

ความสอดคล้องกันระหว่างข้อสอบโอเน็ตวิชาภาษาอังกฤษชั้น
ประถมศึกษาปีที่ 6 กับแผนผังข้อสอบ*
THE ALIGNMENT BETWEEN THE O-NET ITEMS (ENGLISH SUBJECT)
FOR GRADE 6 STUDENTS WITH THE TEST BLUEPRINT

ชญานิ์ บุญทา

Chayanee Boonta

สุพัฒน์ กู้เกียรติกุล

Supath Kookiatkul

วชิราภรณ์ กิจพูนผล

Wachiraporn Kijpoonphol

วริยาภรณ์ เตียวเจริญ

Wariyaporn Tieocharoen

มหาวิทยาลัยอุบลราชธานี

Ubon Ratchathani University, Thailand

Email: Wachiraporn.k@ubu.ac.th

บทคัดย่อ

ข้อสอบโอเน็ตสร้างขึ้นสำหรับนักเรียนประถมศึกษาปีที่ 6 มัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 3 และมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 6 ประกอบด้วยวิชาหลักจำนวน 4 วิชา คะแนนการสอบโอเน็ตมีค่าร้อยละ 20 ของเกรดแต่ละวิชาที่สอบ ดังนั้น เพื่อเตรียมนักเรียนให้ทำคะแนนสอบโอเน็ตได้สูง ครูบางท่านได้ประยุกต์ใช้แผนผังข้อสอบที่ประกอบด้วยมาตรฐานและตัวชี้วัดของข้อสอบโอเน็ต และสร้างแผนการจัดการเรียนรู้ของตน วัตถุประสงค์ในการศึกษาค้นคว้าครั้งนี้ เพื่อพิสูจน์ว่าแผนผังข้อสอบเป็นแนวทางที่ดีสำหรับครู ในการเตรียมนักเรียนสำหรับการสอบโอเน็ตวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ แทนการใช้หลักสูตรแกนกลางที่เป็นเครื่องมือตามปกติ การศึกษานี้แสดงให้เห็นว่า ข้อสอบกับแผนผังข้อสอบมีความสอดคล้องกันอย่างไร นอกจากนี้ยังแสดงให้เห็นถึงความถี่ของตัวชี้วัดแต่ละตัวที่ปรากฏในข้อสอบโอเน็ต ตัวอย่างที่ใช้ในการศึกษาค้นคว้าครั้งนี้คือ ข้อสอบโอเน็ตวิชาภาษาอังกฤษปีการศึกษา 2560 และ 2561 เครื่องมือที่ใช้ได้แก่ ตารางจับคู่ มีการแบ่งข้อมูลออกเป็นสองส่วน ส่วนแรกคือ ข้อมูลที่รวบรวมจากการสำรวจความสอดคล้องกันระหว่างข้อสอบและแผนผังข้อสอบโดยใช้วิธีการหาความสอดคล้องระหว่างหลักสูตรและข้อสอบ ส่วนที่สองคือ

* Received: 2 April 2021; Revised: 5 May 2021; Accepted: 7 June 2021



เกี่ยวข้องกับข้อมูลเชิงปริมาณเพื่อค้นหาตัวชี้วัดที่พบบ่อยที่สุดในข้อสอบ โดยใช้วิธีการทางสถิติ ผลการศึกษาแสดงให้เห็นว่า ข้อสอบโอเน็ตและแผนผังข้อสอบแต่ละข้อสอบสอดคล้องกันอย่างไรบ้าง และตัวชี้วัดที่พบบ่อยที่สุดในข้อสอบโอเน็ต คือ สารที่ 1 มาตรฐาน ต 1.1 ตัวชี้วัด ป.6/4 (บอกใจความสำคัญและตอบคำถามจากการฟัง และการอ่านบทสนทนา นิทานง่าย ๆ และเรื่องเล่า) และตัวชี้วัดที่พบน้อยที่สุด คือ สารที่ 1 มาตรฐาน ต 1.2 ตัวชี้วัด ป.6/2 (ใช้คำสั่ง คำขอร้อง คำขออนุญาต และให้คำแนะนำ)

คำสำคัญ : ข้อสอบโอเน็ต, วิชาภาษาอังกฤษ, นักเรียนชั้นประถมศึกษาปีที่ 6, แผนผังข้อสอบ, ความสอดคล้อง

Abstract

The O-NET which have been built for students in Grade 6, 9 and 12 contained four major subjects. The O-NET score is worth 20% of the final grade of each subject. Therefore, to prepare students to gain high scores in the O-NET tests, some teachers have applied a test blueprint which contains standards and indicators of the O-NET, and created their lesson plans. The aim of this study was to prove that the test blueprint was a good guide for teachers to prepare students for the O-NET (English Subject) instead of using the more Basic Core Curriculum. This study showed how the O-NET test items align with the test blueprint. Moreover, it revealed the frequency of each indicator according to the test blueprint appearing in the O-NET tests. The samples used in this study were 2017 and 2018 O-NET (English Subject). A matching sheet was used as a research tool. The data was divided into two parts. The first part was collected from an investigation of the alignment between the test items and the test blueprint using a test-curriculum alignment method. The second part involved using quantitative data to find the most popular indicator appearing in the tests by using a statistical method. The results demonstrated how the O-NET tests align with the test blueprint item by item and the most frequent indicator appearing in the O-NET tests was F1.1: Gr 6/4 (tell the main idea and answer questions from listening to and reading dialogues, simple tales and stories) while the least frequent was F1.2: Gr 6/2 (use order/ requests to give instructions).

Keywords: O-NET Items, English Subject, Grade 6 students, Test Blueprint, Alignment



Introduction

In Thailand, apart from testing in school, there are national tests. The organization which is responsible for measurement and evaluation at the national level is the National Institution of Educational Testing Service (NIETS). It is assigned to develop national tests, for example, O-NET for grades 6, 9, and 12, GAT (General Aptitude Test), PAT (Professional and Academic Aptitude Test), and 9 subjects. These nation tests play the role to reflect students, teachers, schools and policymakers. The most popular tests were the O-NET tests which contained five subjects (i.e. Thai, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies and English). They were designed based on the framework of the 2008 Basic Education Core Curriculum (Nipakornkitti & Adunyarittigun, 2018). The test blueprint was a short version of the Basic Core Education Curriculum and was built for the first time in 2016. It had only essential standards and indicators for the O- NET tests. Preparing or training students before the test was a serious concern for school administrators and teachers. Some of them adopted test blueprint to create their lesson plans. For example, Burachat (2018) established educational tools with lesson plan related to the indicators in the test blueprint for her students and the results of the O-NET tests of students were higher. Interestingly, after the test blueprint was built, the national mean scores of English O-NET tests in grade 6 were getting higher.

Testing

Testing can assess what students have learned after the completion of a lesson or unit. It can be described as “washback” for learning process, student performance in learning, and the test itself. Teachers can look back at the ways they teach or manage the class whether it is appropriate for their students. According to Brown (2004), tests are a part of assessment to measure the ability, knowledge, or performance in given domain of a person. The test must be explicit and structured to be qualified as a test, for example, multiple choice questions need to have correct answers, writing tests need to have scoring rubric, or an oral interview relies on a question script.



O-NET Tests for the English Subject

1. Curriculum domains

For English language, it contains four domains prescribed in the 2008 Basic Education Core Curriculum.

The first is Language for Communication (F1). It emphasizes on the use of foreign languages for listening, speaking, reading and writing, exchanging data and information, expressing feelings and opinions, interpreting, presenting data, concepts and views on various matters, and creating interpersonal relationships appropriately.

The second is Language and Culture (F2). Its emphasis is on the use of foreign languages harmonious with culture of native speakers; relationships, similarities and differences between languages and cultures of native speakers; and languages and cultures of native speakers and Thai culture; and appropriate application.

The third is Language and Relationship with Other Learning Areas (F3). It portrays the use of foreign languages to link knowledge with other learning areas, forming the basis for further development, and seeking knowledge and broadening learners' world views.

The last one is Language and relationship with Community and the World (F4). It emphasizes of the use of foreign languages in various situations, both in the classroom and the outside community and the global society, forming a basic tool for further education, livelihood and exchange of learning with the global society.

2. Learning Standards

The standards serve as the goals to be achieved in developing learners' quality. These standards prescribe what the students should know and should be able to perform. They also indicate moral and ethical values as well as desirable characteristics upon completing education at basic level (Ministry of Education, 2008). Learning Standards are subsets of curriculum domain, to illustrate, language for communication (F1) contains three learning standards.

3. Indicators

Indicators specify what students should know and be able to practice as well as their characteristics for each level. Indicators reflect the standard of



learning. Being specific and concrete, they can be utilized for prescribing contents, determining learning units and organizing teaching-learning activities. They serve as essential criteria for evaluation in order to verify the learners' quality. Key Stage Indicators specify the goals to be achieved for upper secondary education, for example, in Grade 6, the indicator is described as Gr.6. According to the curriculum, indicators are subsets of the learning standards, to illustrate, the domain of language for communication (F1) contains three learning standards which are F1. 1, F1. 2, and F1. 3. Within F1.1, it contains four indicators which are Gr.6/1, Gr.6/2, Gr.6/3, and Gr.6/4.

Test Blueprint

The test blueprint was first created as guidance and desirable standards and indicators which will be assessed in the O- NET tests. The indicators which were not listed in the test blueprint were unnecessary ones to focus or prepare for a test. Based on the Ministry of Education (2008), in the Basic Core Curriculum B.E. 2551 (AD 2008), there were 20 indicators in total for English Language. However, in the test blueprint contained 14 indicators in both 2017 and 2018.

Related studies

Nipakornkitti and Adunyarittigun (2018) investigated content validity of the O-NET tests in the subject of English for the upper secondary level by using the test- curriculum alignment method. The test samples were the 2009 and 2010 O- NET tests. Five participants were purposively selected to match the O-NET test items with the Basic Education Core Curriculum. Additionally, having five participants for rating was less time-consuming. This was a good point of rating because the participants would not be too exhausted while rating the test items with the linked objectives. The results demonstrated that the O- NET test items were partially aligned with the national curriculum.

In 2019, Pensiri and Adunyarittigun conducted the study to investigate 1) the relationship between O-NET scores and academic achievements, 2) its predictive validity and 3) lecturers' attitudes towards the use of the O-NET for recruiting students into an English major program of a public university in Thailand. The samples were the O- NET scores in foreign language (English) and



academic achievements from academic years 2010 to 2014. Nine lecturers were selected purposively to participate in the semi-structured interview. The results demonstrated that the O- NET score was related to academic achievements and could predict academic achievements of English major students.

However, Imsa-ard (2020) explored what Thai EFL teachers at an upper secondary school level thought about the English test in the O-NET. A hundred teachers completed the questionnaires and 10 of them took part in the follow-up interviews. The main findings revealed that the majority of teachers were not satisfied with the English O-NET. Although they tended to focus on the test paper and taught their students based on the contents in the test paper, there were still some pressures from other stakeholders in educational settings. The findings suggested that the test should include other aspects of language skills, such as listening and speaking, to avoid dependence on rote-learning and memorization.

Because the test blueprint was new, it was difficult to find the studies which mentioned about the alignment between the tests and the test blueprint. Since, there was no clear evidence for validity and reliability of the O-NET tests, there should be test specification to cross-check the content that the test writers aimed to measure. Even the test blueprint was a good guidance, it was still broad to focus. Therefore, it was interesting to prove that a test blueprint was a good guide for teachers to prepare students for the O-NET tests instead of using the Basic Core Curriculum. However, the test writers were anonymous for the 2017 and 2018 O-NET tests. Thus, it was not possible to verify the test content with specification.

Objectives

The objectives of the study were: 1) to find out how the test blueprint was a good guidance for the teachers to prepare the students for the O-NET tests between 2017 and 2018 and 2) to reveal the frequency of each indicator such as Gr 6/1, Gr 6/2, and Gr 6/3 that appeared in the 2017 and 2018 O-NET tests from the most frequent indicators to the least one respectively.

Research Methodology



Test-curriculum Alignment Method and Statistical Analysis Method

According to Andrea and Stephen (2009), the test-curriculum alignment method was used to demonstrate or evaluate the connection between testing, content standards (i.e. curriculum), and instruction. If these components worked together to deliver a consistent message about what should be taught and assessed, students would have the opportunity to learn and to truly demonstrate what they have achieved. Moreover, statistical analysis method was used to summarize and describe quantitative data.

Research Instrument

A matching sheet was used as a tool to collect the data. It was created to investigate the overall result of the alignment between O-NET test items and indicators according to the test blueprint. The matching sheet adapted from D'Agotino et al. (2008) was in the form of tables. The first column was the test item number. The second, third, and fourth columns were curriculum domain 1, 2, and 4 respectively. In these columns, there were sub-standards in each curriculum domain with sub-indicators so that the matcher could put a check mark on the table easily. The matcher had to put a check mark on the indicators' box that each test item is aligned. Then, the number of the marks for each indicator would be counted in total at the end of the table.

Data Collection

This study included two collections of English O-NET for grade 6 Thai students from the years 2017 and 2018. There were 40 items for each collection (80 items in total) which were created by the Thai National Institute of Educational Testing Service under the framework of the 2008 Basic Education Core Curriculum. Moreover, this study adopted the test blueprints of English O-NET for grade 6 from the years 2017 and 2018. They were guidelines containing the curriculum domains, learning standards, indicators, and a number of test items for each domain under the same framework of the Core Curriculum as the tests. The test blueprint was used to investigate the alignment with the tests by matching each test item to its indicators under learning standards and curriculum domains. As previously stated, there were only O-NET tests with their test blueprints during 2017 and 2018 because 1) the O-NET tests were the most up-



to-date test at the present time and 2) for 2017 and 2018, the test blueprints contained the same number of indicators which were 14 indicators.

The data was divided into two parts. The first part was the quantitative data collected from the investigation of the alignment between the test items and the test blueprint using test- curriculum alignment method. The second part was also quantitative data to find out the most frequently used indicator in the tests during the years 2017 and 2018 by using a statistical method.

Data Analysis

Process of Test-curriculum Alignment Method

The first part of the data which is quantitative one obtained by using Test curriculum alignment method to identify the alignment of test items with the test blueprint. There were three dimensions which were curriculum domains, learning standards, and indicators to be analyzed.

Process of Statistical Analysis Method

Quantitative data was analyzed by using statistical analysis method. The matching sheets were used to see the frequencies of each of the test indicator found in the test during the years 2017 and 2018.

Results and Discussion

The matching sheets which were used to find out the alignment between the test items and the test blueprint in 2017 and 2018 were shown in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1 Matching between the Test Items and the Test Blueprint in 2017

[illegible]

[illegible]



Academic Year 2017														
Domain	1 Language for Communication										2 Language and Culture		4 Language and Relationship with Community and the World	
Standard	F1.1		F1.2					F1.3			F2.1	F2.2		F4.1
Indicators/Items	Gr. 6/3	Gr. 6/4	Gr. 6/1	Gr. 6/2	Gr. 6/3	Gr. 6/4	Gr. 6/5	Gr. 6/1	Gr. 6/2	Gr. 6/3	Gr. 6/2	Gr. 6/1	Gr. 6/2	Gr. 6/1
34								✓						
35					✓									
36					✓									
37				✓										
38					✓									
39											✓			
40											✓			
Total	2	7	1	1	4	1	2	3	4	2	3	3	3	4
Total	9		9					9			3	6		4

[illegible]



16									✓					
17									✓					
18									✓					
19									✓					
20									✓					
21									✓					
22									✓					
23		✓												
24		✓												
25		✓												
26		✓												
27		✓												
28														✓
29						✓								
30						✓								
31							✓							
32			✓											
33														✓
34														✓
35					✓									
36										✓				
37										✓				
38							✓							
39					✓									
40							✓							
Total	3	5	2	1	2	2	3	1	7	2	3	4	1	4
Total	8		10					10			3	5		4

Table 1 presented the test items from number 1 – 40 of the 2017 O-NET test compared



with three curriculum domains (five standards). The results showed the matching between the test items and the test blueprint. Most of the test items aligned with the curriculum domain F1 which was language for communication.

Table 2 Matching between the Test Items and the Test Blueprint in 2018

Table 2 presented the test items from number 1 – 40 of the 2018 O-NET test compared

with three curriculum domains (five standards). The results showed the matching between the test items and the test blueprint. Most of the test items aligned with the curriculum domain F1 which was language for communication.

To answer the first question, “how did the O-NET test items administered between 2017 and 2018 align with the test blueprint?”, the results were gained from the matching process by using Test-curriculum alignment method to identify the alignment of test items during the year of 2017 to 2018 with the test blueprint. There were three dimensions to be analyzed. The first was Curriculum domains. The second was Learning standards. The last one was Indicators. According to the Ministry of Education (2008), under the Basic Core Education Curriculum, the Curriculum Domains were the biggest area of all the dimensions for foreign language. It was the first thing to consider in matching process. However, looking at the test blueprint, there were only three domains: Language for Communication (F1), Language and Culture (F2), and Language and Relationship with Community and the World (F4). The domain of Language and Relationship with other Learning Areas (F3) was missing because it focused more on speaking skills.

To answer the research question, “What were the most frequent indicators that appeared in the O-NET tests?”, the most frequent indicators in both 2017 and 2018 were revealed after applying the matching sheet.

In 2017, the most frequent indicators in the test would be shown from the most appeared indicator to the least ones with its explanations in Table 3.



Rank	Indicators	Explanations of Indicators	Frequency (40 items)
1	F1.1 Gr.6/4	Tell the main idea and answer questions from listening to and reading dialogues, simple tales and stories.	7 (17.5%)
2	F1.2 Gr.6/3	Speak/write to express needs, ask for help and agree and refuse to give help in simple situations.	4 (10%)
2	F1.3 Gr.6/2	Draw pictures, plans, charts and tables to show various data heard or read.	4 (10%)
2	F4.1 Gr.6/1	Use language for communication in various situations in the classroom and in school.	4 (10%)
5	F1.3 Gr.6/1	Speak/write to give data about themselves, their friends and the environment around them.	3 (7.5%)
5	F2.1 Gr.6/2	Give data about the festivals/ important days/ celebrations/ lifestyles of native speakers.	3 (7.5%)
5	F2.2 Gr.6/1	Tell similarities/ differences between pronunciation of various kinds of sentences, use of punctuation marks and word order in accordance with structures of sentences in foreign languages and Thai language.	3 (7.5%)
5	F2.2 Gr.6/2	Compare the differences/ similarities between the festivals, celebrations and traditions of native speakers and those of Thais.	3 (7.5%)
9	F1.2 Gr.6/3	Choose/specify the sentences or short texts corresponding to the meanings of symbols or signs read.	2 (5%)
9	F1.2 Gr.6/5	Speak/write to express their own feelings about various matters around them and various activities, as well as provide brief justifications.	2 (5%)
9	F1.3 Gr.6/3	Speak/write to express opinions about various matters around them.	2 (5%)
12	F1.2 Gr 6/1	Speak/write in an exchange in interpersonal communication.	1 (2.5%)



12	F1.2 Gr.6/2	Use orders requests and give instructions.	1 (2.5%)
12	F1.2 Gr.6/4	Speak and write to ask for and give data about themselves, their friends, families and matters around them.	1 (2.5%)
		Total	100%

Table 3 Frequency of Each Indicator Appeared in the 2017 O-NET Tests

In Table 3, it could be seen that the most frequent indicators that appeared in the 2017 O-NET tests was F1.1: Gr6/4 with the frequency of 7 items out of 40. This indicator according to the Ministry of Education (2008), the Basic Core Curriculum was designed to measure the performance of the students whether they are able to “tell the main idea and answer questions from listening to and reading dialogues, simple tales and stories”. And the least ones were F1.2: Gr.6/1, F1.2: Gr. 6/2, and F1.2: Gr. 6/4 with the frequency of only one item in the test. The other results according to 2018 O-NET test, the most frequent indicators that appeared in the test would be shown from the most appeared indicator to the least ones together with its explanations in Table 4.

Table 4 The Frequency of Each Indicator Appeared in the 2017 and 2018 O-NET Test

Indicators	Explanations of Indicators	2017 (40 items)	2018 (40 items)	Total (80 items)	Rank
F1.1 Gr.6/3	Choose/specify the sentences or short texts corresponding to the meanings of symbols or signs read.	2	3	5 (6.25%)	7
F1.1 Gr.6/4	Tell the main idea and answer questions from listening to and reading dialogues, simple tales and stories.	7	5	12 (15%)	1
F1.2 Gr.6/1	Speak/write in an exchange in interpersonal communication.	1	2	3 (3.75%)	12



Indicators	Explanations of Indicators	2017 (40 items)	2018 (40 items)	Total (80 items)	Rank
F1.2 Gr.6/2	Use orders requests and give instructions.	1	1	2 (2.5%)	14
F1.2 Gr.6/3	Speak/write to express needs, ask for help and agree and refuse to give help in simple situations.	4	2	6 (7.5%)	5
F1.2 Gr.6/4	Speak and write to ask for and give data about themselves, their friends, families and matters around them.	1	2	3 (3.75%)	12
F1.2 Gr.6/5	Speak/write to express their own feelings about various matters around them and various activities, as well as provide brief justifications.	2	3	5 (6.25%)	7
F1.3 Gr.6/1	Speak/write to give data about themselves, their friends and the environment around them.	3	1	4 (5%)	9
F1.3 Gr.6/2	Draw pictures, plans, charts and tables to show various data heard or read.	4	7	11 (13.75%)	2
F1.3 Gr.6/3	Speak/write to express opinions about various matters around them.	2	2	4 (5%)	9
F2.1 Gr.6/2	Give data about the festivals/ important days/ celebrations/ lifestyles of native speakers.	3	3	6 (7.5%)	5
F2.2 Gr.6/1	Tell similarities/ differences between pronunciation of various kinds of sentences, use of punctuation marks and word order in accordance with structures of sentences in foreign languages and Thai language.	3	4	7 (8.75%)	4
F2.2 Gr.6/2	Compare the differences/ similarities between the festivals, celebrations	3	1	4 (5%)	9



Indicators	Explanations of Indicators	2017 (40 items)	2018 (40 items)	Total (80 items)	Rank
	and traditions of native speakers and those of Thais.				
F4.1 Gr.6/1	Use language for communication in various situations in the classroom and in school.	4	4	8 (10%)	3

As could be seen in Table 4, the most appeared indicator was F1.1: Gr.6/4 which was the top-ranking indicator in 2017 test. The next one was the F1.3: Gr.6/2 which was the top-ranking indicator appeared in 2018 test. In this case, the result was possible that the top ranking in 2017 and 2018 would have high possibilities to be on top in the next year.

All indicators mentioned in the test blueprint appeared in the test. Some items partly aligned with its indicator. It seemed to be matched with other indicators as well or needed more areas of knowledge to choose the correct answer. However, few items could be seen to have perfect match with its indicator with specific areas of knowledge to answer the question.

However, some items which matched the indicator F1.1, Gr.6/4 required some more knowledge. The objective of the indicator was to let the students tell the main idea and answer questions from listening to and reading dialogues, simple tales and stories. Even the students could understand the text, they still could not answer the question if they did not have the knowledge out of the text to answer.

Another point to be considered was that the story was unseen. It was pretty broad to prepare for the test as the story could be anything unpredictable. In this case, the test blueprint was useless.

Conclusion

This study aimed at proving that a test blueprint was a good guide for teachers to prepare students for the O-NET test instead of the Basic Core Curriculum. Based on the results, it was found that the alignment of test items during the year of 2017 to 2018 with the test blueprints contained three



dimensions which were curriculum domains, learning standards, and indicators. The results illustrated evidences that the most frequent indicator appeared in the 2017 O-NET test was F1.1: Gr.6/4 with the frequency of 7 items out of 40. This indicator according to the Ministry of Education (2008), the Basic Core Curriculum was constructed to measure the performance of the students whether they were able to “accurately read aloud texts, tales and short poems” by observing the principles of reading. Moreover, the most frequent indicators that appeared in the 2018 O-NET test was F1.3: Gr.6/2 with the frequency of 7 items out of 40. This indicator according to the Ministry of Education (2008), the Basic Core Curriculum was designed to measure the performance of the students whether they were able to “draw pictures, plans, charts and tables to show various data heard or read”.

Pedagogical Implications

The most popular indicators appeared in the tests should be the main focuses as it has high possibilities to appear with high scores again in the next year. Therefore, the teachers who would like their students to gain better scores on the English subject in the O-NET tests could follow these indicators and prepare their students. The descriptions of each indicator could be the significant guidelines. However, each indicator cannot be isolated from each other. The major indicators should be emphasized, while the minor one should not be ignored.

Recommendation for Further Studies

It is recommended that similar research studies should be conducted with other levels such as grade 9 and grade 12 to prove the effectiveness of the test blueprint. Moreover, it is noticeable that the most popular indicators appeared in the tests have high possibilities to appear with high scores again. Therefore, the researchers can focus only on these indicators and compare them with the English subject in other grade levels.



References

- Andrea M. and Stephen G. (2009). Evaluating Alignment Between Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction. *Review of Educational Research*. 79(4), pp. 1332–1361.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. London: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Burachat, S. (2018). The Upgrading of Learning Proficiency towards the Reform of the Student- Centered by Action Research and Knowledge Management Follow-Ups. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Surin Rajabhat University*. 12(10), pp. 216-229.
- D'Agostino, J. V. et al. (2008). The rating and matching item-objective alignment methods. *Applied Measurement in Education*. Retrieved on August 1, 2019 from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08957340701580728?journalCode=hame20>.
- Imsa-ard, P. (2020). Voices from Thai EFL Teachers: Perceptions and Beliefs towards the English Test in the National Examination in Thailand. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal*, 13(2), pp. 267-289. Retrieved on June 1, 2021 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1258767.pdf>
- Ministry of Education (2008). *Basic Education Core Curriculum B.E. 2551 (A.D. 2008)*. Bangkok: Agricultural Cooperative Federation of Thailand. Retrieved on August 10, 2021 from http://academic.obec.go.th/images/document/1525235513_d_1.pdf
- Nipakornkitti, N. & Adunyarittgun, D. (2018). An Investigation of Content Validity in O-NET (English Subject) for the Upper Secondary Level (Matthayom 6). *Journal of Liberal Arts*. 18 (1). Retrieved on June 1, 2021 from <https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/liberalarts/article/view/93733/90689>
- Pensiri, A. and Adunyarittgun, D. (2019). Behind the Scores: In Search of the Predictive Validity of O-NET Scores to Academic Achievements of English Major Students, *Journal of Studies in the English Language*. 14(2), pp. 17-48.