College of Technology and Oceanography (MSU-TCTO), my home university, for my study leave and the permission to make use of its Science High School, Preparatory High School, and Laboratory Elementary School as the pilot schools for my research study, and to administer my research questionnaires to its different community high schools;

The Tawi-Tawi State Agricultural College, Mahardika Institute of Technology, and Abubakar Computer Learning Foundation, Inc. for their permission to conduct my research study in their respective secondary and elementary schools;

Dr. Craig A. Mertler, currently the Dean of the Ross College of Education at Lynn University, Florida USA, for the permission to use the Assessment Literacy Inventory and for the needed literature on their instrument;

Prof. Eddie M. Alih, our former chancellor at the MSU-TCTO and under whose leadership I received the ALA Scholarship, for his unwavering support and permission to go on study leave, and for his constant encouragement to grow professionally; Sir Ed, I am also grateful to you for what I am now;

Atty. Lorenzo R. Reyes, our current chancellor at the MSU-TCTO, also for his support and encouragement to complete my PhD study;

Prof. Almuzrin B. Jubaira, my poet-friend whose life is poetry and whose poetry is life, for his appreciation, constant encouragement, and great ideas;

Prof. Felisa B. Halun, our vice-chancellor for academic affairs, and Dr. Elvinia Alivio, our Dean at the College of Education of the MSU-TCTO, for their constant advice to pursue a PhD;

Prof. Clarita A. Taup, Prof. Lucita R. Galarosa, and Prof. Manuel G. Pon of the MSU-TCTO for the validation of my instruments; Mr. Ibba Asakil of the MSU-TCTO Secondary Education Department for his help in coordinating the schools under their jurisdiction;

Mr. Noor Saada, the ARMM Undersecretary, Mr. Marjuni Maddi, the Assistant to the ARMM Regional Governor, and Dr. Abdurizal Aripin, Division Supervisor at the DepEd-Tawi-Tawi Division, for their help in facilitating and channeling the DepEd permissions at the regional and divisional levels;

Mr. Atari A. Idjiran, the DepEd District Supervisor of East South Ubian District, for his support during the conduct of the study in his district and in the municipalities of Bongao and Panglima Sugala;

Mr. Mohammad Nur Tidal, the principal of the Tawi-Tawi School of Arts and Trades, for the 2010-2011 NAT and NCAE results of the Tawi-Tawi Division;

Atty. Anwar Ito, Education Specialist III at the DepEd National Office, and Mr. Rajis Abdulwahid, the DepEd Tawi-Tawi Division Administrative Officer, for the DepEd demographic data;

Mr. Abdulwahid S. Dawang & Mrs. Nena Y. Dawang of DepEd-Tawi-Tawi division for their precious time and effort in arranging some meetings with school officials and in coordinating with some schools in Bongao and other municipalities;

Mr. Mohammad Jalam Eraham of the Tawi-Tawi School of Arts and Trades, Mr. Abdunadi B. Hailaya, my uncle, Mr. Widin M. Hailaya, my brother, and Mr. Jansal Abdulpatta, my brother-in-law, for accompanying me to the different islands and for assisting me during my data collection;

Mr. Ricky Mohammadsali, principal of Simalak Elementary School; Mr. Elwan Matanio, principal of Likud Tabawan Elementary School; Mr. William Baird of the MSU-TCTO; Mr. Rio K. Hailaya, my uncle; Mr. Wilson M. Hailaya, my brother; Mr. Nursirim Kalim and Mr. Nur Perong of Tawi-Tawi School of Arts and

Trades!; Ms. Jurifatol S. Huglay, Ms. Elenda Sahilaja, and Ms. Friselma Demsio of the Abubakar Computer Learning Center, Inc.; Mr. Alhajan Ellehero of the South Ubian National High School; Mr. Nashier Patani of the Ligayan National High School; Mr. Jaymar Gummoh, Mr. Bernasi Bernabi, and Mr. Alham Abdulhatam of the MSU-TCTO Tabawan Community High School; Mr. Nijal Kausad, Mr. Hamran Sairuna, and Mr. Alnajin Najalin of the Notre Dame of Tabawan High School; Mr. Herman Elemero of Lawm Tabawan Central Elementary School; Mr. Hahmin K. Beljium of West Tabawan Elementary School; Mr. Khalid G. Muyong of Talisay Elementary School; Ms. Rajima M. Sappayani of Datu Jaafar Central Elementary School; Mr. Mohammad Region Laison of Sipangkot National High School; Mr. Faiser Launion of Tandubas National High School; Ms. Kalsum Telso of the Sanga-Sanga National High School; Mr. Saupi Kalbi of the Tawi-Tawi West Coast Agricultural High School; Mr. Gabra Buhari, Mr. Kasmal Saraie, and Ms. Samsura Buhari of Mantabuan, Tawi-Tawi; Mr. Mark-Ben Francisco of Simunul, Tawi-Tawi; and Mr. Alpirin Julpati of Tabawan, Tawi-Tawi, for their help in the distribution and collection of the research questionnaires;

All district supervisors, directors/directress, and principals of the elementary and secondary schools in the province of Tawi-Tawi for having facilitated the administration of my survey questionnaires to their respective teachers and students, and my interview to their selected teachers;

All Grade 6, Second Year and Fourth Year high school teachers and students during the school year 2010-2011 in the province of Tawi-Tawi for serving as respondents to my study;

The concerned teachers and students of the MSU-TCTO Science High School, Preparatory High School, and Laboratory Elementary School for serving as pilot participants of my study;

My parents and my entire family for the moral support and for constantly praying for my success; and especially to my wife, Riddang, for the unwavering love, constant support and encouragement, and for standing beside me during the darkest moments of my PhD journey;

And finally, the Almighty **Allah** for the grace and blessings, and for the strength and determination to make this PhD thesis a reality.

Wilham M. Hailaya