Viewpoints on Validity in Dynamic Classroom Teaching

Ming CHEN, Dan-Dan JI

050060, Foreign Language Department, Hebei University of Economics & Business, Shijiazhuang City, Hebei Province

Keywords: Classroom Assessment, Validity, Course Validity, Aftereffect Validity (Classroom assessment and classroom evaluation make no difference in this paper.)

Abstract. Influenced by education informatization, foreign language course structure is undergoing enormous change. The teaching priority is to cultivate students' critical thinking, creative thinking and problem-solving ability, etc. Then validity verification is needed to indicate whether classroom teaching reaches objectives and what aftereffect the classroom teaching makes on students. In this study, the concept of validity of classroom assessment is presented, the aspect of validity is discussed, and it is proposed to verify the influence of classroom assessment on learning through validity verification.

Introduction

Studies on validity are gaining increasing attention from researchers in recent years. Validity is a very important quality standard, especially in large-scale evaluation and high-risk examination. Meanwhile, a variety of teaching modes have been developed for classroom teaching with the continuous reformation of education technology, making classroom teaching more flexible and information-based. Teaching processes featuring flipped classroom, independent learning, dynamic evaluation, etc. have developed from being learnt and recognized to being widely implemented in this information age. The main body of the classroom is students instead of teachers who mainly serve to guide students in their learning process and give feedback of the learning effect. So teachers' feedback and students' mutual evaluation have also become a main part of classroom teaching. Whether classroom assessment can improve students' learning ability is a crucial factor affecting the teaching effect. Even though information technology brings new things to classroom teaching, it also causes some new problems, like the verification of validity of course assessment in the teaching process. Whether it is for a large-scale standardized examination or a small-scale course assessment, validity is the only way to measure the effectiveness of assessment. For students-oriented teaching process, classroom assessment validity and aftereffect validity are of extraordinary importance.

Validity of Classroom Assessment

Development of Validity Verification

The concept of validity is undergoing continuous development since its emergence. Generally, validity is an evaluation process focusing on score inference. The researches on validity begin with the multi-aspects verification which includes content validity, criterion validity, aftereffect validity, test reliability and scoring validity, etc. And then some researchers put forward that reliability, authenticity and course loyalty should also be considered as factors for validity verification. Now validity verification has become the hot topic for researchers. In the later period of last century, Messick, David M proposed to use structure validity as an approach for overall validity verification, which means it's no longer necessary to do validity verification from multiple aspects, because an overall verification can be done through structure validity. Even though overall validity verification is quite persuasive for test evaluation, but in classroom assessment, teachers should not ignore the other validity aspects. Classroom assessment is an evaluation based on course and should reflect the course effectiveness. The effectiveness of course assessment includes the formulation of assessment criteria, the conformance of users' understanding of the assessment criteria and the consistency

during the implementation of assessment criteria, etc. Therefore, in most scholars' opinion, overall validity verification is not fit for classroom assessment and classroom assessment validity needs further theoretical verification.

The Formation of Classroom Assessment Validity

Validity verification is to verify the extent to which the tests measure the constructs that need to be examined and the extent to which the test results can be explained. And it is also an explanation for test results. Reliability indicates whether the same construct can be examined for different students, whether the same explanation can be made. These two aspects are complementary and interdependent. Generally speaking, the course assessment is a process that includes designing teaching content based on course objectives in syllabus, making evaluation criteria for the teaching content implementation, analyzing and judging the course by collecting data related to classroom teaching with testing method, and providing effective feedback, so as to promote teaching quality and students learning motivation. Assessment validity is to verify whether the teaching reaches requirement, whether assessment criteria have reliability, consistency and authority, etc. According to classroom metrology theory (Brookhart, 2003), validity is "to infer and use the measurement results in the measurement process", emphasizing the formative role of course evaluation. Classroom evaluation lays more emphasis on the use of measurement results, that is, the aftereffect of evaluation. Teachers are the main body of evaluation. Test proposition person is also a test scorer. The teachers' teaching practice and their understanding of the teaching objectives indicate the reliability of the validity scorer, which is a part of course evaluation validity. This conforms to the above-mentioned integration of reliability and validity for validity verification.

Classroom evaluation has traditionally been seen as part of classroom teaching rather than evaluation in tests. However, as testers and educationalists have been calling for the importance of classroom assessment and with the emergence of multiple classroom evaluation methods such as formative evaluation, dynamic evaluation and portfolio evaluation, classroom evaluation becomes more familiar to everyone. As an integral part of teaching, classroom assessment should not only contain teaching information but also be supportive for teaching. It serves as the bridge connecting course and teaching. For course and teaching effect evaluation, the most important is to verify content validity and whether teaching and examination match. Due to the subjectivity in teaching and individual differences between teachers, there is difference between different teachers' matching between teaching content and course. So, it is too narrow if matching degree is seen as the only criterion for verification. Therefore, the traditional validity verification method is not suitable for classroom evaluation. In my opinion, the content validity of classroom assessment should be the matching among course standard, teaching content and teaching assessment. Course standards are understood as what academic scores are meant to measure, that is, the construct of the exam. So, standards-based assessment is an effective classroom validity verification method.

The method of classroom assessment has attracted the attention of many domestic and overseas scholars. For Ralph W. Tyler, there should be 4 steps for course setting: identifying goals, selecting experiences, organizing experiences, and evaluating results. Stufflebeam,D.L put forward CIPP model based on Tyler's mode. CIPP is short for the combination of the first letters of 4 evaluations: 1. Context evaluation, 2. Input evaluation, 3. Process evaluation, 4. Product evaluation. Some other well known woks about education assessment are listed in the following table.

Table 1, Comparison between classroom assessment criteria

Researcher	B.R.Worthen and J.R.Sanders	J.K.Black	Gipps,C.A.
Evaluation standard	Assessment about students development and performance	Students self-development	Comparability
	Assessment about textbooks and other course materials	Assessment content	Reliability
	Course design and assessment implementation	Purpose and goal of student assessment	Public credibility
	Assessment about school organization structure	Strategies and technologies adopted	Equality

Assessment criteria related to classroom assessment can be briefly concluded from the above table: 1. Students' self-development and improvement. Because classroom assessment is based on academic progress, so students' self-development and improvement should be the priority in assessment. 2. Course validity or course effectiveness. This includes whether learning objectives are matching course setting and whether testbooks are fit for achieving teaching objectives. Course validity means how much the test content is related to or represents the course, which is whether the test content scope, cognitive type and difficulty reasonably reflect course requirements.

The Effectiveness and Aftereffect of the Assessment

This means whether the assessment strategies and implementation are helpful to students. 4. The reliability of course assessment. In American scholar N.E.Gronlund's opinion, course assessment should combine both qualitative data and quantitative data. Quantitative classroom data, like test score, is static data which is not enough to indicate students ability, as other factors like test environment also affect test results. So, students can be assessed in a more detailed way with dynamic data, such as data about students' participation in class, written homework and self-improvement. Dynamic assessment puts more emphasis on students' progress and meanwhile it can reasonably explain the static data. Teaching and learning are a process about learning and achieving goals. Student's development is a criterion for verifying course setting and teaching effectiveness (Tyler, 1969). Stufflebeam (1983) proposes that assessment is aimed to improve, not to prove, which is in consistence with dynamic assessment theory.

School-based Course Assessment System

For some scholars, classroom assessment is aimed to grade students instead of to provide information for students further improvement (Li Qinghua, 2008), which in my opinion neglects the aftereffect of classroom assessment. The first purpose of classroom assessment is to promote learning and stimulate learning motivation. The assessment aftereffect helps promote learning capacity. Not only intrinsic motivation but also extrinsic motivation is necessary for stimulating learning. If classroom assessment matches school course and students can get credits after finishing their course, which is seen as an extrinsic motivation, then it's better that classroom assessment is based on school course. This includes course setting assessment standards, course program assessment standards, teacher classroom assessment standards, student feedback assessment standards and teaching content assessment standards, etc. And validity verification serves as a criterion for formulating classroom assessment standards.

Dynamic assessment, a kind of classroom assessment initiated by teachers, is to guide students to participate in classroom interaction through intervention strategies and to record teaching and evaluation process with education technologies like portfolio. It combines measurement into teaching process, closely making assessment on students learning process and abilities and paying attention to students future development and potential. Large-scale standardized examination and classroom teaching evaluation mode are undergoing reform and change, which needs validity to be working as evidence. The former is static assessment, while the latter requires dynamic assessment.

Both static and dynamic assessments are important for evaluation mode. The fundamental purpose is to improve the effectiveness of classroom teaching, closely observe students, give timely feedback and put forward the improvement method based on individual difference, respect students' individual differences. Take improvement as an important factor in students performance assessment. Assessment validity is a topic with short history and more research and practice are still necessary for validity verification model.

Reference

[1] Kiely, R. Small answers to the big question: Learning from language programme evaluation [J]. Language Teaching Research, 2009, 13 (1): 99-116.

[2] J. N. Anthony. Educational Assessment of Students [M].New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall, 2001: 15.

[3] Stufflebeam,D.L. The CIPP model for program evaluation [A]. In G.F.Madaus, M.Scriven, & D.L.Stufflebeam (eds.). Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation [C]. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing, 1983. 117-141.

[4] Tyler, R.W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction (29thedition) [M]. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969.

[5] Jin Yan. Brief analysis of the Teaching Evaluation Function of Standardized Language Test [J]. Foreign Language Testing and Teaching, 2011, (1): 26-34, 42.

[6] Yang Huizhong. Thoughts on College English Teaching [J]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 2012, (2): 293-297.