

Utilization Level of Assessment Strategies among Arts Education Teachers of Elementary Stage

Monther Sameh Mohammad Al Atoum¹ , Mowafaq Ali Sharif Alsaggar^{2*}, Taiesir Hamdi Ahmad Tubaishat¹

¹ Department of Plastic Art, Faculty of Fine Arts, Yarmouk University, Jordan.

² Department of Art Education, College of Education, Qatar University, Qatar.

Received: 26/7/2020

Revised: 24/9/2020

Accepted: 4/7/2021

Published: 15/9/2022

* Corresponding author:

alsagar@yu.edu.jo

Citation: Al Atoum, M. S. M., Alsaggar, M. A. S., & Tubaishat, T. H. A. (2022). Utilization Level of Assessment Strategies among Arts Education Teachers of Elementary Stage. *Dirasat: Educational Sciences*, 49(3), 445–459.

<https://doi.org/10.35516/edu.v49i3.2>

351

Abstract

Objectives: This study aims to identify the utilization level of assessment strategies among arts education teachers at the elementary stage.

Methods: To achieve the aims of the study, a descriptive design based on a questionnaire was used. The study sample consisted of arts education teachers at the Jerash Directorate of Education during the first semester of the academic year 2018-2019.

Results: The results of the study reveal that the utilization level of assessment strategies among arts education teachers of the elementary stage, as a whole, was moderate. Furthermore, the results show no statistical significance at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the mean scores of study sample estimations related to the utilization level of assessment strategies among arts education teachers of the elementary stage as a whole due to gender. They also reveal statistically significant differences due to educational qualification, in favor of teachers of higher education qualifications, and due to years of experience, in favor of teachers with ten or more years of experience.

Conclusions: Training teachers of arts education on the utilization of assessment strategies and proposing pre-service courses addressing the employment of assessment and their strategies and their applications in the field of arts education.

Keywords: Assessment tools, authentic assessment, primary grades.

درجة استخدام معلمي التربية الفنية لاستراتيجيات التقويم في المرحلة الأساسية

مدرس سامح محمد العتوم¹، موفق علي شريف السقار^{2*}، تيسير حمدي أحمد طباشات¹

¹ جامعة اليرموك، كلية الفنون الجميلة، قسم الفنون التشكيلية، الأردن

² جامعة قطر، كلية التربية، قسم التربية الفنية، قطر

ملخص

الأهداف: هدفت الدراسة الحالية لتحديد درجة استخدام معلمي التربية الفنية لاستراتيجيات التقويم في المرحلة الأساسية. المنهجية: اعتمدت الدراسة على المنهج الوصفي، وأداتها الاستبانة. تكونت عينة الدراسة من معلمي التربية الفنية في مديرية التربية والتعليم في محافظة جرش خلال الفصل الدراسي الأول 2019/2018. النتائج: أظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن استخدام معلمي التربية الفنية لاستراتيجيات التقويم في المرحلة الأساسية ككل جاء بدرجة متوسطة، أما أدواته، فقد جاءت بدرجة مرتفعة، كما أظهرت النتائج عدم وجود فرق ذات دلالة إحصائية عند مستوى الدلالة ($\alpha = 0.05$) لتقديرات أفراد عينة الدراسة المتعلقة باستخدام معلمي التربية الفنية لاستراتيجيات التقويم في المرحلة الأساسية ككل، يُعزى لمتغير الجنس، ووجود فرق دال لصالح ذوي المؤهل العلمي (دراسات عليا)، ولعدد سنوات الخبرة (10) سنوات فأكثر.

التوصيات: تدريب معلمي التربية الفنية على استراتيجيات التقويم وأدواته بشكل مستمر. وإدراج مساقات في مرحلة ما قبل الخدمة تتعلق باستراتيجيات التقويم وتطبيقاتها في مجال التربية الفنية. وإجراء دراسات تتعلق بأثر استخدام استراتيجيات التقويم وأدواته على التحصيل في مجال التربية الفنية.

الكلمات الدالة: أدوات التقويم، التقويم الواقعي، الصفوف الأساسية العليا..



© 2022 DSR Publishers/ The University of Jordan.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC) license

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Introduction & Theoretical Framework

Arts education course is an integral part of the educational process. It differs from many other school courses, due to depending mainly on the plastic and expressive aspects more than the theoretical ones, where the practical aspects of the topics implemented in the arts education classes reflect students' artistic and expressive skills, as well as their ability to carry out the required tasks in a manner compatible with their ages.

In all aspects of the arts education field, assessment has great importance for its significant role in identifying all that has been achieved from the desired educational objectives, in addition to identifying the roles of the curricula, teachers, students and the educational environment in general. Furthermore, also provides an indicator of the student's ability to utilize what has been learned, and then employ it in other real-life situations, reflected accordingly in his behavior.

Modern assessment is a process aiming to determine the achievement of the educational objectives and the effectiveness of the entire educational program, including planning, implementation, styles, and educational tools" (Osman, 2011: 16). Assessment's intended purposes are represented in provoking learning motivation, reinforcement and self-assessment of the teacher and learner. Assessment also should have several features, the most important of which are: the comprehensiveness and diversity of its methods, means, dynamism, objectives, and procedures (Allam, 2007). Khader (2005: 14) defines assessment as a process of juggling objectives' achievement level. Fathallah (2006: 14) defines modern assessment as "a set of necessary activities required for serving the educational process. It is not only about giving students degrees, but also a multi-stage process that includes several activities".

Mueller (2020) asserts the importance of employing an authentic assessment addresses student's life, as it provides a true indication about the knowledge and skills obtained, and a true indication about students' ability to perform what has been learned. Though, students' well achievement in tests alone is insufficient to identify their potential and ability to apply new knowledge in real-life situations. Moon, Brighton, Callahan, and Robinson (2005) add that the importance of assessment is in obtaining information related to students' strengths and weaknesses, making educational decisions concerning students' learning and development, identifying the effectiveness of the educational process as a whole; and determining the suitability of curriculum for their potentials.

Assessment can be carried out using a set of strategies, and it is the teacher who can select the most appropriate ones:

1. **Performance-based Assessment Strategy:** This type of assessment requires students to explain what has been learned through employing their various skills in real-life situations (McMillan, 2001).

2. **Pen-and-paper Strategy:** This type of assessment is commonly used in articles and tests to obtain accurate evidence concerning students' learning. Tests may include both short/full exams (Odeh, 2005).

1. **Observation-based Assessment Strategy:** It includes a process of observing students' performance to be evaluated at a later stage of the teaching and learning process. It also provides organized and sustainable information about the course learning process and learners' attitudes, behaviors, needs, and performance (Lanting, 2001).

2. **Communication-based Assessment Strategy:** This strategy is a collaborative, reciprocal process, in which learners receive instruction from the teacher. It allows the teacher to identify many of the student's potentials, such as their way of thinking, addressing problems, and solving them (Team, 2004).

3. **Self-review Assessment Strategy:** It is an important strategy through which the development of learners' cognitive perceptions can be identified. It gives students the opportunity to develop their metacognitive skills (McMillan, 2001).

During this strategy, several assessment tools can also be used, such as:

1. **Chick List:** It includes the preparation of lists about the actions or behaviors observed by the teacher or students during the implementation of a specific educational task or skill (Team, 2004).

2. **Scoring Rubric:** It is a simple tool through which a learner's skill level can be determined. Each paragraph of it is subject to a number of grades or levels; i.e., a grade or level indicates the presence of a trait estimated to be low, and another indicates the presence of a trait estimated to be high. Between these two grades or levels, there are a number of other grades or levels that vary in accordance with the presence of the estimated trait (Odeh, 2005).

3. **Oral Rubric:** It is a set of brief paragraphs indicating students' achievement at various levels, as it helps them to

define their next steps on the way to improve their skills (Mostafa, 2009).

4. **Learning Process Log:** It is a log used usually in assessing the workflow; students are asked to write down phrases about experienced situations (drawn usually from their real-life situations), as they can freely express their personal opinions and impressions regarding what has been learned (Team, 2004).

5. **Narrative Record:** It is a short descriptive process the teacher performs to report the learner's achievements. Although it provides a clear view of the learner's progress, it needs time to be implemented (Al-Saud, 2006).

Previous studies

The theoretical literature includes several researches addressing the assessment theme. Al-Maqati (2015) aimed to identify the obstacles of employing alternative assessment strategies encountered by science teachers at the secondary stage in Hail city. Its results revealed that the obstacles of employing alternative assessment strategies were high. It also showed statistically significant differences related to educational qualification, teaching experience, and obtaining training courses.

Abu Sharp (2014) also investigated the assessment strategies used by vocational education teachers in the (8th, 9th, and 10th) grades. According to the questionnaire, the average order of vocational education teachers' utilization of assessment practices was as follows: observation-based assessment, performance-based assessment, self-review assessment, pen-and-paper assessment, and communication-based assessment. The results of the study also showed no statistically significant differences attributed to the teacher's gender.

Al-Zoubi (2013) sought to identify mathematics teachers' familiarity and utilization of realistic assessment strategies and tools at higher basic grades in Jordan. It showed that the employment of assessment strategies was still below the expectations. The results showed that the knowledge and utilization of the observation-based strategy were high, as it reached (100%), while the knowledge and utilization of the student's self-review strategy was (0%). It also revealed no statistically significant differences due to gender, educational qualification, or years of experience variables.

Al-Bashir and Barham (2012) aimed to investigate mathematics and Arabic language teachers' utilization of alternative assessment strategies and tools. Its results revealed that teachers' utilization of paper-and-pencil assessment strategy was high. The utilization of performance-based, observation-based, and communication-based strategies was moderate, while the utilization of self-review strategy and alternative assessment tools was low. It also showed no statistically significant differences due to the specialization effect, and that there are statistically significant differences due to years of experience and training courses effect.

Hamza and Souman (2012) aimed to examine the utilization of realistic assessment strategies among Jordanian teachers of public schools, in addition to identifying their attitudes towards its use. The study concluded that teachers' utilization of realistic assessment was high, indicating that they have positive attitudes towards its utilization. It also identified several obstacles preventing the utilization of authentic assessment, such as students' large number in the same class, the large number of lessons assigned to the teacher, and the lack of training provided for teachers about the application of authentic assessment tools.

Ali (2012) sought to identify the tools or standards employed by arts education teachers in assessing students' performance in the arts education courses. The study revealed that there was no agreed-upon tool or standard among the sample of the study in assessing students' performance.

Tawalbeh, Al-Labadi and Al-Omari (2012) aimed to identify the utilization level of modern assessment strategies among teachers of social studies and science subjects in Jordan. Its results revealed that the most widely used strategies, respectively, are as follows: observation-based assessment strategy, pen-and-paper assessment strategy, performance-based assessment strategy, self-review assessment strategy, and communication-based assessment strategy. The study showed statistically significant differences in the utilization level of observation-based and communication-based assessment strategies in favor of males. It also revealed that teachers with (10) years of experience or more ranked last in utilizing alternative assessment strategies.

Al-Yamani (2011) aimed to determine the comprehensive quality standards required for teaching arts education at the

intermediate stage and assess female arts education teachers' teaching performance. Its results showed that female arts education teachers' utilization of multiple strategies to assess their female students was moderate, and that their utilization level of self-assessment strategies inside the educational institutions was low.

Cheng (2006) sought to examine the utilization level of assessment practices in Hong Kong schools in China, and the utilization level of alternative assessment strategies in these schools. It revealed that teachers need to be supported, encouraged, and trained by their administrators and supervisors on utilizing alternative assessment strategies.

Study Problem

Despite the great interest, the Ministry of Education pays in developing arts education curricula (including all assessment methods and modern strategies) and the emphasis of several studies on the importance of assessment within the educational process, it has been noticed, according to the researcher's experience and knowledge in teaching arts education courses, a lack of employing the assessment strategies included in arts education curricula. It has been found that assessment, in most cases, depends on teachers' self-initiatives, negatively affecting the educational process as a whole, and the effective role of arts education courses in the development of society in particular. Accordingly, the current study is an assessment study that aims to identify the utilization level of assessment strategies among arts education teachers at the basic stages.

Study Questions

- 1- What is the utilization level of assessment strategies among arts education teachers at the basic stages?
- 2- Is there any statistically significant difference at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the means scores of study subjects' estimations on the total instrument measuring arts education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies at the basic, and on the individual domains, due to: gender, qualification, and years of experience?

Objectives of the study

- Determining the utilization level of assessment strategies among arts education teachers
- Determining the differences in utilizing assessment strategies among male and female arts education teachers.
- Determining the utilization level of assessment tools among art education teachers at the basic stage.

The importance of the study

The importance of the current study stems from the fact that it has not been adequately addressed in the arts education field. The researcher hopes to highlight the exerted efforts by arts education teachers to determine the utilization level of assessment strategies. This encouraged specialists and researchers to address this issue and determine its nature. Therefore, the current study attempts to support the Arab library in this field, due to the scarcity of research addressing this issue.

Study Limitations

- **Procedural limitations:** The current study is limited to identifying arts education teachers' opinions about using assessment strategies in Jerash Governorate.
- **Time Limitations:** The current study was applied during the first semester of the academic year 2018/2019.
- **Human Limitations:** The current study is limited to arts education teachers in Jerash.

2. Design of the Study and Procedure

Design of the Study

The study adopted a descriptive survey design to achieve the objectives of the study.

The Population of the Study

The population of the study included all art education teachers at Jarash Governorate educational directorate, totaling (65) male and female teachers in the first semester of the academic year 2018/2019, according to the official records of the educational directorate.

Study population

The study population consisted of all art education teachers in the Directorate of Education in Jerash Governorate, who

numbered (65) teachers in the first semester of the year 2018/2019, according to the official statistics in the directorate.

Sample of the Study

The sample of the study was (62) arts education teachers, (29 = male, 33 = female), who teach art education in schools affiliated with the educational directorate. Table (1) shows the distribution of the study sample according to the variables.

Table (1): Distribution of the study sample according to the variables

Variable	Category	No.	%
Gender	Male	29	46.8
	Female	33	53.2
	Total	62	100.0
Qualification	Diploma	15	24.2
	Bachelor	31	50.0
	Higher Education	16	25.8
	Total	62	100.0
Years of Experience	Less than 10 years	27	43.5
	10 years or More	35	56.5
	Total	62	100.0

Statistical criterion

The study tool paragraphs related to the art education teachers' use of evaluation strategies in the basic stage are answered through a 5-point Likert scale: "very large" that was given the score (5), "large" that was given the score (4), "medium" that was given a score of (3), "few" which was scored a (2), and "very little" that was assigned a score of (1), to determine the degree to which art education teachers use evaluation strategies in the basic stage and for each of its areas as well as for each paragraph of the study tool. Statistical criterion was based on the arithmetic means as follows: The degree of use is very low if the corresponding category of arithmetic averages is (from 1.00 - less than 1.80). The degree of use is low: if the category of arithmetic means corresponding to it (from 1.80 - less than 2.60). The degree of use is moderate if the corresponding average category is (from 2.60 - less than 3.40). The degree of utilization is high if the corresponding average category is (from 3.40 - less than 4.20). The degree of use is too high if the corresponding average category is (from 4.20 - 5.00).

Instruments of the Study

After a comprehensive review of related literature and previous studies in addition to reviewing art education teacher book, a questionnaire was developed and administrated to the sample of the study (Al-Wadi and Al-zoubi. 2011).

Instruments validation

The study tool was validated by presenting it to a committee of specialized arbitrators, as the tool consisted in its initial form of (32) paragraphs distributed on six axes, and after receiving their observations, which focused on the extent of compatibility of the paragraphs with their fields and the safety of the linguistic formulations of the paragraphs, and deleting the field of evaluation tools. The questionnaire consisted o (5) paragraphs, in its final form of (27) items distributed into five areas, namely: the strategy for performance-based evaluation, with (7) paragraphs; the pen-and-paper strategy, with (6) paragraphs; observational evaluation strategy, with (2) paragraphs; communication strategy, with (9) paragraphs; and self-review evaluation strategy, with (3) paragraphs.

Instrument Reliability

With regard to the stability of the questionnaire, its stability was confirmed by applying it to a sample of teachers outside the study sample, whose number reached (12) teachers. The reliability coefficient was calculated with the internal consistency method using the Cronbach alpha equation for the tool as a whole and for each of its areas. Table (2) shows this.

Table (2): Internal consistency co-officiant for the total instrument and its domains

No	Strategy	Internal Consistency (Cronbach-Alpha)
1	Performance Based Assessment	0.85
2	Pen–paper Assessment	0.79
3	Observation Based Assessment	0.70
4	Communication	0.84
5	Self-Review Assessment	0.78
	Total	0.93

As seen in table (2), internal consistency reliabilities for the subdomains ranged between (0.70) and (0.85), while it was for the total instrument (0.93). These values are accepted to achieve the objectives of the study.

Variables of the Study

The study included the following variables:

a. Independent Variables:

- Gender: Male, female.
- Qualification: Diploma, Bachelor, Higher Education.
- Years of Experience: Less than 10 years, 10 years or more).

b. Dependent Variables:

- Teachers' use of authentic assessment strategy in the basic stage, and represented by the means scores of the study sample estimations on the study instrument items related to the use of art education teachers of the total assessment strategies in the basic stage.
- Study instrument Domains, and represented by the means scores of the study sample estimations on the study instrument domains: Performance Based Assessment, Pen–paper assessment, Observation Based Assessment, communication, and Self-Review Assessment.

3. Results and Discussion

Results of the First Question: "What is the utilization level of basic stage art education teachers for assessment strategies?"

To answer this question, means and standard deviations for the study sample estimations on the study instrument items related to the use of art education teachers of the total assessment strategies in the basic stage and its individual domains were calculated as seen in table (3).

Table (3): Means and standard deviations for the study sample estimations on the study instrument items related to the use of art education teachers of the total assessment strategies in the basic stage and its domains in descending order based on the means scores

No.	Domain	Mean*	SD	Rank	Level
5	Self-Review Assessment	3.88	0.46	1	High
3	Observation Based Assessment	3.72	0.49	2	High
1	Performance Based Assessment	3.38	0.32	3	Moderate
2	Pen–paper Assessment	3.20	0.39	4	Moderate
4	Communication	2.75	0.30	5	Moderate
	Total Assessment Strategies	3.21	0.22		Moderate

* Lower Degree (1) - Upper Degree (5)

Table (3) shows that the total level of basic stage arts education teacher utilization of assessment strategies was moderate (M = 3.21, SD = 0.22). Where self-review assessment and observation based assessment strategies came with a high level,

while performance based assessment, pen–paper assessment, and communication strategies came with a moderate level. It also can be shown that self-review assessment ranked first ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 0.46$, Level = High) with a high level, followed by observation based assessment ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 0.49$, Level = High), performance based assessment ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 0.32$, Level = Moderate), pen–paper assessment ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 0.39$, Level = Moderate), and communication ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 0.30$, Level = Moderate); respectively.

These results may be explained by the fact that authentic assessment gives students a valuable opportunity to make judgments about their performance, use clear standards in assessing their artwork, more able develop their ability in observation, analysis, and explanation. Additionally, they can use their previous knowledge and transfer it to real life authentic learning based on assessing what they have learned while determining at the same time what needs to be learned. As for the estimations of art education teachers concerning their observation based assessment strategy ranking second (high), this result may be due to the fact that art activities are practiced while being observed by the teacher, who in turn discusses these work sand monitors them while making this artwork. This result differs from the results of the study of Al-Bashir and Barham (2012), where the degree of teachers' use of the self-review strategy was low and ranked last.

As for the communication evaluation strategy, which came in last place and with a moderate degree, this may be due to the fact that its effective application, such as through conferences, group interviews, and other approaches, requires great skill and effort and a long time to prepare, which lowered the degree of teachers using this method and teachers with a medium degree. This result is consistent with the results of the study of Tawalbeh, Al-Labadi, and Al-Omari (2012) and the Abu Shareb study (2014), in which it also came in last.

In view of the overall degree of art education teachers' use of evaluation strategies coming with a (medium) grade, this means that there are still deficiencies in art education teachers practicing evaluation strategies, which is consistent with the results of the studies of Tawalbeh, Al-Labadi, and Al-Omari (2012) and Al-Yamani (2011). Teachers' use of evaluation strategies was to a moderate degree, differing from the results of the studies of Al-Maqati (2015) and Hamza and Souman (2015), which concluded that teachers' use of teaching evaluation strategies was to a high degree. It also differs from the results of the study of Al-Zoubi (2013), which found that the use of evaluation strategies is still below expectations.

Means and standard deviations of the study sample estimations on every item of each study instrument domains related to arts study teachers' use for assessment strategies in the basic stage was (performance based assessment, pen–paper assessment, observation based assessment, communication, and self-review assessment) calculated from their point of view, as follow:

a. First Domain: Performance Based Assessment

Table (4): Means and standard deviations for the study sample estimations on the study performance based assessment items in descending order based on the means scores

No.	Item	Mean*	SD	Rank	Use Level
2	Demo	4.11	0.68	1	High
1	Presentation	4.10	0.69	2	High
7	Discussion / debate	3.66	0.65	3	High
3	Performance	3.26	0.75	4	Moderate
6	Stimulation / Role Playing	3.23	0.64	5	Moderate
5	Exhibition	2.69	0.74	6	Moderate
4	Speech	2.63	0.71	7	Moderate
	Total Score of Performance Based Assessment	3.38	0.32		Moderate

* Lower Degree (1) - Upper Degree (5)

Table (4) shows that the mean scores of performance based assessment items ranged between (2.63) and (4.11) with a level ranged between (Moderate) and (High). As Demo ranked first ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 0.68$, Level = High), while Speech strategy last ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 0.71$, Level = Moderate).

These results may be due to the nature of the arts education subject and its activities since it needs presentation, and different teaching aids to present local or international models that may guide students while working on artwork in addition to their availability and easiness of use. As for speech effectiveness ranking last, this result may be due to its insignificance in artwork from art education teachers compared to other activities as they rely on learners' training to speak about themes they watched or a story they read. Also, the limited time provided to arts education classes in schools compared to other subjects may explain this result. Finally, speech is not the main tool in the arts education classes for presenting the learning material.

b. Second Domain: Pen–paper Assessment

Table (5): Means and standard deviations for the study sample estimations on the pen-paper assessment items in descending order based on the means scores

No.	Item	Mean*	SD	Rank	Level
8	Multiple Choice Test	3.74	0.94	1	High
9	Matching	3.26	0.81	2	Moderate
11	Complete the Sentence	3.26	0.79	3	Moderate
12	Short Answer	3.24	0.88	4	Moderate
10	True or False	3.08	0.80	5	Moderate
13	Essay and Problem Solving	2.60	1.11	6	Moderate
	Total Score of Pen–paper Assessment	3.20	0.39		Moderate

* Lower Degree (1) - Upper Degree (5)

Table (5) shows that the mean scores of pen-paper assessment items ranged between (2.60) and (3.74) with a level ranged between (Moderate) and (High) where multiple choice ranked first ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 0.94$, Level = High), while essay and problem solving ranked last ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.11$, Level = Moderate).

The use of multiple choice tests ranked first by arts education teachers and this may be due to the nature of arts education school subject, which is theoretical and historical, especially in the upper basic stage. Furthermore, the art education in this stage is based on reviewing historical information such as the history of art and Islamic art also the nature of objective questions needs lesser time to be written and to be scored compared to essay questions requiring much more time and effort in both writing and scoring the questions. Finally, the crowded classes dictate the use of easy-to-write and score questions in addition to the overloaded school schedule on arts education teachers, which may total (24) classes per-week. This result is consistent with the results of the study of Tawalbe, All-Badi, and Al-Omari (2012).

c. Third Domain: Observation Based Assessment

Table (6): Means and standard deviations for the study sample estimations on the observation based paper assessment items in descending order based on the means scores

No.	Item	Mean*	SD	Rank	Level
14	Simple Observation	4.00	0.68	1	High
15	Organized Observation	3.44	0.50	2	High
	Total Score of Observation Based Assessment	3.72	0.49		High

* Lower Degree (1) - Upper Degree (5)

Table (6) shows that the mean scores of observation based assessment items ranged between (3.44) and (4.00) with a high level, where simple observation ranked first ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.68$, Level = High), while organized observation ranked last ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.50$, Level = High).

These results may be explained by that simple observation does not require teachers to prepare as it is based on simplified

selective observation by taking notes and following up while students are working on artworks. By contrast, organized observation requires time and effort in addition to accuracy in being developed, practiced, objective determinations, and assessments, something art education teachers lack in the upper basic stage.

d. Fourth Domain: Communication

Table (7): Means and standard deviations for the study sample estimations on the communication items in descending order based on the means scores

No.	Domain	Mean*	SD	Rank	Use Level
17	Multiple Response Open Questions	3.56	0.50	1	High
19	Opinion Questions	3.52	0.99	2	High
18	Facts related Questions	3.48	0.70	3	High
20	Directed Interview	3.05	0.86	4	Moderate
23	Individual Interview	2.63	0.81	5	Moderate
21	Non-Directed Interview	2.23	0.69	6	Low
16	Conference	2.11	0.75	7	Low
22	Open Interview	2.06	0.70	8	Low
24	Group Interview	2.05	0.60	9	Low
	Total Score of Communication	2.75	0.30		Moderate

* Lower Degree (1) - Upper Degree (5)

Table (7) shows that the mean scores of communication items ranged between (2.05) and (3.56) with a level ranged between (Low) and (High), where multiple response open questions ranked first ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 0.50$, Level = High), while group interview ranked last ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 0.60$, Level = Low).

These results may be due to the easiness of using questions and answers with multiple responses since their use is not a challenge for both students and teachers in the learning context. Also, multiple responses questions require teachers' discussion with students while they work on creating artworks and different educational activities to know the expected results of the work or the activity. As for the effectiveness of group interviews, the fact that it reported a low utilization level might be due to the difficulties and challenges encountered to practice it in the arts education class since it needs time to be practiced.

e. Fifth Domain: Self-Review Assessment

Table (8): Means and standard deviations for the study sample estimations on self-review assessment items in descending order based on the means scores

No.	Domain	Mean*	SD	Rank	Use Level
26	Diary	4.03	0.72	1	High
27	File	3.81	0.79	2	High
26	Self-Assessment	3.79	0.83	3	High
	Total Score of Self-Review Assessment	3.88	0.46		High

* Lower Degree (1) - Upper Degree (5)

Table (8) shows that the mean scores of self-review assessment items ranged between (3.79) and (4.03) with high levels, where diary ranked first ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 0.72$, Level = High), while self-assessment ranked last ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.83$, Level = High). These results may be explained by the fact that art education subject depends on developing art and aesthetic skills among students, which are based on innovation, creativity, meta cognitive skills, critical thinking, and problem solving skills while creating the different artworks.

Results of the Second Question: "Are there statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the means scores of study subjects estimations on the instrument measuring arts education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole and on the individual domains due to gender, qualification, and years of experience?"

To answer this question, means and standard deviations of the study sample estimations on the instrument measuring art education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole were calculated due to gender, qualification, and years of experience.

Table (9): Means and standard deviations of the study sample estimations on the instrument measuring arts education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole due to gender, qualification, and years of experience

Variable	Category	Mean	St. Dev.
Gender	Male	3.19	0.20
	Female	3.23	0.24
	Total	3.21	0.22
Qualification	Diploma	3.20	0.25
	Bachelor	3.16	0.20
	Higher Education	3.31	0.20
	Total	3.21	0.22
Years of Experience	Less than 10 Years	3.13	0.23
	10 Years or More	3.27	0.20
	Total	3.21	0.22

It is noted in Table (9) that there are apparent differences between the averages of the estimates of the study sample individuals on the articles of the study tools related to the use of evaluation strategies of art education teachers in the basic stage as a whole according to a variable (gender, academic qualification, number of years of experience), and to determine the statistical significance of these differences. On the face of it, three-way ANOVA was applied, and Table 10 shows this.

Table (10): Three Way ANOVA for the means scores of the study sample estimations on the items of the study instrument measuring art education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole due to gender, qualification, and years of experience

Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig
Gender	0.029	1	0.029	0.749	0.390
Qualification	0.397	2	0.198	*5.047	0.010
Years of Experience	0.378	1	0.378	*9.628	0.003
Error	2.241	57	0.039		
Corrected Total	2.931	61			

* Significant at ($\alpha = 0.05$)

Table (10) shows:

- The value of significance for gender was (0.390), which is higher than the statistically significant level set at ($\alpha = 0.05$). This means that there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the mean scores of the study sample estimations on the items of the study instrument measuring arts education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole due to gender. These results may be explained by the similar learning environment found in schools. In addition, that arts education teachers, in general, graduate from one university (Yarmouk University), and

this implies that their learning experiences are similar to high extent. Furthermore, they participate in the same training courses, and this makes it logical to assume that both males and females do not have different perceptions.

- The value of significance for qualification was (0.010), which is lesser than the statistically significant level set at ($\alpha = 0.05$). This means that there are statistically significant differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the mean scores of the study sample estimations on the items of the study instrument measuring art education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole due to qualification. To define the direction of these differences, the Post-Hoc comparison Scheffe test was used, as shown in table (11).

Table (11): Post-Hoc Comparison Scheffe test for the means scores of the study sample estimations on the items of the study instrument measuring art education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole due to qualification

Variable	Category		Bachelor	Higher Education
		Mean	3.16	3.31
Qualification	Diploma	3.20	0.04	-0.11
	Bachelor	3.16		-0.15*
	Higher Education	3.31		

* Significant at ($\alpha = 0.05$)

As seen in Table (11), there is a statistically significant difference between the study sample estimations on the items of the study instrument measuring arts education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole due to qualification in favor of (Higher Education). This may be due to those male and female arts education teachers with higher academic qualifications (higher education) having more experience in using assessment strategies as their higher academic degrees mean that they are more informed about such assessment strategies compared to BA and Diploma holders. This result is consistent with the result of Al-Maqati's study (2015), and differs from that of Al-Zoubi study (2013).

- The value of significance for years of experience was (0.003), which is lesser than the statistically significant level set at ($\alpha = 0.05$). This means that there are statistically significant differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the mean scores of the study sample estimations on the items of the study instrument measuring art education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole due to years of experience. And as seen in the table of the mean scores, the difference is in favor of the respondents whose experience ranges from 10 years and above. This result may signify that arts education teachers with more experience use assessment strategies better compared to teachers with lesser experience. They accumulate knowledge and experiences they acquire them by interacting with more students and fellow teachers. This result is consistent with the results of the studies of Al-Maqati (2015) and Al-Zoubi (2013), which concluded that there are significant differences in favor of years of experience. It also differs from the results of the studies of Al-Bashir and Barham (2012) and Tawalbeh, Al-Labadi, and Al-Omari (2012), which reported differences in favor of fewer years of experience.
- Also, the means and standard deviations of the study sample estimations on the instrument measuring art education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole were calculated due to gender, qualification, and years of experience, as seen in table (12).

Table (12): Means and Standard deviations of the study sample estimations on the items of the study instrument measuring art education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole due to gender, qualification, and years of experience

Variable	Category		Performance Based Assessment	Pen–paper assessment	Observation Based Assessment	Communication	Self-Review Assessment
Gender	Male	Mean	3.35	3.16	3.62	2.73	3.95
		SD	0.35	0.38	0.48	0.24	0.44
	Female	Mean	3.41	3.23	3.80	2.76	3.81
		SD	0.29	0.40	0.50	0.34	0.48
	Total	Mean	3.38	3.20	3.72	2.75	3.88
		SD	0.32	0.39	0.49	0.30	0.46
Qualifications	Diploma	Mean	3.41	3.32	4.03	2.56	3.84
		SD	0.36	0.41	0.48	0.34	0.47
	Bachelor	Mean	3.29	3.04	3.60	2.82	3.78
		SD	0.27	0.37	0.47	0.26	0.48
	Higher Education	Mean	3.54	3.38	3.66	2.76	4.08
		SD	0.32	0.30	0.44	0.26	0.38
	Total	Mean	3.38	3.20	3.72	2.75	3.88
		SD	0.32	0.39	0.49	0.30	0.46
Years of experience	Less than 10 Years	Mean	3.29	3.09	3.57	2.70	3.86
		SD	0.33	0.44	0.51	0.28	0.46
	10 years or More	Mean	3.45	3.28	3.83	2.78	3.89
		SD	0.30	0.33	0.45	0.31	0.47
	Total	Mean	3.38	3.20	3.72	2.75	3.88
		SD	0.32	0.39	0.49	0.30	0.46

Table (12) shows that there are apparent differences between the means scores of study sample estimations on the items of the study instrument measuring art education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole due to gender, qualification, and years of experience. To define the direction of these differences, Three Way MANOVA was used, as shown in Table (13).

Table (13): Results of multiple triple analysis of variance of arithmetic means of estimates of study sample individuals in each of the study tool dimensions related to art education teachers' use of evaluation strategies in the basic stage, according to a variable (gender, academic qualification, number of years of experience)

Source of Variance	Domain	Total Squares	Dif	Squares Average	F	Sig
Gender Hotelling's Trace=0.087 Sig = 0.533	Performance Based Assessment	0.083	1	0.083	0.977	0.327
	Pen–paper assessment	0.133	1	0.133	1.136	0.291
	Observation Based Assessment	0.445	1	0.445	2.274	0.137
	Communication	0.004	1	0.004	0.043	0.836
	Self-Review Assessment	0.231	1	0.231	1.105	0.298
Qualification Hotelling's Trace=0.484 Sig = 0.000*	Performance Based Assessment	1.002	2	0.501	*5.899	0.005
	Pen–paper assessment	1.940	2	0.970	*8.280	0.001
	Observation Based Assessment	2.266	2	1.133	*5.786	0.005
	Communication	0.660	2	0.330	*4.058	0.023
	Self-Review Assessment	0.906	2	0.453	2.169	0.124
Years of Experience Hotelling's Trace=0.242 Sig = 0.037*	Performance Based Assessment	0.597	1	0.597	*7.027	0.010
	Pen–paper assessment	0.908	1	0.908	*7.750	0.007
	Observation Based Assessment	1.090	1	1.090	*5.569	0.022
	Communication	0.080	1	0.080	0.985	0.325
	Self-Review Assessment	0.080	1	0.080	0.385	0.537

Source of Variance	Domain	Total Squares	Dif	Squares Average	F	Sig
Error	Performance Based Assessment	4.840	57	0.085		
	Pen–paper assessment	6.678	57	0.117		
	Observation Based Assessment	11.160	57	0.196		
	Communication	4.633	57	0.081		
	Self-Review Assessment	11.910	57	0.209		
Modified Total	Performance Based Assessment	6.276	61			
	Pen–paper assessment	9.251	61			
	Observation Based Assessment	14.810	61			
	Communication	5.417	61			
	Self-Review Assessment	13.163	61			

* Significant at ($\alpha = 0.05$)

Table (13) shows that:

- The value of the significance for all the instrument domains based on gender is higher than the statistically significant level set at ($\alpha = 0.05$). This means that there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the mean scores of the study sample estimations on all the instrument domains measuring art education teachers' utilization of assessment strategies in the basic stage as a whole due to gender.
- The value of the statistical significance for (performance based assessment, pen-paper assessment, observation based assessment, and communication) due to qualification is lesser than the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), which indicates a statistically significant difference at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the mean scores of the study sample estimations on (performance based assessment, pen-paper assessment, observation based assessment, and communication), due to qualification. To define the direction of these differences, the Post-Hoc comparison Scheffe test was used, as shown in Table (14).

Table (14): Post-Hoc Comparison Scheffe test for the means scores of the study sample estimations on (Performance Based Assessment) due to qualification

Domain	Qualification	The difference between the means		
		Mean	Bachelor	Higher Education
Performance Based Assessment	Diploma	3.41	0.12	0.13-
	Bachelor	3.29		0.25*-
	Higher Education	3.54		
Pen–paper assessment	Diploma	3.32	0.28	0.06-
	Bachelor	3.04		0.34*-
	Higher Education	3.38		
Observation Based Assessment	Diploma	4.03	0.43*	*0.37
	Bachelor	3.60		0.06-
	Higher Education	3.66		
Communication	Diploma	2.56	0.26*-	0.20*-
	Bachelor	2.82		0.06
	Higher Education	2.76		

* Significant at ($\alpha = 0.05$)

As seen in Table (14) performance based assessment and pen-paper assessment domains, there are statistically significance differences between the study sample estimations due to qualification in favor of (Higher Education). And in the observation based assessment, the difference was in favor of a Diploma, while in the communication domain, the difference was in favor of Bachelor and higher education. The results of higher education degree holders use more performance based assessments and pen-paper assessments as they are more familiar with their effectiveness since they

have developed perceptions about their importance and they were trained to use them in the classroom. Knowing that these two assessment strategies are based on using demo, presentation, and discussion; and when knowing that they use more objective tests such as multiple choice, matching, complete the sentence, and true/false, these differences imply that art education teachers with higher education degrees are more informed about the effectiveness of specific assessment strategies compared to other academic qualification teachers. As for the use of observation based assessment, which was in favor of a Diploma, this result may be explained by the easiness of its use in the class. For communication assessment, which was in favor of BA and higher education art education teachers, this result reflects the fact that using this strategy requires relatively higher academic skills as it is based on using activities such as conferencing and different types of interviewing.

- The value of the statistical significance for (performance based assessment, pen-paper assessment, and observation based assessment) due to years of experience is lesser than the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), which indicates a statistically significant difference at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the mean scores of the study sample estimations on performance based assessment, pen-paper assessment, observation based assessment), due to experience, in favor of (10 years or more). This result may be explained by that these assessments strategy needs training and rich experiences, which makes teachers with higher experience level more qualified to use them in class.

Recommendations:

In light of the findings of the current study, the researcher recommends:

- Training teachers of arts education on the utilization of assessments strategies and their tools.
- Proposing pre-service courses addressing the employment of the assessment strategies and their applications in the field of arts education.
- Conducting further studies addressing the effect of utilizing assessment strategies and their tools on the achievement of arts education students.

References

- Abu Sharp, S. (2014). *The reality of the use of vocational education teachers for evaluation strategies in the subject of vocational education*. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Jordan, Jordan.
- Allam, S. E.-D. (2007). *Educational evaluation measurement in the teaching process*. Amman: Masirah House for Publishing, Distribution and Printing.
- Al-Basheer, A., & Barham, A. (2012). Using Alternative Assessment Strategies in Assessing Student's Learning in Mathematics and Arabic in Jordan. (in Arabic). *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 13 (1), 241- 270
- Ali, A. (2012). Evaluation of the practical aspect in the lesson of art education in the preparatory stage as Perceived by Their Teachers (in Arabic). *Journal of Al Fath*, 51, 508- 520.
- Al-Maqati, Y. (2015). *Barriers to secondary science teachers' use of alternative assessment strategies*. Unpublished MA thesis, Umm Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia
- Al-Saud, K. (2006). *The teacher's guide / teacher in art education - first grade*. Amman: Curricula and School Books Administration, Jordanian Ministry of Education.
- Al-Yamany, M. (2011). *Evaluating the performance of art education teachers in the intermediate stage in Riyadh in light of comprehensive quality standards*. Unpublished MA thesis, Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University, Saudi Arabia.
- Al-Wadi, M., & Al-Zoubi, A. (2011). *Scientific Research Methods: An Applied Methodological Approach*. Amman: Al Manhal.
- Al-Zoubi, A. (2013). The degree of knowledge and practice of mathematics teachers of actual evaluation strategies and tools. *The Islamic University Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 21 (3), 165-197.
- Cheng, H. (2006). Junior secondary science teachers understanding and practice of alternative assessment in Hong Kong:

- implication for teacher professional development. *Canadian Journal of Science Mathematics Andtechnology Education*, 6 (3), 227-24.
- Fathallah, M. (2006). *Educational evaluation*. Riyadh: International Publishing House.
- Hamzeh, M., & Soman, A. (2012). Frequency of Using Realistic Assessment in the Jordanian Public Schools, and Teacher's Attitudes Towards it (in Arabic). *Hebron University Reserch Journal, Humanities Sciences*, 7 (19), 265- 283.
- Khader, A. (2005). *Educational evaluation*. Dubai: Dar Al-Qalam Publishing and Distribution.
- Lanting, A. (2001). *An Empirical Study of District-wide k-2 Performance Assessment Program: Teacher Practices, Information Gained, and use of Assessment Results*. USA: University of Illinois At Urbana- Champaign.
- McMillan, J. H. (2001). *Essential Assessment Concepts for Teachers and Administrators*. New York City: A Sage Publications Company.
- Moon, T. R. (2005). Development of Authentic Assessments for the Middle School Classroom. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 16(2-3), 119-133.
- Mostafa, S. (2009). *The effect of using alternative evaluation methods on the achievement of tenth grade students in national and civic education in Russeifa District and their attitudes towards it*. Amman: University of Jordan.
- Mueller, J. (2020, 5 8). *Authentic Assessment Toolbox*. Retrieved from what is Authentic Assessment: <http://jfmueeller.faculty.noctrl.edu/toolbox/whatisit.htm>
- Odeh, A. (2005). *Measurement and evaluation in the teaching process*. Irbid: Dar Al-Amal for Publishing and Distribution.
- Osman, M. (2011). *Strategies of educational evaluation and tools*. Amman: Osama House for Publishing and Distribution.
- Team, T. N. (2004). *Modern evaluation strategy and tools (theoretical framework)*. Amman: Jordanian Ministry of Education, Examinations and Examination Administration.
- Tawalbeh, H. & Al Labdi, N. & Al Omary, J. (2012). The Level of Social Studies and Science Teachers' Application of Alternative Evaluation Strategies in Jordan. *Arab Universities Journal for Education and Psychology*, 10 (2), 11- 34.