



**ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTION ON THE QUALITATIVE ASPECTS AND
COMPREHENSIVE PROSPECTS OF M.Ed. CURRICULUM OF CHHATTISGARH
AND ODISHA STATES**

Jubraj Khamari, Ph. D. Assistant Professor, School of Education MATS University, Raipur
(CG), India

Abstract

In the present study an attempt has been made to find out the difference (intra and inter) in the Perceptions of the different categories of respondents of the two states under study regarding the M.Ed. curriculum design as relevance on the basis of experience and expertise of the sample respondents. The responses of the respondents have been collected with the help of a Pre-designed questionnaire reflecting the qualitative aspects and comprehensive level of prospects of M.Ed. curriculum based on certain specific Parameters (8 items) considered for the present study. The scale consists of 8 items each having 4 alternatives such as strongly agree (1), agree (2) disagree (3), strongly disagree (4). The mean score of each item could range from 1 to 4 where 1 indicates strongly agree and 4 indicates strongly disagree (i.e. dissatisfied).

Key Words: *qualitative aspects, comprehensive prospects, M.Ed. curriculum, Chhattisgarh and Odisha states.*

Introduction: The present study is an attempt to find out the perception of different categories of respondents on the qualitative aspects and comprehensive level of prospects of M.Ed. curriculum so as to deduce certain concluding remarks on the improvement of M.Ed. curriculum design.

The parameters (8 items) on the quality and comprehensiveness aspects of M.Ed. curriculum considered for the present study to analyze the perception of the sample respondents under study on different satisfaction scale are:

1. Perception on the inclusion of a compulsory paper of 100 marks on Ancient Indian Philosophy in M.Ed. course for reflecting of Ancient Indian Philosophical idea of Veda &

Upanisad on the modern educational philosophy. **2.** Perception on the inclusion of a compulsory paper on Modern Indian philosophy in M.Ed. course to improve the strength of educational philosophy relating to Ancient Indian Philosophy to focus on rich cultural heritage of India of future aspect. **3.** Perception on the inclusion of Educational Technology as a compulsory paper instead of elective in M.Ed. curriculum to make the education competitive & technological friendly in the present context. **4.** Perception on the inclusion of two papers (General aspect and Experimental aspects of Educational Technology) on one subject of education in M.Ed. curriculum in the area of elective subject specialization for mastery in M.Ed. curriculum by M.Ed. scholar. **5.** Perception on the provision of selecting dissertation topic from the area of specialization in M.Ed. curriculum conferring mastery to M.Ed. scholar. **6.** Perception on keeping two year time duration for present M.Ed. curriculum. **7.** Perception on the provision of providing scope in M.Ed. curriculum to teach practical classes to B.Ed. students concerning to the elective subject specialization of M.Ed. scholar to enhance teaching experience of M.Ed. scholar as teacher educator. **8.** Perception on the qualification and experience of faculty members dealing with M.Ed. Curriculum (minimum Ph.D. degree/NET desirably have research experience) The data has been analyzed with the help of suitable analytical tools and hypotheses have been tested whenever required as discussed subsequently.

PERCEPTUAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PUPIL- TEACHER-EDUCATORS & EXPERTS

Particulars	Sample size	Mean	SD	Variance	Z value	LS	CV
Odisha							
Pupil- teacher-educators	100	12.76	5.06	25.60	-0.1	0.05	39.66
Experts	50	12.86	5.33	28.41			41.45
Chhattisgarh							
Pupil- teacher-educators	100	12.65	5.10	26.01	-0.3	0.05	40.32
Experts	50	12.94	5.32	28.30			41.11
Both states							
Pupil- teacher-educators	200	13.08	5.43	29.48	0.3	0.05	41.51
Experts	100	12.90	5.30	28.09			41.09
All Samples							
Odisha	150	13.05	5.40	29.16	0.1	0.05	41.38
Chhattisgarh	150	12.99	5.38	28.94			41.44

N.B. Pupil- teacher-educators (both the male & female respondents combined in this group).

The Z Value got tested against 0.05 significance level (LS) under the region (-1.96 to +1.96)

M.Ed. Curriculum and Perceptual Differences

Testing of hypothesis: Perceptual differences between Pupil- teacher educators and Experts in Odisha and Chhattisgarh

Hypothesis 1

H₀: The difference is not significant between the perception of Pupil- Teacher Educators and Experts in Odisha

H_a: The difference is significant between the perception Pupil- Teacher Educators and Experts in Odisha

The calculated Z value (- 0.1) falls under the acceptance region (-1.96 to +1.96) at 0.05 significance level, therefore we accept the null hypothesis that the difference is not significant between the perception of Pupil- teacher educators and Experts in Odisha regarding the quality aspects and comprehensive level of prospect of M.Ed. curriculum .

Hypothesis 2

H₀: The difference is not significant between the perception of Pupil- Teacher Educators and Experts in Chhattisgarh.

H_a: The difference is significant between the perception Pupil- Teacher Educators and Experts in Chhattisgarh.

The calculated Z value (- 0.3) falls under the acceptance region (-1.96 to +1.96) at 0.05 significance level, therefore we accept the null hypothesis that the difference is not significant between the perception of Pupil- teacher educators and Experts in Chhattisgarh regarding the quality aspects and comprehensive level of prospect of M.Ed. curriculum.

Hypothesis 3

H₀: The difference is not significant between the perception of Pupil- Teacher Educators of Odisha and Chhattisgarh and Experts of Odisha and Chhattisgarh.

H_a: The difference is significant between the perception of Pupil- Teacher Educators of Odisha and Chhattisgarh and Experts of Odisha and Chhattisgarh.

The calculated Z value (0.3) falls under the acceptance region (-1.96 to +1.96) at 0.05 significance level, therefore we accept the null hypothesis that the difference is not significant between the perception of Pupil- teacher educators of both the states and Experts of both states regarding the quality aspects and comprehensive level of prospect of M.Ed. curriculum.

Hypothesis 4: H0: The difference is not significant between the perception of Pupil- Teacher Educators and Experts (all samples) of Odisha and Chhattisgarh

Ha: The difference is significant between the perception of Pupil- Teacher Educators and Experts (all samples) of Odisha and Chhattisgarh.

The calculated Z value (0.1) falls under the acceptance region (-1.96 to +1.96) at 0.05 significance level, therefore we accept the null hypothesis that the difference is not significant between the perception of Pupil- teacher educators and Experts (all samples) of Odisha and Chhattisgarh regarding the quality aspects and comprehensive level of prospect of M.Ed. curriculum

Findings and Discussion: It is observed from the above hypotheses got tested that the perceptual difference between various categories of respondents in both the states (Odisha and Chhattisgarh) as discussed above is not found significant. It implies that the parameters considered for analyzing the quality aspect and comprehensive level of prospect are agreed upon unanimously by all most all the sample respondents irrespective of their categories and the states they belongs to. Thus the quality aspects and comprehensive prospects agreed upon by the respondents of both the state should be considered for improving the curriculum design of the M.Ed. course so as to make the course user friendly, employable and universally acceptable amidst the changing environment of technology and socio-economic conditions of the people.

The perceptual analysis made above with special reference to inclusion of Ancient Indian philosophy, Modern Indian philosophy, Educational technology as compulsory subject, dissertation work, time duration of M .Ed curriculum and Eligibility criteria of teacher educator forms the basis for improving the quality aspects and comprehensive prospects of M. Ed. Curriculum and ultimately in this regard a few difference found in the perception of the people under study.

Acknowledgement

I acknowledged that this is a original piece of research work.

Reference

TE & SCERT. (2009). *Prospectus & rules for admission into B.Ed. & M.Ed. courses*, Directorate TE & SCERT, Raipur, (C.G.).

- TE & SCERT. (2009). *Prospectus & Rules for admission into B.Ed. & M.Ed. courses*, Directorate TE & SCERT, Bhubaneswar, Odisha.
- Buch, M. B. (1974). *A Survey of Research in Education, Baroda*, Centre of Advance Study in Education (C.A.S.E.), M. S. University Baroda.
- Buch, M. B. (1979). *Second Survey of Research in Education, Baroda, (1972-1978)*, Baroda, Society for Educational Research and Development.
- Buch, M.B. (1987). *Third Survey of Research in Education, (1978-1983)*, N.C.E.R.T., New Delhi.
- Buch, M.B. (1991). *Fourth Survey of Research in Education, Vol-II (1983-1988)*, N.C.E.R.T. New Delhi.
- Buch, M. B. (2000). *Fifth Survey of Research in Education, Vol-II (1988-1992)*, New Delhi, NCERT.
- Buch, M. B. (2006). *Sixth Survey of Research in Education Vol-I (1999-2000)*, New Delhi, NCERT.
- Best, J. W. & Khan, J. V. (1986). *Research in Education, (5th Edition)*, New Delhi, (2009), Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
- Best, J. W. (1989). *Research in Education (6th Edition)*, New Delhi, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
- Best, J. W. (1996). *Research in Education (7th Edition)*, New Delhi, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
- Gupta, S. C. (2006). *Fundamental of Statistics*, Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai, 40004.
- Garrette, H. E. (1967). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, Wakils Kefer and Semens Pvt. Ltd., Bombay.
- Kaul, Lokesh. (1988). *Methodology of Educational Research (2nd Edition)*, Delhi, Vikas Publishing House.
- Sharma, R.A. (2007). *Curriculum Development and Instruction*, Surya Publication Near Govt. Inter College Meerut 250001.
- Srivastav, K.M. (1982). *Effectiveness of Teacher Education Programme, M.B. Buch fourth survey of research in education 1993 P-994*, N.C.T.E. New Delhi.