
A Study on the Current Situation of Classroom Evaluation Literacy of Pre-service English Teachers—A Questionnaire-Based Analysis

Anqi Huang, Yanhua Hu*

College of Foreign Language, Xinjiang Normal University, Urumqi 830000, Xinjiang, China

**Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.*

Copyright: © 2025 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: This article reviews the relevant research on classroom evaluation literacy both domestically and internationally. Pre-service English teachers from several universities in Xinjiang were selected as the research subjects, and questionnaire survey methods were used to understand their cognitive and emotional attitudes towards classroom evaluation, their basic mastery of classroom evaluation knowledge, and their level of classroom evaluation skills demonstrated in teaching evaluation practice. Research has found that most pre-service English teachers can correctly recognize the importance of classroom evaluation. However, there is an urgent need for further systematic learning in both theoretical and practical knowledge related to classroom evaluation, and the level of performance in evaluation skills is also relatively lacking, requiring further strengthening and practice. This study aims to help pre-service English teachers improve their classroom evaluation literacy and enhance the quality of education and teaching.

Keywords: Educational reform; Classroom evaluation literacy; Pre-service English teacher

Online publication: March 26, 2025

1. Introduction

Classroom evaluation, as an integral component of teachers' teaching process, plays a pivotal role in promoting students' learning and development. Especially in pre-service English teachers, classroom assessment serves not only as a tool to evaluate students' language proficiency but also as a critical mechanism for providing feedback to inform and refine teaching methods and strategies.

The concept of teacher assessment literacy was first formalized by Stiggins ^[1], who noted that assessment literate people enter the field of assessment knowing what they are assessing, why they are assessing it, how best to assess academic achievement, how to generate samples of good student performance, and the possible consequences

of accurate or inaccurate assessment and how to prevent them from occurring. As research on language assessment continues to deepen, academics have developed different perspectives on the internal structure of assessment literacy. Some of the most representative of these are “The Seven Standards Saying” [2]; “The Seven Elements Saying” [3]; “The Eight Domains Saying” [4]. Foreign scholars have gradually begun systematic research on teacher evaluation literacy since the 21st century [5–8]. Domestic research in this field started late, and most scholars have constructed their research models following the content structure of existing foreign studies, which mainly consist of reviews of relevant foreign studies [9,10] and a few survey-based empirical studies [11–13]. While there is no uniformity in the academic community regarding teachers’ classroom assessment literacy, most of them have combined the connotation of teachers’ assessment literacy and classroom assessment, Brindley designed a framework for foreign language teachers’ assessment training based on the Seven Standards, which focuses on the enhancement of teachers’ classroom assessment literacy, especially the accumulation and application of assessment knowledge, as well as the improvement of their classroom assessment literacy, and the enhancement of their classroom assessment skills [14]. Domestic scholars Li & Wang believe that foreign language teachers’ classroom assessment literacy refers to the qualities and cultivation related to classroom assessment that foreign language teachers should have, including the concept of classroom assessment, the knowledge and skills they should have when implementing classroom assessment, and the assessment ethics they need to follow [15].

Based on the existing literature, this study argues that classroom assessment is the process by which teachers design or select different assessment methods around learning objectives, collect and interpret evidence of student learning continuously through classroom observation and questioning to identify problems, examine the effectiveness of teaching and learning, and provide feedback for students to adjust their teaching.

2. Research design

2.1. Research participants

This study selected students from Xinjiang University, Xinjiang Normal University and Li Normal University as research subjects.

Table 1. Research participants of the study

Categories	Tag	<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Male	6	18.75
	Female	26	81.25
Grade	First-year graduate student	8	25
	Second-year graduate student	24	75
Participation in education internships	Yes	19	59.38
	No	13	40.63
Courses related to language	Yes	11	34.38

testing and evaluation	No	21	65.63
Normal major	Yes	13	40.63
	No	19	59.38

2.2. Research instruments

The research question of this study is: the overall status and various dimensions of pre-service English teachers' classroom evaluation literacy at Xinjiang Normal University; Differences in Classroom Evaluation Literacy of Pre-service English Teachers at Xinjiang Normal University in Demographic Variables. And this study used the "Pre-service English Teacher Classroom Evaluation Literacy Status Survey Questionnaire" developed by Zheng (2022) based on Plake's "Teacher Evaluation Literacy Questionnaire" and Mertler's "Classroom Evaluation Literacy Tool".

The questionnaire mainly consists of two parts. The first part is the basic information of the survey subjects (1–5 questions); The second part is to investigate the classroom evaluation literacy of the survey subjects, using the Likert five-point scale for scoring. Scores from 1 to 5 represent the level of classroom evaluation literacy of the participating teachers. The lower the score, the lower the level of classroom evaluation literacy of the participating teachers, and vice versa. This includes three first-level dimensions: classroom evaluation beliefs (1–5 questions), classroom evaluation knowledge (6–14 questions), and classroom evaluation skills (15–35 questions), totaling 35 items.

Table 2. Zheng's pre-service English teacher classroom evaluation literacy status survey questionnaire

Dimensions	Items
Classroom evaluation beliefs	1. I believe that classroom assessment is essentially a dynamic developmental learning-promoting assessment. 2. I think the purpose of classroom assessment is to build students' self-confidence and promote their learning. 3. I think the purpose of classroom assessment is to help teachers collect information to improve English teaching. 4. I think classroom assessment is an essential and critical part of the implementation of the core literacy of the English subject. 5. I think classroom assessment is optional and does not affect the GCSE results anyway.
Classroom evaluation knowledge	6. I am well aware of the conceptualization of language proficiency. 7. I understand the English language structure system. 8. I understand the Language Level Scale. 9. I am well aware of the objectives of the English curriculum. 10. I know the process of designing expressive tasks in the English classroom. (e.g., set the topic first...) 11. I know common grading tools (checklist, rating scales/scoring rubrics). 12. I know the specific connotations, advantages and disadvantages of immediate and delayed feedback. 13. I know clearly the difference between descriptive feedback and simple feedback. 14. I know exactly how to use assessment results to improve teaching and learning.

Classroom
evaluation skills

15. I often use the English curriculum standards as a basis for determining specific assessment objectives.
16. I often use the actual levels and needs of students as the basis for determining specific assessment objectives.
17. I often use the content of the textbook as a basis for determining specific assessment objectives.
18. I often use verbal questioning to assess students.
19. I often use classroom observations to assess students.
20. I often use expressive tasks (e.g., speeches, conversations) to evaluate students.
21. I often use accompanying pencil and paper tests to evaluate students.
22. I select classroom assessment methods based on the ability to test the assessment objectives.
23. I can ensure that expressive assessment tasks are aligned with instructional objectives (e.g., presentations, dialogues, discussions).
24. I can design an assessment program using a two-way itemized form (e.g., objectives, content, etc.).
25. I can design tiered language assessment activities. (e.g., learning comprehension, application practice, and transfer of creativity)
26. I can design multi-subject assessment activities, e.g., teacher assessment, self-assessment, mutual assessment.
27. I will work with students to develop grading criteria.
28. I can ensure that students are aware of grading criteria and conduct self- and peer-assessment activities accordingly.
29. I can give descriptive feedback to scaffold learning in response to students' performance in the classroom.
30. I can use appropriate use of immediate feedback to encourage students' classroom performance.
31. I can use appropriate delayed feedback to guide free thinking and develop higher-order thinking.
32. I can communicate learning outcomes to students and give learning advice through interactive and face-to-face marking.
33. I can adjust the objectives, content, level of difficulty, pace, activities, etc., to take into account the effectiveness of classroom instruction.
34. I can evaluate students fairly and objectively, taking into account their differences.
35. I do not differentiate between students based on grades.

2.3. Data collection and analysis

This study collected a total of 32 questionnaires through online distribution, of which 32 were valid, and the response rate was 100%. This study used SPSS 27.0 to conduct descriptive statistics, an independent sample t-test, a one-way ANOVA, and other statistical methods for in-depth analysis of the collected data.

3. Research results

3.1. Overall level of pre-service English teachers' classroom evaluation literacy

Table 3. Overall level of classroom evaluation of literacy of pre-service English teachers

	<i>n</i>	Min	Max	M	SD
Evaluate beliefs	32	1	4.800	3.756	0.658
Evaluate knowledge	32	1	4.889	3.229	0.798
Evaluate skills	32	1	4.857	3.699	0.744

According to Table 3, the minimum value for evaluating beliefs, knowledge, and skills of pre service English teachers is 1, the maximum values are 4.8, 4.889, and 4.857, respectively, and the mean values are 3.756, 3.229, and

3.699, respectively.

3.2. Differential analysis of pre-service English teachers' classroom evaluation literacy on demographic variables

3.2.1. Comparison of classroom evaluation literacy of pre-service English teachers of different genders

In the survey, there were 32 respondents, including 6 male teachers and 26 female teachers. The number of female teachers was far larger than that of male teachers, and the proportion was uneven. In order to test whether gender as an individual characteristic has an impact on the classroom evaluation literacy of the tested teachers, this study selected an independent sample *t*-test to process the data. The specific test results are shown in **Table 4**.

Table 4. Differences in classroom evaluation literacy of pre-service English teachers by gender

	Gender	Number of cases	M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Evaluate beliefs	Male	6	3.167	1.196	-1.469	0.199
	Female	26	3.892	0.385		
Evaluate knowledge	Male	6	2.907	1.295	-0.728	0.496
	Female	26	3.303	0.651		
Evaluate skills	Male	6	3.310	1.491	-0.781	0.469
	Female	26	3.789	0.445		

The independent sample *t*-test results showed that there were no significant differences in the evaluation beliefs, knowledge, and skills of pre-service English teachers of different genders ($p > 0.05$).

3.2.2. Comparison of classroom evaluation literacy of pre-service English teachers in different grades

In the survey, there are 32 respondents in total, including 5 junior students, 4 senior students, 16 first-year graduate students, and 7 second-year graduate students. First-year graduate students are far more than in other grades. In order to investigate whether “grade” is related to the classroom evaluation literacy of the tested teachers, this study conducted a one-way intergroup analysis of variance on the data, and the results are shown in **Table 5**.

Table 5. Differences in classroom evaluation literacy of pre-service English teachers in different grades

Grade level		Evaluate beliefs	Evaluate knowledge	Evaluate skills
Junior	M	4.080	3.311	3.876
	SD	0.502	0.970	0.561
Senior	M	3.950	3.500	4.333

	SD	0.100	1.012	0.261
First-year graduate school student	M	3.587	3.185	3.571
	SD	0.837	0.844	0.939
Second-year graduate school student	M	3.775	3.125	3.512
	SD	0.459	0.595	0.392
F		0.840	0.214	1.436
<i>p</i>		0.483	0.886	0.253

The results of one-way intergroup analysis of variance showed that there were no significant differences ($p > 0.05$) in the evaluation beliefs, knowledge, and skills of pre-service English teachers in different grades.

3.2.3. Comparison of classroom evaluation literacy of pre-service English teachers with different teaching practice experiences

In the survey, there are 32 respondents, including 19 pre-service English teachers with teaching experience and 13 pre-service English teachers without teaching experience. In order to investigate whether “teaching practice experience” is related to the classroom evaluation literacy of the surveyed teachers, this study selected an independent sample *t*-test to test the survey data. The specific results are shown in **Table 6**.

Table 6. Differences in classroom evaluation literacy of pre-service English teachers with different teaching practice experiences

	Have you participated in educational internships	Number of cases	M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Evaluate beliefs	Yes	19	3.747	0.774	-0.091	0.928
	No	13	3.769	0.468		
Evaluate knowledge	Yes	19	3.251	0.826	0.188	0.852
	No	13	3.197	0.787		
Evaluate skills	Yes	19	3.767	0.832	0.614	0.544
	No	13	3.601	0.612		

The independent sample *t*-test results showed that there were no significant differences ($p > 0.05$) in the evaluation beliefs, evaluation knowledge, and evaluation skills of pre-service English teachers with different teaching practice experiences.

3.2.4. Comparison of pre-service English teachers' classroom evaluation literacy based on their learning experiences in different language assessment courses

In the survey, there were 32 respondents, including 11 pre-service English teachers who had participated in the language assessment course and 21 pre-service English teachers who had not participated in the language assessment

course. In order to explore whether the “learning experience of the language assessment course” is related to the classroom assessment quality of the tested teachers, this study chose an independent sample t-test to test the survey data. The specific results are shown in **Table 7**.

Table 7. Differences in classroom evaluation literacy of pre-service English teachers with different language assessment curriculum learning experiences

	Have you taken any courses related to language testing and evaluation	Number of cases	M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Evaluate beliefs	Yes	11	3.545	0.972	-1.05	0.315
	No	21	3.867	0.402		
Evaluate knowledge	Yes	11	3.475	1.054	1.273	0.213
	No	21	3.101	0.617		
Evaluate skills	Yes	11	3.766	1.025	0.362	0.72
	No	21	3.664	0.575		

The independent sample t-test results showed that there was no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) in the evaluation beliefs, knowledge, and skills of pre-service English teachers with different language assessment course learning experiences.

3.2.5. Comparison of classroom evaluation literacy of pre-service English teachers in different majors

In the survey, there were 32 respondents, including 13 pre-service English teachers for teachers' majors and 19 pre-service English teachers for non-teachers' majors. In order to investigate whether the “teacher education major” is related to the classroom evaluation literacy of pre-service English teachers, this study conducted an independent sample t-test on the data, and the analysis results are shown in **Table 8**.

Table 8. Differences in classroom evaluation literacy of pre-service English teachers in different majors

	Did you graduate from a teacher training program	Number of cases	M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Evaluate beliefs	yes	13	3.662	0.869	-0.668	0.51
	no	19	3.821	0.480		
Evaluate knowledge	yes	13	3.462	0.863	1.383	0.177
	no	19	3.070	0.731		
Evaluate skills	yes	13	3.689	0.920	-0.067	0.947

no	19	3.707	0.625
----	----	-------	-------

The independent sample *t*-test results showed that there were no significant differences ($p > 0.05$) in the evaluation beliefs, knowledge, and skills of pre-service English teachers from different majors.

4. Major findings

This study conducted a comprehensive investigation and analysis of the current status of classroom evaluation literacy among pre-service English teachers at Xinjiang Normal University. The main focus was on exploring the performance of pre-service English teachers in three dimensions: classroom evaluation beliefs, classroom evaluation knowledge, and classroom evaluation skills. Furthermore, demographic variables such as gender, grade level, educational internship experience, language evaluation course learning experience, and professional background were further analyzed for their impact on classroom evaluation literacy. The research results reveal the current situation, advantages, and disadvantages of pre-service English teachers in terms of classroom evaluation literacy, providing a reference for future teacher professional development.

4.1. Main research findings

Research has found that the overall performance of pre-service English teachers in classroom evaluation literacy is good, but the development of various dimensions is relatively balanced, indicating that pre-service English teachers have a certain understanding and execution ability of classroom evaluation. Specifically, pre-service English teachers performed the best in classroom evaluation beliefs, with an average score of 3.756 out of 5. This indicates that most pre-service teachers have a correct understanding of the importance of classroom evaluation and firmly believe that classroom evaluation is an important means to promote students' learning and development. Their evaluation beliefs are generally positive and firm, which is an important driving force for them to actively participate in classroom evaluation practices. In the classroom evaluation of literacy of pre-service English teachers, the evaluation knowledge dimension is relatively weak, with an average score of 3.229. This reflects that pre-service teachers have obvious deficiencies in both theoretical and practical knowledge of classroom evaluation, and still need to improve their evaluation theoretical foundation through systematic learning. Especially in terms of the concept of language assessment, English curriculum objectives, assessment tools, and the application of assessment results, the knowledge mastery is not comprehensive and in-depth enough. The average score of classroom evaluation skills for pre-service English teachers is 3.699, which falls between evaluation beliefs and evaluation knowledge. Although they have demonstrated a certain level of skill in classroom evaluation practice, further improvement is still needed. Especially in the selection of evaluation methods, the design of evaluation tasks, the provision of feedback, and the interpretation and application of evaluation results, pre-service teachers need more practical training and professional guidance.

In addition, the study also found that demographic variables have no significant impact on the classroom evaluation of literacy of pre-service English teachers. There were no significant differences in evaluation beliefs, knowledge, and skills among pre-service teachers of different genders, grades, educational internship experiences, language assessment course learning experiences, and professional backgrounds. This indicates that the improvement of classroom evaluation literacy is a universal need that is not limited by individual characteristics and professional backgrounds.

In summary, improving the classroom evaluation literacy of pre-service English teachers is a systematic project that requires joint efforts from schools and teachers themselves. By strengthening training, practical exercises, and promoting advanced concepts, we can effectively promote the comprehensive improvement of pre-service English teachers' classroom evaluation literacy, laying a solid foundation for cultivating a high-quality and professional English teacher team.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Stiggins RJ, 1991, Assessment Literacy. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(7): 534–539.
- [2] American Federation of Teachers, National Council on Measurement in Education, National Education Association, 1990, Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment of Students. NCME, Washington, DC: 1–20.
- [3] Stiggins RJ, 1999, Evaluating Classroom Assessment Training in Teacher Education Programs. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 18(1): 23–27.
- [4] Schafer WD, 1991, Essential Assessment Skills in Professional Education of Teachers. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 10(1): 3–6.
- [5] Boyles P, 2005, Assessment Literacy. *National Assessment Summit Papers*, Iowa State University, Ames, IA: 11–15.
- [6] Davies A, 2008, Textbook Trends in Teaching Language Testing. *Language Testing*, 25(3): 327–347.
- [7] Inbar-Lourie O, 2008, Constructing a Language Assessment Knowledge Base: A Focus on Language Assessment Courses. *Language Testing*, 25(3): 385–402.
- [8] Taylor L, 2009, Developing Assessment Literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29: 21–36.
- [9] Xu Y, 2013, A Review on Classroom Assessment of Foreign Language Teachers. *Foreign Language Testing and Teaching*, 2013(4): 42–50.
- [10] Lin D, 2014, Recent Progress in Foreign Language Assessment Literacy Research. *Modern Foreign Languages*, 2014(5): 711–720 + 731.
- [11] Zheng D, 2010, Evaluation Literacy of Primary and Secondary School Teachers: A Report from Z Province. *Global Education Perspectives*, 2010(2): 31–36 + 42.
- [12] Jiang J, 2019, A Study on the Status Quo and Influencing Factors of College English Teachers' Assessment Literacy.

Foreign Language Field, 2019(6): 18–26.

- [13] Zhao S, 2020, Research on the Status Quo of Classroom Evaluation Literacy of Primary School Teachers: Based on the Survey and Analysis of 1032 Primary School Teachers in Y District of Shanghai. Shanghai Education and Research, 2020(8): 53–59.
- [14] Brindley G, 2001, Language Assessment and Professional Development. Experimenting with Uncertainty: Essays in Honour of Alan Davies, 11: 137–144.
- [15] Li L, Wang Q, 2020, Foreign Language Teachers' Classroom Evaluation Literacy: Concept Structure, Observation System and Practical Implications. Foreign Language Testing and Teaching, 2020(2): 20–27.

Publisher's note

Whioce Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.