



A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DISSATISFACTION OF HOUSE EXAMS OF B. ED. STUDENT OF BHIWANI AND CHARKHI DADRI DISTRICT

B. P. Singh, Ph. D.

Associate Professor, MLRS College of Education, Charkhi Dadri (Haryana).

Abstract

This article investigates students' perceptions and expectation of evaluation of house exams of B.Ed. students to understand the causes of dissatisfaction with the services delivered by the teachers. A total of 195 responses were collected from six colleges of education of Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district. Five achievement tests were prepared for 2nd year students covering all the five compulsory papers. It was found that four out of five questions were subjective in nature and required deeper knowledge of subject matter, skill and process. Only one question was short answer type question. The other causes of dissatisfaction include lack of subject matter, organization of subject matter, time management, space in answer-sheets, length of answer, proper evaluation by teacher, proper communication of educational terms, proper remuneration to teachers, insufficient time to teacher for evaluation, and lack of proper seating arrangement. Based on evaluation deficiencies identified, the study offers some measures that could be used to improve evaluation quality and thereby students satisfaction.



Scholarly Research Journal's is licensed Based on a work at www.srjis.com

Student's academic success is evaluated by their performance in exams conducted by Boards/Universities. These authorities consider three parameters i.e. attendance, internal and external marks which are taken to evaluate students academic performance. It does not inform about the affective and psychomotor domains of the students. Evaluation is an important instrument to provide proper feedback to teaching and learning process (**Hossain M.J. 2014**). Evaluation is also used to know the effectiveness of teachers, method of teaching curriculum, effectiveness of course content and the growth of an individual. Evaluation provides feedback to each and every child at every step for the proper development of the child. Child has to develop some intrinsic evaluation system within himself to take proper judgement and develop such a skill which helps him to take judgement at appropriate time in the right direction.

There are number of disadvantages in the present system of education. The most important disadvantage is the evaluation system of Education (**Beelick B.D.2014**). It lays emphasis on rote memory of curriculum. When a question related to problem, inference, argument, critical thinking and use of intellectual ability is presented, student is unable to

answer the question in competitive exam. All these tests measure only the cognitive behaviour of the students. Hence, evaluation is incomplete as the present system of evaluation does not consider observation, problem solving, project and interview method etc. to know the capability and potential of the student.

Every B.Ed. college conducts only theory exam to check the potential of these students to appear in University exams. These students admitted in colleges of education were from Art, Science and commerce streams. They had higher percentage of marks in graduate and post-graduate exams. The theory papers of B.Ed. house exams were subjective and had only five questions which were to be attempted within three hours. Due to subjective nature of theory papers of B.Ed. house exams, the students felt dissatisfied with the marks they obtained in the house exams. So it is indispensable to explain the student's negative or unsatisfactory experiences. It needs to be defined within a specific context of evaluation. Experiences of dissatisfaction lower the student's overall satisfaction. Students with dissatisfaction have higher levels of general psychological distress and poor physical health.

Student Self Assessment: It is a process in which students evaluate their own work and learning process. It is an important learning tool to assess at his own level. Through self-assessment, learner can find out the skill gap, where he finds himself weak; to concentrate where to give maximum time in learning, set goals, revise the curriculum, find their own speed and progress. It helps the learner to stay engaged and motivated and encourages self-reflection and responsibility for their learning. It represents some but not all the work they have done in class over a period of time. It will be used to help them to reflect on what they have learned and what they still need to learn. Students with cultural and language differences cannot evaluate the score as they cannot reflect their views. (Andrate, H. Valtcheva, A 2009).

Peer Evaluation: In this method learner has to prepare the topic first and submit the assignment and then the learner evaluates the assignment of the peers. It is widely used by the instructor where the strength of the learners are high and manual evaluation is not possible by the instructor. This is used to preserve the quality of standard at a desired level. It improves productivity and performance of learners. It also helps to know the strength and weakness of the learner. And the learners themselves discuss with each other to clarify a specific point. Interaction among learners help the learner to understand their weaknesses and increase their

performance. It is used to save teachers' time and improve students' understanding of course material and improve their net cognitive skills.

Preparing students for self or peer assessment:

Students may have little knowledge about the different forms of assessment and do not take judgement effectively to evaluate self and peer assessment. It is assumed that the teacher is shirking from their responsibilities to engage the students for assessment. It is the responsibility of the teacher to highlight the requirement of assessment and equip them for their own assessment and the assessment of other students. So the teacher should introduce the concept of assessment, its elements, criteria, guidance on how to judge own and others' contributions to also allow the students to develop criteria for each element and communicate the same to each student to get normal rules for evaluation of each topic. The teacher should help them to understand that improving these skills will help them in their future careers.

Rational of the study:

The present study has been proposed to examine the dissatisfaction of house exams of B.Ed. students. Though some of these variables have been investigated earlier, still there is dearth of empirical research on B.Ed. students. The paucity of research encouraged the investigator to initiate a comparative study of dissatisfaction of house exams results of B.Ed. students, as these students are not equipped with self or peer evaluation. Questions in B.Ed. classes are descriptive in nature. Students do not know the concept of assessment, its elements, criteria, guidance on how to judge their own and other's weakness and strength.

Objective: The main objectives of the study were:

1. To construct achievement tests and answer key for B.Ed. 2nd year students on five compulsory papers.
2. To compare the awards given by the investigator to Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district students.
3. To compare the awards given by self evaluation to Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district students.
4. To compare the awards given by peer group to Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district students.
5. To compare the awards given by self and peer evaluation of Bhiwani district students.

6. To compare the awards given by self and peer of evaluation of Charkhi Dadri district students.

Hypotheses: The following null hypotheses were framed for the study.

1. There is no significant difference exist in the awards given by the investigator to Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district B.Ed. students.
2. There is no significant difference exist in the awards given by the self evaluation to Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district B.Ed. students.
3. There is no significant difference exist in the awards given by the peer evaluation to Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district B.Ed. students.
4. There is no significant difference exist in the awards given by self and peer evaluation to Bhiwani district B.Ed. students.
5. There is no significant difference exist in the awards given by the self and peer evaluation to Charkhi Dadri district B.Ed. students.

Research Methodology:- In order to achieve the objectives of the present study, survey method was used (Garret, 2004). The methodological details like sample, tool, procedure of data collection, scoring and statistical techniques are as follow:

Sample: 195 B.Ed. 2nd year students of Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district of Haryana were taken randomly.

Tool used: To assess the achievement of the students, five achievement tests for all five compulsory papers of B.Ed. 2nd year were used.

Data Collection: Five achievement tests prepared by the concerned subject experts were distributed as per the instruction given in each test. After test administration, the response sheets of all the students in all the five subjects were evaluated by the investigator, self and peer group separately.

Statistics: Technique such as descriptive and differential analyses were used to calculate mean, S.D. and 't' values.

Result and Discussion

Table-1: Mean, SD and 't' value for the awards given by investigator.

District	N	Mean	S.D.	't' value
Bhiwani	98	45.52	6.25	
Charkhi Dadri	97	42.34	7.85	4.11 (S)

(S) Significant at .05 (1.97) and .01 (2.60) level

Table-1 reveals that mean score of Bhiwani district students is greater than Charkhi Dadri district students. It shows that 't' value is 4.11 which is greater than the table value at both levels. It shows significant difference in achievement of Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district students. Students of Bhiwani district have more exposure and more physical infrastructure etc. Hence, the hypothesis, "There is no significant difference exists in the awards given by the investigator to Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district B.Ed. students" is rejected.

Table-2: Mean, S.D. and 't' value for the awards given by self evaluation.

District	N	Mean	S.D.	't' value
Bhiwani	98	50.92	7.25	
Charkhi Dadri	97	46.83	8.45	3.629 (S)

(S) Significant at .05 (1.97) and .01 (2.60) level.

Table-2 reveals that 't' value is 3.629 which is greater than the table value at both levels. It shows significant difference in achievement of Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district students. Hence, the hypothesis, "There is no significant difference exist in the awards given by self evaluation to Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri district students" is rejected.

Table-3: Mean, SD and 't' value for the awards given by peer evaluation.

District	N	Mean	S.D.	't' value
Bhiwani	98	47.26	7.32	
Charkhi Dadri	97	44.02	6.84	3.198 (S)

(S) Significant at .05 (1.97) and .01 (2.60) level.

Table-3 indicates that 't' value is 3.198 which is greater than table value at both .05 and .01 level. It shows significant difference in achievement of both districts B.Ed. students. Peer and self evaluation awarded inflated marks as compared to investigator. It shows that students are dissatisfied with marks given by the investigator. This is the reason that students gave inflated marks even after the proper coaching of the students. These marks are unreliable. Hence, the hypothesis, "There is no significant difference exist in the awards given by peer evaluation to Bhiwani and Charkhi Dadri District B.Ed. students" is rejected.

Table -4 Mean, SD and 't' value for the award given by self and peer evaluation of Bhiwani district students.

District	Evluation	Mean	S.D.	't' value
Bhiwani	Self	50.92	7.25	
N = 98	Peer	47,26	7.32	3.51 (S)

(S) Significant at .05 (1.97) and .01 (2.60) level.

Table-4 shows that ‘t’ value is 3.51 which is greater than table value both at .01 and .05 level. It reflects the difference given by self evaluation and peer evaluation. Marks given by self evaluation are more than the marks given by peer evaluation. Hence, the hypothesis, “There is no significant difference exist in the award given by the self evaluation and peer evaluation to Bhiwani district students,” is rejected.

Table-5 : Mean , SD and ‘t’ value for the award given by self and peer evaluation of Charkhi Dadri district students.

District	Evaluation	Mean	S.D.	‘t’ value
Charkhi Dadri (N = 97)	Self	46.83	8.45	
	Peer	44.02	6.84	2.54

Significant at .05 (1.97) level.

Table-5 shows that ‘t’ value is 2.54 which is greater than the table value at .05 (1.97) level. It is not significant at .01 level as the calculated value is lower than the table value. It reflects significant difference in the marks given by self and peer evaluation of students of Charkhi Dadri district students. Hence, the hypothesis, “There is not significant difference exist in the award given by the self evaluation and peer evaluation to Charkhi Dadri district students” is accepted at .01 level.

Educational Implications:- Work can be more successful when students are involved in developing the assessment steps. Students have to develop their own criteria for assessment in consultation with teachers. Major points to be kept in mind are to: i) provide autonomy and responsibility to student, ii) make the students active learner and assessor by increasing deeper learning, iii) motivate the student to have deeper knowledge of subject matter, skill and process.,

iv) motivate student to show critical reflection, v) make the student to develop his own subjectivity and judgement skill, vi) agree that marking criteria shows there is no doubt about judgement given by the group collectively, vii) encourage student to take part ownership of this process, viii) provide timely feedback to students as it developed by their peers, ix) reduce the burden of the teacher if operated successfully, x) peer pressure to give higher grade or friendship should be reduced, xi) avoid to give assessment work to the student who is ill equipped.

xii) avoid the student who is reluctant to give judgement regarding peer, xiii) avoid the student who give same mark to all types of students.

References:

- Andrade, H. and Valtecheva, A (2009): *Promoting learning and achievement through self-assessment. Theory into practice*, 48, 12-19.
- Best, J.W. (1989) : *Research in education* (6th Ed.)
- Beelick B.D. (2014): *Sources of student satisfaction and dissatisfaction.*<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1974.10884547>.
- Garrett, H.E.(2004): *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.
- Mond JM, et al: *Dissatisfaction versus over-evaluation in general population sample of women. Int. J Eat Disord.* (2011).
- Hossaini M.J.(2014): *A study of causes of user dissatisfaction in academic libraries: A case of university students in a developing country. Journal of library administration*, vol. 54, 2014-issue 6.
- NCERT (2009) : *National Curriculum Frame Work*, NCERT, New Delhi.