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ABSTRAK

Kajian ini adalah mengenai pembentukan dan penilaian satu Pakej Penilaian Berportfolio untuk Kajian Tempatan bagi Tahun Lima. Reka bentuk dan pembentukan pakej tersebut tercetus daripada keperluan untuk membentuk satu kaedah penilaian alternatif untuk Kajian Tempatan yang membolehkan pelajar melakukan pemikiran beraras tinggi, penilaian kendiri dan rakan sebaya, dan mempergunakan maklum balas khususnya maklum balas daripada guru.

yang berikut adalah positif. Pada keseluruhannya, pelajar gemar menggunakan Pakej Penilaian Berportfolio.


ABSTRACT

This study is about the development and evaluation of a Portfolio Assessment Package for Year Five Local Studies. The design and development of the package was spurred by the need to develop an alternative assessment for Local Studies that would enable students to practice higher order thinking, self- and peer-assessment, and utilisation of feedback especially feedback from the teacher.

The data collected were analysed qualitatively using Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) coding procedure. The findings indicated that students’ were able to perform higher order thinking when responding to the portfolio assessment tasks. Besides that students were able to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their responses and the responses of their peers through self- and peer-assessment respectively. In addition students were also able to make recommendations to overcome the weaknesses that they had identified. The findings also showed that the teacher, when assessing students’ work, offered students three types of feedback. Feedback was in the form of praise, criticism, and advice. It was found that students preferred feedback in the form of advice and utilised the feedback to review, revise, and improve their work. On the evaluation of the Portfolio Assessment Package based on students’ perspective, the findings showed that students had a positive perception of the assessment tasks in the Portfolio Assessment Package. They also felt positively about self-assessment and peer-assessment practices. Their perception of the teacher’s assessment of their work and the feedback that the teacher offered them was also positive. On the whole the students liked using the Portfolio Assessment Package.

The evaluation of the Package was conducted using Stufflebeam’s process and product evaluation. Process evaluation provided information for the on-going
development of the package. Product evaluation on the other hand provided information on the package from the students' perspective. The information gathered through process and product evaluation was used to make recommendations for further development of the Portfolio Assessment Package, in addition to making recommendations to the Schools Division of the Ministry of Education and the Teacher Education Division of the Ministry of Education.

It can be concluded that the Portfolio Assessment Package is a learning-assessment tool, which can be used to develop students' ability to perform higher order thinking, metacognition, and self-regulation. Students developed their higher order thinking skills by using the assessment tasks of the Portfolio Assessment Package. Students' metacognition on the other hand was developed through students' practice with self-assessment, peer-assessment and reflections. Students showed their ability to self-regulate their learning through the utilisation of feedback especially teacher's feedback. Finally, the findings showed that even academically average eleven-year-old students could use the Portfolio Assessment Package to perform higher order thinking, self- and peer-assessment, in addition to utilising the teacher's feedback to improve their work.
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