

\*

(78)

(176)

( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

5

:

. 2015/3/2 :

**.2016**

. 2014/7/4 :

---

\*  
©

...

---

## **Assessment Difficulties in Information Technology for the Basic Students in Sultanate of Oman from Teachers Point of View**

### **Abstract**

This descriptive study examined the difficulties of assessing the IT course in the Sultanate of Oman, from the teachers point of view. The stratified random sample consisted of 78 male teachers and, 176 female teachers representing various primary educational stages. Data was collected by valid and reliable questionnaire.

The study results revealed that the level of difficulties in assessing IT courses, from the teachers' perspectives was medium. In the other hand, there were no significant statistical differences at ( $\alpha = 0, 05$ ) in assessing the IT courses, from the teachers' perspectives in the Sultanate of Oman, attributed to the teachers gender. There were significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0,05$ ) in evaluating the IT course, from the teachers' perspectives in the Sultanate of Oman, attributed to the years of experience for the benefit of those who poss experience (less than five years). Also there were significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0,05$ ) in the difficulties of evaluating the IT course, from the teachers' perspectives in the Sultanate of Oman, attributed to the specialty, the differences were for the benefit of other courses' teachers.

**Keywords:** Assessment difficulties, IT course, Primary stage

:

.

.

.(Marzano, 2002)

)

(2011

.

.(2004 )

...

---

.(Svinicki, 2004)

.(2002 )

.(Mayer ,2013)

.(2004 )

	:		
		(2009)	
	:	( )	
	:		.1
		:	.2
		:	.3
	:		.4
	:	(2008)	
		:	.1
		:	.2
		:	.3
			.4
2000 )			.5

Lee; Agboola & 2000 2004

...

---

:pre evaluation	.6
:Formative Evaluation	.7
:Diagnosis Evaluation	.8
:Summative Evaluation	.9

### Information Technology of America Association

.(Newhouse, 2011)

" :

.(Marzano,2002)

"

Textual

Numerical

Pictorial

Hawsawi, 2002) Telecommunications

.(Newhouse, 2013 ;

:

:

:

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

:

:(2011 )

.1

.2

.3

.4

...

---

	.5
.	.6
.	.7
.	.8
.	.9

:

(Gibbs, 2007) (

(Çeken, 2010)

:(2011 ) :

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5



.2016

---

.6

.7

.8

.9

.10

:

;Ngai-Ying, 2009

.(2005

.(Çeken, 2010)

.( 2012 )

...



( )

.( )

.(2005 )

:

(Harlow, 2002)

:

(801)

(2006)

(78)

(65.2%)

(77.88%)

(49.14%)

(2008)

(37)

(26)

"

:

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

...



(2011)

.2010/2011

448)

.( 107)

(

(46)

" "

:

(10.9.8)

"

" "

(2013)

(%72)

(2012/2011)

(88)

:

(38)

(3.70)  
(2.95)

(3.74)  
(3.1)

( $\alpha=0.05$ )

( )  
( )

(2008) (2006) (2006) (2004)  
(2010) (2010) (2009)  
(2011) (2010) (2010) (2010)

...



:

:  
:

( )

- :
  - :
    - .1
    - ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) .2
  - )
    - ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) .3
    - ( )
      - ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) .4
  - ( 10 10 - 5 5 1)
    - ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) .5
  - )
    - (
- :

...



:

:

:

:

:

•

•

•

:

:

:

:

2014 – 2013

:



:

:

:

:

16-6

( )

:

:

:

:

:

(514)

(229)

(743)

(2014/2013)

(1)

...

---

(1)

(\*)

229	
514	
743	

(\*)

.2014/2013

:

Krejcic & )

(254)

%34

(Morgan, 1970:608

(176)

(78)

:

(2010)

(2010)

(2004)

(2009)

(30)

:

:

:

(45)

:

:

(10)

(%80)

(41)

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) :

:

( )

(30)

(test-retest)

(0.832)

(Cronbach Alpha)



---

(20) (SPSS) (254)

:

:

•

:

” t”-test” ”

•

:

•

•

:

(2.33 -1)

( 3.67 - 2.34)

( 5-3.68)

”

:

(2)

...

(2)

	1	0.86	4.06		40
	2	1.08	3.94		17
	3	1.08	3.86		8
	3	1.04	3.86		10
	5	1.08	3.85		18
	6	1.17	3.83		41
	7	1.05	3.82		13
	8	1.05	3.81		21
	9	1.07	3.78	( )	19
	9	1.11	3.78		22

.2016

	11	1.07	3.75		11
	11	1.08	3.75	) ) ( .(!	23
	11	1.04	3.75	) (	33
	14	1.13	3.74	) (	32
	15	1.08	3.73		16
	16	1.10	3.72		20
	17	1.14	3.70		30
	18	0.94	3.69		24
	18	1.11	3.69		25
	20	1.05	3.67		3

...

---

	21	1.14	3.66		9
	22	1.16	3.64		28
	22	1.09	3.64		36
	24	1.10	3.63		2
	24	1.14	3.63		15
	24	1.16	3.63		31
	27	1.08	3.62		26
	28	1.11	3.61		7
	28	1.06	3.61		12
	28	0.98	3.61		27
	31	1.12	3.60		38



.2016

	32	1.13	3.59		6
	32	1.02	3.59		14
	34	1.14	3.57		39
	35	1.00	3.53	( )	5
	36	1.08	3.52		29
	37	1.09	3.51		34
	38	1.12	3.48		4
	39	1.14	3.46		37
	40	1.08	3.42		35
	41	0.78	3.24		1
		0.61	3.67		

...

---

			(2)	
	(3.67)			
	"	(40)		(0.61)
(0.86)		(4.06)	"	(3.24 -4.06)
"		(17)		
(3.94)		"		
(35)				(1.08)
				"
	(1.08)		(3.42)	"
		"	(1)	
	(3.24)		"	
				(0.78)
(40)				
"		(17)	"	"
		"		

(2011)

:"  
( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

( )

" "

(4)

**t-test**

**(4)**

0.464	-0.733	0.60	3.63	78	
		0.61	3.69	176	

(4)

( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

(-0.733)

(0.464)

...



(2011)

(2008)

(Harlow, 2002)

"

:

( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

" "

(5)

**t-test**

(5)

0.394	0.854	0.62	3.70	139	
		0.59	3.64	115	

(5)

( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

(0.394)

(0.854)

( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

5 1)

( 10 10 - 5

(6)

(6)

0.63	3.82	118	5
0.59	3.52	71	10 -5
0.53	3.57	65	10
0.61	3.67	254	

...

(6)

( 5 )  
 ( 10) (3.82)  
 ( 10 -5 ) (3.57)  
 (3.52)  
 (One way ANOVA) ( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

:

(7)

0.001	*6.823	2.401	2	4.802	
		0.352	251	88.321	
			253	93.123	

•

( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

(7)

(6.823)

(0.001)

(8)

-5 10	10	5		
3.52	3.57	3.82		
0.30*	0.25*	-	3.82	5
0.05	-		3.57	10
-			3.52	10 -5

( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

\*

5 )

(8)

0.30)

(  
.( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

10

10

(  
-5 )  
(0.25

(2013)

...

(2008)

"

.

:

(  $\alpha = 0.05$ )

)

(

(9)

" "

.

**t-test**

**(9)**

0.001	*-3.972	0.59	3.60	203	
		0.60	3.96	51	

( $\alpha = 0.05$ )

•

( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

(9)

(-3.972)

(0.001)

(3.96)

.(3.60)



(2013)

(2011)

:

:

•

•

...

- 
- - 
  -

.(2008)

.(2013)

.(2009)

.258-227 : (2)10

.(2005)

.(2010)

.(2005)

.(2004)

. :

(2004)

.225-197 (95)

.(2010)

.(2011)

. : 1

.(2010)

:(24) (3)

.797-754

(2011)

. :

. :

.(2008) .

(2011)

189-143 (25)7

(2006)

- - -

.(2009)

. : -

...

---

(2008)

.353-320 (19)

: (2004)

.(2006)

. :  
.(2000) .

. :

(2011)

.(2010)

. :  
.

(2002)

:

.(2010)

. :  
:

(2004)

- Agboola, I. & Lee, A. (2000). "Computer and Information Technology Access for Deaf Individuals in Developed and Developing Countries". *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*. Vol. No. 3, PP 286-289.
- Ceken, R.(2010). Hydrological Cycle through Spiral Curriculum Model in Science Education: The United States versus Turkey. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*. 2( 2), 579-599. 21 p.
- Gibbs,T.(2007). The spiral curriculum: implications for online learning. Masters K; Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Cape Town, Cape . *BMC Medical Education* 7 (21), 52.
- Harlow A.,(2002) the implementation of the Technology curriculum new Zealand. *Learning in technology Education Challenges for the 21 st Century*. Australia, 5-7 December. Vol1, p:161
- Hawsawi, A.M. (2002), Teachers Perceptions of Computer Technology Competencies working with students with mild Cognitive Delay. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Idaho. ID, USA.
- Marzano, R.J. (2002). A comparison of selected methods of scoring classroom assessments. *Journal Applied Measurement in Education* 39(11), 36-38.
- Mayer, Jennifer, (2013). Engagement and assessment in a credit-bearing information literacy course. *Reference Services Review*.1(41), 62-79, 18p.
- Newhouse, C. Paul, (2011). Using IT to assess IT: Towards greater authenticity in summative performance assessment. *Computers & Education* .2(56), 388-402. 15p.
- Newhouse, C. Pau, (2013). Computer-Based Practical Exams in an Applied Information Technology Course. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education* (International Society for Technology in Education. (45) 3, 263-286, 24p.

...

---

Ngai-Ying Wong (2009). Bridge": experimenting in the Spiral Bianshi Mathematics Curriculum. *International Journal of Science & Mathematics Education*. (7) 2, 363-382. 20p.

Svinicki, M. (2004). Authenticassessment: testinginreality. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 100(4), 23-29.