

# DETERMINANTS OF LECTURERS ASSESSMENT PRACTICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOMALIA

Mohamed Isse Sidow

Department of Curriculum Studies, Islamic University in Uganda

## ABSTRACT

*This research investigated the determinants of lecturers' assessment practices in higher education institutions in Mogadishu, Somalia. The factors that determined the lecturer's assessment practice were design, interpretation, application, and administration mechanisms. A quantitative research design was conducted. The questionnaire was used, Cronbach's alpha value is .917. This shows that the scale's internal consistency and reliability for this sample are quite excellent.  $r = .636$ ,  $P = 0.000, .05$ ., the findings revealed a significant, favorable, and robust relationship between design and lecturers' assessment practices. Also, the correlation table shows a good connection between assessment, interpretation, application, and lecturers' assessment practice. (Explained) ( $r = .575$ ,  $p = 0.000, .05$ ) ( $R = .516$ ,  $p = .000, 0.05$ ) there is a strong positive relationship between assessment design, interpretation, and application to lecturers' assessment practice. I recommend that the administration of public and private higher education institutions focus on in-service training on how to upgrade the skills of lecturers toward assessment practice.*

## KEYWORDS

*administration, application, assessment practice, design & interpretation.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper focused on the determinants of lecturers' assessment practices in higher education institutions in Mogadishu, Somalia. Assessment is a systematic foundation for making conclusions about student learning and growth. It is the method for bettering student learning and growth through the process of identifying, choosing, developing, compiling, evaluating, and interpreting the information. The cognitive process of assessment clarifies the current situation at each given time. To collect data for appraisals, assessing is usually utilized. However, organizing measurement data into understandable formats for a variety of factors falls under the purview of assessment. (Lövdén, et al, 2020)

Assessments may reveal how well students have comprehended a specific subject or the extent to which our specified quantitative targets have been achieved. There are essentially two forms of assessment used in education. These tests are summative and formative. Summative assessments are carried out following the conclusion of a program. It is interested in determining what has been accomplished. It suggests a verdict on the results of earlier education. This sort of assessment is used mostly for determining course grades or certifying students' mastery of the desired learning outcomes. It is meant to ascertain the degree to which the instructional objectives have been attained. On the other hand, formative assessment happens all during the examination. It is employed to give ongoing feedback and direction to both students and instructors, influencing the steady development of the curriculum. As a result, it anticipates students' requirements in terms of learning. In higher education institutions different types of assessment

are used to assess students by the university academic staff. The most commonly used types of assessments used in universities include assessment for learning which is also known as formative assessment, assessment of learning which is also equated to summative assessment, and assessment as learning (Aziz, 2018).

Assessment practices skills are proficiencies in which lecturers design tests, award scores/ grades, analyze them, and use the results from the assessments to improve student learning. Good assessment practices among academic staff should focus on unambiguous learning prospects and also ascertain realistic learning that does not propel students into rote learning. Lecturers' assessment practices should provide students with self-motivation skills to learn, and good study practices, and help them to receive timely feedback on what they have learned (Matovu & Zubairi, 2015).

This study aimed to investigate the most determining assessment mechanism on lecturers' assessment practices and how lecturers differ in the assessment mechanism.

### **1.1. Assessment in Higher Education Institutions**

The academic staff at universities uses a variety of assessment methods to evaluate students in higher education institutions. Assessment for learning, also referred to as formative assessment, Assessment of learning, often referred to as summative assessment, and Assessment as Learning are the most frequently utilized forms of assessments at universities (Matovu & Zubairi, 2015).

### **1.2. Assessment at the Universities in Somalia**

In higher education institutions in Somalia, different types of assessments are used to assess students. Although, the most commonly used types of assessments used in the universities in Somalia include summative assessments. Lecturers usually do not do assessments for learning, the score that are designed to test students during the lesson; he adds it when he takes the formative assessment.

### **1.3. Challenges that may Arise if there is No Formative Assessment**

Formative assessment is to monitor student learning to provide ongoing feedback that can be used by instructors to improve their teaching and by students to improve their learning. More specifically, formative assessments: help students identify their strengths and weaknesses and target areas that need work. If there is no formative assessment, Lecturers do not receive feedback on student understanding and achievement of lesson objectives. This can lead to poor academic performance, a lack of awareness about student learning, and the failure of many students in the examination (MUAFAIAH, 2019).

## **2. ASSESSMENT PROCESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**

### **2.1. Design**

Assessment design makes sure that official and informal assessments show how well students are doing in terms of the desired learning objectives. The what, when, and how of assessment are taken into account while designing it. In summary, inclusive assessment conforms to many of the same principles as effective assessment design, makes use of a variety of methods, is strongly related to the intended learning outcomes, is transparent and effectively communicated, fosters

assessment literacy, and makes sure that feedback is effective and tailored to the individual.(Goertler, S, et al, 2018)

The assessment design is to prepare, take, and correct the test through objective and subjective means. The results are then presented to the entire community. When constructing the assessment design, the following principles must be followed: The principles of assessment design should be clear, accurate, consistent, and timely. Information on assessment systems, assessment functions, and procedures should be made available to students, staff, and other external evaluators or examiners. The principle of assessment design is that, to the extent, it is possible without affecting academic standards, testing should be inclusive and equitable. This indicates that tasks and methods should not prejudice any group or individual. The purpose of assessment is to improve student learning, so it should also guarantee that students have the chance to acquire a variety of general skills and talents. A manageable quantity of work should be assessed. Without overburdening staff or students, the assignment schedule and volume of graded work should produce a genuine and trustworthy profile of achievement. To make sure that the aims of assessment are sufficiently addressed and students may learn to engage with assessment successfully, formative and summative assessments should be included in programs. The assessment process should provide timely feedback that encourages learning and paves the way for improvement: Every module's formative assignments that have been submitted by students, as well as summative tasks when necessary, are eligible for individual and/or group assessment. Assessment design makes sure that official and informal assessments show how well students are doing in terms of the desired learning objectives. The what, when, and how of assessment are taken into account while designing it. In summary, inclusive assessment conforms to many of the same principles as effective assessment design, makes use of a variety of methods, is strongly related to the intended learning outcomes, is transparent and effectively communicated, fosters assessment literacy, and makes sure that feedback is effective and tailored to the individual(Appiah, M et al, 2018).

## **2.2. Interpretation**

Testing is the process of giving an interpretation of meaning and value. The class test resulted in scores. It is essential since a test's raw result on its own seldom has any significance. For instance, it is impossible to compare a math test result of 55% to another math test score of 45% that the same individual received. A true zero score and comparable units are absent from the test score alone. As opposed to the latter, which is known as norm-referenced interpretation, the former is known as criterion-referenced interpretation (Watson, J, et al, 2020).

A test's raw results are interpreted using criteria to describe the precise activities that the test taker is capable of performing. This method is known as criterion-referenced interpretation. In other words, a score is given significance by being compared to the predetermined performance benchmark. It allows for the explanation of a learner's test performance without referring to other students' results(Stoeckel, 2021).

The term "norm-referenced interpretation" refers to the process of interpreting raw score data based on the transformation of raw score data into a derived score that identifies the learner's location within a clearly defined referred group. This type of interpretation indicates how a test-taker stacks up against the other test-takers. Norm-referenced interpretation, which ranks test takers' raw scores from highest to lowest, is frequently employed in classroom test interpretation (Reynolds, 2021).

### 2.3. Application

Application assessment is the publication of results. The results are announced by the examination authority, and then all the people who are interested in the assessment results do two things. , Before making instructional decisions and moving the teaching and learning process, physical facilities, curriculum, and lecturers forward, it is critical to first assess the performance of students who have demonstrated good performance and those who have demonstrated poor performance (Kim, Y, et al, 2019).

The availability and viewing of student scores make it possible to track student performance and then reward student performance. The following judgments of instruction that can be made when establishing a student's marks include the following: Placement of students: This entails placing them in the correct learning order and classifying or streaming them according to their topics or abilities. Choosing the right students for general, professional, technical, and commercial courses(Theobald, R, et al, 2019).

**Certification:** This aids in attesting to a student's attainment of a certain performance level. Learning can be stimulated by the instructor or student's motivation, feedback, and suggestions for appropriate practice.By assisting in the evaluation of the efficiency of instructional arrangements, we can improve instruction. For the goal of providing guidance and counseling, modifying the curriculum, choosing students for employment, and modifying teaching strategies. For the student's advancements, for updating parents on students' progress, presenting merit and scholarship prizes, admitting students to educational institutions, and maintaining pupils. (Atondo, G, et al, 2019)

### 2.4. Administration

As you are aware, assessment administration is the process of actually presenting the learning assignment that the examinees must complete to determine the level of learning that has occurred during the teaching-learning process. This method is just as crucial as the exam preparation process. This is because poorly given tests can significantly reduce the validity and reliability of test results in the opportunity for each examinee to prove that they comprehend the learning objectives being assessed must be equal(Adom, D, et al, 2020).

Assessment administration is prepared by the head of examinations and the examination board to ensure the process and manner of assessment. Then they select appropriate assessment measures to assess learning outcomes and clearly define and justify learning outcomes. The administrators also ensure that the assessment materials are secure, and the test administrators ensure the security of the test. The administrators will monitor the test using monitoring as well as administration. After the assessment, the assessment must be edited, translated, revised, and then printed, all of which will affect the performance of the assessment practice, and all of which support the lecturer(Hartikainen, S, et al, 2019).

Other instructions and procedures for administering tests are meant to guarantee test administration quality. Assessment should contain a set of instructions, which are usually of two types. One is the instruction to the test administrator, while the other one is to the testee. The exam's duration should be made explicitly evident to both test administrators and test takers since it is technically significant in test administration. The administrator should provide a good location and seating. The testing setting should be learner-friendly and provide the required physical amenities, including workspace or class size, decent writing desks, good lighting, good

ventilation, moderate temperature, amenities within walking distance, and the calmness needed for optimal focus(Kurdi, G., 2020).

### 3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

To examine the most determining assessment mechanisms to the lecturers’ assessment practices.

#### 3.1. Research Hypothesis

H1: In higher education institutions in Somalia, the Assessment Determinants (design, interpretation, application, and administration) do not predict lecturer assessment practice.

### 4. METHODS

Utilizing a quantitative research strategy and cross-sectional survey methodology, Monava analysis was employed in this study. Three private universities hosted the study's execution.1690 lecturers and university administrators from various public and private institutions made up the study's target group.A self-administered questionnaire was used to gather the data, and it passed muster in terms of validity (CVI = 0.92) and reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.87)Simple random selection was employed to choose study participants in the event of data collection, and all aspects of research ethics were taken into account.

#### 4.1. Reliability

Test-retest reliability can be used to determine how true something is. The pilot contributes to the enhancement of the instruments' appearance and content authenticity, which serves to confirm the correctness of this research. According to (Pallant, J, 2020), a scale's Cronbach alpha coefficient should theoretically be higher than.7. If Values over 7.8 are preferred, so in this article's table of reliability statistics, the value of Cronbach's Alpha is shown as .917. This shows that the scale's internal consistency reliability for this sample is quite excellent.

Table 1: Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha		N of Items
.917		50

  

Table 2: Background Information		
Gender	Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	203
	Female	111
	Total	314
		100.0

  

University	Frequency	Percent
Valid	Public	142
	Private	172
	Total	314
		100.0

Table 1 Shows the Cronbach's Alpha was .917 so this indicates reliability for this sample is quite excellent. Table 2 shows that 64.6 percent of the respondents are men and 35.4 percent are women, so this table indicates that the majority of respondents who provided this information

were men and the smallest were women. This table also demonstrates the university types, of which 172 are private sectors and 142 are public sectors. So this table also, shows that most of the data was collected from private schools.

#### 4.2. Hypotheses

H1: an explanation of whether the design, interpretation, and application are predicted to be the lecturer's assessment practice according to the significance level, which is 0.000. This indicates that the H1 is rejected, and design, interpretation, and application in Universities. This means that there is a significant positive relationship between the design, interpretation, and application and the lecturer's assessment practice in higher education institutions in Somalia.

Table 3: Correlation table for multiple regressions Analysis

		<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Design</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Application</b>
Pearson Correlation	Assessment	1.000	.636	.575	.516
	Design	.636	1.000	.082	.027
	Interpretation	.575	.082	1.000	.177
	Application	.516	.027	.177	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Assessment	.	.000	.000	.000
	Design	.000	.	.074	.317
	Application	.000	.317	.001	.
N	Assessment	314	314	314	314
	Design	314	314	314	314
	Interpretation	314	314	314	314
	Application	314	314	314	314

The findings in Table 3 showed a substantial, favorable, and robust association between design and lecturers' assessment practice according to ( $r = .636$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ,  $.05$ ). Also, when looking at the correlation table, there is a good connection between assessment interpretation, application, and lecturers' assessment practice ( $r = .575$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ,  $.05$ ) (interpretation), and  $r = .516$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $< 0.05$ ) respectively. As it can be seen, there is a strong positive relationship between assessment design, interpretation, and application to lecturers' assessment practice in higher education institutions.

Table 4 of Multiple Regression in ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1					
Regression	14.593	1	14.593	212.077	.000b
Residual	21.469	312	.069		
Total	36.062	313			
2					
Regression	24.509	2	12.254	329.883	.000c
Residual	11.553	311	.037		
Total	36.062	313			
3.					
Regression	30.691	3	10.230	590.431	.000d
Residual	5.371	310	.017		
Total	36.062	313			

The Determinants in Table 4 are Design, Interpretation, and application

The probability of the F figures (590,431) of the regression relationship for the designing, interpreting, and application variables was less than the crucial threshold, as shown in Table 4. (p.001). There is a statistically significant correlation between the three determinant variables and lecturers' assessment practices, as shown by the ANOVA findings of the multiple regression analysis in Table (F [3, 310] = 590.431, p .001). The findings disproved the null hypothesis, according to which the determinants variables and dependent variable had no relationship.

Table 5: Model Summary of multiple regression

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.636a	.405	.403	.26232	.405	212.077	1	312	.000
2	.824b	.680	.678	.19274	.275	266.928	1	311	.000
3	.923c	.851	.850	.13163	.171	356.774	1	310	.000

The Determinants in Table 5 are Design, Interpretation, and application

When all of the determinant variables were examined in the step-wise regression model, Table 5 outcomes from the multiple regression summary models reveal that three variables are statistically significant. The three significant variables from the four components that were examined as determinants of assessment practices produced R values.923 and.851 that were statistically significant at  $p < .05$  (F [3, 310] = 356.774, p .000), as shown in Table 5. The complete model, which encompassed design, interpretation, and application, had an  $R^2$  of.851. The administration was one non-significant variable that was left out of the model. According to Table 5 modified  $R^2$  of.850, almost 85% of the variability in the lecturers' assessment practices is explained by the design, interpretation, and application.

Table 6: the regression coefficient

	.Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2.212	.078		28.469	.000		
	Design	.336	.023	.636	14.563	.000	1.000	1.000
2	(Constant)	1.288	.080		16.029	.000		
	Design	.313	.017	.593	18.416	.000	.993	1.007
	Interpretation	.294	.018	.526	16.338	.000	.993	1.007
3	(Constant)	.661	.064		10.304	.000		
	Design	.310	.012	.588	26.722	.000	.993	1.007
	Interpretation	.252	.012	.452	20.246	.000	.963	1.039
	Application	.241	.013	.421	18.888	.000	.969	1.032
4	(Constant)	1.716E-015	.000		.000	1.000		
	Design	.298	.000	.564	261029047.638	.000	.989	1.011
	Interpretation	.234	.000	.419	190805102.875	.000	.956	1.046
	Application	.234	.000	.409	187208085.049	.000	.968	1.033
	Administration	.234	.000	.389	179519910.478	.000	.986	1.014

When referring to table 6, the result of the regression coefficient of the relationship between assessment practices in assessment design is .336. This shows that lecturers' assessment practices are high in assessment design, which results in an increase of 0.336 units in their assessment practice compared to when it is not high in terms of design. Also, the coefficient of the connection between a lecturer's assessment practice and interpretation is .294. This indicates that the lecturers' assessment practice growth is 2.94 when the interpretation is probably good. Last, the result of the regression coefficients in assessment practice in the application is .241. This demonstrates that .241 rises when the application is constant.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The multiple regression models included four variables as determinant variables for the lecturers' assessment practice. Only three of the four determinant variables included in the model design, interpretation levels, and assessment application were statistically significant. As a result, there is a significant relationship between assessment design, interpretation, application, and lecture assessment practice. One of the proposed predictor factors of the lecturers' assessment practices, such as the administration, was determined to be negligible. We recommend that the administration of public and private higher education institutions concentrate the training on how to upgrade the skills of design, interpretation, and application of lecturers' assessment practice.



## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Lövdén, L. Fratiglioni, M. M. Glymour, U. Lindenberger, and E. M. Tucker-Drob, 'Education and cognitive functioning across the life span', *Psychol. Sci. Public Interest*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 6–41, Aug. 2020.
- [2] K. Kwaka, Influence of Teacher'Assessment Practice in Enhancing Performance in Mathematics among Secondary school students in Mombasa District, Kenya. Unpublished MED project. Nairobi, 2003.
- [3] G. Kurdi, J. Leo, B. Parsia, U. Sattler, and S. Al-Emari, 'A systematic review of automatic question generation for educational purposes', *Int. J. Artif. Intell. Educ.*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 121–204, Mar. 2020.
- [4] Y. C. Kim and J.-H. Jung, 'Conceptualizing shadow curriculum: definition, features and the changing landscapes of learning cultures', *J. Curric. Stud.*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 141–161, Mar. 2019.
- [5] S. Hartikainen, H. Rintala, L. Pylväs, and P. Nokelainen, 'The concept of active learning and the measurement of learning outcomes: A review of research in engineering higher education', *Educ. Sci. (Basel)*, vol. 9, no. 4, p. 276, Nov. 2019.
- [6] L. Corominaset al., 'The application of life cycle assessment (LCA) to wastewater treatment: A best practice guide and critical review', *Water Res.*, vol. 184, no. 116058, p. 116058, Oct. 2020.
- [7] G. T. Atondo, J. A. Abah, and T. Naakaa, 'Continuous Assessment as a Predictor Of Students' Achievement in Mathematics at the Junior Secondary School Level in Makurdi Local Government Area of Benue State, Nigeria', *Nigeria. World Wide Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 18–29, 2019.
- [8] B. W. Tuchman, 'Measuring Educational Outcomes Fundamental of Testing', Atlanta, 1975.
- [9] R. M. Thorndike and T. M. Thorndike-Christ, *Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education: Pearson new international edition*, 8th ed. London, England: Pearson Education, 2013.
- [10] R. J. Theobald, D. D. Goldhaber, T. M. Gratz, and K. L. Holden, 'Career and technical education, inclusion, and postsecondary outcomes for students with learning disabilities', *J. Learn. Disabil.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 109–119, 2019.
- [11] *Assessment and Evaluation in Distance Education*. New Delhi: A Publication of Indira, 2002.
- [12] T. Stoeckel, S. McLean, and P. Nation, 'Limitations of size and levels tests of written receptive vocabulary knowledge', *Stud. Second Lang. Acquis.*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 181–203, Mar. 2021.
- [13] C. R. Reynolds, R. A. Altmann, and D. N. Allen, 'The meaning of test scores', in *Mastering Modern Psychological Testing*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021, pp. 91–131.
- [14] D. Adom, J. Adu-Mensah, and D. A. Dake, 'Test, measurement, and evaluation: Understanding and use of the concepts in education', *Int. J. Eval. Res. Educ. (IJERE)*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 109, Mar. 2020.

## AUTHORS

**Mohamed Isse Sidow** is a senior lecturer, consultant, and researcher at the University of Somalia (UNISO). He attended the University of Nairobi (Uon) Kenya and studied educational planning. He is also a PhD candidate studying curriculum studies at the Islamic University of Uganda (IUIU).

