

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MID TERM EVALUATION OF XII GRADE ARTS STUDENTS OF BARAN AND JHALAWAR DISTRICT

Dr. Ravi Kant Yadav*

ABSTRACT

Teacher educators are concerned about the problems regarding the evaluation procedures. After the declaration of the examination results a large number of students feel that they did not secure marks accordingly and they seem to be unsatisfied with the marks obtained. So problem arises whether their self assessment on the examination is correct or the marks awarded by the evaluator is correct. Under such circumstances students go for re-evaluation. So the problems remain as such whether the self assessment of students are reliable or the awarded marks are reliable. Hence a new concept has emerged that students must know the evaluation procedure and they should know how marks are awarded. So the difference between the two can be minimized. On the other hand it will lead to the decreasing the degree of dissatisfaction after results. Hence the researcher feels that students must know correct self evaluation and evaluation of his classmates (i.e. peer group).

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation is a systematic process of collecting, analyzing and interpreting evidence of student's progress and achievement both in cognitive and non-cognitive areas of learning for the purpose of taking a variety of decisions. Teaching for successful learning cannot occur without high quality evaluation. Evaluation therefore needs to be integrated with the process of teaching and learning. The greater the integration the better the outcomes of learning. Hence, evaluation has to be so designed that it can be used as a powerful means of influencing the quality of what teachers teach and what students learn. Not only this, evaluation has also to provide constant feedback regarding the effectiveness of course contents, processes and the growth of individual learners besides the appropriateness of the evaluation procedure. It must however, be flexible enough to the extent that it can be experimented with and adapted according to the specific situations and needs of the learner groups.

The present system of evaluating at school stage suffers from a number of imperfections. The first and foremost short coming of the evaluation system is that it focuses only on cognitive learning outcomes and completely ignores the non-cognitive aspects which are a vital component of human

personality. Even in cognitive areas it lays too much emphasis on memorisation and little on abilities and skills that require higher mental operations like problem solving, creative thinking, summarising, inferring, arguing etc.

Examination in their present form are not the real measure of students potential because they cover only a small fraction of the course content that the students strive to learn over a period of one year. Nor do they provide for the application of multiple techniques of evaluation like oral techniques, observations, projects assignments etc. as they resort only to the case of written tests.

POA (1992) also felt that the predominance of the external examinations should be reduced. The NPE 1986 emphasized that "assessment of performance is an integral part of process of teaching and learning As a part of nations educational strategy, examinations, should be employed to bring about qualitative improvement in the education. In this way evaluation is the important process in the education systems for observing and assessing pupils achievement. Pupils, parents, teachers, supervisors, principals, Boards of education etc. all feel educational measurement indispensable to the overall educational program. Hence educational examinations are of prime importance and may be defined as the

*Sr. Lecturer, Haribhau Upadhyaya Teachers College for Women, Hatundi-Ajmer (Rajasthan)

assessment of pupils performance when confronted with a series of questions, problems or tasks set in order to ascertain the amount of knowledge that he has acquired and the extent to which he is able to utilize it or the quality and effectiveness of skills that the learner has developed.”

Measurement devices or techniques prepared by the teacher are often the best and sometimes the only means of determining how well classes or individual pupils are progressing towards the objectives of instruction so in academic achievement the attainment test prepared by the teacher is the most frequently used instrument or tool of evaluation in the educational setting belonging to the paper and pencil category. The attainment test consists of relatively large number of carefully selected and scientifically graded small items, words, sentences, paragraphs, problems, or there exercises objectively considered in relation to stage of progress in school subjects at various levels.

In brief the term achievement has a much broader meaning and refers to the acquisition of all the behavioral changes belonging to cognitive affective and psychomotor domains. But in the present study it will be used rather in a narrow sense referring to the outcome which are the direct focus of the classroom activity i.e. cognitive domain. Therefore an attainment test is one that measures pupils accomplishment resulting from learning or instruction in the class.

RATIONALE

In the present context teacher educators are concerned about the problems regarding the evaluation procedures. After the declaration of the examination results a large number of students feel that they did not secure marks accordingly and they seem to be unsatisfied with the marks obtained. So problem arises whether their self assessment on the examination is correct or the marks awarded by the evaluator is correct. Under such circumstances students go for re-evaluation. As re-evaluation practice is not being observed by Board of Secondary Education, Rajasthan here only re-totaling is done but the record of M.D.S. University Ajmer,

reveals the fact that only 5-7% students get change in their marks after re-evaluation. So the problems remain as such whether the self assessment of students are reliable or the awarded marks are reliable. Hence a new concept has emerged that students must know the evaluation procedure and they should know how marks are awarded. So the difference between the two can be minimized. On the other hand it will lead to the decreasing the degree of dissatisfaction after results. Hence the researcher feels that students must know correct self evaluation and evaluation of his classmates (i.e. peer group)

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The following objectives were framed for the study-

1. To construct a achievement test and answer key for XII grade Arts students on their course content.
2. To compare the marks awarded by researcher to the Baran and Jhalawar District students.
3. To compare the marks awarded after self evaluation Baran and Jhalawar District students.
4. To compare the marks awarded by the peer group evaluation to Baran and Jhalawar District students.
5. To compare the marks awarded by self and peer group evaluation of Baran district students.
6. To compare the marks awarded by self evaluation of Jhalawar District students.

HYPOTHESES

The following null hypotheses were framed for the study-

1. No significant difference exists between the marks awarded by researcher to the Baran and Jhalawar district students.
2. No significant difference exists between the marks awarded during self evaluation of Baran and Jhalawar district students.
3. No significant difference exists between marks awarded by peer group of Baran and Jhalawar students.
4. No significant difference exists between the marks awarded in self evaluation and peer group evaluation of Baran district students.

5. No significant difference exists between the marks awarded by self evaluation and peer group of Jhalawar district students.

METHODOLOGY

The study has been conducted through normative testing survey method and the cross sectional approach has been followed.

SAMPLE

Two districts Baran and Jhalawar were selected to administer the achievement test. It was planned to select 5 schools from each district and from each school 20 Arts group students were to be randomly selected for the study. But on the availability only 89 students of Baran district and 80 students of Jhalawar districts were considered. In all 169 students of both sexes from the two districts were selected from different schools during the session 2006-7.

TOOLS USED FOR DATA COLLECTION

Achievement test for different subject combinations of the Arts group.

PROCEDURE AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The present plan was designed to study the Academic achievement of XII grade Arts students of Baran and Jhalawar districts. The objective type test were prepared by a team of researchers. After test administration response sheet was given for self evaluation and peer group evaluation. Then it was also evaluated by the researcher himself. Hence in the present study normative testing survey was followed.

STATISTICS

1. Mean and Standard Deviation were calculated.
2. Significant difference between the mean were calculated.
3. t-values were calculated.

DATA ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

HYPOTHESIS-I

No significant difference exists between the marks awarded by researcher to the Baran and Jhalawar district students.

Table-1

District	N	\bar{X}	σ	df	t value	.05 level of significance
Baran	89	22.79	4.23	167	1.69	Not significant
Jhalawar	80	21.74	3.85			

Table-1 shows that the t-value at .05 level of significance is 1.69 which is not significant. Hence the hypothesis is retained as such which shows that the performance of the students of Baran district and Jhalawar district students is almost similar

HYPOTHESIS-2

No significant difference exists between the marks awarded during self evaluation of Baran and Jhalawar district students.

Table-2

District	N	\bar{X}	σ	df	t value	.05 level of significance
Baran	89	30.48	5.27	167	.67	Not significant
Jhalawar	80	31.03	5.41			

Table-2 shows that the 't' value at .05 level of significance is .67 which is not significant hence the hypothesis is retained as such which shows that the marks awarded by the students of both district indicate no appreciable difference.

HYPOTHESIS-3

No significant difference exists between the marks awarded by peer group of Baran and Jhalawar district students.

Table-3

District	N	\bar{X}	σ	df	t value	.05 level of significance
Baran	89	28.97	4.58	167	1.98	Significant
Jhalawar	80	27.52	4.39			

Table-3 reveals that 't' value at 0.05 level of significance is 1.98 which is significant hence the

hypothesis is rejected. The result shows that the peer group evaluation of Baran and Jhalawar district is significantly different.

HYPOTHESIS-4

No significant difference exists between the marks awarded in self evaluation and peer group evaluation of Baran district students.

Table-4

District	N	\bar{X}	σ	df	t value	05 level of significance
Baran	89	30.48 (Self)	5.27	176	2.04	Significant
		28.97 (Peer)	4.68			

Table-4 shows that 't' value at 0.05 level of significance is 2.04 which is significant. Hence the hypothesis is rejected the result shows that the self evaluation and group evaluation differs significantly.

HYPOTHESIS-5

No significant difference exists between the marks awarded by evaluation and peer group of Jhalawar district students.

Table-5

District	N	\bar{X}	σ	df	t Value	05 level of significance
Jhalawar	80	31.03 (Self)	5.41	158	4.55	Significant
		27.52 (Peer)	4.39			

Table-5 reveals that 't' value at 0.05 level of significance is 4.55 which is significant. Hence the hypothesis is rejected. The result shows that the self evaluation and peer group evaluation differs significantly.

FINDINGS

1. The performance of the students of Baran district and Jhalawar district students is almost similar

2. The marks awarded by the students of both district indicate no appreciable difference.
3. The peer group evaluation of Baran and Jhalawar district is significantly different.
4. The self evaluation and group evaluation differs significantly.
5. The self evaluation and peer group evaluation differs significantly

REFERENCES

- Asusubel, D.P. (1975) The use of Advance Organizer in the Learning and relation of meaningful verbal material. Review of Educational Research Vol. 45, 4
- Best, J.W. (1989) Research in Education (6th Ed.)
- De Cecco, J.P. (1977) The Psychology of learning and Instruction. Prentice Hall of India Ltd., New Delhi
- Ebel R.L.(1991)Essentials of Educational Measurement Prentice Hall of Frisbie, D.A. India, New Delhi
- Gareett, H.E. (1962) Psychology and Statistics in Education Allied Pacific Pvt. Ltd. Bombay.
- Govt. of India (1986) National Policy on Education MHRD Govt. of India Press, New Delhi.
- Gronlund, N.E. (1990) Measurement and Evaluation in teaching (6th Ed.) MacMillan & Linn, R.L. Publishing, New York.
- Lokesh Kaul (1994) Methodology of Educational Research Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
- N.C.E.R.T. (1988) National Curriculum Frame work for Elementary and Secodnary Education N.C.E.R.T., New Delhi.
- Govt. of India (1992) Programme of Action. M.H.R.D. Govt. of India Press, New Delhi.
- N.C.E.R.T. (2000) National Curriculum Frame work for School Education N.C.E.R.T., New Delhi.