

Vol 2 Issue 11 May 2013

Impact Factor : 1.2018 (GISI)

ISSN No :2231-5063

Monthly Multidisciplinary Research Journal

Golden Research Thoughts

Chief Editor
Dr.Tukaram Narayan Shinde

Publisher
Mrs.Laxmi Ashok Yakkaldevi

Associate Editor
Dr.Rajani Dalvi

Honorary
Mr.Ashok Yakkaldevi

IMPACT FACTOR : 0.2105

Welcome to ISRJ

RNI MAHMUL/2011/38595

ISSN No.2230-7850

Indian Streams Research Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double - blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial Board readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

International Advisory Board

Flávio de São Pedro Filho Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Mohammad Hailat Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, University of South Carolina Aiken, Aiken SC 29801	Hasan Baktir English Language and Literature Department, Kayseri
Kamani Perera Regional Centre For Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka	Abdullah Sabbagh Engineering Studies, Sydney	Ghayoor Abbas Chotana Department of Chemistry, Lahore University of Management Sciences [PK]
Janaki Sinnasamy Librarian, University of Malaya [Malaysia]	Catalina Neculai University of Coventry, UK	Anna Maria Constantinovici AL. I. Cuza University, Romania
Romona Mihaila Spiru Haret University, Romania	Ecaterina Patrascu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest	Horia Patrascu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest, Romania
Delia Serbescu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest, Romania	Loredana Bosca Spiru Haret University, Romania	Ilie Pintea, Spiru Haret University, Romania
Anurag Misra DBS College, Kanpur	Fabricio Moraes de Almeida Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Xiaohua Yang PhD, USA Nawab Ali Khan College of Business Administration
Titus Pop	George - Calin SERITAN Postdoctoral Researcher	

Editorial Board

Pratap Vyamktrao Naikwade ASP College Devruk, Ratnagiri, MS India	Iresh Swami Ex - VC. Solapur University, Solapur	Rajendra Shendge Director, B.C.U.D. Solapur University, Solapur
R. R. Patil Head Geology Department Solapur University, Solapur	N.S. Dhaygude Ex. Prin. Dayanand College, Solapur	R. R. Yalikar Director Management Institute, Solapur
Rama Bhosale Prin. and Jt. Director Higher Education, Panvel	Narendra Kadu Jt. Director Higher Education, Pune	Umesh Rajderkar Head Humanities & Social Science YCMOU, Nashik
Salve R. N. Department of Sociology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur	K. M. Bhandarkar Praful Patel College of Education, Gondia	S. R. Pandya Head Education Dept. Mumbai University, Mumbai
Govind P. Shinde Bharati Vidyapeeth School of Distance Education Center, Navi Mumbai	Sonal Singh Vikram University, Ujjain	Alka Darshan Shrivastava S. D. M. Degree College, Honavar, Karnataka Shaskiya Snatkottar Mahavidyalaya, Dhar
Chakane Sanjay Dnyaneshwar Arts, Science & Commerce College, Indapur, Pune	Maj. S. Bakhtiar Choudhary Director, Hyderabad AP India.	Rahul Shriram Sudke Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya, Indore
Awadhesh Kumar Shirotriya Secretary, Play India Play (Trust), Meerut	S. Parvathi Devi Ph.D.-University of Allahabad	S. KANNAN Ph.D., Annamalai University, TN
	Sonal Singh	Satish Kumar Kalhotra

Address:-Ashok Yakkaldevi 258/34, Raviwar Peth, Solapur - 413 005 Maharashtra, India
Cell : 9595 359 435, Ph No: 02172372010 Email: ayisrj@yahoo.in Website: www.isrj.net



A STUDY OF MEAN SCORES OF INTERNAL ASSESSMENT IN BACHELOR OF EDUCATION PROGRAMME IN INDIA

SATISH CHAND BHADWAL AND VIMAL KISHOR

Professor, Department of Education, Himachal Pradesh University,
Shimla, Himachal Pradesh (India)

Research Scholar, Department of Education, Himachal Pradesh University,
Shimla, Himachal Pradesh (India)

Abstract:

The investigation aimed at studying the nature of distribution of means of internal assessment scores awarded by different teacher-training institutions in each of the eight courses of Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) Programme run by Himachal Pradesh University for the years 2008, 2009 and 2010. The sample for the study included all the candidates who were enrolled in B.Ed. Programme in different teacher-training institutions affiliated to Himachal Pradesh University and passed their B.Ed. examination during the sessions 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10. The means of internal assessment marks awarded by different teacher-training institutions in each of the eight courses for the three years were computed. The results revealed that (a) The overall tendency of awarding internal assessment marks remained almost the same for all the eight courses in each of the three years; (b) The combined means, standard deviations, minimum scores and maximum scores were very nearly the same for all the eight courses in each of the three years; (c) Only a nominal number of students were awarded an internal assessment score of 13, 14, 15 or 16 and majority of students were awarded a score of 17 or above in each of the three years; (d) The colleges have been too liberal in awarding internal assessment marks to students in each of the three years; and (e) An increasing trend emerged in awarding internal assessment marks from 2008 to 2010.

KEYWORDS:

Internal Assessment, Bachelor of Education Programme, Himachal Pradesh University.

INTRODUCTION

Education is not only concerned with the acquisition of knowledge but also with the development of desired attitudes, interests, skills and various personal and social qualities. External examinations fail to assess the development of these qualities. Even in the area of assessment of acquisition of knowledge, external examinations have come under heavy criticism. One of the ways to overcome the limitations of external examinations is the introduction of internal assessment -- assessment done internally by the teachers teaching in the same institution. In view of its significance all the major Commissions, Committees and Policy Documents in India have stressed the need of introducing the component of internal assessment at all levels of education.

Though internal assessment is a powerful tool in the hands of a teacher, there is a likelihood of its misuse. It becomes invalid if the teacher is biased, has prejudice against a pupil, and shows favouritism or antagonism towards a pupil. On the other hand, the tool of internal assessment is a very good tool if the assessment is made objectively and is free from bias. Researchers and authors have highlighted several limitations in the scheme of internal assessment in India, especially with respect to its operational part (e.g.

Title : A STUDY OF MEAN SCORES OF INTERNAL ASSESSMENT IN BACHELOR OF EDUCATION PROGRAMME IN INDIA
Source:Golden Research Thoughts [2231-5063] SATISH CHAND BHADWAL AND VIMAL KISHOR yr:2013 vol:2 iss:11

Venkubai, 1965; Kamat, 1972; Raina, 1972; Mathur, 1975; Nath, 1980; Gunasekaran and Jayanthi, 1980; Rasool, Sarup and Sharma, 1981; Dabir, 1984; Pallai and Mohan, 1986; Malhotra, Menon, Bedi and Tulsi, 1989; Das, 1991; Rajput and Agarwal, 1998; Bolashetty, 2002; Sarkaria, 2006; Chopra, 2010; Nivedita and Yadav, 2010, Singh, 2010a; Singh, 2010b; Kumar, 2011; Rajendran, Mary, Christy and Mary, 2012). However, nearly all the researchers recommended the introduction of internal assessment component in the scheme of examinations.

Though quite long back 'The Report of the University Education Commission (1948-49)' and 'Education and National Development: Report of the Education Commission, 1964-66, Volume III' strongly proposed that a system of internal assessment based on periodical evaluations should be introduced as a supplement to the external examination at higher education, yet the component of internal assessment could be formally introduced in traditional academic universities in India in the year 2009 only; thanks to the intervention of University Grants Commission (UGC, India). Earlier, it was limited mainly to some private universities, autonomous colleges, agricultural universities and in professional courses like medical & engineering in one form or the other.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The component of internal assessment was introduced in Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) programme run by Himachal Pradesh University initially in the year 2007; in fact 'Practicum' part in each theory paper was replaced by internal assessment component. Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) is a one year teacher-training programme after graduation i.e. Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.), Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) or Bachelor of Commerce (B.Com). If pursued through Distance Education mode, the duration for completing B.Ed. course has been fixed as two years by National Council of Teacher Education (NCTE). In 2009 this component was slightly modified in view of UGC guidelines. After three and half years of introduction of internal assessment scheme in B.Ed. course, the authors sought to answer the research question:

"What has been the nature of distribution of means of internal assessment scores awarded by different teacher-training institutions in each of the eight B.Ed. theory courses during the last three years i.e. 2008, 2009 and 2010?"

The answer to this question may lead to understand the relevance of internal assessment system in Bachelor of Education programme in India in particular and at higher education level in general.

3. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

To study the nature of distribution of means of internal assessment scores awarded by different teacher-training institutions in each of the eight courses of Bachelor of Education Programme run by Himachal Pradesh University during the years 2008, 2009 and 2010.

4. HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

The means of internal assessment scores awarded by different teacher-training institutions in each of the eight courses of Bachelor of Education Programme run by Himachal Pradesh University will be more or less the same for each of the three years i.e. 2008, 2009 and 2010.

5. METHODOLOGY

5.1 Sample

The sample for the study included all the candidates who were enrolled in Bachelor of Education Programme in different teacher-training institutions affiliated to Himachal Pradesh University and passed their B.Ed. examination during the sessions 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10. The details of the candidates taken for the study are given as under:

Year/Session	Number of institutions affiliated to H.P. University	Total number of candidates appeared in examination	Compartment and failure cases	Number of candidates finally included in the sample
2007-2008	67	6700	176	6524
2008-2009	70	6537	97	6440
2009-2010	73	7826	230	7596

It may be pointed out that barring two, all the teacher-training institutions were being managed privately.

5.2 Selection of Courses

According to the curriculum prescribed for B.Ed. programme run by Himachal Pradesh University every student has to pass the following courses:

1. Six compulsory course viz., Education in Emerging Indian Society, Development of Learner and Teaching-Learning Process, Development of Educational System in India, Essentials of Educational Technology, Education for Values, Environment and Human Rights and School Management
2. Any two of the teaching methodology courses viz., Teaching of -- Physical Sciences, Life Sciences, Mathematics, Social Sciences, English, Hindi, Sanskrit, Home Science and Commerce.
3. Work Education and Work Experience (Theory)
4. Work Education and Work Experience (Practicum – Grade is to be awarded after internal evaluation)
5. Skill in Teaching (Two Subjects per Student – to be evaluated by external examiner)

In the present investigation, only eight courses – six compulsory and two teaching subjects – which had both theory as well as internal assessment component were taken for study. All the teaching-subjects were treated at par and were considered as two subjects for the total sample.

5.3 Data Collection

The scores of the students in internal assessment for each of the selected eight B.Ed. courses were noted down from university records for the years 2008, 2009 and 2010. It may be noted that internal assessment score fixed for each course was 20 out of 100.

6. RESULTS

The means of internal assessment marks awarded by different teacher-training institutions in each of the eight B.Ed. courses for the years 2008, 2009 and 2010 were computed. The results are presented separately for the three years as under.

6.1 Distribution of mean scores for internal assessment in each of the eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2008

The means for internal assessment scores awarded by different teacher-training institutions in each of the eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2008 are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Means of internal assessment scores awarded by 67 teacher-training institutions in each of the eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2008

Sr. No.	N	2008								Combined Means for Eight Courses	
		Course-wise Mean Scores									
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII		
1	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	
2	164	18.06	18.01	17.85	18.10	17.99	18.24	18.14	18.21	18.08	
3	89	16.04	16.30	16.71	16.56	16.10	16.19	16.58	16.52	16.38	
4	61	13.11	13.21	13.19	13.31	13.57	13.59	13.62	13.39	13.37	
5	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	

6	89	17.71	18.43	18.14	18.30	18.41	18.44	17.84	17.94	18.15
7	94	16.95	16.73	17.18	16.79	17.12	17.13	16.93	17.11	16.99
8	88	17.89	17.63	17.82	17.76	17.52	17.26	17.81	18.02	17.71
9	83	18.46	17.90	18.09	17.74	17.63	17.92	18.54	17.65	17.99
10	89	16.26	16.49	17.48	16.66	16.57	16.06	17.67	16.97	16.77
11	59	18.81	18.33	18.59	18.35	18.55	18.54	18.89	18.93	18.62
12	90	18.75	18.04	18.32	17.86	16.85	17.62	17.18	17.91	17.82
13	87	18.14	18.04	17.90	17.21	17.80	17.70	17.67	17.58	17.76
14	85	16.44	16.57	16.43	16.88	16.04	16.68	16.89	16.90	16.60
15	87	17.12	16.78	16.86	16.66	16.06	16.22	17.32	16.89	16.74
16	93	17.84	17.44	17.36	17.82	17.81	17.49	17.96	17.67	17.67
17	92	17.67	18.15	17.80	17.97	17.90	18.34	17.83	18.19	17.98
18	89	18.58	18.19	19.00	18.37	18.47	18.79	18.44	18.84	18.59
19	236	17.11	16.87	16.99	17.72	18.36	18.44	17.57	16.05	17.39
20	85	17.43	17.87	17.37	17.01	17.22	17.44	17.83	17.62	17.47
21	93	15.33	14.86	15.65	14.12	15.12	14.86	15.31	15.83	15.14
22	78	16.93	17.74	18.02	18.02	18.07	17.15	17.32	17.91	17.65
23	191	17.47	17.89	17.37	17.68	17.18	18.15	17.63	17.48	17.61
24	85	16.82	17.49	16.89	17.05	17.24	17.15	17.08	16.75	17.06
25	90	16.00	15.85	16.77	16.60	16.51	16.24	16.52	16.43	16.36
26	83	19.43	18.19	18.07	17.31	18.26	18.00	17.63	18.84	18.22
27	172	18.31	18.34	18.37	18.35	18.52	18.22	18.02	18.19	18.29
28	86	18.15	18.46	17.47	17.58	18.17	17.82	17.80	18.34	17.97
29	95	17.75	17.98	18.02	18.46	18.15	17.96	18.08	18.22	18.08
30	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
31	88	17.63	17.55	17.38	17.40	17.44	17.14	17.04	17.43	17.38
32	88	18.27	18.57	18.77	18.31	18.64	18.40	18.55	18.96	18.56
33	99	17.24	17.21	17.59	17.26	17.41	17.12	17.72	17.36	17.36
34	96	17.82	17.44	17.71	17.60	17.86	17.60	17.77	17.55	17.67
35	93	18.08	18.36	18.06	17.96	18.06	18.18	18.40	18.25	18.17
36	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
37	75	17.41	18.05	17.64	17.54	17.68	17.90	18.09	18.12	17.80
38	88	18.85	19.00	18.88	18.88	18.82	18.55	18.75	18.80	18.82
39	85	18.44	18.24	18.63	18.21	18.32	18.54	18.32	18.29	18.37
40	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
41	85	17.03	17.52	17.40	17.64	17.20	17.28	17.76	17.18	17.38
42	103	18.00	18.48	17.75	17.57	18.23	18.98	17.36	17.53	17.99
43	84	16.61	16.21	16.41	16.42	16.09	16.55	16.77	16.46	16.44
44	89	17.41	15.97	17.37	17.22	16.66	16.85	16.92	17.61	17.00
45	82	18.23	18.06	18.13	18.51	17.87	17.46	17.93	18.07	18.03

46	86	16.00	15.59	14.93	16.32	16.40	15.73	16.11	16.63	15.96
47	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
48	90	17.47	17.78	17.08	18.14	17.97	17.76	17.97	18.14	17.79
49	86	18.18	18.01	16.34	17.33	17.53	17.74	17.51	17.96	17.58
50	74	16.44	16.22	16.56	16.64	16.31	16.79	16.87	16.81	16.58
51	86	17.90	17.91	17.66	18.45	18.00	17.54	17.50	17.84	17.85
52	86	15.87	16.47	16.74	15.97	17.03	16.63	16.72	16.74	16.52
53	144	17.84	17.77	17.88	17.68	17.58	17.86	17.76	17.81	17.77
54	84	18.89	17.22	18.97	17.21	18.90	17.17	18.05	18.27	18.09
55	95	16.95	17.44	17.40	16.72	17.28	17.36	17.25	17.29	17.21
56	90	17.53	16.76	17.77	17.04	17.82	18.06	17.80	17.84	17.58
57	89	19.12	18.92	19.05	19.01	18.93	18.91	19.14	19.08	19.02
58	95	17.35	17.50	17.45	17.52	17.45	17.64	17.67	17.66	17.53
59	88	16.79	16.93	15.75	17.01	16.44	16.44	17.43	17.85	16.83
60	70	17.75	18.00	17.91	17.98	17.94	17.88	17.54	18.00	17.88
61	88	18.09	18.03	18.06	18.11	18.20	18.10	18.23	18.19	18.13
62	171	17.79	17.21	17.97	17.50	17.48	18.07	17.61	17.95	17.70
63	171	18.11	17.78	18.15	17.82	17.96	17.90	17.95	17.94	17.95
64	97	17.12	17.59	17.75	17.27	17.45	17.35	17.63	17.77	17.49
65	89	18.47	17.28	17.96	17.40	16.94	16.88	17.13	17.31	17.42
66	89	17.17	17.25	16.80	16.73	17.03	16.20	17.13	16.97	16.91
67	60	17.98	17.70	18.03	18.05	18.01	17.81	17.93	17.98	17.94
68	182	18.06	17.89	17.71	17.73	18.06	17.69	17.59	17.87	17.83
69	87	18.21	16.88	18.62	18.22	15.86	17.91	17.43	17.96	17.64
70	70	16.35	16.41	16.54	16.37	16.42	16.50	16.30	16.51	16.43
71	91	19.62	19.26	19.49	19.58	19.51	19.42	19.49	19.60	19.50
72	83	18.04	18.09	18.07	18.09	18.19	18.33	18.09	18.07	18.12
73	95	16.70	17.08	15.32	15.42	16.69	17.73	17.21	13.93	16.26

00 The B.Ed. Course did not exist in this college for the year 2008

The examination of Table 1 points out that the means of internal assessment scores for the eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2008 appear to be more or less similar. In order to get a more vivid picture of the nature of these means, the results of Table 1 are summarized in Table 2 in the form of combined means, standard deviations for means along with minimum and maximum mean scores for internal assessment in respect of eight B.Ed. courses for 67 colleges for the year 2008.

Table 2: Combined means, standard deviations and minimum & maximum scores for internal assessment in respect of eight B.Ed. courses for 67 colleges for the year 2008

Course	Combined Mean for 67 Colleges	S.D. for 67 Means	Minimum Mean Score for 67 Colleges	Maximum Mean Score for 67 Colleges
I	17.54	1.04	13.11	19.62
II	17.45	1.00	13.21	19.26
III	17.51	1.03	13.19	19.49
IV	17.43	1.00	13.31	19.58
V	17.48	0.99	13.57	19.51
VI	17.49	0.97	13.59	19.42
VII	17.56	0.85	13.62	19.49
VIII	17.58	1.01	13.39	19.60

Table 2 reveals that the combined means, standard deviations, minimum scores and maximum scores were very nearly the same for all the eight B.Ed. courses in respect of 67 teacher-training colleges for the year 2008. This indicates that the overall tendency of awarding internal assessment marks remained almost the same for all the eight B.Ed. courses during the year 2008. This is further evident from the following observation.

Statistic for 67 Colleges	Minimum for Eight Courses	Maximum for Eight Courses
Mean	17.43	17.58
Standard Deviation	0.85	1.04
Minimum Mean Score	13.11	13.62
Maximum Mean Score	19.26	19.62

It is evident that all the statistics for the year 2008 given above are very near to each other indicating once again that overall tendency of awarding internal assessment marks remained almost the same for all the eight B.Ed. courses during the year 2008.

Further, the minimum and maximum mean scores for eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2008 given in Table 2 reveal that the mean scores for the eight B.Ed. courses are distributed over a range of 5.83 to 6.51. However, this range does not present a clear picture of the distribution of mean internal assessment scores. This becomes obvious from the frequency distribution of mean scores for eight courses for the year 2008 given in Table 3.

Table 3: Frequency distribution of mean scores for eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2008

Course	Year 2008						
	13.00-14.00	14.01-15.00	15.01-16.00	16.01-17.00	17.01-18.00	18.01-19.00	19.01-20.00
I	1	0	4	12	26	21	3
II	1	1	3	13	27	21	1
III	1	1	3	12	28	20	2
IV	1	1	2	12	32	17	2
V	1	0	2	14	29	20	1
VI	1	1	1	13	32	18	1
VII	1	0	1	10	39	14	2
VIII	2	0	1	13	30	19	2
Total	9	4	17	99	243	150	14

Table 3 clearly reveals that out of 536 mean scores only 30 fall up to 16 and rest show a value of 16.01 or above. In fact, majority of mean scores (73.32%) fall between 17.01 and 19.00. This indicates that only a nominal number of students were awarded an internal assessment score of 13, 14, 15 or 16 and majority of students were awarded a score of 17 or above in all the eight B.Ed. courses. Hence, it may be inferred that the colleges have been too liberal in awarding internal assessment marks to students in all the eight B.Ed. courses during the year 2008.

Hence, the hypothesis that “The means of internal assessment scores awarded by different teacher-training institutions in the eight B.Ed. courses will be more or less the same for the year 2008” was accepted.

6.2 Distribution of mean scores for internal assessment in each of the eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2009

The means for internal assessment scores awarded by different teacher-training institutions in each of the eight B.Ed. courses for the years 2009 are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Means of internal assessment scores awarded by 71 teacher-training institutions in each of the eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2009

Sr. No.	N	2009								Combined Means for Eight Courses	
		Course-wise Mean Scores									
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII		
1	80	17.96	18.01	18.38	17.73	17.76	18.42	18.40	17.98	18.08	
2	137	16.73	16.43	16.84	16.59	16.94	16.78	16.53	16.84	16.71	
3	71	17.81	17.97	17.61	17.38	17.69	17.69	18.01	17.64	17.73	
4	63	18.28	18.39	18.49	18.47	18.52	18.52	18.50	18.61	18.47	
5	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	
6	72	18.61	18.59	18.38	18.80	18.36	18.68	18.43	18.50	18.54	
7	70	16.41	16.82	16.68	16.88	16.95	16.52	16.71	16.78	16.72	
8	67	17.77	17.64	17.71	17.76	17.76	17.62	18.00	17.89	17.77	
9	67	19.08	19.07	18.02	17.83	18.20	18.46	18.97	18.80	18.55	
10	81	16.07	16.23	16.45	16.48	16.66	15.75	16.51	16.20	16.29	
11	55	18.34	18.25	18.45	18.29	18.29	18.41	18.58	18.49	18.39	
12	80	17.91	18.02	18.32	18.43	17.65	18.23	17.80	18.07	18.05	
13	80	17.52	15.83	17.06	17.45	16.66	16.88	17.12	16.16	16.84	
14	87	15.03	16.12	16.82	17.88	16.19	16.20	16.78	16.85	16.48	
15	62	18.20	18.29	18.08	18.20	18.09	18.40	18.11	18.20	18.20	
16	163	17.90	17.79	17.67	17.88	17.88	17.90	17.95	17.83	17.85	
17	64	17.50	17.12	17.25	17.81	17.21	17.59	17.48	17.68	17.46	
18	86	18.60	18.50	18.77	18.67	18.75	18.80	18.72	18.81	18.70	
19	210	16.86	17.70	18.02	18.56	18.32	18.05	17.88	15.67	17.63	
20	76	17.38	17.23	17.48	17.59	17.47	17.48	17.46	17.31	17.43	
21	90	17.47	17.55	18.13	17.43	17.24	17.50	17.45	17.26	17.50	
22	65	17.83	18.06	18.04	18.00	18.16	18.04	18.01	17.84	18.00	
23	148	17.09	17.47	17.22	16.18	16.86	17.24	16.82	16.82	16.96	
24	53	18.39	18.52	18.45	18.60	18.64	18.75	18.60	19.05	18.63	
25	68	16.67	16.44	16.66	16.94	16.75	16.38	16.79	16.70	16.67	
26	78	18.25	18.37	18.23	17.76	18.10	18.07	18.21	18.19	18.15	
27	150	17.14	17.44	17.44	17.20	17.42	17.56	17.84	17.87	17.49	
28	69	18.02	17.30	18.53	18.00	17.91	18.73	18.59	17.76	18.11	
29	88	17.94	18.01	18.19	17.96	17.89	17.93	18.14	17.96	18.00	
30	86	18.27	18.18	18.48	18.12	18.55	18.30	18.40	18.59	18.36	

31	134	17.41	17.45	17.38	17.40	17.43	17.35	17.41	17.38	17.40
32	88	16.81	17.62	17.61	17.88	17.90	17.94	17.36	17.51	17.58
33	85	18.23	18.30	18.35	18.07	18.40	18.17	18.48	18.30	18.29
34	82	18.14	18.12	17.90	18.15	18.12	17.89	17.97	17.93	18.03
35	73	18.24	18.10	18.53	18.42	18.32	18.20	18.27	18.39	18.31
36	58	19.79	19.41	19.53	19.58	19.48	19.22	19.43	19.60	19.51
37	67	16.95	17.67	17.62	17.59	16.80	17.07	17.35	17.83	17.36
38	81	18.38	18.54	18.37	18.51	18.65	18.54	18.66	18.71	18.55
39	85	19.44	19.14	19.14	19.34	19.31	19.30	19.21	19.25	19.27
40	65	16.76	16.73	17.15	16.87	16.95	16.96	17.49	17.55	17.06
41	57	19.07	18.78	18.31	18.40	18.42	18.54	19.01	18.87	18.68
42	112	18.41	19.13	19.15	19.32	18.77	19.39	19.17	19.56	19.11
43	88	17.63	17.63	17.53	17.71	17.51	17.80	17.67	17.76	17.66
44	78	16.14	15.79	15.28	16.37	16.06	15.98	16.43	16.84	16.11
45	73	17.58	17.94	17.30	17.63	17.08	18.68	17.34	18.28	17.73
46	71	16.80	18.56	16.76	17.56	16.63	16.84	17.36	17.64	17.27
47	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
48	77	18.58	18.53	18.02	17.58	17.77	17.37	18.45	18.22	18.06
49	88	17.15	17.70	17.27	16.62	16.80	17.29	17.21	17.94	17.25
50	61	16.42	16.40	16.98	17.03	16.21	16.86	16.77	16.85	16.69
51	87	17.36	16.26	16.26	18.64	17.03	17.03	16.85	17.04	17.06
52	71	16.59	16.11	17.07	15.64	16.87	17.53	16.66	16.70	16.65
53	109	17.80	17.66	17.93	17.94	18.31	17.37	18.17	18.24	17.93
54	92	18.42	18.83	18.60	18.48	19.03	18.78	18.78	18.81	18.72
55	87	19.41	19.39	19.44	19.21	19.26	19.42	19.34	19.27	19.34
56	82	16.87	16.37	17.71	17.21	17.12	17.56	17.31	17.15	17.16
57	87	18.11	18.28	18.50	18.14	18.28	18.55	19.31	19.17	18.54
58	91	17.84	17.86	17.81	17.79	18.28	17.91	17.96	18.21	17.96
59	82	18.82	18.78	19.01	18.57	18.42	18.12	18.76	18.93	18.68
60	73	18.36	18.49	18.38	18.41	18.39	18.38	18.36	18.49	18.41
61	130	17.19	17.19	17.19	17.19	17.19	17.19	17.19	17.19	17.19
62	140	18.22	17.84	17.95	17.63	17.79	18.26	18.05	18.09	17.98
63	169	18.09	17.97	18.28	18.46	18.23	17.76	18.52	18.38	18.21
64	92	15.47	15.08	16.39	15.54	16.39	15.16	16.21	16.10	15.79
65	147	17.91	17.39	17.72	17.45	17.61	17.25	17.94	17.80	17.63
66	150	17.89	16.76	16.90	16.97	16.79	16.60	17.28	17.25	17.06
67	62	17.33	17.66	17.54	17.85	17.01	17.45	17.40	17.56	17.48
68	164	18.10	17.59	18.29	17.08	17.66	18.07	17.76	17.93	17.81
69	74	18.10	18.17	17.29	17.75	18.06	17.39	18.48	18.66	17.99
70	61	18.14	17.98	18.16	18.27	18.04	18.00	18.19	17.96	18.09
71	145	18.28	17.96	18.14	17.35	18.05	17.52	18.31	18.00	17.95
72	78	18.03	18.02	17.89	17.58	18.01	18.12	17.96	18.01	17.95
73	78	16.03	16.55	14.60	12.62	15.89	16.42	15.58	14.29	15.25

00 The B.Ed. Course did not exist in this college for the year 2009

The examination of Table 4 indicates that the means of internal assessment scores for the eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2009 appear to be more or less similar. In order to get a more comprehensible picture of the nature of these means, the results of Table 4 are summarized in Table 5 in the form of combined means, standard deviations for means along with minimum and maximum mean scores for internal assessment in respect of eight B.Ed. courses for 71 colleges for the year 2009.

Table 5: Combined means, standard deviations and minimum & maximum scores for internal assessment marks in respect of eight B.Ed. courses for 71 colleges for the year 2009

Course	Combined Mean for 71 Colleges	S.D. for 71 Means	Minimum Mean Score for 71 Colleges	Maximum Mean Score for 71 Colleges
I	17.71	0.91	15.03	19.79
II	17.71	0.92	15.08	19.41
III	17.76	0.87	14.60	19.53
IV	17.70	1.00	12.62	19.58
V	17.71	0.81	15.89	19.48
VI	17.75	0.86	15.16	19.42
VII	17.86	0.83	15.58	19.43
VIII	17.83	0.94	14.29	19.60

Table 5 reveals that the combined means, standard deviations, minimum scores and maximum scores were very nearly the same for all the eight B.Ed. courses in respect of 71 teacher-training colleges for the year 2009. This explains that the overall tendency of awarding internal assessment marks remained almost the same for all the eight B.Ed. courses during the year 2009. This is further apparent from the following observation.

Statistic for 71 Colleges	Minimum for the Eight Courses	Maximum for the Eight Courses
Mean	17.70	17.86
Standard Deviation	0.81	1.00
Minimum Mean Score	12.62	15.89
Maximum Mean Score	19.41	19.79

It is obvious that all the statistics for the year 2009 given above are very near to each other indicating once again that overall tendency of awarding internal assessment marks remained almost the same for all the eight B.Ed. courses during the year 2009.

Further, the minimum and maximum mean scores for eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2009 given in Table 5 reveal that the mean scores for the eight B.Ed. courses are distributed over a range of 3.59 to 6.96. However, this range again does not present a clear picture of the distribution of mean internal assessment scores. This becomes obvious from the frequency distribution of mean scores for eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2009 given in Table 6.

Table 6: Frequency distribution of mean scores for eight B.ED. courses for the year 2009

Course	2009						
	13.00-14.00	14.01-15.00	15.01-16.00	16.01-17.00	17.01-18.00	18.01-19.00	19.01-20.00
I	0	0	2	14	24	26	5
II	0	0	3	12	26	25	5
III	0	1	1	10	26	28	5
IV	1	0	2	9	34	21	4
V	0	0	1	16	23	27	4
VI	0	0	3	10	28	26	4
VII	0	0	1	11	26	27	6
VIII	0	1	1	11	28	24	6
Total	1	2	14	93	215	204	39

Table 6 clearly shows that out of 568 mean scores only 17 fall up to 16 and rest show a value of 16.01 or above. In fact, majority of mean scores (73.77%) fall between 17.01 and 19.00. This indicates that only a nominal number of students were awarded an internal assessment score of 13, 14, 15 or 16 and majority of students were awarded a score of 17 or above in all the eight B.Ed. courses. Hence, it may be inferred that the colleges have been too liberal in awarding internal assessment marks to students during the year 2009.

Hence, the hypothesis that “The means of internal assessment scores awarded by different teacher-training institutions in the eight B.Ed. courses will be more or less the same for the year 2009” was accepted.

6.3 Distribution of mean scores for internal assessment in each of the eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2010

The means for internal assessment scores awarded by different teacher-training institutions in each of the eight B.Ed. courses for the years 2010 are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Means of internal assessment scores awarded by 73 teacher-training institutions in each of the eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2010

Sr. No.	N	2010								Combined Means for Eight Courses	
		Course-wise Mean Scores									
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII		
1	83	18.37	18.42	18.39	18.39	18.33	18.40	18.26	18.16	18.34	
2	179	18.56	18.47	18.35	18.50	18.60	18.55	18.35	18.48	18.48	
3	98	18.30	17.97	17.94	18.09	17.68	18.01	18.33	18.17	18.06	
4	87	19.00	18.73	18.70	18.73	18.77	18.70	18.86	18.79	18.79	
5	86	16.29	16.25	16.22	16.16	16.11	16.65	16.18	16.31	16.27	
6	94	19.00	18.53	19.00	18.23	18.36	18.70	18.34	18.34	18.56	
7	74	16.95	16.56	16.94	16.79	17.08	16.62	17.16	17.18	16.91	
8	93	18.21	18.24	18.47	18.27	18.32	18.50	18.41	18.44	18.36	
9	78	18.76	18.75	17.66	17.76	18.11	18.21	18.98	18.16	18.30	
10	88	17.26	16.39	17.00	16.65	17.03	17.29	17.23	17.43	17.04	
11	58	17.98	17.94	17.98	18.13	17.94	17.89	18.06	18.29	18.03	
12	100	17.99	18.15	17.75	18.40	17.97	17.88	18.10	18.03	18.03	
13	80	16.53	13.75	16.40	16.95	15.22	15.36	15.81	14.56	15.57	
14	98	17.10	17.07	16.47	17.55	17.32	17.34	17.38	17.57	17.22	
15	63	18.50	18.88	18.74	18.88	18.80	18.55	18.80	18.69	18.73	
16	189	17.44	17.58	16.80	16.42	17.70	17.08	17.44	17.02	17.18	
17	82	17.82	17.86	17.79	17.84	17.76	17.75	17.85	18.03	17.84	
18	87	18.93	19.02	18.98	18.70	18.94	18.91	18.90	18.89	18.91	
19	197	17.05	17.09	17.52	17.97	16.64	17.88	16.96	16.21	17.17	
20	73	17.35	16.49	16.94	16.52	17.41	17.69	16.91	17.05	17.04	
21	95	16.18	15.90	16.57	16.13	16.15	16.05	16.47	16.80	16.28	
22	73	17.94	17.95	17.84	18.17	18.20	17.87	18.09	17.90	18.00	
23	183	17.32	17.68	17.02	17.69	17.55	17.56	17.43	17.28	17.44	
24	75	18.30	18.02	18.18	18.40	18.24	18.54	18.22	18.46	18.30	
25	87	16.36	16.00	15.73	16.49	16.39	15.56	16.43	15.74	16.09	
26	88	16.32	16.31	16.65	17.26	16.20	17.57	16.90	17.48	16.84	
27	177	17.72	17.48	17.62	17.09	17.84	17.72	17.86	17.61	17.62	
28	88	17.77	17.79	18.17	16.82	18.02	18.22	17.94	18.44	17.90	
29	93	18.51	18.90	18.26	18.45	18.13	18.27	18.49	18.39	18.42	
30	100	18.10	18.09	17.99	17.87	18.18	18.16	18.52	18.89	18.22	

31	177	18.18	17.93	18.02	18.06	18.07	18.12	18.19	18.29	18.11
32	88	18.80	19.34	19.23	19.37	18.97	19.06	18.45	18.34	18.95
33	98	18.61	18.54	18.30	18.50	18.51	18.53	18.44	18.52	18.49
34	84	17.94	17.32	17.76	17.85	17.59	17.78	17.95	17.95	17.77
35	97	18.15	17.86	17.92	17.90	18.08	18.13	17.90	18.16	18.01
36	63	19.96	19.96	19.95	19.92	19.93	19.69	19.77	19.96	19.89
37	93	17.76	18.59	18.01	18.07	18.22	18.10	18.43	18.36	18.19
38	89	18.96	18.78	18.96	18.69	18.60	19.16	18.78	19.13	18.88
39	95	19.49	18.97	18.86	18.73	19.15	19.17	19.15	19.43	19.12
40	77	16.46	15.48	15.46	16.28	16.81	15.31	15.70	16.05	15.94
41	98	18.50	18.01	17.75	17.98	17.98	17.84	18.09	18.42	18.07
42	104	18.99	18.89	18.97	18.60	19.09	18.52	18.88	18.97	18.86
43	81	17.34	17.50	17.35	17.40	17.39	17.50	17.38	17.51	17.42
44	76	17.60	17.73	17.30	17.28	17.73	17.76	17.67	17.40	17.56
45	81	17.32	17.44	17.04	16.49	17.69	17.29	17.09	17.72	17.26
46	94	17.14	17.95	17.42	17.58	16.68	16.79	17.11	16.87	17.19
47	80	18.18	18.21	18.31	18.25	18.26	18.22	18.32	18.40	18.27
48	89	18.15	18.24	18.32	18.49	18.15	18.13	18.52	18.37	18.30
49	98	16.68	17.07	16.46	16.37	16.39	16.77	16.60	16.98	16.67
50	66	17.37	16.30	17.19	17.48	17.22	16.68	17.60	17.60	17.18
51	84	17.86	18.54	18.11	18.73	17.90	18.16	18.30	18.16	18.22
52	89	17.21	17.01	17.50	17.11	17.29	16.86	17.10	17.35	17.18
53	159	18.15	17.86	18.11	17.91	18.15	17.98	18.18	18.06	18.05
54	96	19.28	19.06	19.41	19.34	19.61	19.57	19.43	19.48	19.40
55	97	18.26	18.34	18.42	18.05	18.14	17.88	18.02	18.16	18.16
56	100	16.86	16.28	15.96	15.51	16.20	16.32	16.43	16.36	16.24
57	78	18.97	19.11	18.91	19.03	18.87	19.20	19.20	19.25	19.07
58	98	17.73	17.68	17.96	17.94	17.70	18.10	17.98	17.77	17.86
59	83	18.28	18.39	18.27	18.19	18.07	18.13	18.15	18.14	18.20
60	77	18.25	18.42	18.42	18.29	18.50	18.51	18.49	18.48	18.42
61	184	17.36	17.39	17.35	17.40	17.59	17.55	17.48	17.65	17.47
62	181	17.50	17.46	18.43	18.39	17.81	17.59	18.02	17.94	17.89
63	193	17.15	17.13	17.15	17.32	17.24	17.00	17.21	17.37	17.20
64	99	17.69	17.59	17.48	17.14	17.38	17.29	17.73	17.53	17.48
65	181	18.02	17.77	17.84	17.56	17.71	17.63	17.91	17.80	17.78
66	189	16.87	16.94	17.01	17.62	17.23	16.69	16.91	17.58	17.11
67	86	15.40	15.58	14.88	15.06	15.18	15.03	15.08	15.02	15.15
68	159	17.21	17.05	17.02	16.57	16.58	16.76	17.33	17.55	17.01
69	84	17.00	17.23	17.22	17.02	17.28	17.39	17.50	17.54	17.27
70	57	18.10	18.07	18.10	17.89	18.08	18.01	18.07	18.01	18.04
71	186	19.25	18.84	18.66	18.82	18.91	19.04	19.01	18.98	18.94
72	84	18.32	18.38	18.35	18.29	18.05	18.28	18.21	18.32	18.27
73	78	15.66	17.46	16.62	14.52	14.94	17.62	16.06	15.97	16.11

The examination of Table 7 points out that the means of internal assessment scores for the eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2010 appear to be more or less similar. In order to get a more vivid picture of the nature of these means, the results of Table 7 are summarized in Table 8 in the form of combined means, standard deviations for means along with minimum and maximum mean scores for internal assessment in respect of eight B.Ed. courses for 73 colleges for the year 2010.

Table 8: Combined means, standard deviations and minimum & maximum scores for internal assessment marks in respect of eight B.Ed. courses for 73 colleges for the year 2010

Course	Combined Mean for 73 Colleges	S.D. for 73 Means	Minimum Mean Score for 73 Colleges	Maximum Mean Score for 73 Colleges
I	17.81	0.91	15.40	19.96
II	17.73	1.05	13.75	19.96
III	17.72	0.95	14.88	19.95
IV	17.70	1.00	14.52	19.92
V	17.72	0.97	14.94	19.93
VI	17.76	0.96	15.03	19.69
VII	17.81	0.92	15.08	19.77
VIII	17.83	0.98	14.56	19.96

Table 8 reveals that the combined means, standard deviations, minimum scores and maximum scores were very nearly the same for all the eight B.Ed. courses in respect of 73 teacher-training colleges for the year 2010. This indicates that the overall tendency of awarding internal assessment marks remained almost the same for all the eight B.Ed. courses during the year 2010. This is further evident from the following observation.

Statistic for 73 Colleges	Minimum for the Eight Courses	Maximum for the Eight Courses
Mean	17.70	17.83
Standard Deviation	0.91	1.05
Minimum Mean Score	13.75	15.40
Maximum Mean Score	19.69	19.96

It is evident that all the statistics for the year 2010 given above are very near to each other indicating once again that overall tendency of awarding internal assessment marks remained almost the same for all the eight B.Ed. courses during the year 2010.

Further, the minimum and maximum mean scores for eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2010 given in Table 8 reveal that the mean scores for the eight B.ED. courses are distributed over a range of 4.56 to 6.21. However, this range yet again does not present a clear picture of the distribution of mean internal assessment scores. This becomes obvious from the frequency distribution of mean scores for eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2010 given in Table 9.

Table 9: Frequency distribution of mean scores for eight B.Ed. courses for the year 2010

Course	2010						
	13.00-14.00	14.01-15.00	15.01-16.00	16.01-17.00	17.01-18.00	18.01-19.00	19.01-20.00
I	0	0	2	11	27	29	4
II	1	0	4	8	29	26	5
III	0	1	3	11	27	28	3
IV	0	1	2	13	25	28	4
V	0	1	2	10	27	29	4
VI	0	0	4	11	25	26	7
VII	0	0	3	10	23	32	5
VIII	0	1	3	7	24	33	5
Total	1	4	23	81	207	231	37

Table 9 clearly reveals that out of 584 mean scores only 28 fall up to 16 and rest show a value of 16.01 or above. In fact, majority of mean scores (75.00%) fall between 17.01 and 19.00. This indicates that only a nominal number of students were awarded an internal assessment score of 13, 14, 15 or 16 and majority of students were awarded a score of 17 or above in all the eight B.Ed. courses. Hence, it may be inferred that the colleges have been too liberal in awarding internal assessment marks to students in all the eight B.Ed. courses during the year 2010.

Hence, the hypothesis that “The means of internal assessment scores awarded by different teacher-training institutions in the eight B.Ed. courses will be more or less the same for the year 2010” was accepted.

7. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The results with respect to the nature of distribution of means of internal assessment scores in each of the eight B.Ed. courses for the years 2008, 2009 and 2010 may be summarized as under:

1. The overall tendency of awarding internal assessment marks remained almost the same for all the eight B.Ed. courses in each of the three years.
2. The combined means, standard deviations, minimum scores and maximum scores were very nearly the same for all the eight B.Ed. courses in each of the three years.
3. Only a nominal number of students were awarded an internal assessment score of 13, 14, 15 or 16 and majority of students were awarded a score of 17 or above in each of the eight B.Ed. courses during each of the three years.
4. The colleges have been too liberal in awarding internal assessment marks to students in each of the eight B.Ed. courses during each of the three years.
5. An increasing trend emerged in awarding internal assessment marks from 2008 to 2010.

The fact that teacher-training institutions have been excessively liberal in awarding internal assessment scores and the scores generally fall towards the higher end of the scale may be attributed to host of factors, such as, the prescribed internal assessment policy is hazy and subjective; there is absence of moderation policy either at institutional or university level; the teachers or institutions are not answerable for under or over marking; there is no provision of periodic evaluation of the scheme and perhaps the true spirit of the concept of internal assessment is not understood by the teachers and the institutions.

In this context, it is meaningful to have an idea of the internal assessment scheme introduced in Himachal Pradesh University through an official notification which is given as under.

Himachal Pradesh University in its notification vide letter No. 6-38/2005(FSS)HPU(Acad) dated November 20, 2009 approved and implemented the introduction of Internal Assessment in Post Graduate courses from the academic session 2010-2011. The details of which given as under:

- 1(a).20% of the maximum marks in each paper for internal assessment (excluding practical examination marks).
- 1(b).Remaining 80% for the examination (excluding practical examination marks).

The duration and other existing scheme of examination will remain unchanged.

- 2.The 20% assigned to internal assessment to be sub-divided as under:

(a)Weightage for attendance: (5 marks)

(i)Upto 75% including condonation of lectures by the competent authority as per provision under

Ordinances	:	Zero
(ii) Without condonation of lectures up to 75%	:	1 Mark
(iii) 76% to 80% lectures	:	2 Marks
(iv) 81% to 85% lectures	:	3 Marks
(v) 86% to 90% lectures	:	4 Marks
(vi) 91% and above	:	5 Marks

(b)Remaining 15 marks will be awarded by the concerned chairpersons on the recommendation of Departmental Council on the basis of the performance of the candidate in any one of the following:

(i) House Examination, (ii) Assignment Writing, (iii) Seminar Presentations

As a matter of fact, it is only the teachers who assign internal assessment scores to the students in their courses and Chairpersons simply forward them to the examination branch making it an individual affair. It seems unbelievable but the fact is that in nearly all privately managed teacher-training institutions the teachers do not play a role in assigning internal assessment to their students and it is the Chairman of the Management Committee who decides and sends the internal assessment scores to the university examination branch.

Another observation of the study was that of an increasing trend in awarding internal assessment marks from 2008 to 2010. The Table 10 below provides an indication of this trend.

Table 10: Trend of mean scores over three years for selected colleges

S. No.	College S. No.	No. of Students (2008)	No. of Students (2009)	No. of Students (2010)	Internal Assessment Mean (2008)	Internal Assessment Mean (2009)	Internal Assessment Mean (2010)	Trend
1	1	00	80	83	00	18.08	18.34	+
2	3	89	71	98	16.38	17.73	18.06	+
3	4	61	63	87	13.37	18.47	18.79	+
4	6	89	72	94	18.15	18.54	18.56	+
5	8	88	67	93	17.71	17.77	18.36	+
6	12	90	80	100	17.82	18.05	18.03	+
7	14	85	87	98	16.60	16.48	17.22	+
8	15	87	62	63	16.74	18.20	18.73	+
9	18	89	86	87	18.59	18.70	18.91	+
10	22	78	65	73	17.65	18.00	18.00	+
11	29	95	88	93	18.08	18.00	18.42	+
12	31	88	134	177	17.38	17.40	18.11	+
13	33	99	85	98	17.36	18.29	18.49	+
14	36	00	58	63	00	19.51	19.89	+
15	39	85	85	95	18.37	19.27	19.12	+
16	48	90	77	89	17.79	18.06	18.30	+
17	50	74	61	66	16.58	16.69	17.18	+
18	52	86	71	89	16.52	16.65	17.18	+
19	53	144	109	159	17.77	17.93	18.05	+
20	54	84	92	96	18.09	18.72	19.40	+
21	60	70	73	77	17.88	18.41	18.42	+
22	65	89	147	181	17.42	17.63	17.78	+
23	66	89	150	189	16.91	17.06	17.11	+
24	2	164	137	179	18.08	16.71	18.48	++
25	10	89	81	88	16.77	16.29	17.04	++
26	32	88	88	88	18.56	17.58	18.95	++
27	37	75	67	93	17.80	17.36	18.19	++
28	38	88	81	89	18.82	18.55	18.88	++
29	44	89	78	76	17.00	16.11	17.56	++
30	51	86	87	84	17.85	17.06	18.22	++
31	57	89	87	78	19.02	18.54	19.07	++
32	72	83	78	84	18.12	17.95	18.27	++

+ The colleges showing regular increase in mean scores over three years or since starting year.

++ The colleges showing highest mean score in 2010.

It is revealed from Table 10 that as many as 23 colleges show a regular increasing trend in internal assessment mean scores from 2008 to 2010; whereas 9 colleges show a lower mean score in 2009 compared to 2008 but shoot up to highest mean score in 2010.

The reason for the upward trend in marking from 2008 to 2010 may be attributed to the smartness of colleges' managements. In the early one or two years of the introduction of internal

assessment component, the colleges were cautious in excessive over marking. But over the years they came to know that they were accountable to none and there was no objection from any quarter with respect to their approach of awarding internal assessment scores. Simultaneously they also observed what other colleges were doing in this regard. These observations encouraged them for over marking. We have deliberately used the term managements in place of teachers. It has been pointed out earlier that barring two, all the seventy one teacher-training institutions are being managed privately. We have first hand information that in private colleges, barring exceptions, it is not the teachers but managements who decide how much internal assessment is to be awarded to students.

This scenario in respect of internal assessment in Bachelor of Education programme generates negative attitude and mistrust towards the operational part of internal assessment and raises questions regarding its relevance. Immediate steps need to be taken to restore confidence in internal assessment system.

REFERENCES

Bolashetty, Shripad S. (2002). Secondary Teacher Education in Karnataka State: Origin, Growth and Present Status. *Indian Educational Review*, 38(2): 14-32.

Chopra, Vanita (2010). Commitment, Professional Ethics and Competency based Teacher-Education -- Problems and Issues concerning Quality Higher Education. *MERI Journal of Education*, V (I): 101-109.

Dabir, P.M. (1984). A Critical Analysis of the Marks at the B.Ed. Examination to Study the Trends and Reliabilities of the Assessment. Ph.D. Edu., Nag. U. In *Fourth Survey of Research in Education (1983-1988)*, Vol. I. Ed., M.B. Buch (1991). New Delhi: National Council for Educational Research and Training, Sri Aurobindo Marg, p. 884, Study No. 1004.

Das, R. (1991). A Comparative Study of the Evaluative Procedures of the Secondary Teacher-Training Institutions in Gujarat State. M.Phil. Edu. The Maharaja Sayajirao Univ. of Baroda. In *Fifth Survey of Research in Education (1988-1992)* Vol. II. New Delhi: National Council for Educational Research and Training, Sri Aurobindo Marg, p. 1443.

Education and National Development: Report of the Education Commission, Volume III, Chapter XI: Higher Education, 1964-66. New Delhi: Ministry of Education, Government of India. First Edition 1966, Reprint Edition May 1970 by National Council of Educational Research and Training, New Delhi, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016.

Gunasekaran, K. and Jayanthi, P. (1980). A Study of the Continuous Internal Assessment and the University Examination Marks of the Undergraduate Semester Courses (1976-77 Batch). Examination Reform Unit, Madras U. In *Third Survey of Research in Education (1978-1983)*, Ed., M.B. Buch (1987). New Delhi: National Council for Educational Research and Training, Sri Aurobindo Marg, pp. 733-734, Study No. 1048.

Kamat, A.R. (1972). Internal and External Assessment. In R.H. Dave and P.M. Patel (Ed.), *Educational Evaluation and Assessment*. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training, pp. 1-69.

Kumar, Rajender (2011). Quality Teacher Education in 21st Century. *Educational Research*, Vol. IX, p. 150. Retrieved from www.sldaveducation.org

Malhotra, M.M., Menon, P.N., Bedi, S.P. and Tulsi, P.K. (1989). Status Study of Internal Assessment of Students in the Polytechnics of Haryana. Independent Study. Chandigarh: Technical Teachers' Training Institute. In *Fifth Survey of Research in Education (1988-1992)*, Vol. II. New Delhi: National Council for Educational Research and Training, Sri Aurobindo Marg, p. 1781.

Mathur, S.S. (1975). U.G.C. Plan of Action: A Critical Review. In A.K. Gupta (Ed.), *Examination Reforms: Directions, Research and Implications*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., p. 50.

Nath, B. (1980). University Examination -- An Analytical Study of the Conduct of Pre-University Degree and Master Degree Examinations of Gauhati University. Ph.D. Edu., Gau. U. In *Third Survey of Research in Education (1978-1983)*, Ed., M.B. Buch (1987). New Delhi: National Council for Educational Research and Training, Sri Aurobindo Marg, p. 739, Study No. 1060.

Nivedita and Yadav, Sonia (2010). Evaluation System in Teacher Education in India. *Edutracks*, 9 (6): 32-33.

Pallai, J.K., and Mohan, S. (1986). Working of the Semester System -- A Review. Dept. of Education, MKU. In *Fourth Survey of Research in Education (1983-1988)*, Vol. II. Ed., M.B. Buch (1991). New Delhi: National Council for Educational Research and Training, Sri Aurobindo Marg, p. 1375, Study No. 1563.

Raina, T.N. (1972). Relationship between External Examination Marks and Internal Assessment of M.Ed. Students. In R.H. Dave and P.M. Patel (Ed.), *Educational Evaluation and Assessment*. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training, pp. 70-80.

Rajendran, S., Mary, J. Sahaya, Christy, D. and Mary, A. Rosaly Therese (2012). Correlation between Internal Assessment and External Assessment of B.Ed. Students". Edutracks, 11 (5): 32-36.

Rajput, Sarla and Agarwal, Mamta (1998). How well are Teachers Aware about Continuous Evaluation: A Study. Indian Educational Review, 33 (1): 132-142. In Indian Educational Abstracts, Vol. 1, No. 2, July 2001, NCERT, New Delhi, pp. 39-40.

Rasool, G., Sarup, R. and Sharma, N.R. (1981). A Comparative Study of Internal and External Awards at the Postgraduate Level in Jammu University. Ph.D. Edu., Jammu U. In Third Survey of Research in Education (1978-1983), Ed., M.B. Buch (1987). New Delhi: National Council for Educational Research and Training, Sri Aurobindo Marg, pp. 739-740, Study No. 1062.

Report of the Secondary Education Commission, Chapter XI, October 1952 to June 1953 (1953). New Delhi: Ministry of Education, Government of India.

Sarkaria, Maninder Singh (2006). Perceptions of Teacher-Educators towards Evaluation and Examination System of ETT Course in DIETS of Punjab. Journal of All India Association for Educational Research, 18 (1 & 2): 88-91.

Singh, Sunil Kumar (2010a). Revamping Teacher Education for Professionalism. University News, 48 (20): 7-12.

Singh, Sunil Kumar (2010b). Higher Education in India: Grassroots' Reality and Challenges. University News, 48 (11): 4-7 and 14.

Venkubai, J. (1965). Internal Assessment: Use and Misuse. Directorate of Higher Education, Hyderabad. In Third Survey of Research in Education (1978-1983), Ed., M.B. Buch (1987). New Delhi: National Council for Educational Research and Training, Sri Aurobindo Marg, p. 748, Study No. 1081.



SATISH CHAND BHADWAL

Professor, Department of Education, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh (India)

Publish Research Article International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished research paper. Summary of Research Project, Theses, Books and Books Review of publication, you will be pleased to know that our journals are

Associated and Indexed, India

- ★ International Scientific Journal Consortium Scientific
- ★ OPEN J-GATE

Associated and Indexed, USA

- EBSCO
- Index Copernicus
- Publication Index
- Academic Journal Database
- Contemporary Research Index
- Academic Paper Database
- Digital Journals Database
- Current Index to Scholarly Journals
- Elite Scientific Journal Archive
- Directory Of Academic Resources
- Scholar Journal Index
- Recent Science Index
- Scientific Resources Database

Golden Research Thoughts
258/34 Raviwar Peth Solapur-413005, Maharashtra
Contact-9595359435
E-Mail-ayisrj@yahoo.in/ayisrj2011@gmail.com
Website : www.isrj.net