INTERNATIONAL

RESEARCHERS

PERCEPTIONS OF PAPER SETTERS AND PAPER EVALUATORS REGARDING QUALITY OF QUESTION PAPERS OF EXAMINATION BOARDS IN PUNJAB PAKISTAN

Anwar Farooq, Dr Muhammad Azeem

www.iresearcher.org

THE INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL "INTERNATIONAL RESEACHERS"

www.iresearcher.org

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCHERS is peer-reviewed, supported by rigorous processes of criterion-referenced article ranking and qualitative commentary, ensuring that only intellectual work of the greatest substance and highest significance is published.

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCHERS is indexed in wellknown indexing diectories

with ICV value 5.90

and moniter by

PERCEPTIONS OF PAPER SETTERS AND PAPER EVALUATORS REGARDING QUALITY OF QUESTION PAPERS OF EXAMINATION BOARDS IN PUNJAB PAKISTAN

Anwar Farooq[1], Dr Muhammad Azeem[2]
[1]Director Administration and Finance, Punjab Examination Commission (PEC), Lahore, Pakistan
[2]Research Fellow, Punjab Examination Commission (PEC), Lahore, Pakistan
(PAKISTAN)
hef362@gmail.com[1] , psychometrician.azeem@gmail.com[2]

ABSTRACT

Examination results have great consequences on students' future life and validity of results is related to validity and quality of examination papers. Quality of exam papers depends on table of specification aligned with curriculum and validity of paper development procedures. Boards of Intermediate and Secondary Education BISEs are conducting public exams from grade 9 to 12 in Punjab province. This study was conducted to assess perceptions of paper setters, paper evaluators and students regarding quality of papers of Lahore BISE. 20 out of 85 paper setters, 143 out of 2862 marking staff and 300 (one hundred from each of public school students, private school students and private students) out 259016 9th grade students and 300 (one hundred from each of public school students, private school students and private students) out 193047 10th grade students participated in the study. Three questionnaires were developed and get validated by expert opinion. Data was collected during and after Lahore BISE's annual exam of 9th and 10th grade students in 2015. Data was analyzed using SPSS. The main finding of this study is that question papers are based on present examination system judge only memory skill of the students. The pattern of question papers based on the present examination system may be modified and items of the paper may be shuffled to minimize the chances of cheating and improving the standards of question papers. Revise the table of specification by adding more application and higher order thinking level questions in exam papers.

Keywords: Examination, Paper Development, Board Exam, Students' Achievement

1. INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of an appropriate examination system can be analyzed by the fact that it provides a fine and suitable ending to the academic year. The literature on the subject reveals that there always remain grave issues in the examination system from paper setting, invigilation, paper marking and tabulation to dissemination of results. Reliability and validity of papers in terms of coverage of curriculum, selection of paper setters, lack of training for the paper setters and examiners, marking system and preparation of results were considered dubious (Bhatti, 1987; Warwick & Reimers, 1995; Greaney & Hasan 1998; Mirza, 1999).

The Fifth Five Year Plan 1978-83 and (Government of Pakistan, 1978) and Seventh Five Year Plan 1988-92 (Government of Pakistan, 1988) recommended to encourage the school teachers to use new type of tests and the content of various text books converted into test items designed to measure different educational objectives.

In order to improve examination system of Pakistan, it was observed in the great deal of importance was given to test scores in academic examinations. These test scores used to prepare cumulative record of the students' achievement. Examination Boards carried out the work of test development and research in collaboration with agencies and individual experts available within or outside Pakistan gradually.

At present, In Pakistan, the prevailing system of examinations especially at secondary level mostly based on Bloom's Taxonomy that drives the curriculum rather than assesses achievement. It is worthwhile to know the quality of exam papers that mostly, in general sayings, are based on assessing factual knowledge rather than students' critical thinking and analytical skills as well as their understanding and comprehension.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Quality of exam papers mainly depends on paper development process.

a. Development of Test

Teaching learning process consists of three basic aspects: establishing objectives, engaging in goal related activities and evaluation of the extent to which goals have been achieved. Among the evaluation devices, written examination is most frequently used, for which tests are constructed or obtained. Gronlund and Linen (1990) stated

that 'test' is an "instrument or systematic procedure for measuring a sample of behavior". It answers the question - "How well does the individual perform either in comparison with others or in comparison with a domain of performance tasks?" Whereas, according to them.

i. Planning a Test

Hameed, Shakir and Saeed (2000) describes that tests are given for many deliberate reasons and in order to achieve diverse purposes. It is necessary to plan them carefully. In educational setting, planning a test entails following steps:

1) **Defining the universe of the test**: The universe of the test is defined by the course outline, textbook, reference material and/or by published item bank. The paper setters as well as the students must precisely know what can be included in the test.

2) **Writing instructional objectives**: The instructional objectives of the course for which test is constructed must be clearly written.

3) **Preparing table of specifications:** Mostly a two-way table of specifications is prepared to decide what should be relative weighting of the various content areas with respect to instructional objectives.

4) **Deciding the item format**: The test items may be written in the following formats:

   - **Structured response items**: Such items contain the educational task, that is, questions and all possible responses or answers to the questions. This type consists of true-false or alternate response items, multiple choice items, completion items and matching items.

   - **Restricted response items**: These impose restrictions on responses to be produced by the students such as write two lines, not more than 30 words etc. Short answer questions fall in this format.

   - **Free response items**: The students are free to respond to the question in the way they like.

5) **Deciding the length of the test**: The length of the test or number of questions to be included in the test is based on student's ability and maturity level, format of the items/questions and the complexity of the educational task posed by the item.

6) **Design of the question paper**: It explains how the questions paper should be presented to the students, i.e. presentation mode and how the students should write their answers,' i.e. response mode.

7) **Directions to test administrators**: The test administrators, who are supposed to conduct the examination, must be provided with detailed instruction to ensure uniform testing conditions.

ii. Instructional Objectives

Statement of the instructional objectives provides conceptual clarity about what should be in the test. In fact, the key to effective evaluation is to relate test procedures to learning outcomes as directly as possible. The desired students' behavior described in the instructional objectives is translated directly into the items of the test.

iii. Number of Items

In general, longer test tends to be more reliable than shorter tests. The length of the test has more influence on reliability coefficient. Spilt half technique is used to estimate reliability of such tests.

iv. Level of Difficulty

A difficult test yields low mean and conversely an easy examination mean tends to be high. The lack of variability in group scores that exist in examination questions which are excessively difficult or easy will yield relatively low reliability.

v.   **Validity of Measurement Instrument**

Validity indicates the extent to which a test correlates with some criterion external to test itself. Contrary to physical sciences, measures in behavioral sciences are usually samples of behavior or of some trait and are not sufficient evidence that the test actually measures the trait for which it is constructed.

vi.   **Statistics Used in the Analysis of Test Results**

In order to interpret test results, we have to execute some statistical manipulation. These statistical procedures are categorized into descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics enable us to describe meaningfully a large number of scores on the test, which provide answer to questions such as what was the average score on the tests etc. Descriptive statistics also permit us to make interpretations and make statements about individual scores such as one's position relative to the group. Major types of statistics are measures of central tendency and measures of relative positions inferential statistic permit us to predict the characteristics of the population.

vii.   **Interpretation of Test Results**

Two types of measurement concerning the point of reference are norm referenced and criterion referenced tests which not only vary in the structure and in other features but are extensively unlike in the way test scores are interpreted.

b.   **Alternative System of Paper Setting**

A review of the current practice in paper setting indicates that the question paper cannot be left on the discretion of the paper setter. Instead, the representation of the question paper to its universe has to be demonstrated in a table of specifications. The table of specifications is, therefore, translated into item banks from where the sample of items will have to be drawn to make a question paper. The selection of the items from the items bank on a given criteria can easily be made by use of a personal computer.

c.   **Current Issues**

Controversy and concern about the wide spread use of' tests began as early as in the 20th century. However, in late 60s and 70s, basic questions were raised, firstly about what role should testing play in decision making and secondly, how students can be stopped to take unfair advantage in taking test? In answering these questions, it is important to distinguish between the qualities of test itself and how it is used. Tests in different areas of curriculum are administrated to yield quantitative information under carefully controlled conditions so that students all over the country undergo the same experience. .

During the last few decades, many critics of standardized tests joined together to call for "Consumer's Action" in testing and a movement "Truth in Testing" was born. This gave rise to the widespread criticism and equally strong were proponents of testing. Both critics and proponents often talk about the same test. These tests are controversial because there are important consequences attached to the score of these tests. High or low score in the other terms mean acceptance or rejection, pass or fail, and promotion or retention. These tests are sometimes labeled as high stake tests because of their nature and controversies surrounding them. These measures are:

1.   Minimum Competency Tests
2.   College Admission Tests
3.   Teacher's Certification Tests

Here minimum competency testing is discussed due to its importance and relevance.

i.   **Minimum Competency Testing**

In competency-based education, competency tests permit students to advance at their own speed. Grades and credits are assigned depending on the quality and quantity of the work created. So, it was the change in the procedure of testing.

Controversy over standardized testing has focused on the role and interpretation of test. The fairness and usefulness of test results, the availability of information about tests and the degree of bias against some students as well are the issues related to the values and ethics. In response to these problems, several states in USA have set requirements that students must pass a minimum competency test in order to receive a certificate. Performance of

unacceptable level may lead to retention or refusal to award certificate. This movement resulted in testing procedure, which was introduced through legislation and is referred to as minimum competency testing.

Minimum competency testing is defined in a number of ways in educational measurement literature. According to Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1997), the term "Competency Testing" encompasses a diverse set of phenomena that includes testing programmes in the public schools, higher education, teacher education, and testing for certification. One of the most useful definitions has been given by Miller (1978) who says that "Minimum competency tests are constructed to measure the acquisition of competence or skills beyond certain defined standards". It is a program mandated by the state or local policy making body and has the following characteristics:

1. To identify students who need remedial interventions.
2. To ensure that all those who are promoted have reached a minimum level of competency.
3. To provide additional motivation to students to increase achievement.

In order to implement a program of minimum competency testing, it is necessary to identify the skills to be tested. Should it be limited to basic skills or should it include higher level skills? It is difficult to differentiate between school skills and life skills. Moreover, setting of rational standards is difficult. There is no way to ascertain the minimum level for success in life skills. However these skills can be defined and it has been suggested that simulated situations be used for performance testing in vocational areas. But simulation of real life situation does not seem to be feasible because of limitations of time. Pencil tests are used extensively and most likely will continue. It is not likely that performance product be part of minimum competency testing due to possible lack of control on work done in non-testing situations.

Will requiring minimum competency test for promotion and finally for awarding diploma improve the situation'? Experts disagree as usual in social sciences. They believe that the close monitoring and clear standards required by minimum competency testing would encourage teachers and students to spend more time in teaching and learning. However, many educationists believe such tests would be undesirable. They argue the freedom of learner would be restricted. The test would control the curriculum and bright student would suffer. It is argued that the benefits which occur from such programs would make the efforts fruitful. It would help to correct deficiencies in school.

Another rationale for minimum competency test is that taxpayers and legislatures want some guarantee that students who have reached certain educational level will have acquired a defined set of knowledge and skills. Establishment of standards and levels of performance is a complex and controversial task.

Minimum competency testing has other implied disadvantages. In an attempt to increase the number of students who attain minimum acceptable achievement, gifted students may be ignored and average performance may be encouraged. Moreover, those who fail persistently be more inclined to dropout. Minimum competency testing may also promote bias against certain groups of students who have special needs.

Programme of minimum competency testing were initiated in response to some perceived deficiencies such as lower standards and was assumed to provide guarantee that those who should pass must have attained minimum standard of performance. They put forth the following propositions.

1. Anticipated failure rate influence standards when examination agencies deal first hand with testing consequences.
2. As standards are erected, safety nets are set up to watch those who fail.
3. Organizational efforts are more visible, intense and detailed during early phases of reforms. Similar efforts are conspicuously absent in later stages.
4. Attention to minority issues especially, in multination societies, is most prominent effort to develop unbiased tests and most inconspicuous in effort to assess adverse impacts.
5. Competency tests and standards function as "symbiotic and political "gestures, not as instrument to reforms.

   d. **New Directions in Testing**

In response to dissatisfaction with traditional form of assessment, new approaches have emerged to deal with testing problems and are at the experimental stage. Each of these approaches has its own problems. One criticism voiced against traditional assessment is to capture child's potential for future learning. Feucrsteion's, "Learning Potentia1- Assessment Device" attempts to look at the process of learning rather than the product. The pupil is presented with various reasoning and memory tasks. When necessary, the teacher prompts and assesses how well the child has benefited. The approach reflects Vygotsky's idea about zone of proximal development. Nevertheless, it offers a thought provoking and radically different approach to testing.

Another criticism against achievement tests is that they yield little information that is really relevant to teachers. In response to this, Curriculum Based Assessment was initiated which argues that testing should be based

on curriculum that the pupil is expected to learn. A teacher must try to judge the individual needs of all the students, and provide experience with testing types and training in study skills.

Teacher competency examinations are the product of dissatisfaction of general public in U.S.A with what was going on their schools. In a survey held in 1990, about 80% people voted for teaching competency examination to be administered to prospective teachers before inducting them into service. They were concerned as a reaction to poor achievement of students as indicated by declining scores on SAT. Doubts were expressed against a small number of teachers publicized to be incompetent. Needs for standard, quality control measure for different teachers' preparation institutions and the need for some standard objective data to select suitable candidates from a large number of applicants with otherwise similar credentials were felt. Teacher assessment programs include testing in basic skills, professional skills, academic knowledge or some combination of the three. Most commonly used tests in USA are the National Teachers Examination and Pre-Professional skills tests (Michel, 1992).

In computer adaptive testing, the student uses a computer terminal instead of test paper. Items are presented on the monitor and the students give the response. The examinee is given items in sequence that depends on his answers. Too easy or too difficult items are not used. These series of items allow for an efficiently derived estimate of the students ability in sharp contrast to the useful testing setting. Computer adaptive tests are individually tailored. Ability level of the examinee is estimated from the item response data in the same way as are used to estimate item difficulty and item discrimination. The estimates can be made with interactive solutions to systems of simultaneous equations. All this requires large sample and statistical precision that can easily be done by computer.

The advantages of this approach are that the amount of time is efficiently reduced; secondly computerized testing provides immediate results and feedback. Such a futuristic program is not far away. Theoretical basis have been established and students in male institutions have access to computers. Development in the field of testing and measurement since 1950's has involved an increased influence of cognitive psychology and a pervasive impact of computers. New models of test performance based on Item response theory, transfer of emphasis from evaluation of products to process, application of statistics to analysis and interpretation of test results and application of the concept of meta-analysis for validation of tests etc. are the recent developments. These developments are likely to continue to influence testing and their glacial impact on educational system is a matter to be cared (Warner, 1990).

In 1960s, a strong anti-testing campaign resulted in the truth in testing movement that demanded more disclosure of test results. There was a concern of the society with bias in educational and employment context which has had a major impact on both the content of test items and way of evaluation (Gronlund, 1985). During 1970's, main concern centered on the needs of low achievers and the educationally disadvantaged, while in 1980s, concern shifted to excellence in education which continued in the nineties. This concern forced teachers use tailored tests containing items that reflect local curricular needs and use of computer devices. The development of computer adaptive test will be one of the major changes in testing during the next few years.

e. Marking Scheme of Papers

When a question paper is prepared for examination, its marking scheme is also developed at the same time. When a marker is given papers to mark, marking scheme is also provided to her/him. Its purpose is to facilitate the marker with her/his work and to provide necessary material to ensure that the marking is fair. Marking scheme is an outline containing answers, division of marks and other necessary material. Actually marking scheme is a document that tells the marker:

- The total marks of the paper;
- The marks allocated to each question and part:
- The correct answer to each question
- Acceptable alternate answers, if any;
- If there are any such answers to some questions which seem to be true, but are wrong;
- How to mark the totally correct answers;
- How to mark the partially correct answers;
- How to mark graphs, diagrams or illustrations in case the students are required to draw them.

f. The Need and Usefulness of Marking Scheme

- Marking scheme gives clear guidance to the markers. Therefore, their job becomes easier and they do not have any confusion.
- Because of the detailed instructions about the division of marks, these are awarded more fairly and not many difficulties are to be faced.
- Availability of correct answers saves the markers from wasting their time and energies.
- Marking Scheme does not allow the markers to do subjective marking. Therefore, reliability and validity of results increases.

- A clear and detailed Marking Scheme enables the markers to award marks according to the mental level of the students faultlessly.
- The marks allocated in the Marking Scheme for each question and parts are also written on the question paper. This lets the students know how much detail and time a question requires. It is pertinent to mention that marking for MCQs will be done on computer software. The markers will be assigned the work to mark the short answer / Open – ended questions for which they are being trained.

3. Research Questions

Following are the research questions

1. What are the perceptions of paper setters regarding quality of exam papers
2. What are the perceptions of paper evaluators regarding quality of exam papers
3.

4. Delimitations of the Study

The study was delimited to the:

1. Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education (BISE) Lahore;
2. Paper setters, supervisory and marking staff participated in the annual SSC exam 2015; and
3. Students of 9th and 10th grades appeared in annual SSC exam 2015.

5. Population and Sampling

The population of the study comprised of 452063 students of grade 9th and 10th appeared in the Secondary School Certificate Examination of BISE Lahore in the years 2015. Similarly, 85 paper setters, 10294 members of supervisory staff and 2862 marking staff were also constituted the population of the study. The category-wise detail of the population can be seen in Table 1 and 2.

Table 1   Description of the Category-Wise Population of Students

Category of Students	Students of Govt. Schools	Students of Private Schools	Students Appeared as Private Candidates	Total
9th Graders	110294	67412	81310	259016
10th Graders	62362	49845	80840	193047
Total	**172656**	**117257**	**162150**	**452063**

Source: Boards of Intermediate and Secondary Education Lahore (2015)

Table 1 shows that overall 259016 students of 9th grade and 193047 students of 10th grade appeared in the annual examination of SSC 2015 were constituted the population of the study. It includes 110294 students of 9th grade and 62362 students of 10th grade of government schools; 67412 students of 9th grade and 49845 students of 10th grade of private schools while 81310 students of 9th grade and 80840 students of 10th grade appeared as private candidates in SSC exam 2015.

Table 2   Descriptions of the Population of Paper Setters and Marking Staff

Category of Population	Kasur	Nankana Sahib	Districts Sheikhupura	Lahore	Total
Sub-examiners	643	405	370	1086	2504
Head Examiners	85	55	71	147	358
Paper Setters	---	---	---	85	85
Total	**728**	**460**	**441**	**1318**	**2947**

Source: Boards of Intermediate and Secondary Education Lahore (2015)

Table 2 reveals that overall 2947 staff includes 2504 sub-examiners, 358 Head examiners and 85 paper setters were also included in the population of this study.

It was not possible to collect the data from the entire population of the study. Therefore, a sample of 20 paper setters (10 Science subjects and 10 Humanities subjects) and 5% of the population of marking staff and

supervisory staff was drawn using simple random sampling technique. In this way, 20 paper setters, 18 head examiners, 125 sub examiners and 514 members of supervisory staff were selected for data collection. Similarly, 600 students (200 from each category) who have been appeared in SSC exam 2015 of BISE Lahore were also selected using convenient sampling technique. Brief description of category-wise sampling can be seen in table 3 and 4.

Table 3   Descriptions of the Sample of Supervisory and Marking Staff

Category of Sample	Kasur	Nankana Sahib	Districts Sheikhupura	Lahore	Total
Sub-examiners	32	20	19	54	125
Head Examiners	04	03	04	07	18
Paper Setters	05	05	05	05	20
Total	**41**	**28**	**28**	**66**	**163**

Table 3 reveals that overall 125 sub-examiners, 18 head examiners and 20 paper setters were selected as sample of the study. With regards to the sample of sub- examiners and head examiners, it shows that 32 sub-examiners and 04 head examiners from Kasur district, 20 sub- examiners and 03 head examiners from Nankana district, 19 sub- examiners and 04 head examiners from Sheikhupura district and 54 sub- examiners and 07 head examiners from Lahore district were selected as sample of the study. In addition, 05 paper setters from each district were also included in the sample of the study.

Table 4   Descriptions of the Category-Wise Sample of Students

Category of Students		Kasur	Nankana Sahib	Districts Sheikhupura	Lahore	Total
9th Grade	Govt. Schools	25	25	25	25	100
	Private Schools	25	25	25	25	100
	Private Candidates	25	25	25	25	100
10th Grade	Govt. Schools	25	25	25	25	100
	Private Schools	25	25	25	25	100
	Private Candidates	25	25	25	25	100
	Total	**150**	**150**	**150**	**150**	**600**

Table 4 shows that 25 students of 9th grade and 25 students of 10th grade of three categories i.e. government schools, private schools and private candidate appeared in annual SSC exam 2015 from each four districts of Lahore Board were selected as sample of the study. Overall, 150 students from each four districts were included in the sample. In this way, total sample of the students of 9th and 10th grades was comprised of 600 students.

6.   DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This study was carried out using a survey questionnaire on five point rating scale having different parts for paper setters, markers and students. It was developed by the researcher after reviewing the related literature and discussion with the supervisor and it was validated through expert opinion and pilot testing in the field. The reliability coefficient was found to be 0.856 for students' questionnaire, 0.818 for supervisor staff, 0.801 for marking staff and 0.827 for paper setters' questionnaire respectively, which was acceptable for administering for large scale data collection (Gay, 2002).

The data was collected using two types of strategies. Data related to the paper setters, supervisory staff, marking staff and students of 9th and 10th grades who appeared in the SSC exams of BISE Lahore in the year 2015 was obtained from the official record of the BISE Lahore. Data related to the perceptions of different stakeholders

regarding existing examination reforms and facilities provided to the students and problems faced by the students was obtained using a separate survey questionnaire for each category of the respondents.

Table 5 Perceptions of the Paper Setters about the Question Papers

Items	Responses %			Mean	SD
	Strongly Disagree/ Uncertain	Strongly Disagree	Agree/ Agree		
Question papers based on present examination system help in measuring the actual performance of students	67	05	28	3.50	0.89
Question papers based on present examination system judge only memory skill of students	85	03	12	3.55	0.87
Question papers based on present examination system make the students to work more hard	72	01	27	3.60	0.78
Question papers based on present examination system measure the achievement level of students in a more precise way	74	02	24	3.70	1.03

Table 5 shows that majority (67%) of the respondents agreed with the statement that question papers based on present examination system help in measuring the actual performance of students while 28% of the respondents disagreed with this point of view. A great majority (85%) of the respondents stated that question papers based on present examination system judge only memory skill of the students while 12% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. Similarly, majority (72%) of the respondents considered that question papers based on present examination system make the students to work more hard while 27% of the respondents disagreed with this point of view. Findings also reveals that majority (74%) of the respondents thought that question papers based on present examination system measure the achievement level of students in a more precise way while 24% of the respondents disagreed with the statement.

Table 6 Perceptions of the Paper Setters about the Question Papers

Items	Responses %			Mean	SD
	Strongly Disagree/ Uncertain	Strongly Disagree	Agree/ Agree		
Question papers based on present examination system produce actual performance of the students	65	02	33	3.75	0.92
Question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students	56	01	43	3.80	1.09
Question papers based on present examination system fully cover the whole syllabus	82	03	15	4.10	0.89
Questions have been developed keeping in view the competencies of the curricula	84	01	15	4.20	0.91
Secrecy and accuracy of question papers is properly maintained	90	02	08	4.50	0.87

Table 6 shows that two-thirds (65%) of the respondents were of the view that question papers based on present examination system produce actual performance of the students while one-third (33%) of the students thought that question papers based on present examination system do not produce actual performance of the students. Similarly, 56% of the participants agreed that question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students while 43% of the respondents disagreed with the view that question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students. Findings also reveals that majority (82%) of the respondents agreed that question papers based on present examination system fully cover the whole syllabus while 84% of the respondents were of the view that questions have been developed keeping in view the competencies of the curricula. A great majority (90%) of the respondents agreed that secrecy and accuracy of

question papers is properly maintained while only 8% of the respondents perceived that secrecy and accuracy of question papers is not properly maintained.

Table 7 Perception of the Marking Staff about the Question Papers

Items	Responses %			Mean	SD
	Strongly Disagree/ Uncertain	Strongly Disagree	Agree/ Agree		
Question papers based on present examination system help in measuring the actual performance of students	70	03	27	3.50	0.79
Question papers based on present examination system judge only memory skill of students	77	03	20	3.35	1.00
Question papers based on present examination system make the students to work more hard	71	03	26	3.55	0.92
Question papers based on present examination system measure the achievement level of students in a more precise way	76	02	22	3.80	1.06
Question papers based on present examination system produce actual performance of the students	75	04	21	3.75	0.82

Table 7 shows that majority (70%) of the respondents agreed with the statement that question papers based on present examination system help in measuring the actual performance of students while 27% of the respondents disagreed with this point of view. Three-fourth (77%) of the respondents stated that question papers based on present examination system judge only memory skill of the students while 20% disagreed with the statement. Similarly, majority (71%) of the respondents considered that question papers based on present examination system make the students to work more hard while 26% of the respondents disagreed with this point of view.

Findings also reveals that majority (76%) of the respondents thought that question papers based on present examination system measure the achievement level of students in a more precise way while 22% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. Analysis also shows that three-fourth (75%) of the respondents were of the view that question papers based on present examination system produce actual performance of the students while 21% of the students thought that question papers based on present examination system do not produce actual performance of the students.

Table 8 Perception of the Marking Staff about the Question Papers

Items	Responses %			Mean	SD
	Strongly Disagree/ Uncertain	Strongly Disagree	Agree/ Agree		
Question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students	66	01	33	3.30	0.76
Question papers based on present examination system fully cover the whole syllabus	80	04	16	4.00	0.78
Questions have been developed keeping in view the competencies of the curricula	84	01	15	4.20	1.03
Secrecy and accuracy of question papers is properly maintained	92	02	06	4.60	0.92

Table 8 shows that two-third (66%) of the participants agreed that question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students while one-third (33%) of the respondents disagreed with the view that question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students. Findings also reveals that majority (80%) of the respondents agreed that question papers based on present examination system fully cover the whole syllabus while 16% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. A great majority (84%) of the respondents were of the view that questions have been developed keeping in view the

competencies of the curricula while 15%. Of the respondents disagreed with the statement. Analysis also reveals that a remarkable majority (92%) of the respondents agreed that secrecy and accuracy of question papers is properly maintained while only 6% of the respondents perceived that secrecy and accuracy of question papers is not properly maintained.

Table 9 Perception of the Students about Authenticity of Question Papers

Items	Responses %			Mean	SD
	Strongly Disagree/ Uncertain	Strongly Disagree	Agree/ Agree		
Question papers based on present examination system help in measuring the actual performance of students	66	05	27	3.35	0.77
Question papers based on present examination system judge only memory skill of students	80	04	16	3.25	1.03
Question papers based on present examination system make the students to work more hard	73	03	24	3.65	0.92
Question papers based on present examination system measure the achievement level of students in a more precise way	74	04	22	3.70	1.09
Question papers based on present examination system produce actual performance of the students	75	02	23	3.75	0.82

Table 9 shows that two-third (66%) of the respondents agreed with the statement that question papers based on present examination system help in measuring the actual performance of students while 27% of the respondents disagreed with this point of view. Majority (80%) of the respondents stated that question papers based on present examination system judge only memory skill of the students while 16% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. Similarly, majority (73%) of the respondents considered that question papers based on present examination system make the students to work more hard while 24% of the respondents disagreed with this point of view. Findings also reveals that majority (74%) of the respondents thought that question papers based on present examination system measure the achievement level of students in a more precise way while 22% of the respondents disagreed with the statement.

Table 10   Perception of the Students about Authenticity of Question Papers

Items	Responses %			Mean	SD
	Strongly Disagree/ Uncertain	Strongly Disagree	Agree/ Agree		
Question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students	64	04	32	3.20	0.76
Question papers based on present examination system fully cover the whole syllabus	78	02	20	3.90	0.78
Questions have been developed keeping in view the competencies of the curricula	77	03	20	3.85	1.03
Secrecy and accuracy of question papers is properly maintained	90	03	07	4.50	0.92

Table 10 shows that three-fourth (75%) of the respondents were of the view that question papers based on present examination system produce actual performance of the students while 23% of the students thought that question papers based on present examination system do not produce actual performance of the students. Similarly, about two-third (64%) of the participants agreed that question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students while one-third (32%) of the respondents disagreed with the view that question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students. Findings also reveals that

majority (78%) of the respondents agreed that question papers based on present examination system fully cover the whole syllabus while 20% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. Majority (77%) of the respondents were of the view that questions have been developed keeping in view the competencies of the curricula while 20% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. Analysis also reveals that a remarkable majority (90%) of the respondents agreed that secrecy and accuracy of question papers is properly maintained while only 7% of the respondents perceived that secrecy and accuracy of question papers is not properly maintained.

7. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The main finding of the study is that majority of the respondents thought that question papers based on present examination system measure the achievement level of students in a more precise way; secrecy and accuracy of the question papers and results is properly maintained; marking system of papers of present examination system is standardized and process of marking is properly monitored and checked by higher authorities. **Findings about Paper**

a. Setters' Perceptions

1. 67% of the respondents agreed that question papers based on present examination system help in measuring the actual performance of students.
2. 85% of the respondents stated that question papers based on present examination system judge only memory skill of the students
3. 72% of the respondents considered that question papers based on present examination system make the students to work more hard
4. 74% of the respondents thought that question papers based on present examination system measure the achievement level of students in a more precise way
5. 65% of the respondents were of the view that question papers based on present examination system produce actual performance of the students
6. 56% of the participants agreed that question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students
7. 82% of the respondents agreed that question papers based on present examination system fully cover the whole syllabus
8. 84% of the respondents were of the view that questions have been developed keeping in view the competencies of the curricula
9. 90% of the respondents agreed that secrecy and accuracy of the question papers is properly maintained while only 8% of the respondents perceived that secrecy and accuracy of question papers is not properly maintained.

b. Marking Staff' Perceptions

1. 70% of the respondents agreed that question papers based on present examination system help in measuring the actual performance of students
2. 67% of the respondents stated that question papers based on present examination system judge only memory skill of the students
3. 71% of the respondents considered that question papers based on present examination system make the students to work more hard
4. 76% of the respondents thought that question papers based on present examination system measure the achievement level of students in a more precise way
5. 75% of the respondents were of the view that question papers based on present examination system produce actual performance of the students
6. 66% of the participants agreed that question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students
7. 80% of the respondents agreed that question papers based on present examination system fully cover the whole syllabus
8. 84% of the respondents were of the view that questions have been developed keeping in view the competencies of the curricula
9. 92% of the respondents agreed that secrecy and accuracy of question papers is properly maintained

c. Students' Perceptions

1. 67% of the respondents agreed that question papers based on present examination system help in

measuring the actual performance of students

2. 80% of the respondents stated that question papers based on present examination system judge only memory skill of the students

3. 73% of the respondents considered that question papers based on present examination system make the students to work more hard

4. 74% of the respondents thought that question papers based on present examination system measure the achievement level of students in a more precise way

5. 75% of the respondents were of the view that question papers based on present examination system produce actual performance of the students

6. 64% of the participants agreed that question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students

7. 78% of the respondents agreed that question papers based on present examination system fully cover the whole syllabus

8. 77% of the respondents were of the view that questions have been developed keeping in view the competencies of the curricula

9. 90% of the respondents agreed that secrecy and accuracy of question papers is properly maintained while

8. CONCLUSIONS

1. Two-third of the respondents agreed that question papers based on present examination system help in measuring the actual performance of students.

2. Two-third of the respondents stated that question papers based on present examination system judge only memory skill of the students

3. Majority of the respondents considered that question papers based on present examination system make the students to work more hard

4. Majority of the respondents thought that question papers based on present examination system measure the achievement level of students in a more precise way

5. Majority of the respondents were of the view that question papers based on present examination system do not produce actual performance of the students

6. Most of the participants agreed that question papers based on present examination system produce consistent marks of the students

7. A great majority of the respondents agreed that question papers based on present examination system fully cover the whole syllabus

8. A great majority of the respondents were of the view that questions have been developed keeping in view the competencies of the curricula

9. A remarkable majority of the respondents agreed that secrecy and accuracy of the question papers is properly maintained.

10. Majority of the respondents perceived that marking system of papers of present examination system is easy

11. Majority of the respondents also thought that marking system of papers of present examination system is standardized

12. Majority of the respondents agreed that process of marking is properly monitored and checked by higher authorities

13. Majority of the respondents thought that appointment of a coordinator in the system of marking enhances the authenticity and accuracy of results

14. Majority of the respondents were satisfied with the present marking system of examinations

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The pattern of question papers based on the present examination system may be modified and items of the paper may be shuffled to minimize the chances of cheating and improving the standards of question papers.

2. Revise the table of specification by adding more application and higher order thinking level questions in exam papers

REFERENCES

Aggarwal, J.C. (1997). *Essentials of examination system.* New Delhi, India: Vikas Publishing House (Pvt.) Ltd.

Alvi, A. (1980). *Educational psychology*. Lahore: Ferozesons publishers.

Assessment Reform Group (1999). *Assessment for learning: beyond the black box.* Cambridge: University of Cambridge, School of Education.

Bhatti, M.A. (1987). *Secondary education in Pakistan: Perspective planning*. Islamabad: National Education Council.

Biggs, J. & Collis, K. (1982). *Evaluating the quality of learning: The SOLO taxonomy.* New York: Academic Press.

Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (1998). *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment.* London: King's College.

Black, P. (1998). *Testing: friend or foe? Theory and practice of assessment and testing.* London: Falmer Press.

Black, P. (1999). Assessment, learning theories and testing systems, in P. Murphy, *Learners, learning and assessment* (pp. 118-134). London: Paul Chapman Publishing, the Open University.

Campbell, K.J., Watson, J.M. & Collis, K.F. (1992). Volume measurement and intellectual development. *Journal of Structural Learning*, *11*, 279-298.

Collis, K.F., & Romberg, T.A. (1991). Assessment of Mathematical performance: An analysis of open-ended test items, in M.C. Wittrock & E. Baker (Eds.), *Testing and cognition.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Courtney, T.D. (1986). The significance of the SOLO taxonomy for learning and teaching in geography. *Geographical Education*, 5 (2), 47–50.

Davey, G. & Pegg, J. (1989). Clarifying level descriptors for children's understanding of some basic 2-D geometric shapes. *Mathematics Education Research 1,* 16- 27.

Ebel, R.L. & Trisbie, D.A. (1986). *Essentials of educational measurement (*4[th]ed.). Prentice Hall: Engle Wood Cliffs NJ.

Gipps, C. (1994). *Beyond testing: towards a theory of educational assessment.* Lewes: Falmer Press.

Gipps, C. (1996). Assessment for learning, in A. Little & A. Wolf (Eds.), *Assessment in transition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Good, C.V. (1973). *Dictionary of education* (3[rd]ed.). New York: Mc-Graw Hills.

Government of Pakistan (1947). *The Pakistan educational conference.* Karachi: Education Division.

Government of Pakistan (1955). *The first five year plan 1955-60.* Karachi: Pakistan Planning Board.

Government of Pakistan (1965). *The third five year plan 1965-70.* Karachi: Planning Commission.

Government of Pakistan (1970). *New education policy.* Islamabad: Ministry of Education.

Government of Pakistan (1971). *Examination system in Pakistan: current practices, problems and possible solutions.* Report of National Committee on Examination 1970-71), Islamabad: Ministry of Education and Scientific Research.

Government of Pakistan (1972). *The education policy 1972-80.* Islamabad: Ministry of Education.

Government of Pakistan (1978). *The fifth five-year plan 1976-81.* Islamabad: Planning Commission.

Government of Pakistan (1979). *National education policy and implementation program.* Islamabad: Ministry of Education.

Government of Pakistan (1979). *National education policy and implementation program.* Islamabad: Ministry of Education.

Government of Pakistan (1988). *The seventh five-year plan 1988-93.* Islamabad: Planning Commission.

Government of Pakistan (1992). *National education policy 1992.* Islamabad: Ministry of Education.

Government of Pakistan (1993). *The eighth five-year plan 1993-98.* Islamabad: Planning Commission.

Government of Pakistan (1998). *National education policy 1998-2010.* Islamabad: Ministry of Education.

Government of Pakistan (1998). *National education policy 1998-2010.* Islamabad: Ministry of Education.

Government of West Pakistan (1967). *Universities in Pakistan.* Lahore: Education Department.

Greaney, V. & Hasan, P. (1998). Public examinations in Pakistan: A system in need of reform, in P. Hoodbhoy, *Education and the state: Fifty years of Pakistan.* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Gronlund, N.E. & Linen, R.L. (1990). *Measurement mid evaluation in teaching (*6[th]ed.). New York: McMillan Publishing Company.

Gronlund, N.E. (1985). *How to construct achievement test.* New York: McMillan Publishing Company.

Hameed, A., Shakir, A.S. & Saeed, A.R. (2000). *Improvement in examination system:* A research study ADB technical education project. Lahore: Punjab Board of Technical Education.

Hargreaves, E. (2001). Assessment for learning in the multi-grade classroom. *International Journal of Educational Development 21,* 553-560.

Harlen, W. & James, M. (1997). Assessment and learning: differences and relationships between formative and summative assessment. *Assessment in Education, 4*(3), 365- 381.

Harlen, W., & Deakin Crick, R. (2003). Testing and motivation for learning. *Assessment in Education, 10 (2),* Retrieved on January 22, 2016 from: http://www.city.londonmet.ac.uk

Jadoon, Z. & Jabeen, I.N. (2008). *Towards effective implementation of semester system in Pakistan: lessons from Punjab University.* Lahore.

Kellaghan, T. & Greaney, V. (2001). *Using assessment to improve the quality of education.* Paris: UNESCO: International Institute of Educational Planning

Khokhar, F.H. (1984). *Education and discipline in schools.* Karachi: Qamar Publishers: Urdu Bazar.

Levins, R. (1996). Ten propositions on science and anti-science. *Social Text*, 46/47, 101–111.

Linn, R.L. & Gronlund, N.E. (2000). *Measurement and assessment in teaching* (8th ed.). Delhi: Pearson Education

Mascarenhas, M. (1991). *Examinations: An informative update.* Delhi: Doaba House.

Michel, R. (1992). *Testing for learning.* New York: The Free Press.

Page 25

Miller, L.C. (1978). *Behavior checklist manual.* Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

Mirza, M. (1999). Examination system and teaching and practice of teachers at secondary, higher secondary and O' level. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 1.

Orlich, C, Harder, R., Callahan, R., Trevisian, M., & Brown, A. (2004). *Teaching strategies: A guide to effective instruction* (7[th]ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Paul, R. (1993). *Critical thinking: What every person needs to survive in a rapidly changing world* (3[rd]ed.). Rohnert Park, California: Sonama State University Press.

Pegg, J. (1992). Assessing students' understanding at the primary and secondary level in the Mathematical sciences, in J. Izard & M. Stephens (Eds.), *Reshaping Assessment Practice: Assessment in the Mathematical Sciences under Challenge*. Melbourne: Australian Council of Educational Research.

Pegg, J.E. & Woolley, S. (1994). An investigation of strategies used to solve a simple deductive exercise in geometry, in G. Bell, et al. *Challenges in Mathematics Education: Constraints and Construction.* Lismore, NSW: Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia.

Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning to teach in higher education*. London: Routledge.

Rehmani, A. (2000). Transmitting a curriculum in translation: A case study of an international religious education and cultural studies curriculum in the context of urban and rural areas of Sindh, Pakistan. Thesis, M.A. Education, London: Institute of Education University of London.

Rowentry, D. (1987). *Assessing students: How shall we know them*? London: Kogan Page.

Shahid. S.M. (1987). *Educational discipline*. Karachi: Rehbar publishers.

Shirazi, M. (2004). *Analysis of examination system at university level in Pakistan.* Unpublished dissertation, Rawalpindi: University of Arid Agriculture.

Smith, E. & Gorard, S. (2005). They don't give us our marks: The role of formative feedback in student progress. *Assessment in Education, 29* (1).

Stones, E. (1994). *Quality teaching: A sample of cases*. New York: Routledge.

Warner, H. (1990). *Computerized Adoptive testing:* A Primer NJ: Erlbaum Hillsdali.

Warwick, D.P. & Reimers, F. (1995). *Hope and Despair? Learning in Pakistan's primary schools.* USA: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

Watkins, C., Carnell, E., Lodge, C. & Whalley, C. (1996). *Effective learning*, in Research Matters, School Improvement Network's bulletin: Institute of Education, University of London.

Watkins, C., Carnell, E., Lodge, C., Wagner, P. & Whalley, C. (1998). *Learning about learning.* Coventry: NAPCE.

Watson, J.M. & Mulligan, J. (1990). Mapping solutions to an early multiplication word problem. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 2.

Watson, J.M., Collis, K.F., & Moritz, J.B. (1994*).* Assessing statistical understanding in Grades 3, 6 and 9 using a short answer questionnaire, in G. Bell, B. Wright, N. Leeson, & G. Geake (Eds.), *Challenges in Mathematics Education: Constraints on Construction*. Lismore, NSW: Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia.