Attitude of Undergraduate students towards Formative Evaluation

Shuvankar Madhu
Guest lecturer, Department of Education, Kazi Nazrul University, Kalla, Asansol, India
Dibyendu Bhattacharyya
Professor, Department of Education, University of Kalyani, Nadia, West Bengal, India

Abstract

The paper contains the study - Attitude of Undergraduate students towards Formative Evaluation. Formative Evaluation is a measuring tool by which we can diagnosis the strength and weakness of teachers, students, curriculum planner's achievement and easily carried out Remedial procedures. It is regarded a part of the teaching-learning process. Now a days, Formative Evaluation is a most popular tool of data collection in the field of Evaluation system. The objectives of the study are to find out the attitude of undergraduate students towards Formative Evaluation. The number of sample was 222, purposively selected from seven undergraduate colleges in West Bengal and the data was collected from them. For the purpose of data collection, a questionnaire has been constructed by the researchers. Self-administered questionnaire was moderate (0.73) which was tasted by split half method. Finally, the researchers found that both male and female students have a positive attitude towards Formative Evaluation and the attitudes towards Formative Evaluation of different streams students has significant differences.

Keywords: *Attitude, Formative Evaluation, Undergraduate Students.*

Introduction: Formative Evaluation is an important concept in the field of 'Measurement and Evaluation in Education'. Formative Evaluation as the name implies, takes place during the formation of learning. It is regarded a part of the teaching-learning process. Formative Evaluation gives feedback to the teacher and helps him to improve upon particular points in the instruction that need modification. It provides continuous feedback to both teacher and student concerning learning success and failures while instruction is in process. Feedback to students provides reinforcement of successful learning and identifies the specific learning errors that need correction. Feedback to teacher provides information and modifying instruction and for presenting group or individual remedial work.

Formative Evaluation is done for measuring the current students. It is done to minor learning and modifying the programme if needed completion. It requires analysis of instructional material for mapping the hierarchical structure of the learning tasks and actual

teaching of the course for a certain period. Formative Evaluation relatively focuses on molecular analysis. Its design is exploratory and flexible. Formative Evaluation seeks to strength or improve a programme or intervention by examining, amongst other things, the delivery of the programme, the quality of its implementation and the organizational context, personnel, structures and procedures.

Al-shehri, K.D.(2008) shown his investigation that both formative assessment and formative feedback can be use to reinforce good teaching and learning practices or can be used as a base for adjusting an existing practice.

Radford, B.W.(2010), conducted a study, with the objectives to investigate the impact of providing formative feedback to missionaries and their teachers regarding each individual missionary's progress and achievement. From the findings of the study, it was indicated that student who completed formative assessments significantly outperformed students who did not complete such assessments.

Aytaged Sisay Zeleke, (2013) study on " A comparative study on the practice of continuous assessment between Addis Ababa and Unity Universities." The major objective of the study was to compare the continuous assessment practices in two universities. The major findings of the study were the judge-mental role of continuous assessment is more practiced than the development role of the assessment.

Fakeye, D.O. (2016) in a research paper " Secondary school Teachers' and students' Attitude towards Formative Assessment and Corrective Feedback in English Language in Ibadan Metropolis " had selected his aim to measure the attitude of students and English teachers towards Formative assessment and Corrective feedback. Finally, he found that formative assessment should be given more prominences in assessing students' learning outcome.

Statement of the problem: The purpose of the researcher was to investigate attitudes toward Formative Evaluation of Undergraduate students from various college in West Bengal. It is, therefore, the researchers embarked to study the research entitled;

<p align="center">**"Attitude of Undergraduate students towards Formative Evaluation"**</p>

Objectives of the Study:

The following objectives were considered for the study -
- To measure the Attitude of Under-graduate students towards Formative Evaluation.
- To compare the Attitude towards Formative Evaluation among different gender of Undergraduate students.
- To compare the Attitude towards Formative Evaluation among different streams of Undergraduate level students.

Hypotheses: Based on the above objectives of the study the following hypothesis have been formulated.

$^0H_1$ -   There will be no significant difference between Boys and Girls on the criteria of Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

$^0H_2$ - There will be no significant difference between Science stream and Commerce stream under-graduate students on the criteria of Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

$^0H_3$ - There will be no significant difference between Science stream and Language stream under-graduate students on the criteria of Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

$^0H_4$ - There will be no significant difference between Language stream and Commerce under-graduate students on the criteria of Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

$^0H_5$ - There will be no significant difference between Social science stream and Language stream under-graduate students on the criteria of Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

.$^0H_6$ - There will be no significant difference between Social science stream and Commerce stream under-graduate students on the criteria of Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

$^0H_7$ - There will be no significant difference between Science stream and Social science stream under-graduate students on the criteria of Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

Methodology: The study adopted descriptive research design of survey type. This study considers Quantitative approach for collection and interpretation of data. The design was considered appropriate because the intention was to gather information on the existing phenomenon and report the situation according to the observation of the respondents.

Sample and Sampling: In this study the Researchers selected 7 colleges (Kalyani Mahavidyalaya, Netaji Mahavidyalaya , Ghatal Rabindra Satabarshaki Mahavidyalaya, Burdwan Raj College, Surendranath College, Naihati Rishi Bankim Chandra Evening College, and Fakir Chand College) in south zone of West Bengal as sample. All colleges were selected through Purposive Sampling method. Total 222 samples were selected from those colleges.

Tools for data collection: To measure the Attitude towards Formative Evaluation, a questionnaire has been prepared. Self-administered questionnaire was moderate (0.73) which was tasted by split half method. Formative Evaluation Scale included 40 items. Four major dimensions and various other dimensions have been taken. The broad dimensions are as follows: Aim of Formative Evaluation, Procedures of Formative Evaluation, Merits and demerits of Formative Evaluation. About 40 items 28 items was in Positive statement and 12 items was in Negative statement. Five-point scale was used for narrating each statement

of questionnaire. All statement was expressed in five alternative categories, viz, Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly disagree.

Analysis and Interpretation: The Mean and SD of the scores of the students is shown in Table -1

Table-1   Showing the Descriptive Statistics of the Sample

Groups	Number of Students	Mean	SD
Total Students	222	155.77	15.03
Total Male Student	107	156.99	15.49
Total Female Student	115	154.55	14.59
Science Stream Students	60	146.50	18.54
Commerce Stream Students	26	154.35	13.75
Language Stream Students	87	157.37	11.81
Social science Stream Students	49	165.18	6.11

Table – 2: Showing 't' test value between total Male and Female students on the criteria of Attitude of Undergraduate students towards Formative Evaluation.

Groups	Total Male Students	Total Female Students
Number	107	115
Mean	156.99	154.55
S.D	15.49	14.59
df= 220 , t = 1.10		

From the table no -2, it is seen that calculated ' t ' value 1.10 which is less than the table value 1.97 at 0.05 level of significant. Therefore, it can be said that calculated ' t ' value is not significant and null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between Total Male Students and Total Female Students in their attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

Table - 3   Showing 't' test value between Science Stream students and Commerce Stream students on the criteria of Attitude of Undergraduate students towards Formative Evaluation.

Groups	Science Stream Students	Commerce Stream Students
Number	60	26
Mean	146.5	154.35

S.D	18.54	13.75
df= 84 , t =2.18		

From the table no -3, it is seen that calculated ' t ' value 2.18 which is grater than the table value 1.99 at 0.05 level of significant. Therefore it can be said that calculated ' t ' value is significant and null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between Science Stream students and Commerce Stream Students in their Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

Table - 4   Showing 't' test value between Science Stream students and Language Stream students on the criteria of Attitude of Undergraduate students towards Formative Evaluation.

Groups	Science Stream Students	Language Stream Students
Number	60	87
Mean	146.5	157.37
S.D	18.54	11.81
df= 145, t = 4.02		

From the table no - 4 , it is seen that calculated ' t ' value 4.02 which is lordly than the table value 1.98 at 0.05 level of significant. Therefore it can be said that calculated ' t ' value is significant and null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, it can be concluded that there exist significant difference between Science Stream students and Language Stream Students in their Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

Table - 5   Showing 't' test value between Language Stream students and Commerce Stream students on the criteria of Attitude of Undergraduate students towards Formative Evaluation.

Groups	Language Stream Students	Commerce Stream Students
Number	87	26
Mean	157.37	154.35
S.D	11.81	13.75
df= 111 , t = 1.01		

From the table no - 5, it is seen that calculated ' t ' value 1.01 which is less than the table value 1.98 at 0.05 level of significant. Therefore it can be said that calculated 't ' value is not significant and null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between Language Stream students and Commerce Stream Students in their Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

Table - 6   Showing 't' test value between Social Science Stream students and Language Stream students on the criteria of Attitude of Undergraduate students towards Formative Evaluation.

Groups	Social science Stream Students	Language Stream Students
Number	49	87
Mean	165.18	157.37
S.D	6.11	11.81
df= 134 , t = 5.07		

From the table no - 6, it is seen that calculated ' t ' value 5.07 which is lordly than the table value 1.98 at 0.05 level of significant. Therefore, it can be said that calculated ' t ' value is significant and null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between   Social science Stream students and Language Stream Students in their Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

Table - 7   Showing 't' test value between Social science Stream students and Commerce Stream students on the criteria of Attitude of Undergraduate students towards Formative Evaluation.

Groups	Social science Stream Students	Commerce Stream Students
Number	49	26
Mean	165.18	154.35
S.D	6.11	13.75
df= 73, t = 3.82		

From the table no -7, it is seen that calculated ' t ' value 3.82 which is lordly than the table value 1.99 at 0.05 level of significant. Therefore it can be said that calculated ' t ' value is significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between Social science Stream students and Commerce Stream Students in their Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

Table - 8   Showing 't' test value between Science Stream students and Social science Stream students on the criteria of Attitude of Undergraduate students towards Formative Evaluation.

Groups	Science Stream Students	Social science Stream Students
Number	60	49
Mean	146.5	165.18
S.D	18.54	6.11
df= 107 , t = 7.33		

From the table no - 4, it is seen that calculated ' t ' value 7.33 which is lordly than the table value 1.98 at 0.05 level of significant. Therefore it can be said that calculated ' t ' value is significant and null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between Science Stream students and Social science Stream Students in their Attitude towards Formative Evaluation.

Findings and Conclusion: From this study it can be concluded that the male and female both students have a positive attitude towards Formative Evaluation, and the attitudes towards Formative Evaluation of different streams students has significant differences. But in the case of language and commerce stream students, there exists no significant differences between their attitude towards Formative Evaluation. It is expected that this study will be an eye opener to the institutional planner and observer. In order to improve our evaluation system, Formative Evaluation is much more important. It can help both teachers' and students' during instruction that provides feedback to adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve students' achievement of intended instructional outcome. So, Formative Evaluation is the best way to diagnosis both teacher and students strengths and weakness continuously and effectively.

_____

References

1. Aggarwal, J.C. (2015). *Essentials of Examination System – Evaluation, Test and Measurement (1ˢᵗ Ed.),* New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
2. Best, J. W. & Kahn, J. V. (2009*). Research in Education (10ᵗʰ Ed.).* New Delhi: PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.
3. Garrett, H. E. (2014). *Statistics in Psychology and Education (6ᵗʰ Ed.).* New Delhi: Paragon   International Publishers.
4. Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E. & Airasian, P. W. (2015). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (10ᵗʰ Ed.).* Noida (U.P.): Pearson publication.
5. Kothari, C. R. (2014). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques (3ʳᵈ Ed.)*, New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
6. Mangal, S. K. (2012). *Statistics in Psychology and Education (10ᵗʰ Ed.).* New Delhi: PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.
7. Mangal, S. K. & Mangal, S. (2015). *Research Methodology in Behavioral Sciences (1ˢᵗ Ed.).* New Delhi: PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.
8. Mohan, R. (2016). *Measurement Evaluation and Assessment in Education (1ˢᵗ Ed.).* New Delhi: PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.
9. NCERT (2005). *The National Curriculum Framework (NCF 2005*), New Delhi: Government of India