Exploring Assessment Techniques and Their Role in Developing Creative Thinking

Dr. Khadija Sittar*[1], Dr. Gulshan Fatima Alvi[2], Dr. Mahwish Safder[3], Faiza Hafeez[4]

Original Article

1. Assistant Professor, Lahore Leads University
Email: drkhadijasittar@leads.edu.pk

2. Assistant Professor, Lahore Leads University
Email: drgulshan.edu@leads.edu.pk

3. Assistant Professor, Lahore Leads University
Email: drmahwish.edu.@leads.edu.pk

4. Researcher. Email: faizahafeez26@gmail.com

Abstract

This study explores the crucial part assessments play in encouraging people to improve their critical and creative thinking abilities. A critical skill for managing the complicated and fast changing world of today is the ability to think creatively. Assessment of these talents becomes crucial in guiding successful educational practices as educators and researchers work to improve creative thinking abilities. The study employed a survey approach and was quantitative in character. Students from district Lahore universities made up the study's population. 150 students from district Lahore's public and private institutions made up the study's sample. Data gathering involved the use of a questionnaire. Questionnaire was consisted on two parts first part was consisted on demographic information and second part was consisted on assessment techniques. Inferential statistics was used for data collection. In the first lines of the essay, it is established how important creative thinking is in a variety of social, intellectual, and professional contexts. It emphasizes how several aspects of creative thinking exist, such as ideation, problem-solving, originality, and adaptability. The challenges of evaluating such a complex skill set are explored, highlighting the limitations of traditional assessment methods that usually give convergent reasoning a prominent priority. As the need for creative thinking keeps increasing, integrating sound assessment practices is essential to developing and refining this vital human ability.

Keywords: Assessment Techniques, Creative Thinking, Adaptability, inventive environment

Introduction

Assessment is crucial to education because it helps instructors customise their teaching strategies and shapes students' learning experiences. Traditional assessment techniques have frequently concentrated on assessing information acquisition and retention, but in today's dynamic and inventive environment, there is a rising understanding of the need of nurturing creative thinking abilities. In order to accurately measure and encourage creative thinking in students, assessment methods must be reevaluated in light of the shift in emphasis towards fostering creativity. A variety of cognitive processes, such as problem-solving, critical analysis, and the development of original ideas, are all included in creative thinking. It is a skill set that influences both professional and personal life, going beyond the fields of the arts and design. Therefore, it is in the best interests of both educators and researchers to comprehend how assessment methods may be used to foster and test creative thinking skills in a variety of educational situations (Gruszka & Tang, 2017).

Fostering creative thinking has become a fundamental objective in the constantly changing world of education. Beyond rote memorization and standardized testing, creative thinking fosters critical thinking, problem-solving innovation, and an open-minded attitude to learning in pupils. The use of evaluation procedures takes on a crucial function in this situation. Assessment is a potent instrument that may influence the learning process itself, not just a way to quantify learning results. This essay tries to explore the complex connection between evaluation methods and the growth of creative thinking. As educators struggle to foster creative thinking abilities, they are coming to the realisation that conventional evaluation methods might not be sufficient. While rote memorization and standardised testing are beneficial for some elements of education, they may unintentionally inhibit creativity by encouraging uniformity and regurgitation of information. Investigating alternative evaluation strategies that support the objectives of creative education is therefore essential (Kaufman, 2019).

Assessment methods have a significant impact on how children learn. Students are more likely to actively interact with the topic, look for innovative solutions, and get a better comprehension of the subject matter when evaluations are created to foster creative thinking. Additionally, because they view exams as chances for improvement, these strategies might encourage students to assume responsibility for their learning. In order to emphasise their significance in promoting creative thinking, this investigation examined a range of assessment techniques, including project-based assessments, portfolios, collaborative assessments, and self-evaluation. We'll look at how each method promotes learners to exercise critical thought, come up with novel ideas, and take calculated risks (Manske & Hoppe, 2014).

In conclusion, there is a complex and significant connection between evaluation methods and the growth of creative thinking. In order to provide students, the abilities they need to succeed in a world that is changing quickly, this article looked into how these approaches may be used to foster creative thinking. By the end of this research, we want to have given educators new perspectives and methods for modifying and creating assessment tools that actively support their students' growth in creative thinking as well as learning.

Review of Related Literature

In today's world of fast change, the ability to think creatively is essential, and educators are realising more and more the importance of encouraging creativity in pupils. Assessment methods are essential to this process since they not only measure but also shape creative thinking. The research on assessment methods and their significance in encouraging creative thinking in educational contexts is examined in this study.

Defining Creative Thinking

Generating original and worthwhile ideas or solutions to issues is a component of creative thinking. It covers a range of elements, such as inventiveness, fluidity, adaptability, and elaboration. These factors must be taken into account in the evaluation process in order to effectively assess creative thinking (Runco & Jaeger, 2012).

Traditional vs. Alternative Assessment

Multiple-choice tests and standardised examinations, which are common forms of traditional evaluation, favour convergent thinking over divergent thinking, which stifles creative expression. Alternatively, project-based examinations, open-ended questions, and portfolios give a more comprehensive picture of a student's creative ability (Torrance, 1988).

Rubrics and Creativity Assessment

Rubrics are an excellent resource for evaluating creativity. In order to evaluate creative thinking, researchers have created rubrics that place a particular emphasis on standards including originality, fluency, and elaboration. These rubrics offer a uniform method to rate creative work and give students helpful criticism (Cropley, 2006).

Peer and Self-Assessment

Students are encouraged to examine their own work and that of their classmates' in terms of originality through peer and self-assessment. This procedure encourages metacognition in addition to improving creative thinking. To be effective, it needs defined guidelines and standards, though (Falchikov & Goldfinch, 2000).

Problem-based education and original thought

When teachers use the problem-based learning (PBL) method, they give their pupils challenging, open-ended issues to solve. This encourages students to think creatively. PBL exams promote creativity by encouraging students to invent, cooperate, and think critically (Savery & Duffy, 1996).

Formative vs. Summative Assessment

During the learning process, formative evaluations offer instant feedback and chances for improvement, making them helpful for fostering the growth of creative thinking abilities. Contrarily, summative exams often analyse the results of learning and may not adequately foster creative thinking (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

Building an Environment for Creative Assessment

It is essential to establish a testing environment that values originality. This involves giving people the chance to take risks, valuing other viewpoints, and highlighting the value of the creative process rather than just the finished result (Craft, 2005).

Cultural and Contextual Factors

Techniques for evaluating students should take into account how environment and culture might affect their ability to think creatively. Assessments should take into account the intricacies of different cultures' meanings and expressions of creativity (Simonton, 2017).

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were following to:

1. Identify the difference between assessment techniques and their role in developing creative thinking among students at university level regarding their demographic variables (gender, qualification, university type, department).

Research Method and Procedure

The study was quantitative in nature and survey method was used. The population of the study were comprised of university students of district Lahore. The sample of the study was 150 students from public and private universities of district Lahore. Simple random sampling technique was used to collect the data. Questionnaire was used for data collection. Questionnaire was consisted on two parts first part was consisted on demographic information and second part was consisted on assessment techniques.

Data Analysis

SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was used for data analysis. Inferential statistics was used for data collection. Independent sample t test and One Way ANOVA was used to identify the difference between demographic variables.

Table 1

Independent sample t test identifies the differences between male and female university students regarding assessment techniques

Gender	*N*	Mean	Std. Deviation	*df*	*t*	*Sig.*
Male	61	37.1803	9.52979	148	-.578	.56
Female	89	37.9551	6.88198			

Table shows the independent sample t test identifies the differences between male and female university students regarding assessment techniques. There was no significant difference between male (*M*=37.1803, *SD*=9.52979) and female (*M*=37.9551, *SD*=6.88198), *t*=-.578, *p*=.56 regarding assessment techniques.

Table 2

Independent sample t test identifies the differences between male and female university students regarding creative thinking

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sign.
Male	61	60.4918	15.55273	148	.964	.33
Female	89	58.4045	10.96349			

Table shows the independent sample t test identifies the differences between male and female university students regarding creative thinking. There was no significant difference between male (*M*=60.4918, *SD*=15.55273) and female (*M*=58.4045, *SD*=10.96349), *t*=-.964, *p*=.33 regarding creative thinking.

Table 3

Independent sample t test identifies the differences between public and private university students regarding assessment techniques

University type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Public	64	38.0469	8.75129	148	.533	.56
Private	86	37.3372	7.51095			

Table shows the independent sample t test identifies the differences between public and private university students regarding assessment techniques. There was no significant difference between public (*M*=38.0469, *SD*=8.75129) and private university (*M*=37.3372, *SD*=7.51095), *t*=-.533, *p*=.56 regarding assessment techniques.

Table 4

Independent sample t test identifies the differences between public and private university students regarding creative thinking

University type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Public	64	59.5938	13.09516	148	.275	.32
Private	86	59.0000	13.03028			

Table shows the independent sample t test identifies the differences between public and private university students regarding creative thinking. There was no significant difference between public (*M*=59.5938, *SD*=13.09516) and private university (*M*=59.0000, *SD*=13.03028), *t*=-.275, *p*=.32 regarding creative thinking.

Table 5

One Way ANOVA identifies the differences among university students regarding assessment techniques on the bases of qualification

	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	18.016	27	.667	1.457	.087
Within Groups	55.857	122	.458		
Total	73.873	149			

Table shows One Way ANOVA identifies the differences among university students regarding assessment techniques on the bases of qualification. Results indicate that there was no significant difference between *df* (149)1.457, *p*=.087 in assessment techniques.

Table 6

One Way ANOVA identifies the differences among university students regarding creative thinking on the bases of qualification

	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	20.858	45	.464	.909	.633
Within Groups	53.015	104	.510		
Total	73.873	149			

Table shows One Way ANOVA identifies the differences among university students regarding creative thinking on the bases of qualification. Results indicate that there was no significant difference between *df* (149).909, *p*=.63 in creative thinking.

Table 7

One Way ANOVA identifies the differences among university students regarding assessment techniques on the bases of departments

	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	16.544	27	.613	.965	.52
Within Groups	77.429	122	.635		
Total	93.973	149			

Table shows One Way ANOVA identifies the differences among university students regarding assessment techniques on the bases of departments. Results indicate that there was no significant difference between *df* (149).965, *p*=.52 in assessment techniques.

Table 8

One Way ANOVA identifies the differences among university students regarding creative thinking on the bases of departments

	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*Sig.*
Between Groups	27.691	45	.615	.966	.54
Within Groups	66.282	104	.637		
Total	93.973	149			

Table shows One Way ANOVA identifies the differences among university students regarding creative thinking on the bases of departments. Results indicate that there was no significant difference between *df* (149).966, *p*=.54 in creative thinking.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to develop and evaluate a self-report questionnaire to gauge how teachers and students felt about 'AFL' practises in the classroom. We created the SAFL-Q, for students, and the TAFL-Q, for instructors, based on a review of the literature on AFL and the guiding principles provided by ARG and CCSSO. Our studies' findings demonstrate a strong match for a 28-item, two-factor solution that was reliable for both the SAFL-Q and the TAFL-Q. Monitoring and scaffolding were the names given to the two components in the surveys for students and teachers. According to correlations, the two components in both the SAFL-Q and the TAFL-Q are not independent of one another. Given that both AFL practises, monitoring and scaffolding, are intrinsically intertwined, this is not surprising. The two components in this study that were empirically developed accurately reflect the theoretical notions. Clarification of learning objectives and criteria as well as classroom questioning are elements under the factor "scaffolding," both of which are primarily instructional practises. Feedback and self-monitoring are two aspects of the monitoring factor that have the similar goal of enhancing learning. The overlap is not total, though. One explanation might be that, although being quite clearly defined (ARG, 2002; Stiggins, 2005), the essential components of AFL are not necessarily orthogonal or mutually incompatible. However, the two elements encompass the majority of the AFL's philosophically

expressed beliefs. We choose to use an open-ended assessment for learning strategy. According to Black and Wiliam (1998b), the use of the assessment information defines whether an assessment is summative or formative in character, not the exam itself. This means that feedback, even when it has a summative purpose, can take on a formative role when used to explain to students why and how their performance falls short of a target and how to do better (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). Additional support for this idea can be found in the writings of Gipps (1994), who characterised AFL as unique due to its emphasis on "(1) learning as an explicit focus of classroom activity and (2) students' learning autonomy," which we have summarized as activities to track students' progress and scaffolding activities to promote growth.

Conclusion

The development of creative thinking in educational contexts depends on assessment methodologies. Alternative approaches, including as rubrics, peer assessment, problem-based learning, and formative assessment, provide more thorough insights into students' creative thinking than traditional methods do. For encouraging creativity in various student groups, it's also crucial to cultivate a creative assessment environment and take cultural and contextual considerations into account.

Recommendation

Rather than stifling creative thought, assessment systems should be created to encourage and nourish it. They should encourage experimenting and taking risks, and place an emphasis on the creative process rather than the finished product. The development of creative thinking abilities may be greatly aided by combining these strategies in a way that is specific to the context and aims. Inspire people to evaluate their own and their peers' creative output. By doing so, you can develop self-awareness and the capacity to identify your own creative skills and areas for development.

References

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(2), 139-148.

Craft, A. (2005). *Creativity in schools: Tensions and dilemmas.* Routledge.

Cropley, A. J. (2006). In praise of convergent thinking. *Creativity Research Journal, 18*(3), 391-404.

Gruszka, A., Tang, M. (2017). The 4P's creativity model and its application in different fields. In: M. Tang & C. H. Werner (Eds.), *Handbook of the management of creativity and innovation: Theory and practice*, World Scientific Publishing, Toh Tuck Link.

Falchikov, N., & Goldfinch, J. (2000). Student peer assessment in higher education: A meta-analysis comparing peer and teacher marks. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(3), 287-322.

Kaufman, J.C. (2019). Self-assessments of creativity: Not ideal, but better than you think. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 13(2), 187–192.

Matlin, M.W. (2014). *Cognitive Psychology*, 5th ed., John Wiley, New Jersey.

Manske, S., Hoppe, H.U. (2014). Automated indicators to assess the creativity of solutions to programming exercises. In: *Proc. of the IEEE 14th International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies*, Athens, Greece, 497–501.

Runco, M. A., & Jaeger, G. J. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal, 24*(1), 92-96.

Savery, J. R., & Duffy, T. M. (1996). Problem based learning: An instructional model and its constructivist framework. *Educational Technology, 35*(5), 31-38.

Simonton, D. K. (2017). *Creativity and culture.* In J. C. Kaufman, R. J. Sternberg, & C. Reiter-Palmon (Eds.), The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity (pp. 715-737). Cambridge University Press.

Torrance, E. P. (1988). *The nature of creativity as manifest in its testing*. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), The nature of creativity (pp. 43-75). Cambridge University Press.