
ASSESSMENT: FROM EXAM ORIENTATION TO CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE

Joseph Mifsud

From the perspective of the child educator, measuring the classroom performance of 'normally-achieving' students is relatively straight forward. Such students are fairly consistent in their classroom performance. Thus any estimate of classroom achievement is a reasonable approximation of what has been learnt to date. Furthermore, when faced with some form of classroom assessment, usually a written examination or 'test', the majority of normally-achieving students do not get upset or refuse to co-operate. Because they do not tend to have a lengthy history of negative experience with assessment, they do not have the need to overcome any resentment for tests. In addition, normally-achieving students typically do not have difficulty in reading or listening to instructions. Such students usually possess sufficient skills in order to:

- (a) prepare for most classroom tests - both psychologically and instructionally;
- (b) prepare for work within a framework of general test-time utilization plan, and
- (c) make sense of test items.

Students with learning difficulties often lack such test preparation and completion skills.

Obtaining valid measures of classroom performance is equally important for under-achieving pupils as it is for normally achieving students. Two main problems remain to be overcome before the abilities of all students can be assessed fairly and usefully. Firstly, much less is known and has been written about assessment in the classroom and the school than about assessment for public or national standardization purposes. This generates the second problem where philosophical perspectives regarding the curriculum, the learning process and the nature of the child, differ and thus vary in the way they interpret the information gathering of assessment procedures. Indeed the terms 'assessment' and 'evaluation' are frequently confused. Duncan and Dunn have attempted to give a working definition of each:

Assessment is the process of gathering information: by teachers about their pupils; by teachers about their teaching; and by pupils about their progress.¹

On the other hand, evaluation 'involves making judgements which can be based on the information provided by the processes of assessment'.² This subtle difference is echoed by Lloyd-Jones when he argues that

Assessment is an all-embracing term. It covers any of the situations in which some aspect of a pupil's education is, in some sense, measured, whether this measurement is [made] by a teacher, an examiner or indeed the pupil himself or herself. Broadly speaking, assessment is concerned with how well the pupil has done, evaluation with whether it [what has been done] was worth doing in the first place.³

The process of evaluating the learner's performance (whether labelled as 'normal' or as an 'under-achiever') is part and parcel of an ongoing evaluation. This is a formative kind of assessment that records the progress of the learner, indicates how his/her performance might be improved, and gives some direction regarding future efforts. Ongoing evaluation helps the teacher to

¹ DUNCAN, A. & DUNN, W., *What Primary Teachers Should Know About Assessment*, (Hodder & Stoughton, London 1988).

² *ibid.*, p.2.

³ LLOYD-JONES, E., 'An Overview of Assessment', in WRIGLEY, J. (ed.), *Assessment: From Principles to Action*, (Macmillan, London 1986), p.1.

give prompt feedback to the learner. This feedback usually coincides with a positive and constructive attitude towards the feedback provided. It varies the types of measurement used, offers opportunities for remediation, includes the learners in the evaluation process, limits subjective remarks and relates ongoing assessment directly to objectives and intended learning targets.

In considering the difference between 'evaluation' and 'assessment', one has to keep in mind that the British examination system, with its emphasis on summative assessment, was taken up lock, stock and barrel by the Maltese educational system and incorporated within its foundations and structure. With the introduction of the National Curriculum (5-16) in Britain and the National Minimum curriculum in Malta, each system has adopted assessment procedures to its requirements. Therefore attainment targets have been introduced in Britain which will provide standards against which pupils' progress and performance can be assessed. The main purpose of such assessment will be to show what a pupil has learnt and mastered and to enable teachers and parents to ensure that he or she is making adequate progress. Where such progress is not made, it will be up to the schools to make suitable arrangements to help the child ('normal' or under-achieving). The Department of Education and Science in the U.K. envisages that much of the assessment at ages seven, eleven, and fourteen, will be done by teachers as an integral part of normal classroom work. But at the head of the assessment process there will be nationally prescribed tests taken by all pupils to supplement the individual teachers' assessments. Teachers will be asked to administer and correct these, but their marking will be 'externally moderated'.

ASSESSMENT IN MALTA

In Malta, on the other hand, the national minimum curriculum's main concern is to define 'examinations'. We therefore find a section which argues that one must be careful so as not to let examinations instill in children the idea of storing a compendium of knowledge in their minds. Instead examinations must be utilized to assess how much the children have learnt and as a tool for the children to show their talents.

This type of 'assessment' is diametrically opposite to the principles of an ongoing evaluation. It fails to answer the basic question in assessing knowledge: why assess the acquisition of knowledge?

Assessment for formative purposes sets out to discover whether or not a child lacks knowledge or has in fact acquired the knowledge recently taught. Assessment must be limited, accurate, purposeful, preferably diagnostic, and must be tailored to suit a variety of types of learning experience.

When analysing the examination results of year six (ten year-old) students in Malta one realises that formative assessment procedures have been abandoned locally. In fact in the 1989 half-yearly examinations more than thirteen per cent of Maltese primary students, attending State Schools, were unable to score more than fifteen on a 100 point scale (See Appendix I at the end of paper). Larger schools on the Island had more than thirty-three per cent of their year six pupils failing to score significantly on the standardized tests. A survey was carried out by the author to review the techniques of assessment (ongoing or summative) being used in the Maltese Primary schools. Bearing in mind that the de-streaming process had only just started (in 1989), and that pupils were streamed on a formal end-of-year national 'assessment' produced by the Test Construction Unit, teachers were asked to put into an order of preference the assessment style which they tended to use most often in class. In all, eighty teachers from sixteen primary schools were interviewed. If we consider these teachers' preferred method of assessing children between the ages of eight and eleven, it becomes quite obvious that the use of 'published tests and inventories' (see Appendix II) is the most commonly used strategy in Malta.

Thus, informal assessment, with its innate advantage of observing children in natural situations rather than in those formally imposed by the assessment procedures, comes out as a loser. There is a strong case for developing this type of assessment for it maintains the spontaneity of the situation, while at the same time becoming more alert to the kinds of information which can arise from this type of activity. Informal assessment requires a programme where children are informally observed after which results are then noted down, so as to assist the building of a profile of each individual child. This information should then be

used to reflect the changing philosophy in the Primary school which places emphasis on meeting the individual (exceptional, normal or under-achieving) needs of the child. In Malta, we have shown no concern to use assessment as the 'vital pedagogic instrument in curriculum design and development',⁴ under the control of the teacher in the school, but rather assessment is used as an instrument to measure or encourage performance. Elliot declares that:

Although assessment patterns lower down the age range are internally and less formally administered, they nevertheless tend to reproduce similar characteristics; namely, an emphasis on judgments which have high definition and are objective, formally determined, numerically recorded and non-negotiable.⁵

The problem with end-of-course tests or examinations is that they usually create a self-fulfilling prophecy in the learner ("I am a failure, I do not know what this 'test' is about") and naturally effect the teacher's expectations ("This girl is a slow-learner so I can't expect much of her"). Such problems are especially prevalent in Malta because assessment is mainly used to allocate pupils to streams, 'bands' and schools. These allocations can create and reinforce differentiation and polarization. Authors such as Broadfoot and Angeli, have shown that this practice leads to the formation of two contrasting cultures within the school: it opens up the pathways to success for one group and closes them off for the other.⁶

Streaming seems to be the direct result of the formal assessment procedures which have been in use in our primary and secondary schools. Assessment is too often seen as information or data that is collected on a child in a vacuum. But the child is a complex

⁴ EVANS, A., 'Editorial', *Secondary Education*, (Longman, London 1977), p. 3.

⁵ ELLIOT, J., 'Teaching for Understanding and Teaching for Assessment', in EBBUT, D. & ELLIOT, J. (eds), *Issues in Teaching for Understanding*, (Longman for School Curriculum Development Committee, York 1985), pp. 116-117.

⁶ BROADFOOT, P.M., *Assessment, Schools and Society*, (Methuen, London 1979). ANGELI, F., *Riforma della Scuola: Ruolo e Compiti*, (Cisem, Milan 1983).

growing organism and assessment needs to be dynamic in order to be realistic. Assessment must be ongoing to understand how a child learns and is developing in an ever-changing 'classroom' environment. Hayes and Nelson suggest that a formative, reliable and valid assessment is one which becomes a systematic manipulation of the environment to observe the child's rate of progress in order to set up the most favourable learning conditions.⁷

AN ASSESSMENT MODEL

A model which has been gaining ground in assessment procedures and which respects the dynamic nature of the growing child is the one developed in 1986 by Bachor and Crealock.⁸ This is an instructional-based model in which the traditional way of information collection, assessment and evaluation is modified and extended. In this model assessment changes to a multifaceted process designed to reflect a continuum of strengths and weaknesses. The model being suggested is reliable in so far as it is immune to chance influences and seems to give consistent results in what it does measure. It occupies a position midway between norm-referenced assessment (which emphasises differences between individual children, putting pupils in an order of merit and thereby indicating relative levels of performance) and criterion-referenced testing (which places the emphasis on absolute levels of performance, that is, checking that what has been taught has indeed been learned. If pupils reach the 'standard' they are deemed satisfactory, and if they do not reach the standard then they are deemed unsatisfactory).

Blanchard explains that schools are more inclined to use one of the two assessment techniques mentioned above because of

⁷ NELSON, R.D. & HAYES, S.C.(eds), *Conceptual Foundations of Behavioural Assessment*, (Guilford Publications, New York 1986).

⁸ BACHOR, D. & CREALOCK, C., *Instructional Strategies for Students with Special Needs*, (Prentice Hall, Scarborough ON. 1986).

'widespread reliance on academic grades' where the 'tendency has been for teaching to be confined to what is ultimately tested'.⁹ In reality no one assessment technique will suffice. The application of all assessment techniques, regardless of validity (that is, they measure what they claim to measure), can never result in more than an estimate in a specific situation of what a child can actually achieve. Thus, to obtain a reasonable estimate of performance for any child, a number of ongoing assessment techniques such as interviewing, observing and testing must be employed that yield information about performance under a variety of conditions (such as when receiving instruction, when working independently, when involved in tasks which one enjoys doing, etc.).

Such procedures will generate information that will allow teachers to estimate the degree of difficulty experienced by any individual engaged in a particular task and to become sensitive to the needs of the individual students. In addition, as Dean, Mills and Simons & Elliot point out, a portion of the assessment data must be drawn from the child's own classroom.¹⁰

If assessments are to become less restricted and less dispiriting, and manage to reflect the genuine quality of pupils' all-round abilities, the co-operation of people close to the ordinary course of events will have to be enlisted.¹¹

The procedures of cumulative record analyses, comparative and continuous observation, and work sample analyses are quite appropriate for this purpose. Such procedures should also include interviewing the teachers involved and examining the effectiveness of the teaching modes used.

In applying the decision making model, Bachor and Crealock argue that the educator should start by examining the record of

⁹ BLANCHARD, J., 'Assessment, Curriculum Development and Teacher Training', *The New Era*, 1986, vol. 67, no. 3 (1986) p.19.

¹⁰ DEAN, J., *Organising Learning in the Primary School*, (Croom Helm, London 1983); MILLS, R., *Observing Children in the Primary Classroom*, (Unwin and Hyman, London 1988); SIMONS, H. & ELLIOT, J., *Rethinking Appraisal and Assessment*, (Open University Press, Milton Keynes, U.K. 1989).

¹¹ BLANCHARD, J., *op. cit.*, p.62.

students in class. They recommend classifying all available information in four categories: 'historical opinions, current opinions, historical measurements, current measurements'.¹² Recently, Bachor suggested that teachers should further classify the information in the cumulative files (available in all Maltese Primary schools) under 'crude' headings by describing the conditions under which the data were collected.¹³

In completing this task teachers are to describe what the assessor (educator) did (observe, test, teach) when presenting any assessment task and what the child was required to do in response (listen, write, read, copy, talk, make). In addition, any available information on how the student has been taught and what lesson materials have been used should be noted, especially if the utility of such methods and materials is commented on.

PROFILING

This type of profiling is both more ethical and more practical than the single form of assessment currently in use in Malta. The ethical argument is quite simple and needs do little more than appeal to our sense of justice. It is clear that examinations test - and teaching consequently recognizes - only a limited range of skills and excludes from consideration many of the talents that most children possess. It is clearly unjust to subject children to a process that does little more than implicitly or explicitly denigrate what virtues they do possess and arrange for the internalization of a sense of failure. Malta has lived for a long time with formal examinations and while there have been occasional spurts of resistance against them, they have generally been sustained because they are the most efficient and simple strategy for selecting and excluding students. The national, unified and uniform system of examination starting from mid-primary schooling has in fact always amounted to a language, a system of communication. The existence, and the dominance of the

¹² BACHOR, D. and CREALOCK, C., *op. cit.*

¹³ BACHOR, D., 'Effective Assessment And Instructional Planning for the Learning Disabled', Paper presented at the Manitoba Congress of the Council for Exceptional Children Conference, Winnipeg, M.B., 1989.

language of examinations creates and reinforces processes of educational division which then designs the experiences, educational and social, through which children are put. But it is an artificial, not a natural language. It is not generated by a natural community and consequently it does not represent the reality which the community experiences. Teachers are implicitly and increasingly recognizing this when they grumble about the way in which education is disrupted half-yearly and yearly by the necessity to fulfill examination requirements.

As indicated in the introduction to this article, when students with particular needs are given a classroom test they face a different set of conditions than do pupils who are normally achieving. Many of the currently applied classroom assessment procedures are in fact designed in 'such a way that the obtained data do not reflect the knowledge base of all students. Comparative observation is an alternative technique by which teachers can examine students' classroom performance in any subject matter in a more reliable and comprehensive manner. They do so by comparing the performance of the student or students in question to a stratified sample of other pupils in class. To be most useful this sample should be specific to one subject matter and should consist of two to four pupils who fall into three groupings: those performing near the 'top' of the class, those performing in the average range, and those having difficulty. Evaluation standards are then based on the amount of work completed in a given period and the quality of the completed tasks.¹⁴

This comparative evaluation may be accompanied by the keeping of a log-book. The purpose of keeping this log-book is to provide a descriptive summary of the student's activities in his/her classroom environment. Although the subject matter observed is not critical at this stage, the observation should include as wide a variety of activities as possible throughout the school day, while avoiding atypical events such as testing periods, and this to obtain

¹⁴ SATTLER, J., *Assessment of Children* 3e., (Sattler, San Diego, California 1988).

a complete representation of any student's general pattern of behaviour.¹⁵ This type of assessment profile may therefore:

1. start as a method of discovering those aspects of a child's school life which make successful traditional learning problematic. These include such aspects as social and background problems, motivation or disciplinary problems, etc.

2. move on to registering and assessing those aspects of individual learning and development which the 'traditional' curriculum has rendered redundant, or at least has labelled as non-significant. These would include personal development, social characteristics, skills previously given a low status or not considered at all.

3. in contrast to traditional teaching and exam-oriented assessment, provide feedback to the educator so that the latter may problematize and evaluate the appropriateness of the structured curriculum.

ASSESSMENT POLICY

These three objectives can be easily traced within the framework of the Maltese National Minimum Curriculum (1989). Item B5 declares that tests and examinations should not be allowed to train children in sheer memorisation and cramming of what they have been taught but rather, these ought to be used by the teacher as tests of understanding and by the children as an opportunity to show their talents.

It is interesting to note, however, that back in 1971, a letter circular issued by the Education Department¹⁶ had already provided a profile of the form of assessment which is being recommended today. The circular summarizes a discussion held

¹⁵ MORRISON, A., 'Formal and Informal Assessment in the Classroom', *Education in the North*, 1984.

¹⁶ Education Department, Circular no. 60, Education Department Malta, December 13th, 1971.

by Heads of Schools on the subject of assessment and the recording of progress of pupils and states:

Agreement was reached on the following points:

1. Assessment should be based on the pupils' progress in all school activities.
2. Assessment does not necessarily depend on formal written or practical tests.
3. Care should be taken not to replace the half-yearly and end-of-year examination by nine monthly tests.
4. As much as possible, teachers are to eliminate the use of formal written or practical tests in making their assessment.
5. Assessments are to be recorded on a 5 point basis - A,B,C,D,E.
6. Teachers are to record, in writing, the monthly grade for each child they teach. This grade is to be based on weekly or fortnightly assessment at the Headmaster's and the teacher's discretion.
7. The monthly grades are to be consolidated by the teachers at the end of January for the first half of the scholastic year and at the end of the scholastic year for the second half.
8. The half-yearly grades are to be recorded on the cumulative record card. This card is to be so devised that the carbon copy can be detached and sent to parents as a half-yearly progress report.
9. The progress reports are to reach the parents not later than the first week of January in the case of the half-year report and not later than two weeks after the end of the scholastic year in the case of the end-of-year report.

Despite these occasional forays into creative and educationally sound assessment procedures and policies, the formal assessment mode has prevailed right into the nineties, and Brown's description of what she terms the 'traditional' approach is strikingly relevant to our context:

The assessment itself usually was carried out in a formal atmosphere and under strictly controlled conditions. Not all of it was undertaken under the auspices of national examination boards, but schools and colleges tended to try to replicate the boards' strict examination conditions: a large hall with an invigilator, no 'cheating', examination 'papers', a fixed allocation of time for responding in writing to the

questions and the whole exercise undertaken at the end of something (a course, a term, a year or a school career).¹⁷

The policy adopted in Malta with regards to assessment has in fact been punctuated by sustained attempts to render schooling divisive. It aims to select, stratify, channel and exclude students. While in the seventies we find authors like Owens and Soule arguing that self-assessment based on a wide variety of cognitive and affective attributes is a means of combatting the

fragmentation of individuals caused by an increasing impersonal society and the human misery that our national obsession with examining, testing, grading, cataloguing, pigeon-holing, and stratifying brings in its train which, we have seen, schools tend to reinforce¹⁸

the concern in Malta has been different. In 1980 we in fact find the Department of Education suggesting:

Apropos to entrance examinations to secondary schools: in the event that entrance examinations to secondary schools are being contemplated - a step which would be deplorable - care should be taken that these examinations be 'eliminative' rather than selective in character. These examinations in other words, should be such as to eliminate those who are incapable of assimilating academic knowledge at secondary school level, either because of neuro-physiological reasons or because of strong resistance both on the part of the student and of his/her parents to academic education.¹⁹

FROM ASSESSMENT TO EVALUATION

The transition from an exam-oriented assessment strategy to what could be referred to as a descriptive performance assessment depends on the culture, values and beliefs of our society. If the belief is that education as it stands serves everybody equally well,

¹⁷ BROWN, S., 'Assessment: A Changing Practice', *Professional Issues in Education*, (Scottish Academic Press, 1989), p.2.

¹⁸ OWENS, G. & SOULE, L., 'The Individual Profile' *Forum*, no. 13, (1970).

¹⁹ Department of Education, 'Ways and Means of Improving Examinations in Secondary Schools', Committee Report, Department of Education, Malta, December 1980.

then it follows rather naturally that assessment is about selecting those who invest in schooling and excluding those who do not. Little attention is given or effort made to accept pupils on their own terms and to facilitate the development of their particular abilities.

Bachor might have come up with a model which could be applicable to the Maltese situation. He describes a procedure whereby students' daily classroom performance is used as the basis of assessment. This procedure has been revised to allow the regular classroom teacher to obtain a technically adequate sample of classroom performance that can be translated directly into teaching\learning objectives.²⁰ Specifically, the following four steps are suggested to complete work sample analysis when the purpose is the description of a single student or a small group of students:

1. Select three to five assignments completed over a period of two to six weeks. The skills or abilities to be observed must be repeated in some form in each selected assignment. For each assignment, list strengths (abilities or skills at or above grade or age level expectations), skills present (abilities or skills mastered by individual but not meeting grade or age level standards) and weaknesses (errors of omission or commission).

2. Look for common error patterns across all work sample analyses.

3. Compare observations of strengths, skills present, and weaknesses to expectations set for students (use curriculum guides or other locally established standards).

4. Using both common error patterns and expectations, prepare diagnostic test items to establish approximate boundaries of performance.²¹

A concluding assessment procedure within this model applicable both to primary and secondary schools would be the introduction of 'trial lessons'. The purpose would here be to evaluate whether

²⁰ BACHOR, D., 'Children's Work: A Basis for Diagnosis and Remediation'. Paper presented at the North Central Teachers' Association Conference, Edmonton, Alberta 1984.

²¹ BACHOR, D, 'Effective Assessment and Instructional Planning ...', op.cit.

any suggested teaching strategy or audio-visual material is likely to work well with a group of students. The criterion of success is whether the student can demonstrate mastery of the taught curriculum at the end of the teaching/learning period. This model provides some solutions to the complaints which the Test Construction Unit voiced in their 'Report On The Primary Schools' Annual Examinations - 1989':

We will not go into the merits or demerits of streaming here, but we do question the criterion presently employed for purposes of streaming pupils from one year to the next, which is based on the total of the raw marks obtained by a student in the five annual papers.²²

CONCLUSION

The position adopted in this article is that the assessment and teaching practices for all pupils must shift from a purely exam-oriented assessment tradition to an ecological one. This modification will take into account the synomorphy which is taking place in the classroom setting. Instead of relying on single measurements or time-bound testing, assessment portfolios that represent any child's classroom ecology are required. In building up such profiles, the emphasis will need to be on the diagnostic side. This diagnostic question could be put as follows: How does the assessment data being collected help to make curriculum decisions more effective? To answer this question, it was suggested that descriptive data that covers a span of time and contains both objective and subjective information is to be collected. Furthermore it was recommended that the collection of these assessment records will permit target attainment comparison. Finally, by using such a model the language which is spoken in assessment will represent a reality common to speaker (educator) and listener (pupil) in the nineties.

²² Department of Education, 'Report on the Primary Schools' Annual Examinations', Test Construction Unit, Department of Education, Malta 1989, p.10.

APPENDIX I

ANALYSIS OF EXAMINATION RESULTS (MAY - JUNE 1989)
YEAR 6 PRIMARIES MALTESE-ENGLISH-MATHEMATICS

Pupils scoring
between 0-15
in the Basic
Subjects
(MALTA)

| Pupils in Year 6 | Pupils failing to score 15 | Percentage | Failed to score 15 in | | | Absences in Examinations |
|------------------|----------------------------|------------|-----------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|
| | | | Maltese | English | Mathematics | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|----|-------|----|----|----|---|
| Attard | 24 | 3 | 12.50 | — | — | 3 | — |
| Bahrija | 21 | 2 | 9.52 | 1 | 1 | 2 | — |
| B'Kara 'B' | 228 | 12 | 5.26 | 6 | 11 | 5 | — |
| B'Buqa 'B' | 103 | 9 | 8.73 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 1 |
| Cospicua 'B' | 126 | 12 | 9.52 | 6 | 6 | 8 | — |
| Dingli | 39 | 1 | 2.56 | — | — | 1 | — |
| Fgura 'B' | 126 | 19 | 15.07 | 3 | 18 | 13 | — |
| Floriana | 31 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Gharghur | 23 | 3 | 13.04 | 3 | 3 | 3 | — |
| Ghaxaq | 52 | 3 | 5.76 | 3 | 1 | — | — |
| Gudja | 32 | 3 | 9.37 | 1 | 3 | 2 | — |
| Gzira 'B' | 63 | 10 | 15.87 | 1 | 6 | 5 | — |
| Hamrun (GP) 'B' | 126 | 10 | 7.93 | — | 10 | — | — |
| Hamrun (SS) 'B' | 65 | 6 | 9.23 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Kalkara | 39 | 8 | 20.51 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Kirkop | 23 | 8 | 34.78 | 6 | 6 | 2 | — |
| Lija | 55 | 6 | 10.90 | 4 | 3 | 5 | — |
| Luqa | 73 | 7 | 9.58 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| Marsa 'B' | 104 | 19 | 18.26 | 10 | 17 | 7 | — |
| M'Scala | 22 | 4 | 18.18 | 4 | 4 | 3 | — |
| Mellieha | 70 | 10 | 14.28 | 5 | 9 | 8 | — |
| M'Xiock | 37 | 7 | 18.91 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Mgarr | 33 | 2 | 6.06 | 2 | 2 | 2 | — |
| Mosta 'B' | 159 | 22 | 13.83 | 11 | 17 | 17 | 1 |
| Mqabba | 32 | 4 | 12.50 | 2 | 2 | 4 | — |

**Pupils scoring
between 0-15
in the Basic
Subjects
(MALTA cont.)**

| | Pupils in Year 6 | Pupils failing to score 15 | Percentage | Failed to score 15 in | | | Absences in Examinations |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------------|-----------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | Maltese | English | Mathematics | |
| Msida | 74 | 14 | 18.91 | 2 | 7 | 1 | — |
| Naxxar | 65 | 11 | 16.92 | 3 | 9 | 4 | — |
| Paola 'B' | 202 | 19 | 9.40 | 7 | 10 | 17 | — |
| Pietà | 39 | 6 | 15.38 | 2 | 6 | 4 | — |
| Qormi (St George) 'B' | 131 | 3 | 2.29 | 2 | 2 | 1 | — |
| Qormi (St Sebastian) 'B' | 118 | 29 | 24.57 | 5 | 12 | 25 | — |
| Qrendi | 31 | 7 | 22.58 | 4 | 3 | 4 | — |
| Rabat 'B' | 129 | 18 | 13.95 | 3 | 13 | 11 | — |
| Safi | 21 | 7 | 33.33 | 2 | 3 | 4 | — |
| San Gwann 'B' | 91 | 12 | 13.80 | 7 | 11 | 4 | — |
| Senglea | 75 | 15 | 20.00 | 5 | 8 | 13 | — |
| Siggiewi | 70 | 12 | 17.14 | 9 | 12 | 4 | — |
| Sliema | 73 | 10 | 13.69 | 7 | 10 | 7 | — |
| St Julians | 96 | 2 | 2.08 | — | — | 2 | — |
| St Paul's Bay | 46 | 1 | 2.17 | 1 | 1 | 1 | — |
| St Venera 'B' | 113 | 25 | 22.12 | 3 | 14 | 22 | — |
| Tarxien 'B' | 93 | 12 | 12.90 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 1 |
| Valletta 'B' | 75 | 16 | 21.33 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 2 |
| Vittoriosa | 40 | 6 | 15.00 | 3 | 5 | 3 | — |
| Zabbar 'B' | 219 | 60 | 27.39 | 20 | 56 | 24 | 6 |
| Zebbug 'B' | 155 | 20 | 12.90 | 15 | 19 | 17 | 1 |
| Zejtun 'B' | 207 | 27 | 13.04 | 14 | 21 | 17 | — |
| Zurrieq 'B' | 163 | 11 | 6.74 | 10 | 11 | 7 | — |

**Pupils scoring
between 0-15
in the Basic
Subjects
(GOZO)**

| | Pupils in Year 6 | Pupils failing to score 15 | Percentage | Failed to score 15 in | | | Absences in Examinations |
|-------------|------------------|----------------------------|------------|-----------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | Maltese | English | Mathematics | |
| Ghajnsielem | 25 | 4 | 16.00 | 1 | 1 | 3 | — |
| Gharb | 21 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Kercem | 17 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| Nadur | 38 | 7 | 18.42 | 7 | 6 | 6 | — |
| Qala | 17 | 2 | 11.76 | 1 | 1 | 2 | — |
| Sannat | 25 | 5 | 20.00 | 3 | 3 | 3 | — |
| Victoria | 74 | 5 | 6.75 | 5 | 5 | 5 | — |
| Xaghra | 48 | 6 | 12.50 | 5 | 4 | 6 | — |
| Xewkija | 35 | 7 | 20.00 | 3 | 2 | 7 | — |
| Zebbug | 13 | 3 | 23.00 | — | — | 3 | — |

MALTA

TOTAL YEAR 6 4331
 FAILURES (15th PERCENTILE) 578
 PERCENTAGE 13.34

GOZO

TOTAL YEAR 6 313
 FAILURES (15th PERCENTILE) 39
 PERCENTAGE 12.46

APPENDIX II

PREFERRED ASSESMENT TECHNIQUES IN MALTESE
PRIMARY SCHOOLS

| | | % |
|--------------------------------------------------|----|-------|
| Published tests and inventories | 34 | 42.5 |
| Informal assessment | 3 | 3.75 |
| Structured observation | 3 | 3.75 |
| Extended writing | 7 | 8.75 |
| Answering direct questions | 6 | 7.5 |
| Sentence completion | 13 | 16.25 |
| Multiple choice questions and Matching questions | 9 | 11.25 |
| Other | 5 | 6.25 |