EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.752 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 13 | Issue:6 | June 2026 -Peer Reviewed Journal

ASSESSMENT LITERACY AND INCLUSIVE ASSESSMENT READINESS OF ENGLISH TEACHERS

Mera Fe D. Caoile
Master of Arts in Educational Management, Rizal Memorial Colleges, Inc.

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra28270
DOI No: 10.36713/epra28270

ABSTRACT

This study determined the relationship between teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness among Grade 8 English teachers in the Division of Davao de Oro. Specifically, it examined the level of teacher assessment literacy in terms of assessment for professional learning, motivation, planning, engagement, and learning, as well as the level of inclusive assessment readiness in terms of personalized instructional strategies, communicative scaffolding strategies, and collaboration and assessment strategies. It also investigated the significant relationship between the variables and identified which domains of assessment literacy significantly influenced inclusive assessment readiness. A quantitative research approach using a descriptive-correlational design was employed. The respondents consisted of sixty (60) Grade 8 English teachers selected from a population of seventy-one (71) using Slovin's formula. Data was collected through adapted survey questionnaires and analyzed using weighted mean, standard deviation, Pearson Product Moment Correlation, and multiple regression analysis. Findings revealed that both teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness were at a high level, indicating that these competencies were oftentimes evident among the respondents. Moreover, there was a significant relationship between teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness. All domains of assessment literacy significantly influenced inclusive assessment readiness, with planning and professional learning showing stronger contributions compared to other domains. Based on the findings, it is recommended that the Department of Education strengthen professional development programs focusing on data-driven instructional planning and reflective assessment practices. School leaders should support collaborative learning communities, while teachers are encouraged to enhance engagement-based and motivational assessment strategies. Future researchers may explore additional variables to further explain inclusive assessment readiness.

KEYWORDS: *assessment literacy; inclusive assessment readiness; English teach*

INTRODUCTION

Assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness have emerged as critical foundations of effective teaching in contemporary education, particularly in language classrooms where learners exhibit diverse abilities, backgrounds, and needs. Assessment literacy refers to teachers' capacity to design, interpret, and utilize assessment evidence to inform instruction and improve student learning, while inclusive assessment readiness reflects teachers' ability to implement equitable and responsive assessment practices that accommodate all learners. These constructs collectively emphasize that assessment should not be limited to measuring achievement but should function as a continuous process that supports engagement, motivation, and differentiated instruction. In English language education, where communication, interaction, and feedback are central, integrating these competencies is even more essential to ensure meaningful learning experiences. This study is situated in the context of Grade 8 English teachers in the Division of Davao de Oro, where the need to strengthen both assessment practices and inclusive teaching approaches remains evident.

At the global level, concerns regarding teacher assessment literacy persist despite the increasing emphasis on formative and learner-centered assessment. Many teachers continue to struggle to interpret assessment data and translate results into effective instructional strategies, thereby limiting the impact of assessment on student learning. According to DeLuca et al. (2019), gaps in teachers' assessment competencies often result in the underutilization of assessment as a tool for instructional improvement. Similarly, Yan and Pastore (2022) explained that teachers frequently rely on traditional assessment practices that prioritize grading over supporting learning processes. In addition, international studies highlight that teachers are often insufficiently prepared to implement inclusive assessment practices, particularly in diverse classrooms where learners differ in language proficiency, cognitive abilities, and socio-cultural backgrounds. Sharma et al. (2021) emphasized that a lack of readiness for inclusive assessment hinders teachers' ability to provide equitable learning opportunities, thereby reinforcing the need to integrate assessment literacy with inclusive teaching competencies.

In the Philippines, similar challenges are observed in both assessment practices and the implementation of inclusive education. The Department of Education has emphasized the importance of assessment reforms; however, many teachers still demonstrate limited proficiency in using assessment data to guide instruction. David and Balarin (2020) noted that teachers often depend on summative assessment practices and lack sufficient training in formative assessment approaches. Furthermore, studies by Oracion and Bagaoisan (2022) revealed that assessment is often treated as a separate activity rather than an integral component of the teaching-learning process. About inclusive education, constraints such as large class

sizes, limited instructional resources, and inadequate professional development opportunities continue to affect teachers' readiness to implement inclusive assessment strategies. UNESCO (2020) reported that these systemic challenges hinder teachers from effectively addressing diverse learner needs, particularly in language classrooms where differentiated instruction and scaffolding are necessary.

At the local level, particularly in the Division of Davao de Oro, these issues are more pronounced due to the contextual realities of public secondary schools. Grade 8 English teachers are expected to implement assessment practices that support diverse learners; however, many face challenges aligning assessment strategies with students' varying levels of English proficiency, learning styles, and sociocultural backgrounds. Local observations indicate that teachers may struggle to use assessment results to plan instruction, provide timely and meaningful feedback, and design engaging assessment tasks that foster student participation. In addition, the application of inclusive strategies such as personalized instruction, communicative scaffolding, and collaborative assessment remains limited due to insufficient training and support systems. As emphasized by recent Philippine-based studies, teachers often demonstrate awareness of inclusive practices but face difficulties in translating these into consistent classroom implementation, particularly in resource-constrained settings.

A critical research gap, therefore, exists in understanding how teacher assessment literacy influences inclusive assessment readiness within the local educational context. While previous studies have examined assessment literacy and inclusive education separately, there is limited empirical evidence exploring the relationship between these two constructs, particularly among English teachers in the Division of Davao de Oro. More specifically, there is a need to investigate how domains of assessment literacy, such as assessment for professional learning, motivation, planning, engagement, and learning, contribute to teachers' ability to implement inclusive assessment strategies. Addressing this gap is essential in developing context-specific interventions that enhance both assessment practices and inclusive teaching competencies.

The significance of this study lies in its potential to provide empirical evidence that can inform policy and practice in basic education. The findings can support the Department of Education in designing targeted professional development programs that strengthen teachers' assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness. Also, the study contributes to the growing body of knowledge on assessment and inclusion by offering a localized perspective that reflects the realities of teachers in the Division of Davao de Oro. Ultimately, the research aims to promote more responsive, equitable, and effective English language instruction that addresses the diverse needs of learners.

THE STUDY'S OBJECTIVES

This study aimed to determine the relationship between the assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness. Specifically, it sought to:

1. Determine the level of assessment literacy of teachers in terms of:
   - 1.1. Assessment for Professional Learning;
   - 1.2. Assessment is for Motivation;
   - 1.3. Assessment is for Planning;
   - 1.4. Assessment is for Engagement; and
   - 1.5. Assessment is for Learning?
2. Determine the level of inclusive assessment readiness of teachers in terms of:
   - 2.1. Personalized Instructional Strategies;
   - 2.2. Communicative Scaffolding Strategies; and
   - 2.3. Collaboration and Assessment Strategies?
3. Establish whether there is a significant relationship between the assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness of teachers?
4. Identify which of the domains of the assessment literacy significantly influence inclusive assessment readiness of teachers?

METHODOLOGY

This chapter introduces the methodological aspect of the study. This covers the research design, research respondents, research instruments, data gathering procedure, and data analysis employed in this investigation.

Method Used

In this study, a quantitative research approach was employed, specifically utilizing a descriptive-correlational design. Quantitative research involved the systematic collection and analysis of numerical data to explain relationships among variables and test hypotheses using statistical techniques (Bloomfield & Fisher, 2019). This approach was appropriate as it allowed the researcher to measure the levels of teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness and examine how these variables were related within a defined population. A descriptive-correlational design, in particular, focused on describing the characteristics of variables and determining the degree and direction of relationships that naturally occurred without any experimental manipulation (Curtis et al., 2019).

Descriptive research was characterized by its non-intrusive nature, where variables were observed as they existed in their natural setting, enabling the researcher to provide an accurate depiction of current conditions (Siedlecki, 2020). In this study, descriptive methods were used to determine the level of teacher assessment literacy across its domains, namely assessment for professional learning, motivation, planning, engagement, and learning, as well as inclusive assessment readiness in terms of personalized instructional strategies, communicative scaffolding, and collaboration and assessment strategies. On the other hand, correlational research aimed to determine whether a statistically significant relationship existed between two or more variables and the strength of such relationships (Bloomfield & Fisher, 2019).

The use of a descriptive-correlational design in this study was appropriate because it allowed for the examination of the relationship between teacher assessment literacy as the independent variable and inclusive assessment readiness as the dependent variable without altering the natural educational setting. In addition, this design supported the identification of which domains of assessment literacy significantly influenced inclusive assessment readiness through predictive analysis. By employing this method, the study generated empirical evidence that contributed to understanding how assessment practices related to inclusive teaching readiness, thereby providing a basis for informed educational interventions and policy development (Curtis et al., 2019).

Sources of Data

The respondents of this study consisted of Grade 8 English teachers from the medium schools in the Division of Davao de Oro. The total population of the study was seventy-one (71) teachers, from which the required sample size was determined using Slovin's formula. Slovin's formula was expressed as $n = N / (1 + Ne^2)$, where n represented the sample size, N was the total population, and e was the margin of error, commonly set at 0.05 in educational research. By applying this formula, the computed sample size for the study was sixty (60) respondents, which was considered sufficient to represent the population with a 5% margin of error and an acceptable level of precision (Tejada & Punzalan, 2019).

The use of Slovin's formula was appropriate for this study because it provided a practical method for determining sample size when the population was known but limited information was available about its variability. It was widely utilized in survey-based and educational research to ensure that the selected respondents adequately represented the population without requiring full participation, which might not have been feasible due to time and logistical constraints (Bobbitt, 2023; Merren, 2023). In this context, selecting sixty (60) respondents from a population of 71 Grade 8 English teachers ensured that the data collected would yield reliable and generalizable findings regarding teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness.

Data Gathering Instrument

The primary instrument for data collection was a structured questionnaire designed to measure both assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness. The questionnaire consisted of closed-ended questions with Likert-scale items to quantify perceptions and experiences.

For data collection, this study utilized an adapted survey questionnaire. The questionnaire that was employed in this undertaking was divided into two sets. The first set focused on the level of assessment literacy. The second set focused on the level of inclusive assessment readiness.

Assessment Literacy

The assessment literacy questionnaire was adapted from Alonzo et. al. (2021). The instrument consisted of 19 items (Appendix E). It had five indicators namely; assessment for professional learning (1-3), assessment is for motivation (1-4), assessment is for planning (1-4), assessment is for engagement (1-3), and assessment is for learning (1-5).

The assessment literacy questionnaire was subjected to pilot testing among a group of respondents with similar characteristics to the actual participants, yielding a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.93, which indicates a very high level of internal consistency. This result suggests that the items in the instrument are reliable and consistently measure the construct of teacher assessment literacy across its five domains, namely assessment for professional learning, motivation, planning, engagement, and learning. The high reliability implies that the questionnaire is appropriate for use in the main study, as it can produce stable and dependable results. Consequently, the instrument was retained with minimal revisions, ensuring that it accurately captures teachers' assessment literacy practices in the Division of Davao de Oro. Below was the grading scale of the level of teacher assessment literacy.

Mean Interval	Descriptive Level	Descriptive Interpretation
4.20 - 5.00	Very High	The teacher assessment literacy is always evident.
3.40 - 4.19	High	The teacher assessment literacy is oftentimes evident.
2.60 - 3.39	Moderate	The teacher assessment literacy is occasionally evident.
1.80 - 2.59	Low	The teacher assessment literacy is seldom evident.
1.00 – 1.79	Very Low	The teacher assessment literacy is never evident.

Inclusive Assessment Readiness

The inclusive assessment readiness questionnaire was adapted from Sharma et al. (2021). The instrument consisted of 26 items. It had three indicators namely; personalized instructional strategies (1-8), communicative scaffolding strategies (1-10), and collaboration and assessment strategies (1-8).

The inclusive assessment readiness questionnaire underwent pilot testing to determine its reliability and suitability for the study, resulting in a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.94, which reflects an excellent level of internal consistency. This indicates that the items effectively measure the construct of inclusive assessment readiness across its three domains: personalized instructional strategies, communicative scaffolding strategies, and collaboration and assessment strategies. The strong reliability coefficient implies that the instrument is coherent and capable of producing consistent responses among respondents. As a result, the questionnaire was deemed valid for use in the actual data collection, with only minor refinements made to improve clarity and ensure alignment with the study context. Below was the grading scale of the level of inclusive assessment readiness of teachers.

Mean Interval	Descriptive Level	Descriptive Interpretation
4.20 - 5.00	Very High	Inclusive assessment readiness of teachers is always evident.
3.40 - 4.19	High	Inclusive assessment readiness of teachers is oftentimes evident.
2.60 - 3.39	Moderate	Inclusive assessment readiness of teachers is occasionally evident.
1.80 - 2.59	Low	Inclusive assessment readiness of teachers is seldom evident.
1.00 – 1.79	Very Low	Inclusive assessment readiness of teachers is never evident.

The instruments in this study were contextualized to achieve their purpose. The researcher integrated all the comments and suggestions from the adviser, panel members, and expert validators to refine the tools and achieve construct validity.

Sampling Technique

The sampling technique that was employed in this study was probability sampling, particularly simple random or stratified sampling, to ensure that each teacher had an equal chance of being selected as a respondent. The use of probability sampling enhanced the representativeness of the sample and minimized selection bias, thereby improving the validity and reliability of the research findings (Kumar, 2023). This approach was essential in ensuring that the results accurately reflected the characteristics of the population being studied.

In terms of inclusion criteria, the respondents were required to be currently teaching Grade 8 English in medium schools within the Division of Davao de Oro during the conduct of the study. Additionally, teachers were required to have at least one (1) year of teaching experience to ensure that they had sufficient exposure to assessment practices. Preference was also given to teachers with three (3) or more years of teaching experience, as they were more likely to have developed deeper competencies in assessment literacy and inclusive teaching strategies. Teachers who were willing to participate voluntarily and provide informed consent were included, while those who were on leave or not directly handling Grade 8 English classes during the data collection period were excluded.

Further, the respondents were expected to have practical familiarity with classroom assessment practices, including the design, implementation, and interpretation of assessment results, as well as experience in handling diverse learners. This was essential because the study focused on examining the relationship between teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness, which required respondents to have relevant professional experience in both domains. By establishing clear and appropriate inclusion criteria, the study ensured that the selected participants could provide meaningful and accurate data.

The selection of sixty (60) respondents from a total population of seventy-one (71) Grade 8 English teachers, guided by Slovin's formula and appropriate sampling techniques, ensured that the study achieved a balance between feasibility and representativeness. This approach strengthened the reliability of the findings and supported the validity of conclusions drawn regarding the relationship between assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness in the Division of Davao de Oro.

Procedure of the Study

Before the research was conducted, an endorsement from the Dean of the Graduate School (Appendix A) was secured after the study had undergone ethical review and approval (Appendix D). Following this, a formal request to conduct the study was submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of Davao de Oro (Appendix B). Upon approval,

coordination was conducted with the principals of selected medium schools to inform them of the study's purpose, scope, and schedule (Appendix C). The researcher also ensured that all ethical protocols, including informed consent and confidentiality agreements, were in place before proceeding with data collection. Clear communication was maintained with school administrators to facilitate the smooth implementation of the research procedures.

Distribution and Retrieval of Questionnaire. After obtaining all necessary permissions, the researcher distributed the structured questionnaires to the selected Grade 8 English teachers who met the inclusion criteria. The questionnaires were administered either in printed form or via an online platform, depending on respondents' accessibility and preferences. Prior to answering, respondents were oriented about the purpose of the study, instructions for completing the questionnaire, and their rights as participants. Adequate time was provided to complete the instrument, and the researcher ensured that all responses were collected systematically. Completed questionnaires were retrieved immediately after completion for printed copies, while online responses were monitored and secured within a specified timeframe to ensure data completeness.

Collection and Statistical Treatment. After retrieving all completed questionnaires, the researcher organized, coded, and encoded the data for analysis. Data cleaning procedures were conducted to check for completeness and accuracy of responses. The collected data were then subjected to appropriate statistical treatments, including the computation of mean and standard deviation to determine the level of assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient to examine the relationship between the variables, and multiple regression analysis to identify which domains of assessment literacy significantly influenced inclusive assessment readiness. The results were interpreted in accordance with established statistical standards, ensuring that the findings were presented accurately and objectively.

Statistical Treatment

For a more comprehensive interpretation and analysis of the data, the following statistical tools were utilized:
For Problems 1 and 2, the weighted mean was used to determine the level of teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness across their respective indicators. The weighted mean was computed to determine the average response for each item and domain, based on the Likert scale used in the questionnaire. This statistical tool enabled the researcher to describe the extent to which assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness were manifested among Grade 8 English teachers. The computed means were then interpreted using the established descriptive rating scale to determine whether the level was very high, high, moderate, low, or very low.

In addition, the standard deviation was utilized to measure the variability or dispersion of the responses from the mean. This statistical measure determined the degree of consistency or agreement among the respondents regarding their perceptions of assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness. A low standard deviation indicated that the responses were closely clustered around the mean, reflecting consistency among respondents, whereas a high standard deviation suggested greater variability.

For Problem 3, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was employed to determine the significant relationship between teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness. This statistical tool measured the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The computed r-value was tested at a 0.05 level of significance to determine whether the relationship was statistically significant. Correspondingly, the p-value was used as the basis for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis.

For Problem 4, multiple regression analysis was used to identify which domains of teacher assessment literacy significantly influenced inclusive assessment readiness. This statistical method determined the predictive power of each domain, namely assessment for professional learning, assessment is for motivation, assessment is for planning, assessment is for engagement, and assessment is for learning. The regression analysis provided coefficients that indicated the extent to which each domain contributed to variations in inclusive assessment readiness. The significance of each predictor was examined using t-values and p-values, while the overall model fit was evaluated using the F-value and coefficient of determination to assess how well the independent variables explained the dependent variable.

Ethical Consideration

The ethical considerations of this study focused on ensuring the protection, dignity, and rights of the Grade 8 English teacher-respondents in the Division of Davao de Oro. This included adherence to established ethical principles such as voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and responsible data handling. The researcher committed to conducting the study with integrity, ensuring that all procedures respected the professional roles of the respondents and aligned with ethical standards in educational research.

Social Value. The researcher recognized the significant social value of this study in improving assessment practices and inclusive teaching strategies among Grade 8 English teachers in the Division of Davao de Oro. By examining the relationship between teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness, the study aimed to provide evidence-

based insights that could enhance teaching effectiveness and promote equitable learning opportunities for diverse learners. The findings were expected to support the Department of Education in designing targeted professional development programs and policies that strengthened inclusive education practices.

Further, the study contributed to addressing gaps in assessment practices by emphasizing the importance of data-driven and inclusive instruction. It was anticipated that the results would benefit not only the teacher-respondents but also learners who would experience more responsive and equitable assessment practices. Ultimately, the study held value for the broader educational community by promoting improved teaching quality and inclusive learning environments.

Informed Consent and Assent. To ensure ethical compliance, informed consent was obtained from all Grade 8 English teacher-respondents prior to their participation. The researcher provided a detailed explanation of the study's purpose, procedures, duration, potential risks, and benefits in clear and understandable language. Participants were given sufficient time to review the information and ask questions before deciding to participate.

The researcher emphasized that participation was entirely voluntary and that respondents could withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences. Written consent forms were secured and properly documented in accordance with institutional ethical standards. This process ensured respect for the autonomy and professional rights of the respondents.

Vulnerability of research respondents. Although the respondents were professional teachers, the researcher acknowledged potential vulnerabilities related to their professional roles, particularly concerns about evaluation or judgment of their assessment practices. To address this, the researcher ensured that participation did not affect their employment status, performance evaluation, or professional standing.

The researcher created a supportive and non-threatening environment during data collection, ensuring that respondents felt comfortable and respected. All questions were framed in a manner that avoided judgment and focused on gathering honest and meaningful responses. By recognizing and addressing these vulnerabilities, the study safeguarded the dignity and well-being of the participants.

Privacy and Confidentiality. Strict measures were implemented to protect the privacy and confidentiality of all respondents. Personal information such as names, school affiliations, and other identifying details were coded or anonymized to ensure that individual responses could not be traced back to specific participants. All data were used solely for research purposes.

The researcher securely stored all collected data using password-protected devices and restricted access to authorized individuals only. In compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012, all information was handled with utmost confidentiality. Findings were presented in aggregate form, ensuring that no individual respondent could be identified in any reports or publications.

Risk, Benefits and Safety. The study posed minimal risk to participants, as it primarily involved answering survey questionnaires related to their teaching practices. However, there was slight discomfort when reflecting on personal assessment practices. To mitigate this, the researcher ensured that all questions were respectfully phrased and that respondents were not required to answer any questions they were uncomfortable with.

The benefits of the study included providing teachers with insights into their assessment practices and contributing to the development of more inclusive teaching strategies. Safety measures included ensuring a secure and comfortable environment during data collection and maintaining open communication with participants regarding their rights. Ethical approval was also sought to ensure adherence to research standards.

Justice. The principle of justice was upheld by ensuring that all Grade 8 English teachers in the Division of Davao de Oro had equal opportunities to participate in the study. The selection of respondents followed fair and unbiased procedures, ensuring that no group was overrepresented or excluded.

The researcher ensured that the benefits and burdens of the study were distributed equitably among participants. All respondents were treated with fairness and respect, and the findings of the study were made accessible to stakeholders to promote shared benefits within the educational community.

Transparency. Transparency was maintained throughout the research process by providing clear and accurate information about the study's objectives, procedures, and expected outcomes. The researcher communicated openly with respondents and school administrators regarding the purpose and significance of the study.

Additionally, the results of the study were shared with relevant stakeholders, including school leaders and teachers, to promote understanding and application of the findings. This openness fostered trust and ensured that the research process was conducted with integrity and accountability.

Qualification of the Researcher. The researcher completed a Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English and was currently pursuing graduate studies in education, which included formal coursework in quantitative research, educational assessment, and inclusive education. The researcher had attended and participated in seminars, webinars, and training sessions related to assessment literacy, research methodology, and inclusive teaching practices. In addition, the researcher

had been involved in academic colloquia and school-based professional development activities that enhanced competence in conducting systematic and ethical research.

Further, the researcher sought guidance and approval from the Research Monitoring Committee (RMC) research ethics committee to ensure that all procedures complied with ethical standards. Continuous consultation with academic advisers and research experts was undertaken to maintain the quality and integrity of the study.

Conflict of Interest. The researcher declared that there were no financial or personal interests that could influence the conduct or outcomes of the study. For instance, the researcher was not in a supervisory or evaluative position over the participating teachers, ensuring that responses were not influenced by authority or power dynamics.

In the event of any potential conflict of interest, such as prior professional relationships with respondents, the researcher disclosed this information and took appropriate measures to maintain objectivity. This ensured that the study remained unbiased and that the findings were based solely on the collected data.

Adequacy of Facilities. The study was conducted using appropriate and adequate facilities to ensure efficient and ethical data collection. Questionnaires were administered either in person within school premises or through secure online platforms such as Google Forms, depending on accessibility and convenience.

The researcher utilized devices such as laptops and secure storage systems for data encoding and analysis. Statistical software was used for data processing, ensuring accuracy and reliability of results. All facilities used ensured privacy, accessibility, and a comfortable environment for respondents.

Community Involvement. Community involvement was essential in ensuring that the study was relevant and beneficial to the Division of Davao de Oro. The researcher coordinated with school heads and local education authorities to inform them about the study and sought their support in facilitating data collection.

Regular communication was maintained with stakeholders to provide updates on the progress and outcomes of the study. The findings were shared with the community to promote awareness and encourage the application of results in improving assessment practices and inclusive education. This collaborative approach strengthened the relevance and impact of the research within the local educational context.

Results

The study revealed that teachers had a **high level of assessment literacy** with an overall mean of **3.97**. Among the indicators, **assessment for professional learning** obtained the highest mean (**M = 4.02**), followed by **assessment for learning** (**M = 3.98**), **assessment for motivation** (**M = 3.97**), and both **assessment for planning** and **assessment for engagement** (**M = 3.94**). This indicates that teachers frequently use assessment to reflect on their teaching, support student learning, plan instruction, motivate learners, and promote engagement.

The level of **inclusive assessment readiness** was also high, with an overall mean of **3.88**. The highest indicator was **personalized instructional strategies** (**M = 3.93**), followed by **communicative scaffolding strategies** (**M = 3.88**) and **collaboration and assessment strategies** (**M = 3.83**). These findings suggest that teachers are generally prepared to apply inclusive practices through differentiated instruction, student interaction, feedback, collaboration, and appropriate assessment adjustments.

The correlation analysis showed a **significant positive relationship** between teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness (**r = .8137, p = .000**). This means that teachers with higher assessment literacy tend to demonstrate stronger readiness to implement inclusive assessment practices. All assessment literacy indicators were significantly related to inclusive assessment readiness, confirming that assessment knowledge and practice are important in supporting diverse learners.

The regression analysis further showed that teacher assessment literacy significantly influenced inclusive assessment readiness (**R = .832, R^2 = .692, F = 24.322, p < .001**). This means that **69.2% of the variation in inclusive assessment readiness** was explained by teacher assessment literacy. Among the predictors, **assessment for planning** had the strongest influence (**β = .648**), followed by **assessment for professional learning** (**β = .640**) and **assessment for learning** (**β = .485**). This implies that teachers become more ready for inclusive assessment when they use assessment data for planning, reflection, feedback, and instructional adjustment.

Overall, the findings confirm that assessment literacy is a key factor in strengthening inclusive assessment readiness. Teachers who can use assessment for planning, learning, motivation, engagement, and professional growth are better equipped to design fair, responsive, and learner-centered assessment practices. These results highlight the need for continuous training on assessment literacy, inclusive assessment, and data-informed instruction to further support diverse learners in English classrooms.

Summary

The main focus of this study was to determine the significance of the relationship between teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness among Grade 8 English teachers in the Division of Davao de Oro. The study involved sixty

(60) English teachers from medium schools who served as respondents. A quantitative approach employing a descriptive correlational research design was utilized to examine both the level of the variables and their relationship. The research instruments were adapted from Alonzo et al. (2021) for teacher assessment literacy and Sharma et al. (2021) for inclusive assessment readiness. These instruments were validated by experts and subjected to pilot testing prior to administration to ensure reliability and validity. Statistical tools such as weighted mean, Pearson Product Moment Correlation, and multiple regression analysis were used in analyzing the data. The hypotheses were tested at a 0.05 level of significance.

1. The findings revealed that the level of teacher assessment literacy among the respondents is high. This indicates that teachers consistently demonstrate competence in using assessment for professional learning, motivation, planning, engagement, and learning. The results suggest that assessment practices are not only evident but are also actively integrated into classroom instruction. Teachers are able to utilize assessment data to guide instructional decisions, support student participation, and enhance learning outcomes, reflecting a strong foundation in assessment literacy within the study context.

2. Similarly, the level of inclusive assessment readiness among the teachers is also high. This implies that teachers are capable of implementing inclusive assessment practices that respond to the diverse needs of learners. The findings show that teachers demonstrate readiness in applying personalized instructional strategies, communicative scaffolding, and collaboration and assessment strategies. These practices indicate that teachers are able to create inclusive and supportive learning environments where students are encouraged to actively participate and achieve according to their individual abilities.

3. Further, the results of the study established that there is a significant relationship between teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness. This finding implies that improvements in teachers' assessment literacy are associated with enhanced readiness to implement inclusive assessment practices. The rejection of the null hypothesis confirms that the two variables are significantly related, highlighting the critical role of assessment literacy in promoting inclusive teaching. The results underscore the importance of integrating assessment knowledge with inclusive strategies to ensure effective and equitable instruction.

4. In addition, the regression analysis revealed that the domains of teacher assessment literacy significantly influence inclusive assessment readiness. This indicates that each domain of assessment literacy contributes to the development of inclusive practices, with certain domains exerting stronger influence than others. The rejection of the second null hypothesis confirms that teacher assessment literacy is a significant predictor of inclusive assessment readiness. Overall, the findings emphasize that strengthening teachers' competencies in assessment literacy is essential in enhancing inclusive, responsive, and effective English language teaching in the Division of Davao de Oro.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were offered:

1. The findings of the study lead to the conclusion that teacher assessment literacy among Grade 8 English teachers in the Division of Davao de Oro is highly demonstrated across its domains, namely assessment for professional learning, motivation, planning, engagement, and learning. This indicates that teachers are capable of utilizing assessment as an integral component of instruction, not only for measuring learning outcomes but also for guiding teaching practices and supporting student development. The results suggest that assessment literacy is embedded in classroom practices, enabling teachers to make informed instructional decisions that enhance student engagement and learning.

2. Likewise, the study concludes that inclusive assessment readiness is also highly demonstrated among the respondents in terms of personalized instructional strategies, communicative scaffolding strategies, and collaboration and assessment strategies. This implies that teachers are generally prepared to implement inclusive practices that respond to diverse learner needs. The findings indicate that teachers are able to create supportive and equitable learning environments where assessment is adapted to accommodate individual differences, thereby promoting participation and meaningful learning among students.

3. Further, the study establishes that there is a significant relationship between teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness. This confirms that teachers who possess higher levels of assessment literacy are more likely to demonstrate greater readiness in implementing inclusive assessment practices. This conclusion supports the assumptions of self-determination theory developed by Deci and Ryan, which emphasize that effective assessment practices enhance motivation, engagement, and a sense of competence among learners. The findings suggest that assessment literacy contributes to creating inclusive environments where students feel supported and are encouraged to actively participate in the learning process.

4. Lastly, the study concludes that the domains of teacher assessment literacy significantly influence inclusive assessment readiness, confirming that assessment literacy is a strong predictor of inclusive teaching practices. This finding is consistent with the transformative learning theory of Mezirow, which highlights the role of reflective practice in improving teaching approaches, and the universal design for learning framework developed by Meyer et al., which emphasizes the importance of flexible and inclusive instructional design. The results imply that teachers who effectively use assessment data and reflect on their practices are better able to design inclusive assessment strategies that address diverse learner needs. The study affirms that strengthening teacher assessment literacy is essential in enhancing inclusive assessment readiness and promoting equitable and effective English language teaching.

Recommendations

The following suggestions were offered based on the conclusions of the study:

It is highly recommended that higher officials in the Department of Education, particularly the Schools Division Superintendent, the Curriculum Implementation Division, and the School Governance and Operations Division of the Division of Davao de Oro, strengthen policies and programs that enhance teacher assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness. Specifically, these offices may design targeted professional development programs focusing on the domains with relatively lower performance, such as assessment for engagement, assessment for planning, and collaboration and assessment strategies. Structured training workshops may emphasize designing interactive assessment tasks, integrating assessment data into lesson planning, and strengthening collaborative practices among teachers. Furthermore, division-wide mentoring systems and learning action cells may be institutionalized to support teachers in applying inclusive assessment strategies in English classrooms. Continuous monitoring and evaluation mechanisms may also be established to ensure that assessment practices are aligned with inclusive education goals.

Similarly, it is recommended that school principals intensify their instructional leadership by providing sustained support for teachers in implementing effective assessment and inclusive practices. Principals may organize regular in-school training sessions, demonstration teaching, and peer coaching activities that focus on improving assessment for engagement and collaborative assessment strategies. Additionally, principals may encourage teachers to develop assessment plans that explicitly incorporate differentiation and scaffolding techniques. Providing access to instructional materials, digital tools, and assessment resources will further enable teachers to design more engaging and inclusive assessments. Establishing a school culture that values collaboration, reflection, and data-driven decision-making is also essential in enhancing both assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness.

Also, it is recommended that teachers continuously enhance their competencies in assessment literacy and inclusive assessment practices. Teachers may focus on improving the domains that showed relatively lower outcomes by designing more engaging and student-centered assessment activities that promote active participation. They may also strengthen their ability to use assessment data for instructional planning by regularly analyzing student performance and adjusting teaching strategies accordingly. In addition, teachers are encouraged to collaborate with colleagues, share best practices, and engage in professional learning communities to improve their use of varied and inclusive assessment strategies. Reflective practice should also be emphasized, allowing teachers to evaluate their assessment methods and make necessary improvements to better support diverse learners.

Further, it is recommended that teachers place greater emphasis on enhancing communicative scaffolding and collaboration strategies by providing frequent and meaningful feedback, encouraging peer interaction, and involving students in the assessment process. Teachers may adopt differentiated assessment approaches that allow learners to demonstrate their understanding through multiple formats such as oral presentations, written outputs, and performance-based tasks. By doing so, teachers can create more inclusive learning environments that cater to students' varied abilities and learning styles.

Lastly, it is recommended that future researchers conduct further studies that explore additional variables that may influence inclusive assessment readiness, such as teacher beliefs, instructional leadership, and availability of resources. Researchers may also replicate this study in different grade levels, subject areas, or divisions to validate the findings and expand the generalizability of the results. Moreover, future studies may employ mixed-methods or experimental designs to gain deeper insights into how assessment literacy can be effectively developed and applied in inclusive classrooms. Investigating intervention programs and professional development initiatives may also provide valuable evidence on best practices in improving both assessment literacy and inclusive assessment readiness.

REFERENCES

1. *Alonzo, D., Labad, V., Bejano, J., & Guerra, F. (2021). The policy-driven dimensions of teacher beliefs about assessment. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 46(3).*
2. *Andrade, H., & Brookhart, S. M. (2020). Classroom assessment as the co-regulation of learning. Routledge.*
3. *Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2019). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 26(6), 551–575.*
4. *Bloomfield, J., & Fisher, M. J. (2019). Quantitative research design. Journal of the Australasian Rehabilitation Nurses Association, 22(2), 27–30.*
5. *Bobbitt, Z. (2023). Slovin's formula: What is it and how to use it. Statology.*
6. *Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2020). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school (Expanded ed.). National Academy Press.*
7. *Brookhart, S. M. (2020). Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know (8th ed.). Pearson.*
8. *Christoforidou, M., & Kyriakides, L. (2021). The impact of school factors on teacher professional learning. Educational Research.*
9. *Cook-Sather, A. (2020). Student voice across contexts: Fostering student engagement. Educational Researcher, 49(3), 182–191.*
10. *Curtis, E. A., Comiskey, C., & Dempsey, O. (2019). Importance and use of correlational research. Nurse Researcher, 23(6), 20–25.*
11. *David, C. C., & Balarin, M. (2020). Assessment practices in Philippine basic education. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.*
12. *Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268.*
13. *DeLuca, C., LaPointe-McEwan, D., & Luhanga, U. (2019). Teacher assessment literacy: A review of international standards and measures. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 31(3), 1–24.*

14. *Department of Education. (2022). Basic education report. DepEd Philippines.*
15. *Emmer, E. T., & Sabornie, E. J. (2020). Handbook of classroom management (2nd ed.). Routledge.*
16. *Epstein, J. L. (2019). School, family, and community partnerships (3rd ed.). Routledge.*
17. *Florian, L. (2019). On the necessary co-existence of special and inclusive education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 23(7–8), 691–704.*
18. *Gay, G. (2020). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.*
19. *Gibson, S., Clarkson, N., & Scott, J. (2022). Inclusive assessment and student diversity in higher education. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 47(4), 543–557.*
20. *Harris, L. R., & Brown, G. T. L. (2019). Student self-assessment and peer assessment: The role of student voice. Educational Psychology Review, 31(2), 1–22.*
21. *Hattie, J. (2020). Visible learning: The sequel. Routledge.*
22. *Hull, P., & Vígh, T. (2025). Teachers' assessment literacy: A descriptive literature review. Hungarian Educational Research Journal, 15(2), 210–225.*
23. *Kumar, R. (2023). Sampling methods in research: A review. ResearchGate.*
24. *Ladson-Billings, G. (2021). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: a.k.a. the remix. Harvard Educational Review, 91(1), 1–27.*
25. *Malipot, M. H. (2021). Challenges in implementing inclusive education in the Philippines. Manila Bulletin.*
26. *Mercer, N., & Dawes, L. (2019). The value of exploratory talk. Educational Psychologist, 54(3), 1–15.*
27. *Merren, G. (2023). Sample size determination using Slovin's formula. Stat Study Hub.*
28. *Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). Universal design for learning: Theory and Practice. CAST Professional Publishing.*
29. *Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 74, 5–12.*
30. *Mueller, P. A., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2021). The effects of meaningful learning tasks on student engagement. Educational Psychology Review, 33(2), 1–15.*
31. *Oo, C. Z. (2022). Acquisition of teacher assessment literacy by pre-service teachers. Issues in Educational Research, 32(2).*
32. *Oracion, E. G., & Bagaoisan, T. E. (2022). Teachers' assessment practices and challenges in Philippine classrooms. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, 9(2), 45–52.*
33. *Panadero, E., Andrade, H., & Brookhart, S. (2019). Fostering self-regulated learning through formative assessment. Educational Psychologist, 54(4), 1–15.*
34. *Pastore, S. (2023). Teacher assessment literacy: A systematic review. Frontiers in Education, 7, 1217167.*
35. *Popham, W. J. (2020). Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know (8th ed.). Pearson.*
36. *Schildkamp, K., Poortman, C. L., & Handelzalts, A. (2020). Data-based decision making for school improvement: Research insights and gaps. Educational Research, 62(3), 257–273.*
37. *SEAMEO INNOTECH. (2021). Teacher professional development in Southeast Asia. SEAMEO Regional Center.*
38. *Sharma, U., Sokal, L., Wang, M., & Loreman, T. (2021). Measuring the use of inclusive practices among pre-service educators: A multi-national study. Teaching and Teacher Education, 107, 103506. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103506*
39. *Siedlecki, S. L. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. Clinical Nurse Specialist, 34(1), 8–12.*
40. *Tai, J., Ajjawi, R., & Umarova, A. (2021). Towards inclusive assessment in higher education. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 46(2), 1–14.*
41. *Tejada, J. J., & Punzalan, J. R. B. (2019). On the misuse of Slovin's formula. The Philippine Statistician, 68(1), 129–136.*
42. *Tomlinson, C. A. (2021). How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms (3rd ed.). ASCD.*
43. *UNESCO. (2020). Global education monitoring report: Inclusion and education. UNESCO Publishing.*
44. *Universities UK, & National Union of Students. (2019). Black, Asian and minority ethnic student attainment at UK universities: #Closingthegap. Universities UK.*
45. *Vangrieken, K., Dochy, F., Raes, E., & Kyndt, E. (2019). Teacher collaboration: A systematic review. Educational Research Review, 27, 17–40.*
46. *Volante, L., & Fazio, X. (2020). Exploring teacher candidates' assessment literacy. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 27(2), 1–18.*
47. *Walqui, A., & van Lier, L. (2020). Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners. WestEd.*
48. *Walsh, S. (2021). Classroom discourse and teacher development. Edinburgh University Press.*
49. *Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 32(2), 1–15.*
50. *Xu, Y., & Brown, G. T. L. (2019). Teacher assessment literacy in practice: A reconceptualization. Teaching and Teacher Education, 58, 149–162.*
51. *Yan, Z., & Pastore, S. (2022). Teacher assessment literacy: International trends and future directions. Frontiers in Education, 7, 1–10.*