

# Exploring assessment perspectives and practices in education: An analysis of the role of assessment in the teaching-learning process \*

**Angélica Vera-Sagredo** 

Docente Investigador Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción, Concepción - Chile  
avera@ucsc.cl

**Francisco Cuvili-Constant** 

Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción, Concepción - Chile  
fcuvili@magisteredu.ucsc.cl

## ABSTRACT

### KEYWORDS

Assessment of learning; teachers; purposes of assessment; procedures; grading.

Assessment plays a crucial role in all educational stages by allowing the measurement of progress and challenges in learning, aligned with specific standards for each level and grade. However, this process has historically focused on verifying learning outcomes according to pre-established goals, a perspective highlighted by various experts. The study evaluated teachers' perceptions of their evaluative practices and how they differ according to various sociodemographic variables. This study, of a quantitative and descriptive nature with a cross-sectional design, used the questionnaire "Evaluation of Student Learning (E.A.E)" to analyze the evaluative practices of 102 teachers in the Biobío region, Chile. The main results revealed that teachers value transparency for evaluative purposes and show a disposition towards more inclusive and reflective practices. A preference for written evaluation and an awareness of the connection between teaching and evaluation were observed. However, there was also a concern about the excessive relevance given to grades, pointing out possible biases towards numerical results to the detriment of the formative process.

Reception 02/26/2024 Evaluation/04/16/2024 Acceptance 05/11/2024

\* This is an Open Access article under the license BY-NC-SA (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>) Published by Universidad Libre - Cali, Colombia

**Funding source:** This research did not receive specific funding from any private, public, commercial, or non-profit entity.

### Authors' contributions

All authors: Conceptualization, formal analysis, investigation, writing of the original draft, review and editing of the writing.

**Cómo citar este artículo/How to cite:** VERA-SAGREDO, Angélica; CUVILI-CONSTANT, Francisco. Exploring assessment perspectives and practices in education: An analysis of the role of assessment in the teaching-learning process. *En:* Entramado. Julio - Diciembre, 2024. vol. 20, no. 2, e-11279 p. 1-13 <https://doi.org/10.18041/1900-3803/entramado.2.11279>

# Explorando perspectivas y prácticas evaluativas en la educación: Un análisis del rol de la evaluación en el proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje

## R E S U M E N

### **PALABRAS CLAVE**

Evaluación de los aprendizajes; profesores; finalidades de la evaluación; procedimientos; calificación

La evaluación desempeña un papel crucial en todas las etapas educativas al permitir la medición de avances y desafíos en el aprendizaje, alineándose con los estándares específicos para cada nivel y grado. No obstante, históricamente, este proceso se ha centrado principalmente en la verificación de los resultados de aprendizaje según metas preestablecidas, una perspectiva destacada por diversos expertos. El objetivo del estudio fue evaluar la percepción de los docentes sobre sus prácticas evaluativas y cómo estas difieren según diversas variables sociodemográficas. Este estudio, de naturaleza cuantitativa y descriptiva con un diseño transversal, empleó el cuestionario "Evaluación del Aprendizaje de los Estudiantes (E.A.E)" para analizar las prácticas evaluativas de 102 profesores en la región del Biobío, Chile. Los resultados principales revelaron que los docentes valoran la transparencia en los propósitos evaluativos y muestran una disposición hacia prácticas más inclusivas y reflexivas. Se observó una preferencia por la evaluación escrita y una conciencia de la importancia de la conexión entre la enseñanza y la evaluación. Sin embargo, también surgió una preocupación por la excesiva relevancia otorgada a las calificaciones, señalando posibles sesgos hacia los resultados numéricos en detrimento del proceso formativo.

# Explorando perspectivas e práticas avaliativas na educação: uma análise do papel da avaliação no processo de ensino-aprendizagem

## R E S U M O

### **PALAVRAS-CHAVE**

Avaliação da aprendizagem; professores; propósitos da avaliação; procedimentos; marcação

A avaliação desempenha um papel fundamental em todas as etapas da educação, pois permite a mensuração do progresso e dos desafios na aprendizagem, alinhados a padrões específicos para cada nível e série. Historicamente, porém, esse processo tem se concentrado principalmente na verificação dos resultados da aprendizagem de acordo com metas preestabelecidas, uma perspectiva destacada por vários especialistas. O objetivo do estudo foi avaliar as percepções dos professores sobre suas práticas de avaliação e como elas diferem de acordo com diversas variáveis sociodemográficas. Este estudo, de natureza quantitativa e descritiva com um desenho transversal, usou o questionário "Evaluation of Student Learning (E.A.E)" para analisar as práticas avaliativas de 102 professores da região de Biobío, no Chile. Os principais resultados revelaram que os professores valorizam a transparência nos propósitos avaliativos e mostram uma disposição para práticas mais inclusivas e reflexivas. Houve uma preferência pela avaliação escrita e uma conscientização sobre a importância da conexão entre ensino e avaliação. No entanto, também houve preocupação com a ênfase excessiva na classificação, apontando para uma possível tendência a resultados numéricos em detrimento do processo de aprendizagem.

## I. Introduction

Evaluation has been the subject of extensive studies and research, addressing various aspects, positions, theories, and practices. In education, assessment plays a crucial role. However, for students, it is often closely linked to exams and grades, while for teachers, it represents a concern that generates debate and doubts. It is often perceived as an external imposition on the classroom, mainly focused on grading. However, it is increasingly understood as assessing and regulating the learning process, facilitating progress, and achieving objectives.

Despite its importance, various factors such as training practices, professional experience, educational policies, and individual teacher characteristics have hindered the implementation of more contextualized and student-centered assessments.

Changing these processes requires time, which implies a deep reflection that allows teachers to recognize the need to transform their assessment practices.

In this context, learning assessment emerges as a fundamental pedagogical tool. It allows teachers to identify students' individual and group strengths and weaknesses. It facilitates the implementation of strategies to achieve the established objectives and, if necessary, adjust the educational process to overcome the deficiencies detected. Therefore, understanding teachers' evaluation practices is crucial to identifying their objectives, the aspects they evaluate, their methods, and the results obtained.

The present research focuses on examining the profile of different teachers in the Biobío region, Chile, about student evaluation. Specifically, it analyzes the purposes of evaluation, what teachers evaluate, the instruments used, and how ratings vary according to sociodemographic variables. Therefore, the study's objective was to evaluate teachers' perceptions of the examined variables.

## 2. Evaluation and its impact on learning

Assessment plays an essential role in each educational stage by facilitating the measurement of learning achievements and obstacles and adjusting to specific standards for each grade and level. Despite this, this process has been mostly oriented to verify learning results according to predefined objectives, as indicated by [Prieto y Contreras \(2008\)](#), who point out the complexity of the procedure, which involves perceptible and subtle aspects originated from the conceptions that teachers have about teaching and evaluation.

Aware of the importance of evaluation, educators adopt various classroom practices to assess learning outcomes. They devote much of their time to assessment-related activities, monitoring environments, making decisions about how and how often to assess, and providing student feedback ([Marchant, 2012](#)). In this context, the statement of [Santos \(2015\)](#), who emphasizes that assessment is a crucial component of the curriculum, as its value for change is undeniable, becomes relevant: "Since success is achieved through assessment, it is crucial to do it properly" ([p. 128](#)).

In order to change the perspective on the objectives of assessment, faculty must possess clear knowledge about the purpose of assessment, what aspects to assess, when to carry out the assessment, and, above all, how to use the results obtained ([Flores and Croda, 2024](#)). Research indicates that teaching practices tend to focus on the reproduction and control of students' knowledge, prioritizing predominantly instrumental and rote evaluative approaches that give importance to results in terms of performance, reproductive capacity, and individual effort ([Reyes, Díaz, Pérez, Marchena, & Sosa, 2020](#); [Santos, 2015](#); [Vera, Poblete, & Díaz, 2017](#)).

In the educational field, pedagogical decision-making is relevant at specific moments of the evaluation process, providing guidelines to achieve objectives and improve the quality of education ([Ibarra-Sáiz and Rodríguez, 2020](#)). The continuous improvement of educational quality implies the evaluation of achievements, leading to the development of educational reforms and different types of evaluation that favor the curriculum and learning processes. Evaluation, a technical-pedagogical decision, is based on criteria that strengthen adequate and contextualized practices and strategies ([Sandoval, Maldonado, and Tapia, 2022](#)).

Despite the challenges and limitations, educational evaluation is conceived in the current context as a constant process of changes and adjustments contextualized to each pedagogical reality, seeking to improve educational processes ([Remolina-Caviedes, 2020](#)). Although it is often associated with the search for the value of the object of knowledge, perpetuating controlling and selective approaches ([Jiménez, 2019](#); [Otero-Saborido and Vásquez-Ramos, 2019](#)), evaluation is considered an educational practice that seeks to raise critical-collective consciousness and promote social transformation and liberation through the realization of faculties ([Azambuya, 2020](#)). In this sense, evaluation should be continuous, formative, and integrative, including reviewing and reflecting on teaching practices ([Espinoza, 2022](#); [Jareño and López, 2015](#)).

Through the National Curriculum, the Chilean Ministry of Education conceives evaluation as a continuous process led by education professionals and students, aimed at obtaining and interpreting learning and making decisions that promote progress in the learning trajectory ([Ministry of Education, 2023](#)). The expectation of improving educational quality implies the evaluation of achievements, aiming at the development of educational reforms and different types of evaluation that

favor the curriculum and learning processes ([Sandoval et al., 2022](#)). Evaluation, then, is understood as a guiding technical-pedagogical decision, dependent on the needs of the context and conditioned by the institutional management teams ([Espinoza, 2022](#)).

[Otero and Vásquez \(2019\)](#) point out that educational assessment in the classroom is enhanced when teachers have curricular normative references determined by objectives and achievement indicators, closing assessment to a mere technical verification, a curriculum aimed at "standardization" without considering interpretive approaches to understand and deepen how assessment develops in various contexts and factors that influence it.

In short, assessment for learning has to be perceived by students as rigorous, useful, and interesting assessment, which implies new future challenges ([Ibarra-Sáiz & Rodríguez, 2020](#); [Sepúlveda, Payahuala, Lemarie, & Opazo, 2017](#)). The evaluation of learning can also be understood as the formulation of various value judgments that seek to improve certain pedagogical processes, determined by the assessment of a professional nature since it is carried out in most cases by teachers according to their responsibilities. It becomes an instance conditioned by multiple factors ([Hurtado, 2020](#)). In this sense, evaluation becomes an important factor in obtaining results, allowing one to measure students' cognitive development, as well as certain skills and abilities, which depend on expected achievement indicators.

However, assessment has minimal effects when it does not contribute to learning that leads to improvement. When students take an active role in assessment, this process becomes effective. Therefore, learning-oriented assessment provides students with quality, clear, and understandable information and offers references on the criteria used and the expected results ([Muñoz-Moreno and Lluich, 2021](#)). Despite this, assessment is still too focused on the interest in an outcome, and today, its focus is determined by understanding the assessment of learning processes as a means to contribute to the development of competencies.

For [Ibarra-Sáiz and Rodríguez \(2020\)](#), it is essential to emphasize continuous evaluation of student progress, not only in the final verification through a numerical result. It should be supported by various focuses, such as student participation and effective feedback, to achieve quality tasks. As [Flores and Croda \(2024\)](#) point out, change in these processes requires time since it implies reflective training that allows teachers to recognize the need to transform their evaluative practices. Learning assessment is a fundamental pedagogical tool that allows teachers to identify the strengths and weaknesses of individual students and the group. It facilitates the implementation of strategic actions to achieve the established objectives and, if necessary, redirect the educational process to overcome the deficiencies and limitations detected ([Ley and Espinoza, 2021](#)). Therefore, it is crucial to know the evaluative practices of teachers in order to identify their purposes, the aspects they evaluate, their procedures, and the grades obtained.

Based on the above, the study addresses the following research questions: (1) What is the profile of teachers concerning the evaluation of their students' learning; (2) Are there significant differences between the purposes of evaluation, what teachers evaluate, the evaluative instruments used and the rating concerning the sociodemographic data of the teachers (sex, age, years of experience, type of establishment and training received); (3) Are there significant differences between the purposes of evaluation, what teachers evaluate, the evaluative instruments used and the rating concerning the sociodemographic data of the teachers (sex, age, years of experience, type of establishment and training received)?

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Method

A quantitative descriptive approach was employed through a cross-sectional design. The variables selected are directly aligned with the research objectives. Therefore, the following variables were evaluated: a) Purposes of the evaluation; b) Content evaluated; c) Evaluation methods and instruments; d) Rating; e) Sociodemographic variables (gender, education, administrative unit, years of work experience). By the ethical standards established in international protocols for research of this nature, informed consent was obtained from all participants, who collaborated voluntarily, and the confidentiality of their responses was assured. It should be noted that all the procedures used in the performance of this study followed the ethical principles for research on human subjects, according to the Declaration of Helsinki updated during the 64th General Assembly in Fortaleza, Brazil, in October 2013. It is relevant to point out that there is no conflict of interest among the authors of this research and that no financial support was received from external sources for its execution.

### 3.2 Sample

A non-probabilistic sample by convenience was used, comprising 102 teachers from different educational establishments in the Biobío region, Chile. Of the total sample, 71 (69.65%) were female and 31 (30.4%) were male. The teachers are between 24 and 72 years old, with an average age of 41.62 years. Regarding the administrative units they work, 62.7% belong to private subsidized schools, 26.5% to public schools, 7.8% to corporations, and 2.9% to private institutions. Regarding teacher training, 41.2% have only an undergraduate degree, 33.3% have a master's degree, 19.6% have a diploma, and 5.9% have a specific diploma in evaluation.

### 3.3 Instruments

Evaluation of student learning (E.A.E.). This instrument was developed by [Alfageme, Miralles, and Monteagudo \(2011\)](#). The scale evaluates the teachers' perception of the evaluative procedures teachers use. The instrument has 68 items divided into four dimensions. The first is the Aims or purposes of the evaluation (21 items): "The evaluation helps me to obtain specific data to guide students." The second one is called What it assesses (12 items), and it is of the type "What a student puts on the exams reflects what he/she knows." The third labeled Assessment procedures and instruments (25 items), of the type, "For me, remediation is retesting." The fourth is related to grading (10 items) of the type, "The grades given by teachers are objective, i.e., they reflect an objective assessment of student knowledge." The statements are presented on a four-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree (3) to Disagree (0) Strongly. The reliability index of this version was appropriate, with a Cronbach's alpha of .868 for Factor 1, .734 for Factor 2, .859 for Factor 3, and .726 for Factor 4 ([Hu & Bentler, 1999](#)).

### 3.4 Procedure and data analysis

The instruments were applied massively and in an online format, covering all the teachers in the sample. Concerning the study's objectives, descriptive analyses were conducted first to understand the teachers' profiles about the items examined. Secondly, to highlight possible differences between groups (gender, age, years of experience, administrative unit, and academic training), we proceeded to examine descriptively and comparatively the means achieved in each scale's dimensions. The significance of these differences was evaluated using Student's t-tests and ANOVA. Before the analyses, the assumptions of normality were verified using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, homogeneity using the Levene test, and the independence of residuals was evaluated. The results indicated the relevance of using parametric tests in the investigation. As part of the research protocol, a codebook was created to ensure the correct tabulation of the data. All statistical analyses were carried out using the SPSS v. 23.0 package.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Descriptive analyses of all dimensions reviewed

In the descriptive results of the items related to the dimension of "Aims or purposes of evaluation," it stands out that the most highly valued statements are related to aspects such as "I clearly explain to students what the purpose of evaluation is" ( $M=2.65$ ;  $SD=0.608$ ), "Evaluation is a process of dialogue, understanding and improvement" ( $M=2.54$ ;  $SD=0.640$ ) and "Evaluation serves me to improve the quality of the teaching-learning process" ( $M=2.54$ ;  $SD=0.655$ ). In general terms, teachers consider that the fundamental purposes of evaluation are defined by the need for students to understand the aspects that will be evaluated clearly and that evaluation instruments provide them with the opportunity to improve and understand the teaching and learning processes.

About the least valued items, lower ratings were observed in "The only one who should be the object of evaluation is the student" ( $M=0.46$ ;  $SD=0.740$ ) and "I do not feel comfortable when I have to explain how I evaluate or have to justify it" ( $M=0.74$ ;  $SD=0.984$ ). These results could be interpreted as a willingness of teachers to consider evaluation as a process that also encompasses their performance as educational professionals, recognizing the importance of justifying and explaining the evaluative decisions they make ([See Table 1](#)).

Table 1.

Descriptive analysis of the dimension Purpose of the evaluation according to teachers' perception (Mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis).

Items	Media	Standard deviation	Asymmetry		Kurtosis	
			Statistic	Standard error	Statistic	Standard error
Assessment should not be my sole responsibility (as a teacher).	1.72	1.075	-.431	.239	-1.052	.474
I clearly explain to the students the purpose of the assessment.	2.65	.608	-1.802	.239	3.385	.474
Assessment allows me to choose and prioritize a particular teaching style.	2.16	.841	-.611	.239	-.533	.474
Assessment is a process of dialogue, understanding, and improvement.	2.54	.640	-1.075	.239	.067	.474
As a teacher, I use assessment to motivate students and to see their progress.	2.40	.679	-.896	.239	.465	.474
Evaluation allows me to provide feedback from external or internal stakeholders (school community, family, others.).	2.43	.653	-.939	.239	.792	.474
Assessment helps me to measure student achievement.	2.39	.677	-.671	.239	-.631	.474
I understand the assessment of the goals of the school institution.	2.10	.802	-.532	.239	-.330	.474
I use evaluation activities fully integrated into the teaching-learning process.	2.48	.685	-1.151	.239	.829	.474
Assessment helps me to improve the quality of the teaching-learning process.	2.54	.655	-1.333	.239	1.518	.474
I adapt the difficulty of the exams to the level of the class.	2.46	.753	-1.422	.239	1.746	.474
The social function of evaluation is to legitimize the selection and hierarchization imposed by the social system on the educational system.	1.59	.999	-.187	.239	-.997	.474
Assessment helps me to obtain specific data to guide students.	2.36	.742	-.998	.239	.583	.474
I do not feel comfortable when I have to explain how I assess or have to justify it.	.74	.984	1.129	.239	.090	.474
Assessing student learning is one of the most difficult tasks.	1.95	.860	-.666	.239	.010	.474
Theessing student learning is one of the most time-consuming tasks.	1.96	.843	-.531	.239	-.217	.474
I am skilled in conducting assessments of student learning	2.49	.671	-1.166	.239	1.000	.474
I feel that I need more training in assessing student learning	1.64	.920	-.220	.239	-.735	.474
Assessment often absorbs the better part of students' and teachers' energy	1.86	.965	-.461	.239	-.732	.474
The only one who should be assessed is the learner	.46	.740	1.855	.239	3.507	.474
Assessment should focus on detecting what students do not know.	.89	.974	.613	.239	-.914	.474

Source: Own elaboration.

About the descriptive results on what the teacher evaluates, it stands out that his evaluations focus on aspects such as "I adapt the evaluated contents to the taught contents" ( $M=2.54$ ;  $SD=0.670$ ) and "I evaluate each student about the established objectives" ( $M=2.51$ ;  $SD=0.714$ ). These results indicate that evaluations are primarily linked to the content taught and the pre-established objectives. In contrast, the least valued items include statements such as "In the evaluation, I do not make a selection, conscious or unconscious, of the content" ( $M=0.54$ ;  $SD=0.829$ ) and "There is always an element

of chance in the test because I only ask a part of what is taught: I do not evaluate everything that is taught” (M=0.58; SD=0.838). In this sense, it is inferred that most teachers do not consider surprise elements in the evaluations performed, and, on the contrary, there is a conscious selection of the contents to be evaluated (See Table 2).

Table 2.

Descriptive analysis of the dimension: What is evaluated according to teachers' perceptions (mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis)?

Items	Media	Standard deviation	Asymmetry		Kurtosis	
			Statistic	Standard error	Statistic	Standard error
I evaluate each student based on the established objectives.	2.51	.714	-1.450	.239	1.816	.474
Above all, I evaluate the conceptual contents.	1.39	.956	.107	.239	-.904	.474
I adapt the evaluated content to the taught content.	2.54	.670	-1.354	.239	1.407	.474
In the evaluation, I do not make a conscious or unconscious selection of the content.	.54	.829	1.577	.239	1.853	.474
The test always has an element of chance because I only ask a part of what is taught: I do not evaluate everything taught.	.58	.838	1.345	.239	.967	.474
A good assessment practice is to adapt the assessment not to each subject but to the characteristics of each student.	2.17	.833	-.847	.239	.253	.474
As a teacher, I can identify all the student's mistakes and successes in their learning.	1.68	.858	-.183	.239	-.560	.474
Assessment should be based on an understanding of how students learn.	2.09	.785	-.659	.239	.211	.474
Assessment should accommodate individual student differences.	2.21	.775	-.637	.239	-.251	.474
Students achieve their school success with minimal effort.	.65	.930	1.293	.239	.600	.474
What a student puts on tests reflects what he or she knows.	.75	.801	.828	.239	.083	.474
Students learn much more than what can be tested on a test.	2.28	.894	-1.274	.239	.981	.474

Source: Own elaboration.

Regarding the evaluation procedures and instruments used by teachers, it is highlighted that the majority of teachers agree that “Student evaluation using tests is the most extended and used practice” (M=2.29; SD=0.739) and that “Self-evaluation contributes to self-regulation of student work and learning” (M=2.17; SD=0.719). On the other hand, the least valued statements include “As a teacher, I do not modify my evaluation methods” (M=0.54; SD=0.753) and “It is not equal to pass at different times; I award a higher grade to those who pass on the first attempt” (M=0.71; SD=0.918) (See Table 3).

Table 3.

Descriptive analysis of the dimension Evaluation procedures and instruments according to teachers' perception (Mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis).

Items	Media	Standard deviation	Asymmetry		Kurtosis	
			Statistic	Standard error	Statistic	Standard error
I evaluate specific and quantifiable aspects rather than processes or competencies.	1.40	1.017	.157	.239	-1.063	.474
Conventional assessment practices prevent changes in my teaching practice. I must change the assessment to change my pedagogy.	1.59	.948	-.223	.239	-.827	.474
I think that conventional assessment practices prevent innovation	1.88	.893	-.275	.239	-.811	.474

Continued on next page

Items	Media	Standard deviation	Asymmetry		Kurtosis	
			Statistic	Standard error	Statistic	Standard error
The teacher is free to have, within the limits tolerated by the system, a wide margin of maneuver to interpret the assessment rules	1.91	.880	-.359	.239	-.659	.474
I usually assess students at the end of the teaching-learning process	1.07	.957	.414	.239	-.881	.474
As a teacher, I do not change my assessment methods	.54	.753	1.281	.239	.994	.474
To assess correctly, I need to use a wide variety of instruments	1.92	1.021	-.409	.239	-1.078	.474
Teaching or assessment procedures can be responsible for a large part of school failure	1.81	.864	-.284	.239	-.576	.474
I rarely use qualitative assessment procedures (notebooks, assignments, observation, etc.) because they are subjective	.89	.866	.585	.239	-.556	.474
Diagnostic assessment is more of an administrative requirement than of pedagogical interest	1.16	1.088	.482	.239	-1.066	.474
The test is the most objective instrument: it is necessary for assessment	.75	.826	.917	.239	.252	.474
Student assessment using tests is the most widespread and used practice	2.29	.739	-.682	.239	-.321	.474
Checking student results is a very common classroom activity, it has even becomes the most Frequent	1.90	.764	-.238	.239	-.370	.474
Tests favor certain social groups (almost always middle classes and native students) and do not provide equal opportunities	1.49	1.041	.080	.239	-1.154	.474
School life is reduced to a permanent preparation for tests	1.51	1.012	-.056	.239	-1.074	.474
I use self-assessment as a complement to other assessment procedures	1.96	.757	-.074	.239	-.882	.474
Self-assessment helps students self-regulate their work and learning	2.17	.719	-.423	.239	-.389	.474
Students do not have the capacity or seriousness to determine whether they have learned or not	1.04	.974	.445	.239	-.936	.474
Continuous assessment is not practiced; only continuous or more frequent tests are carried out	1.56	1.020	-.105	.239	-1.086	.474
Supporters of frequent assessments usually highlight motivation as the main objective and claim that students work harder if they know they are going to be assessed	1.86	.845	-.235	.239	-.655	.474
I consider it easy to assess through direct observation	1.65	.981	-.133	.239	-.985	.474
For me, recovery is the repetition of tests	.78	.875	.800	.239	-.326	.474
It is not the same as passing at one time or another, I give a higher grade to those who pass at the first opportunity.	.71	.918	1.170	.239	.434	.474
My final assessment is an average of the partial assessments throughout the course.	1.31	1.053	.169	.239	-1.189	.474

Source: Own elaboration.

The descriptive results related to the grades given to students indicate that, according to the teachers' perception, "Grades are the main concern of parents and students" ( $M=2.51$ ;  $SD=0.671$ ), and that students would assign greater importance to tests than to class work and activities, mainly because of the final grade they receive ( $M=2.09$ ;  $SD=0.966$ ). In addition, it is observed that teachers would not completely agree with the statement that numerical grading is superior to qualitative assessment using adjectives ( $M=0.94$ ;  $SD=0.877$ ) (See Table 4).



Table 4.

Descriptive analysis of the evaluation dimension according to the teachers' perception (Mean, standard deviation, asymmetry, and Kurtosis)

Items	Media	Standard deviation	Asymmetry		Kurtosis	
			Statistic	Standard error	Statistic	Standard error
My students' assessment is reduced to a grade.	1.18	1.075	.370	.239	-1.160	.474
The grades given by the teachers are objective; that is, they reflect an objective assessment of the student's knowledge.	1.68	.834	-.474	.239	-.222	.474
A greater number of questions in the test implies simpler questions and the obtaining of better results.	1.25	.917	.277	.239	-.720	.474
The significance of grades comes from the value given to them from a social point of view.	1.92	.898	-.598	.239	-.282	.474
Grades condition the future of the students	1.53	1.096	-.030	.239	-1.301	.474
Grades are a means of controlling the work and behavior of my students	1.30	.993	.158	.239	-1.034	.474
Grading by numbers is better than qualitative assessment using adjectives (remarkable, outstanding...)	.94	.877	.385	.239	-.986	.474
The importance of grades has been exaggerated since they need the precision intended to be given to them; wanting to measure in tenths implies aspiring to an accuracy that does not exist in educational assessment.	1.87	.930	-.419	.239	-.683	.474
Grades are the main concern of parents and students	2.51	.671	-1.440	.239	2.401	.474
My students give more importance to tests than to class work and activities because of the final grade they receive	2.09	.966	-.718	.239	-.565	.474

Source: Own elaboration.

#### 4.2 Differences between gender, years of experience, dependencies, and training of teachers

The results reveal statistically significant differences between men and women in some items analyzed. About what teachers evaluate, discrepancies are observed in favor of men in the item that addresses the presence of chance in the tests, where the male group shows a higher score ( $M_m=0.41$ ,  $SD=0.748$ ,  $M_h=0.84$ ,  $SD=0.934$ ;  $t(100) -2,472=$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Likewise, significant differences are recorded in two items in the Procedures and Instruments category favoring men. The first is related to the perception that diagnostic evaluation is more of an administrative requirement than a pedagogical interest ( $M_m=0.76$ ,  $SD=0.853$ ,  $M_h=1.19$ ,  $SD=0.833$ ;  $t(100) -2,374=$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The second refers to the belief that passing at different times is not the same since they give a higher grade to those who pass at the first opportunity ( $M_m=0.58$ ,  $SD=0.856$ ,  $M_h=1.00$ ,  $SD=1.000$ ;  $t(100) -2,374=$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). These results suggest that, unlike women, men could perceive the diagnostic evaluation as an administrative requirement; they would evaluate knowledge not addressed and apply different standards at different evaluation times.

Regarding the grade, statistically significant differences were evident in several items, all in favor of men. In particular, in "Grades are a means to control the work and behavior of my students" ( $M_m=1.17$ ,  $SD=1.014$ ,  $M_h=1.61$ ,  $SD=0.882$ ;  $t(100) -2,112=$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), "The importance of grades has been exaggerated since they do not have the precision that is intended to give them; wanting to measure in tenths implies aspiring to an accuracy that does not exist in educational evaluation" ( $M_m=1.69$ ,  $SD=0.950$ ,  $M_h=2.29$ ,  $SD=0.739$ ;  $t(100) -3,125=$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), "Grades are the main concern of parents and students" ( $M_m=2.41$ ,  $SD=0.709$ ,  $M_h=2.74$ ,  $SD=0.514$ ;  $t(100) -2,360=$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and "My Students give more importance to tests than to class work and activities, due to the final grade they receive" ( $M_m=1.92$ ,  $SD=1.011$ ,  $M_h=2.48$ ,  $SD=0.724$ ;  $t(100) -2,827=$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) (See Table 5).

Table 5.

Means (standard deviation) and comparisons of teachers according to gender concerning the variables examined (t-test and significance).

Dimensions	Items	Women		Men		t	Sig
		Ma	SD	M	SDn		
What is evaluated	The test always has an element of chance because I only ask for a part of what is taught. I do not evaluate everything that is taught.	.41	.748	.84	.934	-2.472	.015
Evaluation procedures and instruments	Diagnostic evaluation is more of an administrative requirement than a pedagogical interest.	.76	.853	1.19	.833	-2.374	.019
	It is not the same as passing at one time or another; I give a higher grade to those who pass at the first opportunity.	.58	.856	1.00	1.000	-2.177	.032
	Grades are a means to control the work and behavior of my students	1.17	1.014	1.61	.882	-2.112	.037
Grading	The importance of grades has been exaggerated because they do not have the precision that is intended to give them; wanting to measure in tenths implies aspiring to an accuracy that does not exist in educational evaluation	1.69	.950	2.29	.739	-3.125	.002
	Grades are the main concern of parents and students	2.41	.709	2.74	.514	-2.360	.020
	My students give more importance to tests than to class work and activities because of the final grade they receive	1.92	1.011	2.48	.724	-2.827	.006

Source: Own elaboration.

Regarding the administration of the different establishments, statistically significant differences were identified in one of the purposes of the evaluation, specifically in the item "The only one who should be evaluated is the student" ( $F(1,101) = 3.905$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Multiple comparisons indicate these differences were observed between municipal and subsidized private establishments ( $M=0.85$ ,  $SD=1.064$ , respectively,  $M=0.30$ ,  $SD=0.525$ ). Similarly, statistically significant differences were evident in one of the items of the dimension "What is evaluated," specifically in the item "I consider that the evaluation should be based on the understanding of how the students learn" ( $F(1,101) = 2.756$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Multiple comparisons for this item indicate differences between establishments belonging to corporations and those of municipal administration ( $M=1.13$ ,  $SD=0.641$ , respectively,  $M=2.00$ ,  $SD=0.877$ ).

Regarding the statistical differences by type of training (only undergraduate studies, master's, diploma, and diploma in evaluation), several significant disparities stand out. Teachers with only undergraduate studies surpass those with specific diplomas in evaluation in the item "I clearly explain to students what the purpose of the evaluation is" ( $F(3,101) = 3.270$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

Regarding the item "Evaluation is a process of dialogue, understanding and improvement" ( $F(3,101) = 2.973$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), differences are observed in favor of teachers with a master's degree over teachers with a specific diploma in evaluation. Also, professionals with a master's degree significantly surpass those with diplomas in evaluation in "As a teacher, I use evaluation to motivate students and to show their progress" ( $F(3,101) = 2.891$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

In the item "Evaluation helps me improve the quality of the teaching-learning process" ( $F(3,101) = 5.190$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), teachers with a master's degree also show a higher performance compared to teachers with a diploma in evaluation. Finally, significant differences are observed between teachers with a master's degree and those with specific diplomas in evaluation in "I am qualified to carry out evaluations of student learning" ( $F(3,101) = 3.564$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

In conclusion, the data indicate that teachers with a master's degree present greater effectiveness in several aspects related to educational evaluation than those with only a diploma in evaluation. It suggests that more advanced and complete training, such as that obtained through a master's program, can provide stronger skills and competencies in pedagogical evaluation (See Table 6).

Table 6.

Means (standard deviation) and comparisons of teachers according to their academic training and the items examined (ANOVA and significance).

Items	Undergraduate Education		Master's Education		Education Diploma		Education Diploma in Evaluation		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
I clearly explain to students the purpose of the assessment	2.79	.415	2.62	.604	2.60	.598	2.00	1.265	3.270	.024
Assessment is a process of dialogue, understanding and improvement	2.43	.630	2.71	.524	2.65	.671	2.00	.894	2.973	.035
As a teacher, I use assessment to motivate students and to show their progress	2.43	.630	2.71	.524	2.65	.671	2.00	.894	2.891	.039
Assessment helps me improve the quality of the teaching-learning process	2.50	.595	2.74	.511	2.55	.605	1.67	1.211	5.190	.002
I am trained to carry out assessments of student learning	2.50	.672	2.56	.561	2.60	.598	1.67	1.033	3.564	.017

Source: Own elaboration.

No statistically significant differences were observed related to age or years of professional experience.

## 5. Discussion

Regarding the descriptive analyses of the items in the dimension of the purposes of the evaluation, the results reveal that teachers value transparency in communicating the evaluative purposes. This recognition is consistent with the statements of [Santos \(2015\)](#), who highlights evaluation as a crucial component of the curriculum and its impact on academic success. Likewise, it was evident that teachers clearly understood evaluation as a tool for continuous improvement ([Sandoval et al., 2022](#)). The willingness of teachers to consider evaluation as a process that involves both the student and the teacher himself also aligns with the perspective of [Otero-Saborido and Vásquez-Ramos \(2019\)](#).

This study, by previous research ([Santos, 2015](#); [Vera et al., 2017](#)), highlights the need to change the perspective towards an evaluation that fosters the understanding and improvement of educational processes. The willingness expressed by teachers to consider evaluation as a practice involving students and education professionals opens the door to implementing strategies that promote reflection and transparency in the evaluation process.

Regarding the descriptive results of "What the teacher evaluates," a direct connection between what is evaluated and what is taught is suggested, as well as an alignment with the predefined objectives. This approach coincides with the importance that [Ibarrá-Sáiz and Rodríguez \(2020\)](#) attribute to pedagogical decision-making in evaluation to achieve goals and improve educational quality. The tendency of teachers to avoid surprise elements and consciously select the evaluated content indicates that evaluation is perceived as a reflective and planned practice. Despite the inherent complexity of evaluation, teachers show commitment to an approach that favors coherence between teaching and evaluation, supporting the ideas of [Santos \(2015\)](#) and [Vera et al. \(2017\)](#). This coherence is interpreted as a strategy to ensure that the evaluation effectively measures and improves student learning.

A clear preference is observed for written evaluation as the most used method, in line with the research of [Vera et al. \(2017\)](#). Furthermore, the importance of involving students, for example, in self-assessment and their assessment processes, is recognized, supporting the need expressed by [Santos \(2015\)](#) for assessment to be a dialogic process oriented towards continuous improvement. The results indicate a willingness to change and an openness to consider different assessment approaches and moments. These findings suggest that teachers are receptive to diverse assessment practices, seeking to balance traditional written assessment with methods that encourage students' self-reflection and self-regulation. This approach aligns with the idea that assessment should not be limited to measuring performance but should also contribute to the comprehensive development of students ([Azambuya, 2020](#)).

In terms of grades, there is evidence of a significant social importance attributed to these procedures, highlighted by students and their families as a key indicator of academic success ([Santos, 2015](#)). However, this relevance could divert attention towards numerical results to the detriment of the students' formative process, focusing more on grades as final measures than the lear-

ning process itself. In this regard, [Vera et al. \(2017\)](#) point out that to address this problem, teachers must consider evaluation as a valuable source of information to reorient and transform their practices. It requires a deep understanding of the underlying rationalities and conceptions that inform these practices. Knowing these rationalities allows us to identify teachers' professional knowledge and beliefs, which is crucial to adequately assess certain content and skills and thus improve the educational process. Significant divergences are revealed by exploring the disparities between men and women in various dimensions and evaluation items. First, men tend to perceive assessment as a less predictable process. Second, they perceive that diagnostic assessment is more oriented to administrative demands than their pedagogical interest. Third, they tend to take a more critical view of grades, recognizing their limitations in accurate measurement and questioning the relevance of these grades in the educational field.


These gender divergences in perceptions about assessment underline the importance of considering gender as an influential factor in teacher training and the design of inclusive assessment strategies sensitive to diverse gender perspectives. This finding is supported by previous research, such as that conducted by [Vera et al. \(2017\)](#), which has also highlighted the relevance of gender in educational perception and practice. Understanding these differences can significantly contribute to implementing more equitable and gender-specific approaches in the educational field.

The results obtained about school administration and teacher training provide a comprehensive view of the influence of these factors on the perceptions and assessment practices of education professionals. In particular, it is observed that professionals in municipal schools maintain that assessment should focus exclusively on students as the only subjects of assessment and be based on an understanding of how they learn. As [Moreno-Olivos \(2021\)](#) points out, one of the main difficulties in assessment is that assessment still needs to be centered on the teacher's figure. These strategies focus more on assessing learning than on using assessment as a learning tool and an integral part of the learning process. In this sense, to improve assessment practices, it is crucial to shift the focus from the teacher to the student, allowing assessment to become a two-way process that encourages reflection and continuous growth. It implies adopting assessment methods that not only measure performance but also facilitate the comprehensive development of students. Statistical differences by type of training reveal that teachers with a master's degree demonstrate greater effectiveness in several aspects of educational assessment than those with only a specific diploma in assessment. In particular, teachers with a master's degree stand out in the ability to use assessment as a tool for dialogue, understanding, and improvement, as well as in the ability to motivate students and to use assessment in the continuous improvement of the teaching-learning process, as indicated by the study by [Vera et al. \(2017\)](#). In addition, these teachers consider themselves better trained to carry out assessments of student learning.

In contrast, teachers with only undergraduate studies outperform those with specific diplomas in assessment in the clarity they explain the purpose of assessment to students. These findings suggest that more advanced and comprehensive training, such as that obtained through a master's program, can provide stronger skills and competencies in pedagogical assessment, resulting in more effective and enriching teaching practice.

## 6. Conclusions

In conclusion, this study reveals that teachers value transparency in communicating assessment purposes and understand assessment as a tool for continuous improvement. There is a direct connection between what is assessed and taught, and teachers prefer written assessment. However, they also recognize the importance of involving students in their assessment processes. However, challenges persist regarding the relevance of grades and gender differences in perceptions about assessment. Advanced training strengthens teachers' assessment skills. A more inclusive, contextualized, and student-centered assessment is recommended, addressing gender differences and encouraging ongoing teacher training.

Some limitations of the study are related to the sample size, which could affect the generalizability of the results. The study's cross-sectional design limits the ability to establish causal relationships and understand changes over time. Future research projects could focus on designing strategies that foster transparency in the communication of assessment purposes, taking advantage of teachers' willingness to consider assessment as an inclusive process. It is also suggested that initiatives be explored to strengthen the connection between teaching and assessment, promote assessment methods aligned with predefined objectives, and adapt equitable approaches to address gender and training level disparities. 

## Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## Bibliographic references

1. ALFAGEME, Begoña; MIRALLES, Pedro; MONTEAGUDO, José. Diseño y validación de un instrumento sobre evaluación de la geografía y la historia en educación secundaria. En *Enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales*. 2011. vol. 10, p. 48-60. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=324127610007>
2. AZAMBUYA, María Eugenia. La evaluación educativa: aproximación a un caso de 1° de la ESO. En *Márgenes, Revista de Educación*. 2020. vol. n° 1 (1), p. 240-262. <https://doi.org/10.24310/mgnmar.v1i1.7153>
3. ESPINOZA, Eudaldo. La evaluación de los aprendizajes. En *Revista Conrado*. 2022. vol. 18 n° 85, p. 120-127. [http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S1990-86442022000200120](http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1990-86442022000200120)
4. FLORES, Emmanuel; CRODA, Gabriela. Concepciones de evaluación del aprendizaje. un análisis para la transformación de las prácticas evaluativas. En *Revista panamericana de pedagogía*. 2024. n° 37, p. 10-24. <https://doi.org/10.21555/rpp.vi37.2796>
5. HU, Li-tze; BENTLER, Peter. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: conventional criteria versus new alternatives. In *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*. 1999. vol. 6 n° 1, p. 1-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
6. HURTADO, Frank. Planificación y evaluación curricular: elementos fundamentales en el proceso educativo. En *Dissertare*. 2020. vol. 5 n° 2, p. 1-18. <https://revistas.uclv.org/index.php/dissertare/article/view/2928/1826>
7. IBARRA-SÁIZ, María Soledad; RODRÍGUEZ, Gregorio. Aprendiendo a evaluar para aprender en la Educación Superior. En *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativa*. 2020. vol. 13 n° 1, p. 5-8. <https://revistas.uam.es/riee/article/view/12070>
8. JAREÑO, Francisco; LÓPEZ, Raquel. Actividades de evaluación continua - correlación con la calificación de la prueba final y efecto sobre la calificación final. Evidencia en Administración y Dirección de Empresas. En *Revista Complutense en Educación*. 2015. vol. 26 n° 2, p. 241-254. [https://doi.org/10.5209/rev\\_RCED.2015.v26.n2.42948](https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_RCED.2015.v26.n2.42948)
9. JIMÉNEZ, José Alonso. Aproximaciones epistemológicas de la evaluación educativa: entre el deber ser y lo relativo. En *Foro de Educación*. 2019. vol. 17 n° 27, p. 185-202.
10. LEY, Nelly; ESPINOZA, Eudaldo. Características de la evaluación educativa en el proceso de aprendizaje. En *Revista Universidad y Sociedad*. 2021. vol. 13 n° 6, p. 363-370. [http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?pid=S2218-36202021000600363&script=sci\\_arttext&tlng=pt](http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?pid=S2218-36202021000600363&script=sci_arttext&tlng=pt)
11. MARCHANT, Gregory. Classroom assessment practices: a survey of botswana primary and secondary school teachers. *Ball State University Muncie*. 2012.
12. MINISTERIO DE EDUCACIÓN. Ciclo de la evaluación. 2023. <https://www.curriculumnacional.cl/portal/Evaluacion/>
13. MORENO-OLIVOS, Tiburcio. Cambiar la evaluación: Un imperativo en tiempos de incertidumbre. En *ALTERIDAD. Revista de Educación*. 2021. vol. 16 n° 22, 223-234. <https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v16n2.2021.05>
14. MUÑOZ-MORENO, José; LLUCH, Luis. Evaluación para el aprendizaje de los estudiantes universitarios en la realidad confinada. En *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativa*. 2021. vol. 14 n° 2, p. 37-50. <https://doi.org/10.15366/riee2021.14.2.003>
15. OTERO-SABORIDO, Fernando; VÁSQUEZ-RAMOS, Francisco. (2019). La Evaluación Educativa en el Currículo LOMCE en Primaria: Análisis de los Currículos Autonómicos en Educación Física. En *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativa*. 2019. vol. 12 n° 1, p. 47-58. <https://doi.org/10.15366/riee2019.12.1.003>
16. PRIETO, Marcia; CONTRERAS, Gloria. Las concepciones que orientan las prácticas evaluativas de los profesores: un problema a develar. En *Revista Estudios Pedagógicos*. 2008. vol. 34 n° 2, p. 245-262. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052008000200015>
17. REMOLINA-CAVIÉDES, Juan Francisco. Evaluación educativa y codeterminación de la producción escolar. En: *Revista Artigos*. 2020. vol. 28 n° 106, p. 135-155. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-40362019002701629>
18. REYES, Carmen; DÍAZ, Alicia; PÉREZ, Rocío; MARCHENA, Rosa; SOSA, Fátima. La evaluación del aprendizaje: percepciones y prácticas del profesorado Universitario. En *Profesorado: Revista de currículum y formación del profesorado*. 2020. vol. 24 n° 1. <https://doi.org/10.30827/profesorado.v24i1.8449>
19. SANDOVAL, Pedro; MALDONADO, Ana; TAPIA, Mónica. Evaluación educativa de los aprendizajes: conceptualizaciones básicas de un lenguaje profesional para su comprensión. En *Páginas de Educación*. 2022. vol. 15 n° 1, p. 49-75. <https://doi.org/10.22235/pe.v15i1.2638>
20. SANTOS, Miguel. Corazones, no solo cabezas en la Universidad. Los sentimientos de los estudiantes ante la evaluación. En *REDU, Revista de Docencia Universitaria*. 2015. vol. 13 n° 2, p. 125-142. <https://riunet.upv.es/handle/10251/137679>
21. SEPÚLVEDA, Alejandro; PAYAHUALA, Héctor; LEMARIE, Fernando; OPAZO, Margarita. ¿Cómo evalúan el aprendizaje los profesores de matemática?: percepción de los estudiantes de escuelas básicas municipalizadas de la décima región. En *REXE- Revista De Estudios Y Experiencias En Educación*. 2017. vol. 16 n° 30, p. 63-79. <https://revistas.ucsc.cl/index.php/rexe/article/view/347>
22. SAGREDO, Angélica; POBLETE CORREA, Susana; DÍAZ LARENAS, Claudio (2017). Percepción de los docentes chilenos sobre sus perspectivas, habilidades y prácticas evaluativas en el aula. En *Estudios pedagógicos*. 2017. vol. 43 n° 3, p. 361-372. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052017000300021>