

Decision on submission to Teaching and Teacher Education

From: Teaching and Teacher Education (em@editorialmanager.com)

To: arsyad.arafii@ikipmataram.ac.id

Date: Thursday, July 23, 2020, 12:35 PM GMT+8

Manuscript Number: TATE_2020_529

TEACHERS' CONCEPTIONS OF VALUES AND DIMENSIONS OF ASSESSMENT PRACTICE: THE EFFECT OF TEACHERS' CHARACTERISTICS

Dear Mr Arrafii,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Teaching and Teacher Education.

We have completed the evaluation of your manuscript. The reviewers recommend reconsideration of your manuscript following major revision. We invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing the comments below. Please resubmit your revised manuscript by Oct 21, 2020.

When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. Also, please make sure you check overall cohesion and coherence of manuscript once you have revised it. Please note that your revised submission may need to be re-reviewed. Although we will try to maintain all original reviewers, should any be unavailable new reviewers will be sought. Please note that this does not guarantee publication of the manuscript.

To submit your revised manuscript, please log in as an author at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/tate/>, and navigate to the "Submissions Needing Revision" folder.

Teaching and Teacher Education values your contribution and I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,
Jan Gray
Executive Editor
Teaching and Teacher Education

Editor and Reviewer comments:

Reviewer #1: This is a solid empirical paper on teachers' assessment practices and values underlying them. The paper has enough theoretical studies, relevant methodology used and interesting findings that are discussed. However, the implications to international teacher education and teaching could be addressed more. There are some references used that are not in the list of references. The whole paper should be checked carefully.

Reviewer #2: Dear Author(s)

Thank you for the opportunity to read your article. This paper offers insights into what an important area of teacher practice from an under-researched context. I hope the following advice on strengthening your paper is helpful. I attach an annotated version of the paper with tracked change suggestions to help with the technical aspects of the grammar of the text from a native English speaker. I am always deeply humbled by multi-lingual academic colleagues like yourself so offer this with respect to the level of communication of the paper submitted. This is only on the grammatical side, as punctuation, style, cohesion and coherence are generally sound. In general the paper is well argued and logically organised. However, at some points in the paper there needs to be clearer warrant provided. For example when the authors talk about 'initial appraisal of K13' (last para of page 2) it is not clear whether this is informally by the authors or whether there is any published

analysis or media commentary to support the claim. Similarly when 'research indicated...' (penultimate para of page 3) is claimed no research is cited and when international evidence is cited (p9) it is not clear from which contexts evidence comes.

Abstract and title

In the abstract a reader would need information about the study in terms of the evidence base for the claims. This means that a summary of the research designs and methods should be included after sentence 2. I also suggest that the Indonesian context be mentioned in both the title and abstract.

Introductory section

The introductory section includes strong arguments for the development of thinking about assessment in relation to different learning theories. This draws on international, seminal thinking and is relevant as background to the focus of the paper. However, it is recommended that this argument is linked more closely to the Indonesian context in which the study was carried out. For example, when the move from behaviourist to constructivist approaches is mentioned as being promoted, a reader would need to know who was promoting this and how this reached the Indonesian educational context. This could include reference to reports, policies or initiatives as well as academic literature. This would be new knowledge the authors could contribute to the readership. So to, for readers to know when socio-culturalist thinking started to influence thinking in Indonesia. It would also be useful to know whether there were any constructivist and socio-cultural led practices already in existence pre K13 to help understand how big a shift for teachers the K13 reform was. There was good symmetry between the beginning and the concluding parts of the paper as key ideas were returned to.

Literature review

Although the lines of argument are clear, this section of the paper could be precised. The main lines of argument have been covered by other authors and there is substantial use of verbatim quotes which could be paraphrased. To help justify what is included in this section of the paper it is important for a reader to find out how the ideas are relevant to the study's context and the teachers' whose perceptions are examined. How do the ideas cover relate to the roles of formative and summative assessment, how assessment is viewed as a process as well as a product ... preK13 in Indonesia? This might involve referring to local reports/policies. This contextualisation would be important to help set the scene for the findings proposed by Warwick et al's study (p3). This section of the paper includes clear statements on where there are gaps in the literature to help justify the paper's focus. Some key factors which the study took into consideration are also set up well, which led logically to the research questions (p5), although before this in some places it would help to know where the studies referred to have been conducted to indicate how relevant they might be to the Indonesian context. In particular it is important to note that the ALIC study on which the research design is based included the Indonesia context (Warwick et al, 2015).

Research design/Method section

It is important to note that the ALIC study and its questionnaire have already been used in Indonesia. How does your study compare with the ALIC study as there is a danger that the study might appear to be a repeat of the ALIC study and it is important to make clear the contribution of this paper? (There are clear findings which are discussed as identifying new findings later in the paper, but not particularly in relation to the ALIC study). Whilst the sampling and recruitment procedure is clear, there is no mention of how participants were invited to participate voluntarily? Were there any ethical clearances which were needed prior to approaching the participants? There was confidence shown in the data analysis and transparency of how data was prepared and handled for analysis, which was shown throughout the results section. The limitations section was useful to show reflexivity on the research design had been considered.

Results section

The findings section was logically discussed and interpretations offered, comparing data with other studies. However, there could have been a finer grained comparison with perspectives within the ALIC study, in particular the Indonesian data from this 2015 study and greater reference to where some of the studies cited were carried out. ALIC teachers/respondents were often discussed (for example three times on p7 and again at several points on p9) as if they were a homogenous group, even though they covered Indonesian, Argentinian, Indian, Nigerian and Saudi Arabian settings. There were one or two points which could be made clearer for the reader, and some suggestions as to where are indicated on the attached annotated version of the paper, for example page 8. In terms of structure, I suggest that the discussion of values and practices in the results section could be subdivided more clearly with subheadings. A consistent term or clarification about terms is recommended for commentary feedback, comment-only feedback and comment feedback. This would need to distinguish as to whether comments are given on feedback with marks or alone, which is a significant difference in AfL practice. There are some interesting findings, particularly p10-12, and these sections move towards implications.

An ethical issue was raised for me on p12. I feel uncomfortable about the Jazardi quote being given so much prominence and wondered whether summarizing the issue would be fairer to the central office, given they are named and identified in this point.

Concluding sections

I suggest you stick to the values-practice language of the ALIC study and questionnaire used in the title of the concluding section (p13). This section is well written and brings the paper together well. There are some comments added to the limitations and conclusion sections, on the technical side.

Data in Brief (optional):

We invite you to convert your supplementary data (or a part of it) into an additional journal publication in Data in Brief, a multi-disciplinary open access journal. Data in Brief articles are a fantastic way to describe supplementary data and associated metadata, or full raw datasets deposited in an external repository, which are otherwise unnoticed. A Data in Brief article (which will be reviewed, formatted, indexed, and given a DOI) will make your data easier to find, reproduce, and cite.

You can submit to Data in Brief when you upload your revised manuscript. To do so, complete the template and follow the co-submission instructions found here: www.elsevier.com/dib-template. If your manuscript is accepted, your Data in Brief submission will automatically be transferred to Data in Brief for editorial review and publication.

Please note: an open access Article Publication Charge (APC) is payable by the author or research funder to cover the costs associated with publication in Data in Brief and ensure your data article is immediately and permanently free to access by all. For the current APC see: www.elsevier.com/journals/data-in-brief/2352-3409/open-access-journal

Please contact the Data in Brief editorial office at dib-me@elsevier.com or visit the Data in Brief homepage (www.journals.elsevier.com/data-in-brief/) if you have questions or need further information.

MethodsX (optional)

We invite you to submit a method article alongside your research article. This is an opportunity to get full credit for the time and money spent on developing research methods, and to increase the visibility and impact of your work. If your research article is accepted, we will contact you with instructions on the submission process for your method article to MethodsX. On receipt at MethodsX it will be editorially reviewed and, upon acceptance, published as a separate method article. Your articles will be linked on ScienceDirect.

Please prepare your paper using the MethodsX Guide for Authors: <https://www.elsevier.com/journals/methodsx/2215-0161/guide-for-authors> (and template available here: <https://www.elsevier.com/MethodsX-template>) Open access fees apply.

More information and support

FAQ: How do I revise my submission in Editorial Manager?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28463/supporthub/publishing/

You will find information relevant for you as an author on Elsevier's Author Hub: <https://www.elsevier.com/authors>

FAQ: How can I reset a forgotten password?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28452/supporthub/publishing/

For further assistance, please visit our customer service site:

<https://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing/>

Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about Editorial Manager via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/7 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/tate/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.



Manuscript (without author details) with reviewer comments June 2020.docx
82kB

Decision on submission to Teaching and Teacher Education

From: Teaching and Teacher Education (em@editorialmanager.com)

To: arsyad.arafii@ikipmataram.ac.id

Date: Wednesday, October 7, 2020, 06:47 PM GMT+8

Manuscript Number: TATE_2020_529R1

INDONESIAN TEACHERS' CONCEPTIONS OF VALUES AND DIMENSIONS OF ASSESSMENT PRACTICE: THE EFFECT OF TEACHERS' CHARACTERISTICS

Dear Mr Arrafii,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Teaching and Teacher Education.

We have completed the evaluation of your manuscript. The reviewers recommend reconsideration of your manuscript following revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing the comments below. Please resubmit your revised manuscript by Jan 05, 2021.

When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline in a cover letter every change made in response to their comments and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. Also, please make sure you check overall cohesion and coherence of manuscript once you have revised it. Please note that your revised submission may need to be re-reviewed. Although we will try to maintain all original reviewers, should any be unavailable new reviewers will be sought. Please note that this does not guarantee publication of the manuscript.

To submit your revised manuscript, please log in as an author at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/tate/>, and navigate to the "Submissions Needing Revision" folder under the Author Main Menu.

Teaching and Teacher Education values your contribution and I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,
Jan Gray
Executive Editor
Teaching and Teacher Education

Editor and Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer #2: Dear Author(s)

Thank you for considering all of the reviewers' feedback and offering a comprehensive and thoughtful response to each point raised. The revisions you have made strengthen the contribution of this paper by providing greater clarity, locating it more clearly in wider literature and offering greater criticality in its lines of argument. This paper has been strengthened in response to the reviewers' feedback and now makes a stronger contribution making clear that it is from an under-researched context and helping readers to understand how it adds to evidence for local and international relevance. It has now been made much clearer how this paper adds to the knowledge gained from the ALIC study, which generated data in Indonesia using the same survey instrument. There are some interesting findings, particularly p10-12, and these sections move towards implications, so making some clear contributions. The Figures and Tables are vital to an understanding of the paper and support the discussions well.

Introduction

The abstract has now included information about the research design and the title and the abstract make clear the research context. The introductory section includes strong arguments for the development of thinking about assessment in relation to different learning theories. This draws on international, seminal thinking and is relevant as background to the focus of the paper. There is now more information for a reader about relevant aspects of the Indonesian educational

context in which the study was carried out, for example a critical reflection on the development of curricular and pedagogical reform. It was good to see that readers now have more support for this analysis, and new references (including some very recent ones) have been added to both this and the subsequent literature review sections.

There is one sentence of the original which would benefit from a review grammatically:

'Rather, no mean of the K13 implementation other than through the top-down mandate is promoted.' (p1). This might read:

'Rather, no means to implement the K13 curriculum, other than through the top-down mandate, is offered.'

Literature review

To improve the balance of the paper, it is clear that the literature review has been edited down and less prominence given to verbatim quotes, the points made by these key authors now having been paraphrased and included in more critical lines of argument. The context and analysis of curricular and pedagogical change started in the introduction is developed strongly through this literature review section, drawing on some contemporary publications to support the claims made about the contradictions between pedagogical principles and assessment practices; assessment as process and as product. It is now much clearer as to which references are more directly relevant to your Indonesian context and the additions made throughout this section have helped in this respect. This section of the paper includes clear statements on where there are gaps in the literature to help justify the paper's focus. The additional text on p5 supports this. Some of the key factors which the study took into consideration are also set up well, which lead logically to the research questions (p5).

I suggest that 'stick on' (p2) is replaced with 'focus on'.

I suggest a small rewording of the following sentence (p3) with 'the' becoming 'a' and 'is' becoming 'being' to read as follows:

'Given such emphasis, the K13 reform may be viewed as a reinforced and enriched version of the 2004 curriculum with an explicit mention of peer and self-assessment as a strong feature of the reform, despite the utilization of these strategies being prescribed only for assessment of the social and behavioural aspects of learning' (MoE, 2017).

Research design/Method section

There is a much clearer explanation of how the study reported in this paper extends evidence collected in the earlier ALIC study, particularly on p6 but also in the results section following, making clearer the contribution of this paper. The sampling and recruitment procedure is clear and there is now information about ethical clearances gained prior to approaching the participants. I am glad that you were happy to consider the ethical issue raised on p12 and, in response, have removed the Jazardi quote. I think this reduces the potential for reputational critique to cause harm to the central office, given that they were named and identified in the original quotation. The limitations section was useful and shows your reflexivity about the research design and evidence collected.

Results section

The paper is well argued and logically organised. In this revision there is also a clearer warrant provided for claims. There was confidence shown in the data analysis and transparency of how data was prepared and handled for analysis. The findings section was logically discussed and interpretations offered, comparing data more explicitly with other studies. This now includes a much stronger finer-grained comparison with evidence from the ALIC study, in particular.

Concluding sections

There is a useful new paragraph included (p15) which extends ideas about the implications of the paper, with reference to key findings. The paper is accessible and relevant to an international audience and clearly written, other than grammatical issues, which have been addressed in this revised version and there is increased clarity and consistency regarding terminology. A few minor grammatical amends are recommended above regarding new additions.

Reviewer #3: I find this a very interesting and relevant article. Discussion about teacher perspectives on assessment and the connections to their practice is of utmost importance in considering how we, as teacher educators, move forward with professional learning about assessment. The beginning of the manuscript clearly sets up the study and provides motivation for the study. The study makes connections to a previous study, ALIC, but extends the results to provide more specificity and more extensive data.

There are a few substantive issues that should be cleared up.

* I find the sentence regarding product vs process (p. 4) to be somewhat awkward and I do not really see much follow up with this idea so I am confused with why that was brought in.

* There seems to be a distinction made between formative and summative assessment, yet it is how an assessment is used that makes it formative or summative. The assessment itself does not stand alone as formative or summative.

* In the results section, there seemed to be a greater level of detail with respect to values than with respect to practices. I think that in the section on teacher practices, more detail about specific teacher practices would be helpful rather than making the reader flip to the appendix to get the detail. At this point, as a reader, I wanted to know more.

* The authors make an argument that age is different than experience yet there is a statement that those who are younger seem to be more accepting of using progressive assessment practices and this could be because they are closer to being in a teacher training program. I would think that would be more connected to experience than age. I'm not sure that the case for age being a factor is a strong one.

There are also several grammatical errors, typos, or unclear sentences that could be addressed. One common error is in the use of "the" and other articles, and in the use of et al. A closer edit would be useful. There are also a few sentences that could use more clarity. One example is a very long sentence towards the top of page 16. On p. 5, 'Assessment for Learning in International Context (ALIC)' the word "Context" should be "Contexts".

Data in Brief (optional):

We invite you to convert your supplementary data (or a part of it) into an additional journal publication in Data in Brief, a multi-disciplinary open access journal. Data in Brief articles are a fantastic way to describe supplementary data and associated metadata, or full raw datasets deposited in an external repository, which are otherwise unnoticed. A Data in Brief article (which will be reviewed, formatted, indexed, and given a DOI) will make your data easier to find, reproduce, and cite.

You can submit to Data in Brief when you upload your revised manuscript. To do so, complete the template and follow the co-submission instructions found here: www.elsevier.com/dib-template. If your manuscript is accepted, your Data in Brief submission will automatically be transferred to Data in Brief for editorial review and publication.

Please note: an open access Article Publication Charge (APC) is payable by the author or research funder to cover the costs associated with publication in Data in Brief and ensure your data article is immediately and permanently free to access by all. For the current APC see: www.elsevier.com/journals/data-in-brief/2352-3409/open-access-journal

Please contact the Data in Brief editorial office at dib-me@elsevier.com or visit the Data in Brief homepage (www.journals.elsevier.com/data-in-brief/) if you have questions or need further information.

MethodsX (optional)

We invite you to submit a method article alongside your research article. This is an opportunity to get full credit for the time and money spent on developing research methods, and to increase the visibility and impact of your work. If your research article is accepted, we will contact you with instructions on the submission process for your method article to MethodsX. On receipt at MethodsX it will be editorially reviewed and, upon acceptance, published as a separate method article. Your articles will be linked on ScienceDirect.

Please prepare your paper using the MethodsX Guide for Authors: <https://www.elsevier.com/journals/methodsx/2215-0161/guide-for-authors> (and template available here: <https://www.elsevier.com/MethodsX-template>) Open access fees apply.

More information and support

FAQ: How do I revise my submission in Editorial Manager?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28463/supporthub/publishing/

You will find information relevant for you as an author on Elsevier's Author Hub: <https://www.elsevier.com/authors>

FAQ: How can I reset a forgotten password?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28452/supporthub/publishing/

For further assistance, please visit our customer service site:

<https://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing/>

Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about Editorial Manager via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/7 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/tate/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Decision on submission to Teaching and Teacher Education

From: Teaching and Teacher Education (em@editorialmanager.com)

To: arsyad.arafii@ikipmataram.ac.id

Date: Monday, November 9, 2020, 02:10 PM GMT+8

Manuscript Number: TATE_2020_529R3

INDONESIAN TEACHERS' CONCEPTIONS OF VALUES AND DIMENSIONS OF ASSESSMENT PRACTICES: THE EFFECT OF TEACHERS' CHARACTERISTICS

Dear Mr Arrafii,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Teaching and Teacher Education.

The editorial team is pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication. Please find any reviewer and/or editorial team comments below.

Your accepted manuscript will now be transferred to our production department. We will create a proof which you will be asked to check, and you will also be asked to complete a number of online forms required for publication. If we need additional information from you during the production process, we will contact you directly.

The editorial team kindly reminds you that you (and your possible co-authors) are the only persons who will be proofing your article before publication. We appreciate your attention to this important matter. It is during the proofing process that you will also replace any references that were removed for masked/blind review to your article. Please do not forget to add such information within the text and in your references before approving your final proofing.

We also kindly ask that you and your co-authors register as reviewers for Teaching and Teacher Education through the Editorial Manager System. We appreciate authors and co-authors sharing their expertise by reviewing articles for Teaching and Teacher Education.

We appreciate your manuscript submission to Teaching and Teacher Education and hope you will consider us again for future submissions.

Yours sincerely,
Jan Gray
Executive Editor
Teaching and Teacher Education

Editor and Reviewer comments:

More information and support

FAQ: When and how will I receive the proofs of my article?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/6007/p/10592/supporthub/publishing/related/

You will find information relevant for you as an author on Elsevier's Author Hub: <https://www.elsevier.com/authors>

FAQ: How can I reset a forgotten password?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28452/supporthub/publishing/