

## A Study of Opportunities and Threats of Descriptive Assessment from Managers, Teachers and Experts Points of View in Chaharmahal and Bakhteyari Primary Schools

Mahin Naderi<sup>[a]</sup>; Maryam Shoja Hiedari<sup>[a]</sup>; Fatemeh Mehrabifar<sup>[b]</sup>; Hamid Mortazavi<sup>[c]</sup>;  
Mohammad Reza Jalilvand<sup>[d],\*</sup>

<sup>[a]</sup>Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Educational Science & Psychology, University of Isfahan.

<sup>[b]</sup>Faculty of Educational Planning, Islamic Azad University, Oloom Tahghighat Branch, Tehran, Iran.

<sup>[c]</sup>Department of Educational Sciences, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran.

<sup>[d]</sup>Department of New Sciences and Technologies, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.

\*Corresponding author.

Received 18 April 2012; accepted 13 June 2012

### Abstract

The aim of current study is to determine the strength and weakness of executing descriptive evaluation from the viewpoint of deans, teachers and experts of Chaharmahal and Bakhtiari province. A survey descriptive approach was performed. Statistical population includes 208 deans, 303 teachers, and 100 executive experts of descriptive evaluation scheme in Chaharmahal and Bakhtiari province in educational year 1387-88. Sample's volume after some statistical estimation calculated to be 175, and members of the sample were selected by random sampling of a category proportional to the selected volume, that contains 100 teachers, 50 deans and 25 experts. To identify the justifiability of the inventory, opinions of twelve persons including advisor professor, consulting professor, designer of the descriptive evaluation scheme, four of educational planning department professors and five of experts holding masters and Ph. D. degrees that are executives of the scheme in Chaharmahal and Bakhtiari, were used. Measurement tools included; 1) documents including reports, regulations and documents related to the running of this plan; 2) interviews conducted to use the opinions of experts in doing descriptive evaluation; 3) a self-administrated questionnaire including 4 items and 74 close-ended questions, and open-ended ones. For analyzing the data produced by inventory, we used SPSS-13 to analyze the data in two levels of descriptive and inferential. We also have used single variable t-test,

independent t-test, one-way analysis of variance, and least significant difference (LSD) tests. Results showed that the executives of descriptive evaluation scheme in Chaharmahal and Bakhtiari province evaluate the so called scheme above average regarding to four scales (strength and weakness).

**Key words:** Chaharmahal; Bakhteyari; Opportunities; Threats; Primary school

Mahin Naderi, Maryam Shoja Hiedari, Fatemeh Mehrabifar, Hamid Mortazavi, Mohammad Reza Jalilvand (2012). A Study of Opportunities and Threats of Descriptive Assessment from Managers, Teachers and Experts Points of View in Chaharmahal and Bakhteyari Primary Schools. *Canadian Social Science*, 8(3), 22-31. Available from URL: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/j.css.1923669720120803.3243> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.css.1923669720120803.3243>.

### INTRODUCTION

During the past few years, there have been extensive arguments over educational reforms in schools. The evaluation of students is considered as a key factor in school reformation and improvement in education and learning (Seif, 2010). Dissatisfied with traditional forms of evaluation, most countries decided to revise and reconsider their evaluation systems. During the last two decades, the researchers in this field have also proposed new methods of evaluation. This new method is called descriptive evaluation as opposed to the traditional system of evaluation and based on new educational attitudes to combat the challenge the educational system faces (Hassani & Ahmadi, 2005). This system of descriptive evaluation was passed in the 296th summit of the supreme council of education along with setting goals for the tentative scheme of descriptive evaluation in elementary school students with one of its main objectives being the reformation of education – learning process in classrooms. An increased mental stability (stability of learning),

increased interest in learning, attention to the objectives of non-cognitive areas are considered as other objectives of this project (Hassani, 2006). It is expected that proper evaluation will pave the way for educational reforms. In traditional educational systems, evaluation was performed as the last step in order to make judgments about the students going on to higher levels. Currently, evaluation is an indispensable part of the teaching – learning process, which focuses on leading the students' learning rather than classifying them (Pasha Sharifi, 2004).

## THE NECESSITY OF THE STUDY

The academic evaluation system is one of the components of the educational system, which connects education and learning. It is one of the factors improving these two components. The evaluation of academic improvement is an important subject which has received great attention from educational experts and policy makers (Nevo, 1995). Educational evaluation involves the process of planning, development and provision of descriptive information about the components of the curriculum (Mehr Mohammadi, 2002). Evaluation motivates the students to learn how to learn. Teachers should judge the students' weaknesses and strengths based on studying the results of the evaluation and considering academic goals and expectations and propose some tips for the improvement of the students' learning activities and psychological well-being (Zeini Vand, 2008). One of the most important issues overlooked in some societies and therefore in planning and developing infrastructures is the differences among students. Obviously, one of the most challenging issues the educational system has always faced is whether the role of the educational system is to educate the elite or to educate all children and students regardless of their differences (Armion, 2008). The UNESCO notes the urgency of developing modern solutions to the problems human beings face in the 21st century, as if feeling there should be different methods in educational systems than the old and traditional ones (Tawil, 2002). The descriptive evaluation was proposed as opposed to traditional method of evaluation and based on new strategies for facing the government's challenges. The descriptive evaluation is the process of gathering, analyzing and interpreting information using different tools (paper-pencil tests, performance tests, recording observations, checking homework assignments, tasks and so on) about different aspects of the learning and decision making process and providing useful descriptive feedbacks in order to direct this process to a better realization of goals (Hassani, 2009). When the educational evaluation stops being traditional or quantitative, there is no longer a marked difference between students with special needs and their normal peers because the criteria for evaluation is not just getting grades in exams, and students at any age (perhaps both genders) are given unlimited opportunities

to test their talents in different areas and get social and personal achievements. These opportunities could be "athletic, academic, scientific, artistic, technical, etc." ones (Foster, 2007). The advantages of the descriptive evaluation include expressing weaknesses and strengths in learning, providing suitable solutions to problems, and respecting individual differences between students. In this form of evaluation, each student is tested against himself/herself and is not compared to other students with different skills and abilities (Habibi, 2008). Research shows that evaluating improvement is a complicated and vague challenge (Kanter & Jick, 2002). One challenge which the educational evaluation system faces is lack of a proper propagation pattern for developments in this area. In fact, the problem of spreading innovation and general changes is an important challenge of the whole educational system of the country and the subsystem of evaluation will inevitably suffer. One serious challenge for a sound a logical set up of this plan is the negative attitude parents and societies have toward this plan. An early study conducted by the bureau of evaluation shows obvious negative attitudes. Therefore, a comprehensive plan needs to be developed to correct the attitude of the teachers (Moghni Zade, 2004). Educational experts consider evaluation as a key factor in improving schools, teaching methods of teachers and learning of students (Stigins, 2004). The concept of competency is among these concepts which have been extensively discussed. It could be defined as the ability to use knowledge, attitudes and skills in an inventive and effective way, in different situations (Farstad, 2004). Since the process of teaching and learning is not completed without evaluation, a proper evaluation could be considered as the art of the teacher. Therefore, it is vital that the teachers gain necessary skills for proper evaluation in order to trigger learning, judging and critical thinking in learners (Habibi, 2008). In the descriptive evaluation scheme in schools, the learning is improved through an emphasis on qualitative evaluation, performance evaluation, and giving descriptive feedback (Seif, 2003). The complementary stage of the evaluation requires that both teachers and students' roles change (Teresa, 2004). International research shows that there have been great advances in changing school curriculums in a lot of countries. Some Asian countries such as Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, India, and the Philippines have started the competency-based plan to meet the needs of the modern society (UNESCO, 2000). Eastern European countries have adopted lot of changes, one of them being competency-based plan (West Creighton, 1999). Although evaluation is a part of the teaching and learning process, it plays a much bigger role and its effects on the subsystems of educational systems are more. Therefore, it is required that, prior to the spread of the new evaluation method in the country, its weaknesses and strengths are studied through scientific researches to help enforce it in the best way.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The results of a study conducted by Hebdige (2003) on evaluating Croatian students without giving grades showed that the students and teacher were satisfied with this kind of evaluation with less anxiety and more psychological health. Teachers who were more skillful in conducting this kind of evaluation had fewer problems with their students, who learned better.

Ghazi Ghaith (2003) noted that when an interactive and cooperative method of teaching and evaluating is adopted in a classroom, the students hold a more positive view towards a fair system of grading by the teacher, solidarity and integrity and a supportive atmosphere in class. However, competitive and individualistic methods resulted in reverse outcomes.

Van Evera (2004) studied the effectiveness of evaluation feedbacks in the performance and motivation of the students in science classes of junior high school. In this study, the students received written feedback for their homework and class assignments, while the control group received grades, without any other feedbacks. The findings indicated that the feedback of evaluation led to a significant increase in the students' efficiency in junior high school.

Waddel (2004) studied the influences of written feedbacks in evaluation on the students' motivation and objective orientation. In this study, 79 fourth grader elementary school children were studied. The first study was a return scheme of ABAB, which was performed in order to support the cause-and-effect relationship between feedback grades (i. e., evaluation based on the Rubric of written feedback of the teacher) and the effectiveness of the feedback (i. e., the students' attitudes towards the value of the written feedback). The results of the covariance analysis revealed that the examination group reported a significantly higher level of objective orientation. The overall linear model, using frequent measurements, supported the relationships among the feedback grades and also between the homework grades and the feedback grades. However, the relationship between the effectiveness of the feedback and educational performance was not significant.

Arthur (2004) studied the influence of performance feedback, prior improvement, homework complexity, and cultural knowledge on the personal mathematical efficiency as well as on personal evaluation of African-American students. The sample consisted of 72 fourth and fifth- grader elementary school students. In this study, prior knowledge was introduced into the analysis as the auxiliary random variant and two three-way MANCOVA tests were performed. The results of both analyses showed a significant main influence on the personal evaluation based on the performance feedback. Furthermore, in the second analysis, prior knowledge led to a significant main effect on the personal efficiency.

Gest, Welsh, and Domitrovich (2005), and Sammons and Reynolds (1977) noted that the most proper form of evaluation of the effectiveness of the school and making sure of the quality of the school is by studying the effects of academic behavior and the evaluation of knowledge and other actions performed by the school and class on the social and emotional feedbacks of the students.

Saeed, Gondal and Bushra (2005) studied the improvement level of elementary school students in Pakistan. The sample consisted of 1080 3rd and 5th grader elementary students randomly selected from 36 elementary schools in 9 zones of the Punjab province. The tools used in this study included improvement tests in three academic subjects of math, Urdu (the official language) and life skills (Islamism, social studies, and sciences). Some part of the results showed that the improvement level of the 3rd graders in Urdu was low, being 15.2 and life skills was high, being 29.9. However, the 5th graders showed their highest level of improvement in life skills with 31.63 and their lowest level of improvement in math with 10.8. Overall, the improvement of the girls was better than that of boys. Also, the students in the rural areas outperformed the students in urban areas.

Lubbers (2006) indicated that if the evaluation system adopted in the classroom creates positive emotional atmosphere with strong social relationships, the students will show a higher academic improvement.

Various studies indicate that the psychological well-being of the students is related to their academic improvement, and students who suffer from some kind of psychological problems or lack of psychological health often face educational failure (Brodby, 2007).

Loukas and Murphy (2007) conducted a study on 488 students between the ages of 10 to 14 to study four aspects of the class atmosphere, namely conflict, solidarity, and competition among students and their satisfaction with the class. They suggested that a peaceful, supportive, less competitive, and more satisfactory atmosphere, with high solidarity among students play a key role in their psychological well-being.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- 1) Do teachers, principals, and experts performing this scheme in Chaharmahal and Bakhtiari consider its strengths as higher than average?
- 2) Do teachers, principals, and experts performing this scheme in Chaharmahal and Bakhtiari consider its weaknesses as higher than average?
- 3) Do the opinions of principals, teachers and experts performing this plan vary depending on demographic parameters such as age, gender, the number of working years, position, and education?

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A survey is a kind of research used to distribute the properties of a population (Sarmad & Bazargan, 2005, 81). In a survey, the researcher uses interviews or questionnaires to detect ideas, opinions, perceptions and preferences of people (Salimi, 1999, 20). This study is a descriptive-survey one. It is descriptive because the researcher tries to describe the current situation regarding the strengths and weaknesses of performing descriptive evaluation from the point of view of principals, teachers and experts performing this plan and in doing so, they use documents, questionnaires, and interviews. The data gathering tools include interviews and questionnaires.

### Population

The population of this study consisted of all principals, teachers, and executive experts of descriptive evaluation in the academic year 2008-9, with 208 principals, 303 teachers and 100 experts.

### Sampling

A sample is usually a part of the population which represents the population and has more or less the properties of the whole population. In other words, sampling means a certain number of people from the population is chosen as the representative of the whole population (Delavar, 1999, p.54). In this study in order to choose the sample group, random stratified sampling was used so that all specific subgroups are present in the sample sufficiently (Gal, Burg & Gal, 2007). In this study, since the variance of the population was not available, the researcher randomly used the researcher-made questionnaire with 30 executives of descriptive evaluation and the variance of the sample was calculated. Then the confidence coefficient was 95% which was calculated as 1.96. From 175 distributed questionnaires, all of them were retrieved and analyzed. Table 1 shows that 100 teachers, 50 principals, and 40 experts made up the sample. The sample was distributed in a way that all parts of the province were taken into account. Therefore, the 1st and 2nd zones of Shahre kurd, Kiar and Buldaji, were considered because the plan was performed completely during the academic year 2009-2010. Saman and Farsan also were considered because of high numbers of classes with the descriptive plan.

**Table 1**  
**Sample Frequency Distribution**

Experts sample size	Teachers sample size	Principals sample size	City or region
6	40	10	shahre kord region 1
6	21	10	shahre kord region 2
4	15	6	Farsan
3	14	6	Saman
3	15	10	kiar
3	15	8	boldadji
25	100	50	total

## Research Instruments

The tools for data gathering were documents, interviews and questionnaires.

- 1) Documents: all reports and documents related to the execution of descriptive evaluation were gathered and credited.
- 2) Interviews: Interviews were conducted to use the experiences of the performers of this scheme. Interviews were conducted individually and in person, in a semi-organized way, with questions predefined in line with the main components of the questionnaire. This form of interview includes integrative questions and in order to get more information and better analyze the situation, open ended questions were also included. This form of interview has the advantage of getting the same data from respondents. The received information has greater depth compared to fully organized questionnaires (Gal, Burg, & Gal, 2007).
- 3) Questionnaire: questionnaires are one of the most usual and direct ways for gathering data in descriptive researches. In this study, since there wasn't a standardized questionnaire for this study, the questionnaire of the researcher was used. In doing so, the researcher first studied the literature and based on the results of the interviews and with the help of some experts tried to develop the questionnaire. During the early study, vague or overlapping questions were omitted and based on the opinions of the experts, a questionnaire with 74 close-ended questions and 4 open-ended questions was developed and its reliability was calculated. The questionnaire consists of 2 parts which evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of performing the descriptive evaluation method, respectively.

## Validating the Tool for Validating the Questionnaire

In evaluating any tests or measuring tools there are many considerations, which are referred to as validity and reliability. Validity refers to the objectives of the test and realizing them. In other words a test is valid when it is suitable for testing the items (Seif, 2005). In order to determine the validity of the questionnaire, advisors, professors in librarianship and psychology departments, 10 experts with M.A. and Ph. D. degrees which carried on the descriptive evaluation in Chaharmahal and Bakhtiari and Dr. Hassani, professor at Tehran University were asked for their opinions.

## Reliability

Reliability means if we measure the evaluated property with the same tool and under the same conditions, how precise and reliable will the results be? (Hooman, 1999). In other words, the tool has to be used in other conditions and giving the same results. There are different ways to determine the reliability of a questionnaire. To determine

the reliability of the questionnaire the Cronbach alpha was used. The reliability coefficient of “strength” was 0.98 and that of “weakness” was 0.80 and the total was 0.89, indicating high reliability.

### Findings

According to table 2, the highest mean for items related to “increasing accuracy in doing tasks” is  $\bar{X} = 4.49$  and the lowest one is for “increasing educational researches at school by the teacher” with  $\bar{X} = 4.29$ .

**Table 2**  
**Frequency and Percentage of Items Related to Opportunities**

Items	Neutral		Very low		Low		Much		Very much		$\bar{X}$
	Percent	distribution	Percent	distribution	Percent	distribution	Percent	distribution	Percent	distribution	
Dealing with students with special needs	0.6	1	1.7	3	8.0	14	40.0	70	49.7	87	4.36
Increasing educational researches at schools by teachers	-	-	1.7	3	16.6	29	37.7	66	44.0	77	4.24
Increasing active roles of students in self improvement	-	-	1.1	2	12.0	21	39.4	69	47.4	83	4.33
Flexibility in decision making for teachers	-	-	1.7	3	11.4	20	42.3	74	44.6	78	4.29
Increasing a sense of cooperation in classrooms	-	-	3.4	6	6.9	12	40.0	70	49.7	87	4.36
Boosting creativity in students	1.7	3	2.9	5	5.7	10	41.1	72	48.6	85	4.32
Improving a sense of responsibility in students	-	-	0.6	1	7.4	13	44.0	77	48.0	84	4.39
Positive change in the students behavior	-	-	1.1	2	9.1	16	44.6	78	45.1	79	4.33
Long lasting friendship between the student and the teacher	-	-	1.1	2	10.9	19	42.9	75	45.1	79	4.32
Evaluation of emotional states of the students by the teacher	0.6	1	1.1	2	15.4	27	37.7	66	45.1	79	4.25
Evaluation of the behaviors of the students by the teacher	0.6	1	1.1	2	13.7	24	30.3	53	54.3	95	4.36
Improving a sense of self-worth in students	1.1	2	1.7	3	7.4	13	36.0	63	53.7	94	4.39
Improving critical thinking among students	1.1	2	-	-	10.3	18	36.0	63	52.6	92	4.38
Evaluating all cognitive aspects of the students by teachers	-	-	1.1	2	7.4	13	39.4	69	52.0	91	4.42
Increasing the attention of the teacher to individual differences of the students	0.6	1	-	-	10.3	18	40.0	70	49.1	86	4.37
Increasing the students adaptability to social changes	-	-	1.1	2	8.0	14	41.7	73	49.1	86	4.38
Weakening aggressiveness in students	-	-	1.7	3	10.3	18	41.7	73	46.3	81	4.32
Improving meaningful relationships between parents and schools	0.6	1	2.3	4	13.7	24	36.6	64	46.9	82	4.26
Improving the attention of parents to their children’s improvements	1.1	2	0.6	1	14.3	25	28.6	50	55.4	97	4.36
Improving accuracy in doing tasks	0.6	1	1.7	3	8.6	15	26.3	46	62.9	110	4.49

**Table 3**  
**A comparison of the Mean Scores for the Opportunities of the Descriptive Evaluation Plan with the Hypothesized Mean 3**

t	se	S	Mean	Item
35.54	0.038	0.504	4.35	Opportunity

Table 3 shows that observed t is higher in the 5% error level. Therefore, the opportunities of the descriptive evaluation is higher than average.

questions related to threat of lack of sufficient cultural grounds for accepting descriptive evaluation is  $\bar{X} = 4.52$  and the lowest one is for endangering active relations among teachers and principals with  $\bar{X} = 4.09$ .

Table 4 shows that the highest mean for answers to

**Table 4**  
**Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Items Related to Threats**

Items	Neutral		Very low		Low		Much		Very much		$\bar{X}$
	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	
Inadequate educational workshops for training executives during the execution of descriptive evaluation	1.7	3	4.6	8	8.6	15	31.4	55	53.7	94	4.30
Teachers overlooking substantial goals due t excessive attention to small ones	-	-	2.3	4	9.7	17	36.0	63	52.0	91	4.37
Difficulty in changing the culture of evaluation	0.6	1	2.3	4	13.1	23	32.0	56	52.0	91	4.32
Substituting 20 with 'expected'	1.7	3	2.3	4	8.6	15	41.7	73	45.7	80	4.27
A vague picture of the future of the descriptive evaluation for parents	-	-	1.1	2	8.0	14	40.0	70	50.9	89	4.40
A vague picture of the future of the descriptive evaluation for teachers	-	-	1.1	2	7.4	13	45.7	80	45.7	80	4.36
The possibility of low performance of students evaluated by this method	1.1	2	5.7	10	14.3	25	35.4	62	43.4	76	4.14
Feigned performance of the plan given financial problems of the teachers	2.9	5	2.9	5	18.9	33	32.0	56	43.4	76	4.10
Biased evaluation of the students activities by teacher	1.7	3	2.9	5	17.1	30	34.9	61	43.4	76	4.15
Mistaking performance assignment with performance evaluation	1.7	3	2.9	5	17.1	30	36.6	64	41.7	73	4.13
High cost of the performance of the plan for low income families	1.1	2	4.6	8	16.6	29	38.8	67	39.4	69	4.10
Discouragement of the teachers due to lack of financial and emotional support	0.6	1	5.1	9	10.9	19	43.4	76	40.0	70	4.17
Possibility of endangering active and mutual relations among teachers and principals	1.7	3	5.7	10	14.3	25	38.3	67	46.9	70	4.09
A shift in the role of the teachers to evaluators	1.7	3	6.3	11	12.6	22	32.6	57	46.9	82	4.16
Inadequate knowledge of the teachers and executives	0.6	1	4.0	7	13.1	23	29.1	51	53.1	93	4.30
Lack of clarity in goals in the executives' pinion	0.6	1	2.3	4	8.6	15	34.3	60	54.3	95	4.39
Inadequate opportunities for cultural groundings in order to accept the plan	-	-	1.1	2	8.00	14	28.6	50	62.3	109	4.52

Table 5 shows that observed  $t$  is higher than critical value in 5% error level, so the threats are higher than average.

**Table 5**  
A Comparison of the Mean Score for Threats with the Hypothesized Mean 3

t	se	S	$\bar{X}$	Component
28.26	0.044	0.587	4.25	Threat

According to Table 6, the observed  $t$  wasn't significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ). Therefore, there is not a significant difference between the opportunities and threats of the descriptive

evaluation from the point of view of male and female respondents.

**Table 6**  
A Comparison of the Mean Score for Opportunities and Threats of the Descriptive Evaluation Plan in the Respondents' Opinions Based on Gender

P	t	Male		Female		Components
		$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	
0.459	0.742	4.32	0.581	4.37	0.424	Opportunities
0.988	0.015	4.25	0.625	4.25	0.554	Threats

According to Table 7, observed  $t$  regarding strength and weakness of descriptive evaluation was significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ). Therefore, there is significance difference among the respondents' opinions between the opportunities and

threats of the descriptive evaluation regarding position. In other words, their responses to two components are not the same based on their positions in elementary schools in Chaharmahal and Bakhtiari.

**Table 7**  
A Comparison of the Mean Score for Opportunities and Threats of the Descriptive Evaluation Plan in the Respondents' Opinions Based on Position

P	F	Principals		Teachers		Experts		Components
		$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	
0.348	1.10	4.39	0.463	4.22	0.675	4.36	0.465	Opportunities
0.042	2.79	4.35	0.548	4.12	0.525	4.09	0.630	Threats

Table 8 shows that the observed  $t$  was not significant in  $p \leq 0.05$ . Therefore, there is not a difference between opportunities and threats of the plan regarding education.

In other words, the responses given by respondents with diploma to Ph. D. to two components were the same.

**Table 8**  
A Comparison of the Mean Scores of Threats and Opportunities Based on Education

P	t	High school diploma		Associate degree		B.A		M.A and higher		components
		$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	
0.429	0.927	4.27	0.712	4.29	0.580	4.36	0.444	4.55	0.320	Opportunities
0.679	0.505	4.34	0.252	4.21	0.495	4.24	0.677	4.42	0.318	Threats

Table 9 shows that the observed  $F$  is not significant in  $p \leq 0.05$ , so there is not a difference between strengths and weaknesses based on the respondents' years of working. In other words, the responses of the performers of the plan

with less than 10 to more than 20 years of working to two components of the descriptive evaluation in elementary schools of Caharmahal and Bakhtiari was the same.

**Table 9**  
A Comparison of the Mean Scores of Threats and Opportunities Based on Working Years

P	t	Less than 10 years		10 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 and higher		component
		$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	
0.213	1.51	4.29	0.639	4.36	0.385	4.41	0.379	4.21	0.636	Opportunities
0.355	1.09	4.13	0.630	4.31	0.591	4.31	0.577	4.17	0.563	Threats

In Table 10, the highest frequency distribution in male answers to opportunity of descriptive evaluation improving sense of responsibility in students with 15 respondents which is 50% of the whole. The highest

frequency distribution in female answers to the opportunity of descriptive evaluation increasing critical thinking in students is 14 which is 47%.

**Table 10**  
**Frequency Distributions of Male and Female Responses to the Component of Opportunities**

Percentage	Frequency	Most responses to opportunities	Gender
50	15	Increase in a sense of responsibility in students	Male
47	14	Boosting critical thinking in students	Female

Table 11 shows that the most frequent answers are that difficulty to change the evaluation culture is one of the threats with 15 respondents (50%). The highest frequency

answers for female respondents are that difficulty to change the evaluation culture is one of the threats with 14 respondents (47%).

**Table 11**  
**Highest Frequency Distributions of Male and Female Responses to the Component of Threats**

Percentage	Frequency	Most responses to threats	Gender
50	15	Difficulty in changing the culture of evaluation	Males
47	14	Difficulty in changing the culture of evaluation	Females

Table 12 shows the frequency distribution and mean scores for answers to opportunities and threats. It shows the mean scores for answers to opportunities are higher than those of threats.

**Table 12**  
**Frequency Distribution and Mean Responses to the Components Related to the Performance of the Plan**

$\bar{X}$	Frequency	Component
16.85	337	Opportunities
13.64	332	Threats
30.49	669	Total

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

1) The opportunities of the descriptive evaluation in elementary schools of Chaharmahal and Bakhtiari from the point of view of teachers, principals and expert:

Based on the findings regarding opportunities, the consensus of teachers on the descriptive evaluation has been higher than average. Regarding the third question which addressed the consensus of teachers, the results showed that the mean scores for all 20 questions were higher than average (3), which shows teachers agree with the opportunities. The opportunities with the highest priorities were increasing accuracy in doing tasks, evaluation of all cognitive areas by the teacher ( $\bar{X} = 4.42$ ), improving sense of merit in students ( $\bar{X} = 4.39$ ), improving sense of responsibility in students ( $\bar{X} = 4.39$ ).

The observed t for opportunities is higher than the critical value in the 5% error level, which shows the opportunities are higher than average.

Regarding opportunities, this study is in line with those of Abu Mohammadi and Khanghaee (2004) and Haghighi (2005) which showed that descriptive evaluation

is an effective way in evaluating all cognitive areas of the students. Shokrollahi (2006) showed that descriptive evaluation is effective since the teacher has complete control over the behaviors of the students in doing a specific task. In Abu Mohammadi and Khanghaee (2004), the teachers also believed that descriptive evaluation improves thinking in students.

2) The threats of the descriptive evaluation from the point of view of teachers, principals and experts in Chahr mahal and Bakhtiari:

Based on the findings related to the items of threats shown in table (23-4) to (25-4), the consensus of teachers regarding threats has been higher than average. The findings showed that the mean scores for all 20 questions on this item were higher than average (3) which shows the teachers agree with the threats of descriptive evaluation. The threats with the highest priorities are lack of adequate cultural grounds for accepting the descriptive evaluation ( $\bar{X} = 4.52$ ), the possibility of having a vague image of the future of the plan for parents ( $\bar{X} = 4.40$ ) and inadequate knowledge of the teachers and the executives ( $\bar{X} = 4.39$ ). The mean score for threats was ( $\bar{X} = 4.35$ ). A comparison of the answers mean score with the hypothesized mean (3) showed that the threats were higher than average. Lack of adequate cultural grounds for accepting this plan is the most important threat which should be taken seriously, otherwise the plan could not be successful. The issue of internalizing is discussed in Manteghi (2004). He decided that developing and deepening educational innovations are not only done by providing budgets and facilities but also with internalizing. Fullan (1985) believes that deep changes in the culture of the schools, relationship with external organizations, and cultural grounding in society cause innovation to be internalized. Wolcott (1977), in



studying internalizing educational innovations, reports that a lot of researchers ignore the way the teachers, i.e. the real consumers of innovations, treat these innovations. Therefore it is essential to consider human issues and cultural groundings in realizing innovations. The results of these studies are in line with those of threat including: lack of adequate cultural groundings for accepting descriptive evaluation, having a vague future image of the plan by parents, and lack of adequate knowledge by teachers and executives of the plan.

### THE OPINIONS OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS AND EXPERTS BASED ON DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS OF AGE, GENDER, NUMBER OF WORKING YEARS, AND EDUCATION

The results based on the gender of the teachers indicated that regarding the two components there was not a significant difference among men and women, i.e. both male and female teachers answered the same.

The findings regarding position showed that there was a significant difference among the mean scores for the two components. This suggests that principals, teachers, and experts did not answer the questions the same.

The results based on the number of working years showed that the mean scores for the strengths and weaknesses, there wasn't a significant difference among responses based on the number of working years.

The results based on the academic degree showed that the mean scores for the two components were not significantly different, so there was not a difference between the strengths and weaknesses in the respondents' points of view based on their academic degrees.

### IMPLICATIONS FOR OPPORTUNITIES

Using complementary activities and relating different subjects to each other, the context for increasing accuracy in doing tasks, improving the sense of cooperation, responsibility and merit in students is provided.

Evaluation, encouragement and supporting successful executives and giving prizes.

Evaluation, encouragement and supporting educational researches conducted by teachers and giving prizes to the best.

Evaluation, encouragement, and supporting school researching done by students.

Implications for threats

Programs should be conducted to change the attitudes of teachers towards this plan, since they in turn change the attitudes of parents and students.

Holding training classes for parents to decrease their preventive role in conducting the plan.

Other organizations like the national TV could help provide the cultural context.

Training parents to cooperate with schools in conducting the plan.

The executives should be chosen with high sensitivity. Conducting the plan needs people who can give more freedom to teachers to do the plan successfully.

### REFERENCES

- AbuMoahammadi, M., & Khanghaee, B. M. (2004). *A study of the Viewpoints of Elementary School Teachers Regarding Descriptive Evaluation in Yazd* (Unpublished dissertation). The Educational Research Council of the Bureau of Education in Yazd.
- Arther, L. A. (2004). *An exploration of the impact of prior achievement, task complexity, cultural knowledge, and performance feedback on mathematics self-efficacy and self-assessment of American preadolescent students* (Doctoral dissertation). Howard University.
- Berry, R. (2004). *Teachers perception of their roles and their students roles in the formative assessment process*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for research in Education (AARE2004) Doing the public Good, Melbourne, Austealia. Retrieved at 21 August 2996 from <http://www.Aare.Edu.Au/04pap/ber04978-pdf>
- Bradby, H., Varyani, M., Oglethorpe, R., Raine, W., White, I., & Helen, M. (2007). British Asian Families and the Use of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services: A Qualitative Study of a Hard to Reach Group. *Social Science & Medicine*, 65(12), 2413-2424. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.07.025>
- EbrahimiDinani, A. (2007). *A study of the strengths and weaknesses of the process of change in the qualitative-descriptive evaluation plan in elementary schools in Isfahan* (Unpublished dissertation). MA thesis, Isfahan University.
- Farstad, H. (2004). *Competencies for Life: Some Implication for Education*. National Institute Technology, Oslo, Norway, Background paper to workshop, UNESCO, 47 the International Conference on Education, Geneva.
- Foster, E. M. (2007). Can System Integration Improve Mental Health Outcomes for Children? *Children and Youth Services Review*, 29(10), 1301-1319. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2007.05.004>
- Fullan, M., & Promfret, A. (1977). Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation. *Review of Educational Research*, 47 (2), 355-397. doi:org/10.3102/00346543047002335
- Gest, S. D., Weish, J., & Domitrovich, C. (2005). Behavioral predictors of changes in social relatedness and liking school in elementary school. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(4), 281-301. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.06.002>
- Ghazi, G. (2003). The relationship between form of instruction, achievement and perceptions of classroom climate. *Educational research*, 45(1), 83-93. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0013188032000086145>
- Habibi, F. (2008). *A Study of the Challenges of Using Descriptive Evaluation*. Selected papers of Khoram Abad seminar, bureau of education, Lorestan, KhorramAbad: Shapookhast.
- Hassani, M. (2006). A Model for Spreading Innovation in the Iranian Educational System. *The Educational Innovations Periodical*, 15(5), 151-177. Retrieved from <http://www.noormags.com/view/fa/articlepage/110135>

- Hassani, M. (2008). *A Guidebook for Performing Qualitative-Descriptive Evaluation in Classrooms*. Tehran: Abed Publications.
- Hassani, M., & Ahmadi, H. (2005). Descriptive Evaluation: A New Model in Educational Evaluation. Tehran: *The Organization of Educational Research and Planning*. Ministry of Education.
- Hebdige, R. (2003). *Teacher Portfolio Assessment*. ERIC: ED385608.
- Kanter, R.M., Stein B., & Jick T.D. (1992). *The Challenge of Organizational Change: How Companies Experience It and Leaders Guide It*. New York: Free Press.
- Karimi, A. (2005). *The Impacts of the New Descriptive Evaluation Method on Behavioral Disorders in Shiraz Elementary School Students*. Research report, Fars education organization (unpublished dissertation).
- Kemp, J., & Toperoff, D. (1998). *Guidelines for Portfolio Assessment in Teaching English*. Ministry of Education.
- Khoshkholgh, I., & Pasha Sharifi, H. (2006). An Evaluation of the Tentative Performance of Descriptive Evaluation in Some Elementary Schools in the Country. *Education periodical*, 16(5), 159-173. Retrieved from <http://www.noormags.com/view/fa/articlepage/364436>
- Loukas, A., & Murphy, J. (2007). Middle School Student Perceptions of School Climate. Examining Protective Function on Subsequent Adjustment Problems. *Journal of school psychology*, 45(3), 293-309. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.10.001>
- Lubbers, M. (2006). The Impact of Peer Relations on Academic Progress in Junior High. *Journal of school psychology*, 44 (6), 491-512. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.07.005>
- MehrMohammadi, M. (2002). *Curriculum, Attitudes, Viewpoints and Perspectives*, Mashhad: Astan Ghods Razavi Publications.
- Mohammadi, F. (2005). *A Study of the Impacts of Descriptive Evaluation on the Self-esteem of 3rd Grader Elementary Students in Tehran*. MA thesis. AL Zahra University (unpublished dissertation).
- MortezaeeNezhad, E. (2005). *A Study of the Attitudes of Teachers and Parents on Using Descriptive Evaluation in 1st and 2nd Grades of Elementary Schools in Tehran in 2004-5 Academic Year*. M.A thesis. Islamic Azad University of ShahreRei (unpublished dissertation).
- MoghniZadeh, M. H. (2004). *Necessity of Measuring Emotional Intelligence and the Implications of Self-retrieved Educational Improvement*. Retrieved from [www.parsei.com/education](http://www.parsei.com/education)
- Manteghi, M. (2006). A Study of the Challenges of Educational Innovations. Tehran: *The First Conference of Educational Innovations*, 24-38.
- Mussavi, S. Z. (2005). *An Opinion Poll from Performers of Descriptive Evaluation Based on the Objectives of the Plan in 2004-2005 Academic Years* (unpublished dissertation). Research report, Qom Bureau of Education.
- Nevo, D. (1995). *School-Based Evaluation: A Dialogue School Improvement*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Saeed, M., Gondel, M. B., & Bushra (2005). Assessment Achievement of Primary Grader Students and Factors Affecting Achievement in Pakistan. *The International Journal of Education Management*, 19, 486-490. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513540510617436>
- Sammons, D. R., & Renynolds, S. (1997). *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. Retrieved from <http://www.aar.edu.au/confo.htm>
- Seif, A. A. (2003). The Concept of Evaluation and Its Influence on the Teacher's Methodology and Learning of Students. Tehran: *The first conference of educational evaluation*, The Bureau of Educational Evaluation.
- Shkrollahi, M. (2006). *A Comparison of Descriptive and Traditional Evaluation Styles Based on Four Descriptive Standards (Moral, Effectiveness, Practicality and Accuracy), From the Point of View of Tehran Elementary School Teachers in 2004-5 Academic Year* (Master's thesis). Tehran, Tarbiat Moalem University.
- Sharifi, Hassan pasha (2004). The Evaluation of Performance in the Process of Teaching – Learning. *The National Conference of Reforms in Education*, 323-341. Tehran: Educational research.
- Stiggins, R. (2004). New Assessment Beliefs for a New School Mission. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(1), 22-27. Retrieved from <https://docushare.prsd.ab.ca/docushare/dsweb/Get/Version-563/Stiggins%20Paper%20%282%29.pdf>
- Tawil, S. (2002). *Curriculum Change and Social Inclusion. Final report*. The Regional Seminar Held in Vilnius, Lithuania. December 2001, UNESCO.
- Teresa, W. L. (2004). Formative Assessment in General Studies Classrooms. *Hong Kong Teachers Center Journal*, 3, 141-154. Retrieved from <http://repository.ied.edu.hk/dspace/handle/2260.2/7242>
- UNESCO (2000). *Globalization and Living Together; the Challenge for Educational Content in Asia, Final Report of Sub-region Course on Curriculum Development*. New Delhi, India.
- Van Evera, W. C. (2004). *Achievement and Motivation in the Middle School Science Classroom: The Effects of Formative Assessment Feedback* (Doctoral dissertation). George Maason University.
- Waddell, C. A. (2004). *The Effect of Negotiated Written Feedback Within Formative Assessment on Fourth-grade Students Motivation and Goal Orientations* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Missouri, Saint Louis.
- West, R., & Crighton, J. (1999). Examination Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Issues and Trends. *Assessment in Education, Principles, Policy & Practice*, 6(2), 271-289. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09695949992919>
- Zeinivand, M. (2008). *The Influence of the Descriptive Evaluation on Students in Terms of Psychological Well-being*. Selected Papers of the Conference 2008, Khoram Abad, Lorestan Bureau of Education, Khoram Abad.