

International conference “Education, Reflection, Development”, ERD 2015, 3-4 July 2015,  
Cluj-Napoca, Romania

## The divergent relationship between assessment and self-assessment in higher education. Experimental results

Cristian Stan<sup>a</sup>, Adriana Denisa Manea<sup>b\*</sup>

<sup>a,b</sup>Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Educational Sciences Department, Cluj-Napoca, Sindicatelor Street no. 7, 400029, Romania

---

### Abstract

Alongside teaching and learning, educational assessment and self-assessment make up the basic components of the educational process. The congruence between a teacher's assessment and the student's self-assessment is an important motivational factor for the continuation of the educational process while the incongruity between the two processes can determine a reduction in the student's implication towards obtaining academic performance. Thus, our study aims to capture the degree to which the assessment – self-assessment relationship is a congruent one, the factors that influence the self-assessment process, the frequency of the students' attempts at estimating their grades and the type of discrepancies between them.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of the Scientific Committee of ERD 2015

*Keywords:* assessment, self-assessment, determinant factors of self-assessment, evaluative underestimation, evaluative overestimation, evaluative discrepancy.

---

### 1. Theoretical considerations

The designing of a better educational reality in the absence of a suitable theoretical approach, centered on the issue of studying the integrative manner of self-assessment and educational assessment is unlikely. Research in the field made so far exclusively made the mistake of either treating only the educational assessment either addressing educational self-assessment as a simple effect, a secondary moment of the evaluative approach taken by

---

\* Corresponding author. Tel.:0040264405300.  
E-mail address: [cristiss2004@yahoo.com](mailto:cristiss2004@yahoo.com); [adriana.manea@yahoo.com](mailto:adriana.manea@yahoo.com)

the teacher (Frey, A., Bernhardt, R., 2012). The effective modernization of the evaluation of the process of educational assessment involves, first, taking into account that this is not a mono-block structure and does not occur suddenly but involves successive stages. Thus, compared to the traditional way of designing the process of educational assessment, the sequential model proposed comprises four interrelated levels: verification, measurement, quantification and reasoning (Stan, C., 2005). The moment of verification refers to all effective ways of "collecting" information on the performance of the academic results of the students. Thus, at this level, we can distinguish the existence of two sub-components: verification methods and verification tools. Verification methods are structured either by concrete ways of objectification of the students' achievements (oral, written, analysis of the products of their activity) or by the degree of specificity of the task (indiscriminate verification, individualized verification). In turn, the tools of verification refer to all techniques and concrete procedures of collecting information on the students' achievements and is presented as current tests, essays, docimologic tests, exams etc.. The concrete choice and combination of methods and tools for the evaluation leads to building the teacher's personal evaluative strategy.

The second sequence of the process of educational assessment is the measurement, defined as the mapping process, based on certain rules, on abstract concepts with some empirical indicators. In other words, measurement, as part of the evaluative approach involves contrasting the students' achievements to certain docimologic standards. In general, school performance is defined as the effectiveness of school behavior in a given educational situation, efficiency resulting from the mobilization of cognitive and affective-motivational resources of the student when faced with a particular type of school tasks. School performance depends on the student's skills as well as on his ability to mobilize them (Durand, M. 1991). We emphasize in this context the fact that school performance includes in its composition three subdomains: the amount of information, the understanding of that information and its practical application capacity. In turn, docimologic standards refer to the reference system that sets the criteria taken into account in the measurement operation. Docimologic standards present, according to most specialists, three main forms of objectification and many particular ways of combining them. These main forms are: the requirements of the syllabus and textbook, the educational group which includes the student and the student's past performance.

The third main component of the assessment is the quantification. We define the quantification as a complex process of mapping or associating meanings with certain phenomena, events or results. In the particular case of educational evaluation, quantification refers to attributing connotations to the level of congruence between the students' achievement and related docimological standards, with the level of congruence previously established by the measurement operation. Quantification, as part of the evaluative approach, takes in turn two main forms: school grade and rating. The school grade is a way of encoding the form of the annual school performance level in accordance with rules previously specified and constant over time. Grading therefore requires looking at school performance for certain features corresponding to the ideal reference model of that performance, using a rigorously constructed scale. Specific to the interval scale is the fact that the origin of the scale is a conventional one, with no point 0 required by the nature of the measured phenomenon so that the maximum level of the scale is also a conventional one. This means that, for example, we can not say that a student with a grade of 5 is two times less potent than a student with a grade of 10. The rating, just like the grade, expresses the level of congruence between school performance and docimological standards as a conventional form, except that in this case the method of coding is not numbers, but one based on linguistic formulations such as "very good" "satisfactory" etc.. We want to mention the fact that in the case of granting marks, the evaluator also uses a measurement scale, which in this case is not represented by intervals, but by ordinals. Noteworthy in this context are three aspects: the real grade, just like the real rating, that would objectively reflect the value of school performance, is a hypothetical entity that the grade or rating awarded is contrasted to with a margin of error of variable magnitude; the extension of the number of scale categories does not necessarily bring any increase in the precision of the grade nor the rating; in terms of frequency, the higher importance is given to grades, which are distributed on a scale of intervals forming ordered linear spaces, from one extreme of unfavorability into one of favorability (Zamfir, C., Vlăsceanu, L., 1993, Wessiak, G., Guthel, C., 2013).

Argumentation is the fourth component of the evaluative approach. In this context we define the argument as an approach of an explanatory nature with the purpose of facilitating understanding, at the level of the subject assessed, the reasons which led to the granting of certain grades or rating. Noteworthy in this regard is that the argument is different both from conditioning (in that it requires the active participation of students) as well as

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/1108541>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/1108541>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)