See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346205829

Contemporary trends in the evaluation of kindergarten children in Jordan according to Jordanian teachers' perceptions

Article *in* Education 3-13 · October 2020 DOI: 10.1080/03004279.2020.1833062

CITATION		READS	
3 autho	rs, including:		
	Ali Mustafa Al-Elaimat Hashemite University 18 PUBLICATIONS 120 CITATIONS		Kholoud Adeeb Al-Dababneh Hashemite University 51 PUBLICATIONS 489 CITATIONS
	SEE PROFILE		SEE PROFILE





Education 3-13 International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rett20

Contemporary trends in the evaluation of kindergarten children in Jordan according to Jordanian teachers' perceptions

Ali Mustafa Alelaimat, Kholoud Adeeb Al-Dababneh & Eman K. Al-Zboon

To cite this article: Ali Mustafa Alelaimat, Kholoud Adeeb Al-Dababneh & Eman K. Al-Zboon (2022) Contemporary trends in the evaluation of kindergarten children in Jordan according to Jordanian teachers' perceptions, Education 3-13, 50:1, 78-96, DOI: <u>10.1080/03004279.2020.1833062</u>

To link to this article: <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2020.1833062</u>



Published online: 13 Oct 2020.

|--|

Submit your article to this journal 🗹





View related articles 🗹



View Crossmark data 🖸



Check for updates

Contemporary trends in the evaluation of kindergarten children in Jordan according to Jordanian teachers' perceptions

Ali Mustafa Alelaimat ¹^o^a, Kholoud Adeeb Al-Dababneh^b and Eman K. Al-Zboon^b

^aDepartment of Childhood, Queen Rania Faculty For Childhood, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan; ^bDepartment of Special Education, Queen Rania Faculty for Childhood, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the most common contemporary evaluation methods used by kindergarten teachers to assess kindergarten children. The study sample consisted of 527 kindergarten teachers. A scale was developed in order to achieve the study's purposes. The results indicated that the Teacher's Practices in the Evaluation Process (TPEP) had the highest mean score, and the Informal Evaluation Methods (IEM) had the lowest. The results revealed that there are statistically significant differences in the evaluation methods kindergarten teachers use in their classrooms according to their qualifications, their years of teaching experience and the interaction between these two variables. The study recommends training courses for kindergarten teachers to raise their competencies in the field of evaluation, in order to change the methods of evaluation used and avoid the errors of traditional evaluation methods. **ARTICLE HISTORY**

Received 13 May 2020 Accepted 29 July 2020

KEYWORDS

Evaluation methods; children; kindergarten teachers; contemporary trends

Introduction

Current education needs to be oriented towards providing children with the necessary life skills and competencies, in order to achieve success in their life and be positive contributors to their society. To ensure that this is happening, it is necessary to assess children's skills and competencies through classroom evaluation (Chew & Lee, 2013). Classroom evaluation is thus considered to be an integral part of the curriculum (Dunphy, 2008), as a means of facilitating children's learning and growth in early childhood programmes.

Kindergarten teachers (KGT) must identify methods that they can use to determine children's progress, an issue which connects with those of how to assess children in ways where the evaluation process not only collects data about the child but also helps the teacher in making decisions about the best ways to teach children (Banerjee & Luckner, 2013; Build Strong Foundations for Pennsylvania's Young Children, 2005; Chew & Lee, 2013).

The institution of the kindergarten (KG) is designed to provide a climate and activities that help children to achieve comprehensive and integrated development in all areas, and to make positive changes in children's concepts, habits, tendencies, interests and skills. Thus, the evaluations provided by KGs must focus on helping teachers to learn more about the children, identifying the progress made by the children in all developmental areas, and identifying ways to support their learning and development (Al-Zoo, 2015; Duffy, 2010; Navarrete, 2015; McLachlan, 2017). It is worth mentioning that, as a result of the challenges associated with evaluating KG children, there has been a move away from standardised evaluation methods towards a focus on contemporary evaluation methods

which aim to understand children, their learning and their development in the educational contexts in which they are involved (McLachlan, 2017; Snow & Van Hemel, 2008).

As an important field of study, KG teachers and researchers had to consider whether the evaluation methods used were appropriate for evaluating children before they started school. There is a need to assess whether the evaluation methods used by KG teachers stand up to reality and to identify what training teachers need in evaluation methods to develop their abilities when assessing young children. This provides the focus of the current study.

Research aim and research questions

The aim of this study was to identify the most common contemporary trends in the evaluation of kindergarten children from kindergarten teachers' perspectives. More specifically, the authors of this manuscript asked two research questions:

- (1) From teachers' perspectives, what evaluation methods are most commonly used by kindergarten teachers?
- (2) Does length of teaching experience (years) and level of teaching qualification influence the evaluation methods used by kindergarten teachers?

To answer these questions, KGTs in Amman, Jordan responded anonymously to a questionnaire comprising 70 items rated against three scales: Evaluation (Formal Evaluation Methods (FEM), Informal Evaluation Methods (IEM)); Teacher's Practices in the Evaluation Process (TPEP); and Evaluation Areas and Times (EAT). Once developed, the questionnaire was piloted and assessed for reliability and content validity.

Theoretical framework

Contemporary trends in evaluation

In Jordan, the terms assessment and evaluation sometimes are used interchangeable. In this article, the used term is evaluation as it is usually used in Jordanian context in the case of conducting a final review to gauge the quality or the current state of educational programmes. this process of evaluation would be known as 'assessment' in other nations, such as UK.

Traditionally, the purpose of evaluation in early childhood education was to identify what the child lacked and what needed improvement, rather than what the child knew, while the teacher was considered objective in that evaluation, without an impact on the child (Carr, 2001). However, contemporary practices of early childhood evaluation generally focus on collecting information about children's learning, development, and progress, and documenting that data to make decisions and plan services for children (Arndt & Tesar, 2015; Dunphy, 2008). In this process, the concept of evaluation in early childhood programmes has gone beyond the concept of screening and diagnosis to include answering questions about children's status and progress, and providing information about classroom programmes (Navarrete, 2015; Snow & Van Hemel, 2008). It is acknowledged that evaluation practices can identify and inform instructional planning and influence how the curriculum is applied in the classroom (Chew & Lee, 2013). Evaluation may be considered as a periodic process of observation, interpretation and planning in order to facilitate children's learning and development but, at the same time, it is also seen as a means of documenting and compiling information about children (Dunphy, 2008; Featherstone, 2011). Formative and summative evaluation play an essential role in gathering information about children as well as documenting their development against prescribed goals (Navarrete, 2015). Evaluation is, first and foremost, a tool used for improving learning, building on past knowledge, and making observations. Formative evaluation directly informs and drives instructional practices and children's learning by gathering information about the children's performance for the purpose of improving teaching and learning. It frequently uses interactive methods of evaluation to measure the learning process and the progress in developmental aspects, in order to identify learning needs and adjust teaching appropriately, rather than simply assessing content or product of learning (Chew & Lee, 2013; Dunphy, 2008; Kim & Davidson, 2019). Formative evaluation can also be seen as a means of illustrating the learning that has taken place, by documenting the achievements of children – usually with regard to certain expectations – as a summative form of evaluation. Furthermore, the aim of evaluation can be seen as feeding the learning process, to improve teaching itself, to stimulate the rethinking of teaching methods and to re-evaluate teaching practices, in order to make decisions on the best way to meet the children's needs (Arndt & Tesar, 2015).

It is clear that, if the purpose of evaluation is to inform instruction, teachers need to understand how data are collected, in order to draw accurate results from the evaluation and link them to appropriate educational strategies. Recent research confirms the role of teachers in evaluation, and calls for improved training of teachers on how to collect, interpret and use data to make educational decisions for all children (Kim & Davidson, 2019; Wilson, 2017), including those with developmental delay, by helping to identify them and providing early interventions to address challenges before they become major barriers to learning (Wilson, 2017). When teachers are able to use data to inform teaching, they make a more significant impact on children's learning. A study by Furtak, Kiemer, Circi, Swanson, Leon, Morrison and Heredia (2016) showed that teachers who participated in formative evaluation training programmes obtained significantly greater improvements in children's achievement from the beginning to the end of learning than teachers who did not participate in such training. The study also showed a correlation between the quality of the feedback provided to children and their grades in subsequent summative evaluation.

Teachers, therefore, are expected to integrate evaluation data throughout the education cycle to monitor children's achievement and guide decision-making in meeting required standards (Gullo & Hughes, 2011). This could be achieved by using diagnostic and training evaluation to guide teaching and learning. In higher education, this recovery was supported by empirical research that effectively demonstrates the benefits of formative evaluation in improving summative outcomes (Black & Wiliam, 2006).

Although the diagnostic-formative-summative evaluation process was initially used in education to form integrated evaluations, more contemporary concepts of evaluation have emerged in the early-years framework, focussed on involving children and their parents in the evaluation of the learning process, and on employing evaluation data to support and guide the teaching and learning process (Dunphy, 2008).

The contemporary uses of evaluation also focus on the importance of the classroom context, social interactions and continual developmental learning as the basis for children's learning (Black & Wiliam, 2006; Pyle & DeLuca, 2013). Brookhart (2004) also emphasises the importance of integrating evaluation with individualised, developmentally appropriate instruction.

To achieve this balance in teachers' classroom evaluation practices, meeting multiple development and academic targets, Gullo and Hughes (2011) and Pyle and DeLuca (2013) identified the principles of the kindergarten evaluation process. They suggest that it should be continuous and comprehensive, involving multiple formats that provide information on diverse learning approaches, integrated with learning objectives.

Moreover, contemporary trends in education focus on problem-based learning, which involves children bringing different levels of prior knowledge to the classroom, while suggesting that teaching practices should allow children to share this knowledge and build on it. So that children's learning processes and outcomes can be observed, formative observations can be made immediately to help children improve their learning, thus making the learning very clear to the children as they work to solve the problem. With these classroom evaluation practices, twenty-first-century skills, such as collaboration and communication skills, can be honed, while self-directed learning that solves the problem is emphasised (Chew & Lee, 2013).

As previously discussed, it is clear that the primary purposes of evaluation in ECD include informing instruction, diagnostic and selection purposes, and accountability and programme evaluation. To achieve these purposes, there are various types of evaluation which KG teachers need to be trained to use to advance teaching and learning processes (Snow & Van Hemel, 2008).

Methods of evaluation

An evaluation process may involve many methods to gather information about children's development and learning, including observational notes, pictures or drawings by the child, samples from the child's writing, language samples, photographs and tape or video recordings of the child (Sakellariou & Mitsi, 2019).

Others have categorised evaluation methods used with kindergarten children into formal and informal evaluation methods, which can provide systematic and ongoing information about the growth and learning of the children and the effectiveness of the programmes offered to them (Scott-Little & Niemeyer, 2001).

Formal evaluation methods

Formal evaluation methods refer primarily to standardised testing, which is considered the most formal forms of continuous evaluation because tests place significant restrictions on the child's behaviour, including strict control of standard conditions. The examiner's skill has particular importance when using this type of evaluation, in order to increase the probability that each child is evaluated in the same way, and that test scores allow for a fair comparison between individuals and groups (Epstein, Schweinhart, DeBruin-Parecki & Robin, 2004). It is worth noting that tests vary according to the purposes for which they were designed and may measure abilities, achievement, interests, competencies, values and personal characteristics. While these tests are designed to measure individual characteristics, they can be designed individually or collectively, and their results can be used to plan and guide instruction, study differences between individuals and groups, and provide guidance and direction (Nah & Kwak, 2011; Wortham, 2008). Curriculum-Based Assessment (CBA) is one of the most common testing methods of collecting information about children, which allows tracking the child's achievement along serial and continuous goals, within a developmental, sequential approach (Van der Heyden, Witt, Naquin & Noell, 2001).

Informal evaluation methods

Many researchers and institutions studying childhood have suggested that the use of standardised tests should be limited, because they do not represent the best method of evaluation for children (The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), 2005). They emphasise that the context of this evaluation process can affect the performance of KG children, who do best when working in familiar, comfortable, natural and informal conditions (Nah & Kwak, 2011). Thus, the information used to evaluate young children should be collected not only during adult-led activities, but also during free play, daily routine and activities initiated by the child. In this field, many researchers have found that the observation of daily activities, play and work is more appropriate than formal tests using structured assignments when assessing young children (Pellegrini, 2001; Nah & Kwak, 2011).

Informal evaluation methods are subdivided into authentic (observation, anecdotes record, portfolios) or naturalistic evaluation, which is usually used to assess children's growth and development by teachers or team members in early childhood programmes. Informal survey tests can be applied to determine the needs of young children and teachers may use informal survey assessment tools to assess language development or potential language problems. This type of evaluation should be consistent with the curriculum goals and educational practices which apply in the classroom (Epstein et al., 2004). Accordingly, there is agreement among early-childhood stakeholders that the evaluation of early-childhood education and development must be informal and implemented over time, in the context of the child's interactions with materials, objects and people. Children are best assessed through authentic methods, including real-life tasks, samples of their work, observations of the children in naturalistic settings, and ratings of their everyday behaviours. This is because, for all children, especially kindergarten children, performance in an evaluation reflects their experiences more than their potential abilities for success in school (Scott-Little & Niemeyer, 2001). Informal evaluation, conducted when children participate in activities they believe are relevant and meaningful, is likely to produce the best evaluations of early learning and development (Dunpgy, 2008).

Observation is considered one of the most effective informal methods, because it enables teachers to understand the nature of children's development and, thus, to plan programmes with the potential to meet their needs and developmental demands, in line with their abilities and level of maturity (Hashim, Yunus & Ali, 2010; Nah & Kwak, 2011).

The narrative or story approach to assessing children's learning in KG uses structured observations, which are often very short and presented in a narrative form. This method of evaluation is considered one of the most effective, providing a comprehensive and holistic picture of a child's current abilities, gathering evidence about children's development, achievements and progress (Wessel & Ho, 2018). Conversations with children are also considered an appropriate method of providing teachers with rich information about their understandings, preoccupations, sense of identity and interests.

Checklists and ratings scales are also used to record that certain behaviours are not present and typically include a list of specific behaviours to monitor any aspect of physical, social, emotional or cognitive growth and development. An individual survey may be conducted for each child, recording information about certain behaviours or achievements, such as the assessment of communication skills, collaborative learning skills or motor skills, or surveys may use a group of children (Wrotham, 2008).

Collecting samples of children's work, which provides KG teachers with information on the child's development and learning in the form of a selected compilation of the child's work (such as artwork; stories that the child likes; photographs the child has collected, samples of the child's writing), and then comparing these works with their previous performance. A file on each child is a way of organising and keeping their work over a long period of time, and helps teachers to understand the children's development and growth and to involve parents during monthly meetings, helping them to understand how their child is developing in KG (NAEYC, 2005).

Portfolio evaluation involves a collection of examples of a child's work that show the child's abilities and skills, as well as their achievements and progress over time. These data can be kept in a cumulative portfolio, with the work arranged in chronological order (Dunphy, 2008). Portfolios can also be electronic (ePortfolios) which can encourage the participation of parents and families in children's learning and development, which is considered important in supporting children's learning (Tsirika, Kakana & Michalopoulou, 2017).

Technology-based evaluation is also used in programme evaluations, such as in reading and arithmetic, or for evaluations related to a specific curriculum, as well as with other programmes. It allows the design of lesson planning activities or the continued review of evaluation tools, online evaluation resources and e-learning management. It enables the progress in children's learning to be monitored, which can be used to document learning outcomes and manage their use of web pages (Danniels, Pyle & DeLuca, 2020).

Ideally, a variety of information from multiple sources should be used to evaluate children's progress, because the results are used to make important decisions. Parents should, therefore, be involved in the evaluation process, as they are considered to be a primary source of information about their children; conducting parent interviews is one of the basic methods of collecting data on children's skills (Nah & Kwak, 2011).

Many studies across the world have addressed the evaluation of kindergarten children and related issues. For example, Rajab (2006) found that evaluations in kindergarten are often only concerned with measuring the extent to which the child has remembered information. Rajab also

suggested that there is a lack of awareness among teachers about evaluation processes, the formulation of goals in a non-procedural behavioural manner, and the modern evaluation methods that can be applied in kindergartens. These include objective visual evaluation techniques and oral tests; the use of alternative evaluation methods, the use of observation as an important and appropriate tool for activities in kindergartens; standardised tests that measure growth in physical, mental, social and emotional aspects; use of cumulative children's files and learning bags; use of peer evaluation, teacher exercises, learner sheets, and participation in the curriculum.

Brown and Rolf's (2005) study of 20 practitioners specialising in early childhood and student teachers specialising in childhood studies shows that 90% of practitioners use informal evaluations and 10% use formal evaluations. In contrast, 70% of the student teachers indicated that they would use formal evaluation tools when a child was experiencing difficulty and that their choice of tool would depend on individual situations, while all planned to use informal evaluations within their programmes in the following year. The majority of the practitioners using informal evaluations indicated that they used observation and checklists and referred to more than one type of observation (narrative, time sampling and event sampling); 33% used summaries and features of growth; 22% used rating lists, and none used portfolios or home visits. All student teachers referred to the use of checklists; 60% referred to the use of rating lists and 30% used observations. No students used summaries, achievement profiles or growth profiles, although these methods had been presented to them as part of their evaluation study in their undergraduate subject.

Funk and Bingham (2005) showed that observation focussed on the single factor of academic ability. Expressing their views on the effectiveness of observation, teachers noted its ease of use and found it useful in planning education. They found that the teacher's rating, direct evaluation and portfolio system included within the tool of observation helped significantly in understanding children's learning and development during the year.

Chan and Wong (2010) conducted a study in kindergartens in Hong Kong, which revealed four major changes in evaluation methodology: the selection of evaluation tools, planning procedures, data collection methods, and the use of new evaluation activities.

A report published by Build Strong Foundations for Pennsylvania's Youngest Children (2005) addressed the challenges facing the evaluation of kindergarten children, such as their attention span and inability to use paper and pen tests. The report concluded that both formal and informal evaluations are crucial in evaluating this stage.

Hashim et al. (2010) aimed to identify the evaluation methods used by 476 kindergarten teachers when assessing children's learning in the classroom. The preferred methods were to evaluate children through question-and-answer sessions after activities, observations and test papers.

Navarrete's (2015) results indicate that teachers use varied evaluation methods and tools, and that teachers believe that collaboration with colleagues and parents plays a role in assisting evaluation practice; the results also indicate that children have limited participation in the evaluation process.

Banerjee and Luckner (2013) show that teachers use a large number of different standardised and non-standardised procedures, including observation, play-based activity, parent report, checklists, teacher-created tests.

The previous studies suggest that the evaluation process in kindergartens is complex, and needs information from multiple resources. Therefore, the evaluation methods used in these studies are varied, using both formal and informal approaches, showing the importance of these methods and their potential effectiveness in the evaluation process depending on their purpose. The majority of studies have also indicated the importance of evaluating all aspects of children's growth and development, and ensuring that the evaluation is continued throughout the year.

In recent years, most countries worldwide have paid more attention to the design, application and use of early childhood evaluation, to identify the most effective tools and methods for evaluating children in kindergarten. Teachers, however, face the challenge of finding evaluation methods that can be used to assess children's development and learning while serving multiple purposes across the curriculum (Brown, 2011; Pyle & DeLuca, 2013).

This challenge is compounded by the scarcity of empirical research on the evaluation of children's development and learning in early-years classrooms (Pyle & DeLuca, 2013), since the major focus on evaluation and measuring learning for children has been in the primary and elementary stages (Brookhart, 2004; Roach, Wixson & Talapatra, 2010). There have, thus, been few studies on classroom evaluation practices for kindergarten teachers (Brown, 2011; Pyle & DeLuca, 2013). Instead, early childhood researchers have provided a conceptual basis for understanding evaluation practices by identifying the basic principles of early-age evaluation (Dunphy, 2008; Gullo, 2006). Accordingly, there is a need to provide evidential support for the evaluation methods used by KGTs and to explore how teachers' practices are consistent with the appropriate evaluation methods that should be used by KGTs when assessing children.

As discussed above, a number of other studies identify the evaluation tools that need be used to evaluate kindergarten children's abilities and progress. However, in the context of Jordan, teachers who are working with kindergarten children still appear to have limited knowledge of appropriate evaluation methods when evaluating both programmes and children's abilities and progress. The present study was conducted in order to address these issues.

Significance of the study

In recent years, Jordan's education system has focussed on early childhood, in order to ensure quality education for pre-school children by developing educational programmes and by training teachers. To achieve high-quality kindergarten programmes, however, there is a need to consider the issue of evaluation, which provides teachers with critical information and which can influence education-related decisions.

Good evaluation practices should inform decisions about age-appropriate approaches and what is suitable for individuals. Considering the views and experiences of teachers when formulating methods for the evaluation of children may also help teachers' continuous professional development and influence the teaching practices used with young children. A review of the research literature on early childhood education in Jordan revealed a lack of studies related to the majority of classroom evaluation issues in early childhood programmes (those found include Banerjee & Luckner, 2013; Build Strong Foundations for Pennsylvania's Young Children, 2005; Chew & Lee, 2013; Hashim et al., 2010; Pyle & Deluca, 2013). There is, therefore, an urgent need to examine the key issues related to this subject for pre-school education.

The current study discusses the classroom evaluation practices that teachers most commonly use in kindergartens, as the teacher is responsible for the planning and implementation of curricula and for evaluation in the classroom (Chew & Lee, 2013). There is a further challenge in understanding the most important methods used by teachers in kindergartens: these are affected by factors related to the teacher, such as the number of years of teaching experience and academic qualifications (Chew & Lee, 2013).

This research thus seeks to contribute to the literature by displaying the evaluation methods used by kindergarten teachers, especially in Jordan, through the identification of the most common evaluation methods used by those teachers in the classroom. Depending on the results of the study, potential gaps in practice may be identified. With this knowledge, appropriate interventions can be implemented to correct current evaluation practices or to enhance the knowledge of teachers, if necessary.

This study is of current importance, as the Ministry of Education in Jordan is undergoing modernisation in order to keep pace with the growth of knowledge, scientific and technological progress and social and economic development, and is implementing changes, particularly at the kindergarten stage.

Jordanian context

The Ministry of Education has paid great attention to the kindergarten stage, and has worked to develop and improve the systems and legislation applicable to this stage, stressing the necessity of providing the best possible conditions, materials and human capabilities in caring for children. As a result of diligent work following the first educational development conference in 1987, the Law of Education No. (3) of 1994 was issued, in which, for the first time, the kindergarten stage was acknowledged as one of the stages of education in Jordan, with defined characteristics and goals. Since that time, the educational system in Jordan has continued to develop, including the kindergarten stage, and is now considered very developed. As of 2015, the state provides a comprehensive basic education for both boys and girls through the Education Reform for Knowledge Economy programmes (ERFKE I & II), and ongoing efforts to improve these achievements have contributed to the development of the education system (Ministry of Education [MoE], 2018).

It is noteworthy that the majority of children are enrolled in basic education, but significantly fewer children are enrolled in nurseries and kindergarten (KG), with only 3% of children in nurseries, 14.5% in KG1, and 62.2% in KG2 (Unicef 2015, 2020). The government has an ambitious plan to universalise KG2 while increasing the number of children enrolled in and the guality of nurseries in KG1. These plans are linked to the strategic plan for education in the Ministry of Education (2018–2022), and the National Strategy for Human Resources Development (2016–2025) which aim to improve the quality of the education sector in Jordan, including ECE, by increasing the enrolment rate in kindergarten as well as upgrading kindergarten teachers' skills, curriculum and evaluation processes, and promoting community participation. As a result, the Ministry of Education in Jordan has developed quality standards in terms of administrative and technical matters for all levels of education. According to these standards, the quality of kindergarten education in Jordan has improved over the past few years, due to a number of initiatives. For example, a pre-service teacher education programme was created, for which 99% of KG teachers from KG2 were eligible in 2015, focussing on involving parents in their children's education, using technology in kindergarten and enriching educational programmes. Moreover, the Early Reading and Mathematics Project (RAMP) was developed to increase children's willingness to learn, improve learning materials and better prepare teachers and administrators to provide effective education. Jordan is now experiencing a rising demand for KG2, due to the increasing population, increasing awareness of the importance of early childhood development, and an increase in the number of working mothers (MoE, 2018).

Despite the development of education at KG-level, however, quality improvements are still needed. For example, the curriculum requires review in order to improve and modernise it; there is poor monitoring, evaluation and accountability in the kindergarten stage, so the quality assurance system for kindergarten need to be reviewed, evaluated and strengthened and, while most teachers are eligible, existing teachers need ongoing professional development opportunities to further develop their skills. In addition, the comprehensive training manual for KG teachers should be reviewed and updated. This should include strategies for the inclusion of children with developmental delays and children at risk in regular kindergartens. The coordination between universities in training and developing the skills of KG teachers, who are predominantly female, is also weak and must be strengthened to improve these teachers' skills. Finally, most kindergarten classrooms and teachers use limited information and communications technology and evaluation processes. Although the Ministry of Education has developed a kindergarten system, it has not yet been tested and evaluated as achieving the necessary improvements at this educational stage (MoE, 2018).

Methods

A descriptive, quantitative approach was employed; this is appropriate for the objectives of the current study, which aims to identify the methods of evaluation used by kindergarten teachers.

Participants

The study sample consisted of all the teachers of kindergarten children in 520 public and private kindergartens in Amman (the capital of, and the largest city in, Jordan) in the academic year 2017/2018. This comprised 1060 teachers, according to statistics obtained from the Department of Education in the Ministry of Education in Jordan (Ministry of Education, 2018). The questionnaire was distributed to all kindergartens in the capital city of Amman and 730 were returned. Of these, 527 were adopted in the analysis of the data, after the exclusion of incomplete questionnaires. With regard to kindergarten teachers' qualifications, 124 teachers had college diplomas, 317 were graduates and 86 had post-graduate qualifications. The teachers also had varying lengths of experience in teaching kindergarten children: 247 had fewer than five years' teaching experience; 158 had between 5 and 10 years' experience, and 122 had more than 10 years of teaching experience. Of the kindergartens, 253 were public and 274 were private.

Ethical considerations

Official ethical approval was obtained from the Ministry of Education before inviting participants to take part in the study. Participants were informed in advance of the purpose of the study and gave their consent before completing the study questionnaire. Participants were assured that their responses would be treated with anonymity and confidentiality.

Instrumentation

In order to identify the quality of the methods, tools and procedures used by kindergarten teachers in the evaluation of kindergarten children, a specific survey questionnaire was designed. A comprehensive review of the theoretical literature on the evaluation of kindergarten children (Ashria, 2014; Rajab, 2006; Funk & Bingham, 2005) was used as the main resource in designing the questionnaire.

The final draft of the questionnaire consisted of 70 items rated on a three-point Likert-type scale (3 = to a large extent, 2 = to some extent, 1 = not at all). The survey questionnaire consisted of three scales, each related to the evaluation of kindergarten children. The first was The Evaluation Methods scale, which included two sub-scales: (a) The Formal Evaluation Methods (FEM) sub-scale, consisting of 15 items that addressed teachers' perceptions of the common formal methods they used in evaluating kindergarten children in classrooms; (b) The Informal Evaluation Methods (IEM) sub-scale, which consisted of 13 items examining teachers' perceptions of the common informal methods they used in evaluating kindergarten children in classrooms. The second scale was the Teacher's Practices in the Evaluation Process (TPEP), which consisted of 18 items examining teachers' views of the practices and procedures used before, during and after evaluation, including parental involvement, evaluation goals, etc. Finally, The Evaluation Areas and Times (EAT) scale consisted of 24 items that measured the development areas teachers valued in evaluation, and the time they chose to perform the evaluation process.

The degree of use was considered to be high if the mean (average) was more than 2.33; 2.33–1.66 refers to neutral use, and less than 1.66 refers to low use.

Validity and reliability of the instrument

The initial draft of the study instrument was written in English and it was then translated into Arabic for respondents for whom Arabic was their first language. A language specialist proofread both the Arabic and English copies and made some modifications to a number of items in the questionnaire.

Further face and content validity of the instrument was obtained through a review of the Arabic version by a group of 10 expert faculty members, at 3 Jordanian universities, who specialised in early childhood education (ECE) and educational evaluation. The instrument was field-tested with 20 kindergarten teachers. They were asked to express their opinion on the appropriateness of the study

EDUCATION 3-13 👄 87

instrument to measure evaluation methods and tools used in kindergartens; the relevance of the items to the domains in which they were developed; and the appropriateness and relevance of the language. Changes suggested by the validation panel and field test were incorporated into the development of the instrument: seven items were rephrased, and four items were excluded due to a lack of clarity or incompatibility.

In order to estimate the reliability of the instrument, Test-Retest scores were computed for each domain and for the total domains, for a sample of 30 kindergarten teachers outside the research sample. These were then re-applied to the same sample after two weeks of application. The Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the two application times. Evidence of reliability was also computed using Cronbach's alpha for each subscale and for the total scale. Table 1 shows the reliability coefficients of the study instrument:

Data collection

The questionnaires were distributed by hand to kindergarten teachers at the end of the second semester of the 2017/2018 academic year. Before distributing the questionnaires, we explained the purpose of the study to the participants and clarified that their responses would be kept confidential. The participants were encouraged to read each item carefully before selecting the appropriate choice.

Data analysis

The survey questionnaire was analysed quantitatively using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22. To address the research questions, descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, two-way ANOVA were used.

Results

Results pertaining to the first research question

To establish the evaluation methods most commonly used by kindergarten teachers, according to their ratings, standard deviations and ranks were used.

As shown in Table 2, the mean score of all 4 dimensions of the questionnaire was 1.75 (SD 0.25), where 3 = high use, which reveals a moderate average of responses. Regarding the means and standard deviations of the scale dimensions, the teacher's practices in the evaluation process (TPEP) had the highest mean use (M = 1.83, SD = 0.34), whereas the informal evaluation methods (IEM) dimension had the lowest (M = 1.66, SD = 0.33), suggesting that participants feel that they use informal evaluation methods less than other practices when evaluating kindergarten children.

With regard to the four domains for which kindergarten teachers reported the extent of their use when evaluating children in kindergarten, regarding the teacher practices related to the evaluation process domain, 'involving parents in the evaluation process' item had the highest use by teachers in this domain, with a mean of 2.53. With regard to the formal evaluation domain, the results show that

Tuble In Hendbling coeff	ference of the study instrument.			
Dimension	Test-retest	Cronbach's Aph		
FEM	0.86	0.87		
IEM	0.83	0.85		
TPEP	0.82	0.82		
EAT	0.87	0.88		
Total	0.90	0.91		

88 👄 A. M. ALELAIMAT ET AL.

Dimension	Mean	Std. deviation	Rank	Level
FEM	1.76	.32	2	Moderate
IEM	1.66	.33	4	Low
TPEP	1.83	.34	1	Moderate
EAT	1.72	.36	3	Moderate
Total	1.75	.25		Moderate

Table 2. The distribution of evaluation methods kindergarten teachers used.

the most-used tool for kindergarten teachers was 'Apply ready-made evaluation forms in kindergarten', with a mean of 2.42.

The most-used method by kindergarten teachers in the domain of areas and times evaluation was 'Make sure to assess the extent to which children acquire basic concepts', with a mean of 2.31. Methods from the domain of informal evaluation were the least-used compared to others. The most-used method in this domain was 'Use narrative observation and narrative recording', with a mean of 2.1. More details of these results can be seen in the Appendix.

Results pertaining to the second research question

In order to examine the main effects of teaching experience and teacher qualifications, and the interaction between teaching experience and teacher qualifications on a linear combination of the four domains representing the evaluation methods used by kindergarten teachers (formal evaluation methods, informal evaluation methods, teacher practices related to evaluation processes, areas of evaluation times), a two-way ANOVA was employed.

As shown in Table 3, there were significant differences (p < 0.05) among teachers' perceptions as a result of their qualifications on both the overall scale and the four domains. The results of pairwise comparisons, shown in Table 4, indicate that there were statistically significant differences between the mean score for teachers who were graduate and post-graduate, compared to teachers with a diploma.

As shown in Table 3, there were significant differences in teaching experience for the overall scale and four domains in favour of teachers with 5–10 years' experience and those with over 10 years' experience compared with teachers who had fewer than 5 years' teaching experience, as the results of pairwise comparisons shown in Table 5.

Table 3 also shows statistically significant differences for the interaction between years of teaching experience and teacher's qualification for the overall scale (f = 2.405, p < .05), for the formal evaluation method domain (f = 10.223, p < .05), and for the practices domain (f = 4.143, p < .05).

Dimension	Source	Type III Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig
FEM	Teachers' qualification	2.497	2	1.284	14.928	.000**
	Teaching experience	3.673	2	1.836	21.958	.000**
	Teachers' qualification \times Teaching experience	3.420	4	.855	10.223	.000**
IEM	Teachers' qualification	2.547	2	1.274	12.552	.000**
	Teaching experience	2.253	2	1.126	11.100	.000**
TPEP	Teachers' qualification	1.926	2	.963	8.966	.000**
	Teaching experience	1.768	2	.884	8.228	.000**
	Teachers' qualification \times Teaching experience	1.780	4	.445	4.143	.003**
EAT	Teachers' qualification	3.137	2	1.568	13.573	.000**
	Teaching experience	1.897	2	.949	8.210	.000**
Total	Teachers' qualification	2.369	2	1.184	22.233	.000**
	Teaching experience	1.990	2	.995	18.679	.000**
	Teachers' qualification × Teaching experience	.512	4	.128	2.405	.049*

 Table 3. Result of ANOVA test of teachers' responses related to the level of teaching qualification and lenght of teaching experience (years) variables.

Note: Error df = 518 for each F reported. ** p < 0.001; * p < 0.05.

Dimension	Teachers' qualification		Mean difference	Std. Error	Sig
FEM	Diploma	Graduate	147	.032	.000*
		Post-graduate	229	.043	.000*
IEM	Diploma	Graduate	185	.034	.000*
		Post-graduate	123	.054	.027*
TPEP	Diploma	Graduate	178	.034	.000*
		Post-graduate	122	.046	.034*
EAT	Diploma	Graduate	202	.036	.000*
		Post-graduate	188	.048	.001*
Total	Diploma	Graduate	182	.025	.000*
		Post-graduate	168	.033	.000*

Table 4. Result of pairwise comparisons of teacher perceptions of the evaluation methods used related to level of teaching qualification variable.

** *p* < 0.001; * *p* < 0.05.

Discussion

This study was conducted to identify the evaluation methods most commonly used by kindergarten teachers when assessing children's abilities and progress, as perceived by the teachers themselves, and to explore statistically significant differences between kindergarten teachers in their perceptions of these methods, related to their qualification level and length of teaching experience.

Evaluation methods used by KG teachers

The results of the study indicate that the evaluation methods most commonly used by KGTs were moderate on the overall scale. These findings are similar to those of other studies, such as those of Kolak, 2013, which found the teachers had a moderate use of evaluation of the teaching process, and Banerjee and Luckner (2013), where early childhood professionals reported that they used evaluation methods to assess children's development and learning. This may be due, as suggested by Estetia (2010), to the general framework, and the general and specific outcomes of the kindergarten curriculum in Jordan prepared by the team of educators and academics at the Ministry of Education, which is the reference that guides KG teachers. However, this general framework left issues of output from the evaluation to the KG teachers and did not clarify how the evaluation was to be carried out or the educational methods that teachers should follow, which led to the failure to establish a standard evaluation process for all KG teachers. It is true that every teacher can apply their own capabilities and experience in this field, but there is a need for the general framework to define evaluation standards, as well as detailing the outcomes to be shared internally and externally.

The results showed also that the evaluation method teachers used most commonly according to their own perception was teacher's practices related with the evaluation process (TPEP), followed by The Formal Evaluation Methods (FEM), then The Evaluation Areas and Times (EAT), while Informal

Dimension	The shine serves		14 1:00	Ct d. Europe	C1-1
variable.					
Table 5. Result of pairwis	e comparisons of teacher	perceptions of evaluation	on methods used related	to the Teaching e	experience

Dimension	Teach	ning experience	Mean difference	Std. Error	Sig	
FEM	Less than 5 years (5–10)years		189	.031	.000*	
		More than 10 years	158	.033	.000*	
IEM	Less than 5 years	(5–10)years	149	.033	.000*	
TPEP	Less than 5 years	(5–10)years	098	.034	.017*	
		More than 10 years	104	.021	.037*	
EAT	Less than 5 years	(5–10)years	139	.035	.001*	
		More than 10 years	095	.038	.048*	
Total	Less than 5 years	(5–10)years	141	.026	.000*	
	•	More than 10 years	107	.029	.000*	

** *p* < 0.001; * *p* < 0.05.

Evaluation Methods (IEM) were least used by teachers, in their own perception. The analysis of these results revealed that, despite the moderate use of evaluation methods, a wide variety of methods was used by the respondents when evaluating KG children, especially those methods related to practice and formal methods for evaluating children's development and learning, in a variety of areas and times but more than informal methods of evaluating children. These results could be due to the belief of teachers that formal evaluation methods, as traditionally used in evaluation processes, are more reliable, while they may feel that they do not have the necessary competencies to evaluate the child using informal methods. The process of establishing kindergartens and teaching children within this stage is relatively recent in Jordan, and the focus of teachers is generally on traditional evaluation methods, which depend primarily on tests and formal evaluation. This is confirmed by a number of teachers in the study sample and is in line with the findings of Shepard, Kagan & Wurtz (2000), who report that KGTs focus more on testing and formal evaluation than on using informal evaluation, and need more training to develop non-formal evaluation methods for children. Sakellariou and Mitsi (2019) confirm this result, finding that KG teachers lack confidence in terms of training and up-to-date knowledge of evaluation issues; they are used to more traditional and stereotypical methods of evaluating the expected outcomes of teaching and learning, despite their positive attitude towards using alternative evaluation methods in kindergarten. The findings of the present study are, therefore, consistent with the suggestions of early childhood professionals and organisations (e.g. Bagnato, McLean, Macy & Neisworth, 2011; Snow & Van Hemel, 2008; Sakellariou & Mitsi, 2019), regarding the need to use non-formal evaluation methods to assess the strengths of young children and to plan appropriate goals and instruction. As Ashria (2014) observed, there is a lack of expert-led evaluation processes in kindergartens due to the lack of specialisation and training in kindergartens. Accordingly, the current study recommends the appointment of evaluation specialists in kindergartens, along with the development of KGTs' abilities and skills in assessing children's learning and development.

The results also show that teachers' practices related to the evaluation process domain (i.e. practices related to whether, during the evaluation process, KG teachers select appropriate and diverse evaluation methods and take into consideration children's characteristics, individual differences, the context in which the child is evaluated – individually or within small groups – and the participation of parents) had the highest score of the other domains, with a mean score of 1.83, and SD 0.34, especially their belief in the importance of involving parents in the evaluation process, which had the highest mean within this domain. This result could be due to kindergarten teachers' awareness of the importance of evaluation and their belief that evaluation data are collected in order to make decisions about education and services. The results also suggest that they believe that families are an integral part of this process. Most respondents within this domain reported that they shared the results of evaluations with families and used these results to plan goals, reflecting the inclusion of parents in the evaluation process. This finding can be attributed to the important role played by parents at the kindergarten stage, which potentially has a positive influence on teachers' evaluation practices (Navarrete, 2015) if implemented correctly, including the participation of parents in the evaluation process. However, communication between most kindergarten teachers and parents still needs to be more active and directed towards partnership in all areas related to children (Rutland & Hall, 2013). These results regarding parental participation are consistent with modern literature on evaluation (Rutland & Hall, 2013), which attributes to parents a significant role in the evaluation process, oriented towards an ecological approach to evaluation, which is based on the collection of data in multi-disciplinary evaluations, including the contributions of parents, doctors and teachers as a team (Neill, 2004).

Formal evaluation methods were ranked as the second most common method used by KGTs, especially the use of ready-made test evaluation forms. In general, the results in this domain indicated that participants focussed on the use of tests and measures that are primarily concerned with cognitive development. They used pre-prepared evaluation papers for each educational unit and papers prepared by the kindergarten administration, and focussed less on tests designed for growth and development. As such, it is clear that teachers do not employ a holistic approach in assessing children's learning and progress, despite the evolution of the evaluation system in kindergartens; evaluation is still largely directed towards measuring cognitive growth, through the use of standards and tests prepared by specialists, rather than focussing on developmental growth. Therefore, KGTs need to be more aware that, while tests and papers related to a specific unit or to cognitive aspects of the concepts and information gained in the evaluation process are effective, it is important to realise that evaluation does not occur only once in the academic year and does not occur for one aspect only, but is a series of consecutive episodes used to identify a reference point and make individual comparisons to identify strengths and weaknesses. This is consistent with Funk & Bingham (2005), who showed a significant focus on academic ability in children, and with Rajab's (2006) findings that teachers should focus on the cognitive aspects of evaluation. In contrast, other researchers found that, despite the wide range of strategies used, it was clear that a holistic approach was employed for assessing young children (Gullo & Hughes, 2011; Linfield, Warwick and Parker, 2008). Hashim et al. (2010), however, argue that standardised tests should be limited and do not consider them the best way to assess children's progress.

Uses related to the areas and evaluation times domain were ranked third by KGTs, with a mean score of 1.71 and are seen by kindergarten teachers as a way to assess the extent to which children acquire basic concepts. This is perhaps due to the focus of teachers' attention on the evaluation of knowledge and information acquired by children, as well as the teachers' need for training in assessing kindergarten children. This is confirmed by the findings of the Educational Strategic Plan (2018–2022) in Jordan, which reports that KGTs need to train and develop their performance in the fields of planning, implementation and evaluation, regardless of their qualifications, years of experience and number of training courses attended (MOE, 2018).

The least-used evaluation methods in kindergartens, as perceived by the teachers, were related to informal evaluation, with a mean score of 1.66, and KGTs considered the method of narrative observation and narrative recording to be their most-used method within this domain. This result is consistent with the findings of Navarrete (2015) and Nah and Kwark (2011), who reveal that the most-used evaluation method was observation, and the results of Blaiklock (2013), which focusses on narrative descriptions when assessing children's learning and progress. However, in the current study, this informal method is not considered one of the most-used evaluation methods in kindergartens, which may be due to the fact that little attention is given to appropriately training teachers in how to evaluate KG children using informal methods. This may leave KGTs with insufficient knowledge, skills and competences in this field, or they may not have sufficient experience of informal evaluation. In particular, there are differences in the application of these methods with KG children compared to those in other educational stages. This suggestion is supported by many studies (e.g. Rajab, 2006; Blaiklock, 2013) which have found that teachers are not adequately trained, either before or during service, on how to evaluate children informally.

These findings are further supported by Banerjee and Luckner (2013), who stress the need to develop teachers' skills in the evaluation of kindergarten children using observation, checklists and other informal methods. As such, training KGTs to assess children's progress using informal methods is highly recommended.

Demographic variables and group differences

The results of the two-way ANOVA reveal statistically significant differences among kindergarten teachers in their perceptions of the most common evaluation methods used in their schools. These differences are attributable to their level of qualification, both for the overall scale and the four domains, in favour of graduate and post-graduate teachers compared to teachers with diplomas. This can be attributed to the fact that teachers who have a higher level of education have completed more advanced courses in the field of evaluation and teaching children and have greater skills than teachers with a diploma. Little, Goe and Bell (2009), conversely, found that qualifications and certifications do not necessarily predict effective teaching that enhances children's learning.

There were also significant differences related to teaching experience, for both the overall scale and the 4 domains, in favour of teachers with 5–10 years' experience and those with more than 10 years' teaching experience, compared with teachers who have fewer than 5 years' teaching experience. These results are consistent with those of Araujo, Carneiro, Cruz-Aguayo and Schady (2016), who found that children taught by teachers with three or fewer years of experience learn less on average. This differs, however, from Banerjee and Luckner (2013), who found no significant differences due to teachers' years of experience when it came to the evaluation standards used in kindergartens. This result may be due to the fact that KGTs with 10 years or more experience and a higher level of qualification have greater skills and experience in dealing with children and evaluation methods; their experience with children may lead to the development of skills in evaluating these children's abilities and progress. Much of the research shows that differences in teachers' education and experience explain very few differences in the quality of teaching and evaluation of children (Hanushek & Rivkin 2012).

Finally, the results show statistically significant differences for the interaction between teaching experience and teachers' level of qualification for the overall scale, for the formal evaluation method domain and for the practices domain.

Conclusions

This research was carried out in order to examine teachers' perceptions of the evaluation methods most commonly used by KGTs. Based on the findings of this study, a number of conclusions can be drawn. In general, the findings suggest that kindergarten teachers perceived a need to train on how to evaluate kindergarten children. The major findings of the study show that KGTs need more training specifically in informal evaluation methods. Additionally, kindergarten teachers seem to be excessively concerned with assessing just the cognitive development of kindergarten children, rather than other developmental aspects.

It is worth mentioning that we cannot deduce that, simply because teachers give moderate ratings for the use of evaluation methods in all areas, they therefore have *skills* in all domains. Further research is needed to establish whether teachers actually use this range of evaluation methods, or whether they just believe that they do.

This study used a single research method: the survey questionnaire. No attempt was made to gather information using other research methods, such as observation or interview, which hinders the generalisation of its results. It is hoped that future studies will draw upon other sources to define the evaluation methods most commonly used by KGTs, in ways that the current study did not consider.

Recommendations

From the above, it can be concluded that it is essential to implement an action plan to provide serving kindergarten teachers with up-to-date university and in-service courses to train them in how to effectively assess kindergarten children, using modern trends in evaluation. In these courses, teachers should be trained in integrated evaluation, including not just cognitive aspects but also other developmental aspects, how to plan lessons in line with the evaluation process, how to assess children's progress and summarise evaluation results and how to make decisions regarding how and what to teach, based on these results. This will assist KGTs to teach more effectively. Some KGTs in Jordan need to develop professionally, by continuing to read recent research related to modern trends in assessing KG children, and need to be encouraged to work in collaboration with other teachers, principals, parents and supervisors, by providing opportunities for them to

work as one team. These effective cooperation techniques will help teachers to learn more about children and to assess their progress more effectively.

Further studies need to be conducted, perhaps using a qualitative approach, to examine the teachers' views in more depth, considering the impact of other variables, such as cooperative teaching and in-service training, on the use of modern evaluation approaches with kindergarten children. Finally, it is hoped that the findings of this research will serve as evidential data which other studies may develop in the future.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Ali Mustafa Alelaimat 🔟 http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3401-377X

References

- Al-Zboon, E. 2015. "Evaluation of the Interactive National Curriculum, the Framework Document and the Public and Private Outcomes of the Kindergartens Program for Children with Hearing Disabilities from the Point of View of Their Teachers." Journal of Educational Sciences 11 (3): 387–402.
- Araujo, M., P. Carneiro, Y. Cruz-Aguayo, and N. Schady. 2016. "Teacher Quality and Learning Outcomes in Kindergarten. Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), Felipe Herrera Library." https://publications.iadb.org/publications/english/ document/Teacher-Quality-and-Learning-Outcomes-in-Kindergarten.pdf.
- Arndt, S., and M. Tesar. 2015. "Early Childhood Assessment in Aotearoa New Zealand: Critical Perspectives and Fresh Openings." Journal of Pedagogy (JoP) 6 (2): 71–86.
- Ashria A. (2014). "Evaluation in Kindergarten in the Light of Ethical Intelligence in Accordance with the Standards of Academic Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions", The Fourth International Arab conference on quality assurance in higher education (IACQA'2014), 1-3/4/2014, Faculty of Education, Zarqa University, Jordan, 530-545. http:// khartoumspace.uofk.edu/123456789/25660.
- Bagnato, S., M. Mclean, M. Macy, and J. Neisworth. 2011. "Identifying Instructional Targets for Early Childhood via Authentic Assessment: Alignment of Professional Standards and Practice-Based Evidence." Journal of Early Intervention 33 (4): 243–253.
- Banerjee, R., and J. Luckner. 2013. "Assessment Practices and Training Needs of Early Childhood Professionals." Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education 34: 231–248. doi:10.1080/10901027.2013.816808.
- Black, P., and D. Wiliam. 2006. "Developing a Theory of Formative Assessment." In Assessment and Learning, edited by J. Gardner, 81–100. London: Sage.
- Blaiklock, K. 2013. "What Are Children Learning in Early Childhood Education in New Zealand?" Australasian Journal of Early Childhood 38 (2): 51–56.
- Brookhart, S. 2004. "Classroom Assessment: Tensions and Intersections in Theory and Practice." *Teachers College Record* 106: 429–458.
- Brown, C. 2011. "Searching for the Norm in a System of Absolutes: A Case Study of Standards Based Accountability Reform in pre-Kindergarten." *Early Education and Development* 22: 151–177.
- Brown, J., and S. Rolf. 2005. "Use of Child Development Assessment in Early Childhood Education; Early Childhood Practitioner and Student Attitudes Toward Formal and Informal Testing." *Early Child Development and Care* 175 (3): 193–202.
- Build Strong Foundation for Pennsylvania's Young Children. 2005. "Early Childhood Assessment for Children from Birth to Age 8 (Grade 3); Pennsylvania Standards for Learning Assessment & Curriculum December. 1–39. https://www.pakeys.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/EarlyChildhoodEvaluation.pdf.
- Carr, M. 2001. Assessment in Early Childhood Settings: Learning Stories. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chan, S., and S. Wong. 2010. "Exploring Assessment and Accountability for Children's Learning a Case Study of a Hong Kong Preschool." *Early Education & Development* 21 (2): 234–262.
- Chew, A., and I. Lee. 2013. "Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Classroom Assessment in Republic Polytechnic, Singapore." International Association For Educational Assessment (IAEA), 39th annual conference (2013). https://iaea.info/ documents/teachers-beliefs-and-practices-of-classroom-assessment-in-republic-polytechnic-singapore/
- Danniels, E., A. Pyle, and C. DeLuca. 2020. "The Role of Technology in Supporting Classroom Assessment in Play-Based Kindergarten." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 88, doi:10.1016/j.tate.2019.102966.

94 👄 A. M. ALELAIMAT ET AL.

- Duffy, B. 2010. "The Early Years Curriculum." In *Contemporary Issues in the Early Years*, edited by G. Pugh and B. Duffy, 95–108. London: SAGE.
- Dunphy, E. 2008. Supporting Early Learning and Development Through Formative Assessment: A Research Paper. *Commissioned by the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment, NCCA.* www.ncca.ie.
- Epstein, A., L. Schweinhart, A. DeBruin-Parecki, and K. Robin. 2004. *Preschool Assessment: A Guide to Developing a Balances Approach*. New Brunswick, NJ: NIEER Preschool policy matters 7 (July). http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/7-1.pdf.
- Estetia, S. 2010. The Evaluation and its Methods in Pre-School in Jordan: Reality and Aspirations. https://arabic.jo/res/ seasons/28/28-5.pdf.
- Featherstone, S. 2011. Catching Them At It: Assessment in the Early Years. London: A & C Black.
- Funk, J., and G. Bingham. 2005. The Benefits of User-Friendly Data Collection: Effective Preschool Assessment Practices, http://www.excelligence.com/StudyResults2007.pdf?domainredirect=true.
- Furtak, E. M., K. Kiemer, R. K. Circi, R. Swanson, V. de León, D. Morrison, and S. C. Heredia. 2016. "Teachers' Formative Assessment Abilities and Their Relationship to Student Learning: Findings From a Four-Year Intervention Study." *Instructional Science* 44 (3): 267–291. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.nwciowa.edu/10.1007/s11251-016-9371-3.
- Gullo, D. 2006. "Assessment in Kindergarten." In *K Today: Teaching and Learning in the Kindergarten Year*, edited by D. F. Gullo, 138–150. Washington, DC: NAEYC.
- Gullo, D., and K. Hughes. 2011. "Reclaiming Kindergarten: Part I. Questions About Theory and Practice." *Early Childhood Education Journal* 38: 323–328. doi:10.1007/s10643- 010-0429-6.
- Hanushek, E., and S. Rivkin. 2012. "The Distribution of Teacher Quality and Implications for Policy." Annual Review of Economics 4 (1): 131–157. doi:10.1146/annurev-economics-080511-111001.
- Hashim, N., H. Yunus, and M. Ali. 2010. "Preschool Teacher Assessment Methods in Children's Learning." The International Journal of Learning, 446–458. doi:10.18848/1447-9494/CGP/v17i04/46979.
- Kim, Y., and M. Davidson. 2019. Assessment to Inform Instruction: Formative Assessment. USAID. https://www.globalreadingnetwork.net/sites/default/files/media/file/Assessment%20to%20Inform%20Instruction.pdf.
- Kolak, A. 2013. "Teachers' Attitudes Towards Evaluation Process," Život i škola, br. 31 (1/2014.) god. 60., str. 109. 125. UDK: 371.26:371.12, Izvorni znanstveni rad Primljeno: 15. Sijecnja.
- Linfield, R., P. Warwick, and C. Parker. 2008. "I'm Putting Crosses for the Letters I Don't Know': Assessment in the Early Years." In *Teaching and Learning in the Early Years*, edited by D. Whitebread and P. Coltman, 89–107. New York: Routledge.
- Little, O., L. Goe, and C. Bell. 2009. A Practical Guide to Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED543776.pdf.
- McLachlan, C. 2017. "Assessment in Early Childhood Education." Oxford Bibliographies, doi:10.1093/obo/9780199756810-0179.
- Ministry of Education [MoE]. 2018. "Ministry of Education: Education Strategic Plan 2018–2022." http://www.unesco.org/ new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/FIELD/Amman/pdf/ESP_English.pdf.
- Nah, K., and J. Kwak. 2011. "Child Assessment in Early Childhood Education and Care Settings in South Korea." Asian Social Science 7 (6): 66–78.
- The National Association for the Education of Young Children [NAEYC]. 2005. Accreditation Performance Criteria Approved April 2005 by NAEYC Governing Board Universal and KinderGarten Strands. Available online: http://www.NAEYC.org.
- Navarrete, A. (2015). Assessment in the Early Years: The Perspectives and Practices of Early Childhood Educators. Masters Dissertation, Dublin Institute of Technology. https://arrow.dit.ie/aaschssldis.
- Neill, P. 2004. "A Better Way To Do Preschool Assessment Announcing the Revised Preschool COR." *High/Scope Educational Research Foundation* 23 (1): 1–4. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.610. 6697&rep=rep1&type=pdf.
- Pellegrini, A. 2001. "Practitioner Review: The Role of Direct Observation in the Assessment of Young Children." Journal of Child Psychology: Psychial 42 (7): 861–869.
- Pyle, A., and C. Deluca. 2013. "Assessment in the Kindergarten Classroom: An Empirical Study of Teachers' Assessment Approaches." *Early Childhood Education Journal* 41 (5): 373–380. http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10643-012-0573-2.
- Rajab, M. 2006, July. "Developing Methods of Evaluating Kindergarten Children in the Light of Modern Trends." Journal of Childhood Studies, Institute of Graduate Studies for Children Ain Shams 9 (32): 11–26.
- Roach, T., C. Wixson, and D. Talapatra. 2010. "Aligning an Early Childhood Assessment to State Kindergarten Content Standards: Application of a Nationally Recognized Alignment Framework." *Educational Measurement Issues and Practice* 29 (1): 25–37.
- Rutland, J., and A. Hall. 2013. "Involving Families in the Assessment Process." Dialog 16 (4): 113-120.
- Sakellariou, M., and P. Mitsi. 2019. "The Evaluation Techniques in Early Childhood Education: A Comparative Research." Journal of Educational System 3 (4): 1–9.

- Scott-Little, C., and J. Niemeyer. 2001. Assessing Kindergarten Children: What School Systems Need to Know. Improving Learning Through Research & Development (SERVE), 1 Ed, Associated with the School of Education, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Shepard, L., S. Kagan, and E. Wurtz. 2000. "Principles and Recommendations for Early Childhood Assessments." The National Education Goals Panel, the Goal 1 Early Childhood Assessments Resource Group.
- Snow, C., and S. Van Hemel. 2008. Early Childhood Assessment: Why, What, and How. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.
- Tsirika, M., D. Kakana, and A. Michalopoulou. 2017. "The e-Portfolio in a Kindergarten Classroom: Adopting Alternative Assessment Methods Through Action Research." *American Journal of Educational Research* 5 (2): 114–123.
- UNICEF. 2015. "Education for Prosperity: Delivering Results. A National Strategy for Human Resource Development 2016-2025." http://www.mohe.gov.jo/en/documents/national-hrd-strategy.pdf.
- UNICEF. 2020. "Flexible Programme Consultant. Jordan Country Office." https://www.unjobnet.org/jobs/detail/ 14688191.
- VanDerHeyden, A., J. Witt, G. Naquin, and G. Noell. 2001. "The Reliability and Validity of Curriculum-Based Measurement Readiness Probes for Kindergarten Students." Sholl Psychology Review 30 (3): 363–382.
- Wessel, M., and W. Ho. 2018. "Narrative Assessment. A New Approach to Advocacy Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and Communication." Hivos and Wageningen University & Research. file:///D:/Users/kd15262/Downloads/ VanWesselandHo.NarrativeAssessment.pdf.
- Wilson, S. 2017. Exploring the Importance of Using Formative Assessment in Informing Instruction to Improve Student Learning. Orange City, Iowa NW Commons: Northwestern College. https://nwcommons.nwciowa.edu/education_ masters.
- Wrotham, S. 2008. Assessment in Early Childhood Education. 5th Ed. Merril, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendix: Questionnaire

No.	Sub-scale/item	Mean	SD	Rank	Level
Subs	cale 1. Formal Evaluation Methods (FEM)				
	Prepare pre-evaluation papers to assess children in each educational unit.	1.42	0.6	11	Low
	Use an evaluation form that corresponds to the child <u></u> 's development to know about his / her growth in a particular development aspect (language, motor, social) and evaluate children based on it	1.16	0.43	15	Low
	use pre-prepared evaluation papers prepared by the kindergarten administration.	1.61	0.73	8	Low
	Apply ready-made evaluation models.	2.42	0.71	1	High
	prepare items to evaluate children based on my knowledge of the development areas among kindergarten children.	2.05	0.86	6	Moderate
	Use pre-evaluation sheets in cooperation with kindergarten teachers on unit concepts and information.	1.47	0.66	10	Low
	Use of measurements and tests prepared by specialists in cognitive development	1.29	0.62	13	Low
	Use measurements and tests prepared by specialists in social and emotional development	2.24	0.85	5	Moderate
	Use the tests available to assess children	1.54	0.7	9	Low
	Apply evaluation forms prepared by the Ministry of Education or the General Administration of Kindergartens	1.27	0.56	14	Low
	Use tests prepared by specialists in the field of motor development.	1.63	0.74	7	Low
	Use tests prepared by specialists in adaptive behaviour	1.36	0.66	12	Low
	Use tests prepared by language development specialists	2.29	0.9	3	Low
	Use tests prepared by specialists in different areas of development.	2.41	0.81	2	Moderate
	Assess children by using tests designed for grow and develop	2.25	0.78	4	Low
	Total	1.76	0.31		Moderate
Subs	cale 2. Informal Evaluation Methods (IEM)				
	Use observation method inside the activity room.	1.54	0.74	9	Low
	Use observation method while child working _in the learning stations.	1.2	0.58	13	Low
	Use observation method while child outdoor playing	2.04	0.8	3	moderate
	use naturalistic observation.	1.78	0.86	5	moderate
	Use event sampling observation.	1.62	0.76	7	Low
	choose samples of the children works and keep it in child portfolio.	1.46	0.71	11	Low
	Use parent interview method.	1.55	0.78	8	Low
	Use the specific observation method.	1.36	0.68	12	Low

(Continued)

96 👄 A. M. ALELAIMAT ET AL.

Continued.

!

No	Sub-scale/item	Mean	SD	Rank	l evel
	Use the time observation method	1.75	0.81	6	moderate
	Use rating lists in the evaluation process.	1.49	0.7	10	Low
	Use the Portfolio file	1.88	0.78	4	moderate
	Use checklists and questionnaires based on parental involvement in the evaluation	2.05	0.75	2	moderate
	process			_	
	Use narrative observation and narrative recording.	2.1	0.85	1	moderate
	Total	1.66	0.33	-	Low
Subso	ale 3. Teacher''s Practices in the Evaluation Process(TPEP)				
	Take into consideration the children characteristics when evaluating.	1.83	0.87	9	Moderate
	Assess children individually	1.53	0.77	15	Low
	Use methods that fit different growth characteristics	1.54	0.78	14	Low
	Encourage children to take an active role in assessing their performance	1.88	0.83	8	Moderate
	Use tools that fit different growth characteristics	2	0.91	5	Moderate
	Choose previously appropriate evaluation tools.	1.73	0.83	10	Moderate
	Set the goal of the evaluation and select the appropriate evaluation tools previously.	1.91	0.83	7	Moderate
	Develop my experience in interpreting child works	1.52	0.77	16	Low
	Use a variety tools to collect information.	1.57	0.77	12	Low
	Use the evaluation only to identify if children have acquired the educational concepts.	1.65	0.88	11	Low
	Assess children while working in small groups	2.08	0.92	4	Moderate
	Collect child information from multiple resources.	1.48	0.77	17	Low
	Use the evaluation just to see how well children have acquired information about	1.44	0.7	18	Low
	educational units.				
	Involve parents in the gathering information process.	1.99	0.85	6	Moderate
	Use evaluation process when child have behavioural problems	1.61	0.77	12	Low
	Assess the children's" cognitive aspects only.	2.31	0.86	2	Moderate
	Spend my time reviewing the methods available to collect information (eg parents,	2.17	0.84	3	moderate
	preschool, peer,)				
	Involve parents in the evaluation process.	2.53	0.78	1	High
C	I OTAI	1.82	0.34		moderate
Subso	are 4. Evaluation Areas and Times (EAT)	1.00	0.01	0	
	Evaluate the children at the end of each unit	1.80	0.91	8 1	moderate
	Evaluate the extent to which the children have acquired the basic concepts.	2.31	0.81	15	moderate
	Evaluate the output to which the children have acquired language concents	1.01	0.72	15	LOW
	Evaluate the children linguistic development	1.23	0.52	24	moderate
	Evaluate the children regularly (weekly monthly guarterly yearly)	1.44	0.7	20	moderate
	Evaluate the children motor sensory skills	1.55	0.85	14	
	Evaluate the children emotionally and socially growth	1.01	0.77	7	moderate
	Evaluate the children cognitive development	1.65	0.05	13	Low
	Evaluate the emiliter cognitive development Evaluate how well the children have acquired scientific concents	2 12	0.88	2	moderate
	Evaluate children while working in the classroom	1.8	0.00	11	moderate
	Evaluate children ⁴ s adaptive behaviour	1.0	0.85	6	moderate
	Evaluate the children in the morning circle	1.51	0.64	18	low
	Evaluate the motor skills of children	1.37	0.63	21	low
	Evaluate the children in the outdoor playground.	1.52	0.74	17	low
	Evaluate the precise motor skills of children	1.36	0.67	22	low
	Evaluate how well the children have acquired mathematical concepts	1.78	0.81	12	moderate
	Evaluate children while they wait to leave school	1.49	0.7	19	low
	Evaluate the child's problem-solving style.	1.84	0.76	9	moderate
	Evaluate children ⁴ s thinking skills.	2.02	0.75	4	moderate
	Focus primarily on the final evaluation to determine how well the children have	2.09	0.82	3	moderate
	acquired knowledge				
	Identify the children"s abilities and skills through their initial evaluation at the	1.81	0.86	10	moderate
	beginning of the school year				
	Set the level of growth for the children in the beginning of the year.	1.57	0.7	16	low
	Identify the children"s abilities and skills at the beginning of the year, based on the	1.29	0.6	23	low
	previous year <u></u> 's evaluation.				
	Total	1.71	0.35		moderate