Analysis of Assessment Design in English Language Curriculum 2006 Of Pakistan: A Qualitative Study

Zia ul haq Kakar
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Education Greenwich university Karachi.
Ziakakar09@gmail.com

Dr. Victoria Joseph,
Head of the department of education Greenwich university Karachi,
drvictoriajoseph@grenwich.edu.pk

Salma Akhter Zia
M Phil, Education principal Govt: Girls Model High School Mission road Quetta, Balochistan
Sameenzia999@gmail.com

Abstract

Assessment is an essential component of the curriculum. The curriculum is a policy document that guides assessment mechanisms before, during, and after instruction. The curriculum envisioned assessment in standards, benchmarks, and students' learning outcomes (SLOs) by providing action words. assessment is an integral part of the learning process. Language skill development depends on the quality of assessment design and practice during and after instruction. This research study critically analyzes the language skills assessment design intended in Pakistan's language curriculum, 2006. The study aimed to explore the assessment design intended in standards, benchmarks, and students' learning outcomes SLOs, in the language curriculum of Pakistan 2006 of secondary classes. The study's objective was to investigate the language assessment scheme of LNC, 2006, as well as understand the extent of the assess ment design of the national curriculum, 2006. It is also aimed at to what extent this design supports language assessment and responds to language assessment theories. The document analysis model of "Bowen (2009)" was adopted for this study. The study findings show that the assessment design intended in LNC, 2006 of Pakistan could be more supportive in developing language skills. The level of action verbs used for standards, benchmarks, and SLOs, is very low, almost from Bloom's Taxonomy first three-stage of the cognitive domain. Listening and speaking skills are almost neglected in assessment design. The findings of this study will inform policy developers and curriculum workers to improve the language assessment design. Additionally, the results will guide teachers in understanding language assessment design and implementation accordingly.

Keywords: Assessment, assessment design, language assessment, curriculum, Standards, Benchmarks, Students' Learning Outcomes.

Introduction

Background of the Study

Assessment plays a vital role in the development of language skills (Cho et al., 2020). It is an integral part of instruction that helps teachers understand students, needs, interests, learning styles, and achievement levels. Assessment-derived learning and guide the improvement of instruction. It helps planners and policy-maker regarding language development. Language assessment aims to obtain data to support decisions about a person's language-related knowledge, skills, or abilities (Green, 2014).

The curriculum is an official document with many chapters, including objectives, content criteria, suggested teaching methodology, and evaluation procedures. The assessment design and strategies are part of every portion of the curriculum, as learning without assessment is impossible (Oliva & Gordon II, 2012). The action verbs in standard, benchmarks, and SLOs, indicated the quality of the assessment. The content/learning materials developed based on SLOs indicated the assessment's worth (McMillan, 2017). Language development is there for genuinely dependent on the quality of assessment.

There are four fundamental skills of language, listening, speaking, reading, writing, and every skill development needs particular assessment strategies. Every language skill development needs unique assessment strategies as all these skills are different from each other. The pedagogical and assessment skills imparted by teachers in the classroom decide the quality of learning. The teacher sometimes plans to develop multiple language skills during classroom instruction, so it needs particular assessment strategies to understand the quality of language assessment during and after instruction. Therefore, teachers must have knowledge and skills about language assessment, appropriate assessment strategies for specific language skills, and language designed-in curriculum. The importance of the alignment of language assessment design in the curriculum with language assessment theories increased as the teachers always followed the intended assessment design of the curriculum. It was experienced that students were continually assessed only for writing tasks using traditional assessments and summative exams. The other essential language skills, listening, speaking, and reading, should be given

appropriate importance in the assessment scheme. Language comprises four basic skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Green, 2014).

The researcher Kakar et al. (2021) indicated that teachers only focused on writing skills because they knew that only writing assessment was the target of the assessment design. In classrooms, the traditional reading by students is part of instruction, but formal assessment is not there to assess the skill, and the speaking and listening skills were ignored. The assessment strategy, formative and summative, is separate from the instruction and the examination for listening and speaking. Gudu (2015) also discovered that teachers only focused on reading and writing skills, and students are not in the position to get an opportunity of speaking and listening expressions in assessments (Gudu, 2015). It is, therefore, essential to investigate the assessment design in the curriculum, which is the policy document for instruction and assessment.

Problem Statement

Curriculum guides instructors in planning, implementing, and evaluating their pedagogical process. The effectiveness of the learning process is wholly dependent upon the guidance of assessment envisioned in the curriculum. The need to investigate the assessment design in the national English language curriculum, 2006, Pakistan to understand the scheme of assessment envisioned for developing language skills has emerged from the researcher's personal experiences as a student, teacher, and curriculum developer. The research studies also indicated the gap between curriculum and instruction regarding assessment practice. The research on language assessment also indicated that more research studies must be conducted to explore authentic and rigorous assessment mechanisms for language development. This study explores the assessment design, intended in standards, benchmarks, and SLOs, in Pakistan's 2006 language curriculum of secondary classes.

Rationale and Significance

This study will be valuable for curriculum development in understanding and getting perceptions about the design of language assessment intended in the curriculum. It would guide curriculum developers in improving the standards, benchmarks, and students' learning outcomes (SLOs) regarding assessment. It will aid in improving policy

implementation regarding language assessment practices. It will assist in improving assessment practices to meet due weightage for all language skills, especially overlooked speaking and listing competencies. It will provide data to the curriculum developers for the development of quality language assessment design and will support them in improving intended assessment strategies.

Objectives of the Study

1. To investigate the national curriculum, 2006, standards, benchmarks, and SLOs, level of representation in language assessment.

Research Questions

1. How does the English language national curriculum, 2006 of Pakistan intend the assessment design for a language skills assessment?

2. In what way do the standards, benchmarks, and students learning outcomes (SLOs) of NCP, 2006 (mis)represent language assessment?

Literature Review

Assessment and Curriculum

Assessment is an essential component of the curriculum. In a standards-based education system, the curriculum envisioned assessment in standards, benchmarks, and students' learning outcomes (SLOs). An assessment of describing expected competencies as learning outcomes and evaluating students' progress toward those learning outcomes is standard-based education (Laksitowening, Santoso & Hasibuan, 2017). The alignment between assessment and curriculum standards, benchmarks, and SLOs is necessary for an effective learning environment. Any educational system that employs a standard-based education system is thought to benefit greatly from the alignment of educational standards and assessments (Alkhateeb & Nasser, 2014).

Student learning outcomes (SLOs) played an important role in curriculum implementation.

The curriculum implantation processes are guided by Pakistan educational sector plan (Malik et al., 2020). Assessment is an integral part of curriculum implementation. So

assessments must be shaped in accordance with the SLOs to meet the objectives of the curricula.

Curriculum 2006 and Assessment

In Pakistan, a standard-based curriculum was developed in 2005–2006, and secondary classes started implementing it in 2012. The alignment of standards and assessments is a requirement for any program of instruction based on standards (Gulzar & Mahmood, 2019). Pakistan's National Curriculum Implementation Framework (2006, pp. 153–159) describes the assessment scheme, outlining the objectives, methods, and different assessment forms. Specific question categories are listed in the methodologies of assessment section (pp. 154–156) to be chosen from when creating the question paper for summative assessment, along with the validity and reliability concerns for test scoring (Malik et al., 2020). The Pakistan national curriculum objectives of the assessment are to measure learning as indicated in SLOs, benchmarks, and standards, using a summative approach only.

Furthermore, no feedback is offered following summative assessment, even though summative assessment aims to assess learning and prove grades (Iahad . et al., 2004). Moreover, the National Curriculum of 2006 focuses on testing knowledge rather than individual natural progress, which could imply disregarding the learner's specific needs. Additionally, only a written test is used to assess all language skills, which may imply evaluation weaknesses. The research claimed that in summative assessment, it is challenging to locate any testing for listening and speaking abilities in assessing language skills. According to Powers (2010), measuring any one skill does not provide a complete picture of what a person knows or can do in real life.

Educational Outcomes

The terminology used to describe various educational outcomes is diverse and often perplexing. Consider the following terms, which are all regularly used: Goals, Objectives, Aims, Competencies, Outcomes, Standards, Targets, Dimensions, and Expectations. End-of-year accountability examinations evaluate state standards or general objectives intended in the curriculum. Common tests are similar to state tests; however, they are administered every few weeks. Specific objectives and learning targets are tightly tied to instructional modules and relate to daily or weekly quizzes, examinations, projects, and other assessments. The learning target is the foundation for reaching standards and goals competency (McMillan, 2017).

Educational Goals

Educational goals are broad statements regarding the anticipated outcomes for students and the overall aim or significant intention. They cover what will be emphasized broadly during extended learning periods, usually lasting a year or more, and often what will be emphasized across all school years. Goals are primarily intangible and abstract, making them difficult to quantify (Gronlund, 1995 & McMillan, 2017).

Standards

The concept of "standards" grew famous and influential in the 1990s, spurring reform by arguing for particular "high-level" student goals. Although the standards movement primarily focused on what had previously been referred to as general student outcomes or objectives. Standards define the knowledge and skills that students must possess to pass a specific level, course, or curriculum. As a result, standards are almost synonymous with broad (long-term) goals. The term "objective" has a long history, and the concepts connected with it apply to standards as well (specific objectives are very similar to learning targets) (McMillan, 1997).

Educational Objectives

Educational objectives are declarations of student achievement that should be proven after a unit of study. The term "objectives" has been used to define student outcomes for a long time. However, the term has been employed in various ways over the years,

depending on the terms used to convey the type of objective, the user's arm, and the degree of specificity. Gronlund (1995) defines instructional aim as "planned learning outcomes" (p. 3), although the term "instructional" conjures up images of something the teacher does, not something the student does. Behavioural, performance, and terminal objectives are all terms used to describe learning objectives for students. Action verbs describe these goals, including add, state, define a list, contract, design, categories, count, and lift. Action verbs are significant because they show what pupils do at the end of the lesson.

The critical point, whether one focuses on general or specific objectives, is to define what students will know and be able to do, not what teachers will do to help students acquire the information and abilities stated. Teaching objectives or learning activities are things like lecturing for a set amount of time, asking questions, grouping students, giving individual feedback, conducting experiments, using a map to show where certain countries are located, having students solve math problems on the board, having students read orally, and so on. These instructional objectives outline the activities students will participate in and what one must do to ensure that the activities occur as planned (McMillan, 2017).

Students Learning Outcomes SLOs

Student learning outcomes are the objectives used in standard-based curricula for both intended targets and assessment indicators. For the formative assessment tasks and summative assessment tests, developers used the action words used in SLOs for assessment purposes. The national curriculum 2006 of Pakistan is standard-based and envisioned these SLOs only for summative purposes. The researcher Azhar et al. (2020) also expressed that SLOs and benchmarks intended in the national curriculum define the objective of assessment as the assessment of learning. The researcher indicated that these SLOs envisioned in the national curriculum of 2006 assign learners and teachers the role of assessors who gauge their learning and provide formative feedback. However, in summative assessment, neither the teacher nor the students receive any feedback from the assessment data in schools (Azher et al., 2020)

Research Methodology

Research Design

The qualitative research design was adopted for this study. A document analysis strategy was used to analyze Pakistan's e National Curriculum 2006. Qualitative research is a scientific approach to understanding concepts, opinions, or experiences, which entails gathering and evaluating non-numerical data. It can be utilized to gain an in-depth understanding of a subject or develop fresh research ideas. Babbie (2002) explained that the qualitative study is a non-numerical study and interpretation of observation to uncover underlying meanings and linkages patterns (Babbie, 2002).

Population and sample

The population of this study was language curricula 2006 of Pakistan. The researcher adopted purposive sampling for this study. The sample was the Pakistan English language curriculum, 2006 of secondary classes.

Data Collection Strategy for this study

The data collection strategy was a critical analysis of the Secondary English curriculum, 2006, of Pakistan's official document. Document analysis is an essential strategy of qualitative data analysis. A systematic technique for assessing or evaluating printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) documents is known as document analysis. Like other qualitative research methodologies, document analysis necessitates examining and interpreting data to extract meaning, gain insight, and develop empirical knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Rapley, 2007).

The researcher developed the data collection tool in light of the study objectives and conceptual framework. The tool was shared with five experts of the bureau of curriculum Balochistan, and expert opinions were incorporated to ensure validity.

Data Analysis Process

The data analysis strategy for this study was Document analysis and Content analysis. The document analysis model of " Bowen, (2009)" was adopted for this study. Bowen (2009) explains that a systematic technique for assessing or evaluating printed and electronic documents is known as document analysis. Document analysis, like other

qualitative research methodologies, necessitates the examination and interpretation of data in order to extract meaning, gain insight, and develop empirical knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; see also Rapley, 2007). Documents contain text (words) and photos that were recorded without the participation of a researcher. Other mute or trace evidence, such as cultural relics, is not included in this debate. Documents, according to Atkinson and Coffey (1997), are social truths that are produced, disseminated, and used in socially organized ways (p. 47), as cited (Bowen, 2009). The English national curriculum ENCP, 2006 document was analyzed in the light of formative, summative, performance, authentic assessment, methods, and techniques. Bloom's taxonomy was also considered an important tool and document for analyzing ENCP, 2006. The main focus was on the assessment design intended in these documents. The language assessment theories were another vital criterion to align ENCP,2006, and textbooks' language assessment design with the prominent language assessment theories. The action words used in standards, benchmarks, and student learning outcomes, were analyzed concerning language assessment. The wording of standards, benchmarks and SLOs indicated the level of assessment designed for language acquisition.

Chapters two and three of the national curriculum 2006 of Pakistan, which consisted of standards, benchmarks, and SLOs, were critically analyzed. The researcher developed a tool consisting of competencies intended in the national curriculum and standard, benchmarks, SLOs, and Bloom's taxonomy cognitive domain stages to understand the level of assessment. The tool provided data on the action verbs used for standards, benchmarks, and SLOs. The researcher developed another tool to understand the numbers and repetition of action verbs suggested by Bloom's taxonomy action verb table. The tool was applied, which provides data about the number of action verbs, their repetition, and placement in Bloom's taxonomy cognitive domain stages.

Findings / Result

In what way do the standards, benchmarks, and students learning outcomes (SLOs) of NCP, 2006 (mis)represent language assessment?

Tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 are about the types and levels of assessment intended in the Language National Curriculum, 2006 of Pakistan. The three most important areas, the

standards, benchmarks, and student learning outcomes (SLOs), of the curriculum, which indicate the assessment level, are included in this table. Bloom's cognitive domain stages are considered a measurement scale. The wording used for standards, benchmarks and SLOs is analyzed using action words, the table used for Bloom's Taxonomy cognitive domain. The first three stages were considered lower order, and the second three were considered higher, starting from knowledge toward evaluation.

Analysis of Standards

Table 1

NO	Chapters	Themes Competency	Assessment	Blooms Stages					
				Knowledge	Comprehension	Application	Analysis	Synthesis	Evaluation
			Summative						
			Continuous						
			Formative						
1	Standards	Reading and Thinking Skills		1	2	1	1		
		Writing Skills				2		1	
		Oral Communication Skills				1			
		Formal and Lexical Aspects of Language			1	2			
		Appropriate Ethical and Social Development				1			

The above table 1 shows that the action verbs used for standard reading and thinking skills were intended as one is for knowledge, two for comprehension, one is for application, and one is for analysis; this shows that the standard level is deficient. The standard must consist of higher levels, such as synthesis and evaluation, as the SLOs and benchmarks are the subtypes of standards. If the standards are low, it is understood that the SLOs and Benchmarks will also be below. The table shows that the action verbs for the standard for writing skills were intended as two for application and one for synthesis. The table shows that the action verbs for the oral and communication skills standard were intended as only one for application. The table shows that the action verbs for the standard for the formal and lexical aspect of language skill were intended as one for comprehension and two for application. The table shows that the action verbs for the standard for Appropriate Ethical and Social Development skills were intended only for application.

Analysis of Bench Marks

Table 2

NO	Chapter	Themes Competency	Assessment	Knowledge	Comprehension	Application	Analysis	Synthesis	Evaluation
				(Blooms Taxonomy stages)					
			Summative						
			Continuous						
			Formative						
2	Benchmarks	Reading and Thinking Skills					5		1
		Writing Skills			2		4	1	

		Oral Communication Skills					1	1			
		Formal and Lexical Aspects of Language						4		
		Appropriate Ethical and Social Development		1		1	1		1

The above table 2 shows that the action verbs used for Benchmark reading and thinking skills were intended as five analyses and one evaluation. The table shows that the action verbs for Benchmark for writing skills were intended as two knowledge, four for analyses, and one for synthesis. The table shows that the action verbs for Benchmark for oral and communication skills were intended as only one for application and one for analyses. The table shows that the action verbs for Benchmark for the formal and lexical aspect of language skill were intended as four for analyses. The table shows that the action verbs for Benchmark for Appropriate Ethical and Social Development skills were intended as only one for knowledge, one for analyses, and one for evaluation.

 Analysis of Students' Learning Outcomes SLOs

Table 3

NO	Chapt	Themes Competency	Assessment	Blooms Taxonomy stages					
				Knowledge	Comprehension	Application	Analysis	Synthesis	Evaluation
			Summative						
			Continuous						
			Formative						
3	**Stud**	Reading and Thinking Skills		14	11	12	19	8	4

		Writing Skills		16	01	13	09	06	04
		Oral Communication Skills		01	04	10	01	13	01
		Formal and Lexical Aspects of Language		05	05	13	27	09	02
		Appropriate Ethical and Social Development							

The above table 3 shows that the action verbs used for students learning outcomes, SLOs reading, and thinking skills were intended as fourteen for knowledge, eleven for comprehension, twelve for application, nineteen for analysis, eight for synthesis, and four for evaluation. The table shows that the action verbs for students learning coms and SLOs for writing skills were intended as sixteen for knowledge, one for comprehension, thirteen for application, nine for analysis, six for synthesis, and four for evaluation. The table shows that the action verbs for students learning out coms, SLOs for oral and communication skills were intended as one for knowledge, four for comprehension, ten for application, one for analysis, thirteen for synthesis, and one for evaluation. The table shows that the action verbs for students learning out coms and SLOs for the formal and lexical aspects of language skill were intended as five for knowledge, five for comprehension, thirteen for application, twenty-seven for analysis, nine for synthesis, and two for evaluation. The table shows that the action verbs for students learning out coms, SLOs for Appropriate Ethical and Social Development skill were intended as zero for all, knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation

Competencies, Standards, and Benchmarks

The second section of the curriculum document explains competencies, Standards, Benchmarks, and Student Learning Outcomes. It elaborated on the Competencies in the

English language intended for NCP, 2006, explained the rationale for competencies and standards, and summarized competencies and standards.

This section explains the operational definitions of competency, standards, and benchmarks. It is also elaborated that competency is the key learning area, the standard defines the competency, benchmarks elaborate the standards cluster-wise, and SLOs are the grade-wise description of the Benchmark. The Pakistan English national curriculum, 2006, consists of five competencies and eight standards. Competency one, reading and thinking skills, have two standards; writing skill has one standard, oral communication has one standard, and formal and lexical aspect has three standards. Appropriate ethical and social development has one standard. All the standards and rationale are explained in this section. There are no specific contents about the assessment.

The wording of the standards indicated the assessment. The word "discovers," "understand," and "comprehension" of the first standard of competency one are the action verbs used by Bloom which can be used for assessment strategies. In the same way, the words of the second standard, "read", "analyze", and "relate" can be used in assessment strategy. However, these words could be more explicit for assessment strategy but can be inferred. The word of second competency first standard, "produce" "academic," and "creative writing," can also be used in the development of assessment strategies.

Moreover, the words "used" and "communication" of the third competency standard are also the same and can be used for assessment purposes. Standards one and three of four competencies also have words of the same nature, such as "articulate" and "use". While the competency five standards do not have any action verb which can indicate the assessment mechanism. These words can be used in the development of textbook strategies, test item development, classroom strategies, and for questioning in the classroom. Although there are no specific guidelines about assessment, these words indicate the level of assessment.

Benchmarks one, two, and three of the first standard and competency one use the word (analyze). In contrast, benchmark four uses (analyze, evaluate, and synthesize) words, indicating the higher learning elaborated by Bloom's taxonomy. In Benchmark one

standard two, competency one, the word analyze is used, which indicates the higher stage of Bloom's taxonomy. The second competency writing skills, standard one, Benchmark one, two, three, and four, consists of the words analyze, write, plan, comparison, contrast, and classification, indicating the assessment level. Competency three, oral communication skills, standard one, Benchmark one, and two consist of the words "use" and "demonstrate" indicated by the assessment design. In competency four standard one, Benchmark one, the word "pronounces" indicates the assessment strategy. Competency four, benchmark one-word "analyzes" indicated the assessment level. The competency four standard three benchmarks one, two, three words "recognize" "use" and "analyze" indicated the assessment level. The competency five standard one Benchmarks one, two, three, the words "recognizes", "develop" "understand" and "evaluate" indicated the level of assessment.

Section three of Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes

Section three of the curriculum document is about the SLOs**.**

The structure of the SLO of English National Curriculum 2006 of Pakistan consists of three critical sections, the content, context, and command/ action verbs; these action verbs indicate the level of assessment. Bloom indicated action verbs and level of assessment in, the taxonomy of educational objectives.   The command words of 9th and 10th-class SLOs are as under:

Table 4

Command Words of 9th and 10th Classes SLOs

Competency		Standards	Benchmarks	Classes	SLOs, Action Words,
C 1	Reading and Thinking Skills	S 1	B 1	9th, 10th	Analyze, identify, define, illustrate, Compare, recognize, arrange, order,
			B 2	9th, 10th	Apply, Distinguish, deduce, use, read, locate, recognize, explore, interpret, extract, summarize, relate, evaluate, apply,

			B 3	9th, 10th	Interpret, analyze, organize, recognize.
			B 4	9th, 10th	Locate, choose, identify, recognize, comprehend, use, utilize.
		S 2	B 1	9th, 10th	Read, analyze, identify, recognize, infer, compare, create.
C 2	Writing Skills	S 1	B 1		Develop, select, write, order, analyze, write, explain, use, incorporate, synthesize.
			B 2	9th, 10th	Analyze, write, narrate, distinguish, state, list, organize, use, anticipate, summarize, evaluate, identify, recognize, interpret, restate, replace.
			B 3	9th, 10th	Write, analyze.
			B 4	9th, 10th	Develop, select, draft, plan.
C 3	Oral Communicat	S 1	B 1	9th, 10th	Select, use, respond, express.
			B 2	9th, 10th	Demonstrate, restate, explain, modify, exhibit, negotiate, express, summarize, use, identify, analyze, compile, create, negotiate, exhibit, evaluate.
C 4	Formal and Lexical Aspects of Language	S 1	B 1	9th, 10th	Use, recognize.
		S 2	B 1	9th, 10th	Illustrate, use, examine, deduce, analyze, understand, explore, examine, recognize, identify.
		S 3	B 1	9th, 10th	Demonstrate, apply, recognize, illustrate, identify, classify, form, use.
			B 2	9th, 10th	Apply, illustrate, recognize, Express.
			B 3	9th, 10th	Analyze, classify, identify, use, recognize.
C 5	Appropriate Ethical and	S 1	B 1	9th, 10th	
			B 2	9th, 10th	
			B 3	9th, 10th	
				9th, 10th	

Table 4 shows that most of the SLO's wording belongs to Bloom's taxonomy's first three stages. This indicates a lower level of assessment plan envisioned in the curriculum.

Discussion

The English curriculum at the secondary level consists of different sections. The standards, benchmarks, and SLOs are the objectives intended for language acquisition. The action words used for standards, benchmarks, and SLOs in the English national curriculum, 2006 indicated the level of assessment. Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives is an essential tool for exploring the level of assessment. Researchers classify the first three stages, knowledge, comprehension, and application, as lower order, and analysis, synthesis, and evaluation are classified as the higher level of assessment objectives. Researchers explain different action verbs for each Bloom's taxonomy cognitive domain stage.

Most of the standards, benchmarks and SLOs intended for English language skill development in the national curriculum 2006 of Pakistan belong to the lower level. The action verbs used for this purpose belong to the lower level of Bloom's taxonomy cognitive domain.

There needs to be a specific assessment mechanism in curriculum documents. Listening, speaking, reading, and writing are four language skills that differ and need specific instructional strategies and assessment techniques in the learning process. There are no specific strategies, the mechanism for each skill in the curriculum document.

The curriculum document analysis shows that there are five competencies reading and thinking, writing, oral communication, formal and lexical aspects of language, and appropriate ethical and social development are intended as key learning areas in the national curriculum, 2006. The first area for improvement of this curriculum is that the competencies or critical learning areas need to be clarified and specific. Research shows that language comprises four basic skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing (AI-Jaw, 2010) as cited (Green, 2013). In the first competency, reading and thinking skills are joined into one competency, which is quite different. The learning strategies are different; therefore, assessment strategies are also different during and after instruction for developing these skills. According to Anthony Green, the intention of the assessor during the assessment of receptive skills is to understand the development of students, reading

and listening skills, and the level of comprehension (Green, 2013, p. 98). While the thanking skill is different from the reading skill, how is it possible to design, develop, and implement the same nature of activities for both of them?

In the same way as oral communication, competency combines listening and speaking skills. Listening is receptive, while speaking is a productive skill, and both are very different from each other; nevertheless, they are essential language skills. The logic behind the combination of these two skills is inconceivable. The development of listening skills is quite different from the development of speaking skills. In the same way, the assessment strategies during instruction and at the end of the session are different, so the combination of these two skills will directly affect the assessment design. Anthony Green classified langue skills. Reading and listening are receptive skills, and their development process is quite different from each other; in the same way, speaking and writing are productive or interactive skills, and every skill has a different development level (Green, 2013, p. 98). The only single point which indicated the assessment design in the first section of LNC, 2006, is the expression of, (listening and speaking skills are to be developed in the classroom context). So the assessment design will be contentious, though it is not mentioned in the document.

In the second and third sections, the wording of standards, benchmarks, and SLOs indicated the assessment level. The action verb used for three kinds of adjectives shows the higher and lower level of assessment plans as indicated by Bloom's taxonomy action verbs table. These words can be used in the development of textbook strategies, test item development, classroom strategies, and for questioning in the classroom. Although there are no specific guidelines about assessment, these words indicate the level of assessment. The document analysis shows that most of the standard action verbs used for the standard belong to the first three stages of Bloom's taxonomy cognitive domain. This shows the low level of assessment plan on the one hand and low quality of standard on the other hand. The concept of "Standards" grew popular and influential in the 1990s, spurring reform by arguing for particular "high-level" student goals (McMillan, 2017, p.47). The standard must consist of higher levels, such as synthesis and evaluation as the SLOs, and benchmarks are the subtypes of standards. If the standards are low, it is understood that

the SLOs and benchmarks will also be lower, and then the strategies of learning materials and instructions assessment will also be lower. It shows that the assessment plan in this section needs to be considered necessary by the curriculum developers. The wordings of the Benchmark are of good quality than standards. It has been observed that most of the action verbs used for Benchmarks belong to the last three stages of Bloom's taxonomy cognitive domain, which shows the higher-level assessment planned in benchmarks. Although this is the weakness of the curriculum document, as the sub-objectives (benchmarks) are at a higher level than the objectives from an assessment point of view, it supports textbook developers and teachers in the development and conduction of assessment.

Similarly, the level of SLOs is moderate. It is observed that most of the action verbs used for SLOs belong to the first three stages of Bloom's taxonomy cognitive domain; however, several words belong to higher stages, which shows the balanced and moderate level of assessment planned in SLOs. McMillan describes the higher and lower level in these words, Bloom's taxonomy of the cognitive domain has gotten much press, and it has been used to define action verbs to go along with various sorts of cognitive learning. There are six levels in the cognitive domain. Each level indicates a more complicated form of cognition. Although the cognitive domain is sometimes described as having "lower" and "upper" levels, the authors of the taxonomy regard only the knowledge level to be lower; all other levels are higher (McMillan, 2017, p. 51).

Conclusion

The results show that the competencies of language curriculum are not clear. In the first competency, reading and thinking skills are joined into one competency; while the thanking skill is different from the reading skill, it is impossible to design, develop, and implement the same nature of activities for both skills, which ultimately affects the assessment. In the same way, oral communication competency combines listening and speaking skills. Listening is receptive, while speaking is a productive skill, and both are very different from each other; nevertheless, they are essential language skills. Eventually, this affects the assessment design. Reading and listening are receptive skills, and their development process is quite different from each other; in the same way,

speaking and writing are productive or interactive skills, and every skill has a different development level. These should be developed differently to improve the assessment and instructional processes. The level of standards, benchmarks and SLOs are low, as the action words used belong to the first three stages of Bloom's taxonomy, which ultimately affect the assessment level. Similarly, the standards, benchmarks, and student learning outcomes do not support language development. The assessment design is weak in the national language curriculum 2006.

Recommendations

The policy-makers should review the curriculum document and include a thorough assessment plan with specific procedures for each language skill. There should be a continuous assessment mechanism, and every skill should have an equal chance at certification and grading schemes. By implementing higher-level action verbs recommended by Bloom's taxonomy, the national curriculum's standards, benchmarks, and SLOs should be raised in level. There should be a reorganization of the national curriculum's standards and a standard of skills (oral communication should be divided into listening and speaking skills, and reading and thinking skills should be separated.

References

Alkhateeb, H. M., & Nasser, R. (2014). Assessment of learning and study strategies of university students in Qatar using an Arabic translation of the learning and study strategies inventory. *Psychological reports*, *114*(3), 947-965.

Azhar, S., Ali, Z., Taj, S., & Habibi, M. R. (2020). Analysis of the National Curriculum 2006 in the Light of Learner-Centered Ideology. *Journal of Education & Humanities Research, University of Balochistan, Quetta-Pakistan*, *9*(1), 1-12.

Babbie, E. (2002). The basics of social research. Ed. *Belmont, Calif*.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*.

Cho, H. J., Yough, M., & Levesque-Bristol, C. (2020). Relationships between beliefs about assessment and self-regulated learning in second language learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *99*, 101505.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). Strategies for qualitative data analysis. *Basics of Qualitative Research. Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*, *3*(10.4135), 9781452230153.

Green, D. W., & Abutalebi, J. (2013). Language control in bilinguals: The adaptive control hypothesis. Journal of cognitive psychology, 25(5), 515-530.

Green, A. (2014). Exploring language assessment and testing: Language in action. Oxon: Routledge.

Gronlund, N. E. (1995). How to Write and Use Instructional Objectives. Englewood Cliffs. NJ Merrill.

Gudu, B. O. (2015). Teaching Speaking Skills in English Language Using Classroom Activities in Secondary School Level in Eldoret Municipality, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(35), 55–63.

Gulzar, K., & Mahmood, N. (2019). Challenges to maintaining alignment between secondary level mathematics curriculum and assessments in Pakistan. *Journal of Research*, *13*(2), 234-246.

Iahad, N., Dafoulas, G. A., Kalaitzakis, E., & Macaulay, L. A. (2004, January). Evaluation of online assessment: The role of feedback in learner-centered e-learning. In *37th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 2004. Proceedings of the* (pp. 10-pp). IEEE

Kiazai, A. N., Kakar, A. Q., & Akhtar, S. An inquiry about the formative use of assessment to improve instructions at the secondary level in District Quetta.

Laksitowening, K. A., Santoso, H. B., & Hasibuan, Z. A. (2017). E-Learning Personalization Using Triple-Factor Approach in Standard-Based Education. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 801, No. 1, p. 012027). IOP Publishing.

Malik, S., Khan, A., & Sadiq, U. (2020). A comparative analysis of assessment schemes in Secondary School Certificate and Cambridge O Level English examination papers in Pakistan: Need for reform. *Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences (Pakistan)*, *28*(1).

McMillan, J. H. (1997). *Classroom Assessment. Principles and Practices for Effective*

McMillan, J. H. (2017). *Classroom assessment: Principles and practice that enhance student learning and motivation*. Pearson.

Miller, M. D., Linn, R. L., & Norman, E. Gronlund, (2009). Measurement and Assessment in Teaching.

Murtagh, M. J., Thomson, R. G., May, C. R., Rapley, T., Heaven, B. R., Graham, R. H., ... & Eccles, M. P. (2007). Qualitative methods in a randomised controlled trial: the role of an integrated qualitative process evaluation in providing evidence to discontinue the intervention   in one arm of a trial of a decision support tool. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, *16*(3),224– 229.

Oliva, P. F., & Gordon II, W. R. (2012). *Developing the curriculum*. Pearson Higher Ed.

Pakistan. Federal Ministry of Education (2006) National Curriculum for the English Language Grades I-XIIwww.moe.gov.pk/English Language-I-XII.pdf

Powers, D. E. (2010). The case for a comprehensive, four-skills assessment of English-language proficiency. *R & D Connections*, *pp. 14*, 1-12.

Rapley, T. (2007). Exploring documents. *Making conversation, discourse and document analysis*, pp. 111-124.