

ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOME BASED EDUCATION AMONG BA ECONOMICS STUDENTS IN COIMBATORE

Dr. K.Vidyakala¹, Dr. Nithyakala², Dr. J.Deepa³, Anjana⁴, P.Nandhini⁵

¹HoD, Department of Business Administration, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

²Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

³Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

⁴BBA Student, Department of Business Administration, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

⁵ Research Scholar (FT), Department of Business Administration, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT:

Outcome-based education (OBE) is an educational theory that bases each part of an educational system around goals (outcomes). By the end of the educational experience, each student should have achieved the goal. There is no single specified style of teaching or assessment in OBE; instead, classes, opportunities, and assessments should all help students achieve the specified outcomes. The role of the faculty adapts into instructor, trainer, facilitator, and/or mentor based on the outcomes targeted.

Keywords: OBE

INTRODUCTION:

Outcomes are actions/ performances that embody and reflect learner competence in using content, information, ideas and tools successfully. According to Geysler (1999) learners do important things with what they know they have taken a significant step beyond knowing itself. Vella, Berardinelli & Burrow (1998) reminds the importance of accountability mechanisms (learner assessment) that directly reflect student performance and help learners “know what they know”. Thus outcomes describe the results of learning over a period of time – the results of what is learned versus what is taught. OBE is defined as a “...comprehensive approach to organizing and operating an education system that is focused in and defined by the successful demonstrations of learning sought from each student” (Spady, 1994).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To examine the significant difference between the personal profile of the respondents and learning styles; perception towards OBE.
- To identify the relationship between preferred learning styles and perception towards OBE.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The analysis of this paper is based on primary data collected from students and secondary data collected from the related websites, books and articles from different journals.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Kathleen Jane Collins (2014) made a study on outcomes-based education and deep learning in first year social work in South Africa. This article argues in support of deep learning principles and presents narrative constructions from two differently advantaged departments of social work, illustrating how lecturers and students there have adapted to outcomes-based education. The study concluded that statutory requirements and institutional pressures influence against the development of deep learning. The urgency to incorporate transformative learning in meeting professional standards is placed in the international context.

Linda Barman, Charlotte Silen and Klara Bolander Laksov (2014) studied about outcome based education and teacher's tensions in balancing between student learning and bureaucracy. This study is found to be an empirical contribution to the debate about outcome and competency based approaches in health sciences education. A qualitative method was used to study how teachers from 14 different study programmes designed courses before and after OBE was implemented. Using an interpretative approach, analysis of documents and interviews was carried out. The findings show that teachers enacted OBE either to design for more competency-oriented teaching-learning or further detail knowledge or thus move towards reductionism. This shows variations of how teachers enacted the same outcome-based framework for instructional design.

Dela Cruz and Ortega-Dela Cruz (2017) analysed about educator's attitude towards outcome based information technology education in the Philippines. This study used descriptive-correlational research design to determine what attitudes they may have towards the success of its implementation at a local university in Laguna, Philippines. Findings revealed that IT educators have positive attitude towards OBE. Results of Pearson's Chi-Square test revealed the significant relationships among education, training, and attitude.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:**ANOVA**

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is a statistical method used to test differences between two or more means. It may seem odd that the technique is called "Analysis of Variance" rather than "Analysis of Means." It is used to test general rather than specific differences among means. ANOVA was done using SPSS software version 16.0

Analysis of OBE Assessment

BA ECONOMICS							
OBE ASSESSMENT		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	S/NS
Demographic factors							
Age	Between groups	1.220	3	.407	1.219	.305	NS
	Within groups	56.410	169	.334			
	Total	57.630	172				
Mother Tongue	Between groups	2.801	7	.400	1.204	.303	NS
	Within groups	54.829	165	.332			
	Total	57.630	172				
Nature of Family	Between groups	.518	1	.518	1.550	.215	NS
	Within groups	57.112	171	.334			
	Total	57.630	172				
Year of study	Between groups	4.276	2	2.138	6.812	.001	S
	Within groups	53.354	170	.314			
	Total	57.630	172				
Instruction in	Between groups	.048	1	.048	.144	.705	NS
	Within groups	57.582	171	.337			
	Total	57.630	172				
Socio-Economic Factors							
Parents Occupation	Between groups	.748	4	.187	.552	.698	NS
	Within groups	56.882	168	.339			
	Total	57.630	172				
Monthly income of Family	Between groups	3.097	2	1.549	4.827	.009	S
	Within groups	54.533	170	.321			
	Total	57.630	172				

(Source: Primary data)

INTERPRETATION

The f value and the significant value of the demographic profile and socio economic profile is higher than the acceptable value of 0.05 except year of study where in „year of study“ $F=6.81, P<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.001 and „monthly income of family“ where in $F=4.83, p<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.01. Thus from the above table it is concluded that year of study and monthly income of family of the respondents influence the OBE assessment.

Critical cross Field Outcomes**Table No.4.3.6: Analysis of Critical OBE Learning Styles of BA ECONOMICS**

BA ECONOMICS							
CRITICAL OBE		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	S/NS
Demographic factors							
Age	Between groups	3.501	3	1.167	2.875	.038	S
	Within groups	68.592	169	.406			
	Total	72.092	172				
Mother Tongue	Between groups	6.899	7	.986	2.494	.018	S
	Within groups	65.193	165	.395			
	Total	72.092	172				
Nature of Family	Between groups	2.373	1	2.373	5.821	.017	S
	Within groups	69.719	171	.408			
	Total	72.092	172				
Year of study	Between groups	6.933	2	3.466	9.044	.000	S
	Within groups	65.160	170	.383			
	Total	72.092	172				
Instruction in	Between groups	.227	1	.227	.541	.463	NS
	Within groups	71.865	171	.420			
	Total	72.092	172				
Socio-Economic Factors							
Parents Occupation	Between groups	.190	4	.047	.111	.979	NS
	Within groups	71.902	168	.428			
	Total	72.092	172				
Monthly income of Family	Between groups	4.127	2	2.064	5.162	.007	S
	Within groups	67.965	170	.400			
	Total	72.092	172				

(Source: Primary data)

INTERPRETATION

The f value and the significant value of the demographic profile and socio economic profile is higher than the acceptable value of 0.05 except „mother tongue” where in mother tongue $F=2.49, p<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.02 , „nature of the family” $F= 5.82, p<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.02, „year of study” $F=9.04, p<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.00 and „monthly income of family” $F=5.16, p<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.01. Thus from the above table it is concluded that „mother tongue, nature of the family, year of study and monthly income of family” of the respondents influence the critical OBE.

Reflection Process

Table No.4.3.7: Analysis of Reflection of OBE Learning Styles of BA ECONOMICS

BA ECONOMICS							
REFLECTION OF OBE		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	S/NS
Demographic factors							
Age	Between groups	.383	3	.128	.295	.829	NS
	Within groups	73.247	169	.433			
	Total	73.630	172				
Mother Tongue	Between groups	6.028	7	.861	2.102	.046	S
	Within groups	67.602	165	.410			
	Total	73.630	172				
Nature of Family	Between groups	.119	1	.119	.276	.600	NS
	Within groups	73.511	171	.430			
	Total	73.630	172				
Year of study	Between groups	2.423	2	1.212	2.892	.058	NS
	Within groups	71.207	170	.419			
	Total	73.630	172				
Instruction in	Between groups	.000	1	.000	.001	.978	NS
	Within groups	73.630	171	.431			
	Total	73.630	172				
Socio-Economic Factors							
Parents Occupation	Between groups	1.437	4	.359	.836	.504	NS
	Within groups	72.193	168	.430			
	Total	73.630	172				
Monthly income of Family	Between groups	1.841	2	.921	2.180	.116	NS
	Within groups	71.789	170	.422			
	Total	73.630	172				

(Source: Primary data)

INTERPRETATION

The f value and the significant value of the demographic profile and socio economic profile is higher than the acceptable value of 0.05 except „mother tongue“ where in mother tongue $F=2.10, p<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.05. Thus from the above table it is concluded that mother tongue of the respondents influence the reflection of OBE.

OBE process**Analysis of Process of OBE Learning Styles of BA Economics**

BA ECONOMICS							
PROCESS OF OBE		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	S/NS
Demographic factors							
Age	Between groups	2.262	3	.754	1.623	.186	NS
	Within groups	78.536	169	.465			
	Total	80.798	172				
Mother Tongue	Between groups	2.087	7	.298	.625	.735	NS
	Within groups	78.711	165	.477			
	Total	80.798	172				
Nature of Family	Between groups	.700	1	.700	1.493	.223	NS
	Within groups	80.098	171	.468			
	Total	80.798	172				
Year of study	Between groups	5.591	2	2.796	6.320	.002	S
	Within groups	75.206	170	.442			
	Total	80.798	172				
Instruction in	Between groups	.012	1	.012	.026	.872	NS
	Within groups	80.785	171	.472			
	Total	80.798	172				
Socio-Economic Factors							
Parents Occupation	Between groups	1.060	4	.265	.558	.693	NS
	Within groups	79.737	168	.475			
	Total	80.798	172				
Monthly income of Family	Between groups	4.120	2	2.060	4.567	.012	S
	Within groups	76.678	170	.451			

(Source: Primary data)

INTERPRETATION

The f value and the significant value of the demographic profile and socio economic profile is higher than the acceptable value of 0.05 except year of study where in „year of study“ $F=6.30, p<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.002 and „monthly income of family“ $F=4.57, p<0.05$ indicate that the significant value is 0.01. Thus from the above table it is concluded that „year of study and monthly income of family“ of the respondents influence the process of OBE.

INFERENCE:

It is concluded that „Mother tongue and Year of study“ in Auditory, „Mother tongue and year of study“ in kinaesthetic, „Year of study and Monthly income“ in OBE Assessment, „Age, Mother tongue, Year of study, nature of family and Monthly income“ in Critical cross field Outcome, „Mother tongue“ in Reflection, „Year of study and Monthly income“ in Learning Process has the significant value in ANOVA test of BA Economics.

CONCLUSION:

Year of Study and Monthly Income of the Family“ influences the OBE Assessment. „Age, Mother Tongue, Nature of Family, Year of study and Monthly Income of the Family influences OBE Critical Cross Field Outcomes and OBE Learning Process. Mother tongue influences the Reflection of OBE. It is concluded that other personal profile of the respondents did not significantly influence the other learning styles and perception about OBE.

REFERENCE:

Kathleen Jane Collins (2014) “outcomes-based education and deep learning”
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872813503856>. Volume 58

Linda Barman, Charlotte Silen and Klara Bolander Laksov (2014) DOI: [10.1007/s10459-013-9491-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-013-9491-3) .

Dela Cruz and Ortega-Dela Cruz (2017) “educator”s attitude towards outcome based information technology education”. Vol. 4, No. 8, 2016, PP597-601. doi: 10.12691/education-4-8-3