

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Background

We, people, are always full of thoughts, emotions, and feelings. These thoughts, emotions and feelings are expressed by using language. Language is the universal medium through which human beings express all the things and make their daily routine easy. It is human species specific property and not possessed by other living beings. Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary (2005, p.862) defines language as "the system of communication in speech and writing that is used by people." Likewise Richards et al. (1985, p.153), define it as "the system of human communication by means of a structural arrangement of sound (or their written representation) into larger units, e.g. morpheme, words, sentences, utterances."

These definitions indicate language is a complex phenomenon especially used as a means of communication. There are innumerable languages in the world and no language is superior or inferior in terms of communicating ideas. However, some languages, such as English, play a dominant role in the society. It is one of the official languages of the UN. So, it is thought that the English language is one of the major languages of the world and coming with increasing number of users in various field and sectors such as education, mass media, science and technology and so on. Many books have been published in this language. We can get hottest information of various fields by using the internet services which are

expressed mainly in the English language. It means the importance of the English language can be hardly exaggerated.

In the context of Nepal, English has been officially taught with the establishment of Durbar school.

In the last few decades, the position of English in the formal education curricula has been fluctuated. Sometimes, it was proposed that English language be introduced from grade four and at other times it was introduced from grade one. Likewise, the university education also faced similar type of dilemma as it failed to make Nepali the medium of instruction mandatory since the early 90s. (Bhattarai and Gautam, 2007, p.33).

Nowadays it is taught as a foreign language in Nepal and has been made a compulsory subject in schools and campuses as its importance has been realized. So it has become an integral part of the formal education system in Nepal. When we talk about formal education we should not forget about language learning and testing system of it. Thus, it is essential for English teachers to get some basic knowledge about language teaching and testing.

1.1.1 Language Learning and Testing

In the field of language teaching, testing refers to the process of gathering information on the nature, level and trend of the learners' progress in developing the competence in target language. We expect the learners to perform some observable behaviors according to our

objectives of programme and a test, as a measurement instrument, is supposed to quantify the behaviors according to some explicit procedures. Language learning and testing are interrelated phenomena. Language learning and testing are two sides of a coin. Language teaching is not complete without testing. Both are so closely related that we cannot separate them from each other. According to Heaton (1975, p.5), "Both testing and teaching are so closely interrelated that it is virtually impossible to work in either field without being constantly concerned with other." Similarly Coombe (2007, p.36) says, "Language testing at any level is highly complex undertaking that must be based on theory as well as practice." In other words, testing is a part of language teaching and it has a lot to do with language education. Testing is one of the important means of evaluation in language learning. Teaching is not complete without testing. Though, testing is a separate activity, it is an integral part of teaching. It means that teaching is influenced by testing or vice-versa. In other words, teaching is imparting knowledge and skills to a person, whereas testing is measuring the persons' ability to retrieve and use that knowledge and skills. The aim of teaching is not only related to instructional planning and evaluation of learners' progress and teachers' effectiveness but also related to the evaluation of how well learners can use their language resources for purposeful and meaningful communication. To sum up, testing is one of the significant and indispensable activities of teaching which strengthens teaching learning activities. Therefore, it is crucial for English teachers to get knowledge about the relationship between teaching and testing.

1.1.2 Importance of Testing

Testing is an inherent part of teaching. Until some decades ago, language testing was regarded as a small part of applied linguistics and language teaching. It did not have much role to play, but nowadays it is regarded as a separate subject with great weighting. Language has been developed in such a way that like any other area of study, it has become an independent discipline. According to Heaton (1975, p.5), "A language test which seeks to find out what candidates can do with language provides a focus for purposeful, everyday communication activities. Such a test will have a more useful effect on the learning of a particular language than a mechanical test of structure." Similarly Hughes' (1989, p.7) opinion is that language testing aims to measure the proficiency of the learners in regardless of language courses offered to them. It also aims to discover the achievement of the objectives of a course of study by the learners.

According to Harris (1974, as cited in Mainali 2005, p.3), "Language testing has the purpose of classifying or placing individuals in appropriate classes. On the basis of students' performance, they can be categorized as good or bad." Similarly, Coombe (2007, p.46) views that the development of English language tests depends upon a number of factors must importantly, however, is that the guiding principle of validity, reliability, practicality, washback, authenticity, transparency and security should guide the creation of classroom tests.

Testing is used as a process of scrutinizing how far learners have learned what a teacher wishes them to learn. In this process, the teacher usually makes queries in the classroom during or after his teaching or administers an examination at the end of a lesson, or a unit or a chapter or a course of study. (Khaniya, 2005, p.1)

To sum up, a test is conducted to reinforce learning, to motivate the students and to give feedback to the teacher and the materials writers. However, a test is usually conducted to achieve one or all of the following immediate purposes or objectives that denote the importance of testing in language learning activities:

- i. Testing is helpful to diagnose students' strengths and weaknesses and use remedial works for improvement.
- ii. It motivates students to learn or review specific materials.
- iii. It is helpful to place students in a new grade / at appropriate level.
- iv. It determines the students' achievements.
- v. It is helpful to find out the students' proficiency and progress.
- vi. It is important to determine the efficiency of the course.
- vii. It is useful to furnish with appropriate data for making decisions about teaching learning programmes.
- viii. It is helpful to evaluate the effectiveness of different tools of examinations as well as language teaching.

ix. It is useful to assess for some purpose external to current teaching.

1.1.3 Meaning and Importance of Marking

A language test has two main aspects: setting and marking. The term 'setting' refers to the construction of the instruments designed for the purpose of eliciting responses from learners, and the term 'marking' refers to the process of assigning marks to those responses following certain explicit rules, i.e. evaluation of those responses. Similarly, mark is the outcome of an examination, often expressed as percentage because of the adjustments such as heavier weighting for sometimes the mark is not always the same as the total score. "Marks may be associated with a student's attempt at an assessment task in the same way that grades may be associated with a student's overall attainment in a course. A mark may be a number or a label of a category." (<http://www.alte.org/projects/glossary.php>. Retrieved August 23, 2009). Similarly, there are two main activities in testing process; pre-administrative and post-administrative. Marking is related to the post-administrative activity in which the result is interpreted. Under this activity a tester can use different tools to bring consistency in his/her marking. Among these tools **marking scheme** is one which plays a vital role in marking exam papers. This study is related to the effectiveness of marking scheme in testing exam papers or students' achievement.

Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary (2005, p.940) defines marking as "the activity of checking and correcting the written work or exam papers of students." According to Khaniya (2005, p.155), "Scoring a composition is quantifying a piece of writing in terms of the presence or absence of

certain aspects of it, whether specified implicitly or explicitly." So marking is a process in which a marker evaluates the students' achievement on the basis of certain aspects of piece of writing or expected goals or objectives of the examination. It would be better if a teacher/marker is guided by certain aspects that are to be evaluated in objective way to get uniformity in testing. In this regard Ur (2005, p.44) says," The tests are marked and returned as quickly as possible (within a week) so that we can discuss specific points while the test is still fresh in students' minds."

Although marking is a complex process, it is very important in teaching learning activities because it can be a good feedback both for teachers and students. So a tester or marker should be much careful while marking the answer-sheets of the students. Mark obtained in test and examination generally judges the effectiveness of whole educational programme as well as efficiency and competence of the teachers.

The importance of marking can be pinpointed in the following points:

- i. It is an essential part of language testing to get feedback both for teacher and students. Teachers can judge the effectiveness of their teaching on the basis of marking. Similarly, students can test their own learning performance.
- ii. Marking provides a base for certification.
- iii. It is useful/helpful to take academic decisions.
- iv. Marking has a vital role in grading and upgrading of students. It tells us the certain position of the students because of the mark which he/she has secured in their examinations/tests.

- v. Marking is helpful to evaluate the approaches, methods and techniques of language teaching as well as testing.
- vi. It helps guardians to be aware of how well their students are performing in language learning.
- vii. It shows the areas of difficulties of the content of the language courses considering students and teachers.
- viii. It is really helpful for stakeholders i.e. the test designers, teachers' trainers and textbook writers of language learning activities. They can evaluate their works through the mark secured by the students.
- ix. It plays a great role to evaluate the whole educational programme.

1.1.4 Approaches to Marking

Subjectivity is one of the greatest problems in marking specially marking students writing tasks. According to Khaniya (2005, p. 154) "Experts argue that if well designed marking schemes are used and markers are trained in marking, the degree of subjectivity can be minimized."

According to Copper (1977), Ali (1988) and Lloyed-Jones (1977, as cited in Khaniya, 2005, p.155), approaches to marking compositions have traditionally been discussed under two main headings: e.g. atomistic and holistic. Lloyed-Jones (1977, p.33) says," Atomistic scoring method, sometimes called 'indirect or frequency-count' rely on the assessment of particular features associated with skills in discovering whereas, holistic methods consider samples of discourse."

Different approaches are emerged to minimize the subjectivity in marking. Subjectivity is developed due to the individual student's creativity level, expression ability, and selection of vocabulary, writing style, and originality and so on. Weir (1990, p. 82) has remarked, "Even if examiners are provided with an ideal marking scheme, there might always be some who do not mark in exactly the required." It means variation in marking is one of the problems of scoring which directly or indirectly creates problem; affects the students, teachers and others who are involved in educational pogramme. In order to cope with such problems various approaches to marking have been emerged.

According to Davies, (1968, cited in Gautam, 2001, p.16 and Sharma, 1999, p.9) there are three commonly used approaches to marking. They are:

- a. Impressionistic marking
- b. Analytical marking
- c. Multiple marking

But Khaniya (2005, p.156) views that general impression, and analytic methods are considered simple and reliable in assessing writing ability of learners in terms of their ability to communicate.

Similarly, Heaton (1975, p.148) discusses one more method of marking which is:d. Mechanical accuracy or error count method.

1.1.4.1 Impressionistic Marking

This is one of the methods of marking which refers to the process of assigning marks to an answer on the basis of the total impression of

the examiner about it as a whole. It means a sample of scripts (up to about one third) is selected randomly and tried to replicate the ability range involved.

According to Heaton (1975, p.147), "The impression method of marking entails one or more markers awarding a single mark (multiple marking), based on the total impression of the composition as a whole." He further adds that as it is possible for a composition to appeal to a certain reader but not to another, it is largely a matter of luck whether or not a single examiner likes a particular script. The examiner's mark, thus, can be highly subjective one based on a fallible judgment, affected by fatigue, carelessness and prejudice. He further says that impression marks must be based on impression only, and the whole object is defeated if examiners start to reconsider marks and analyze compositions.

According to Hughes (1989, p.86), who calls this method 'holistic scoring', it 'involves the assignment of a single score to a piece of writing on the basis of an overall impressions of it. He points out rapidity as the main advantage of holistic scoring.

Impressionistic scoring is fast and economical because it seeks for the total effect of a piece of writing as well as assesses the answers related to language. But various sub-skills and elements of language are not equally marked due to total effect of piece of writing at a time.

1.1.4.2 Analytical Marking

Analytical marking approach refers to the preparation of marking scheme and allocation of separate scores for each of a number of aspects of a task and assigning scores accordingly. According to Hughes (1989, p.91), "Methods of scoring which requires separate score for each of a number of aspects of a task are said to be analytical marking." It is related to test content and process of development of test items, i.e. pre-administrative and post-administrative phase of the test.

1.1.4.3 Multiple Marking

Multiple marking denotes the process of marking in which two or three markers are involved for a single answer sheet. It differs from the analytical marking and impressionistic marking in the sense that latter approaches involve only one marker for each piece of a work. Multiple marking is desirable to seek high accuracy and to make sure high score reliability.

1.1.5 Marking Scheme: An Introduction

Language testing is a highly complex activity. It must be based on theory as well as practice. A language tester should consider some principles of language testing, which are essentials to govern good test design, application /administration and analysis. Marking scheme and answer keys are important tools to language testers in scoring any

answer sheets of the students. It is a guideline in scoring answer sheets to measure all aspects of language testing considering the special aspects without any potentiality of partiality.

Marking scheme is a guideline to the examiners and head examiners of SLC answers. The definition is specially focused on marking SLC answer sheets. Khaniya (2005, p.138) defines, "A marking scheme is a comprehensive document indicating the explicit criteria against which candidates' answer will be judged; it enables the examiner to relate particular marks to answers of specified quality." Similarly, "A marking scheme is set of criteria used in assessing student learning and a marking guide provided to the marker of an assignment, which explains the marking criteria for each part of the assignment."([lodge.google.com/p/great apes/wiki/domin vocabulary](http://lodge.google.com/p/great%20apes/wiki/domin%20vocabulary). Retrieved January 2, 2009). The above definition emphasizes that marking scheme is a set of criteria which is used to assess student learning. The above definition also defines that marking scheme is a marking guide. It also provides the marker with assign score to an assignment considering the marking criteria for each part of the assignment. In other word, the above definition focuses on the specific marking criteria of assignment for the markers.

"A list of all the acceptable responses to the terms in a test. A marking scheme makes it possible for a marker to assign score to a test accurately ([www.oup.com/elt/local/global /promotion/oet](http://www.oup.com/elt/local/global/promotion/oet). Retrieved September 1, 2009). The retrieved definition also talks about reporting the value of a student's attempt in testing especially at an assessment task and defines "A marking

scheme is a way of assessing and reporting the value of a student's attempt at an assessment task." (www.tedi.edu.uk/downloads/criteria.PDF. Retrieved August 20, 2009). Similarly, "Marking scheme is a list of all the acceptable responses to the item in a test. A mark scheme makes it possible for a marker to assign a score to test accurately. (<http://www.alte.org/projects/glossary.php>. Retrieved August 23, 2009)

There are some other web definitions which talk about the importance as well as the format of the marking schemes in testing. The retrieved definitions of the marking scheme are presented below:

For each externally set assessment or question paper there must be mark scheme that is designed to ensure that all examiner mark the assessment or question paper consistently and reliably. The mark scheme provides the range of expected responses to all the questions in the question paper and indicates how many marks should be awarded to any particular answer the marks for each question in the mark scheme must exactly match those in question paper which normally includes an indication of the mark allocation for each question or sub-questions. All marking schemes are intended to promote positive marking, i.e. it is assured that a candidate starts with zero marks and is awarded marks for whatever achievement is demonstrated rather than starting with the

maximum number of marks or having marks deducted for wrong or incomplete answer (<http://www.ciea.org.uk>. Retrieved August 20, 2009).

Similarly, when we talk about marking scheme, it is necessary to think about the format of it. The examiner/marker should be familiar with the format of marking scheme. If the examiner/marker doesn't know about the format of marking scheme, he/she can face many problems in marking the particular answer sheet of their students. Sometimes, the format of marking scheme depends on the nature of question paper and the purpose of testing too. Regarding the format of marking scheme, some web definitions are presented below:

The format of the mark scheme depends on the nature of the question paper and what are being tested. Some mark schemes (or a selection of mark schemes) award mark point by point. Candidates are awarded mark for the correct answer (or for a correct response if there is more than one possible correct answer) and no marks for an incorrect answer. In some cases the principle examiner will list a range of acceptable and acceptable answer to offer guidance to the examining team. For more complex question the mark scheme may allow a range of possible marks, depending on the accuracy and extent of the response. So for example, a question marked out of three may allow one mark for a correct response two marks for a correct response plus a simple explanation and three

marks for a correct response plus a fuller explanation. (<http://www.ciea.org.uk>. Retrieved August 20, 2009).

So marking scheme is a document which indicates the specific criteria of specific answers of the candidates and allows us to judge considering the criteria while we are scoring them the answer sheets of the examinees/students.

1.1.6 Role of Marking Scheme

Marking scheme is a device /document which can play a vital role in scoring. Scoring is the post-administrative activity. Scoring or marking is considered to be positive or negative respectively according to whether one rewards mark for what is correct. So marking is not an easy task. The scorer may face so many problems in marking an answer book fairly. Fair judgment is one of the greatest challenges of the scorers. There may be dilemma whether or not to assign a certain mark to certain aspect of an answer book.

While marking, we take into account the different components of a composition such as content , and the way it is presented and so on, and then we measure the quality of the composition by seeing how well it fulfills the purpose of the writing task. The decision about which element in a composition are to be focused on, and

to what degree, to some extent, is based on the purpose of the test and the nature of the test. (Khaniya, 2005, pp.154-5).

It means we have so many problems regarding the fair judgment of the answer sheets of our students. A tester has to be familiar with all the facts related to the testing of all language skills. As a scorer he/she has to be aware of and anticipate the kind of problems that may arise during marking. In this regard Davies (1968, p.29) says, “For examinations in the marking of which subjective judgment is required, some degree of marker unreliability must be accepted.” He further adds that this marker unreliability can be reduced (i) by an analytical procedure in which different aspects of materials to be assessed are marked separately; (ii) by increasing the number and decreasing the size of the units to be marked and (iii) under certain conditions, by replicating an ‘impressionistic’ marking procedure.

According to Davies (1968, p.29) when we consider statistical aspect, there are three main causes of disagreement among markers who independently mark the same set of scripts:

- i. The marks awarded may differ in average standard or level. One marker may be generally severe, another generally lenient.
- ii. The marks may differ in their scatter or spread. One marker may employ the whole range of the available scale, another only part of it.

- iii. The mark may order the examinees differently. Discrepancies among the markers in rank order are reflected in low inter correlations among the arrays of mark they assign.

Writing skill i.e. composition writing of the students should be tested according to their level whether they are at basic, intermediate or advanced level. If they are at basic level, then they should not be penalized for common grammatical error. But if they are advanced level, then their writing skill should be tested more strictly. (Heaton, 1975, p.136).

Similarly, Weir (1990) says:

Two different approaches for assessing writing ability can be adopted. Firstly, writing can be divided into discrete level, e.g. grammar, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation, and these elements can be tested separately by the use of objective tests. Secondly, more direct extended writing tasks of various types could be constructed. These would have greater construct and washback validity but would require a more subjective assessment. (p.58).

Preparing a marking scheme is a difficult job. Although it is prepared by head examiners or subject teachers, the examiner and students should be familiar

with it. When the students are familiar with marking systems or techniques, they can easily handle the problems of answering process in their examinations. When we talk about the preparation and application of the marking scheme the following points are useful in our context too.

Marking scheme is prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant question, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardization meeting attend by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in the examination. The standardization meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to the questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardization meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates scripts alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer this to the principal examiner. (www.qaa.org.uk Retrieved 20 August 2009).

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reaction to the particular paper. Assumptions about further mark scheme on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment

remain constant, details will change depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

The survey of the literature on role of marking indicates that marking is not merely the assigning marks to a certain answer sheet . It is more a process of fairly and consistent way. The process is more reliable by using marking schemes. The role of marking scheme can be summarized in the following points:

- i. Marking scheme guides the markers (examiner/head examiner) to mark the specific features of the writing.
- ii. It is helpful to bring consistency among markers.
- iii. It is helpful to find out the content of the marking.
- iv. It can contribute to spread the mark considering the weightage of the course.
- v. It develops the skills of marking answer sheets.
- vi. It makes the scoring more reliable.

1.2 Review of Related Literature

A number of teachers and research scholars have carried out several studies on testing focusing on examination system at school level or campuses in the Department of English Education.

Adhikari (1986) carried out a research on “ Differences in Written Correction of English Teachers”. The objective of his study was to identify the nature of variation in correction techniques. The study

showed that there is no uniformity in teachers' correction. The same errors are treated in different ways. The study emphasized the uniformity in teachers' correction. So, one of the major problems of marking is the lack of uniformity among the teachers in marking the answer sheets of the students. In order to keep the uniformity among the teachers, marking scheme can play a vital role in marking.

Sharma (1999) who carried out a research on "A Study in Marking an English Answer Book", attempted to find out the nature and degree of variation in marking an SLC compulsory English answer book by different groups of examiners. The marks assigned by different group of examiners were compared to find out leniency.

Sharma's findings were:

- i. Variation in marking is found to occur not only across but also within groups of various kinds.
- ii. English teachers are found to be more lenient than others.
- iii. More variation in marking is found to occur in subjective test item than in objective test items.
- iv. Trained teacher are more lenient than untrained teachers in general.

Gautam (2001) conducted his study on "An Analysis of Subjective Marking" which makes an attempt to determine variation on marking by different groups of examiners. He divided the examiners while he was

conducting his research activities into different groups i.e. sex, age, designation, training, mother tongue, etc.

Some of the findings of his study are presented below:

- i. Variation in marking is found to occur in all the subjective test items included in the questionnaire.
- ii. The lower age of the examiners and female examiners are more lenient than the higher age of the examiner, the designation in academic position and male examiners respectively.

Kshetree (2001) conducted his research on "A Study on the Washback Effect of the SLC Examination" and the objectives of the study were to find out the washback effect of examination in teaching and learning of English, and to analyze the materials used by teachers and students. The findings of his study are presented in descriptive form as: the secondary level English teachers did not seem to be much informative. They were not found equipped with very simple materials like the package of the newly implemented courses of English. The washback effect of the SLC examination as a whole was negative. His study has undoubtedly opened the new area of research in language teaching and testing.

Sah (2003) has attempted to find out and compare the effectiveness of objective and subjective test. This was a cross-sectional study entitled "Effectiveness of Objective and Subjective Type of Tests for Grade 10" in which both primary and secondary sources of data were utilized.

The major findings of the study were that the performance of the students was better in objective test than in subjective test; the total difference of the students' performance in the subjective test and objective test was that of 16.42%; the performance of the students in both subjective and objective tests was better in the seen passage, etc.

Mainali (2005) conducted her study entitled "A Study on Marking an Answer Book: A Case of Grade IX Compulsory English". The objective of her study was to find out nature and degree of variation in marking an English answer book of grade IX. She presents them in terms of:

- i. experienced vs inexperienced teachers
- ii. trained vs untrained teachers
- iii. private vs government school teachers.

She used both primary and secondary sources of data. The population of the study was divided into two types and it consisted of the examinees and examiners. She found out that experienced teachers are stricter than inexperienced ones, trained teachers are less lenient than untrained ones and government aided school teachers are more lenient than private school teachers.

Regmi (2006) carried out her research on the topic " A Study of Washback Effect of B.Ed. Examination: A Case of English Language Teaching Materials and Practice". The objectives of her study were to find out the washback effect of the examination of the course 'ELT

Materials and Practice' to examine the trends of examination, questions from the academic year 2059 to 2062 on the basis of the course objective. Her finding is that examination system has negative washback effect on teaching and learning.

She has further explained her findings as follows;

- Examinations do not represent all courses objectives.
- Content coverage of theoretical examination has been found low.
- Since practical examination is not found practicable there is danger of cheating in practical examination.

The present study is different from those in the sense that it is related to the effectiveness of marking scheme in language testing especially the answer sheets of the students up to SLC level. So far as my knowledge is concerned, nobody has carried out a research on effectiveness of marking skill in testing.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- i. To find out the role of marking scheme in testing answer sheets.
- ii. To suggest some pedagogical implications.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Testing and examination are the most important aspects of language teaching. In every educational institutions of the world , testing is an

inherent part of language study. Without testing, teaching learning process is not adequate. The study will be significant for highlighting the meaning, importance and effectiveness of marking scheme that may help to reduce inconsistency in marking answer sheets of the students. It will provide feedback to the concerned teachers, teacher-trainers, test designers, examiners, examinees, policy makers, methodologists and all the others who are directly and indirectly involved in English language teaching in Nepal and abroad. It will be significant for improving marking system in systematical ways as well as bringing uniformity in testing/ marking answer sheets of our students.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

This chapter involves the methodology followed to carry out the research. The topics given below will describe the methodology adopted for the purpose.

2.1 Sources of Data

The researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data to carry out this research work.

2.1.1 Primary Sources

Forty teachers of Morang and Jhapa districts, who were teaching English in secondary level, were the primary sources of data from which the researcher conducted marking conferences taking 20 teachers from each district. Among the 20 teachers, 10 were trained and 10 untrained from each district. The researcher conducted the conference marking in two parts of respected districts i.e. one each.

2.1.2 Secondary Sources

The secondary sources of data were different books, magazines, journals, newspaper, articles, websites and documents related to language testing. Some of them are: Heaton (1975), Davies (1968), Ur (2005), Khaniya (2005), etc.

2.2 Sampling Procedure

The total population consisted of forty English teachers of Morang and Jhapa districts who are teaching English in secondary level. The teachers were trained, untrained, male and female. The researcher used the technique of judgmental sampling. The answer sheets (App. I, II, III) of the students were used to find the effectiveness of marking scheme which were collected by conducting dummy examination.

2.3 Tools for Data Collection

The question paper of SLC exam, Marking Scheme, Marking Scoring Form and the answer sheets of the students were the major tools for data collection.

2.4 Process of Data Collection

The researcher adopted the following stepwise procedures to collect the data.

- i. The researcher collected the SLC questions (App. IV) and marking scheme of 2008 (App. V) from OCE and zeroxed them.

- ii. The researcher visited some private and government-aided schools to administer a sample examination. Then, he collected answer sheets and observed different competency levels of the students. After that he selected three answer sheets among them.
- iii. The researcher then personally requested the teachers to take part in conference marking. Then, he supplied stationery materials as pens/pencils, blank sheet of paper etc. The researcher got them to mark the given answer sheets.
- iv. The researcher kindly requested and encouraged the teachers to mark the given three answer sheets without using marking scheme. When they completed marking the answer sheets, the researcher again requested them to mark the answer sheets by using marking scheme.

2.5 Limitations of the Study

The study had the following limitations:

- i. The study was limited to find the role/effectiveness of marking scheme for SLC level.
- ii. The study was confined to the selected teachers of Morang and Jhapa districts.
- iii. The study was limited to the marking of SLC answer sheets specially in testing reading and writing skills of the students.

CHAPTER THREE

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data obtained from the conference marking which was conducted in Jhapa and Morang, 20 teachers from each district. The marking of the answer-sheets were recorded and tabulated to meet the objectives of the study.

The analysis and interpretation is done under the following sub headings:

3.1 Effectiveness of the Marking Scheme in Total

Firstly, the researcher analyzed the data in total considering the highest and the lowest average score among the teachers with and without using the marking scheme and tabulated the assigned marks in the following table:

Table No. 1

Average Marks and Differences in Total

Sets	WOM	WM	Difference in average
Set A	14.5	16.5	+2
Set B	44.7	47.36	+2.66
Set C	66.53	66.61	+0.8

The above table shows that the difference of the assigned average mark is increased especially in set A and set B. The assigned average mark was 14.5 without using marking scheme and it was increased by 2 marks with marking scheme in set A. Similarly, the assigned average mark was 44.7 without using marking scheme and it was increased by 2.66 in average mark with marking scheme. On the other hand, in the case of set C the average mark assigned without using marking scheme was 66.53 and the difference was increased by 0.8 in average mark with marking scheme. In all above mentioned cases with using marking scheme, the marks are nearer to the true mark of the respected answer sheets. Similarly, the marks are very nearer the average mark of the answer sheets after using marking scheme. Thus, it is the conclusion that in every case there is positive result of marking when an examiner uses marking scheme in marking his/her answer sheets. So it is the conclusion of the research that marking scheme is effective in testing the answer sheets of the students.

3.2 District Wise Comparison

The researcher selected 20 teachers from Morang and 20 from Jhapa districts using judgmental sampling procedure. In order to find out the effectiveness of marking scheme, he analyzed the obtained data by comparing the marks of the teachers assigned by them by using marking scheme and without using marking scheme according to the district. The following two tables show the district wise marks assigned in different sets.

Table No. 2
Morang District

S. N.	Set A			Set B			Set C		
	WOM	WM	Diff.	WOM	WM	Diff.	WOM	WM	Diff.
1	13.5	16.5	3	42	47	5	63	67.5	4.5
2	16.5	15.5	-1	44.5	46	1.5	67.5	65	-2.5
3	11.5	13.5	2	45	47	2	68	66	-2
4	15.5	14.5	1	46.5	47.5	1	66	66	0
5	14.5	14.5	0	45	47.5	2.5	65	65	0
6	17	15	2	47.5	47	-0.5	62	65	3
7	14	13.5	-0.5	45	48	3	66.5	66	-0.5
8	13.5	17.5	4	44.5	48	3.5	69.5	69.5	0
9	15	16	1	48.5	47	-1.5	63	68	5
10	16	16	0	50	47	-3	66	66.5	0.5
11	11.5	14.5	3	46	48	2	64.5	65	0.5
12	20.5	16.5	-4	46	47	1	62.5	67	-4.5
13	9.5	15.5	6	43.5	48	4.5	72	67	-5
14	11	14	3	47.5	47	-0.5	65	66	1
15	12	12.5	-0.5	47.5	47.5	0	67	66	-1
16	13.5	15.5	2	47.5	48.5	1	71	67	-4
17	12.5	13.5	1	50.5	46.5	-4	61	65	4
18	17	16	-1	40.5	46	5.5	73	66.5	-6.5
19	17	17	0	45.5	47.5	2	71.5	68.5	-3
20	12.5	16	3.5	47	48	1	69	68.5	-0.5
Total	284	303.5		920	946		1333	1331	

Table No. 3
Jhapa District

S. N.	Set A			Set C			Set B		
	WOM	WM	Diff.	WOM	WM	Diff.	WOM	WM	Diff.
1	20.5	16	-4.5	47.5	47.5	0	65.5	67.5	2
2	18	16	-2	46	47.5	1.5	64	64.5	0.5
3	13	16	3	46	47	1	63.5	66	2.5
4	16.5	16	-0.5	46	47.5	1.5	66.5	66.5	0
5	15.5	17	2.5	46.5	47.5	1	63	66	3
6	12.5	17.5	5	45	47	2	65	67	2

7	14.5	17.5	3	48	46	-2	65.5	67	1.5
8	13	17	4	47.5	47	-0.5	67.5	66.5	-1
9	16	16.5	0.5	45	48	3	66	67.5	1.5
10	13.5	17	3.5	43.5	46.5	3	67.5	66	-0.5
11	11	14.5	3.5	40.5	47.5	7	62	68.5	6
12	12.5	17	4.5	47.5	46.5	-1	68	65.5	-2.5
13	16	17.5	1.5	46	48.5	2.5	68.5	67	-0.5
14	12.5	17.5	5	41	48	7	70	67	-3
15	14.5	16	2.5	46	48.5	2.5	69	66	-3
16	15	16.5	1.5	45.5	48.5	3	72	66.5	-5.5
17	20	17	-3	48.5	45.5	-3	69.5	66.5	-3
18	17.5	16	-1.5	50	48	-2	66	67	1
19	16	17.5	1.5	45	48	3	65.5	64.5	-1
20	13.5	15.5	2	43	46	3	65	68.5	3.5
Total	301.5	331.5		914	946.5		1329.5	1331.5	

The above tables show that the marking scheme is effectively used by the teachers of Jhapa because the differences among the sets are greater in comparison with the differences among the teachers of Morang. In other words, when the researcher analyzes the above tables, he finds positive and negative differences in the scoring of the given sheets after using the marking scheme. The differences are from -5.5 to 7.0 marks in different sets among the forty teachers. When the difference is zero/nil (0) and assigned mark is nearer to the average mark of that answer sheet, we can say that the role of marking scheme is not effective. On the other hand, if the difference is in positive or negative marks as -5.5 and 7.0 after using marking scheme, it will show the positive as well as negative effect of marking scheme in testing. It means if there is a negative difference the examiner reduces some marks after using marking scheme. Similarly, if there is positive difference the examiner adds some marks after using marking scheme. In order to find out the positive effect of marking

scheme, the mark should be nearer to the average mark of the particular answer sheet in both cases i.e. positive or negative differences.

The above tables clearly show that the differences of zero/nil (0) are of two teachers of Jhapa district in the marking of different sets of answer sheets. But the differences of zero/nil (0) are of seven teachers of Morang district. So the effectiveness of marking scheme is higher in comparison with Morang district. The difference of -5.5 is found in the marking of informant no.16 of Jhapa district in set C. The difference also brings to the nearest mark of that answer sheet. Similarly, there is a difference of 7 marks in set B of the teacher of Jhapa district. It means the informant no.11 of Jhapa adds 7 marks after using marking scheme. After adding 7 marks, the assigned mark is nearer to the average mark so the teachers of the Jhapa used the marking scheme effectively in comparison with the teachers of Morang district.

3.3 The Analysis of Marking Scheme between Trained and Untrained Teachers.

The following tables show that the marks assigned by the trained and untrained teachers. The researcher had requested 10 trained and 10 untrained from each district.

Table No. 4
Trained Teachers of both Districts

S. N.	Set A			Set B			Set C		
	WOM	WM	Diff.	WOM	WM	Diff.	WOM	WM	Diff.
1	13.5	16.5	3	63	67.5	4.5	42	47	5

2	16.5	15.5	-1	67.5	68	0.5	44.5	46	1.5
3	11.5	13.5	2	68	68	0	45	47	2
4	15.5	14.5	1	66	66	0	46.5	47.5	1
5	14.5	14.5	0	65	65	0	45	47.5	2.5
6	17	15	2	62	65	3	47.5	47	-0.5
7	14	13.5	-0.5	66.5	66	-0.5	45	48	3
8	13.5	17.5	4	69.5	69.5	0	44.5	48	3.5
9	15	16	1	63	68	5	48.5	47	-1.5
10	16	16	0	66	66.5	0.5	50	47	-3
11	20.5	16	-4.5	65.5	67.5	2	47.5	47.5	0
12	18	16	-2	64	64.5	0.5	46	47.5	1.5
13	13	16	3	63.5	66	2.5	46	47	1
14	16.5	16	-0.5	66.5	66.5	0	46	47.5	1.5
15	15.5	17	2.5	63	66	3	46.5	47.5	1
16	12.5	17.5	5	65	67	2	45	47	2
17	14.5	17.5	3	65.5	67	1.5	48	46	-2
18	13	17	4	67.5	66.5	-1	47.5	47	-0.5
19	16	16.5	0.5	66	67.5	1.5	45	48	3
20	13.5	17	3.5	67.5	66	-0.5	43.5	46.5	3
TM	300	319		1310.5	1334		919.5	943.5	
AM	15.00	15.95	0.00	65.53	66.70	0.00	45.98	47.18	

The above table shows the assigned mark in different sets by the trained teachers of both districts. Among the 20 trained teachers the average mark of set A, set B and set C is 15, 45.95 and 66.5 without using marking scheme and 15.95, 47.17 and 66.7 respectively after using the marking scheme. After using marking scheme the variation is minimized and most of the assigned marks are nearer to the average mark. Thus, it brings consistency in marking and also shows the vital role of marking scheme in marking. When the researcher analyzed the assigned marks considering the individual performance of the trained teachers, the greatest difference was found of 8 marks in set B without using marking scheme but it was

minimized after using marking scheme and difference was of 2 marks only. Similarly, in most of the cases the assigned marks are very near to the average mark of the given sets with using marking scheme. So there is consistency in marking after using marking scheme.

Table No. 5
Untrained Teachers of both Districts

S. N.	Set A			Set B			Set C		
	WOM	WM	Diff.	WOM	WM	Diff.	WOM	WM	Diff.
1	11.5	14.5	3	64.5	65	0.5	46	48	2
2	20.5	16.5	-4	62.5	67	-4.5	46	47	1
3	9.5	15.5	6	72	67	-5	43.5	48	4.5
4	11	14	3	65	66	1	47.5	47	-0.5
5	12	12.5	-0.5	67	66	-1	47.5	47.5	0
6	13.5	15.5	2	71	67	-4	47.5	48.5	1
7	12.5	13.5	1	61	67	6	50.5	46.5	-4
8	17	16	-1	73	66.5	-6.5	40.5	46	5.5
9	17	17	0	71.5	68.5	-3	45.5	47.5	2
10	12.5	16	3.5	69	68.5	-0.5	47	48	1
11	11	14.5	3.5	62	68.5	6	40.5	47.5	7
12	12.5	17	4.5	68	65.5	-2.5	47.5	46.5	-1
13	16	17.5	1.5	68.5	67	-0.5	46	48.5	2.5
14	12.5	17.5	5	70	67	-3	41	48	7
15	14.5	16	2.5	69	66	-3	46	48.5	2.5
16	15	16.5	1.5	72	66.5	-5.5	45.5	48.5	3
17	20	17	-3	69.5	66.5	-3	48.5	45.5	-3
18	17.5	16	-1.5	66	67	1	50	48	-2
19	16	17.5	1.5	65.5	64.5	-1	45	48	3
20	13.5	15.5	2	65	68.5	3.5	43	46	3
TM	285.5	316		1352	1335.5		914.5	949	
AM	14.28	15.80	0.00	67.60	66.78	0.00	45.73	47.45	

The above table shows the assigned mark in different sets by the untrained teachers of both districts. Among the 20 untrained teachers the average mark of sets A, B & C is 15.1, 43.47 and 67.6 without using marking scheme and 18.25, 47.45 and 66.5 respectively after using the marking scheme. After using marking scheme the variation is minimized and most of the assigned marks are nearer to the average mark. Thus, it brings consistency in marking and also shows the vital role of marking scheme in marking. When the researcher analyzed the assigned marks considering the individual performance of the trained teachers, the greatest difference was found of 11 marks in set C without using marking scheme but it was minimized after using marking scheme and difference was of 5.5 marks only in set A. Similarly, in most of the cases the assigned marks are very near to the average mark of the given sets. So there is consistency in marking after using marking scheme.

When the researcher compares the effectiveness of marking scheme among the trained and untrained teachers of both districts, the marking scheme is more useful and effective for the untrained teachers because the differences among the untrained teachers was higher in comparison with trained teachers. It means the untrained teachers effectively used the marking scheme to bring consistency in their marking. The above table clearly shows that there is the difference of 7 marks in case of informants nos 11 and 14. The informant no.11 assigns 40.5 marks without using marking scheme but after using marking scheme he/she assigns 47.5 marks. Similarly, the informant no 14 assigns 41 marks without using marking scheme but after using assigns 48 marks. In the case of trained teachers the greatest difference is of 3 marks only after using marking scheme and without using marking scheme. Thus, the analysis shows that the marking

scheme is more effective to the untrained teachers in scoring the answer sheets of the SLC examination.

3.4 Comparison and Analysis of Marking Scheme Considering the Different Sets of Answer Sheets.

The researcher selected three different types of answer sheets and named them as sets A, B and C. Set A is the answer sheet which can secure 15 to 17 marks in average because the researcher had already marked the same answer sheet before going to real research. Similarly, the sets B and C are the answer sheets of the students that can secure 45 to 47 and 65 to 67 marks respectively when we use marking scheme in testing them. The following table shows the set wise analysis of the marks with and without using marking scheme.

Table No. 6

Set Wise Comparison of the effectiveness of Marking Scheme

S. N.	SET A			SET B			SET C		
	WOM	WM	DIFF	WOM	WM	DIFF	WOM	WM	DIFF
1	13.5	16.5	+3	42	47	5	63	67.5	4.5
2	16.5	15.5	-1	44.5	46	1.5	67.5	68	0.5
3	11.5	13.5	+2	45	47	2	68	68	0
4	15.5	14.5	1	46.5	47.5	1	66	66	0
5	14.5	14.5	0	45	47.5	2.5	65	65	0
6	17	15	2	47.5	47	-0.5	62	65	+3
7	14	13.5	-0.5	45	48	3	66.5	66	-0.5
8	13.5	17.5	4	44.5	48	3.5	69.5	69.5	0
9	15	16	1	48.5	47	-1.5	63	68	5
10	16	16	0	50	47	-3	66	66.5	0.5
11	11.5	14.5	3	46	48	2	64.5	65	0.5

12	20.5	16.5	-4	46	47	1	62.5	67	-4.5
13	9.5	15.5	+6	43.5	48	4.5	72	67	-5
14	11	14	+3	47.5	47	-0.5	65	66	1
15	12	12.5	-0.5	47.5	47.5	0	67	66	-1
16	13.5	15.5	+2	47.5	48.5	1	71	67	-4
17	12.5	13.5	+1	50.5	46.5	-4	61	67	+6
18	17	16	-1	40.5	46	5.5	73	66.5	-6.5
19	17	17	0	45.5	47.5	2	71.5	68.5	-3
20	12.5	16	3.5	47	48	1	69	68.5	-0.5
21	20.5	16	-4.5	47.5	47.5	0	65.5	67.5	+2
22	18	16	-2	46	47.5	1.5	64	64.5	+0.5
23	13	16	+3	46	47	+1	63.5	66	2.5
24	16.5	16	-0.5	46	47.5	+1.5	66.5	66.5	0
25	15.5	17	+2.5	46.5	47.5	+1	63	66	+3
26	12.5	17.5	5	45	47	+2	65	67	+2
27	14.5	17.5	+3	48	46	-2	65.5	67	1.5
28	13	17	4	47.5	47	-0.5	67.5	66.5	-1
29	16	16.5	0.5	45	48	+3	66	67.5	+1.5
30	13.5	17	3.5	43.5	46.5	3	67.5	66	-0.5
31	11	14.5	3.5	40.5	47.5	7	62	68.5	+6
32	12.5	17	4.5	47.5	46.5	-1	68	65.5	-2.5
33	16	17.5	+1.5	46	48.5	2.5	68.5	67	-0.5
34	12.5	17.5	+5	41	48	7	70	67	-3
35	14.5	16	+2.5	46	48.5	2.5	69	66	-3
36	15	16.5	1.5	45.5	48.5	3	72	66.5	-5.5
37	20	17	-3	48.5	45.5	-3	69.5	66.5	-3
36	17.5	16	-1.5	50	48	-2	66	67	1
39	16	17.5	1.5	45	48	3	65.5	64.5	-1
40	13.5	15.5	+2	43	46	3	65	68.5	3.5
TM	585.5	635	20	1834	1892.5	50	2662.5	2669.5	-29
AM	14.64	15.88		45.85	47.31		66.56	66.74	

The table above shows that the variation in marks is reduced after using marking scheme in every set. The set A's marking is more reliable after using

marking scheme because the marks assigned by many teachers are nearer to the average marks of that very set. The above table clearly shows that, the answer sheet of average students is marked in a consistent way in comparison with other slow and fast learner students after using marking scheme.

3.5 The Analysis of Marking Scheme in Individual Performance of the Teachers

The table below shows mark assigned by the individual marking of the teachers of different sets i.e. set A, set B and set C. The table also shows the difference, similarity and equality of scoring (assigned marks) and the positive effect of marking scheme.

Table No. 7
Individual Performance of the Teachers (Set A)

Q.N.	1			2		3			4			5	6	7	8	GT	Rem.	Diff
S.Q. S.N.	A	B	C	A	B	A	B	C	A	B	C							
1	-	1	1.5	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	6	3	16.5	WM	3
	-	1	2	-	-	1		-	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	13.5	WOM	
2	-	2	2	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	2	-	-	5	1.5	16.5	WM	1
	-	2	2	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	5	1.5	15.5	WOM	
3	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	4.5	1	11.5	WM	2
	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	13.5	WOM	
4	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	14.5	WM	1
	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	15.5	WOM	

5	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	14.5	WM	0
	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	14.5	WOM	
6	-	2	1	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	17	WM	2
	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	15	WOM	
7	-	2	0.5	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	6	1.5	14	WM	-0.5
	-	2	0.5	-	-	0.5	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	13.5	WOM	
8	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	5	1.5	13.5	WM	3
	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16.5	WOM	
9	-	2	2	0.5	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	6	1.5	15	WM	1
	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16	WOM	
10	-	2	0.5	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16	WM	0
	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16	WOM	
11	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	4	1.5	11.5	WM	3
	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	14.5	WOM	
12	-	2	2	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	2	-	-	5	1.5	16.5	WM	-4
	-	1.5	2	-	-	1	-	3	1	-	2	-	-	5	5	20.5	WOM	
13	-	2	0.5	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	6	2	15.5	WM	6
	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	1.5	9.5	WOM	
14	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	2	1	11	WM	3.5
	-	2	0.5	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	14.5	WOM	
15	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	12.5	WM	0.5
	-	1.5	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	12	WOM	

16	-	1.5	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	3	-	-	6	1.5	15.5	WM	-2
	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	6	1.5	13.5	WOM	
17	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	13.5	WM	1
	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	5	1.5	12.5	WOM	
18	-	1.5	2	-	-	1	0.5	-	1	-	2	-	-	6	1	17	WM	-1
	-	1.5	1.5	-	-	1	0.5	2	1	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16	WOM	
19	-	2	1	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	6	4	17	WM	0
	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	-	2	3	-	2	-	-	5	1.5	17	WOM	
20	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	3	1.5	12.5	WM	4.5
	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16	WOM	
21	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	0.5	2	4	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	20.5	WM	4

	-	1.5	2	-	-	1	0.5	0	1	-	3	-	-	6	1.5	16.5	WOM	
22	-	1.5	2.5	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	3	-	-	5	3	18	WM	-2
	-	2	1	-	-	0.5	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16	WOM	
23	-	2	0.5	-	-	1	0.5	1	-	-	2	-	-	0	1.5	13	WM	3
	-	2	1	-	-	1	0.5	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16	WOM	
24	-	1.5	2	-	-	2	0.5	1	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16.5	WM	-0.5
	-	2	1	-	-	1	0.5	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16	WOM	
25	-	1.5	2	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	5	1	15.5	WM	1.5
	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	17	WOM	
26	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	0.5	1	-	-	2	-	-	3	1.5	12.5	WM	5
	-	2	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	17.5	WOM	
27	-	1.5	1.5	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	6	1.5	14.5	WM	3
	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	3	17.5	WOM	
28	-	1.5	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	3	1.5	13	WM	4
	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	17	WOM	
29	-	1.5	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	5	1.5	16	WM	0.5
	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16.5	WOM	
30	-	1.5	1.5	-	-	2	1	0.5	-	-	1	-	-	5	1	13.5	WM	3.5
	-	2	2	-	-	1	0.5	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	17	WOM	
31	-	1.5	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	3	1.5	11	WM	3.5
	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	6	1.5	14.5	WOM	
32	-	1.5	2	-	-	0	1	1.5	-	-	2	-	-	3	1.5	12.5	WM	5.5
	-	1.5	1.5	-	-	1	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	17	WOM	
33	-	1.5	2	-	-	0.5	1	1.5	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16	WM	-5
	-	2	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	17.5	WOM	

34	-	1.5	2	-	-	0.5	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	3	1.5	12.5	WM	5
	-	2	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	17.5	WOM	
35	-	1.5	1.5	-	-	2	1	0.5	-	-	1	-	-	6	1	14.5	WM	4.5
	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	6	1.5	16	WOM	
36	-	2	1.5	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	15	WM	-5
	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	0.5	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	16.5	WOM	
37	-	2	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	4	20	WM	3
	-	1.5	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	17	WOM	

38	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	3	17.5	WM	1.5
	-	2	1.5	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	6	1.5	16	WOM	
39	-	2	0.5	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	5	1.5	16	WM	1
	-	2	1.5	-	-	1	0.5	3	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	17.5	WOM	
40	-	1.5	0.5	-	-	2	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	3	1.5	13.5	WM	4.5
	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	6	1.5	15.5	WOM	

The above table shows the individual performance of forty teachers in marking the answer sheet of Set A. The average mark of set A is 14.5 without using marking scheme. But it is increased after using marking scheme and it becomes 16.5. In order to analyze the data, the researcher compares the assigned marks in two ways. Firstly, he compares the individual marking among forty teachers considering highest and lowest marks without using marking scheme and using marking scheme. Similarly, he tries to seek the effectiveness of the marking scheme finding the variation and consistency of marking regarding the assigned marks by the individual teachers.

So, the above table clearly shows that the highest mark is 20.5 which were assigned by informant no. 12 and 21 without using marking scheme and lowest mark is 9.5 assigned by informant no. 30. The difference among the teacher is of 11 marks. On the other hand, after using marking scheme the highest mark is 17.5 which was assigned by informant no. 39 and the lowest is 12.5 of informant no. 15. Now the difference is just of 4.5 marks. Thus, the difference is minimized because of the marking scheme in the individual performance of the teachers.

When the researcher compares the marks assigned by the particular teacher, he finds the highest difference of 6 marks. It means the informant no.13 assigned 9.5 marks without using marking scheme but after using marking scheme he/she provides 15.5 marks for the same answer sheet i.e. set A. The mark 15.5 is also the nearest mark of the average mark. Similarly, the table also shows that after using marking most of the marks are nearer to the average mark of set A. Thus, it shows the effectiveness of marking scheme.

Table No. 8
Individual Performance of the Teachers (Set B)

S.N.	1			2		3			4			5	6	7	8	GT	Rem.	Diff
S.Q.	A	B	C	A	B	A	B	C	A	B	C							
S.N.																		
1	1	1	2.5	1	2	3	2	3	5	3	2	3	3	6	4.5	42	WOM	5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	6	3	2	3	3	6	5	47	WM	
2	1.5	1.5	2	2	1	3	3	4.5	4.5	3	1	4	4	5	4.5	44.5	WOM	1.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.0	5	3	2	3	3	6	5	46	WM	
3	1.5	1.5	2	1	2	3	2	5.0	5	2	2	5	3	5	5	45	WOM	2
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.0	4	3	2	5	3	6	5	47	WM	
4	2	2	3.5	1	2	3	3	4.5	5.5	3	1.5	4	4	3	4.5	46.5	WOM	1
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.0	4	3	2	5	3.5	6	5	47.5	WM	
5	1.5	1.5	3.5	1	1.5	3	2	4.0	4.5	3	2	4	4	5	4.5	45	WOM	2.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	3.5	4.5	3	2	5	3.5	6	5	47.5	WM	
6	1.5	1.5	3.5	1	2	3	3	4	3.5	3	2	5	5	5	4.5	47.5	WOM	-0.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	4	3	2	4	4	6	5	47	WM	
7	1.5	1.5	3	0.5	1.5	2	3	4.5	4.5	3	2	3	4	6	5	45	WOM	3
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	5	6	3	2	3	3	6	5	48	WM	
8	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.5	5	3	2	3.5	4	3	4.5	44.5	WOM	3.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	5	6	3	2	3	3	6	5	48	WM	
9	2	2	3	1	2	3.5	3	5	4.5	3	2	4	3	6	4.5	48.5	WOM	-1.5

	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.5	5.5	3	2	3	3	6	5	47	WM	
10	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	4	5.5	2	3	5	4.5	6	5	50	WOM	-3
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	6	3	2	3	3	6	5	47	WM	
11	1.5	1.5	3.5	2	2	2.5	2	4.5	3.5	2.5	1.5	5	4	5	5	46	WOM	2
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	4	3	2	5	4	6	5	48	WM	
12	1.5	1.5	3	0.5	1.5	3	3	4.5	5	3	2	4	3	6	4.5	46	WOM	1
	1.5	1.5	3	1	1	3	3	4	6	3	2	4	3	6	5	47	WM	
13	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	2	2	4.5	5	2	2	4	3	5	5	43.5	WOM	4.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	6	3	2	4	3	6	5	48	WM	
14	2	2	2.5	1	2	3	3	4	5.5	3	2	4	4	5	4.5	47.5	WOM	-0.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	6	3	2	3	3	6	5	47	WM	
15	1.5	1.5	3.5	1	2	3	3	4.5	4.5	3	2	4	4	5	5	47.5	WOM	0
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.0	4	3	2	5	3.5	6	5	47.5	WM	
16	1.5	1.5	3.5	0.5	1.5	3	3	4.0	4.5	3	2	4	5	6	4.5	47.5	WOM	1
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.5	4	3	2	5	4	6	5	48.5	WM	
17	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.5	5	3	2	5	5	6	5	50.5	WOM	-4
	1.5	1.5	3.5	1	2	2	3	4.5	4.5	3	2	4	4	5	4	46.5	WM	
18	2.0	1	2	1	2	3	2.5	3	5.5	3	2	3	3	3	4.5	40.5	WOM	5.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.5	6	3	2	1.5	3	6	5	46	WM	
19	1.5	1.5	2	1	1.5	3	3	3.5	5.5	3	2	3.5	4	6	4.5	45.5	WOM	2
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	5	6	3	2	3	3	6	4.5	47.5	WM	
20	1.5	1.5	2	1	2	3	3	4	4.5	2.5	2	5	4.5	6	4.5	47	WOM	1
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	5	6	3	2	3	3	6	5	48	WM	
21	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	2	4.5	6	2.5	2	4	3	6	4.5	47.5	WOM	0
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	6	3	2	3.5	3	6	5	47.5	WM	
22	1.5	1.5	2	1	2	3	2	4.5	6	3	2	3.5	3	6	5	46	WOM	1.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	6	3	2	4.5	3	5	5	47.5	WM	
23	1.5	1.5	2	1	1	2	3	4.5	5	3	3	5	3	6	4.5	46	WOM	1
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	6	2	2	5	3	5	5	47	WM	
24	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1	3	3	3	6	3	2	4	3	5.5	5	46	WOM	1.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	6	3	2	4	3	6	5	47.5	WM	
25	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	2	3	3.5	5	3	2	5	3	6	4.5	46.5	WOM	1.5
	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3	3	4	5	3	2	5	3	6	5	47.5	WM	

26	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3	3	3.5	4	3	2	4	3	6	5	45	WOM	2
	1.5	2	3	1	2	3	3	4.5	4	3	2	4	3	6	5	47	WM	
27	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.5	5	2.5	3	5	4	4	5	48	WOM	-2
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	2	2.5	4.5	6	3	2	3	3	6	5	46	WM	
28	2	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	5	3.5	3	3	3	6	3.5	47.5	WOM	-5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	6	3	2	3	3	6	5	47	WM	
29	1	2	2.5	1	2	2	2	4	4.5	3	3	4	3	6	5	45	WOM	3.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	6	3	2	4	3	6	5	48	WM	
30	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	3	3.5	6	3	2	6	2	3	4.5	43.5	WOM	3
	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3	3	3.5	6	3	2	5	2	6	4.5	46.5	WM	
31	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2	3	3	4	3	2	5	3	3	4.5	40.5	WOM	7
	1.5	2	2.5	1	2	3	3	4	5	3	2	5	3	6	4.5	47.5	WM	
32	1.5	1.5	3	1	1.5	3	3	3.5	5.5	3	2	5	3	6	5	47.5	WOM	-1
	1.5	1.5	2	1	2	3	3	3.5	5	3	2	5	3	6	5	46.5	WM	
33	1.5	2	3	1.5	2	3	3	3	5	3	2	4.5	3	5	4.5	46	WOM	2.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	2	3	3	4	6	3	2	4	3	6	5	48.5	WM	
34	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	2	3.5	3	5	3	2	4.5	2	3	4.5	41	WOM	7
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	6	3	2	4	3	6	5	48	WM	
35	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	3	3	4.5	3	2	5.5	3	6	5	46	WOM	2.5
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4	5.5	3	2	5	3	6	5	48.5	WM	
36	2	2	2	0.5	2	3	3	5	6	3	2	4	3	3	5	45.5	WOM	3
	2	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	5.5	6	2.5	2	3	3	6	5	48.5	WM	
37	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.5	4.5	3	2	3.5	5	6	5	48.5	WOM	-3
	1.5	1.5	2	1	2	2	3	5	5.5	3	2	3	3	6	5	45.5	WM	
38	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	4.5	5	2.5	3	4	5	6	5	50	WOM	-2
	1.5	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	5	6	3	2	3	3	6	5	48	WM	
39	1.5	1.5	3.5	1	2	3	3	4.5	4.5	3	2	4.5	4	3	4	45	WOM	3
	1	1.5	3	1	2	3	3	5	5	3	2	3.5	4	6	5	48	WM	
40	1.5	1.5	3.5	1	2	2	2.5	4.5	5	3	3	3	3	3	4.5	43	WOM	3
	1.5	1.5	3	1	1.5	3	3	5	5.5	2	2	3	3	6	5	46	WM	

The above table shows the individual performance of forty teachers in marking the answer sheet of set B. The average mark of set B is 44.7 without using

marking scheme. But it is increased after using marking scheme and it becomes 47.36. In order to analyze the data, the researcher

compares the assigned marks in two ways. Firstly, he compares the individual marking among forty teachers considering highest and lowest marks without using marking scheme and using marking scheme. Similarly, he tries to seek the effectiveness of the marking scheme finding the variation and consistency of marking regarding the assigned marks by the individual teachers.

So, the above table further shows that the highest mark is 50.5 which were assigned by informant no. 17 without using marking scheme and the lowest mark is 40.5 assigned by informant no.18. The difference among the teacher is of 10 marks. On the other hand, after using marking scheme the highest mark is 48.5 which was assigned by informants' no. 16,29,33,35, and 36 and the lowest is 45.5 of informant no.37. Now the difference is just of 4.5 marks. Thus, the difference is minimized because of the marking scheme in the individual performance of the teachers.

When the researcher compares the marks assigned by the particular teacher, he finds the highest difference of 7 marks. It means the informant no.31 assigned 40.5 marks without using marking scheme but after using marking scheme he/she provides 47.5 marks for the same answer sheet i.e. set B. Similarly, the informant no.34 assigned 41 marks without using marking scheme but after using marking scheme he/she provides 48 marks for the same answer sheet of set B. The marks 47.5 and 48 are also the nearest marks of the average mark of

set B. Similarly, the above table shows that after using marking scheme most of the assigned marks are nearer to the average mark of set B. Thus, it shows the effectiveness of marking scheme.

Table No.9
Individual Performance of the Teachers (Set C)

S.N.	1			2		3			4			5	6	7	8	GT	Rem	Diff
S.Q.	A	B	C	A	B	A	B	C	A	B	C							
S.N. ↓																		
1	2	1.5	4	1.5	3	2	3	8	8	4	2	8	5	3	9	63	WOM	4.5
	2.5	2	3.5	1.5	2.5	3	2	5.5	8	4	3	10	5	5.5	9.5	67.5	WM	
2	2.5	1.5	5	1.5	2	3	2	7	8	4	3	8	4.5	5	9.5	67.5	WOM	.5
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	2	3	3	7	7	4	3	8.5	4.5	6	10	68	WM	
3	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	1.5	3	4	5	8	4	3	9	4.5	6	10	68	WOM	0
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	1.5	3	2	6	8.5	4	3	9	5	6	10	68	WM	
4	-	1.5	4.5	1.5	2.5	3	3	6	7.5	4	3	10	5	6	8.5	66	WOM	0
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	2	2	3	6	8	4	3	10	5	4.5	8.5	66	WM	
5	3	2	4	1.5	2.5	3	4	7	5	4	3	9.5	4	4	8.5	65	WOM	0
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	2	3	3	6	8	4	3	9.5	5	3	8.5	65	WM	
6	3	2	4	1.5	2	3	4	1.5	6.5	4	3	9	5	4	9.5	62	WOM	3
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2	3	2	6	7	4	3	9	6	4	9.5	65	WM	
7	2.5	1.5	5	1.5	3	3	2	8	8	4	3	6	4	6	9	66.5	WOM	-0.5
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	3	3	2	7.5	8	4	3	6	4.5	6	9	66	WM	
8	3	1.5	5	1.5	2	3	3	7	8	3.5	3	9	5	6	9.5	69.5	WOM	0
	2.5	1.5	5	1.5	2	3	3	7	8	3.5	3	9	5	6	9.5	69.5	WM	
9	2.5	1.5	3.5	2	3	3	2	8	8	3	2	10	4	4	8.5	63	WOM	5
	2.5	1.5	4.5	2	3	3	2	8	8	3	3	10	5	4	8.5	68	WM	
10	2	1.5	4.5	1.5	3	3	2	7	8	3	2	8	4.5	6	10	66	WOM	0.5
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	2	3	3	7	8	4	3	8	5	4	9.5	66.5	WM	
11	2.5	2	4	1.5	2	3	2	6	7	4	3	8	6	4	9.5	64.5	WOM	0.5
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2	3	2	6	6.5	4	3	9	6	4	9.5	65	WM	

12	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	2	3	2	6	7	3.5	3	8	4.5	4	9.5	62.5	WOM	4.5
	2.5	1.5	5	1.5	2	3	3	7	8	4	3	8	4	5	9.5	67	WM	
13	3	1.5	5	1.5	3	3	3	8	8	4	3	10	5	6	9	72	WOM	-5
	2.5	1.5	5	1.5	3	3	2	8	8	4	3	10	5	4	8.5	67.0	WM	
14	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2.5	3	4	7	7	4	3	9	5	5	10	65	WOM	1
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2.5	3	3	7	7.5	4	3	9	4	5	9.5	66	WM	
15	2.5	1.5	5	1.5	2	3	2	7	8	3	3	11	5	4	8.5	67	WOM	-1
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2	3	3	7	8	3	3	11	5	4	8.5	66	WM	

16	2.5	1.5	5	1.5	3	3	4	7	8	4	3	9	4.5	4	9	71	WOM	-4
	2.5	1.5	5	1.5	2.5	3	3	6.5	8	4	3	8.5	5	4	9	67	WM	
17	2.5	1.5	5	1.5	1.5	3	2	3	7	3.5	3	10	4	4	9.5	61	WOM	6
	-	1.5	4.5	1.5	2.5	3	3	6	8	3.5	3	11	4.5	6	9	67	WM	
18	3	1.5	4.5	2	2.5	3	4	8	8	4	3	10	5	6	8.5	73	WOM	-6.5
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1	2	3	3	6	8	4	3	10	5	4	8.5	66.5	WM	
19	3	2	5	1.5	3	3	3	8	8	4	3	8	5	6	9	71.5	WOM	-3
	2.5	1.5	5	1.5	1.5	3	2	7	8	4	3	10	5	5	9	68.5	WM	
20	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	3	3	2	7	8	4	3	10	4.5	6	8.5	69	WOM	-0.5
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	2	3	3	8	8	4	3	10	4	4	9.5	68.5	WM	
21	2	1.5	4	1.5	3	2	3	8	8	4	2	8	5	5	8.5	65.5	WOM	2
	2.5	2	3.5	1.5	2.5	2	3	8	8	4	3	9	5	4	9.5	67.5	WM	
22	2	1.5	3.5	1.5	3	2	3	6	8	4	3	8	5	5	8.5	64	WOM	.5
	2.5	2	4.5	1.5	2	3	3	6	8	4	3	8	5	4	9.5	64.5	WM	
23	2.5	2	3	1.5	2	3	3	6	7.5	3	3	8	5	4.5	9.5	63.5	WOM	2.5
	2.5	1.5	3.5	1.5	2.5	3	3	7	8	4	3	8	5	4	9.5	66	WM	
24	2.5	1.5	3	1.5	2	3.5	4	7	8	4	3	10	4	4	8.5	66.5	WOM	0
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2.5	3.5	4	8	7	4	3	8	4	4	9.5	66.5	WM	
25	2	1.5	3	2	2	3	4	5	7.5	4	2	10	5	3	9	63	WOM	3
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2.5	3	3.5	4	8	4	3	8	5	6	9.5	66	WM	
26	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	2	3	3	6	8	4	3	9	4	4	9	65.5	WOM	2
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2	3	3	6	8	4	3	9	5	4	9.5	67.5	WM	
27	2.5	1.5	3	1.5	2.5	3	2	7	8	3	2	9	4.5	6	10	65.5	WOM	1.5
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	3	3	3	6	8	4	3	9	4.5	4	9.5	67	WM	
28	2.5	1.5	3.5	1.5	2	3	3	6	8	4	3	10	4	6	9.5	67.5	WOM	0

	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	2	3	3	6	8	4	3	10	4	4	9.5	67.5	WM	
29	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2	3	3	6	7	7	3	8.5	4	4	9.5	66	WOM	1.5
	2.5	1.5	3	1.5	2.5	3	4	7	8	4	3	9	5	4	9.5	67.5	WM	
30	2.5	2	3	2	2.5	3	3	8	8	4	3	8	4.5	5	9	67.5	WOM	1.5
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	2	3	3	6	8	4	3	9.5	4	4	9.5	66	WM	
31	2.5	1.5	3	1.5	2	2	3	7.5	8	4	3	8	4.5	3	8.5	62	WOM	6.5
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2.5	3	3	6	8	4	3	9	5	6	9.5	68.5	WM	
32	2.5	1.5	3.5	2	2.5	3	3	8	8	4	3	10	4	4	9.0	68	WOM	-
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2.5	3	3	6	8	4	3	9	4	4	9.5	65.5	WM	2.5
33	2.5	1.5	3.5	2	2.5	3	4	7	8	4	3	10	5	3	9.5	68.5	WOM	-
	2.5	2	4.5	1.5	2	3	3	6.5	8	4	3	9	4.5	4	9.5	67	WM	1.5

34	2.5	2	4	1.5	2	3	3	7.5	9	4	3	8	6	5	9.5	70	WOM	3
	2	1.5	3	1	3	3	4	8	8	4	3	8	5	4	9.5	67	WM	
35	2	1.5	3	1.5	3	3	3	8	8	4	3	8.5	5	6	9.5	69	WOM	-3
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2.5	3	3	6	8	4	3	9	4.5	4	9.5	66	WM	
36	3	1.5	4.5	1.5	3	3	4	7	8	4	3	10	5	6	8.5	72	WOM	-5.5
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	2	3	4	7	8	4	3	9	5	4	8.5	66.5	WM	
37	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	3	3	3	8	8	4	3	9	5	4	9.5	69.5	WOM	-3
	3	1.5	5	2	2	3	2	7	8	3	2	8	4.5	6	9.5	66.5	WM	
38	3	2	3	1.5	2.5	3	3	7	8	3	3	8	4.5	6	8.5	66	WOM	1
	2.5	1.5	4.5	1.5	3	3	3	8	8	3	3	8	4.5	4	9.5	67	WM	
39	3	1.5	3	2	3	3	2	7	8	3	3	8	4	5	10	65.5	WOM	1
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2	3	3	6	8	4	3	8	4.5	4	9.5	64.5	WM	
40	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	6	8	3	2	9	4	5	10	65	WOM	-0.5
	2.5	1.5	4	1.5	2	3	3	6	8	4	3	8	4.5	4	9.5	64.5	WM	

The above table shows that the average mark of Set C is 66.53 without using marking scheme and 66.61 with marking scheme. The highest mark is 73 which were assigned by the informant no. 18 and the lowest is 61 of informant no. 17. So, the difference is of 12 marks without using marking scheme. On the other hand the highest mark is 69.5 which were assigned by informant no. 8 and

lowest mark is 64.5 of informant no 39 and 40 and the difference is the 7.5 marks after using marking scheme. The marking is consistent after using marking scheme because the difference was minimized after using marking scheme.

When the researcher compares the marks assigned by the particular teacher, he finds the highest difference of -6.5 marks. It means the informant no. 18 assigned 73 marks without using marking scheme but after using marking scheme he/she provides 66.5 marks for the same answer sheet i.e. set C. The mark 66.5 is also the nearest mark of the average mark. Thus it shows the effectiveness of marking scheme.

There is the highest difference of 12 marks among the different sets when the teachers marked the answer sheets without using the marking scheme. There was inconsistency in marking answer sheets of the students. But after using marking scheme, the marking is consistence. Because of the marking scheme, the differences in scoring among the teachers/informants were minimized. The highest difference was of 5 marks after using marking scheme. Similarly, the assigned marks after using marking scheme were nearer to the average marks of every set.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND RECOMENDATIONS

4.1 Findings

On the basic of the analysis and interpretation of data the major findings of the study are summarized in the following points:

- i. High differences are found in marking the answer sheets of students when a teacher does not use the marking scheme in marking because the difference of the marking of the same answer sheets by the same teacher is of 7 marks. Similarly, the difference is of 11 marks among the teachers without using marking scheme but the difference is not only minimized but also come nearer to the average mark of that answer sheet after using marking scheme.
- ii. Higher differences are found in the marking of the answer sheet of those students who are fast learners i.e. in set C, the variation is of 12 marks without using marking scheme in comparison with other sets. But the highest variation was found in set A after using marking scheme. The variation was of 5.5 marks.
- iii. There is no significant difference among the average mark of the students after using and without using making scheme in total but when the researcher compares individual marking of the teachers there is the significant difference in the markings.

- iv. The differences are high among the untrained teachers in comparison with the trained teachers. The highest difference is in set A in both cases but after using marking scheme it is minimized.
- v. The differences are higher among the teachers of Morang than the teachers of Jhapa districts. The teachers of Jhapa perform better in the markings.
- vi. Regarding the language skills marking scheme is effective to mark the reading comprehension than writing competency level of the students.
- vii. Marking scheme is more useful and effective to the untrained teachers.
- viii. Regarding the sets of answer-sheets marking scheme is more effective to fast learner students i.e. set C.

4.2 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings listed above, the researcher recommends the following points for pedagogical implication:

- i. To reduce the variation in marking OCE should provide clear marking scheme to the examiners of the SLC answer-sheets.
- ii. The answer sheets of the fast learner students should be marked more minutely in comparison with average and slow learner students.
- iii. OCE and other keen interested researchers should not totally depend on the average mark of the students assigned by the teachers but also analyze personal marking of the teachers.

- iv. Marking training should be given to the untrained teachers who are taking part in marking answer sheets of SLC examinations.
- v. In order to minimize the variation in marking, controller of OCE should encourage and help the students or teachers who are going to carry out a research work on marking English answer sheets.
- vi. Finally, the examiner must use marking scheme and question papers to mark the answer sheets fairly and consistently.

References

- Adhikari, U. (1986). *Differences in written correction of English teachers*. An unpublished thesis of M.Ed. Department of English Language Education, T.U., Kritipur.
- Bhattarai, G.R. (2001). *A thematic analysis of research reports*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Bhattarai, G.R. & Goutam, G.R. (2007). The proposed ELT survey: redefining status and role of English in Nepal. *Journal of NELTA*. Vol.12 No.1&2, December, 2007.
- Christine, C. (2007). Fundamentals of language assessment. *Journal of NELTA*. Vol.12 no .1&2, December, 2007.
- Davies, A. (ed.). (1968). *Language testing symposium: a psycholinguistic approach*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Doff, A. (1988). *Teach English: a training course of teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gautam, P. (2001). *An analysis of subjective marking*. An unpublished thesis of M.Ed. Department of English Education, T.U. Kritipur.
- Harris, D.P. (1974). *Testing English as a second language*. Bombay: Tata McGrawhill Publishing Company Ltd.
- Harrison, A. (1983). *A language testing handbook*. London: Modern English Publications.
- Heaton, J.B. (1975). *Writing English language tests*. Longman: ELBS.
- Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:
- Khaniya, T.R. (2005). *Examination for enhanced learning*. Lalitpur: Millennium Publication.

- Kshetree, A.K.(2001).*A study on the washback effect of the SLC examination.* An unpublished thesis of M.Ed. Department of English Education. T. U. Kritipur.
- Lado, R. (1993). *Language testing.* London: Longman.
- Luitel, B. (1995). *A study of the gravity of grammatical error made by Nepali learners of English.* An unpublished thesis of M. Ed. Department of English Education. T.U. Kritipur.
- Mainali, I.D. (2005). *A study on marking an answer book a case of grade ix compulsory English .* An unpublished thesis of M. Ed. Department of English Education. T. U. Kritipur.
- Neupane, M. (2004). *A study on washback effect of examination: a case of communicative English.* An unpublished thesis of M. Ed. Department of English Education. T.U. Kritipur.
- Regmi, N. (2006). *Washback effect of B.Ed. examination: A case of English Language Teaching Materials and Practice.* An unpublished thesis of M.Ed. Department of English Education. T.U. Kritipur.
- Richards, et al. (1986). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics.* London: Longman
- Sharma and Sharma, (1997). *Curriculum and evaluation.* Katmandu: M. K. Publisher.
- Sharma, U.N. (1999). *A study in marking an English answer book.* An unpublished thesis of M.Ed. Department of English Education. T. U. Kritipur.
- Sah, R. (2003), *Effectiveness of objective and subjective types tests for grade 10.* An unpublished thesis of M.Ed. Department of English Education. T.U. Kritipur.
- Ur, P.(2005). *A course in language teaching : practice and theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weir, C.J. (1990). *Communicative language testing .* London: Prentice hall.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX-I

Answer Sheet A

A.

①

- a) surprising ⇒
- b) console ⇒
- c) essort ⇒
- d) complaining ⇒
- e) falling ⇒
- f) confusion ⇒

B. Write 'T' for true and 'F' for false statement.

- a) ~~F~~ TRUE.
- b) False.
- c) True.
- d) True.

C. Answer the following questions:

- a) What does the writer have to do at home?
⇒ I have to look after her.
- b) How does Nima's writing look like?
⇒ Nima is writing to stumbling.
- c) Why is her mother not able to look after Nima?
⇒
- d) How does Nima play games?
⇒ Then she'd make a mess of things because she really.
- e) When does mother feel angry with the writer?
⇒ My mother has to go out to work so that leaves just me.
- f) Why is her mother not able to look after Nima?
⇒ Ever since father died life hasn't been very easy for mother and I guess I hadn't made things any easier
g) stumbling about having to keep an eye on Nima and all that.