Learner perceptions of assessment of creative products in communication design

ABSTRACT

One major dilemma that appears not to help art and design students in their studio work is the assessment of creative outputs. Key issues inherent to assessment are who is carrying out the assessment and with what measure, especially when learners do not contribute to the assessment processes. This study sampled 247 tertiary students (104 male and 143 female) for their perceptions of assessment of their creative project-based learning in the Department of Communication Design, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana. Data were sourced using a self-administered questionnaire. Four themes emerged from the participants’ responses during data analysis: (1) perceptions on importance of creativity in graphic design, (2) relevance of creative process in creative production, (3) assessment and (4) assessment practice. Descriptive analysis was used to evaluate students’ perceptions of creativity and its assessment, and to further investigate how their perceptions might affect their attitudes towards the creative process. Results indicated that students overwhelmingly appreciated the concept of creativity, and suggest that teachers wishing to improve students’ attitudes towards the creative process and assessment of their creative projects, in general, should involve students in defining the learning outcomes and assessment criteria and involve them in the
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process. This study provides a pioneering work on how students perceive the assessment of their creative projects, and opens the way for further assessment studies involving both instructors and students. The findings have implications for instructors of communication design and school administrators, particularly those in tertiary education.

RELEVANCE TO DESIGN PRACTICE

Studies have shown that providing an enabling and congenial school environment is crucial to the creative development of the student (Lowenfeld and Brittain 1987; Burke 2007; Haring-Smith 2007). Assessment contributes largely to school acceptability, and determines what and how students learn. This study explores this issue and determines students’ perceptions of the assessment process. The results of the study contribute to discourse of finding an acceptable assessment and evaluation process that can benefit the institution and the student.

INTRODUCTION

Assessment in art and design education is as important as in other disciplines (Lindström 2006). However, it is an area persistently bedevilled with challenges (Craft 2001; Cowdroy and de Graft 2005; Jackson 2005; Rohrbach 2009; Willems 2009; Williams et al. 2010). Assessment of creative work, object or event is difficult and problematic (HEMIE 2006; Ellmers 2006; Aschenbrener et al. 2007; Mason et al. 2003; de la Harpe and Peterson 2008; Clerke 2007) and its impact, could be both positive or negative on creative development (Mason et al. 2003). In considering the sources of challenges in assessment in art and design, Mason et al. (2003) have advanced many propositions, notable among them: varying educational contexts, leading to different art education goals; a wide range of practical, critical and contextual activities; different assessment procedures and instruments; and the varying nature of work.

In Eca’s contribution to the sources of challenges, she notes that ‘students’ artworks are not easy to assess’ (2002: n.p.), and therefore the lack of clear consensus on best practices and common parameters to consider when evaluating students’ efforts or creative production aggravates the problem (Rohrbach 2009; Balchin 2005). Rohrbach (2009) further notes that lack of documentation and an acceptable assessment format continues to impede the assessment of creative products, and that this challenge provides new researchable areas for consideration.

On the other side of the assessment debate in art and design is the question of what assessment in art and design should focus on (de la Harpe et al. 2009). Several studies have shown that creativity is central to the assessment of art and design education (Williams et al. 2010) and the cause of all challenges. The relevance and importance of assessing for creativity has been vividly captured by Balchin, who opines that ‘creativity assessment might be regarded as an attempt to recognise or identify creative characteristics or abilities among people or to understand their creative strengths and potential’ (2005: 1). Consequently, the assessment of creativity and creative production has been attracting researchers since creativity became a topical issue in education (Treffinger et al. 2002); however, it is fraught with many challenges.

There is no single definition of creativity (Willis 2010), and many studies concede that defining creativity is complex (Aschenbrener et al. 2007;
Harris 2008; Williams et al. 2010), let alone its assessment. I argue that E. P. Torrance’s (1966) definition of creativity as cited in Kim as a process of becoming sensitive to a problem, deficiencies, gaps in knowledge, missing elements, disharmonies, and so on; identifying the difficulty; searching for solutions, making guesses, or formulating hypothesis about these deficiencies; testing and retesting these hypothesis and possibly modifying and retesting them; and finally communicating the result. (Kim 2006: 3)

Provides the best platform for teachers to develop curriculum and assessment. Lowenfeld and Brittain consider creativity as being “constructive, productive behaviour that can be seen in action or accomplishment” (1987: 74). They further argue that the accomplishment or action should not necessarily be phenomenal or unique, but a contribution from the individual to the society. These proposals challenge many of the definitions put forward by various scholars, in that they allow for and support the minutest contribution an individual can make. They also serve as a motivator for the young to explore further and more deeply (Lowenfeld and Brittain 1987: 74), and as a base for childhood education.

Creative ideas and products come from manipulating and transforming resources through a process. The creative process offers a credible and systematic approach to arriving at a conclusion or solution. Williams et al. postulate that ‘creativity and creative processes are as much about problem definition as they are about problem solving’ (2010: n.p.). Several creative processes were proposed in Torrance’s (1993) study, notable among them the pioneering works of Wallas’ (1926) ideation process, Osborn–Parnes’ (1953) creative problem-solving process and Edward de Bono’s (1967) lateral thinking. The primary concerns of these models were to study and evolve defined and recognizable human thinking and a structured methodology that facilitates critical thinking in problem solving, thereby facilitating the evaluation of the process.

Contributing to the discourse on the importance of the process to student learning, Ehmann speculates that ‘the journey is the destination’ (2005: 109). She emphasizes that assessing the process has the potential to involve the student in his or her learning, thereby a stronger approach to learning and risk-taking is seen as a tool for understanding improving personal development. Accordingly, assessment of the process is built into the curriculum with clear goals. However, in Salamon’s study, she speculates that the ‘process can be as valuable as the product’ (2008: 77). In Rogers and Fasciato’s (2005) study, they suggest that creativity is an individual characteristic and expression, and hence cannot be assessed; rather, the process and product are worth assessing. Other studies on creativity have suggested that the assessment of product or the final artefact is popular among higher education institutions (de la Harpe and Peterson 2008). Jackson (2005) isolates only the process and product, while de la Harpe et al. (2009) suggest process, product and person. However, Balchin (2005: 2) concludes that the best complex composite instrument should assess not only the product, but the four P’s (product, process, person and press).

King and Anderson, as cited in Kleiman (2004), sincerely believe that it is the product that is used to evaluate the personality behind the product, and hence it is the product that needs to be evaluated. Kleiman (2004) acknowledges the challenges posed by assessing the process, when clearly there is no...
correlation or definite line of determination between a good creative process and a good creative product.

Another controversial area within the assessment milieu is who (Jackson 2005) should be doing the assessing within the school system. Many diverse views have been expressed and proposed. Three common opinions exist: the teacher, namely, a sole assessor, or preferably a team of experts within the school, otherwise termed consensual assessment (Balchin 2005; Jackson 2005; Welch 2008), or perhaps the teacher and students engaged collaboratively in the process of assessment. Rohrbach (2009) again acknowledges the great difficulty the assessor (instructor) and the assessed (student) continue to encounter, in terms of evaluating the student’s effort through his or her creative products, and by extension, comparing achievements with learning objectives and projected outcomes.

Welch (2008) recommends that the parties involved in teaching and learning should negotiate what could and should be assessed within a studio-based learning environment. Harris (2008) recommends that teachers, course leaders and anyone who matters in the assessment of students’ creative products should share their common understanding of what creativity is and what is expected.

Balchin (2005) considers that due to the complexity and multi-dimensional nature of creativity, it is impossible to carry out a comprehensive assessment with simple instruments for analytical procedures. Consequently, it has been postulated that the time has come for more consistency, clarity, continuity and transparency in assessment practice in the creative arts for greater fairness in subjective judgements (Eca 2002; Clines 2007; Willems 2009).

Information about perceptions of communication design students on creativity, the creative process and assessment of creative products is needed to assist educators in developing programmes and practices that will positively impact the work and career futures of design students. Learners can serve as sources of information about how the communication design education programme impacts students’ preparation for future work, expectations for work and careers, and sources of support for school and careers.

In response to the current era of school reform, the purpose of this study was to provide information to educators that will assist them in enhancing the employment readiness and career preparation of communication design students. The primary objective of this study was to investigate student perceptions towards creativity and assessment issues. Selected variables were examined to determine possible influences on student perceptions. Specific research questions for this study were:

1. To what extent did the students perceive creativity as a useful component of graphic design education?
2. To what extent did the students perceive the creative process as a useful learning experience?
3. How does assessment impact on student learning?
4. How could the assessment practice be improved to further enhance student learning?

METHODOLOGY

The research was undertaken in a medium-sized university, using a quantitative approach, bound by a case study method in order to explore participants’ perceptions on creativity and assessment of creative product practice. The data were collected as part of an initial study examining communication
design students’ perceptions about the assessment of their creative products. The study uses the descriptive and analytical survey methods.

**POPULATION OF STUDY**

A total of 247 undergraduate students from the Department of Communication Design at Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, a public university in Ghana, were selected to participate in the study. The inclusion criteria for students include (1) being enrolled in a communication design programme at the undergraduate level and (2) currently being in the third semester or above in their study. The selection of students in the third semester or above is to ensure that they have enough knowledge to answer questions relating to creativity, the creative process and assessment practices in the programme. The purposive sampling method was used. Three academic levels took part in the study, and the total number of students involved in the study was 250. About 100 (40.5%) level 200, 50 (20.2%) level 100 and 97 (39.3%) level 400 students completed the questionnaire. A total of 247 respondents returned usable questionnaires.

**DATA COLLECTION**

In this study, a field survey was conducted in which questionnaires were administered on evaluation and assessment of creative products. The aim was to determine students’ perceptions about how the assessment of creative products is conducted in the department. The questionnaire was distributed directly by the researchers to the students immediately after a lecture to elicit the maximum participation, responses and effective collection. A return rate of nearly 98.8 per cent was achieved.

**MEASUREMENT**

The questionnaire collected demographic information about each respondent, as well as his or her offerings in statistics, measurement and research methodology. The questionnaire items for this scale were specifically designed for the study. The questionnaire consisted of a number of items rated on a five-point Likert scale, from 0='strongly disagree' to 3='strongly agree', and were intended to elicit at least two items for each attribute. There were 25 items generated based on the literature on assessment practice in art and design in higher education. Interviews were conducted with students outside of the study sample (Sudman et al. 1996). There were four dimensions tested in the study, namely, perceptions on importance of creativity in graphic design (N=6), relevance of creative process in creative production (N=8), assessment (N=6) and assessment practice (N=5). After the initial interviews were completed, eight items were dropped from the scale and minor changes were made to make them conceptually relevant. All quantitative survey responses were coded, entered into the data editor and analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), release 16.0.0.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The following four areas emerged as important characteristics of the assessment environment for fostering creativity: (1) perceptions on importance of creativity in graphic design, (2) perceptions on relevance of creative process in creative production, (3) views on assessments and (4) perceptions on
assessment practice. The demographic distribution is as follows: 50 respondents (20.2%) came from level 100, 100 respondents (40.5%) were from level 200 and 97 respondents (39.3%) were from level 400. A total of 147 (57.9%) of the respondents were female, and 104 (42.1%) were male. The age range of the participants is as follows: eleven students (4.5%) were 19 and 20 years of age; the majority of the respondents, 186 (75%) were between 21 and 23 years of age; 38 respondents (15.4%) were between 24 and 25 years of age; nine students were between 26 and 30 years of age; and three students (1.2%) were above 31 years of age. The demographic data collected were limited to academic level, age and gender.

PERCEPTIONS ON IMPORTANCE OF CREATIVITY

To address the first research question, ‘To what extent did the students perceive creativity as a useful component of graphic design education?’ a quantitative survey was conducted after an assessment session. Descriptive statistics of student responses from six closed response-type items in the questionnaire were computed to reveal the students’ perceptions of creativity. As shown in Table 1, in the first category, which sought students’ knowledge on creativity, an overwhelming majority of 242 respondents (98.0%) agreed that creativity is significantly important to every graphic designer. This was expected, and is a strong indicator of creative behaviour expected from the respondents; the result matches those obtained by Acheson (2006). A negligible number of five respondents (2%) disagreed, stating that creativity is not important. Again it was observed that 86.20% of students believe that everybody was born with some level of creativity, while 13.8% disagree. Acheson’s (2006) study showed similar results, although this result provided higher numbers supporting the notion of innate ability. Respondents in this instance have much greater awareness and better appreciation of creativity due to the nature of the programme being pursued. When asked whether creative
behaviour could be acquired, 91.56% agreed, while only 8.5% disagreed. This result is similar to one reported by Acheson that indicated that ‘creativity can be developed’ (2006: 4).

About a third (28.7%) of students responded that creative behaviour could be attained immediately, while most of the students (71.2%) disagreed. Almost all the respondents (91.9%) thought that creativity was an ongoing process, while less than a tenth (8.1%) disagreed. The majority of the respondents (87.9%) were of the view that creativity should be assessed, while 12.2% disagreed completely with this. The results from the table undoubtedly suggest that most of the students appreciate the foundations of creativity theory as propounded by creativity theorists such as Lowenfeld and Brittain (1987) that everyone was born with some element of creativity, while some of the students may not have been well enough prepared for the questionnaire, or some may have had a weak understanding.

**PERCEPTIONS ON CREATIVE PROCESS**

To address the second research question, ‘To what extent did the students perceive creative process as a useful learning experience?’ eight items on the questionnaire addressed the students’ ability to apply prior knowledge in the creative process and how they use the creative process in art production. Table 2 shows that the respondents were divided on the question of whether creativity needs a creative process: 57.8% disagreed with the idea that no creative process was needed, while 42.1% believed that without the process one could equally produce a creative product. This finding corroborates Kleiman’s view. The majority of respondents (83.4%) thought that lecturers should teach students how to go through the creative process, while 16.6% of the students disagreed with any teaching of the process. Though the number disagreeing could be considered small, it is significant since the creative process has over time proven to be a major contributing factor to individual creative development. It was also found out that 93.1% agreed that when they went through the creative process it helped them produce creative products that were statistically rare and objective-attaining.

On the other hand, a very small number (6.9%) thought otherwise. When asked whether lecturers encouraged them to go through the creative process, 76.6% of students agreed, while 23.5 % disagreed. There could be other reasons for these results, since students engage in other activities and pursue courses that do not require that they go through the creative process. Again, from the information gathered, the researchers found that 83.8% of students were willing to go through the creative process, while 15.8% were not. A quarter of the population indicated that they do not embark on thorough background search and study before tackling a task, while the remaining three-quarters (75.5%) did some research before every project. Most students (85.1%) in the population sampled know about the creative process, while 14.9% did not. The results in Table 2 clearly show the attempts by the lecturers in the department to use or adhere to basic design tenets; however, some respondents showed strong reservations about the use of the design process. This reservation is indicative of student preference for one’s own approach to solving design problems, which is a typical creative behaviour and freedom of expression.
The third research question dealt with assessment, and six items on the questionnaire addressed the question: ‘How does assessment impact on student learning?’ The results are captured in Table 3. About 56% agreed that low marks could be a motive to work harder, while 44% disagreed with this statement. This result is indicative of the fact that assessing creativity has been an inhibitor, as acknowledged by Acheson (2006). Almost half of the respondents (49.0%) were satisfied with their marks anytime they were assessed by the teacher, while 51.0% of the students claimed they were often unsatisfied with their marks. About 65% of students agreed that lower marks discouraged them and affected their subsequent performance, while 34.8% disagreed. This view corroborates Clerke’s (2007) assertion of the impact of grade on student aptitude for a subject. As many as 87.2% of the respondents agreed that more studio critiques should be conducted, while 12.8% of students did not feel this was necessary.

Although most respondents were not satisfied with the mark they received, they were not upset, but rather considered it as a challenge. Regarding lecturer bias, 46% conceded that lecturers were biased in their assessment, while the majority 54% disagreed. These results are similar to Rohrbach, where approximately half of the respondents ‘believed that their professors reviewed their work moderately well and that the feedback they received was moderately accurate’ (2009: 9). Lastly, 53% of students thought that their lecturers did not open up to them when they tried approaching them concerning their marks for creative product, as compared to 47% who considered their lecturers to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions on creative process</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity does not need a creative process</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should teach creative process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative process helps in producing creative products</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative process should be encouraged</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers encourage students to go through creative process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to go through creative process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know about creative process</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I conduct research pertaining to the course I’m taking</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 3=strongly agree (SA); 2=agree (A); 1=disagree (D); 0=strongly disagree (SD).

Table 2: Results of perceptions on creative process (N=247).

PERCEPTIONS ON ASSESSMENT

The third research question dealt with assessment, and six items on the questionnaire addressed the question: ‘How does assessment impact on student learning?’ The results are captured in Table 3. About 56% agreed that low marks could be a motive to work harder, while 44% disagreed with this statement. This result is indicative of the fact that assessing creativity has been an inhibitor, as acknowledged by Acheson (2006). Almost half of the respondents (49.0%) were satisfied with their marks anytime they were assessed by the teacher, while 51.0% of the students claimed they were often unsatisfied with their marks. About 65% of students agreed that lower marks discouraged them and affected their subsequent performance, while 34.8% disagreed. This view corroborates Clerke’s (2007) assertion of the impact of grade on student aptitude for a subject. As many as 87.2% of the respondents agreed that more studio critiques should be conducted, while 12.8% of students did not feel this was necessary.

Although most respondents were not satisfied with the mark they received, they were not upset, but rather considered it as a challenge. Regarding lecturer bias, 46% conceded that lecturers were biased in their assessment, while the majority 54% disagreed. These results are similar to Rohrbach, where approximately half of the respondents ‘believed that their professors reviewed their work moderately well and that the feedback they received was moderately accurate’ (2009: 9). Lastly, 53% of students thought that their lecturers did not open up to them when they tried approaching them concerning their marks for creative product, as compared to 47% who considered their lecturers to
Learner perceptions of assessment of...

1. Questions on assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions on assessment</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower marks discourage students and affect their performance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
<td>(20.6%)</td>
<td>(32.0%)</td>
<td>(33.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low marks encourage me to improve</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23.9%)</td>
<td>(20.2%)</td>
<td>(29.6%)</td>
<td>(26.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my marks anytime I am assessed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11.7%)</td>
<td>(39.3%)</td>
<td>(33.6%)</td>
<td>(15.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More studio critiques should be conducted</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.3%)</td>
<td>(7.7%)</td>
<td>(28.3%)</td>
<td>(58.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer is biased in assessing</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21.5%)</td>
<td>(32.8%)</td>
<td>(29.1%)</td>
<td>(16.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers open up whenever students approach them about marks</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23.5%)</td>
<td>(29.9%)</td>
<td>(24.7%)</td>
<td>(21.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 3=strongly agree (SA); 2=agree (A); 1=disagree (D); 0=strongly disagree (SD).

Table 3: Perception on assessment (N=247).

be open to discussing grading-related issues. The findings indicate a mixed response, suggesting that some of the students may not have been treated well earlier on or may have been in an uncomfortable situation at one time.

PERCEPTIONS ON ASSESSMENT PROCESS

To address the last research question, 'How could the assessment practice be improved to further enhance student learning?' five items were used to collect the data. An overwhelming 86.7% agreed that students should be part of the assessment process, while a minority of 13.3% did not agree that students should be part of assessing their works. This result suggests students’ preference towards realizing greater clarity and accountability in assessment, as shown by Acheson (2006). A total of 84% of the students believed that project guidelines should be given alongside design assignments, while 16% students disagreed with this statement. A simple majority of 66% of students said that they became confused and wasted their time without assignment guidelines, while 34% disagreed with this statement. Again, 38% of students said that assessment criteria are given to them before commencing a new assignment, while 62% of the respondents did not agree. Almost 47% of the students sampled had participated in the evaluation of their own works, while 53% of the students had not participated in the evaluation or assessment process. The opinions expressed by the respondents clearly suggest that the challenge of assessing students’ creativity and creative products is real and cut across many educational systems, regardless of borders and remained unresolved; when students are not involved in the evaluation process and when students do not know of the assessment criteria. The students’ responses varied and came in different forms. They included positive, negative and constructive criticisms on students’ involvement in the assessment processes. The responses from the students clearly showed directions of students’ perception and provided solutions for better assessment development.
Walker and Barfield (2006) suggest that the studio-based environment provided by art and design education offers various opportunities to involve students in the assessment processes, thereby increasing and improving their learning opportunities. The respondents were divided on the issue of lecturer bias. The perception of lecturer bias is alarming and somewhat justifiable, especially when they are used to teacher-controlled learning environments and students do not participate in the classroom decision-making and assessment processes. Another important issue worth noting is the provision of assessment criteria. The school has traditionally provided the grounds for competition among students; for teachers, parents and students the student’s school results are a measure of his or her intelligence, success and strength. This has helped to build a culture of ‘survival of the fittest’, which has both negative and positive implications for student learning.

Consequently, it could be assumed that the provision of assessment criteria before a project would suggest to the ‘good’ students that the ‘weaker’ students have been ‘given support’, especially when the students are only exposed to teacher-centered school systems and are frequently assessed using traditional assessment procedures to determine whether concepts taught are learned and mastered.

For effective teaching and learning to take place, the following suggestions corroborated by Nicol (2009: 17) on good assessment and feedback practice are worth considering:

1. Provision and use of criterion-referenced assessment of creative product should be seriously considered, since studies have shown that using criterion-referenced assessment helps improve student learning and performance.
2. Since studio critique is an appropriate environment for giving feedforward and evaluation, involving students in studio critique sessions would promote clarity of feedforward and sincerity, and improve accountability in the assessment process. This may also correct any wrong perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions on assessment</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be part of the assessment process</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project guidelines should be given anytime an assignment is given</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I waste time and get confused without any project guidelines</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment criteria are given to me before starting an assignment</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are included in evaluating their creative products</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 3=strongly agree (SA); 2=agree (A); 1=disagree (D); 0=strongly disagree (SD).

Table 4: Perception on assessment process (N=247).

DISCUSSION
1. Learners have related to lecturer bias. Lecturers should be more approachable when discussing assessment-related issues with students.
2. Students should be encouraged to learn how to criticize their peers’ visual products so that they are aware of some of the mistakes that are likely to occur when they are working on their own products.
3. The issue of assessment policy and use of assessment criteria should be discussed and developed in the class. It should also be discussed in the design brief.
4. The assessment criteria should include all stages of the creative process and the end product. This would encourage students to use and exploit the creative process.
5. Encourage interaction and dialogue around learning (peer and teacher-student).
6. Provide high-quality feedforward information that would help the learner to self-correct.
7. Give choice in topic, method, criteria and timing of assessments.

CONCLUSION

This investigative research has been an attempt to determine what students know about creativity, the creative process, and how the assessments of their creative products by lecturers affect their learning and performance. It is refreshing to note that the majority of students appreciate what creativity is and its characteristics, which is very important in design education. They also unanimously agreed that the creative process is relevant to the achievement of learning outcomes and expected skill competence; however, there were a few grey areas. The division of respondents on assessment and lecturers’ bias needs further examination.

This study has revealed communication students’ increased desire to be part of the assessment process. The above recommendations are to serve as solutions to enable students to better appreciate the challenges of assessing creative products. There is a need for more research into students’ views on assessment within art and design, especially their participation.
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