

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266420023>

Investigation of Teacher Opinions about Performance Assessment with Respect to the Gender and Branch Variables

Article in Journal of Turkish Science Education · January 2011

CITATIONS

8

READS

649

2 authors:



Mustafa Metin
Erciyes University

70 PUBLICATIONS 873 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Haluk Özmen
Trabzon University

67 PUBLICATIONS 2,315 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Investigation of Teacher Opinions about Performance Assessment with Respect to the Gender and Branch Variables

Mustafa METİN¹ , Haluk ÖZMEN²

¹ Assist. Prof. Dr., Artvin Çoruh University, Education Faculty, Artvin-TURKEY

² Assoc.Prof.Dr. Karadeniz Technical University, Education Faculty of Fatih, Trabzon-TURKEY

Received: 29.07.2011

Revised: 16.09.2011

Accepted: 26.10.2011

The original language of the article is English (v.8, n.4, December 2011, pp.3-17)

ABSTRACT

The aim of study is to investigate teachers' opinions about performance assessment with respect to the gender and branch variables. The study was carried out with 610 primary teachers who educated primary schools in Artvin and Rize cities in spring semester of 2009-2010. Survey methodology was used in this descriptive manner study. Data was gathered with a 35-item questionnaire which was developed and provided to reliability and validity by the researchers. As a result of the study, it was determined that teachers had positive opinions about performance assessment. Besides, it was found significant difference ($p<0.05$) between gender and Positive views about performance assessment (PVPA) and Negative views about performance assessment (NVPA) sub-scale of questionnaire and between branch and PVPA and Knowledge level about performance assessment (KLPA) sub-scale of questionnaire ($p<0,05$).

Keywords: Measurement-Assessment; Performance Assessment; Teachers.

INTRODUCTION

It has been implemented a new teaching programme in Turkish for a few years. This programme encourages the students to have an active role and the teachers to guide the students (Çepni et al., 2008). It is desired that students must have necessary ability to solve problem, to think critically, to analyze data, to communicate with oral or writing and to self-assessment (Kutlu, Doğan & Karakaya, 2008; Sağlam-Arslan, Avcı & İyibilir, 2008). In addition, measurement and assessment approach has varied based on the changes in the curriculum. Alternative measurement and assessment based on the process have also been



superseded by traditional measurement and assessment ways in the new instructional curriculum (Çepni, 2007; Çepni et al., 2008; Kutlu, Doğan & Karakaya, 2008; MEB, 2004).

Alternative assessment is a non-traditional assessment such as filling in the blanks for sentences and diagrams, matching components from different columns, judging items to be true or false, choosing the right answer from multiple-choice items, and giving short answers to questions (Çepni, 2007; Çepni et al., 2008). Performance assessments are defined as concrete and authentic tasks that require students to do something with their knowledge and skills, such as giving an activity, demonstration, presentation or writing a report (Nitko, 2004; Shavelson, 1994). It was believed that alternative assessment provide the chance to determine students' learning difficulties, learning level and realize effective learning of students (Çepni, 2007). Besides, it was expressed that this approach helps students to obtain high level skills, critical perspective, creative thinking and problem solving (Kutlu, Doğan & Karakaya, 2008). Assessment towards performance and activities related to daily life has been stressed in this approach. Therefore, assessment activities towards the performance have been used in the alternative assessments.

Performance assessment was defined as doing something, not merely knowing and on process as well as product (Linn & Gronlund, 2000). Kim (2005) expressed that performance assessment was a student performance, creates, or products something over a long period of time to permit evaluation of either the process or the product, or both. According to Baron (1991), performance assessment is defined as a constructed response in which students are actively engaged in solving a realistic problem that demands more than simply recalling memorized knowledge. Reeves (2000) believe that performance assessment is the ability of learner in applying his/her knowledge and skills to real life simulations. Performance assessment involves asking students to demonstrate their ability to reason, to perform particular skills, and/or to create specific products. Teachers then observe these student performances or examine the student products and judge the level of student mastery (Stiggins, 2001). According to Shavelson, Baxter and Pine (1992), performance assessment is characterized by students performing concrete, meaningful tasks scored on the reasonableness of the procedure not simply on achieving the correct answer. It was phrased that the fundamental purpose of performance assessment is the improvement of student learning, not the rendering of an evaluation.

Linn and Baker (1996) identified a number of characteristics of performance assessments. Researcher expressed that the use of open-ended tasks as a performance assessment. The tasks that focus on higher-order or complex skills; employ context-sensitive strategies; use complex problems requiring several types of performance and significant student time; may require group, as well as individual, performance; and allow for a significant degree of student choice. Moreover, performance assessment helps students to develop some skills such as inquiry, problem solving, oral presentation, organizing skills and writing (Metin, 2008; Linn & Gronlund, 2000; Kim, 2005; Nitko, 2004; Shavelson, 1994). Besides, performance assessment is so important that students' science process, higher level thinking, creativity thinking, problem solving skills were developed (Airasian, 2001; Birgin, 2003; Çepni, 2007; Khattri, Reve & Kane, 1998; Kubiszyn & Borich, 1993; Metin, 2008, Kutlu, Doğan & Karakaya, 2008). Another benefit of using performance assessment is the collaborative aspect of performance assessment. Students participate in the process of designing tasks, setting criteria, and evaluating performances and products. Establishing and sharing criteria creates opportunities to collaborate and clarify important learning outcomes for teachers, students, and parents. Learners have opportunity to practice the authentic activities that they might encounter in real life with performance assessment. These activities allow them to transfer their skills to various real world related settings (Simonson et al.,

2000). In addition, performance assessments assist instructors to have a better understanding of student learning (Winking, 1997). Performance assessment allows teachers to assess higher order thinking skills and deeper understandings (Firestone, Mayrowetz & Fairman, 1998).

It has been seen that although performance assessment has positive impacts on the students, some teachers have hesitation about using it in their classrooms (Çalık, 2007; Metin & Demiryürek, 2009). This hesitation may stem from lack of knowledge on the performance assessment (Kanatlı, 2008; Metin, 2010; Metin & Özmen, 2009), unsuccessful applications, and unawareness of the performance assessments' positive effects (Kanatlı, 2008; Metin & Demiryürek, 2009). Therefore, it is very important to determine the teachers' opinions. Even though there are many studies about determining the teachers' opinions about portfolio and alternative assessments in relevant literature (Adanalı, 2008; Algan, 2008; Birgin, 2003; Çalık, 2007; Güven & Eskiürk, 2007; Metin & Demiryürek, 2009; Orhan, 2007; Sağlam Arslan, Avcı & İyibilir, 2008), there are limited number of studies determining the teachers' opinions about the performance assessments (Çiftçi, 2010; Metin, 2011). So, it is believed that the present study will have important contributions to the literature and guide to future studies. In this regard, the present study aims to determine the teachers' opinions about performance assessment in the respect to the gender and branch variable.

The aim of study is to investigate opinions of teachers about performance assessment. In accordance with this objective, the study specifically focuses on the following research questions:

- What do teachers have positive opinions about performance assessment?
- What do teachers have negative opinions about performance assessment?
- What do teachers encounter difficulties to preparing performance task?
- Is there a difference on teachers' opinions about performance assessment between genders?
- Is there a difference on teachers' opinions about performance assessment between different branches?

METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study is to determine teachers' opinions about performance assessment with respect to the gender and branch variables. This research was carried out in fall semester of 2010. Survey methodology was used in the study. Surveys can be useful when a researcher wants to collect data on phenomena that cannot be directly observed (Karasar, 2005).

a) Participants

This research was carried out in fall semester of 2010 with 610 voluntary teachers working elementary schools in Artvin and Rize. Sample of the research consists of 292 male (47.9%) and 318 female (52.1%) volunteer teachers. It was determined that 76 of these teachers (12.5%) were under the age of 25, 282 of them (46.2%) were between 26 and 35 years old, 156 of them (25.6%) were between 36 and 45 years old and 96 of them (15.7%) were over the age of 45. Besides, according to professional experience variable, 196 (32.1%) between one and four years, 146 (23.9%) between five and nine years, 122 (20%) between ten and fourteen years 64 (10.5%) between fifteen and nineteen years and 82 (13.4%) more twenty years. In terms of their branch's dispersion of teachers are; 234 (38.4%) elementary teachers, 76 (12.5%) science and technology teachers, 84 (13.8%) mathematic teachers, 44 (7.2%) social science teachers, 60 (9.8%) Turkish teachers and 112 (18.4%) teacher from others branch such as Physical teachers, Music teachers, English teachers and Moral and Religion teachers.

b) Instrument

In the research, a questionnaire consisted of 35 items was used to collect data. The questionnaire was developed and provided reliability and validity by the researchers. The questionnaire consisted of four sub-dimensions. The questionnaire has two parts. In the first part, there are some demographic questions as independent variables such as gender, age, professional experience and branch variable. In the second part, there is a questionnaire which determinate to teachers' opinions on performance assessment.

In this study, the questionnaire was developed through the use of five stage model proposed by (Karasar, 2005). In the first stage, many studies related to performance assessment were examined in order to determine the statements about performance assessment and how a questionnaire can be developed (Adanalı, 2008; Algan, 2008; Çalık, 2007; Çiftçi, 2010; Kanatlı, 2008; Metin, 2008; Metin, 2010; Metin & Demiryürek, 2009; Metin & Özmen, 2009, 2010; Metin, 2011). After examining the results, it was carried out interview with 15 teachers in different branches and they were asked to four questions about the performance assessment. The four main questions were as follows: 1) *"What do you think about performance assessment? Please explain"*, 2) *"What do you think about negative features of performance assessment? Please explain"*, 3) *"What do you think about negative features of performance assessment? Please explain"* and 4) *"Do you encounter any problems while applying performance assessment? Please explain"*. Interview was carried out teachers in appropriate environment which teachers filled comfort in this environment and teachers explained to abstain. These interview and literature helped constitute the item pool. There are fifteen teachers in different branches who participated voluntarily in our study. The aim of selecting students in different levels is to determinate suitable statements for all teachers. Teachers' composition assignments were given in an environment in which the students felt comfortable.

In the second stage, after interview and reviewing, an item pool was developed which consisted of 47 statements about performance assessment. There were 23 positive and 24 negative statements in the item pool of draft attitude scale. After deciding on the items, an initial item pool was generated and 47 items were put on a five-point rating scale using classifications like "strongly disagree," "disagree," "undecided," "agree" and "strongly agree."

In the third stage, for the purpose of content validation, an initial draft of the instrument with 47 items on a five-point rating scale was given to a group of four education experts in the fields of Turkish language, educational psychology, and educational measurement. Their opinions helped to determine whether the selected items were valid items for assessing teachers' opinions about performance assessment. Having received feedback from experts, twelve items were deleted because they were found unsuitable in terms of clarity. According to expert opinions, it was decided that this questionnaire consists of four sub-scales. First sub-scale called on positive views about performance assessment consists of twelve items. Second sub-scale called on negative views about performance assessment consists of ten items. Third sub-scale called on knowledge level about performance assessment consists of five items. Forty sub-scales called on meeting difficulty form applying performance assessment consists of eight items

In the fourth stage, the final draft of the attitude scale with 35 items was administered to 610 teachers for calculating validity and reliability of the attitude scale. Teachers' responses were entered in an excel file created for further analyses.

In the last stage, the data collected from the 610 teachers in the study was analyzed by means of factor analysis and reliability analysis through the use of SPSS 11.5. Before

conducting the factor analysis of the scale, the Kaiser–Meyer Olkin (KMO) measurement of sampling adequacy and Barlett’s test were calculated to evaluate whether the sample was large enough to apply a satisfactory factor analysis and was examined to determine appropriateness of factor analysis. The KMO sampling adequacy test statistic was 0.848. This value is higher than the threshold value of 0.01 (Kline, 1994). Barlett’s test of Sphericity statistic was significant [3191.18 ($p < 0.01$)]. Results of KMO and Barlett’s test appear to support the validity of the factor analysis usage for this study. The data was subjected to factor analysis using the principle component method. The principal components factor analysis was followed by a varimax rotation (rotated component matrix). These four factors of questionnaire explained 65.425% of the total variance. This value is appropriate considering that other work focused on opinions showed lower explained variance (Kline, 1994: 41%). Besides reliability analysis was performed for each of the emerged sub-scales, and the Cronbach alpha correlation coefficients were used. Then, the Cronbach alpha correlation coefficients were calculated among these factors. It was discovered that all of the sub-dimensions of the questionnaire reliable coefficient changed between 0.70 – 0.83 and general reliable coefficient was 0.85.

c) Analysis of data

Teachers’ responses to the questionnaire were statistically analyzed according to gender and branch variables via SPSS 11.5 software. It is just like five point Likert Type scale and each statement were labelled as 5=completely agree, 4=mostly agree, 3=medium level agree, 2=slightly agree and 1=disagree. Positive attributions were graded as 5-1 and negative attributions were graded as 1-5 questionnaire. Ranges of agreement with the attributions on the questionnaire was determined by using $(n-1)/n$ formula and after calculations the interval width of the range between 1 through 5 was calculated as 0.8. The interval width of 1.00-1.80 showed disagree, the 1.81-2.60 intervals showed slightly agree, the 2.61-3.40 interval showed medium level agree, the 3.41-4.20 interval showed mostly agree, and the 4.21-5.00 interval showed completely agree of agreement with the statements on questionnaire. The mean ($\bar{x}$) percentages (%) and frequency (f) scores were computed for each attribution. In the study, some parametric tests such as t-test; one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) based on $p=0.05$ significance level were used to clarify the significance of the differences on means. LSD test was used in order to determine source of the differences on means in ANOVA.

FINDINGS

The aim of study is to investigate opinions of teachers about performance assessment with respect to the gender and branch variables. For this aim, the questionnaire was performed to teachers. It is showed that results of the questionnaire have four sub-scales in tables.

According to gender and branch, means of teachers’ answers regarding attributions of first sub-dimension called on “*positive views about performance assessments*” were given in Table 1.

Table 1. Means of teachers' answers regarding attributions of first sub-dimension

	Positive views about performance assessment (PVPA)	M	F	Pr	Sci	Tur	Mat	Soc	Oth	$\bar{x}$
1	I think that performance assessment is an objective assessment approach	3,14	2,69	3,06	2,74	3,00	2,57	2,82	2,93	2,90
2	Students were assessed versatily with performance assessment.	3,24	3,04	3,25	2,89	3,00	3,14	2,64	3,32	3,13
3	Performance assessment enabled students to evaluate themselves	3,36	2,99	3,24	3,42	3,13	2,90	3,00	3,14	3,17
4	I think that performance assessment increase creativity	3,35	3,11	3,04	3,58	3,00	2,95	3,36	3,64	3,23
5	performance assessment increase self-confident of students	3,41	3,21	3,27	3,53	3,27	3,14	3,09	3,46	3,31
6	I think that learning with performance assessment are more detailed	3,44	3,25	3,26	3,79	2,93	3,57	3,45	3,21	3,34
7	It was carried out applications regarding identification of students in performance assessment	3,70	3,03	3,32	3,58	3,20	3,14	3,36	3,50	3,35
8	Performance assessment is a effective assessment approach for different from standard examination	3,31	3,21	3,35	2,95	2,87	2,86	3,64	3,64	3,26
9	I identifies students easily with performance assessment	3,22	2,97	3,28	3,42	2,87	2,71	2,91	2,93	3,09
10	I believe that peer assessment is improved to students	3,25	3,10	2,98	3,42	3,40	3,24	3,18	3,21	3,17
11	I think that students cannot make self-assessments appropriately	3,60	3,51	3,55	3,37	3,53	3,67	3,64	3,57	3,55
12	I don't believe that portfolio effect improvement of students	3,12	2,75	2,96	2,68	3,00	2,71	2,64	3,25	2,92

M: Male; F: Female, Pr: Primary teachers, Sci: Science and Technology teachers; Tur: Turkish teachers; Mat: Mathematic teachers; Soc: Social science teachers; Oth; teachers from other branches

In table 1, it can be seen that mean score of 12 attributions in positive views about performance assessment sub-dimension are between 2.90 and 3.55. This result revealed that eleven attributions in this sub-dimension are in “medium level agrees” category and the other is in “mostly agree” category. According to gender of teachers' variable, it was determined that even though male teachers responded “mostly agree” to 5th, 6th and 7th attributions, female teachers responded “medium level agrees”. In additions to science and technology teachers and teachers from other branches' answers the fourth, fifth and seventh attributions, science and technology teachers' answers the third, ninth and tenth attributions are in “mostly agree” category, however, the other teachers' answers these attributions are in “medium level agrees” category. Similarly, while science and technology mathematic and social science teachers' answers the sixth attributions are in “mostly agree” category, in the other teachers' answers these attributions are in “medium level agrees” category.

According to gender and branch, means of teachers' answers regarding attributions of second sub-dimension called on “negative views about performance assessments” were given in Table 2.

Table 2. Means of teachers' answers regarding attributions of second sub-dimension

	Negative views about performance assessment (NVPA)	M	F	Pr	Sci	Tur	Mat	Soc	Oth	$\bar{x}$
1	I think that application of performance assessment is very difficult.	2,91	2,66	2,75	2,63	2,53	2,90	3,18	2,82	2,78
2	I think that performance assessment is very tiring.	2,60	2,42	2,62	2,68	2,40	2,29	2,64	2,32	2,51
3	I believe that performance assessment takes too much time	2,34	2,53	2,52	2,42	2,13	2,48	2,27	2,46	2,44
4	I think that instruments of performance assessment is very expensive	2,58	2,89	2,78	2,47	2,80	3,05	2,27	2,79	2,74
5	I believe that portfolio assessment is waste of time	2,91	2,70	2,83	2,47	2,60	2,67	3,09	3,07	2,80
6	I think that check list is not necessary	3,08	2,97	2,87	2,84	3,00	3,14	3,27	3,29	3,02
7	I think that self and peer assessment are waste of time	3,08	2,83	2,81	2,26	3,00	3,05	2,91	3,61	2,95
8	I believe that performance task is not necessary	2,89	2,87	2,88	2,47	2,87	3,00	2,36	3,29	2,88
9	I think that it is very difficult to applicability of performance assessment	2,88	2,52	2,87	2,32	2,87	2,57	2,55	2,64	2,70
10	I don't want to applied it if applicability of performance assessment is not compulsory	2,53	2,45	2,57	2,00	2,20	2,19	2,09	3,18	2,49

M: Male; F: Female, Pr: Primary teachers, Sci: Science and Technology teachers; Tur: Turkish teachers; Mat: Mathematic teachers; Soc: Social science teachers; Oth; teachers from other branches

As seen from table 2, the mean score of 10 attributions in negative views about performance assessment sub-dimension are between 2.44 and 3.02. This result revealed that seven attributions in this sub-dimension are in “medium level agrees” category and the other is in “slightly agree” category. According to gender variable, it was investigated that even though male teachers' answers to the fourth attribution in this sub-dimensions are in “slightly agree” category, female teachers' answers to this attribution are in “medium level agrees” category and female teachers' answers to the ninth attribution in this sub-dimensions are in “slightly agree” category, whereas male teachers' answers to this attribution are in “medium level agrees” category. In addition, it can be seen that although science and technology, social science and primary teachers' answers to the second attributions are in “medium level agrees”, the other teachers' answers to this attribution are in “slightly agree” category. Besides, science and technology, social science teachers' answers to the fourth attribution, science and technology teachers' answers the fifth attribution and science and technology, mathematics and social science teachers' answers to the ninth attribution are in “slightly agree” category, despite the fact that the others teachers' answers to these attributions are in “medium level agrees” category.

According to gender and branch, means of teachers' answers regarding attributions of third sub-dimension called on “*knowledge level about performance assessments*” were given in Table 3.

Table 3. Means of teachers' answers regarding attributions of third sub-dimension

	Knowledge level about performance assessment (KLPA)	M	F	Pr	Sci	Tur	Mat	Soc	Oth	$\bar{x}$
1	I don't have enough knowledge about performance assessment	3,75	3,47	3,59	3,95	3,13	3,62	3,55	3,64	3,60
2	I don't know how to assess rubric	3,52	3,32	3,42	3,42	3,60	3,24	3,36	3,46	3,42
3	I don't know how to prepare portfolio	3,61	3,38	3,55	3,63	3,33	3,14	3,64	3,57	3,49
4	I don't know completely how to prepare performance and project task	3,48	3,43	3,58	3,11	3,13	3,05	3,55	3,86	3,45
5	I have not enough knowledge about rubrics	3,21	3,28	3,15	3,16	2,67	3,57	3,00	3,68	3,25

M: Male; F: Female, Pr: Primary teachers, Sci: Science and Technology teachers; Tur: Turkish teachers; Mat: Mathematic teachers; Soc: Social science teachers; Oth; teachers from other branches

According to the mean scores of five attributions in knowledge level about performance assessment sub-dimensions in Table 3, are between 3.25 and 3.60. This result revealed that one attribution in this sub-dimension are in “medium level agrees” category and the other is in “mostly agree” category. According to gender variable, it was determined that even though male teachers' answers to the second and third attributions in this sub-dimension are in “mostly agree” category, female teachers' answers to these attributions are in “medium level agrees” category. In addition, it can be seen that even though Turkish teachers' answers to first and third attributions, mathematic teachers' answers to second, third and fourth attributions, science and technology teachers' answers to the fourth attribution are in “medium level agrees” category, the other teachers' answers to these attributions are in “mostly agree” category.

According to gender and branch, means of teachers' answers regarding attributions of fourth sub-dimension called on “*Encountering problems from applications of performance assessment*” were given in Table 4.

Table 4. Means of teachers' answers regarding attributions of fourth sub-dimension

	Encountered problems during applications of performance assessment (EPPA)	M	F	Pr	Sci	Tur	Mat	Soc	Oth	$\bar{x}$
1	I encounter problems during determining performance standards	3,36	2,90	2,87	3,37	2,93	3,57	3,09	3,25	3,12
2	I am slogging during assessing of portfolio	2,94	3,00	2,87	3,21	2,93	2,90	2,73	3,18	2,97
3	It impossible that all of students participate to application of performance assessment activities	2,79	2,72	2,79	3,11	3,00	2,43	2,55	2,64	2,75
4	I am slogging during preparing of performance tasks	3,24	2,90	3,06	3,05	2,73	2,76	3,27	3,39	3,06
5	It difficult to apply performance assessment activities in the classroom environment	2,50	2,57	2,59	2,63	3,00	2,33	2,36	2,32	2,53
6	I think that determining performance criteria is very difficulty	2,92	3,12	2,84	2,84	3,00	3,29	3,27	3,25	3,02
7	Evaluation of performance task is very difficult	3,02	3,10	3,01	2,53	3,07	2,95	3,91	3,29	3,06
8	I think that preparing different assessment form for each students are arduous	2,54	2,63	2,61	2,21	2,33	2,76	2,91	2,68	2,59

As seen in table 4, the mean score of eight attributions in encountering problems from applications of performance assessment sub-dimension are between 2.53 and 3.12. This result revealed that six attributions in this sub-dimension are in “medium level agrees” category and the other is in “mostly agree” category. According to gender variable, it was investigated that even though female teachers’ answers to the eighth attribution in this sub-dimension are in “mostly agree” category, male teachers’ answers to this attribution is in “medium level agrees”. In addition, it can be seen that although mathematics and social science teachers’ answers to the third attribution and science and technology and Turkish teachers’ answers to fifth attribution are in “mostly agree”, the other teachers’ answers to this attribution are in “medium level agrees” category. Besides, while teachers from other branches, mathematics and social science and primary teachers’ answers to the eighth attribution are in “mostly agree”, the other teachers’ answers to this attribution are in “medium level agrees” category.

In order to determine whether teachers’ opinions on performance assessment scores differed between genders of teachers, an independent-sample t-test was conducted. The independent-sample t-test scores can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Independent sample t-test scores in terms of genders

	Male (n=292)		Female(n=318)		t	p
	$\bar{X}$	ss	$\bar{X}$	ss		
PVPA	39,89	5,907	37,52	7,289	4,397	,001
OVPA	32,20	7,535	33,14	6,501	-1,664	,002
KLPA	12,44	3,768	13,12	3,913	-2,186	,267
EPPA	24,68	5,669	25,28	5,516	-1,320	,106

The independent-sample t-test scores show that there are significant differences between the teachers’ PVPA ($t=4.397$; $p<0.05$) and OVPA ($t=-1.664$; $p<0.05$) sub-dimensions in terms of gender. However there are no significant differences between the teachers’ KLPA ($t=-2.186$; $p>0.05$) and EPPA ($t=-1.320$; $p>0.05$).

In order to see whether teachers’ opinions about performance assessment scores differed in terms of teachers’ branch, one-way between-groups ANOVA test was conducted. Table 6 provides the descriptive statistics on branch of teachers.

Table 6. Summary of one way ANOVA on branch of teachers

	Pr (n=234)		Sci (n=76)		Tur (n=60)		Mat (n=84)		Soc (n=44)		Oth (n=112)		F	P
	$\bar{X}$	ss	$\bar{X}$	ss	$\bar{X}$	ss	$\bar{X}$	ss	$\bar{X}$	ss	$\bar{X}$	ss		
PVPA	38,8	7,95	40,0	5,08	37,2	3,90	37,2	6,04	38,4	6,09	39,3	6,83	2,22	,050
OVPA	32,5	7,70	35,4	6,66	33,6	4,64	32,67	5,79	33,36	5,39	30,54	7,62	4,88	,000
KLPA	12,7	3,87	12,7	3,52	14,1	3,33	13,38	4,08	12,91	4,35	11,79	3,73	3,47	,004
EPPA	25,6	6,38	25,1	5,28	25,1	4,29	25,00	4,39	23,91	4,15	24,00	5,85	1,65	,145

According to the mean scores in Table 6, science teachers have higher score on PVPA ($\bar{X}=40.00$) and OVPA ($\bar{X}=35.4$) sub-dimensions than the other teachers. Besides, Turkish teachers have higher score on KLPA ($\bar{X}=14.1$) and primary teachers have higher score on EPPA ($\bar{X}=25.6$) sub-dimensions than the other teachers. As seen result in table 6, the ANOVA test scores show that in the term of teachers’ branch, while there are statistically difference at the $p<.05$ level in teachers’ PVPA, OVPA and KLPA sub-dimensions, there is not statistically difference at the $p>.05$ level in teachers’ EPPA sub-dimension. In order to

find out the source of the differences in teachers' opinions on performance assessment in the term of teachers' branch, LSD test was used and scores are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. LSD test scores on branch of teachers

		PVPA		OVPA		KLPA		EPPA	
Branch		Se	p	Se	p	Se	p	Se	p
Pri	Sci	.888	.188	.913	.001	.504	.970	.736	.438
	Tur	.974	.095	1.001	.267	.552	.011	.807	.544
	Mat	.856	.056	.880	.838	.486	.173	.709	.380
	Soc	1.106	.735	1.136	.441	.627	.761	.917	.062
	Oth	.773	.524	.795	.014	.439	.034	.641	.051
Sci	Pri	.888	.188	.913	.001	.504	.970	.736	.438
	Tur	1.162	.016	1.194	.128	.659	.035	.963	.933
	Mat	1.065	.009	1.095	.012	.604	.287	.883	.952
	Soc	1.275	.226	1.310	.117	.723	.812	1.057	.280
	Oth	1.000	.498	1.028	.000	.567	.094	.829	.205
Tur	Pri	.974	.095	1.001	.267	.552	.011	.807	.544
	Sci	1.162	.016	1.194	.128	.659	.035	.963	.933
	Mat	1.137	.993	1.169	.425	.645	.244	.943	.888
	Soc	1.336	.348	1.373	.863	.758	.107	1.107	.269
	Oth	1.077	.049	1.106	.006	.611	.000	.892	.205
Mat	Pri	.856	.056	.880	.838	.486	.173	.709	.380
	Sci	1.065	.009	1.095	.012	.604	.287	.883	.952
	Tur	1.137	.993	1.169	.425	.645	.244	.943	.888
	Soc	1.252	.313	1.287	.588	.710	.507	1.038	.294
	Oth	.971	.029	.998	.033	.551	.004	.805	.215
Soc	Pri	1.106	.735	1.136	.441	.627	.761	.917	.062
	Sci	1.275	.226	1.310	.117	.723	.812	1.057	.280
	Tur	1.336	.348	1.373	.863	.758	.107	1.107	.269
	Mat	1.252	.313	1.287	.588	.710	.507	1.038	.294
	oth	1.197	.469	1.231	.022	.679	.099	.992	.927
Oth	Pri	.773	.524	.795	.014	.439	.034	.641	.051
	Sci	1.000	.498	1.028	.000	.567	.094	.829	.205
	Tur	1.077	.049	1.106	.006	.611	.000	.892	.205
	Mat	.971	.029	.998	.033	.551	.004	.805	.215
	Soc	1.197	.469	1.231	.022	.679	.099	.992	.927

As shown in table 7, source of the difference in PVPA sub-dimension arises from between science and technology and Turkish teachers, science and technology-mathematic teachers and teachers from other branches-Turkish teachers, teachers from other branches-mathematic teachers ($p < 0.05$). Besides, source of the difference in OVPA sub-dimension arise from between teachers from other branches and primary, science and technology, Turkish, mathematic, social science teachers; science and technology and primary, mathematic teachers ($p < 0.05$). Furthermore, source of the difference in KLPA sub-dimension arise from between teachers from other branches and primary, Turkish, mathematic, social science teachers; Turkish teachers and primary, science and technology teachers ($p < 0.05$).

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSIONS

At the end of study, it was seen that the teachers had both positive and negative opinions about performance assessment. Also the teachers thought that they could understand their students well, it increased students confidence, developed creative thinking of students

enabled them to assess in multi-ways and also enabled students to evaluate themselves. Teachers' opinions about performance assessment were supported many studies in literature (Adanalı, 2008; Airasian, 2001; Birgin, 2003; Birgin & Baki, 2007; Çepni, 2007; Kan, 2007; Khattri, Reve & Kane, 1998; Kubiszyn & Borich, 1993; Kutlu, Doğan & Karakaya, 2008; Linn & Gronlund, 2000; Metin, 2008; Metin & Demiryürek, 2009; Metin, 2010, 2011; Metin & Birişçi, 2010, 2011). Nonetheless teachers had positive opinions, teachers also thought that performance assessments were time consuming and tiring; students could not make self-assessments appropriately in portfolio, peer assessments; there was no use in checklists. Negative opinions of teachers about performance assessment are the same as many studies determinate teachers opinions performance and portfolio assessment. Many researchers revealed that there are many disadvantages of performance and portfolio assessment such as time consuming, expensive, arduous and tiring (Airasian, 2001; Birgin, 2003; Çepni, 2007; Kan, 2007; Kutlu, Doğan & Karakaya, 2008; Linn & Gronlund, 2000; Metin, 2010; Metin & Demiryürek, 2009). Besides, in the studies of Adanalı (2008), Algan (2008), Kanatlı (2008), Metin (2010) and Metin and Özmen (2010), it was expressed that teachers thought students could not make self-assessments appropriately and using of checklist was unnecessary. It was very normal for teachers to have both positive and negative opinions. This situation has stemmed from that teachers have not already applied the performance assessment approach. If teachers apply activities of performance assessment consistently in the classroom, they increase positive opinions about performance assessment. This idea was supported by Metin (2010).

In another result of study, there was a statistical and meaningful difference ($p < 0.05$) at the positive views about performance assessment (PVPA) and negative views about performance assessment (NVPA) sub-dimensions of teachers' thoughts about the performance assessments. It was found that this difference was in favour of male teachers. According to this result it can be said that male teachers have more positive opinions about the performance assessment than female teachers. This case may stem from that female teachers have less knowledge than male teachers. Therefore, female teachers have less positive attitudes towards the performance assessments. Metin (2010) and Metin and Özmen (2009) revealed that female teachers need more knowledge about measurement and assessment field than male teachers. Besides, in the studies of Kanatlı (2008) and Metin (2010) it were concluded that aspect of male teacher on measurement and assessment were more positive than female teachers. Besides, male teachers perceived to be enough fields of measurement and assessment.

When it was investigated teachers' opinions about performance assessment in the term of branch, it is seen that science teachers have more positive thought about the performance assessments than primary teachers and mathematics teachers. Furthermore the teachers from other branches such as Physical teachers, Music teachers, English teachers and Moral and Religion teachers have more negative opinions about the performance assessment than primary teachers and mathematics teachers, social studies teachers have. In other words science teachers have the most positive opinion about the performance assessment among the teachers and the teachers from other branches have the most negative opinions about the performance assessments. Science teachers may have the most positive opinions about the performance assessment may stem from that preparing performances task for science is so easier than other courses and performance task examples are so much abundant in the field of science. In the literature, the studies about the performance assessment have generally been made at the field of science teaching (Çepni, 2007; Çepni et al., 2008; Metin, 2010; Metin & Özmen, 2009, 2010; Şenel, 2008). It was thought that the sources of teachers from other branches have more negative opinions about performance assessment because they were not

wanted to using performance assessment in the classroom and they have not enough knowledge about this assessment.

Another result retrieved from the study is that the teachers do not have enough knowledge about the performance assessment. It is seen that the teachers do not know how to assess rubrics, how to prepare performance and project task and portfolio. These results are supported by some studies in the literature. Many studies such as Adanalı (2008), Algan (2008), Kanatlı (2008), Metin (2010), Metin and Birişçi (2011), Metin and Demiryürek (2009), and Metin and Özmen (2010) expressed that teachers have not knowledge performance assessment. At the study, it is seen that there is no meaningful difference based on gender at the level of knowledge. Either female teachers or male teachers have alike of knowledge about the performance assessments. In addition, it is seen that Turkish teachers have more knowledge about performance assessment than Primary teachers and Science teachers. Besides, it is understood that Science teachers and Primary teachers have more knowledge than the teachers from other branches. In other words, consciousness of Turkish teachers on performance assessment is the highest among the other teachers and the teachers with the least knowledge about the performance assessment are Physical teachers, Music teachers, English teachers and Moral and Religion teachers. According to results of study, all of teachers need to teaching of performance assessment. However, Physical teachers, Music teachers, English teachers and Moral and Religion teachers need to more teaching of performance assessment than the others teachers. The result show that there are not sample of performance task and there are not enough knowledge and examples about performance task in course books and teacher guide books for Physical teachers, Music teachers, English teachers and Moral and Religion teachers. Thus, some researchers dictated that there are not enough examples of application about performance task in the course books (Metin, 2010; Metin & Demiryürek, 2009)

The fact that the teachers do not have enough knowledge about the performance assessment may possible a problem while they apply this assessment approach in the classroom. As a matter of fact, it is understood that the teachers encounter problems when they determine the performance criteria, prepare the performance task and assess. When results of the study are related to the literature, it is understood that the biggest problems are that teachers do not have enough knowledge about this assessment and there are not enough example materials and checklists that guide the teachers in different branches. It was provided to carried out performance assessment appropriately that rational of performance was comprehend assessment to teachers and encountering problems of teachers related to performance assessment were removed.

REFERENCES

- Adanalı, K. (2008). *Sosyal bilgiler eğitiminde alternatif değerlendirme: 5. sınıf sosyal bilgiler eğitiminin alternatif değerlendirme etkinlikleri açısından değerlendirilmesi*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.
- Airasian, P.W. (2001). *Classroom assessment: Concepts and application*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Algan, S. (2008). *İlköğretim 6. ve 7. sınıf sosyal bilgiler dersi öğretim programının ölçme ve değerlendirme ögesinin öğretmen görüşleri açısından incelenmesi*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana
- Baron, J. B. (1991). *Performance assessment: Blurring the edges of assessment, curriculum, and instruction*. In: Kulm G, Malcolm SM (eds.), *Science assessment in the service of reform* Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 247-266.
- Birgin, O. (2003). *Bilgisayar destekli bireysel gelişim dosyasının uygulanabilirliğinin araştırılması*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, KTÜ Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Trabzon.
- Birgin, O. & Baki, A. (2007). The use of portfolio to assess student's performance, *Türk Fen Eğitimi Dergisi*, 4(2), 75-90.
- Çalık, S. (2007). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin yenilenen ilköğretim programlarının ölçme ve değerlendirme süreci hakkındaki düşünceleri üzerine bir araştırma*, 16. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi, 5-7 Eylül 2007, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Tokat.
- Çepni, S. (2007). Performansların Değerlendirilmesi, Karip, E. (Ed.), *Ölçme ve Değerlendirme*, Pegema Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Çepni S, Ayas, A., Akdeniz, A.R, Özmen, H., Yiğit, N. & Ayvacı, H. (2008). *Kuramdan Uygulamaya Fen ve Teknoloji Öğretimi*, Pegema Yayıncılık, 7. Baskı, Ankara.
- Çiftçi, S. (2010). İlköğretim birinci kademe 4. ve 5. sınıf öğretmenlerinin performans görevlerine ilişkin görüşleri, *İlköğretim Online*, 9(3), 934-951.
- Firestone, W., Mayrowetz, D. & Fairman, J. (1998). Performance-based assessment and instructional change: The effects of testing in Maine and Maryland. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 20, 95-113.
- Güven, B. & Eskitürk, M. (2007). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin ölçme ve değerlendirmede kullandıkları yöntem ve teknikler*, 16. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi, 5-7 Eylül 2007, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Tokat.
- Kan, A. (2007). Portfolyo değerlendirme. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32, 133-144.
- Kanatlı, F. (2008). *Alternatif ölçme ve değerlendirme teknikleri konusunda sınıf öğretmenlerinin görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Hatay.
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri* (15. Baskı), Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Khatti, N., Reeve, A.L. & Kane, M.B. (1998). *Principles and practices of performance assessment*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Kim, S. (2005). *Effects of implementing performance assessment on student learning: Meta-analysis using Hlm*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.
- Kline, P. (1994) *An Easy Guide to Factor Analysis*, London: Routledge.
- Kubiszyn, T. & Borich, G. (1993). *Educational testing and measurement: Classroom application and practice*, Harper Collins College Publishers, Fourth Edition.
- Kutlu, O., Doğan, C. & Karakaya, I. (2008). *Öğrenci başarısının belirlenmesi performansa ve portfolyoya dayalı durum belirleme*. Ankara: Pegema Yayıncılık.
- Linn, R. L. & Baker. E. L. (1996). Can performance-based student assessments be psychometrically sound?, In J. B. Babon & D. P. Wolf (Eds.), *Performance-based student assessment: Challenges and possibilities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago press.
- Linn, R. L. & Gronlund, N. E. (2000). *Measurement and assessment in teaching*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- MEB, (2004). *İlköğretim fen ve teknoloji dersi (4–5. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı*. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. Ankara
- Metin, M. (2008). Performans değerlendirmenin öğretmen adayları üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi. *Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi*, 354, 28-35
- Metin, M. (2010). *Fen ve teknoloji öğretmenleri için hazırlanan performans değerlendirmeye yönelik hizmet içi eğitim kursunun etkililiği*, Doktora Tezi, KTU Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Trabzon.
- Metin, M. (2011). The examinations of teachers' attitude towards performance assessment with respect to the different variables. *Energy Education Science and Technology Part B: Social and Educational Studies*, 3(3), 269-284.
- Metin, M. & Birişçi, S. (2010). Öğretmen adaylarının performansa dayalı değerlendirmenin etkisi hakkındaki düşünceleri: “çevre sorunu örneği”. *Türk Eğitim Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(3), 527-567.
- Metin M. & Birişçi, S. (2011). Opinions of primary teachers in different branch about alternative assessment. *Education & Science*, 36 (159), 140-153.
- Metin, M. & Demiryürek, G. (2009). Türkçe öğretmenlerinin yenilenen Türkçe öğretim programlarının ölçme - değerlendirme anlayışı hakkındaki düşünceleri. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28, 37-51.
- Metin, M. & Özmen, H. (2009). Öğretmenlerin performans değerlendirmeye yönelik hizmet-içi ihtiyaçlarının belirlenmesi: Artvin ili örneği. *Fen, Sosyal ve Çevre Eğitiminde Son Gelişmeler*, 18 – 20 Kasım 2009, Giresun Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, Giresun.
- Metin, M. & Özmen, H. (2010). Fen ve teknoloji öğretmenlerinin performans değerlendirmeye yönelik hizmet içi eğitim (HİE) ihtiyaçlarının belirlenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 18, (3), 819-838.
- Nitko, A. J. (2004). *Educational assessment of students*, 4th Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Orhan, A. T. (2007). *Fen eğitiminde alternatif ölçme ve değerlendirme yöntemlerinin ilköğretim öğretmen adayı, öğretmen ve öğrenci boyutu dikkate alınarak incelenmesi, Doktora Tezi*, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Reeves, T. C. (2000) Alternative assessment approaches for online learning environments in higher education. *Educational Computing Research*, 3(1), 101-111.
- Sağlam Arslan, A, Avcı, N. & İyibilir, Ü. (2008). Fizik öğretmen adaylarının alternatif ölçme-değerlendirme yöntemlerini algılama düzeyleri. *Dicle Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11, 115-128.
- Shavelson, R.J., Baxter, G.P. & Pine, J. (1992) Performance assessments; political rhetoric and measurement reality, *Educational Researcher*, 22-27.
- Shavelson, R. J. (1994). Guest editor's preface, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 21, 235-237.
- Simonson M., Smaldino, S, Albright, M. & Zvacek, S. (2000). Assessment for distance education (ch 11) *Teaching and Learning at a Distance: Foundations of Distance Education*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Stiggins, R. J. (2001). *Student-involved classroom assessment* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.
- Şenel, T. (2008). *Fen ve teknoloji öğretmenleri için alternatif ölçme ve değerlendirme tekniklerine yönelik bir hizmet içi eğitim programının etkililiğinin araştırılması*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, KTÜ Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Trabzon.
- Winking, D. (1997). Critical issue: Ensuring equity with alternative assessments [online document]. NCREL (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory), Oak Brook: IL. Available online: <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/methods/assment/as800.htm>