PERCEPTIONS OF COLLEGE TEACHERS AND STUDENTS ON THE SEMESTER SYSTEM IN UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGES OF MIZORAM

BY

ROSY LALRINSANGI
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SUPERVISOR
PROF.H.MALSAWMI

JOINT SUPERVISOR
DR. LALMUANZUALI

Submitted

In partial fulfillment of the requirement of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education of Mizoram University, Aizawl

MIZORAM UNIVERSITY
AIZAWL - 796004, MIZORAM

Prof. H. Malsawmi **Phone: 9436360683**
Department of Education **E-mail: drmalsawmi@yahoo.co.in**

Dr. Lalmuanzuali, Asst. Prof. **Phone: 8014336220**
Department of Education **E-mail:lalnui_f@rediffmail.com**

Dated Aizawl, the 29th March, 2023

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled **"*Perception of College Teachers and Students on the Semester System in Undergraduate Colleges of Mizoram*"** submitted by Rosy Lalrinsangi, Regn. No. MZU/Ph.D/925 of 19.04.2016 for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education of the Mizoram University, Aizawl, India embodies the record of original investigation carried out by her under my supervision. She has been duly registered and the thesis presented is worthy of being considered for the award of Ph.D. degree. This research work has not been submitted for any degree of any other university.

(PROF. H. MALSAWMI)
SUPERVISOR

(DR. LALMUANZUALI)
JOINT SUPERVISOR

MIZORAM UNIVERSITY
AIZAWL : MIZORAM – 796004

Month: March **Year: 2023**

DECLARATION

I, Rosy Lalrinsangi, hereby declare that the subject matter of this thesis is the record of work done by me, that the contents of this thesis did not form basis of the award of any previous degree to me or to do the best of my knowledge to anybody else, and that the thesis has not been submitted by me for any research degree in any other University/Institution.

This is being submitted to the Mizoram University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education.

(ROSY LALRINSANGI)
Scholar

(PROF. H. MALSAWMI)
Supervisor

(PROF. LOKANATH MISHRA)
Head
Education Department

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I express my profound gratitude to the Almighty God for granting me good health and the ability to complete my thesis.

I take great pleasure in extending my deepest and sincerest gratitude to my Supervisor, Prof. H. Malsawmi, , and my Joint Supervisor, Dr. Lalmuanzuali, Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Mizoram University, for their unwavering patience and guidance throughout my research studies. Their valuable inputs and support have been instrumental in helping me complete my thesis. I would also like to thank all the faculty members of the Education Department at Mizoram University for their support during my research studies.

I am profoundly grateful to the faculties of all the colleges in Mizoram for their valuable responses. I sincerely thank those faculties who have assisted me in collecting responses from the students of their respective colleges. I also extend my gratitude to the students who have responded to the questionnaire and shared their perceptions of the semester system in undergraduate colleges.

I am thankful to the Examination Department of Mizoram University for providing me with the data of colleges under Mizoram University. My thesis would have been incomplete without their invaluable information.

I am grateful to my respected principal, Dr. Jennifer Lalbiakdiki, Govt. T. Romana College, and my colleagues in Govt. T. Romana College for their support in completing my research work.

Finally, my deepest gratitude goes to my husband Mr. Lalhmingmawia, for his unwavering support and inspiration.

Dated Aizawl
The 29th March 2023

(**ROSY LALRINSANGI)**
Department of Education
Mizoram University

CONTENTS

List of Tables

CHAPTER – I

INTRODUCTION

Higher education has been acknowledged as a crucial factor for the progress of a nation. This is because a well-established education system is closely related to the progress of a country. It is widely accepted that higher education is a key driver for social, economic, and technological development. By providing individuals with the necessary knowledge, skills, and critical thinking abilities required to thrive in the current fast-paced and rapidly evolving world, higher education plays a critical role in producing a competent and skilled workforce that can contribute to the advancement and prosperity of the country.

Moreover, higher education is also essential for the development of a nation's social and cultural fabric, human capital, and technological infrastructure, making it a critical investment in the future of any country. Higher education promotes inclusivity, diversity, and societal values, which in turn leads to social cohesion and sustainable development. It also enhances the technological capabilities of a nation by producing innovative solutions to modern-day challenges. The standard of education therefore has a direct correlation with the progress of a country. Therefore, investing in higher education is critical to building a skilled workforce and promoting social, economic, and technological development, making it an essential ingredient for the prosperity of any nation.

Education is indeed a powerful tool for bringing about positive change and development in a nation. As noted by Mahajan (2017), the continuous updating of the educational system to meet the needs of contemporary society is a testament to its importance in driving progress. Mirunalini and Anandan (2012) further emphasized the role of education in shaping a positive attitude and developing skills and abilities. Moreover, education is an important factor in addressing various issues faced by developing nations, such as poverty, income gaps, and health. According to Dhakal (2009), education plays a significant role in reducing poverty, bridging income

disparities between different genders and ethnicities, widening income gaps between men and women, and enhancing health, nutrition, and life expectancy. Thus, education is considered the most crucial factor in promoting social and economic development. Access to higher education is particularly important for producing qualified and competent individuals who can contribute to the development of a nation. Education is not only important for the current generation but also for future generations, as it can be applied in various aspects of life to pursue progress and reach goals. Therefore, investing in education is crucial for the development of any nation.

In nations undergoing rapid economic expansion and modernization, there is a substantial demand for and supply of personnel with higher training and equipment. These countries likewise have a high rate of population growth. Numerous international leaders acknowledge the importance of combining western principles and values and establishing a close relationship between the various levels of education. Because of the high graduate unemployment rate, teaching and learning methodologies have shifted their emphasis from memorization and recall to the development of analytical and problem-solving skills. Improving the quality of education, including the curriculum and course structure, infrastructure facilities, and scientific equipment, has been the top objective of less developed nations.

In order for higher education systems to improve their quality, it is crucial that they adhere to principles of effectiveness, efficiency, and equity. Internal effectiveness indicators include enrollment and graduation rates, success, failure, repeat, and withdrawal rates. External effectiveness can be measured by the percentage of graduates employed in the public sector or self-employed compared to those who are unemployed. Efficiency is achieved when the output is proportional to the resources input. Equity involves providing flexibility in course structure and special opportunities for historically disadvantaged segments of society to pursue an accredited course of study that allows them to showcase their talents, creativity, and skills without wasting time. Higher education institutions offer a range of short-term, long-term, and professional courses for students who are struggling to improve their academic skills or employment prospects. These courses can be taken individually or

in conjunction with other institutions. By promoting equity, efficiency, and effectiveness, the higher education system can contribute to the development of a highly skilled human capital foundation.

The recommendations of various commissions and committees serve as a framework for improving the quality of higher education. The University Education Commission 1948-49 recommendation lays the foundation for the development of curricula in higher education, while Kothari's Report (1964) and the National Policy on Education (NPE) of 1986 provide an action plan for quality improvement at different levels of education. The National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) uses its criteria and key indicators for quality assessment and accreditation to guide and motivate institutions to improve their standards. The evidence collected by NAAC through these indicators is then used to evaluate the quality of higher education institutions. These frameworks and evaluations are crucial for ensuring that higher education institutions are constantly striving to provide the best possible education to their students.

The eleventh five-year plan of India suggests a variety of changes to the curricula that are to be implemented in higher education institutions across the country. The Yashpal Committee Report from 2009 and the National Knowledge Commission's report to the public from 2008–2009 on higher education both advocated a revamping of higher education through the implementation of academic and administrative changes. The University Grants Commission (in its 11th plan, presented in March 2009) and, subsequently, the Association of Indian Universities (AIU) placed a strong emphasis on the following recommendations in order to bring higher education in Indian universities on par with that offered in universities located in developed countries. This was done with the challenges of the changing times in mind as well as the goal of making the higher education offered at Indian institutions comparable to that offered in colleges located in industrialized nations.

1. Semester System
2. Choice Based Credit System.
3. Curriculum Development

4. Examination Reforms
5. Administrative Reforms

All of the aforementioned recommendations for reforms have been reviewed by representatives of various universities in the country, and consideration has been given to their implementation with the intention of transforming higher education—a transformation in which students transition from being passive recipients of knowledge to becoming active participants in the process of knowledge absorption. The education system in the country is attempting to make a paradigm shift from a teacher-centric mode to a learner-centric mode by focusing on the all-round integral development of students' personalities in order to produce good citizens. This shift is necessary for the education system to be successful.

1.1.0 Semester system

The semester system is an educational system that is widely used in many countries around the world. It is a method of organizing and structuring the academic year into two or more semesters, each lasting for a specific number of months. In India, the semester system has been in existence since the late 1990s and has been implemented in various universities and colleges across the country. Before the implementation of the semester system, the Indian education system followed an annual system, where students were required to appear for one final examination at the end of the academic year. This system was considered to be outdated and inadequate in terms of imparting quality education and assessment of students. Hence, the Indian education system underwent a major transformation with the introduction of the semester system.

The Education Commission's (1964–1966) proposal received fair consideration from the University Grants Commission (U.G.C.). The U.G.C. created a committee of a small number of specialists to provide their perspectives on the semester system. Based on the advice of these experts, the U.G.C. published a pamphlet titled Principles and Mechanics of the Semester System (1971) to assist universities desiring to adopt the semester system. The experts believed that the implementation of the semester system, if carried out in a coordinated and systematic

manner, would initiate a process of modernization and improvement in both the teaching and learning processes, in addition to bringing about much-needed reform and flexibility in course content and evaluation techniques.

The term "semester" is defined as "half of the academic year, typically 16 to 18 weeks" by the Dictionary of Education. The college half year is a six-month term period, mainly in German universities and some U.S. institutions (Shorter Oxford Dictionary). "Either of the two terms, of about eighteen weeks each, which usually make up a school or college year" (Webster's New World Dictionary). Based on the preceding definitions, it is evident that the term "semester" refers to the split of the academic year into two halves termed "semesters," with independent course planning for each semester.

Merits of semester system:

The semester system has several advantages over other academic systems, making it a popular choice for students and institutions alike. Some of the key merits of the semester system are discussed below.

Flexibility: The semester system allows students to pursue a variety of courses at the same time, providing them with the flexibility to explore their interests and strengths. Students can select courses from different departments and disciplines, allowing them to broaden their knowledge base and gain a well-rounded education. This flexibility is especially important for students who are uncertain about their career paths or who want to explore different fields before making a decision.

Focus on learning: The semester system encourages students to focus on learning and to take their studies seriously. This is because students have limited time to complete their courses and must maintain a certain grade point average in order to progress to the next semester. This focus on learning helps students to develop good study habits and to prioritize their education, leading to better academic performance and career opportunities.

Consistent Assessment: The semester system provides students with consistent and regular assessments, allowing them to monitor their progress and receive feedback on their performance. This feedback is essential for students as it helps them to identify their strengths and weaknesses and to adjust their study habits accordingly. It

also gives students an opportunity to ask questions and to receive clarification from their instructors, leading to a deeper understanding of the course material.

Improved Time Management: The semester system helps students to develop good time management skills, as they must balance their coursework with other responsibilities such as work, family, and extracurricular activities. This time management skills are essential for success in both academic and professional life.

Reduced Stress: The semester system helps to reduce stress and anxiety, as students have more opportunities to receive feedback and to seek help from their instructors. This is because courses are divided into smaller, manageable units, allowing students to focus on one subject at a time. Additionally, the consistent assessments provide students with regular opportunities to gauge their performance and to receive feedback, reducing the stress associated with final exams.

Effective Resource Allocation: The semester system allows institutions to allocate resources effectively, as they can plan their course offerings and staffing needs in advance. This enables institutions to offer a wider variety of courses, to allocate resources to the most in-demand programs, and to ensure that students receive the support they need to succeed.

Improved Planning and Preparation: The semester system allows students to plan and prepare for their future careers, as they can choose courses that align with their interests and goals. This allows students to gain the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in their chosen fields, improving their chances of finding employment after graduation.

Improved Retention Rates: The semester system has been shown to improve retention rates, as students are more likely to stay enrolled in their programs when they are able to make steady progress. This is because students are able to see the results of their efforts, leading to a greater sense of accomplishment and motivation to continue their studies.

The semester system has several key merits that make it an attractive option for students and institutions alike. It provides students with flexibility, encourages a focus on learning, provides consistent assessment, improves time management, reduces stress, enables effective resource allocation, improves planning and

preparation, and improves retention rates. These benefits make the semester system a valuable tool for promoting student success and academic excellence.

Demerits of semester system:

The semester system, while having some advantages, also has some disadvantages. However, despite its popularity, there are several demerits associated with the semester system.

High Pressure and Stress: The compressed time frame of the semester system can put students under a great deal of pressure and stress. Students are required to cover a large amount of material in a short amount of time, which can be overwhelming, especially for students who struggle with a particular subject. This can lead to students feeling burned out and can affect their overall academic performance.

Inadequate Time for Revision: With the limited time available in a semester, students often find it difficult to revise all the subjects thoroughly. This is especially true for students who struggle with a particular subject and need more time to grasp the concepts.

Inadequate Time for Assignments: The semester system requires students to submit a large number of assignments within a short time frame. This can lead to students feeling overwhelmed and can result in a decline in the quality of their work.

Inability to Drop a Course: In the semester system, students are required to make a decision about their course selection at the beginning of the semester. If a student decides to drop a course later on, it can have a negative impact on their overall academic performance and may affect their future academic and career prospects.

Limited Time for Extracurricular Activities: With the demanding schedule of the semester system, students often have limited time for extracurricular activities. This can be a disadvantage for students who are interested in pursuing interests outside of the classroom, such as sports or music.

Inadequate Time for Practical Work: In some courses, practical work is an essential component of the curriculum. The semester system may not provide enough time for students to complete the necessary practical work, which can affect their overall understanding of the subject and their ability to apply what they have learned in real-world scenarios.

Inadequate Time for Research: Research is an important component of higher education, and the semester system may not provide enough time for students to complete their research projects. This can result in a lack of depth and breadth in students' understanding of their chosen subject.

Financial Burden: The semester system often requires students to pay for their courses on a per-semester basis. This can be a financial burden for students, especially if they have to take multiple courses in a single semester.

Limited Opportunity for Transfer Credits: The semester system may not allow for the transfer of credits from one institution to another. This can be a disadvantage for students who wish to transfer to another institution or pursue a higher degree.

Inadequate Time for Professional Development: The compressed time frame of the semester system can make it difficult for students to take part in professional development activities, such as internships or co-op programs. This can limit students' exposure to real-world experiences and affect their ability to transition into the workforce after graduation.

The semester system has several demerits that can negatively impact students' academic and personal lives. These include high pressure and stress, inadequate time for revision and assignments, limited time for extracurricular activities and practical work, financial burden, and limited opportunities for transfer credits and professional development. While the semester system has its advantages, it is important for institutions to consider these demerits and take steps to address them to ensure that students have a positive and supportive learning experience.

1.1.1 Semester system in USA

A number of forward-thinking nations, including the United States, the Soviet Union, Japan, Germany, etc., used the semester system. The following is a short explanation of the semester system used in these nations.

When looking at the literature on the subject of the semester system in the United States, we see the following pattern emerge: W.H. Cowley claims (in the University Calendar, 1964) that calendars have been popular in the United States ever since the establishment of the first college in 1636. Harvard University successfully used the four-term system for the first 165 years. After that, in the 18th

and 19th centuries, the three-term pattern became the norm. As a result of the dominant educational philosophy of the time in Germany, the three-term system was complemented by the two-term system known as the "semester system." According to the 1964* University Calendar report, the semester system was the most commonly used academic calendar among American colleges. According to the American Council on Education's Office of Statistics, Information, and Research, 14% of schools used the quarter system while the vast majority used the semester system. Two ordinary terms, each lasting around 15 weeks, plus a summer session, make up the typical semester schedule. Sessions throughout the summer tend to attract a slightly different clientele and offer a more limited selection of courses than those given during the normal academic year. Most universities place a premium on students really taking in the material being presented in class. It works well with required reading, weekly lectures, and hour-long and semester-long exams. The report claims that some changes have been made to the current semester 4 calendars in order to better serve the people's needs and goals. It is also the truth that various semester schedules are used by American colleges and universities.

1.1.2 Semester system in the Soviet Union

In addition to this, it has been discovered that the higher education system in Moscow, Soviet Union, follows the semester model of instruction. The academic year is broken up into two distinct semesters. There is a break for the winter holidays in the middle of each academic semester. At the conclusion of each semester, there will be a series of examinations. At the beginning of each academic semester, the instructor will discuss the subjects, books, and references that will be utilized over the duration of the class. There is a cap on the number of students in each class. In the case of the exam, the examination for the first semester is different from the examination for the second semester. The first phase is known as "Zachoth," and it is during this phase that it is determined whether or not the student has passed the examination. The marks for the examinations taken during the second semester are based on a scale of five points.

1.1.3 Semester system in India

The Indian educational system has been influenced by the semester system, which can be traced back to the United States, the Soviet Union, and many other countries. The influence of the United States and other countries is undeniable in India's decision to adopt the semester system. As a modern approach, the semester system has been adopted by several Indian universities, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. In India's higher education institutions, this is a novel approach. Agricultural teaching was the inspiration for the new method. In 1959, a turning point in agricultural education began with the founding of India's first agricultural institutions. This system of higher education takes its cues from the United States' Land Grant Colleges and is responsible for providing education in a variety of agricultural fields through formal coursework, research, and extension programs. Originally, most agricultural schools followed the Land Grant Colleges' model and used a trimester system, but now more than half have shifted to a semester schedule.

Indian Institutes of Technology also made pioneering efforts in implementing the semester system in India. This is mainly due to the fact that technological institutes have to depend to a large extent on the knowledge and techniques developed in advanced countries. As a result of the vital flow of ideas and information from the developed countries, the concept of the semester system also influenced these institutions. The three most important functions of the technological institutes are the transmission of knowledge, the development of new techniques, and the research and development of new technologies. Their plan is to create science courses in engineering that take a contemporary approach to the development of curriculum, and this will apply to the course work as well as the laboratory instruction. The institutes came to the conclusion that the semester was the most appropriate method to use in order to accomplish these goals.

India's educational system has begun to gradually incorporate the semester system. After agricultural and technological institutes, a small number of affiliated and residential universities introduced the semester system, either in part or in its entirety. In 1967, Meerut University was the first to implement the semester system on a broad basis. The system was implemented at approximately 55 connected

institutions with more than 60,000 students. In addition to Meerut University, many other universities in India have adopted the semester system, such as Aligarh Muslim University, Banaras Hindu University, M.S. University, Madras University, Annamalai University, and Jawaharlal Nehru University, among others. Numerous universities in the nation have implemented the semester system at the undergraduate and graduate levels in an effort to modify the organisation of higher education. The implementation of the semester system at a number of institutions of higher education has altered the instructional framework.

1.1.4 Associated aspects of semester system

The semester system was previously defined as a period of half an academic year, with instruction divided into two parts. It is a complete, self-contained unit with a well-defined purpose. The semester continues with course restructuring, student self-study, and flexibility in teaching and learning, and to deal with these aspects, the semester has become associated with the internal assessment and grade system. When the words "pattern," "model," or "system" are used together, an image of a complex structure made up of essential and non-essential components is formed. Semester systems have become associated with terms such as credit systems, grade systems, internal assessments, continuous assessments, and so on. These associated aspects of the semester system are discussed as follows:

Method of Teaching:

The semester system provides teachers with a variety of alternative teaching strategies to choose from, including lecture technique, discussion, team teaching, programmed learning, practical work, field work, project work, and so on. Teachers are free to select the method of instruction that will result in the greatest achievement of goals. The semester system is learner-centered, and teachers and students participate in a variety of activities, including tutorials, tests, comprehensive examinations, alternative assessment tools, assignments, seminars, presentations, discussions, self-study, projects, field work, laboratory practicals, and the like. The primary objective of the semester system is to enhance students' abilities. Seventy-five percent attendance is required to take external semester examinations under the semester system. Each student must attend at least 75% of the lectures, including

seminars, tutorials, and presentations, for each course enrolled in each semester. The RUSA policy paper also asks for a shift in educational approach, with less emphasis on lecturing and more student participation. Instruction is to be divided into three components: lecture, tutorial, and practical (lab, fieldwork, case studies) (LTP), with credits weighted based on the number of contact hours per week for each component.

Course of Study:

On the basis of UGC regulations, each university develops its course structure and associated college guidelines. Courses in the semester system are planned to cover the entire semester; it is not simply the division of a one-year course into two sections but rather a self-contained unit with clear objectives and a well-defined purpose. The courses under the semester system maintain continuity within the study area. According to UGC standards, the credit-based semester system enables flexibility in curriculum design and credit assignment depending on course content and teaching hours. As stated by Philip Altbach, "The credit system is merely a method for keeping track of time spent on academic work." It is the primary currency of academic student effort. "When a student has acquired a sufficient number of credits in courses or other academic work that is accepted for the award of a degree or certificate, the programme is deemed complete and a degree is granted." Each course is worth a particular number of credits. One credit corresponds to one hour of instruction (lecture or tutorial) or two hours of practical work or fieldwork each week. When the student successfully completes this course, he obtains the credits associated with it. If a student successfully completes a single course within a semester, he is not required to repeat that course. Students can earn credits at their own pace and in their own time. The adaptability and interdisciplinary nature of a choice-based credit system supply students with their interests and needs and aid teachers in their lesson design. The CBCS gives students the option to choose from three types of required courses: core courses, elective courses, and foundation courses.

- Core courses: Every semester contains a core course. The papers in the core courses cover the basics of the discipline. The core course is compulsorily studied by the student as a core requirement.

- Elective courses: Elective courses are courses from which each student can select courses based on his or her preferences to get a degree. Elective courses may be highly specialized or supportive of the discipline; they may also provide a broader perspective, facilitate exposure to another discipline or subject, or enhance the student's ability.
    a) **Discipline-Specific Elective (DSE) Course**: These courses are interdisciplinary in character and are offered by the main discipline or subject of study. Colleges are permitted to submit their own papers for consideration in this area.
    b) **Dissertation/Project:** It is an elective course designed to obtain specialized or advanced knowledge, such as a supplement or support study for a project, and a candidate studies such a course independently with the advisory support of a teacher or faculty member.
    c) **General Elective (GE) Cours**e: It is a course selected from a variety of unconnected disciplines or subjects. These courses are interdepartmental.

Foundation courses:

There are two types of foundation courses:

a) **Ability Enhancement Compulsory Courses (AECC):** The content of these courses contributes to knowledge enhancement. They are required for all academic areas. Ability Enhancement Compulsory Courses (AECC) includes Environmental Science and English/MIL Communication.
b) **Skill Enhancement Courses (SEC):** These courses are value-based and geared toward man-making education; they may be chosen from a pool of courses.

Internal Assessment:

Internal and external assessments make up the semester system evaluation. Attendance, internal tests, assignments, seminars, viva, essays, tutorial presentations, discussions, project work, field work, laboratory practical, and term papers are

among the components of internal assessments. Depending on the regulations of the respective university, internal assessment may account for 20% or 25% of the final grade. Teachers are accountable for assessing internal assessments. In each course, students' performance is evaluated and publicized. Before the beginning of the end-of-semester examination, the college submits internal grades to the relevant institution in a correct manner after passing them through the college's moderation committee. Internal assessment is not subject to repetition or improvement under the semester system. If a student does not participate in internal evaluation, he or she receives no internal grade for that course. According to the requirements of several colleges, students who do not participate in internal assessment are unable to take the end-of-semester exam. However, if unforeseen circumstances arise, the teacher allows the student to make alternative arrangements to take the internal exam. Periodic and open internal assessment is designed to help students acquire academic awareness and vigilance as well as discover their flaws and improve their performance.

External Examination:

Every semester concludes with an external test covering the entire course material. The external examinations are organized by the university's examination controller. Depending on the regulations of the institution, external examinations carry either 80% or 75% weight. End examinations are written or laboratory-based examination projects, works, and dissertations designed to evaluate students' skills and knowledge. Each course's end-of-semester tests typically last three hours.

Grading system:

Although numerical marking has been used in Indian universities for quite some time, it does appear to have some flaws. Since colleges and universities use varying grading scales, it is difficult to compare students from different schools. The University Grants Commission suggested using a grading system since it is both scientific and uniform. UGC recommended using a 10-point grading scale (grades, grade points, and letters of the alphabet) to evaluate students' work. The following table – 1.1 shows the Grading pattern in CBCS as per UGC guidelines.

Table – 1.1

Grading in CBCS as per UGC Guidelines

Sl. No.	Letter Grade	Grade	Grade Point
1	O	Outstanding	10
2	A+	Excellent	9
3	A	Very Good	8
4	B+	Good	7
5	B	Above Average	6
6	C	Average	5
7	P	Pass	4
8	F	Fail	0
9	Ab	Absent	0

Two methods comprise the grading system: relative grading and absolute grading. Relative grading is based on the distribution (usually a normal distribution) of marks achieved by all students enrolled in a course, with grades assigned based on a cut-off mark or percentile. Marks are transformed into grades at predetermined class intervals in absolute grading.

a) **Semester Grade Point Average (SGPA):** It is a measure of the performance of work done in a semester. SGPA is equal to the sum of all the total points earned by the student in a given semester divided by the number of credits registered by the student in that semester.

b) **Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA):** It is the sum of all the total points earned in all the previous semesters and the current semester divided by the number of credits registered in all these semesters.

1.2.0 Semester system in Mizoram

In 1989, following the establishment of statehood in 1987, the Department of Higher and Technical Education was established to oversee university education and college education. A parliamentary law was enacted in 2000 for the formation of a central university in Mizoram, 27 years after the NEHU was established. Mizoram University (MZU) was founded on July 2, 2001. Since then, the Mizoram University,

which is a Central University, has taken over the assets and liabilities of the former NEHU campus in Aizawl, Mizoram. In addition to Mizoram University, a private university known as ICFAI University, Mizoram was founded in 2006, and the National Institute of Technology (NIT) was founded in 2001. Recently, on August 7, 2018, the state government created the Mizoram Institute of Medical Education and Research (MIMER), which was later renamed Zoram Medical College (ZMC). Prior to the establishment of Mizoram University, the College of Veterinary Science and Animal Husbandry, which is a constituent college of the Central Agriculture University and falls under the Department of Agricultural Research and Education of the Ministry of Agriculture, began operating in Aizawl during the 1997-1998 academic year. Since Mizoram was granted statehood, numerous other smaller institutions with regional significance and local-level institutes have emerged.

The Mizoram University, which has adopted the educational model of the NEHU, offers a three-year bachelor's degree program. It establishes a year-by-year curriculum and administers annual exams for undergraduate courses. To improve the education system in the state of Mizoram, the government of Mizoram established the Education Reforms Commission on May 8, 2009; the commission published its report on July 30, 2010 in the form of a book titled Towards an Enlightened and Inclusive Mizo Society. The Commission's terms of reference were all-encompassing, encompassing the pre-school, primary, secondary, higher, and professional education sectors.

In response to the University Grants Commission's call for the universalization of the semester system in order to enhance the learning process, Mizoram University implemented the semester system on the undergraduate curriculum in the affiliated colleges rather than maintaining the annual system in order to increase the value for the students. In its 14th Academic Council meeting, held on June 26, 2009, Mizoram University established a committee to examine the UGC's action plan and its implementation at the undergraduate level. Since the 2011–2012 academic years, the Mizoram University has enforced the introduction of the semester system as opposed to the yearly system for all of its associated colleges. The following table – 1.2 shows the undergraduate colleges offering arts, science and

commerce stream which are affiliated to Mizoram University. These colleges offer their respective programmes in various districts of Mizoram:

Table – 1.2

Undergraduate colleges offering arts, science and commerce affiliated to Mizoram University

Sl.No.	Colleges	District	Streams
1.	Pachhunga University College	Aizawl District	Arts, Science & Commerce
2.	Govt. Aizawl College	Aizawl District	Arts, Commerce
3.	Government Hrangbana College	Aizawl District	Arts & Commerce
4.	Govt. Zirtiri Residential Science College	Aizawl District	Science
5.	Govt. Saitual College	Saitual District	Arts
6.	Govt. Aizawl North College	Aizawl District	Arts
7.	Govt. Johnson College	Aizawl District	Arts
8.	Govt. Aizawl West College	Aizawl District	Arts
9.	Govt. T. Romana College	Aizawl District	Arts
10.	Govt. J. Thankima College	Aizawl District	Arts & BBA
11	Aizawl City College	Aizawl District	Arts
12.	Divine Mercy College	Aizawl District	Arts & BSW
13.	Helen Lowry College	Aizawl District	Arts & Commerce
14.	Lunglei Government College	Lunghlei District	Arts & Science
15.	Govt. Hnahthial College	Lunghlei District	Arts
16.	Govt. J. Buana College	Lunghlei District	Arts & commerce
17.	Higher & Technical Institute of Mizoram	Lunghlei District	Arts, BSW, Commerce & BCA
18.	Govt. College Champhai	Champhai District	Arts, Science, commerce & BCA
19.	Govt. Khawzawl College	Champhai District	Arts
20.	Govt. Zawlnuam College	Mamit District,	Arts
21.	Govt. Mamit College	Mamit District,	Arts
22.	Govt. Kamalanagar College	Lawngtlai District,	Arts
23.	Govt. Lawngtlai College	Lawngtlai District,	Arts
24.	Govt. Kolasib College	Kolasib District	Arts & Science
25.	Govt. Serchhip College	Serchhip District,	Arts, Science & BCA
26.	Govt. Saiha College	Saiha District	Arts
27.	Mizoram Christian College	Aizawl District	Arts & Commerce

1.2.1 Regulations for the semester system at the undergraduate level in Mizoram University colleges

Mizoram University established semester systems for undergraduate colleges offering three-year programmes. Some of the most important regulations are as follows:

1. The Undergraduate programme consists of three academic years, each of which is divided into two semesters. The first academic year shall consist of the first and second semesters, the second academic year of the third and fourth semesters, and so on.
2. Each semester must have a minimum of 90 working days, excluding holidays, sports, exams, and semester break.
3. The candidates will be registered during the first semester session.
4. An applicant has a maximum of ten semesters, or five years, to clear back papers (in one stretch). The candidate is permitted as many attempts as possible throughout the allotted time period.
5. In the entire UG programme a candidate has to earn 140 credits as follows: Foundation course - 20 credits, Major core course - 72 credits, Elective core course - 48 credits.
6. The first to fourth semesters each consist of 23 credits, while the fifth and sixth semesters each consist of 24 credits. Continuous assessment carries 25 marks (12 marks for class test, which will be an average of two tests, 8 marks for seminar/project/assignment, and 5 marks for attendance), whereas the final exam carries 75 marks.
7. Each semester have 400 marks and the total marks for the course is 2400.
8. The duration of a theory class is one hour, whereas a practical is two hours.
9. The syllabus for each paper is divided into five units, and the contact hour for each course/paper is 50 hours.
10. From the first to the fourth semester, there is no differentiation between core, honours, and electives. At the time to admission to fifth semester, students

must select one subject as a core, major, or honours subject. The remaining two topics shall be core elective subject 1 and core elective subject 2.

11. In accordance with UGC requirements, Mizoram University designed the curriculum framework to be used by constituent and affiliated undergraduate colleges. Mizoram University created three subject combinations with constraints in subject combination for elective subjects in each semester, such as in the Arts: Education/Geography, History/Sociology, Public administration/Economics, etc. In Science: Mathematics/statistics, Physics/statistics, Zoology/ Geology/ Biochemistry, etc. Colleges can also structure the subject combination to suit their needs.
12. Mizoram University outlined the question format for theory and practical exams. Theory: The question paper will have 10 marks for objective multiple-choice questions, 15 marks for short answers, and 50 marks for descriptive writing. Practical: Continuous evaluation will be worth a total of 75 points, the practical record will be worth 10 points, the End-of-semester viva-voce test will be worth 10 points, and class attendance will be worth 5 points.
13. According to Mizoram University regulations, a minimum of 75% attendance is required to sit for the semester's final exam.

1.3.0 Rationale of the study

In recent years, one of the most pressing issues in the world of higher education has been the need for a fundamental shift in its underlying concepts and philosophies. Undergraduate and graduate courses have remained consistent for a very long time, accompanied by out-of-date teaching techniques. All of this necessitates urgency in terms of flexibility, innovation, and new educational methodologies. Modernization, fundamental improvements in the teaching and learning processes, and much-needed reforms in subject matter can go a long way toward bringing our higher education in line with the needs of a rapidly industrializing society. In this context, the semester system of higher education is believed to be an appropriate means of attaining society's future goals. One of the

most common and widely used instructional formats in today's higher education institutions is the semester system. According to Pathak and Rahman (2013), the primary objective of the semester system is "to focus on a continuous assessment system and regular monitoring of students' progress, setting up a comprehensive and in-depth learning environment to build the capacity of learners by developing the required knowledge, skills, and attitudes to become an efficient and effective diversified citizen".

The semester system is the result of contemporary research in the realm of education. The term "semester system" refers to the division of a calendar year into two sessions, each lasting six months. In other words, a semester is a six-month period during which teaching activities are carried out. In a semester system, the final examination is conducted six months after the course has begun. In this arrangement, exams are therefore administered twice every year rather than annually. It is now evident that the term "semester" refers to the separation of the academic year into two sections, each of which has its own set of course offerings. The semester-based academic year can occasionally be divided into three or four quarters, or trimesters. The semester system was designed to provide students with opportunities for continuous assessment, evaluation, and feedback. This was the primary motivation behind the system's implementation. Throughout the academic year, students are required to participate for a longer amount of time, which helps them develop the habits of regular study, punctuality, and a work ethic. While the benefits of the semester system are clear, there is still a long way to go before it can be successfully implemented in a nation like India, where resources and opportunity are scarce.

In Indian universities, the semester system of instruction has generated much discussion. Intentionally or unintentionally, administrators of higher education, professors, students, and members of the general public appear to have questions about the relevance and success of the semester system. In this context, scholars have concentrated on identifying and examining the most relevant aspects of the semester system, such as its benefits and drawbacks, importance, and application. Education is a field that is always subject to analysis and investigation. Since 2011-2012, when Mizoram University implemented the semester system for all of its affiliated

colleges, no prior research has been conducted on the perceptions of college professors and students in Mizoram regarding the semester system. In order to obtain a full understanding of the semester system, it is necessary to investigate the perceptions of college lecturers and students regarding the semester system in Mizoram's undergraduate institutions.

Teachers and students were chosen as the subjects of this study because they are the primary stakeholders and beneficiaries of the semester system's implementation. According to Pathak and Rahman (2013), the effectiveness of any system's execution is largely determined by the level of beneficiary satisfaction. This suggests that one of the measures of the semester system's effectiveness is measuring teachers' and students' perceptions. The current study seeks to better understand how students and teachers perceive the semester system in terms of their familiarity with the programme, its efficacy, and the challenges they face during implementation.

1.4.0 Research Questions

1. Has there been any scale constructed to find out the perception of stakeholders on semester system?
2. Do teachers and students perceive the semester system favourably?
3. Is there any difference in teachers' perception on semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' status, stream of course and teaching experience?
4. Is there any difference in student's perception on semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study?

1.5.0. Statement of the problem

The present study is stated as: ***Perception of College Teachers and Students on the Semester System in Undergraduate Colleges of Mizoram.***

1.6.0. Objectives of the study

The study will be conducted with the following objectives in view:

1. To construct and standardize teachers' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.

2. To construct and standardize students' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
3. To find out teachers' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
4. To compare teachers' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with respect to gender, locale, teachers' designation, stream of course and teaching experience.
5. To compare teachers' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation. Stream of course and teaching experience.
6. To find out the students' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
7. To compare students' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with respect to gender, locale and stream of study.
8. To compare students' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study.

1.7.0 Hypotheses of the study

The following hypotheses are framed in relation to the identified objectives:

1. There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' overall perception on semester system.
2. There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' overall perception on semester system.
3. There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' overall perception of semester system.
4. There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' overall perception of semester system.
5. There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' overall perception of semester system.

6. There is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' overall perception of semester system.
7. There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' overall perception of semester system.
8. There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' overall perception of semester system.
9. There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' overall perception on semester system.
10. There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
11. There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
12. There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
13. There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
14. There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
15. There is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
16. There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
17. There is no significant difference between short experienced and long experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
18. There is no significant difference between middle experienced and long experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of

semester system.

19. There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
20. There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
21. There is no significant difference between Associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
22. There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
23. There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
24. There is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
25. There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
26. There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
27. There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
28. There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
29. There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
30. There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

31. There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
32. There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
33. There is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
34. There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
35. There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
36. There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
37. There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
38. There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
39. There is no significant difference between associate teachers and assistant teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
40. There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
41. There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
42. There is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

43. There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
44. There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
45. There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
46. There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.
47. There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.
48. There is no significant difference between associate professor and assistant professors' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.
49. There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.
50. There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.
51. There is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.
52. There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.
53. There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system

component of semester system.

54. There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.
55. There is no significant difference between male students and female students' overall perception of semester system.
56. There is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' overall perception of semester system.
57. There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' overall perception of semester system.
58. There is no significant difference between science students and arts students' overall perception of semester system.
59. There is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' overall perception of semester system.
60. There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
61. There is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
62. There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
63. There is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
64. There is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.
65. There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
66. There is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

67. There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
68. There is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
69. There is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.
70. There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
71. There is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
72. There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
73. There is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
74. There is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.
75. There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
76. There is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
77. There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
78. There is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
79. There is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.
80. There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

81. There is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.
82. There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.
83. There is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.
84. There is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

1.8.0 Operational definitions of the term

Perception:

Perception is the process by which individuals organize and interpret sensory information in order to understand and make sense of their environment. It involves the recognition and interpretation of stimuli, such as sounds, images, and smells, and the assignment of meaning to them based on previous experiences and expectations (Goldstein, 2020). In the present study, perception refers to how college teachers and students perceive the various components of the semester system, including general observation, course of study, evaluation, teaching method, and a choice-based credit system.

Semester:

A semester system is an academic term. A semester system divides the academic year into two sessions. Consequently, a semester typically spans six months. For the present study, semester system refers to the procedure where academic year is divided into two semesters of six months for the purpose of planning of academic work, delivery of teaching, evaluation and monitoring of the progress of the students. Semester system has been adopted by Mizoram University since 2011-2012.

College Teachers:

A college teacher refers to a teacher who teaches in a college or university. For the present study, college teachers refer to the teachers teaching arts, science and commerce in undergraduate colleges under Mizoram University.

College Students:

A "college student" refers to a full-time or part-time student enrolled in an institution of higher education. For the present study, college students in Mizoram University's undergraduate colleges studying arts, science, or commerce are included.

Undergraduate college:

Undergraduate college is the stage after secondary education and before postgraduate education. For the present study, "undergraduate college" refers to those colleges or institutions under Mizoram University offering three years of study in arts, science, and commerce. The undergraduate college students are those who have not yet been awarded a bachelor’s degree.

References:

Abro, S. G. (2014, January 27). *Critical analysis of semester and annual system.* Wordpress. https://sheerazgul.wordpress.com/2014/01/27/research-critical-analysis-of-semester -and-annual-system/

Altbach, P. G. (2001). Measuring academic progress: The course–credit system in American Higher Education. *Higher Education Policy*, *14*(1), 37–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0952-8733(00)00026-x

Akhtar, P. R. (1980). *A critical study of the semester system in selected universities in India* [Unpublished master's thesis]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

Bhushan, S. (2009). *Restructuring higher education in India*. Rawat Publications.

Bista, M. (2016). *Opinion of teachers towards semester system in mathematics education* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Tribhuvan.

Chalam, K. S. (2005). *Challenges of Higher Education*. Anmol Publications.

Clark, N. (2014). *Higher education reforms in India: Credits, semesters and access.* World Education News & Reviews. https://wenr.wes.org/2014/06/higher-education-reforms-in-india-credits-semesters-and-access/

Constitution of India. (n.d.). Provision for free and compulsory education for children. https://www.constitutionofindia.net/constitution_of_india/directive_principles_of_state_policy/articles/Article%2045#:~:text=Article%2036%2C%20Draft%20Constitution%20of,the%20age%20of%20fourteen%20years.

Department of Examination, Mizoram University. (2011). *Mizoram University Under Graduate Syllabus.* Mizoram University.

Department of Examination, Mizoram University. (2021). *Result Book Odd Semester 2021 Undergraduate I, III & V Semester*

Das, A. (2018). Attitude of teacher trainees towards semester system in West Bengal. *International Journal of Management, Technology and Engineering, 8*(7),

1545-1551.
http://www.ijamtes.org/gallery/166.july%20ijmte%20-%20853.pdf

Das, R. (2016). A study on students' perception about the implementation of semester system in the undergraduate college [Unpublished master's thesis]. Dibrugarh University.

Dhakal, S. (2009). Education and poverty: A gender analysis. *Economic Journal of Nepal*, *32*(1), 37-49.

Goldstein, E. B. (2020). *Sensation and perception*. Cengage Learning.

Jadoon, Z. I., & Jabeen, N. (2006). Human resource management and quality assurance in public sector universities of Pakistan: The case of Punjab University. In Proceedings of 1st International Conference on Assessing Quality in Higher Education (pp. 11-13). http://www.hec.gov.pk/INSIDEHEC/DIVISIONS/QALI/OTHERS/CONFERENCES/ICAQHE/Documents/ICAQHE06-15.pdf

Jain, P. (2017). A study about failure semester system for general courses in MP. *International Journal of Research Science & Management, 4*(6), 103-109.

Khan E.A., AfzaL A., Gillani I.G. & Shahjahana Y.(2021). Effect of Teachers Education Programs on Prospective Teachers' Attitude towards Teaching Profession. *Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology, 18* (7).

Khattak, S. M. S., & Khan, M. S. (2015). A case study of annual and semester systems of examination on Government College of Management Sciences, Peshawar, Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(4), 37-42

Joshi, K. M., & Ahir, K. V. (2013). Indian higher education: Some reflections. *International Economics*, *7*(1), 42-53.

Lalrinsanga, B., Sailo, Z., & Lalhlimpuii. (2021). Attitude of Government Aizawl West College students towards semester system at college level. *Mizoram Educational Journal*, *7*(3&4), 72-78.

Lalrinzuali, F. (2017). *Choice based credit system at post graduate level in Mizoram University: A critical analysis* (Doctoral dissertation). Mizoram University.

Madhukhar, I. (2003). *Changing context of higher education*. Delhi: Authors Press.

Mahajan, K. (2017). What is the role of education in nation-building? Retrieved from https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-role-of-education-in-nation-building.

Malsawmi, H. (2010). *Progress and expansion of education in Mizoram, an analysis*. Aizawl, Mizoram: JP Offset Printers and Publishers.

Mavina, G., Zivanai, S., & Mhandara, L. (2017). Factors affecting poor lecture attendance during the first three weeks of the semester: Agricultural Engineering Department, Chinhoyi University of Technology, Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Research in Social Science*, *7*(9).

Ministry of Education. (1966). *Education and National Development: Report of the education commission, 1964-66.* National Council of Educational Research and Training.

Ministry of Education. (n.d.). National policy on education 1986, programme of action 1992. https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/upload_document/npe.pdf.

Mirunalini, M., & Anandan, K. (2012). Teacher Professional Perception of B.Ed Student Teachers*, Journal of Community Guidance and Research*, *29*(3), 473-480.

Mizoram University 2021-2022. *Annual Report Mizoram University 2021-2022.*

Mohan, R. (2022, May 29). *Fall semester, Spring Semester & Winter Semesters abroad*. Fall semester, Spring semester & Winter semesters abroad. Retrieved March 27, 2023, from https://www.hotcoursesabroad.com/india/find-your-course/how-to-choose-the-right-study-abroad-destinations/different-semesters-in-different-countries-abroad/

Nasreen, S., Abbas, J., Shahzad, M. A., & Rizwan, M. (2017). Assessment of students' learning achievements under semester system in Pakistan. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 7(10), 730-735. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2017.7.10.959

Natarajan, V. (1979). *Monograph on semester system for universities.* Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi

Padmanabhan, C. (2016). Endangering academic autonomy. *Economic and Political Weekly*, *51*(5), 20-22.

Pathak, T., & Rahman, M. A. (2013). Perception of students and teachers towards semester system: A study in some selected degree colleges of Nagaon town of

Nagaon District of Assam. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *4*(13), 84-91. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234633876.pdf

Patil, V. T. (1984). *The semester system: Substance and problems*. Sterling Publ.

Powar, K. B. (2002). *Indian higher education: A conglomerate of concepts, facts and practices.* Concept Publishing Company.

Prakash, V. (2007). Trends in growth and financing of higher education in India. Economic and Political Weekly, *42*(31), 3249-3258. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4419875

Report of the Education Reforms Commission, Mizoram 2009-2010. *Towards an Enlightened and Inclusive Mizo Society*. Education Reforms Commission, Mizoram July 2010.

Roshiah, R. J. (1979). *A critical study of the perceptions of college communities about the desirability and feasibility of introducing semester system in their colleges in the city of Madras* [Unpublished Master's thesis]. M.S. University of Baroda.

Shabbir, A., & Hassan, M. U. (2014). Perception of students and teachers towards the implementation of semester system of examination at undergraduate level. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 36(1), 105-116.

Sharma, S. C. (2022). *Inducing quality and relevance in Indian higher institutions, some thoughts: In Reimagining Indian Universities.* Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi.

Shoukat, L. & Muhammad, W. (2015). Perception of teachers and students towards the functionality of semester system at university level in the context of Pakistani social and administrative set-ups. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, *III*(4), 68–80. https://doi.org/10.20472/te.2015.3.4.006

Singh, J. D. (n.d.). *Higher education in India – Issues, challenges and suggestions.* https://www.universityofcalicut.info/news/higher_edu_jd_singh.pdf

Singh, K. (2016). Perception of university students towards semester system – A survey. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, *6*(8).

Solanki, G. (2019). Difference between semester system and annual system. *International Journal of Research*, *7*(12).

Sonwane, J. R. (2015). Something about semester system in education. *GYANODAYA - The Journal of Progressive Education*, *8*(2), 1. https://doi.org/10.5958/2229-4422.2015.00008.0

Team, C. (2019, March 4). *Worldwide academic calendars*. iSTUDENTglobal. Retrieved March 27, 2023, from https://i-studentglobal.com/student-lifestyle/worldwide-academic-calendars/

Tilak, J. B. G. (1999). Higher education reforms in India. *Journal of Higher Education*, *70*(1), 1-18. DOI: 10.2307/2649265

UGC. (2008). From Chairman on examination reforms. D.O. No. F.1-2/2008(XI Plan), dated Jan 31, 2008: Annexure-II, Action Plan for Academic and Administrative Reforms.

UGC. (2009). From Chairman, D.O. No.F.1-2/2008 (XI Plan). On Examination Reforms, dated March 2009.

UGC. (2008). *Guidelines on adaptation of choice based credit system.* University Grants Commission.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1998). *Higher education in the twenty-first century: Vision and Action.* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000116345.

University Grant Commission. (2015). *Instructional template for facilitating implementation of Choice Based Credit System (CBCS).* https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/4426331_Instructional-Template.pdf

Varghese, N. V. (2018). *Indian higher education report 2017: Teaching, learning and quality in higher education.* Saga Publications.

Yadav, A., Sharma, R., Dangi, J., & Tiwari, P. (2016). A comparative study of students' performance between semester and annual examination system. DAVV, Indore.

CHAPTER – II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter deals with a review of related literature. A survey of relevant literature enables the researcher to appreciate the types of previous studies undertaken and to identify knowledge gaps. It offers the researcher information and guidance for the path they must take. The literature review provides the researcher with a conceptual framework of references, approaches, procedures, data sources, the construction of instruments, and statistical procedures for addressing the topic.

Research takes advantage of the knowledge which has accumulated in the past as a result of constant human endeavour. It can never be undertaken in isolation of the work that has already been done on the problems which are directly or indirectly related to a study proposed by a researcher. A careful review of research journals, books, dissertations, thesis and other sources of information on the problem to be investigated is one of the important steps in the planning of any research study. (Koul, 2021).

Before the University Grants Commission made the semester system mandatory for undergraduate colleges beginning with the 2011-12 academic year, a few universities in India had already adopted the semester system, which has been in use in developed nations for decades. There were numerous research studies undertaken in industrialized nations on the semester system, as well as a few studies conducted in India. As the semester system of education in India's undergraduate colleges became required, additional research was undertaken on the topic. The findings and observations of various researchers are presented in this chapter, which has been divided under the following subheadings:

1. Studies conducted in India and
2. Studies conducted abroad

2.1.0 Studies conducted in India:

Jat (1970) conducted research on the perceptions that teachers had of the semester system. It appeared that the majority of the instructors had a favourable attitude towards the adoption of the semester system, which was supported by the findings.

Parikh (1972) investigated college students and the semester system. According to the findings of an opinion poll, the majority of students viewed the semester system favourably. Graduate students exhibited a more positive outlook than their undergraduate counterparts.

Sharma (1976) carried out research comparing traditional examinations to semester examinations and discovered that the quality of performance was higher in the semester system than in the traditional examination system.

Gupta (1978) did an in-depth investigation into the semester system of education. From the results of the study, the semester system places a strong emphasis on giving students the opportunity to take part in extracurricular activities such as social organisations, scientific societies, and games and sports. The semester method resulted in significantly less work for both the instructors and the students. The necessary areas for improvement are the instructional aids and the associated equipment.

Patel (1978) undertook a critical analysis of the current semester system and evaluation mechanism for the B. Ed. and M. Ed. programmes within the faculty of education and psychology. Male M. Ed. students had the highest favourable attitude towards the semester system, whereas male B. Ed. students had the least favourable view. The outsiders were the most positive about the grading system, followed by female M. Ed. students.

Akhtar (1980) executed a critical study of the semester system in selected universities in India. The findings revealed that the overall attitude of the teachers and the students concerning the semester system was positive. No significant difference was found in the attitudes of the teachers and the students towards the semester system.

Mazumdar (2010) emphasized the advantages of the semester system in his work

titled "Introduction of the semester system in Indian colleges." It is beneficial for the students to keep up a relationship with their textbooks throughout the school year because they are given the opportunity to do so through this activity. Students have the opportunity to acquire a more profound comprehension when they are subjected to routine evaluation. It makes for easier communication between instructors and their respective classes.

Haseena and Reddy (2012) examined the attitude of postgraduate students towards the semester system and discovered that, regardless of gender, the majority of students held a more positive view of the semester system. The science students indicated a more favourable opinion towards the semester system than the Arts students.

Sridevi (2012) studied teacher trainees' and teacher educators' perspectives on the semester structure of the B.Ed. programme in Kerala, and she found that several changes had been made to the curriculum without proper consideration of the course's length.

Mallik (2013) conducted research on the feasibility of implementing a semester system of examination in an undergraduate course at Calcutta University. The study's findings revealed that government teachers had a more favourable perception of the semester system than aided-college teachers. The attitudes of rural, urban, and semi-urban residents towards the semester system were markedly different.

Pathak and Rahman (2013) investigated how professors and students felt about the semester system. According to a survey conducted in a few chosen degree-granting institutions in Nagaon Town, Nagaon District, Assam, both teachers and students generally had positive opinions of the curriculum. The majority of students expressed dissatisfaction with the CGPA system's evaluation. For the majority of students, the semester system was a hardship and a source of academic worry.

Pabla (2014) conducted research on the potential paradigm shift that might result from switching from the semester system to the annual system. Based on the findings, it was recommended that we return to the annual system while making some adjustments within the system. In addition to this, it recommended reverting to

the annual system, which would make the duration of teaching hours in learning transactions significantly longer. Under the annual system, there would be a lot more time for teaching pupils in-depth information about the subject, as well as plenty of time for them to participate in extracurricular activities.

Trivedi and Soni (2014) conducted an empirical analysis of the semester system pattern in schools and discovered that neither teachers nor parents favoured the examination procedure under the semester system.

Ghosh and Mallik (2015) did a comparative case study on accomplishment variation in the yearly and semester systems of examinations. The study indicated that the students scored higher under the semester system than under the annual system. The performance of both the boys and girls was also higher than the annual system. Overall, the semester system proved to be more effective than the annual system.

Aithal and Kumar (2016) conducted an examination of the college credit system based on student preferences. The study revealed that the educational system has transitioned from being teacher-centered to student-centered. The students had greater flexibility and exposure. On the other hand, the ability to select electives outside of the main subject may dilute the depth of study in core areas. Due to their lack of expertise, students may have trouble selecting subjects.

Garcha (2016) investigated the attitude of pre-service teacher trainees toward the semester system: The Role of Stream, and discovered that the vast majority of pre-service teacher trainees had a neutral opinion about the semester system. The course of study had little effect on the attitude of the student teachers.

Singh and Kumar (2016) analyzed the difficulties associated with implementing the semester system in a globalized environment. They advocated for regular and on-going engagement between students and teachers, which would instill good study habits in the pupils. Furthermore, it was suggested that effective implementation of the semester system requires dedication and teacher training.

Garcha (2017) investigated the effect of gender towards teacher trainees' attitudes on the semester system. The attitudes of male teacher trainees towards the semester

system did not differ significantly from those of female teacher trainees.

Jain (2017) conducted a study on the failure of the semester system for general courses in MP and came to the conclusion that the borrowed semester system has failed in India. Learning objectives have dwindled as the emphasis on practical exercises has waned.

Kalita (2017) looked at how undergraduates at Dibrugarh University, Assam, perceived the semester system. Based on the results of the study, it seems that most students view evaluation procedures and semester-based curricula with scepticism. Overwhelmingly, students rated the classroom experience as positive. The semester format was mostly disliked by undergraduates.

Biswas (2018) conducted an analytical study on the choice-based credit system (CBCS). According to the findings of the study, the system has increased teacher and student engagement. It has replaced rote learning and memorizing with critical thinking and analyzing alternatives among students. Students perceived the system to be student-centered, promoting the child's overall development.

Das (2018) evaluated the attitude of West Bengal's pre-service teachers towards the semester system. The findings revealed that scientific teachers had a more positive disposition than arts professors. Female science teachers had developed a more positive attitude than female arts professors. Regarding the attitude towards the semester system, no major gender differences were discovered.

Meher (2018) polled undergraduate and postgraduate students at Gangadhar Meher University (GMU) in Sambalpur about the semester system in terms of gender and stream. The major findings demonstrated that all students expressed satisfaction with the semester examination system. The semester system was also thought to be more effective than the traditional system.

Rajivlochan and Rajivlochan (2018) analysed the semester system and the choice-based credit system in higher education. The study concluded that the two systems are necessary to prepare India's higher education for global competition and the information economy, and to pave the path for future growth.

Behera et al. (2019) investigated the perceptions of undergraduate students and

instructors towards the implementation of the semester examination system. All of the study's respondents viewed the semester system as more efficient than the traditional one, as demonstrated by the researchers' findings. Regarding curriculum and evaluation, all of the teachers and students were satisfied with the system. However, the main concern was the delayed release of student results.

Biswal (2019) analyzed students' perspectives on the semester examination system in higher education. The data demonstrated that the semester system had a positive effect on the educational attainment, achievement, performance, motivation, and personality development of the students.

Chaliha and Gogoi (2019) conducted a study on the attitudes of undergraduate general degree students toward the semester system. The findings found that science students had a better attitude towards the semester system than arts and commerce students. There was no substantial difference between the attitudes of arts and science students towards the semester system. Science students exhibited a better attitude than commerce students in relation to their attitude towards the semester system. The attitude of arts students was more favourable than that of commerce students.

Patgiri (2019) investigated the relevance of the semester system in higher education. It was revealed that the semester system may cause students to become bookworms, which is detrimental to their social skills and personalities. Under this approach, teachers' inability to cover the complete course was primarily due to a lack of time.

Reddy (2019) conducted a study on the semester system of engineering students in relation to their fathers' location and profession. The study revealed that urban students held a more favourable view of the semester system. The father's occupation significantly influenced the students' attitudes.

Solanki (2019) examined the distinction between the semester system and the annual system. The study revealed that while the semester system had a busy schedule and less time for students to explore different fields outside of their studies, the annual system provided students with a great deal of time for their extracurricular activities. Between the semester and annual systems, the teaching and learning methods and evaluation procedures vary significantly.

Kumar (2020), in his paper titled "Semester versus yearly system: Which is better?" concluded that the semester system is superior to the annual system. The semester system encourages better reading habits in students. The evaluation and grading system is more effective with the semester system. However, the excessive amount of homework assigned to students led to academic stress and pressure.

Neog (2020) concluded a study on the efficiency of the semester system at the undergraduate level, with a focus on the institutions in the Sonitpur district that are affiliated with Gauhati University. With the establishment of the semester system, the majority of students are examination-focused, according to the survey. The semester system has increased student workload and decreased time for extra-curriculars. On the other hand, the semester system has fostered solid study habits among the students and increased their consistency in attendance.

Anuradha (2021) wrote an article comparing the semester and annual systems, in which she argued that the ongoing evaluation under the semester system is superior to the annual system, which overburdens students academically. Under the semester system, students typically perform better than under the annual system.

Kumar and Sudarshan (2021) investigated the perspectives of undergraduate students in India towards the implementation of Choice Based Credit System (CBCS). The data revealed that the vast majority of students have a favourable opinion of the semester system. While the students viewed the system favourably due to its adaptability, continual review, and skill development, there were concerns with it, such as overburden, overwork, and a lack of infrastructure.

Lalrinsanga et al. (2021) did a study titled “Perceptions of government Aizawl West College students about the semester system at the college level.” The study demonstrated that students had a favourable opinion of the semester system. The majority of students had a positive view of the semester system, including effective engagement, transparency, integrity, and teacher and administration responsibility.

Mondal (2021) evaluated the significance of the semester system of evaluation in the Indian setting and determined that the semester system was more favourable for students than the annual system. Since examinations are administered at regular intervals, most of what has been learned remains fresh. The semester system is

proactive, whereas under the annual system, students only felt engaged during the exam period.

2.2.0 Studies conducted abroad:

Tong (1977) conducted research on pre-university students and the semester system in Thailand, which found that male teachers had a more positive outlook on the semester system than female teachers. The gender of the students did not influence their perspective on the semester system. The teachers' attitudes regarding the semester system were not significantly influenced by their prior experiences.

Krohn and O'Connor (2005) investigated student effort and performance throughout the semester, and their findings indicated that attendance had no effect on students' performance. Students' study time negatively affected their exam performance.

Sarwat (2006) analysed the discrepancies in the academic objectives of students enrolled in yearly and semester systems. The study revealed that students under the annual system favoured mastery goals, while students under the semester system preferred performance goals. Gender plays a crucial role in students' academic objectives.

Malik et al. (2010) conducted a comparative analysis of MA English performance under the yearly system and the semester system in Pakistan. The findings demonstrated a considerable disparity between the results of students under the yearly and semester systems.

Khattak et al. (2011) examined English teachers' and students' perceptions of the differences between the yearly and semester systems of postgraduate education in Mardan. According to the findings of the study, students viewed the semester system as more productive and efficient than the annual system.

Rahman and Riaz-ud-din (2011) compared the quality of education in Pakistan's Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province under the annual and semester systems. They discovered that the semester system is more advantageous in higher education since it emphasizes practical living.

Aslam et al. (2012), in a study assessing the factors influencing students' satisfaction with the semester system in Pakistani colleges, discovered that students viewed the semester system as the most effective technique to maximise learning. The teachers' efforts and behaviours play a key influence in delivering pupils happiness with the semester system. On the whole, students preferred the semester system over the annual system.

Munshi et al. (2012) conducted research on the examination process in the semester system, focusing on what constitutes observation by teachers and students. According to the data, the researchers discovered that the teachers had, to a certain extent, a more positive attitude than the students did towards the semester system.

Yousaf and Hashim (2012) conducted a case study of the annual and semester examination systems at Peshawar's government college of management sciences. The study found that pupils using the semester system did much better than those using the annual method. The majority of students favoured the semester system because it offered a superior grading mechanism. Comparing the yearly system to the semester system, the students felt that the annual system was excessively burdensome.

AyubBuzdar et al. (2013) did an assessment of students' learning achievements under semester system in Pakistan. The majority of students were satisfied with the semester system, according to the findings. The role of teachers as evaluators is beneficial to the learning of students. In contrast, the lack of time was a significant problem under the semester system.

Chandio et al. (2013) conducted a study on the issues encountered by university academics in the semester system. Under the semester system, the study indicated that teachers felt overburdened by excessive effort and academic requirements. Therefore, it was suggested that teachers' workloads be reduced to improve educational quality.

Plessis and Pretorius (2013) conducted a case study on "semesterization: a great system's downfall" and found that the semester system had failed in almost every way. There was no time during the semester module to reflect on students' accomplishments in their assignments.

Rana and Perveen (2013) did a study to evaluate the perceptions of Punjab university students regarding the semester system in Pakistan. It was revealed that the semester system lowered students' workload, hence increasing their pass rate. However, the semester structure did not assist students in mastering the subject.

Abro (2014) started analysing the semester and annual systems critically. According to the study, when it came to grading systems, most students favoured the semester system over the annual system. The majority of students thought they performed better academically under the semester system than under the annual system. For a better understanding of the idea, the majority of students chose the semester method over the annual approach.

Chongbang (2014) compared the semester system and annual system of the Education faculty. The results demonstrated that the semester system differs from the annual system in terms of instructional methods. The semester system emphasises innovative and student-centered instruction, whereas the annual system follows restrictive and teacher-centered instructions. The semester method resulted in a greater pass rate for students than the annual system.

Mehmood et al. (2014) evaluated students' and teachers' perspectives on Pakistan's semester assessment system in higher education. According to the findings of the study, students viewed the semester system as knowledge-based and effective in covering all parts of their performances. The majority of students preferred the semester system because it improved presentation abilities and fostered a conducive learning environment. On the other hand, the semester system has increased instructors' workload, favouritism, and bias, and cannot provide sufficient time for extracurricular activities. The semester system was viewed favourably by the vast majority of teachers.

Khattak et al. (2015) investigated the perceptions of students at Sarhad University on the effect of various examination systems on their academic achievement. The results suggested that pupils received higher grades under the semester system. In the semester system, students had superior presentation skills. On the other side, students were dissatisfied with the semester system's reliability. The word “examination system” was suggested for use in higher education.

Naqvi and Fatima (2015) studied the hybrid semester system in the MBBS programme at Ziauddin Medical College, they issued a recommendation that a uniform credit transfer policy should be adopted in all medical institutions. Grade Point Average (GPA) and Cumulative Grade Point Average should be used to report the final results (CGPA).

According to Pandey's (2015) article semester versus annual system, students have opposed the semester system on the grounds that the limited seats under the semester system prevented numerous students from pursuing higher education. Curriculum modifications and infrastructural development are required. Under the semester system, education was excessively expensive.

Shoukat and Muhammad (2015) conducted a study on the perceptions of university lecturers and students regarding the effectiveness of the semester system in the context of Pakistani social and administrative structures. The study revealed that under the semester system, teachers have the discretion to apply authoritative control. The semester system must be redesigned in accordance with its original tendencies, which will alter social and administrative standards.

Bista (2016) conducted a survey of teachers' attitudes towards the semester system in mathematics education and discovered that the teachers favoured the semester system. It was discovered that the semester system was more effective than the annual system.

Dangi (2016) investigated students' perspectives on the adoption of the semester system. The outcome demonstrated that university students viewed the semester system and its execution well. The students, however, were dissatisfied with the policies and practices, the arduous evaluation system, and the regular examinations. In contrast, university professors exhibited an unfavourable opinion towards the semester system.

Karki (2016) conducted research titled “Teachers' and students' perceptions of internal evaluation techniques in the semester system: a case study at a university campus.” According to the findings of the study, the majority of students and instructors viewed the internal assessment procedure under the semester system

favourably. On the other hand, key downsides include, among others, the absence of an operational calendar, the absence of provisions for teacher rewards, and the lack of student cooperation.

Pandey (2016) investigated the problems and prospects: An evaluation of the semester system in Tribhuvan University's faculty of humanities and social sciences (M.A. English). The significant findings were that the pass percentage of the students increased significantly. Students, on the other hand, perceived favouritism or bias among teachers as the system's main disadvantage.

Sharma (2016) conducted a meta-analysis of studies on the semester system implementation: What lies ahead? Despite the socioeconomic issues, it was determined that the semester system was more effective than the traditional system. The system's success is dependent on collaboration and responsible stakeholders.

Batool et al. (2017) conducted research on students' perspectives on the usefulness of the semester and annual assessment systems at the Institute of Education and Research. The study revealed that the semester system outperformed the annual system by keeping students involved in their studies, broadening their perspectives and topic competence, boosting pass rates, and enhancing the quality of education. In contrast, the semester system has put an excessive workload on students and does not fulfil their educational goals.

Ghimire (2017) studied the opportunities and problems of mathematics education assessment methodologies (A comparative analysis between annual and semester systems in master’s in education, Nepal). Thus, the analysis revealed that the semester system has provided more opportunities than the annual system. Regarding assessment methods, the semester system was less efficient than the annual system.

Basharat et al. (2018) investigated the yearly versus semester assessment system in physiotherapy in Pakistan from the student's perspective. The majority of students reported that they did better and received higher grades under the semester system than under the annual system. However, the annual system delivered a higher quality of education than the semester system. Therefore, the annual system was superior to the semester system in terms of educational quality.

Chemjong (2018) investigated students' perceptions of the semester system in mathematics education and discovered that students have a favourable view of the semester system.

Dahal (2018) investigated students' attitudes towards the Master of Business Studies (MBS) semester system. A case study of the Nepal commerce campus revealed that, on the whole, the students had a favourable opinion of the MBS semester structure.

Baral et al. (2019) investigated the postgraduate semester structure and its implementation at Prithvi Narayan Campus: Students' opinions. According to the statistics, the majority of students viewed the semester system as providing quality education. The lecture approach was most frequently employed in education.

Matlakala et al. (2019) investigated the implementation of the semester system in undergraduate programmes for open distance education. They discovered that the semester system's limitations are the restricted time for teaching and learning, the academic workload, and the types of evaluation used.

Munnawar and Awan (2019) explored the concerns about the semester system at Pakistan's public universities. It was discovered that female students had a more positive view of the semester system than male students. The semester system is viewed differently by students at various universities. The majority of students believe that the semester system encourages students to study, creates a superior learning environment, improves student productivity, and encourages creative self-expression.

Paudel (2019) examined the views of university instructors about the English language curriculum of the M.Ed. semester system. The data revealed that the English teachers held a favourable view of the curriculum but a negative view of its design and implementation context.

Subedi (2019) investigated the perspectives of Tribhuvan University students and faculty regarding the semester system. The findings of the survey demonstrated that both teachers and students held a favourable view of the semester system's curriculum. The perception of the teaching and learning environment was likewise positive. Students had a favourable impression of the instructors and their instructional methods.

Azam et al. (2020) conducted a cohort-based assessment of the prevalence of anxiety, depression, and stress among pharmacy undergraduates in the annual and semester systems. The data revealed a statistically significant difference, indicating that students in the semester system were more disposed to all three factors than students in the yearly system.

Al-Dossary and Esmail (2020) compared the number of students absence rate in the quarter and semester systems. The findings of the study revealed that the semester system lowered the trainee absence rate relative to the quarter system.

Kalhoro and Lakho (2020) evaluated university students' perceptions of the semester structure and research at Karachi University. According to the study's findings, students' desire for research is connected with their choice for the semester system. The semester system should be supported and implemented in colleges affiliated with universities.

Pervaiz et al. (2020) investigated the causes of and solutions to problems with fair assessment in the semester system at public universities in Punjab, Pakistan. The findings of the study indicated that the proficiency of teachers in their assessments was inadequate. The course outlines were not finished in a timely manner. Teachers lacked access to skill-enhancement training and services.

Sardar et al. (2020) investigated the factors influencing students' satisfaction with the semester system in Pakistani universities. The study found that the semester system was more effective than the traditional one. It is also suggested that collaboration between students and teachers could increase satisfaction.

Akhtar and Hashmi (2021) attempted to investigate semester system issues faced by university students. On the basis of the data, it was determined that the semester system was plagued by significant issues such as lack of time, lack of presentation skills, academic stress, and student worry.

Akhund (2021) examined the academic achievement discrepancies between annual and semester-based assessment systems for medical students, using anatomy subject scores as an example. It was discovered that students on the semester system outperformed those on the annual system.

Bakhsh et al. (2021) investigated semester system practises in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, and public sector universities. The research uncovered several disadvantages of the semester system, including teacher favouritism in grading, inadequate preparation for lectures, unfinished courses, and the overburdening of students with tasks and presentations.

Paudel and Campus (2021) studied the prospects, limitations, and brief experience of the semester system at Tribhuvan University. The study indicated that the semester system discourages absenteeism and aids the instructor in determining the students' capabilities. The semester system proved superior to the annual system in terms of the teaching and learning process and the provision for in-depth learning.

Sharma (2021) conducted research on assessment focus: A case of English language education examinations within the semester system at Tribhuvan University. He discovered that the guiding principle for assessment procedures is “evaluation of learning” rather than “assessment for learning.”

Sherpa and Baraily (2022) Examined faculty members' perspectives on the semester system introduced by a college associated with Tribhuvan University in Nepal. The study revealed a variety of faculty perspectives on the semester system. It was determined that the behaviours of students and professors, as well as the lack of preparation by teachers and management, were particularly difficult and ineffective. Yet, the efficiency of the semester system could result in pedagogical reform and global knowledge

2.3.0 Overview of literature review:

The relevant literature reveals that the research conducted on semester system focused mostly on the attitudes, perceptions, views, and ideas of teachers and students regarding the various components of semester system. In addition, critical and analytic research was conducted on the semester system's technique, adaptability, credit system, continuous assessment, examination, and similar topics. In a comparative research, the annual and semester systems, as well as their advantages and disadvantages, were examined. The examination of these studies demonstrates that no comparable research has been conducted across the entire state

of Mizoram. Current research on the attitude of students towards the semester system was limited to a single college, and the results indicate that the majority of students hold a favourable view of the semester system. The results of this survey should provide insight into how teachers and students in Mizoram feel about the semester system, which will be valuable for raising awareness of the semester system, its effectiveness, and the issues it brings, as well as for informing reform initiatives.

References:

Abro, S. G. (2014, January 27). Critical analysis of semester and annual system. *WordPress.* https://sheerazgul.wordpress.com/2014/01/27/research-critical-analysis-of-semester-and-annual-system/

Aithal, P. S., & Kumar, P. M. S. (2016). Analysis of choice based credit system in higher education. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Modern Education (IJERME), 1*(1), 278-284. http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161046

Akhtar, B., & Hashmi, M. A. (2021). Exploring Problems Faced by University Students Regarding Semester System. *Global Social Sciences Review, VI*(I), 564-571. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2021(VI-I).57

Akhtar, P. R. (1980). *A critical study of the semester system in selected universities in India* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

Akhund, S. A. (2021). Medical students' academic achievement differences in annual and semester-based examination systems: Anatomy subject scores as an example. *Cureus, 13*(11), e19775. https://dx.doi.org/10.7759%2Fcureus.19775

Al-Dossary, A. S., & Esmail, A. M. S. (2020). Comparison of the absence of the trainees in quarter and semester system. *Arab Journal for Scientific Publishing (AJSP), 2,* 346-362. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343817961_Comparison_of_the_Absence_of_the_Trainees_in_Quarter_and_Semester_Systems?enrichId=rgreq-1eb6d36a76f2c8ab96c47b46efc14cefXXX&enrichSource=Y292ZXJQYWdlOzM0MzgxNzk2MTtBUzo5Mjc1NzM2NjQwOTIxNjFAMTU5ODE2MjIwMzY3OQ%3D%3D&el=1_x_2 &_esc=publicationCoverPdf

Anuradha (2021). *What is the difference between semester and annual System.* Pediaa. https://pediaa.com/what-is-the-difference-between-semester-and-annual-system/

Aslam, H. D., Younis, A., Sheik, A. A., Maher, M. & Abbasi, Z. A. (2012). Analysing factors affecting students' satisfaction regarding semester system in universities of Pakistan. *Journal of American Science, 8*(10), 163-170. https://www.academia.edu/download/32344637/JOURNAL_OF_AMERICAN_SCIENCE.pdf

AyubBuzdar, M., Ali, A., Akhtar, A. H., Maqbool, S. & Nadeem, M. (2013). Assessment of students' learning achievements under semester system in Pakistan. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research, 3*(6), 79-86. https://www.textroad.com/pdf/JBASR/J.%20Basic.%20Appl.%20Sci.%20Res.,%203(6)79-86,%202013.pdf

Azam, M., Ishaq, R., Iqbal, Q., Jan, S. U., Mengal, S. U., & Saleem, F. (2020). Frequency of anxiety, depression and stress among pharmacy undergraduates of annual and semester system: A cohort-based comparison. *Journal of Pharmacy Practice and Community Medicine, 6*(3), 35-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.5530/jppcm.2020.3.12

Bakhsh, K. Naz, B. A. & JavedIqbal (2021). Semester system practices in public sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Ilkogretim Online, 20*(5), 3032-3038. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=13053515&AN=150195530&h=ZOsUXSuCgXbWrXDuoXYLaRcIHo%2BoP7G%2Bv6VlKWr%2FsvMdH9rIsCCG8tU6FUSOP7d82ZNcbKDRfrLKQiQqUw4fYA%3D%3D&crl=c.

Baral, U. N., Chhetri, T. B., & Subedi, G. (2019). Semester system and its implementation at Prithvi Narayan Campus: What do postgraduate students say. *Prithvi Journal of Research and Innovation, 1,* 23-38. http://dx.doi.org/10.3126/pjri.v1i0.29886

Basharat, A., Qamar, M. M., Arshad, M., Anwar, H., Bashir, N., Anwar, T., Khalid, S., Batool, J., Zubair, H., Naz, S., Bashir, K. & Nawaz, R. (2018). Annual vs semester examination system in physio-therapy in Pakistan: A student Prospective. *International Journal of Physiotherapy and Research, 6*(1), 2600-26005. https://dx.doi.org/10.16965/ijpr.2017.261

Batool, A., Ahmad, S. & Ch, A. H. (2017). A study of students' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of semester and annual examination system at Institute of Education and Research. *International Journal of Educational and Pedagogical Sciences, 11*(10), 2582-2585. https://zenodo.org/record/1340388/files/10009295.pdf.

Behera, S., Meher, V. & Baral, R. (2019). Perception of students and teachers towards the implementation of semester system of examination at undergraduate level. *(Ed.), Examination reforms for quality higher education in India: Challenges and pportunities (pp.246-252).* New Delhi Publishers. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333021239_Perception_of_Students_and_Teachers_towards_the_Implementation_of_Semester_System_of_Examination_at_Undergraduate_Level.

Bista, M. (2016). *Opinion of teachers towards semester system in mathematics education*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan University. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1489

Biswal, S. (2019). Student's perception on semester system of examination at higher education level. In S. K. Rout (Ed.), *Examination reforms for quality higher education in India: Challenges and opportunities* (pp. 273-277). New Delhi Publishers.

Biswas, S. (2018). Choices based credit system (CBCS) - An analytical study. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews, 5*(3), 1362x-1368x. http://ijrar.com/upload_issue/ijrar_issue_1469.pdfChaliha, M. & Gogoi, P. K. (2019). A study on attitude towards semester system of students at the undergraduate level of general degree course. *Online Journal of Multidisciplinary Subjects, 12*(4), 479-484. http://www.researchguru.net/volume/Volume%2012/Issue%204/RG63.pdf

Chandio, J. H., Sindher, R. H. & Gulrez, N. (2013). A Study on the Problems faced by University Academia in Semester System. *Journal of Educational Research, 16*(1), 65-70. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=10279776&AN=91919989&h=0lVfWh5%2FGziOY

I7L%2BFK9UhBDjmL879mdDc116ky9m61vJkgZZC7hJC1oIbl11E5Pa9KW wZHO53Jui%2BxsmvB%2FGw%3D%3D&crl=c

Chemjong, R. (2018). *Students' perception towards semester system in mathematics education* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan University. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1681.

Chongbang, K. B. (2014). Comparative study of semester system and annual system of faculty of education (mini research report). *Faculty of Education, Tribhuvan University*.

Dahal, R. K. (2018). Students' Perception towards Master of Business Studies (MBS) Semester System: *A Case Study of Nepal Commerce Campus*. Pravaha, 24(1), 181–195. https://doi.org/10.3126/pravaha.v24i1.20237

Dangi, N. (2016). *Students' attitude towards semester system implementation* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan University. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1598.

Das, A. (2018). Attitude of teacher trainees towards semester system in West Bengal. *International Journal of Management, Technology and Engineering, 8*(7), 1545-1551. http://www.ijamtes.org/gallery/166.july%20ijmte%20-%20853.pdf

Garcha, P. S. (2016). Attitude of pre service teacher trainees toward semester system: Role of stream. *GHG Journal of Sixth Thought, 3*(2), 54-57. http://www.ghgcollegesadhar.org/files/education/journal/j_12_9_2016.pdf

Garcha, P. S. (2017). Role of gender on attitude of teacher trainees toward semester system. *International Journal of Education, 7,* 61-65. http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.17195.28968.

Ghimire, R. C. (2017). Opportunities and challenges of assessment strategies implemented in Mathematics education (A comparative analysis between annual and semester systems in master in education, Nepal). *International Journal of Educational Science and Research (IJESR), 7*(6), 131-134. https://www.academia.edu/35617432/OPPORTUNITIES_AND_CHALLENGES_OF_ASSESSMENT_STRATEGIES_IMPLEMENTED_IN_MATHEMAT

ICS_EDUCATION_A_COMPARATIVE_ANALYSIS_BETWEEN_ANNUAL_AND_SEMESTER_SYSTEMS_IN_MASTER_IN_EDUCATION_NEPAL

Ghosh, S. & Mallik, P. S. (2015). A comparative case study on achievement variation in annual and semester system of examinations. *The Scholar, 1*(1), 7-12. http://journal.fakirchandcollege.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/7-12.pdf

Gupta, M. P. (1978). An Analytical Study of Semester System of Education. *Journal of Higher Education 4,* (1)*,* 41-47.

Haseena, S. & Reddy, L. K. (2012). Attitude of post graduate students towards semester system. *International Journal of Scientific Research, 3*(2), 506-507. http://dx.doi.org/10.15373/22778179/FEB2014/168

Jain, P. (2017). A study about failure semester system for general courses in MP. *International Journal of Research Science & Management, 4*(6), 103-109. https://www.ijrsm.com/issues%20pdf%20file/Archive-2017/June-2017/11.pdf.

Jat, M. S. (1970). *A study of teachers' attitude towards semester system* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Meerut University.

Kalhoro, F. A. & Lakho, M. K. (2020). Perception of university students regarding semester system and research: Case of Karachi University . *Salu-commerce & economics review*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4396090

Kalita, G. (2017). Perception towards the semester system of education among the undergraduate students of Dibrugarh University, Assam. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Advanced Studies (IJIRAS), 4*(10), 205-212. http://www.ijiras.com/2017/Vol_4-Issue_10/paper_36.pdf

Karki, R. (2016). *Teachers' and students' beliefs on practices of internal assessment in semester system: A case of university campus* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan University. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1558.

Khattak, H., Mughal, A. W., Marwat, M. K., Jan, S., Waseem, M., & Bibi, S. (2015). Perception of the students of Sarhad University regarding the impact of different systems of examination upon their academic performance. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education, 4*(2), 43-51. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dr-Mohibullah-Marwat/publication/348835060

_Perception_of_the_Students_of_Sarhad_University_Regarding_the_Impact_of_Different_Systems_of_Examination_upon_Their_Academic_Performance/links/601278ac299bf1b33e2ddf18/Perception-of-the-Students-of-Sarhad-University-Regarding-the-Impact-of-Different-Systems-of-Examination-upon-Their-Academic-Performance.pdf

Khattak, Z. I., Ali, M., Khan, A. & Khan, S. (2011). A study of english teachers and students' perception about the differences between annual and semester system of education at postgraduate level in Mardan. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15*, 1639-1643. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.345.

Koul, L., (2021). Methodology of Educational Research (pp.177) Vikas Publishing House.

Krohn, G. A., & O'Connor, C. M. (2005). Student effort and performance over the semester. *Journal of Economic Education, 36*(1), 3-28. http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JECE.36.1.3-28

Kumar, P. S. & Sudarshan, M. (2021). Perception of undergraduate students towards implementation of Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) in India. *Development of Education, 4*(2), 54-64. DOI 10.31483/r-98563

Kumar, S. (2020, May 29). *Semester vs annual system- which is better?* CollegeDekho. https://www.collegedekho.com/articles/semester-vs-annual-system-good-move-or-not/.

Lalrinsanga, B., Sailo, Z. & Lalhlimpuii (2021). Attitude of government Aizawl West College students towards semester system at college level. *Mizoram Educational Journal, 7*(3&4), 72-78.

Malik, T., Avais, P., & Khanam, T. (2010). Comparative analysis of MA English results under annual and semester system: Quality assurance in Pakistan. *Language in India, 10*(5), 68-82. http://www.languageinindia.com/may2010/tayyaba1.pdf

Mallik, P. S. (2013). A study on implementability of semester system of examination in under graduate course of Calcutta University. *Indian Journal of Applied Research, 3*(11), 122-124. DOI: 10.15373/2249555X/NOV2013/40

Matlakala, M., Mgutshini, T., Greeff, W. J. & Chetty, D. (2019). Use of the semester system in undergraduate programmes for open distance education. *Africa Journal of Nursing and Midwifery, 21*(2). https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC-1a7fe4716c

Mazumdar, M. (2010). *Introduction of semester system in Indian colleges.* Grin. https://www.grin.com/document/177187

Meher, D. (2018). Opinion of undergraduate and postgraduate students of Gangadhar Meher University (GMU) Sambalpur regarding semester system in relation to gender and stream. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews, 5*(3), 171z-174z. http://ijrar.com/upload_issue/ijrar_issue_1840.pdf.

Mehmood, T., Abdullah, Zaman, A. & Ali, S. (2014). Perceptions of students and teachers regarding semester system of examination in higher education in Pakistan. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences, 4*(8S), 122-126. https://www.textroad.com/pdf/JAEBS/J.%20Appl.%20Environ.%20Biol.%20Sci.,%204(8S)122-126,%202014.pdf.

Mondal, P. (2021). Relevance of the semester system of evaluation in Indian context. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research, 10*(7(8)), 100-102. http://ijmer.in.doi./2021/10.07.167.

Munnawar, S. & Awan, A. G. (2019). Problems of semester system in public sector universities of Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Humanities, 5*(4), 812-835. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5767-6229.

Munshi, P., Javed, M. & Hussain, I. (2012). Examination in semester system: what is observation of faculty and students. *The Sindh University Journal of Education – SUJE, 41.* https://sujo-old.usindh.edu.pk/index.php/SUJE/article/view/1945.

Naqvi, A. S., & Fatima, S. (2015). Hybrid Semester System in MBBS Program-Ziauddin Medical College Experience. *Pak J Med Dent*, *4*(1), 78-80. https://pjmd.zu.edu.pk/images/pdf/volume4/issue1/14%20-%20REP%20-%20Hybrid

%20semester%20system%20in%20MBBS%20Program_Ziauddin%20Medical%20College%20Experience%20.pdf

Neog, A. (2020). A study on the effectiveness of semester system at undergraduate degree level with special reference to the colleges of Sonitpur district under Gauhati University. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine, 7*(8), 1569-1575. https://ejmcm.com/article_4330_e6f8e3ae06b113cdeb45c4850760dd4b.pdf.

Pabla, M. (2014). A Paradigm shift from semester system to annual System. *Indian Journal of Research, 3*(4), 173-174. https://www.worldwidejournals.com/paripex/recent_issues_pdf/2014/April/April_2014_1397566957_01068_56.pdf.

Pandey, A. (2015). *Semester vs annual system.* EducateNepal. https://www.educatenepal.com/article_archive/print_it/435

Pandey, H. (2016). *Problems and prospects: An evaluation of semester system in faculty of humanities and social sciences (M. A. English) of Tribhuvan University.* Preprints. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358039851_Problems_and_Prospects_An_Evaluation_of_Semester_System_in_Faculty_of

Parikh, S. N. (1972). *University Students and Semester System - An Opinion Study* [Unpublished master's thesis]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

Patel, U. A. (1978). *A critical study of the present scheme of semester system and evaluation pProcedure at the B.Ed. and M.Ed. programme in the faculty of education and psychology* [Unpublished master's thesis]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

Patgiri, B. K. (2019). Relevance of semester system in higher education. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 4*(4), 792-795. https://ijisrt.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/IJISRT19AP672.pdf

Pathak, T., & Rahman, M.A. (2013). Perception of students and teachers towards semester system: A study in some selected degree colleges of Nagaon town of Nagaon District of Assam. *Journal of Education and Practice, 4*(1), 84-91. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234633876.pdf.

Paudel, P. (2019). University teachers' attitudes towards English language curriculum of M.Ed. semester system. *Journal of NELTA*, *24*(1-2), 107–125. https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v24i1-2.27683.

Paudel, R., & Campus, R. R. (2021). *Semester system at Tribhuvan University opportunities, challenges and brief experience.* Preprints. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354170814_Semester_System_at_Tribhuvan_University_Opportunities_Challenges_and_Brief_Experience

Pervaiz, M., Sarwar, M. & Shah, A. A. (2020). Causes of and solution to the challenges in fair assessment in semester system at public universities of the Punjab, Pakistan. *International Journal of Distance Education and E- Learning (IJDEEL), 5*(2), 108-122.

Plessis, E. D. & Pretorius, F. J. (2013). *Semesterisation: The downfall of a great system? A case study*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337648824_Semesterisation_The_downfall_of_a_great_system_A_case_study

Rahman, G. & Riaz-ud-din (2011). A comparative study of the quality of education in annual and semester system in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Language in India, 11*(7), 203-217. http://www.languageinindia.com/july2011/semestercomparisonfinal.pdf

Rajivlochan, M., & Rajivlochan, M. (2017). Choice-based credit system and semester system in higher education. In N. V. Varghese, A. Pachauri & S. Mandal (Eds.), *India higher education report 2017: Teaching , Learning and quality in higher education*. SAGE Publication India Pvt Ltd.

Rana, A. M. K. & Perveen, U. (2013). A study to investigate the views of Punjab University students regarding semester system in Pakistan. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities, 2*(2), 79-83. http://www.ajssh.leena-luna.co.jp/AJSSHPDFs/Vol.2(2)/AJSSH2013(2.2-09).pdf

Reddy, B. Y. (2019). A study of semester system of engineering students with locality and father occupation. *GJRA- Global Journal for Research Analysis, 8*(7), 61-62.

https://www.worldwidejournals.com/global-journal-for-research-analysis-GJRA/file view/July_2019_1562331955_8707628.pdf

Sardar, I., Maqsood, Z., Jawad, S., Akhtar, R. & Latif, H. (2020). Factors affecting students' satisfaction regarding semester system: Evidence from Pakistani Universities. *Quest Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 1*(2), 192-201. https://doi.org:10.3126/qjmss.v1i2.27438

Sarwat, S. (2006). Differences in the achievement goals of the students studying in annual and semester systems. *The Journal of Educational Research, 9*(4), 52-64. http://jer.iub.edu.pk/publications/6.pdf

Sharma, N. P. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of Researches on Implementing the Semester System: The Way Ahead? *Tribhuvan University Journal*, *30*(2), 105–114. https://doi.org/10.3126/tuj.v30i2.25557.

Sharma, N. P. (2021). Assessment focus: A case of English language education tests in Tribhuvan University semester system. *Nepalese Journal of Educational Assessment, 3*(1), 28-39. https://www.ero.gov.np/upload_file/files/post/1614877513_738807797_Journal_2077%20for%20web.pdf#page=35

Sharma, R. C. (1976). 'A study of traditional and semester examination. *Journal of Educational Research and Extension, 1,* 44-46.

Sherpa, D., & Baraily, K. (2022). Faculties' perception on semester system at TU affiliated colleges, Nepal. *AMC Journal*, *3*(1), 101–113. https://doi.org/10.3126/amcj.v3i1.45465

Shoukat, L. & Muhammad, W. (2015). Perception of teachers and students towards the functionality of semester system at university level in the context of Pakistani social and administrative set-ups. *International Journal of Teaching and Education, 3*(4), 68-80. https://ideas.repec.org/a/sek/jijote/v3y2015i4p68-80.html

Singh, K. V., & Kumar P. (2016). Challenges in Implementation of Semester system in Globalized World. *International Journal of Applied Research, 2*(3), 89-91. https://www.allresearchjournal.com/archives/2016/vol2issue3/PartB/2-2-97.pdf

Solanki, G. D. (2019). Different between semester system and annual system. *International Journal of Research in all Subjects in Multi Languages, 7*(12), 36-38.

http://www.raijmr.com/ijrsml/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/IJRSML_2019_vol07_issue_12_Eng_11.pdf.

Sridevi, K. V. (2012). A Study of Attitude of Teacher Trainees and Problems faced by Teacher Educators on Semester System of B. Ed Programme in Kerala. *Golden Research Thoughts, 1*(11), 1-5. http://aygrt.isrj.org.www.allresearchjournal.com/

Subedi, A. (2019). Perceptions of students and teachers towards the semester system of Tribhuvan University. *Interdisciplinary Research in Education, 4*(1), 19-34. https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/ire/article/download/25707/21469/77501.

Tong, P. S. (1977). *A Study of Pre-University Student and Semester System in Thailand* [Unpublished master's thesis]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

Trivedi, J. C. & Soni, B. K. (2014). A study of semester system pattern in schools: An empirical study. *Prestige International Journal of Management and Research, 6/7*(2/1), 5-16. https://search.proquest.com/openview/5d66c65167c977c4dea4c16d94ce2c94/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2032264

Yousaf, A. & Hashim, M. (2012). A case study of annual and semester systems of examination on Government College of management sciences, Peshawar, Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 2*(9), 53-73. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Muhammad-Hashim-15/publication/265751215_A_Case_study_of_Annual_and_Semester_Systems_of_Examination_on_Government_College_of_Management_Sciences_Peshawar_Pakistan/links/57435b6b08ae9f741b3a184e/A-Case-study-of-Annual-and-Semester-Systems-of-Examination-on-Government-College-of-Management-Sciences-Peshawar-Pakistan.pdf

CHAPTER – III

METHODOLOGY

Research is a logical and systematic search for new and useful information on a particular topic. It is an investigation of finding solutions to scientific and social problems through objective and systematic analysis. It is a search for knowledge, that is, a discovery of hidden truths. Here knowledge means information about matters. The information might be collected from different sources like experience, human beings, books, journals, nature, etc. A research can lead to new contributions to the existing knowledge. Only through research is it possible to make progress in a field. Research is done with the help of study, experiment, observation, analysis, comparison and reasoning. Research is in fact ubiquitous. More precisely, research seeks predictions of events and explanations, relationships and theories for them.

Research methods are a variety of techniques that people use when studying a given phenomenon. They are planned, scientific, and value-neutral. What that means is that good research methods don't "just happen." Instead, they are deliberately employed in a way that is designed to maximize the accuracy of the results. Research methods are concerned with use of any of the following: theoretical methods, numerical techniques, experimental techniques and other relevant data and tools necessary for the research study. It is not necessary that every theory, technique and information in the topic of research is useful for a particular problem. A researcher has to identify and select materials which are useful to his research study. The function of the research method is to provide for the collection of relevant information with minimal expenditure of effort, time and money.

The methodology and procedure adopted for the present study is discussed and presented as follows:

1. Method of study
2. Population and sample
3. Tools used for data collection

4. Collection and tabulation of data and
5. Statistical techniques for analysis

3.1.0 Method of Study;

Descriptive research studies are designed to obtain information of the current status of things, events and phenomenon under investigation and draw valid general conclusions. It also involves measurement, classification, analysis, comparison, and interpretation. In the present study descriptive survey method has been adopted as it is to find out the perception of teachers and students on semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram and to compare the differences in the perception of teachers and students on semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram with reference to gender, locale, stream of study/course, teachers' designation and teaching experience.

3.2.0 Population and Sample;

The population of the present study comprised of all the students and teachers in undergraduate colleges offering semester system under Mizoram University. By the records of annual report of Mizoram University 2021-2022, there were 27 colleges in undergraduate level adopting semester system. Of the 27 colleges, there were twenty-six colleges offering arts stream, six colleges offering science stream and nine colleges offering commerce stream. Altogether there were 1062 undergraduate teachers out of which 814 were arts teachers, 198 were science teachers and 50 were commerce teachers. Similarly, there were a total of 19023 students in undergraduate colleges under Mizoram University out of which 15988 were arts students, 1941 were science students and 1094 were commerce students

Sample is a small portion selected from the entire population. It refers to a smaller, manageable version of a larger group. It is a subset containing the characteristics of a larger population. Samples are used in statistical testing when population sizes are too large for the test to include all possible members or observations. A sample should represent the population as a whole and not reflect any bias toward a specific attribute. For the present study multistage random sampling technique is employed for collecting data. Colleges were randomly selected after which samples were randomly chosen from the selected colleges. The sample of

teachers and students were selected from 21 colleges out of 27 colleges. The name of the college and number of selected sample teachers and students from different streams is given in the following table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Number of selected teachers and students from different colleges

Sl. No.	Colleges	Streams	No. of teachers	No. of students
1	Pachhunga University College	Arts	2	17
		Science	26	80
		Commerce	1	27
2	Govt. Aizawl College	Arts	24	48
		Commerce	8	74
3	Govt. Hrangbana College	Arts	3	22
		Commerce	3	12
4	Govt. Zirtiri Residential Science College	Science	21	59
5	Govt. Aizawl North College	Arts	1	59
6	Govt. Johnson College	Arts	17	23
7	Govt. Aizawl West College	Arts	2	21
8	Govt. T. Romana College	Arts	20	52
9	Govt. J. Thankima College	Arts	1	27
10	Lunglei Government College	Arts	3	6
		Science	6	7
11	Govt. Hnahthial College	Arts	3	5
12	Govt. J. Buana College	Arts	7	10
		Commerce	4	27
13	Higher & Technical Institute of Mizoram	Arts	1	15
		Commerce	6	36
14	Govt. College Champhai	Arts	6	5
		Science	14	9
		Commerce	5	19
15	Govt. Khawzawl College	Arts	4	6
16	Govt. Kamalanagar College	Arts	-	49
17	Govt. Lawngtlai College -	Arts	2	7
18	Govt. Kolasib College	Arts	7	36
		Science	2	18
19	Govt. Serchhip College	Arts	5	10
		Science	7	10
20	Govt. Saiha College	Arts	3	17
21	Helen Lowery College	Arts	2	-
		Commerce	5	10
TOTAL			221	823

The distribution of selected sample of college teachers and students based on gender, locale, and stream of course are presented in table 3.2.

Table 3.2

Number of selected sample of teachers and students based on different variables

Variables	Male	Female	Urban	Rural	Arts	Science	Commerce
Teachers N=221	104	117	143	78	113	76	32
Students N=823	451	372	252	571	435	183	205

3.3.0 Tools used for data collection;

Two sets of perception scale on semester system were developed by the investigator:

(i) Teachers' perception scale on semester system.

(ii) Students' perception scale on semester system.

3.3.1. Teachers' Perception Scale on Semester System:

To study the perception of teachers on semester system, the investigator prepared a perception scale for college teachers. The perception scale for college teachers consist of 57 statements, and were categorized under five components as follows:

1. General observation component
2. Course of study component
3. Evaluation component
4. Method of teaching component
5. Choice Based Credit System component

Each statement in the perception scale has five response option such as - Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. For scoring purposes, the positive statements were given the scores 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 and the negative statements were given the scores 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Reliability of the scale:

The co-efficient of reliability was computed by using the split half method of correlation and it was found to be 0.90.

Validity of the scale:

Content validity was established by seeking the judgments of ten experts and professionals in the field of education with the nature of content covered by the statements on semester system.

Norms:

Teachers' perception score were converted into z-score. The following table 3.3 shows the z-score norms for teachers' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.

Table 3.3

Z score norms for teachers' perception on semester system

Mean: 198.80 Standard Deviation: 19.598 Number: 221

Raw score	Z-Score	Raw score	Z-Score	Raw score	Z-Score
243	2.26	210	0.57	183	-0.81
242	2.2	209	0.52	182	-0.86
238	2	208	0.47	181	-0.91
237	1.95	207	0.42	180	-0.96
236	1.9	206	0.37	179	-1.01
235	1.85	205	0.32	178	-1.06
234	1.8	204	0.27	176	-1.16
232	1.69	203	0.21	175	-1.21
229	1.54	202	0.16	174	-1.27
228	1.49	201	0.11	173	-1.32
227	1.44	200	0.06	172	-1.37
226	1.39	199	0.01	171	-1.42
225	1.34	198	-0.04	170	-1.47
224	1.29	197	-0.09	169	-1.52
223	1.23	196	-0.14	166	-1.67
222	1.18	195	-0.19	165	-1.72
220	1.08	194	-0.24	162	-1.88
219	1.03	193	-0.3	161	-1.93
218	0.98	192	-0.35	160	-1.98
217	0.93	190	-0.45	157	-2.13
216	0.88	189	-0.5	155	-2.24
215	0.83	188	-0.55	151	-2.44
214	0.78	187	-0.6	141	-2.95
213	0.72	186	-0.65	135	-3.26
212	0.67	185	-0.7	128	-3.61
211	0.62	184	-0.76		

Based on this z-score norms, teachers can be categorized into seven categories as shown in the following table 3.4.

Table – 3.4

Norms for interpretation on teachers' level of Perception on Semester System

Sl.No.	Range of z-Scores	Grade	Levels of Perception
1	+2.01 and above	A	Extremely Favourable Perception
2	+1.26 to +2.00	B	Favourable Perception
3	+0.51 to +1.25	C	Above Average Perception
4	-0.50 to +0.50	D	Moderate Perception
5	-1.25 to -0.51	E	Below Average Perception
6	-2.00 to -1.26	F	Unfavourable Perception
7	-2.01 and below	G	Extremely Unfavourable Perception

The sample for teacher's perception scale on semester system is attached in APPENDIX – I.

3.3.2. Students' Perception Scale on Semester System;

To study the perception of college students towards semester system, the investigator prepared another perception scale for the students. The perception scale consists of 27 statements categorized under five components as follows:

1. General observation component
2. Course of study component
3. Evaluation component
4. Method of teaching component
5. Choice Based Credit system

Each statement in the perception scale on semester system has five response options such as - Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. All the statements in students' perception scale were positive, therefore, for scoring purposes, they were given the scores 5, 4, 3, 2, 1.

Reliability of the scale:

For establishing the reliability of the scale, 'Test Retest Method' was applied. The co-efficient of reliability of the scale is 0.801.

Validity of the scale:

For the present scale, content validity was established by seeking the decisions of ten experts and professionals in the field of education with the nature of content covered by the statements on semester system.

Norms:

Students' perception score were converted into z-score. The following table 3.5 shows the z-score norms for students' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.

Table 3.5

Z score norms for students' perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram

Mean: 107.69 Standard Deviation: 10.486 Number: 823

Raw score	Z-Score	Raw score	Z-Score	Raw score	Z-Score
135	+2.60	113	+0.51	92	-1.50
134	+2.51	112	+0.41	91	-1.59
133	+2.41	111	+0.32	90	-1.69
132	+2.32	110	+0.22	89	-1.78
131	+2.22	109	+0.12	88	-1.88
130	+2.13	108	+0.03	87	-1.97
128	+1.94	107	-0.07	86	-2.07
127	+1.84	106	-0.16	85	-2.16
126	+1.75	105	-0.26	84	-2.26
125	+1.65	104	-0.35	83	-2.35
124	+1.56	103	-0.45	82	-2.45
123	+1.46	102	-0.54	81	-2.55
122	+1.36	101	-0.64	80	-2.64
121	+1.27	100	-0.73	79	-2.74
120	+1.17	99	-0.83	73	-3.31
119	+1.08	98	-0.92	69	-3.69
118	+0.98	97	-1.02	68	-3.79
117	+0.89	96	-1.11	66	-3.98
116	+0.79	95	-1.21	60	-4.55
115	+0.70	94	-1.31		
114	+0.60	93	-1.40		

Based on this z-score norms, teachers may be categorized into seven categories as shown in the following table 3.6.

Table – 3.6

Norms for interpretation on students' level of Perception on Semester System

Sl.No.	Range of z-scores	Grade	Levels of Perception
1	+2.01 and above	A	Extremely Favourable Perception
2	+1.26 to +2.00	B	Favourable Perception
3	+0.51 to +1.25	C	Above Average Perception
4	-0.50 to +0.50	D	Moderate Perception
5	-1.25 to -0.51	E	Below Average Perception
6	-2.00 to -1.26	F	Unfavourable Perception
7	-2.01 and below	G	Extremely Unfavourable Perception

The sample for Students' perception scale on semester system is attached in APPENDIX – II.

3.4.0. Collection and Tabulation of Data;

The perception scales were administered by the investigator through offline and online mode to the teachers and students of colleges under Mizoram University. Google form was used for online mode. The investigator visited few colleges and obtained the required data after acquiring permission from the college Principals.

The data collected from the teachers and students were scrutinized and scored according to the scoring procedures. Each respondent was assigned a serial number after categorizing them with respect to their gender, locale, stream of course, teachers' designation and teaching experience. The scores obtained by each respondent were then entered in the tabulation sheet and these were statistically treated and analyzed.

3.5.0. Statistical techniques for analysis:

Keeping in view the objectives of the study and nature of data, the investigator employed the following statistical techniques for analyzing the data.

Descriptive statistics such as the Mean, Standard deviation, percentages, z-score were employed to find out the nature of score distribution and for classifying the respondents into different categories.

Inferential statistics such as 't' test and correlations were employed to find out the difference between the mean scores of different groups as well as for establishing validity and reliability of the constructed perception scale.

CHAPTER – IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The present chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of data. As stated in chapter 1, the objective of the present study includes constructing and standardizing of perception scale for teachers and students on semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram; to find out the perception of teachers and students on semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram; to compare the differences in the perception of teachers and students on semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram with reference to gender, locale, stream of study/course, teachers' designation and teaching experience.

The data for the present study were collected from the sample by administering the two different sets of perception scale for the teachers and students to study their perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram which were developed by the researcher.

Thus, the responses obtained from the respondents were scored, classified, tabulated and analyzed. The analysis of the data was carried out with the help of appropriate statistical techniques, and the findings were also interpreted keeping in mind the objectives of the study in accordance with the objectives stated in chapter I as follows:

1. ***Objective No.1:*** To construct and standardize teachers' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
2. ***Objective No.2:*** To construct and standardize students' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
3. ***Objective No.3:*** To find out teachers' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
4. ***Objective No.4:*** To compare teachers' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with respect to gender, locale,

teachers' designation, stream of course and teaching experience.

5. ***Objective No.5:*** To compare teachers' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation, stream of course and teaching experience.

6. ***Objective No.6:*** To find out the students' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.

7. ***Objective No.7:*** To compare students' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with respect to gender**,** locale and stream of study.

8. ***Objective No.8:*** To compare students' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study.

4.1.0 Objective No.1: To construct and standardize teachers' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram

Since there was no perception scale to assess the semester system of undergraduate colleges for teachers, the investigator decided to construct and standardize teachers' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges. The procedure adopted for its construction and standardization were as follows:

4.1.1 Item selection:

The investigator initially made around 113 statements relating to teachers' perception of semester system and divided them into different components. These statements were then given out to 10 experts consisting of professionals in the field of education for editing as well as for content analysis. After the scale was sent out and the opinions of the experts were collected, some statements were deleted, and some statements were modified. After this, 69 statements were selected for the second draft of the perception scale.

4.1.2 Pretesting of the preliminary draft:

Before administering the perception scale to teachers for try out, the investigator tested the draft to three (3) college teachers and asked them to check

whether the language was ambiguous and difficult to understand, and to make sure whether there are any problems in responding to the items. Small changes in the instructions and in the language were made after considering the reactions and comments of these teachers. This was done in order to find out whether the scale is going to be acceptable for the population for whom it was intended.

4.1.3 Try out:

The 69 item perception scale was made ready for the final try out which was also the pilot study for the present investigation. This was administered to 60 college teachers randomly selected from different colleges in Aizawl city. The teachers were requested to give their responses as honestly as possible. After administering the scale to 60 college teachers, the perception scale was collected and item analysis was done by finding out the discrimination value of each item/statement.

4.1.4 Item discrimination:

After administration of the test to 60 college teachers, scoring was done using Likert method. The entire scores were arranged in ascending order, and the upper 27% and lower 27% were set aside for item analysis and discrimination.

The mean and standard deviation of perception score for each statement were then computed separately for the above mentioned top and bottom groups. The t-values for significance of differences between the mean perception scores of the top and bottom 27% group of respondents, that were indicative of their discrimination values, were calculated for all the 69 statements. After this was completed, those items having t value above 1.96 i.e. statements which was significant at 0.05 level of confidence were retained for the final scale. Consequent to item discrimination, 12 statements were yet again discarded since these statements do not discriminate between favourable and unfavourable perception and the final scale that was ultimately employed for data collection comprised of 57 statements. The Mean and Standard Deviation value of top and bottom group on each of the 69 statements and the discrimination value in the form of ‘t-value’ are given in table 4.1.

Table 4.1

Mean, SD and t-value of high and Low groups on different statements of teachers' perception Scale

Item No.	High Group		Low Group		t value	Significance
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	3.92	0.96	4.56	0.51	3.02	.01
2	2.74	0.90	3.37	0.93	2.53	.05
3	3.15	0.95	4.33	0.48	5.79	.01
4	3.56	0.80	4.48	0.51	5.07	.01
5	3.85	0.60	4.33	0.48	3.25	.01
6	2.78	1.12	4.04	0.52	5.30	.01
7	2.96	0.81	4.04	0.59	5.59	.01
8	2.70	0.87	4.00	0.39	7.07	.01
9	3.63	0.56	4.30	0.61	4.17	.05
10	3.48	0.98	4.37	0.69	3.87	.01
11	3.19	0.93	4.00	0.78	3.50	.01
12	19.3	0.73	2.56	1.19	2.35	.05
13	2.63	0.79	3.78	0.64	5.86	.01
14	2.96	0.81	4.07	0.55	5.91	.01
15	2.85	0.77	3.81	0.56	5.27	.01
16	3.48	0.75	3.85	0.53	2.09	.05
17	1.81	0.68	2.85	1.06	4.27	.05
18	3.15	0.91	4.04	0.44	4.59	.01
19	3.19	0.88	3.56	0.75	1.66	NS
20	2.52	0.85	3.56	0.64	5.07	.01
21	2.48	0.80	3.19	0.88	3.07	.01
22	2.78	0.93	3.37	0.69	2.66	.01
23	3.56	0.80	3.93	0.68	1.84	NS
24	2.63	0.97	3.15	0.82	2.13	.05
25	3.00	0.78	3.81	0.62	4.23	.05
26	2.78	0.85	4.00	0.48	6.52	.01
27	2.89	0.89	3.96	0.52	5.41	.01
28	3.22	0.80	3.96	0.59	3.88	.01
29	2.56	1.09	3.44	0.85	3.35	.01
30	2.22	0.70	2.26	0.90	0.17	NS
31	3.70	0.67	3.85	0.72	0.78	NS
32	3.00	0.78	3.56	0.58	2.96	.01
33	3.62	0.88	4.04	0.34	2.24	.05
34	2.30	0.87	2.96	0.94	2.71	.01
35	3.4	0.77	3.30	0.78	0.70	NS
36	3.81	0.74	4.48	0.51	3.87	.01
37	2.04	0.90	3.04	0.90	4.09	.01
38	3.74	0.76	4.04	0.71	1.48	NS
39	2.56	0.89	2.85	0.95	1.18	NS
40	2.81	0.92	3.00	0.73	0.82	NS
41	2.44	0.85	3.56	0.70	5.26	.01
42	3.41	0.75	4.15	0.82	3.47	.01
43	2.81	0.92	4.15	0.60	6.30	.01

44	3.44	1.01	3.89	0.70	1.88	NS
45	3.52	0.80	4.15	0.66	3.14	.01
46	3.67	0.68	4.30	0.78	3.17	.01
47	3.56	0.75	4.48	0.51	5.30	.01
48	2.48	0.75	3.44	0,70	4.87	.01
49	4.00	0.68	4.44	0.58	2.59	.01
50	3.78	0.58	4.37	0.49	4.06	,01
51	2.63	0.88	3.37	0.69	3.44	.01
52	3.22	0.89	4.11	0.42	4.68	.01
53	2.81	0.96	3.93	0.62	5.05	.01
54	3.48	0.75	4.30	0.47	4.78	.01
55	2.89	0.75	3.15	1.03	1.06	NS
56	2.85	0.86	3.81	0.48	5.05	.01
57	3.11	0.80	4.30	0.54	6.37	.01
58	3.93	0.55	4.30	0.54	2.49	.05
59	3.56	0.70	4.15	0.60	3.34	.01
60	1.96	0.65	2.85	1.03	3.80	.01
61	3.37	0.74	4.11	0.42	4.51	.01
62	3.19	0.79	3.74	0.66	2.82	.01
63	3.26	0.81	4.04	0.71	3.75	.01
64	3.89	0.51	3.67	0.88	1.13	NS
65	3.00	0.83	3.52	0.70	2.48	.05
66	3.44	0.85	3.85	0.66	1.97	NS
67	2.22	0.93	3.26	0.76	4.47	.05
68	2.37	0.88	3.37	0.79	4.38	.05
69	2.74	0.76	3.30	0.72	2.74	.01

4.1.5 Establishment of reliability:

The investigator applied ‘Split-Half Method’ for the establishment of reliability of the scale. The perception scale was given to 60 teachers belonging to different streams. After scoring, the whole scale was divided into two halves by dividing the items into odd and even numbers. The co-efficient of reliability was computed between the two halves of the score by using the “Product Moment Correlation”. The co-efficient of reliability of the whole scale came out to be .90 (after applying Spearman Brown’s formula) which can be considered adequate for an attitude scale. The Split Half scores for establishing reliability co-efficient of the scale have been given in table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Split Half Scores for Determining the Reliability of teachers' perception Scale

Sl.No	Score on first half	Score on second half	Sl.No	Score on first half	Score on second half
1	100	88	**31**	101	100
2	96	84	**32**	124	114
3	111	108	**33**	114	99
4	110	93	**34**	104	94
5	113	106	**35**	102	88
6	101	93	**36**	107	104
7	110	105	**37**	100	95
8	103	93	**38**	112	109
9	96	92	**39**	108	98
10	102	101	**40**	104	97
11	90	84	**41**	112	102
12	95	83	**42**	95	88
13	116	111	**43**	107	93
14	108	99	**44**	108	104
15	105	99	**45**	96	96
16	94	85	**46**	104	107
17	105	101	**47**	102	97
18	88	88	**48**	111	107
19	75	66	**49**	103	95
20	109	96	**50**	117	95
21	92	74	**51**	106	88
22	106	101	**52**	106	91
23	99	90	**53**	90	82
24	106	94	**54**	109	99
25	74	77	**55**	107	89
26	115	99	**56**	125	110
27	95	99	**57**	103	91
28	94	87	**58**	118	98
29	93	83	**59**	109	98
30	103	84	**60**	114	102

4.1.6 Establishment of validity:

In order to acquire correct and precise outcome, it is important that a scale should be adequately valid. For the present scale, content validity was established by seeking the judgments of experts and professionals in the field of education with the nature of content covered by the statements on semester system. The scale was given to 10 experts and all the experts approved on the validity of the content of items.

4.1.7 Scoring procedure and Serial Number of Positive and Negative Items:

Teachers were given the perception scale on semester system and they were required to give a response to every statement according to his or her own view, on the five point scale provided for each item such as, Strongly agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. For scoring purposes, the positive statements were given the scores 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 and the negative statements were given the scores 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. The highest possible score for the test is (57 X 5) 285, and the lowest possible score is (57 X 1) 57, since the total number of statements in the scale is 57. The item numbers for positive and negative statements are given in table 4.3.

Table 4.3

Item Numbers for Positive and Negative Statements on teachers' perception scale

Sl.No.	Types of statements	Item Numbers	Total
1	Positive	1,3,4,5,7,9,10,11,13,14,16,18,21,23,24,26,29,31,34, 35,36,37,38,40,41,43,45,47,48,49,51,52,53,57	34
2	Negative	2,6,8,12,15,17,19,20,22,25,27,28,30,32,33,39,42,44, 46,50,54,55,56	23

4.1.8 Norms and interpretation of teachers' perception scale:

In order to establish the norms for the present perception scale, the investigator administered the newly constructed perception scale to 221 college teachers of Mizoram. Thereafter, it was scored in accordance with the indicated procedure. The mean as well as the standard deviation of the perception scale were computed. Teachers' perception score was then converted into z-score and based on this z-score, teachers can be categorized into seven categories. The score range and interpretation of teachers' perception on semester system is presented in table 4.4.

Table 4.4

Score range and interpretation of teachers' perception scale

(Mean: 198.80) (Standard Deviation: 19.598) (Number: 221)

Score range	Interpretation
Above 242	Extremely favourable perception
224 - 238	Favourable perception
209 - 223	Above average perception
190 - 208	Moderate perception
175 - 189	Below average perception
160 - 174	Unfavourable perception
Below 157	Extremely unfavourable perception

4.2.0 Objective No. 2: To construct and standardize students perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram

Just as no perception scale to assess the semester system for teachers was available, there was also no perception scale to assess the perception of semester system for college students. The investigator again decided to construct and standardize students' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges. The procedure adopted for its construction and standardization were as follows:

4.2.1 Item selection:

At the outset, the investigator made around 102 statements relating to students' perception of semester system and also divided them into different components. These statements were also given out to the same 10 experts in the field of education for editing and for content analysis. After collecting the scale from the experts, some statements were deleted, and some statements were modified wherein only 67 statements were selected for the second draft of the perception scale.

4.2.2 Pretesting of the preliminary draft:

Before administering the perception scale to students for try out, the investigator tested the draft to ten (10) students and asked them to check whether the language was vague and difficult to understand, and also to make sure if there are any troubles in responding to the items. Small changes in the language were made after seeing the reactions and comments of these students. This was also done in order to note whether the scale is going to be acceptable for the population for whom it was intended.

4.2.3 Try out:

Thus the 67 item perception scale was made ready for the final try out. This was administered to 100 college students who were randomly selected from the different colleges in Aizawl city. The students were also requested to give their responses as honestly as possible. After administering the scale to 100 college students, the perception scale was collected and item analysis was done by finding out the discrimination value of each item/statement.

4.2.4 Item discrimination:

After administering the test to 100 students, scoring was done using Likert method. The entire scores were arranged in ascending order, and the upper 27% and lower 27% were set aside for item analysis and discrimination.

The mean and standard deviation of perception score for each statement were then computed separately for the above mentioned top and bottom groups. The t-values for significance of differences between the mean perception scores of the top and bottom 27% group of students, that were indicative of their discrimination values, were calculated for all the 67 statements. Then, those items having t value above 1.96 i.e. statements which was significant at 0.05 level of confidence were retained for the final scale. Consequent to item discrimination, 40 statements were once again discarded since these statements do not discriminate between favourable and unfavourable perception and the final scale that was finally retained for data collection comprised of 27 statements. Surprisingly, all significant statements happens to be positive statements. The Mean and Standard Deviation value of top and bottom group on each of the 67 statements and the discrimination value in the form of 't-value' are given in table 4.5.

Table 4.5

Mean, SD and t-value of high and Low groups on all the statements of students' perception Scale

Item No.	High Group		Low Group		t value	Significance
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	4.22	0.50	4.00	0.39	1.83	NS
2	4.04	0.57	3.70	0.50	0.14	NS
3	3.96	0.59	3.67	0.62	1.80	NS

4	2.93	1.04	2.48	0.94	1.66	NS
5	4.37	0.56	3.96	0.44	2.96	.01
6	4.22	0.64	3.81	0.48	2.64	.01
7	4.07	0.62	3.78	0.75	1.59	NS
8	2.37	0.88	2.26	0.71	0.51	NS
9	4.48	0.51	3.33	0.96	5.49	,01
10	4.37	0.54	3.89	0.58	3.10	.01
11	4.07	0.62	3.56	0.80	2.67	.01
12	2.41	0.93	2.30	0.99	0.42	NS
13	3.70	0.67	3.48	0.64	1.24	NS
14	3.67	0.88	3.78	0.85	0.47	NS
15	2.15	0.66	2.33	0.68	1.01	NS
16	4.04	0.65	3.74	0.53	1.84	NS
17	4.11	0.58	3.52	0.70	3.39	.01
18	4.04	0.59	3.52	0.85	2.61	.01
19	2.74	0.58	2.44	0.89	1.16	NS
20	4.00	0.68	3.78	0.51	1.36	NS
21	3.89	0.64	3.48	0.85	1.86	NS
22	2.37	0.93	2.30	0.54	0.36	NS
23	4.00	0.55	3.22	0.80	4.59	.01
24	4.04	0.65	3.63	0.69	2.24	.05
25	4.04	0.85	3.67	0.68	1.68	NS
26	2.67	0.96	2.48	0.85	0.79	NS
27	2.52	0.85	2.37	0.74	0.68	NS
28	4.10	0.51	3.48	0.80	3.71	.01
29	4.04	0.44	3.74	0.66	1.76	NS
30	2.07	0.73	2.15	0.53	0.43	NS
31	2.48	0.56	3.67	0.68	0.50	NS
32	4.19	0.56	3.67	0.68	3.07	.01
33	2.63	0.74	2.30	0.67	1.65	NS
34	4.33	0.55	3.93	0.47	2.90	.01
35	4.26	0.66	3.63	0.74	3.20	.01
36	3.11	3.83	2.41	0.64	0.94	NS
37	3.39	0.64	3.52	0.58	2.23	.05
38	3.93	0.68	3.37	0.93	2.52	.05
39	3.89	0.80	3.63	0.69	1.28	NS
40	2.19	0.83	2.26	0.66	0.36	NS
41	3.89	0.64	3.48	0.98	1.81	NS
42	2.26	0.71	2.52	0.75	1.30	NS
43	2.04	0.59	2.30	0.67	1.51	NS
44	4.46	0.51	3.74	0.81	4.24	.05
45	4.22	0.42	3.63	0.74	3.47	.01
46	4.22	0.58	3.81	0.62	2.41	.05
47	2.37	0.74	2.37	0.79	0.00	NS
48	4.27	0.53	3.70	0.47	4.15	.05
49	4.00	0.48	3.70	0.61	1.76	NS
50	2.33	0.83	2.44	0.58	1.50	NS
51	4.22	0.64	3.52	0.70	4.12	.05
52	2.33	0.88	2.22	0.58	0.55	NS

53	4.30	0.72	3.74	0.59	3.29	.01
54	4.07	0.38	3.70	0.47	3.19	.05
55	2.22	0.85	2.44	0.70	1.10	NS
56	3.96	0.52	3.63	0.56	2.36	.05
57	2.41	0.80	2.56	0.80	0.75	NS
58	3.81	0.74	3.63	0.63	1.12	NS
59	4.00	0.62	3.44	0.64	3.24	.05
60	4.00	0.63	3.59	0.84	2.02	.05
61	4.04	0.65	3.63	0.74	2.05	.05
62	2.48	0.94	2.26	0.53	1.10	NS
63	4.00	0.55	3.67	0.73	1.94	NS
64	3.85	0.77	3.85	0.60	0.00	NS
65	3.96	0.71	3.85	0.66	0.55	NS
66	4.19	0.48	2.33	0.51	2.14	.05
67	2.44	0.89	2.33	0.68	0.52	NS

4.2.5 Establishment of reliability:

The investigator applied 'Test retest method' for the establishing the reliability of the scale. For this, the developed scale was administered to 90 students and after one week, the same scale was administered to the same students. The scores obtained by the students on the two tests were used to compute the co-efficient of reliability by using the product moment correlation. The co-efficient of reliability of the scale came out to be .801 which can be considered adequate for the perception scale. The Test - Retest scores of all 90 students which were used for establishing reliability co-efficient of the scale have been given in the following table 4.6.

Table 4.6

Test Retest Scores for Determining the Reliability of Students' Perception Scale

Sl.No	Score on 1st test	Score on 2nd test	Sl.No	Score on 1st test	Score on 2nd test
1	113	108	46	111	106
2	105	102	47	116	112
3	97	96	48	107	107
4	98	100	49	114	114
5	111	109	50	99	97
6	111	106	51	118	120
7	107	105	52	106	105
8	110	115	53	107	103
9	104	114	54	105	103
10	94	97	55	105	106
11	108	108	56	96	97
12	120	124	57	96	105
13	102	104	58	116	114

14	92	102	59	115	109
15	116	114	60	100	106
16	98	100	61	106	102
17	107	105	62	109	103
18	101	103	63	95	99
19	115	105	64	104	99
20	109	110	65	100	99
21	103	106	66	107	113
22	109	109	67	108	108
23	112	111	68	109	101
24	102	112	69	107	114
25	105	107	70	111	111
26	116	106	71	117	114
27	97	90	72	120	121
28	105	97	73	102	106
29	99	92	74	110	118
30	99	99	75	109	105
31	119	115	76	98	104
32	96	98	77	115	116
33	100	97	78	96	91
34	106	106	79	116	110
35	118	123	80	119	120
36	106	100	81	105	100
37	112	113	82	113	116
38	99	96	83	113	112
39	106	100	84	105	103
40	117	117	85	103	108
41	102	108	86	101	98
42	106	103	87	99	97
43	120	114	88	104	98
44	104	104	89	112	108
45	105	105	90	108	106

4.2.6 Establishment of validity:

For the present scale, content validity was established by seeking the decisions of experts and professionals in the field of education with the nature of content covered by the statements on semester system. The scale was given to 10 experts and all the experts approved on the validity of the content of items.

4.2.7 Scoring procedure and Serial Number of Positive and Negative Items:

Students were given the perception scale on semester system and they were required to give a response to every statement according to his or her own view, on the five point scale provided for each item such as, Strongly agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. Since all the statements in students'

perception scale were positive, each statements were counted by assigning the score 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. The highest possible score for the test is (27 X 5) 135, and the lowest possible score is (27 X 1) 27, since the total number of statements in the scale is 27. The item numbers for positive statements are given in table 4.7.

Table 4.7

Item numbers for positive and negative statements on students' perception scale

Sl.No.	Types of statements	Item Numbers	Total
1	Positive	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19, 20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27	27
2	Negative	-	0

4.2.8 Norms and interpretation of students' perception scale:

In order to establish the norms for students' perception scale, the investigator administered the newly constructed perception scale to 823 college students of Mizoram. Thereafter, it was scored in accordance with the stated procedure. The mean and standard deviation of the score were computed. The score was then converted into z-score, and based on this z-score, the students can be classified into seven categories. The score range and interpretation of students' perception on semester system is presented in table 4.8.

Table 4.8

Score range and interpretation of students' perception scale

(Mean: 107.69) (Standard Deviation: 10.49) (Number: 823)

Score range	Interpretation
Above 130	Extremely favourable perception
121 - 129	Favourable perception
113 - 120	Above average perception
103 - 112	Moderate perception
95 - 102	Below average perception
87 - 94	Unfavourable perception
Below 86	Extremely unfavourable perception

4.3.0 Objective No. 3: To find out teachers' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram

In order to find out teachers' perception on semester system, teachers'

perception scale developed by the investigator was administered to college teachers selected for the present sample. After scoring, teachers' perception on semester system was categorized into seven groups based on z-score and they are presented in table 4.9.

Table 4.9

Teachers' perception level on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram

Level of perception	Number and percentage
Extremely favourable perception	2 (.90%)
Favourable perception	16 (7.24%)
Above average perception	56 (25.34%)
Moderate perception	85 (38.46%)
Below average perception	37 (16.74%)
Unfavourable perception	18 (8.15%)
Extremely unfavourable perception	7 (3.17%)
TOTAL	**221**

The above table 4.9 shows that .90% teachers had extremely favourable perception on semester system, 7.24% of teachers had favourable perception, 25.34% of teachers had above average perception, 38.46% of teachers had Moderate perception, 16.74% of teachers had below average perception, 8.15% of teachers had unfavourable perception, and 3.17% of teachers had extremely unfavourable perception. This means that the largest percentage of teachers had moderate perception on semester system. Teachers who had extremely favourable perception on semester system are the least.

4.4.0 Objective No.4: To compare teachers' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with respect to gender, locale, teachers' designation, stream of course and teaching experience

The differences in teachers' perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram were compared with reference to different independent variables like gender, locale, teachers' designation, stream of course and teaching experience. For this, the mean and standard deviation of the scores of these different

variables were calculated. The mean differences were then tested by applying 't' test and the details are presented in the following tables.

4.4.1 Teachers' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender:

Hypothesis No.1 states that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' overall perception of semester system.

The differences in the teachers' overall perception about semester system in undergraduate colleges were compared with reference to gender. Table 4.10 shows the comparison of male teachers and female teachers' overall perception on the semester system.

Table 4.10

Comparison of male and female teachers' overall perception of Semester System

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	104	196.99	19.589	3.420	2.637	1.297	NS
Female	117	200.41	19.553				

NS=Not significant

Analysis of the result vide table 4.10 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference in the overall perception of semester system between the male and female teachers is 1.297, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers in their overall perception on semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.1) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' overall perception of semester system is accepted.

4.4.2 Teachers' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to locale:

Hypothesis No.2 states that there is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' overall perception of semester system.

The differences in the teachers' overall perception about semester system in undergraduate colleges were compared with reference to locale. Table 4.11 shows

the comparison of urban teachers and rural teachers' overall perception of semester system.

Table 4.11

Comparison of urban and rural teachers' overall perception of Semester System

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	143	197.45	20.234	3.834	2.673	1.436	NS
Rural	78	201.28	18.239				

NS=Not significant

An examination of the result vide table 4.11 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference in the overall perception on semester system between the urban and rural teachers is 1.436, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at .05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between urban and rural teachers in their overall perception on semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.2) which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' overall perception of semester system is accepted.

4.4.3 Teachers' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to teachers' designation:

Hypothesis No.3 states that there is no significant difference between Associate professors and assistant professors' overall perception of semester system.

The differences in the teachers' overall perception about semester system in undergraduate colleges were compared with reference to teachers' designation. Table 4.12 shows the comparison of assistant professor and associate professor' overall perception of semester system.

Table 4.12

Comparison of assistant professor and associate professors' overall perception of Semester System

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Associate	131	200.36	19.219	3.825	2.697	1.418	NS
Assistant	90	196.53	20.027				

NS=Not significant

Analysis of the result vide table 4.12 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference in the overall perception on semester system between assistant professor and associate professors is 1.418, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the overall perception of assistant and associate professors on semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.3) which assumes there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' overall perception of semester system is accepted.

4.4.4 Teachers' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to stream of course:

Three streams of course namely Science, Commerce and Arts are most commonly offered in colleges in Mizoram. Therefore, colleges in Mizoram have science teachers, commerce teachers and arts teachers. In order to compare these three stream of teachers the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.4 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' overall perception of semester system.

Hypothesis No.5 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' overall perception of semester system.

Hypothesis No.6 states that there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' overall perception of semester system.

The differences in the teachers' overall perception about semester system in undergraduate colleges were compared with reference to teachers taking the three streams of courses. Table 4.13 shows the comparison of science teachers & commerce teachers, science teachers & arts teachers and commerce teachers & arts teachers' overall perception of semester system.

Table 4.13

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts teachers' overall perception of Semester System

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science teachers	76	198.86	21.117	7.699	3.829	2.011	*
Commerce teachers	32	191.16	16.776				
Science teachers	76	198.86	21.117	2.074	3.004	0.690	NS
Arts teachers	113	200.93	18.885				
Commerce teachers	32	191.16	16.776	9.773	3.457	2.827	**
Arts teachers	113	200.93	18.885				

NS=Not significant *=Significant at .05 level **=Significant at .01 level

Analysis of the result vide table 4.13 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science teachers and commerce teachers is significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 2.011 is greater than the criterion 't' value, therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers with respect to their overall perception of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No. 4) that assumes that there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' overall perception of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .05 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of science teachers, as their mean score is higher than the commerce teachers. The result indicates that science teachers have a more favourable overall perception of semester system than the commerce teachers.

Further examination of the result vide table 4.13 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference in the overall perception on semester system between science teachers and arts teachers is 0.690, whereas the required 't' value with df = 187 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the overall perception of science teachers and arts teachers on semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.5) which assumes there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' overall perception of semester system is accepted.

Continuing with the analysis of the result vide table 4.13 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers is significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 2.827 is greater than the criterion 't' value, therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers with respect to their overall perception of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No. 6) that states that there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' overall perception of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts teachers, as their mean score is higher than the commerce teachers. The result indicates that arts teachers have a more favourable overall perception of semester system than the commerce teachers.

4.4.5 Teachers' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to their teaching experience:

Teachers experiences in teaching were divided into three categories – i) Below 10 years who were considered as having short teaching experience, ii) Between 10 to 20 years who were considered as having middle teaching experience and iii) Above 20 years who were considered as having long teaching experience. In order to compare these three groups of teachers, the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.7 states that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' overall perception of semester system.

Hypothesis No.8 states that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' overall perception of semester system.

Hypothesis No.9 states that there is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' overall perception of semester system.

The differences in the teachers' overall perception about semester system in

undergraduate colleges were compared with reference to the three teaching experience. Table 4.14 shows the comparison in teachers' overall perception of semester system based on short experienced teachers & middle experienced teachers, short experienced teachers & long experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers & long experienced teachers.

Table 4.14

Comparison in teachers' overall perception of semester system based on short & middle, short & long and middle & long teaching experience

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Short experience	83	201.16	17.611	0.868	3.344	0.260	NS
Middle experience	59	200.29	20.960				
Short experience	83	201.16	17.611	5.941	2.988	1.989	*
Long experience	79	195.22	20.248				
Middle experience	59	200.29	20.960	5.073	3.555	1.427	NS
Long experience	79	195.22	20.248				

NS= Not significant *= Significant at .05 level

Scrutiny of the result vide table 4.14 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference in the overall perception of semester system between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers is 0.260 whereas the required 't' value with df = 140 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the overall perception of short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers on semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.7) which states that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' overall perception of semester system is accepted.

Further analysis of the result vide table 4.14 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers is significant since the calculated 't' value of 1.989 is greater than the criterion 't' value. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers with respect to their overall perception of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No. 8) that assumes that there is no significant difference between short experienced

teachers and long experienced teachers' overall perception of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .05 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of short experienced teachers, as their mean score is higher than the long experienced teachers. The result indicates that short experienced teachers have a more favourable overall perception of semester system than the long experienced teachers.

Continuing with the analysis of the result vide table 4.14 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference in the overall perception of semester system between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers is 1.427, whereas the required 't' value with df = 136 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the overall perception of middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers on semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.9) which assumes there is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' overall perception of semester system is accepted.

4.5.0 Objective No.5: To compare teachers' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation. Stream of course and teaching experience

Teachers' perception scale on semester system was divided into five components namely (A) General observation, (B) Perception on course of study (C) Perception on evaluation, (D) Perception on method of teaching and (E) Perception on choice based credit system (CBCS).

The differences in teachers' perception of semester system in these five components were compared with reference to different independent variables like (i) Gender, (ii) Locale, (iii) Teachers' designation, (iv) Stream of course and (v) Teaching experience. For this, the mean and standard deviation of the scores of these five variables were calculated with reference to the different independent variables. The mean differences were then tested by applying 't' test and the details are presented in the following tables.

4.5.1 Teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system:

Teachers' perception on general observation components of semester system were compared with reference to different independent variables as follows:

(i) With reference to gender:

Hypothesis No.10 states that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system was compared with reference to gender. Table 4.15 shows the comparison of male teachers and female teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system.

Table 4.15

Comparison of male and female teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	104	59.95	7.764	1.040	1.008	1.031	NS
Female	117	60.99	7.150				

NS= Not significant

Analysis of the result vide table 4.15 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system is 1.031, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.10) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system is accepted.

(ii) With reference to locale:

Hypothesis No.11 states that there is no significant difference between urban

teachers and rural teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system was compared with reference to locale. Table 4.16 shows the comparison of urban teachers and rural teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system.

Table 4.16

Comparison of urban and rural teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	143	59.93	7.565	1.621	1.028	1.578	NS
Rural	78	61.55	7.153				

NS= Not significant

Study of the result vide table 4.16 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system is 1.578, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between urban and rural teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.11) which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system is accepted.

(iii) With reference to teachers' designation:

Hypothesis No.12 states that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system was compared with reference to teachers' designation. Table 4.17 shows the comparison of associate professors and assistant professors' perception on general observation component of semester system.

Table 4.17

Comparison of associate professors and assistant professors' perception on general observation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Associate	90	59.60	7.504	1.522	1.020	1.492	NS
Assistant	131	61.12	7.371				

NS= Not significant

Scrutiny of the result vide table 4.17 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception on general observation component of semester system is 1.492, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.12) which assumes that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the general observation component of semester system is accepted.

(iv) With reference to stream of course:

There were three streams of courses and therefore the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.13 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 14 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 15 states that there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system was compared with reference to stream of course. Table 4.18

shows the comparison of science & commerce teachers, science & arts teachers and commerce & arts teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system.

Table 4.18

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science teachers	76	59.99	7.979	1.487	1.491	0.997	NS
Commerce teachers	32	58.50	6.658				
Science teachers	76	59.99	7.979	1.429	1.139	1.255	NS
Arts teachers	113	61.42	7.201				
Commerce teachers	32	58.50	6.658	2.916	1.358	2.147	*
Arts teachers	113	61.42	7.201				

NS= Not significant *= Significant at .05 level

Enquiry of the result vide table 4.18 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system is 0.997 whereas the required 't' value with df = 106 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the science teachers and commerce teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.13) which assumes there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system is accepted.

Further investigation of the result of table 4.18 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system is 1.225 whereas the required 't' value with df = 187 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the science teachers and arts teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.14) which assumes there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system is accepted.

Continuing with the analysis of the result vide table 4.18 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers is significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 2.147 is greater than the criterion 't' value at .05 level, therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.15) which assumes there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .05 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts teachers, as their mean score is higher than the commerce teachers. The result indicates that arts teachers have a more favourable perception on the general observation component of semester system than the commerce teachers.

(v) With reference to teaching experience:

Teachers were categorized into three groups based on their teaching experience. i) Short teaching experience, ii) Middle teaching experience and iii) Long teaching experience. In order to compare these three groups of teachers, the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.16 states that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 17 state that there is no significant difference between short experienced and long experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 18 states that there is no significant difference between middle experienced and long experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system was compared with reference to teaching experience. Table 4.19

shows the comparison in teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system based on the three types of teaching experience.

Table 4.19

Comparison of teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system based on short & middle, short & long and middle & long teaching experience

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Short experience	83	61.86	6.707	1.025	1.252	0.818	NS
Middle experience	59	60.83	7.782				
Short experience	83	61.86	6.707	3.020	1.137	2.657	**
Long experience	79	58.84	7.697				
Middle experience	59	60.83	7.782	1.995	1.333	1.497	NS
Long experience	79	58.84	7.697				

NS= Not significant **= Significant at .01 level

Analysis of the result vide table 4.19 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system is 0.818 whereas the required 't' value with df = 140 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.16) which assumes there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system is accepted.

Further analysis of the result vide table 4.19 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers was significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 2.657 is greater than the criterion 't' value at .01 level, therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.17) which assumes that there is no significant difference between short experienced and long experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system is rejected since the two groups differed

significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of short experienced teachers, as their mean score is higher than the long experienced teachers. The result indicates that short experienced teachers have a more favourable perception on the general observation component of semester system than the long experienced teachers.

Continuing with the analysis of the result of table 4.19 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system is 1.497 whereas the required 't' value with df = 136 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.18) which states that there is no significant difference between middle experienced and long experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system is accepted.

4.5.2 Teachers' perception on course of study component of semester system:

Teachers' perception on course of study components of semester system were compared with reference to different independent variables as follows:

(i) With reference to gender:

Hypothesis No.19 states that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system was compared with reference to gender. Table 4.20 shows the comparison of male teachers and female teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Table 4.20

Comparison of male and female teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	104	32.89	4.133	0.875	0.591	1.480	NS
Female	117	33.77	4.656				

NS= Not significant

Analysis of the result vide table 4.20 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is 1.480, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.19) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is accepted.

(ii) With reference to locale:

Hypothesis No.20 states that there is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system was compared with reference to locale. Table 4.21 shows the comparison of urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Table 4.21

Comparison of urban and rural teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	143	33.06	4.426	0.854	0.622	1.374	NS
Rural	78	33.91	4.411				

NS=Not significant

Study of the result vide table 4.21 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is 1.374, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between urban and rural teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.20) which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is accepted.

(iii) With reference to teachers' designation:

Hypothesis No.21 states that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system was compared with reference to teachers' designation. Table 4.22 shows the comparison of associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Table 4.22

Comparison of associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the course of study component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Associate	90	33.32	4.266	0.059	0.600	0.099	NS
Assistant	131	33.38	4.555				

NS= Not significant

Scrutiny of the result vide table 4.22 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the course of study component of semester system is 0.099, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.21) which assumes that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the course of study component of semester system is accepted.

(iv) With reference to stream of course:

There were three streams of courses and therefore the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.22 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 23 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 24 states that there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system was compared with reference to stream of course. Table 4.23 shows the comparison of science & commerce teachers, science & arts teachers and commerce & arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Table 4.23

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science teachers	76	33.89	4.729	2.051	0.861	2.381	*
Commerce teachers	32	31.84	3.785				
Science teachers	76	33.89	4.729	0.470	0.678	0.693	NS
Arts teachers	113	33.42	4.330				
Commerce teachers	32	31.84	3.785	1.581	0.783	2.018	*
Arts teachers	113	33.42	4.330				

NS= Not significant *= Significant at .05 level

Examination of the result vide table 4.23 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science teachers and commerce teachers is significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 2.381 is greater than the criterion 't' value at .05 level, therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.22) which assumes there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .05 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of science teachers, as their mean score is higher than the commerce teachers. The result indicates that science teachers have a more favourable perception in the course of study component of semester system than the commerce teachers.

Further examination of the result vide table 4.23 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is 0.693 whereas the required 't' value with df = 187 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.23) which assumes there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is accepted.

Continuing with the examination of the result of table 4.23 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is 2.018 and the required 't' value with df = 143 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is higher than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.24) which assumes there is no significant

difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is rejected since the two groups differed significantly at .05 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts teachers, as their mean score is higher than the commerce teachers. The result indicates that arts teachers have a more favourable perception in the course of study component of semester system than the commerce teachers.

(v) With reference to teaching experience:

Teachers were categorized into three groups based on their teaching experience. i) Short teaching experience, ii) Middle teaching experience and iii) Long teaching experience. In order to compare these three groups of teachers, the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.25 states that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 26 state that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 27 states that there is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system was compared with reference to teaching experience. Table 4.24 shows the comparison in teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system based on the three types of teaching experience.

Table 4.24

Comparison of teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system based on short & middle, short & long and middle & long teaching experience

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Short experience	83	33.63	4.330	0.016	0.782	0.021	NS
Middle experience	59	33.61	4.771				
Short experience	83	33.63	4.330	0.740	0.677	1.094	NS
Long experience	79	32.89	4.285				
Middle experience	59	33.61	4.771	0.724	0.786	0.921	NS
Long experience	79	32.89	4.285				

NS= Not significant

Analysis of the result vide table 4.24 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in course of study component of semester system is 0.021 whereas the required 't' value with df = 140 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.25) which assumes there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is accepted.

Further analysis of the result vide table 4.24 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in course of study component of semester system is 1.094 whereas the required 't' value with df = 160 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.26) which assumes there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is accepted.

Continuing with the examination of the result of table 4.24 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is 0.921 whereas the required 't' value with df = 136 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.27) which states that there is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system is accepted.

4.5.3 Teachers' perception on evaluation component of semester system:

Teachers' perception on evaluation components of semester system were compared with reference to different independent variables as follows:

(i) With reference to gender:

Hypothesis No.28 states that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system was compared with reference to gender. Table 4.25 shows the comparison of male teachers and female teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Table 4.25

Comparison of male and female teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	104	27.69	3.489	0.154	0.478	0.322	NS
Female	117	27.54	3.604				

NS= Not significant

Study of the result vide table 4.25 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is 0.322, whereas the required 't' value

with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.28) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is accepted.

(ii) With reference to locale:

Hypothesis No.29 states that there is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in evaluation component of semester system was compared with reference to locale. Table 4.26 shows the comparison of urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Table 4.26

Comparison of urban and rural teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	143	27.29	3.728	0.899	0.471	1.908	NS
Rural	78	28.19	3.117				

NS=Not significant

Further study of the result vide table 4.26 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is 1.908, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between urban and rural teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.29) which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is accepted.

(iii) With reference to teachers' designation:

Hypothesis No.30 states that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system was compared with reference to teachers' designation. Table 4.27 shows the comparison of associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Table 4.27

Comparison of associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the evaluation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Associate	90	27.50	3.614	0.187	0.489	0.383	NS
Assistant	131	27.69	3.506				

NS= Not significant

Exploration of the result vide table 4.27 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is 0.383, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.30) which assumes that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is accepted.

(iv) With reference to stream of course:

For the three streams of courses the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No. 31 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 32 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 33 states that there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system was compared with reference to stream of course. Table 4.28 shows the comparison of science & commerce teachers, science & arts teachers and commerce & arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Table 4.28

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science teachers	76	27.71	3.513	1.648	0.757	2.176	*
Commerce teachers	32	26.06	3.627				
Science teachers	76	27.71	3.513	0.272	0.518	0.525	NS
Arts teachers	113	27.98	3.454				
Commerce teachers	32	26.06	3.627	1.920	0.719	2.671	**
Arts teachers	113	27.98	3.454				

NS= Not significant *= Significant at .05 level **=Significant at .01 level

Investigation of the result vide table 4.28 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science teachers and commerce teachers is significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 2.176 is higher than the criterion 't' value at .05 level, therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.31) which assumes there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .05 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that the difference is in favour of science teachers, as their mean score is higher than the commerce teachers. The result indicates that science

teachers have a more favourable perception in the evaluation component of semester system than the commerce teachers.

Further investigation of the result vide table 4.28 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is 0.525 whereas the required 't' value with df = 187 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.32) which assumes there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is accepted.

Continuing with the investigation of the result of table 4.28 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers is significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 2.671 is greater than the criterion 't' value at .01 level. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Consequently, the null hypothesis (No.33) which assumes there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts teachers, as their mean score is higher than the commerce teachers. The result indicates that arts teachers have a more favourable perception in the evaluation component of semester system than the commerce teachers.

(v) With reference to teaching experience:

Teachers were categorized into three groups based on their teaching experience. In order to compare these three groups of teachers, the investigator formulated three different hypotheses:

Hypothesis No.34 states that there is no significant difference between short

experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 35 state that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 36 states that there is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

The difference in teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system was compared with reference to the three teaching experience. Table 4.29 shows the comparison of teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system based on the three types of teaching experience.

Table 4.29

Comparison of teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system based on short & middle, short & long and middle & long teaching experience

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Short experience	83	27.58	3.411	0.388	0.608	0.638	NS
Middle experience	59	27.97	3.676				
Short experience	83	27.58	3.411	0.199	0.552	0.360	NS
Long experience	79	27.38	3.603				
Middle experience	59	27.97	3.676	0.586	0.627	0.935	NS
Long experience	79	27.38	3.603				

NS= Not significant

Study of the result vide table 4.29 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is 0.638 whereas the required 't' value with df = 140 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.34) which assumes there that there is no significant difference between short experienced

teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is accepted.

Further study of the result vide table 4.29 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in evaluation component of semester system is 0.360 whereas the required 't' value with df = 160 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.35) which assumes there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is accepted.

Continuing with the study of the result of table 4.29 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is 0.935 whereas the required 't' value with df = 136 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.36) which states that there is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is accepted.

4.5.4 Teachers' perception on method of teaching component of semester system:

Teachers' perception on method of teaching components of semester system was compared with reference to different independent variables as follows:

(i) With reference to gender:

Hypothesis No.37 states that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system was compared with reference to gender. Table 4.30 shows the comparison of male teachers and female teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Table 4.30

Comparison of male and female teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	104	47.14	5.376	0.881	0.688	1.282	NS
Female	117	48.03	4.775				

NS= Not significant

Study of the result vide table 4.30 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is 1.282 whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.37) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is accepted.

(ii) With reference to locale:

Hypothesis No. 38 states that there is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system was compared with reference to locale. Table 4.31 shows the comparison of urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Table 4.31

Comparison of urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	143	47.64	5.168	0.092	0.706	0.130	NS
Rural	78	47.55	4.930				

NS= Not significant

Study of the result vide table 4.31 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is 0.130, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between urban and rural teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.38) which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is accepted.

(iii) With reference to teachers' designation:

Hypothesis No.39 states that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system was compared with reference to teachers' designation. Table 4.32 shows the comparison of associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Table 4.32

Comparison of associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Associate	90	47.47	4.881	0.243	0.687	0.354	NS
Assistant	131	47.71	5.219				

NS=Not significant

Exploration of the result vide table 4.32 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is 0.354, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis No.39 which assumes that there is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is accepted.

(iv) With reference to stream of course:

For the three streams of courses the investigator formulated three different hypotheses:

Hypothesis No. 40 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 41 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 42 states that there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system was compared with reference to stream of course. Table 4.33 shows the comparison of science & commerce teachers, science & arts teachers and commerce & arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Table 4.33

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science teachers	76	47.34	5.515	1.530	1.071	1.428	NS
Commerce teachers	32	45.81	4.889				
Science teachers	76	47.34	5.515	0.959	0.772	1.242	NS
Arts teachers	113	48.30	4.705				
Commerce teachers	32	45.81	4.889	2.488	0.971	2.563	0.05
Arts teachers	113	48.30	4.705				

NS= Not significant *= Significant at .05 level

Investigation of the result vide table 4.33 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science teachers and commerce teachers is not significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 1.428 is less than the criterion 't' value at .05 level, therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.40) which assumes that there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is accepted.

Further investigation of the result vide table 4.33 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is 1.242 whereas the required 't' value with df = 187 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.41) which assumes that there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is accepted.

Continuing with the investigation of the result of table 4.33 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers is significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 2.563 is higher than the

criterion ‘t’ value at .05 level. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Consequently, the null hypothesis (No.42) which assumes that there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .05 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts teachers, as their mean score is higher than the commerce teachers. The result indicates that arts teachers have a more favourable perception in the method of teaching component of semester system than the commerce teachers.

(v) With reference to teaching experience:

Teachers were categorized into three groups based on their teaching experience. In order to compare these three groups of teachers, the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.43 states that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 44 state that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 45 states that there is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

The difference in teachers’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system was compared with reference to the three teaching experience. Table 4.34 shows the comparison of teachers’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system based on the three types of teaching experience.

Table 4.34

Comparison of teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system based on short & middle, short & long and middle & long teaching experience

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Short experience	83	47.57	5.175	0.468	0.878	0.533	NS
Middle experience	59	48.03	5.143				
Short experience	83	47.57	5.175	0.224	0.796	0.282	NS
Long experience	79	47.34	4.959				
Middle experience	59	48.03	5.143	0.692	0.871	0.794	NS
Long experience	79	47.34	4.959				

NS= Not significant

Study of the result vide table 4.34 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is 0.533 whereas the required 't' value with df = 140 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.43) which assumes that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is accepted.

Further study of the result vide table 4.34 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is 0.282 whereas the required 't' value with df = 160 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.44) which assumes that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is accepted.

Continuing with the study of the result of table 434 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is 0.794 whereas the required 't' value with df = 136 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No. 45) which states that there is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is accepted.

4.5.5 Teachers' perception on choice based credit system component of semester system:

Teachers' perception on choice based credit system components of semester system were compared with reference to different independent variables as follows:

(i) With reference to gender:

Hypothesis (No. 46) states that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system was compared with reference to gender. Table 4.35 shows the comparison of male teachers and female teachers' perception in choice based credit system component of semester system.

Table 4.35

Comparison of male and female teachers' perception in choice based credit system component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	104	29.31	3.778	0.778	0.501	1.553	NS
Female	117	30.09	3.645				

NS= Not significant

Study of the result vide table 4.35 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is 1.553, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers' perception in choice based credit system component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No. 46) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is accepted.

(ii) With reference to locale:

Hypothesis No. 47 states that there is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system was compared with reference to locale. Table 4.36 shows the comparison of urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Table 4.36
Comparison of urban and rural teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	143	29.52	3.722	0.552	0.523	1.056	NS
Rural	78	30.08	3.713				

NS= Not significant

Study of the result vide table 4.36 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is 1.056, whereas the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between urban and rural teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.47) which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is accepted.

(iii) With reference to teachers' designation:

Hypothesis No.48 states that there is no significant difference between associate professor and assistant professors' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system was compared with reference to teachers' designation. Table 4.37 shows the comparison of associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Table 4.37

Comparison of associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Associate	90	28.64	3.667	1.814	0.498	3.645	**
Assistant	131	30.46	3.587				

****=Significant at .01 level**

Exploration of the result vide table 4.37 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is 3.645, and the required 't' value with df = 219 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated 't' value is larger than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.48) which assumes that there is no significant difference between associate professor and assistant professors' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is rejected. Since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of assistant professors, as their mean score is higher than the associate professors. The result

indicates that assistant professors have a more favourable perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system than the associate professors.

(iv) With reference to stream of course:

For the three streams of courses, three different hypotheses are formulated as follows:

Hypothesis No.49 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Hypothesis No.50 states that there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Hypothesis No.51states that there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

The difference in the teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system was compared with reference to stream of course. Table 4.38 shows the comparison of science & commerce teachers, science & arts teachers and commerce & arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Table 4.38

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science teachers	76	29.92	3.651	0.984	0.808	1.217	NS
Commerce teachers	32	28.94	3.910				
Science teachers	76	29.92	3.651	0.116	0.546	0.212	NS
Arts teachers	113	29.81	3.717				
Commerce teachers	32	28.94	3.910	0.868	0.775	1.120	NS
Arts teachers	113	29.81	3.717				

NS= Not significant

Investigation of the result vide table 4.38 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science teachers and commerce teachers is not significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 1.217 is less than the criterion 't' value at .05 level, therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.49) which assumes that there is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is accepted.

Further investigation of the result vide table 4.38 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is 0.212 whereas the required 't' value with df = 187 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.50) which assumes that there is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is accepted.

Continuing with the investigation of the result of table 4.38 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers is not significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 1.120 is less than the criterion 't' value at .05 level. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system. Consequently, the null hypothesis (No.51) which assumes that there is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is accepted.

(v) With reference to teaching experience:

Teachers were categorized into three groups based on their teaching experience. In order to compare these three groups of teachers, the investigator

formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.52 states that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Hypothesis No.53 states that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Hypothesis No.54 states that there is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

The difference in teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system was compared with reference to the three teaching experience. Table 4.39 shows the comparison of teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system based on the three types of teaching experience.

Table 4.39

Comparison of teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system based on short & middle, short & long and middle & long teaching experience

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Short experience	83	30.53	3.538	0.683	0.626	1.090	NS
Middle experience	59	29.85	3.773				
Short experience	83	30.53	3.538	1.758	0.569	3.089	**
Long experience	79	28.77	3.697				
Middle experience	59	29.85	3.773	1.075	0.644	1.671	NS
Long experience	79	28.77	3.697				

NS= Not significant **=Significant at .01 level

Study of the result vide table 4.39 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is 1.090 whereas the required 't' value with df = 140 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower

than the criterion ‘t’ value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers’ perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.52) which assumes that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers’ perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is accepted.

Further study of the result vide table 4.39 reveals that the ‘t’ value for the significance of difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers’ perception in choice based credit system component of semester system is 3.089 and the required ‘t’ value with df = 160 to declare the difference as significant is 2.61 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated ‘t’ value is higher than the criterion ‘t’ value, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers’ perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.53) which assumes that there is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers’ perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is rejected. Since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of short experienced teachers, as their mean score is higher than the long experienced teachers. The result indicates that short experienced teachers have a more favourable perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system than the long experienced teachers.

Continuing with the study of the result of table 4.39 discloses that the ‘t’ value for the significance of difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers’ perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is 1.671 whereas the required ‘t’ value with df = 136 to declare the difference as significant is 1.98 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated ‘t’ value is lower than the criterion ‘t’ value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers’ perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.54) which states that there is no significant

difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is accepted.

4.6.0 Objective No.6: To find out the students' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram

In order to find out students' perception of semester system, students' perception scale developed by the investigator was administered to college students selected for the present sample. After scoring was done, the scores were converted into z-score and based on this z-score students were categorized into seven groups with respect to their perception on semester system and they are presented in table 4.40.

Table 4.40

Students' perception level on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram

Level of perception	Number and percentage
Extremely favourable perception	29 (3.52%)
Favourable perception	40 (4.86%)
Above average perception	156 (18.96)
Moderate perception	407 (49.45%)
Below average perception	121 (14.70%)
Unfavourable perception	44 (5.35%)
Extremely unfavourable perception	26 (3.16%)
TOTAL	**823**

The above table 4.40 shows that with respect to students' perception level on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram, (3.52%) of college students had extremely favourable perception on semester system, 4.86% of college students had favourable perception, 18.96% of college students had above average perception, 49.45% of college students had moderate perception, 14.70% of college students had below average perception, 5.35% of college students had unfavourable perception and 3.16% of college students had extremely unfavourable perception of semester system. This means that the largest percentage of college students had moderate

perception on semester system. There were only few students who had extremely favourable perception as well as extremely unfavourable perception on semester system.

4.7.0. Objective No.7: To compare students' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with respect to gender, locale and stream of study

The differences in students' perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram were compared with reference to different independent variables like gender, locale, and stream of course. For this, the mean and standard deviation of the scores of these different variables were calculated. The mean differences were then tested by applying 't' test and the details are presented in the following:

4.7.1 Students' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender:

Hypothesis No. 55 states that there is no significant difference between male students and female students' overall perception of semester system.

The differences in the students' overall perception about semester system in undergraduate colleges were compared with reference to gender. Table 4.41 shows the comparison of male students and female students' overall perception on the semester system.

Table 4.41

Comparison of male and female students' overall perception of Semester System

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	451	107.63	11.383	0.127	0.721	0.176	NS
Female	372	107.76	9.297				

NS=Not significant

Analysis of the result vide table 4.41 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference in the overall perception of semester system between the male and female students is 0.176, whereas the required 't' value with df = 821 to declare the difference as significant is 1.96 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't'

value is lower than the criterion ‘t’ value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female students in their overall perception on semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.55) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male students and female students’ overall perception of semester system is accepted.

4.7.2 Students’ overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to locale:

Hypothesis No.56 states that there is no significant difference between urban students and rural students’ overall perception of semester system.

The differences in the students’ overall perception about semester system in undergraduate colleges were compared with reference to locale. Table 4.42 shows the comparison of urban students and rural students' overall perception of semester system.

Table 4.42

Comparison of urban and rural students’ overall perception of Semester System

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	252	105.35	10.433	3.382	0.787	4.296	**
Rural	571	108.73	10.350				

****=Significant at .01 level**

An examination of the result vide table 4.42 reveals that the ‘t’ value for the significance of difference in the overall perception on semester system between the urban and rural students is 4.296, and the required ‘t’ value with df =821 to declare the difference as significant is 2.58 at .01 level. Since the calculated ‘t’ value is higher than the criterion ‘t’ value, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between urban and rural students' in their overall perception on semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.56) which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' overall perception of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of rural students, as their mean score is higher than the urban students. The result indicates that rural students have a more favourable overall perception of semester system than the urban students.

4.7.3 Students' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to stream of course:

Three streams of course namely Science, Commerce and Arts are most commonly offered in colleges in Mizoram. Therefore, colleges in Mizoram have science students, commerce students and arts students. In order to compare these three streams of students the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.57 states that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' overall perception of semester system.

Hypothesis No.58 states that there is no significant difference between science students and arts students' overall perception of semester system.

Hypothesis No.59 states that there is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' overall perception of semester system.

The differences in the students' overall perception of semester system in undergraduate colleges were compared with reference to the three streams of courses. Table 4.43 shows the comparison of science students & commerce students, science students & arts students and commerce students & arts students' overall perception of semester system.

Table 4.43

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts students' overall perception of Semester System

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science students	183	105.71	9.016	0.076	0.959	0.080	NS
Commerce students	205	105.63	8.864				
Science students	183	105.71	9.016	3.784	0.851	4.448	**
Arts students	435	109.49	11.024				
Commerce students	205	105.63	8.864	3.860	0.868	4.445	**
Arts students	435	109.49	11.024				

NS=Not significant ****=Significant at .01 level**

Analysis of the result vide table 4.43 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science students and commerce students is not

significant. Since the calculated ‘t’ value of 0.080 is less than the criterion ‘t’ value, therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students with respect to their overall perception of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No. 57) that assumes that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students’ overall perception of semester system is accepted.

Further examination of the result vide table 4.43 reveals that the ‘t’ value for the significance of difference in the overall perception on semester system between science students and arts students is 4.448, and the required ‘t’ value with df = 616 to declare the difference as significant is 2.59 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated ‘t’ value is higher than the criterion ‘t’ value, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the overall perception of science students and arts students on semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.58) which assumes there is no significant difference between science students and arts students’ overall perception of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts students, as their mean score is higher than the science students. The result indicates that arts students have a more favourable overall perception of semester system than the science students.

Continuing with the analysis of the result vide table 4.43 reveals that the ‘t’ value for the significance of difference between commerce students and arts students is significant. Since the calculated ‘t’ value of 4.445 is greater than the criterion ‘t’ value, therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between commerce students and arts students with respect to their overall perception of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No. 59) that states that there is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' overall perception of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts students, as their mean score is higher than the commerce students. The result indicates that arts students have a more favourable overall perception of semester system than the commerce students.

4.8.0 Objective No.8: To compare students' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study

Students' perception scale on semester system was divided into five components namely (A) General observation, (B) Perception on course of study (C) Perception on evaluation, (D) Perception on method of teaching and (E) Perception on choice based credit system (CBCS).

The differences in students' perception of semester system in these five components were compared with reference to different independent variables like (i) Gender, (ii) Locale, (iii) and Stream of course. For this, the mean and standard deviation of the scores of these variables were calculated. The mean differences were then tested by applying 't' test and the details are presented in the following tables.

4.8.1 Students' perception on general observation component of semester system:

Students' perception on general observation components of semester system were compared with reference to different independent variables as follows:

(i) With reference to gender:

Hypothesis No.60 states that there is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception on general observation component of semester system was compared with reference to gender. Table 4.44 shows the comparison of male students and female students' perception on general observation component of semester system.

Table 4.44

Comparison of male and female students' perception on general observation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	451	24.21	3.023	0.089	0.194	0.459	NS
Female	372	24.12	2.555				

NS=Not significant

Analysis of the result vide table 4.44 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between male students and female students' perception on general observation component of semester system is 0.459, whereas the required 't' value with df = 821 to declare the difference as significant is 1.96 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female students' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.60) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the general observation component of semester system is accepted.

(ii) With reference to locale:

Hypothesis No.61 states that there is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception on general observation component of semester system was compared with reference to locale. Table 4.45 shows the comparison of urban students and rural students' perception on general observation component of semester system.

Table 4.45

Comparison of urban and rural students' perception on general observation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	252	23.67	3.058	0.723	0.223	3.245	**
Rural	571	24.39	2.681				

****= Significant at .01 level**

Study of the result vide table 4.45 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between urban students and rural students' perception on general observation component of semester system is 3.245,–and the required 't' value with df = 821 to declare the difference as significant is 2.58 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated 't' value is higher than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between urban and rural students' perception on

general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.61) which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the general observation component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of rural students, as their mean score is higher than the urban students. The result indicates that rural students have a more favourable perception on general observation component of semester system than the urban students.

(iii) With reference to stream of course:

There were three streams of courses and therefore the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No. 62 states that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 63 states that there is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 64 states that there is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception on general observation component of semester system was compared with reference to stream of course. Table 4.46 shows the comparison of science & commerce students, science & arts students and commerce & arts students' perception on general observation component of semester system.

Table 4.46

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts students' perception on general observation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science students	183	23.86	2.377	0.175	0.264	0.663	NS
Commerce students	205	23.68	2.377				
Science students	183	23.86	2.377	0.678	0.225	3.007	**
Arts students	435	24.54	2.943				
Commerce students	205	23.68	2.377	0.853	0.242	3.518	**
Arts students	435	24.54	2.943				

NS= Not significant **= Significant at .01 level

Enquiry of the result vide table 4.46 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science students and commerce students' perception on general observation component of semester system is 0.663 whereas the required 't' value with df = 385 to declare the difference as significant is 1.97 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the science students and commerce students' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.62) which assumes there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the general observation component of semester system is accepted.

Further investigation of the result of table 4.46 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science students and arts students' perception on general observation component of semester system is 3.007 and the required 't' value with df = 616 to declare the difference as significant is 2.59 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated 't' value is higher than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between the science students and arts students' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.63) which assumes there is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the general observation component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts students, as their mean score is higher than the science students. The result indicates that arts students have a more favourable

perception on the general observation component of semester system than the science students.

Continuing with the analysis of the result vide table 4.46 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between commerce students and arts students is significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 3.518 is greater than the criterion 't' value at .01 level, therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception on general observation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.64) which assumes there is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the general observation component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts students, as their mean score is higher than the commerce students. The result indicates that arts students have a more favourable perception on the general observation component of semester system than the commerce students.

4.8.2 Students' perception on course of study component of semester system:

Students' perception on course of study components of semester system were compared with reference to different independent variables as follows:

(i) With reference to gender:

Hypothesis No.65 states that there is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception in the course of study component of semester system was compared with reference to gender. Table 4.47 shows the comparison of male students and female students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Table 4.47
Comparison of male and female students' perception in the course of study component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	451	11.67	1.760	0.007	0.114	0.064	NS
Female	372	11.67	1.517				

NS= Not significant

Analysis of the result vide table 4.47 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between male students and female students' perception in the course of study component of semester system is 0.064, whereas the required 't' value with df = 821 to declare the difference as significant is 1.96 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female students' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.65) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the course of study component of semester system is accepted.

(ii) With reference to locale:

Hypothesis No.66 states there is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the course of study component of semester system

The difference in the students' perception in the course of study component of semester system was compared with reference to locale. Table 4.48 shows the comparison of urban students and rural students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Table 4.48

Comparison of urban and rural students' perception in the course of study component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	252	11.40	1.706	0.395	0.127	3.109	**
Rural	571	11.79	1.617				

****= Significant at .01 level**

Study of the result vide table 4.48 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the course of study component of semester system is 3.109, and the required 't' value with df = 821 to declare the difference as significant is 2.58 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated 't' value is higher than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between urban and rural students' perception in the

course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.66) which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the course of study component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of rural students, as their mean score is higher than the urban students. The result indicates that rural students have a more favourable perception in the course of study component of semester system than the urban students.

(iii) With reference to stream of course:

There were three streams of courses and therefore the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.67 states that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Hypothesis No.68 states that there is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Hypothesis No.69 states that there is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

The difference in students' perception in the course of study component of semester system was compared with reference to stream of course. Table 4.49 shows the comparison of science & commerce students, science & arts students and commerce & arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

Table 4.49

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science students	183	11.39	1.680	0.060	0.171	0.353	NS
Commerce students	205	11.45	1.679				
Science students	183	11.39	1.680	0.496	0.146	3.398	**
Arts students	435	11.89	1.603				
Commerce students	205	11.45	1.679	0.436	0.140	3.110	**
Arts students	435	11.89	1.603				

NS= Not significant **= Significant at .01 level

Examination of the result vide table 4.49 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the course of study component of semester system is not significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 0.353 is less than the criterion 't' value at .05 level, therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.67) which assumes there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the course of study component of semester system is accepted.

Further examination of the result vide table 4.49 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science students and arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system is 3.398 and the required 't' value with df = 616 to declare the difference as significant is 2.59 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated 't' value is higher than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between the science students and arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.68) which assumes there is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts students, as their mean score is higher than the science students. The result indicates that arts students have a more favourable perception in the course of study component of semester system than the science students.

Continuing with the examination of the result of table 4.49 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system is 3.110 and the required 't' value with df 638 to declare the difference as significant is 2.59 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated 't' value is higher than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the commerce students and arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.69) which assumes there is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the course of study component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts students, as their mean score is higher than the science students. The result indicates that arts students have a more favourable perception in the course of study component of semester system than the commerce students.

4.8.3 Students' perception on evaluation component of semester system:

Students' perception on evaluation components of semester system were compared with reference to different independent variables as follows:

(i) With reference to gender:

Hypothesis No, 70 states that there is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system was compared with reference to gender. Table 4.50 shows the comparison of male students and female students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Table 4.50
Comparison of male and female students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	451	24.16	2.769	0.127	0.177	0.716	NS
Female	372	24.28	2.320				

NS= Not significant

Study of the result vide table 4.50 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between male students and female students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is 0.719, whereas the required 't' value with df = 821 to declare the difference as significant is 1.96 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.70) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is accepted.

(ii) With reference to locale:

Hypothesis No.71 states that there is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception in evaluation component of semester system was compared with reference to locale. Table 4.51 shows the comparison of urban students and rural students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Table 4.51
Comparison of urban and rural students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	252	23.83	2.586	0.558	0.195	2.865	**
Rural	571	24.38	2.554				

****= Significant at .01 level**

Study of the result vide table 4.51 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is 2.865, and the required 't' value with df = 821 to declare the difference as significant is 2.58 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated 't' value is higher than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between urban and rural students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.71)

which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of rural students, as their mean score is higher than the urban students. The result indicates that rural students have a more favourable perception in the evaluation component of semester system than the urban students.

(iii) With reference to stream of course:

For the three streams of courses the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.72 states that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No.73 states that there is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Hypothesis No.74 states that there is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system was compared with reference to stream of course. Table 4.52 shows the comparison of science & commerce students, science & arts students and commerce & arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

Table 4.52

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science students	183	24.17	2.333	0.365	0.245	1.488	NS
Commerce students	205	23.81	2.499				
Science students	183	24.17	2.333	0.244	0.215	1.131	NS
Arts students	435	24.42	2.687				
Commerce students	205	23.81	2.499	0.609	0.217	2.806	**
Arts students	435	24.42	2.687				

NS= Not significant **= Significant at .01 level

Investigation of the result vide table 4.52 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science students and commerce students is not significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 1.488 is less than the criterion 't' value at .05 level, therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.72) which assumes there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is accepted.

Further investigation of the result vide table 4.52 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is 1.131 whereas the required 't' value with df =616 to declare the difference as significant is 1.96 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the science students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.73) which assumes there is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is accepted.

Continuing with the investigation of the result of table 4.52 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between commerce students and arts students is significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 2.806 is greater than the criterion 't' value at .01 level. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a

significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system. Consequently, the null hypothesis (No.74) which assumes there is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts students, as their mean score is higher than the commerce students. The result indicates that arts students have a more favourable perception in the evaluation component of semester system than the commerce students.

4.8.4 Students' perception on method of teaching component of semester system:

Students' perception on method of teaching components of semester system was compared with reference to different independent variables as follows:

(i) With reference to gender:

Hypothesis No.75 states that there is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system was compared with reference to gender. Table 4.53 shows the comparison of male students and female students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Table 4.53

Comparison of male and female students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	451	31.86	4.107	0.355	0.260	1.366	NS
Female	372	32.22	3.342				

NS= Not significant

Study of the result vide table 4.53 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between male students and female students' perception in

the method of teaching component of semester system is 1.366 whereas the required 't' value with df = 821 to declare the difference as significant is 1.96 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is lower than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.75) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is accepted.

(ii) With reference to locale:

Hypothesis No. 76 states that there is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system was compared with reference to locale. Table 4.54 shows the comparison of urban students and rural students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Table 4.54

Comparison of Urban and Rural students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	252	31.34	3.870	0.979	0.289	3.389	**
Rural	571	32.32	3.707				

****= Significant at .01 level**

Study of the result vide table 4.54 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is 3.389, and the required 't' value with df = 821 to declare the difference as significant is 2.58 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated 't' value is higher than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between urban and rural students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.76) which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban students

and rural students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of rural students, as their mean score is higher than the urban students. The result indicates that rural students have a more favourable perception in the method of teaching component of semester system than the urban students.

(iii) With reference to stream of course:

For the three streams of courses the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No. 77 states that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 78 states that there is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Hypothesis No. 79 states that there is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system was compared with reference to stream of course. Table 4.55 shows the comparison of science & commerce students, science & arts students and commerce & arts students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

Table 4.55

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science students	183	31.22	3.701	0.181	0.377	0.481	NS
Commerce students	205	31.40	3.723				
Science students	183	31.22	3.701	1.432	0.327	4.378	**
Arts students	435	32.65	3.739				
Commerce students	205	31.40	3.723	1.251	0.316	3.960	**
Arts students	435	32.65	3.739				

NS= Not significant **= Significant at .01 level

Investigation of the result vide table 4.55 reveals that the ‘t’ value for the significance of difference between science students and commerce students is not significant. Since the calculated ‘t’ value of 0.481 is less than the criterion ‘t’ value at .05 level, therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.77) which assumes that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is accepted.

Further investigation of the result vide table 4.55 reveals that the ‘t’ value for the significance of difference between science students and arts students’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is 4.378 and the required ‘t’ value with df = 616 to declare the difference as significant is 2.59 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated ‘t’ value is higher than the criterion ‘t’ value, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the science students and arts students’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.78) which assumes that there is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts students, as their mean score is higher than the science students. The result indicates that arts students have a more favourable perception in the method of teaching component of semester system than the science students.

Continuing with the investigation of the result of table 4.55 discloses that the ‘t’ value for the significance of difference between commerce students and arts students is significant. Since the calculated ‘t’ value of 3.960 is higher than the criterion ‘t’ value at .01 level. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between commerce students and arts students’ perception in the method of teaching component of semester system. Consequently, the null hypothesis (No.79) which assumes that there is no significant difference between

commerce students and arts students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts students, as their mean score is higher than the commerce students. The result indicates that arts students have a more favourable perception in the method of teaching component of semester system than the commerce students.

4.8.5 Students' perception on choice based credit system component of semester system:

Students' perception on choice based credit system components of semester system were compared with reference to different independent variables as follows:

(i) With reference to gender:

Hypothesis No.80 states that there is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system was compared with reference to gender. Table 4.56 shows the comparison of male students and female students' perception in choice based credit system component of semester system.

Table 4.56
Comparison of male and female students' perception in choice based credit system component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Male	451	15.74	2.111	0.273	0.139	1.963	*
Female	372	15.47	1.881				

***=Significant at .05 level**

Study of the result vide table 4.56 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between male students and female students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is 1.963, and the required 't' value with df = 821 to declare the difference as significant is 1.96 at 0.05 level. Since the calculated 't' value is higher than the criterion 't' value, it can be

concluded that there is a significant difference between male and female students' perception in choice based credit system component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No. 80) which assumes that there is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .05 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of male students, as their mean score is higher than the female students. The result indicates that male students have a more favourable perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system than the female students.

(ii) With reference to locale:

Hypothesis No. 81 states that there is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system was compared with reference to locale. Table 4.57 shows the comparison of urban students and rural students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Table 4.57

Comparison of urban and rural students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Urban	252	15.11	2.054	0.726	0.153	4.742	**
Rural	571	15.84	1.956				

****= Significant at .01 level**

Study of the result vide table 4.57 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is 4.742, and the required 't' value with df = 821 to declare the difference as significant is 2.58 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated 't' value is higher than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between urban and rural students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.81) which assumes that there is no significant difference between urban students and rural students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of rural students, as their mean score is higher than the urban students. The result indicates that rural students have a more favourable perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system than the urban students.

(iii) With reference to stream of course:

For the three streams of courses the investigator formulated three different hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis No.82 states that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Hypothesis No.83 states that there is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Hypothesis No.84 states that there is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

The difference in the students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system was compared with reference to stream of course. Table 4.58 shows the comparison of science & commerce students, science & arts students and commerce & arts students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Table 4.58

Comparison of science & commerce, science & arts and commerce & arts students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	MD	SE_{MD}	t- Value	Sig. level
Science students	183	15.07	1.929	0.222	0.196	1.132	NS
Commerce students	205	15.29	1.933				
Science students	183	15.07	1.929	0.934	0.172	5.430	**
Arts students	435	16.00	2.009				
Commerce students	205	15.29	1.933	0.712	0.166	4.295	**
Arts students	435	16.00	2.009				

NS= Not significant **= Significant at .01 level

Investigation of the result vide table 4.58 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science students and commerce students is not significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 1.132 is less than the criterion 't' value at .05 level, therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.82) which assumes that there is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is accepted.

Further investigation of the result vide table 4.58 reveals that the 't' value for the significance of difference between science students and arts students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is 5.430 and the required 't' value with df = 616 to declare the difference as significant is 2.59 at 0.01 level. Since the calculated 't' value is higher than the criterion 't' value, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the science students and arts students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system. Therefore, the null hypothesis (No.83) which assumes that there is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts students, as their mean score is higher than the science students. The result indicates that arts students have a more

favourable perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system than the science students.

Continuing with the investigation of the result of table 4.58 discloses that the 't' value for the significance of difference between commerce students and arts students is significant. Since the calculated 't' value of 4.295 is higher than the criterion 't' value at .01 level. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system. Consequently, the null hypothesis (No.84) which assumes that there is no significant difference between commerce students and arts students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system is rejected, since the two groups differed significantly at .01 level of confidence. A comparison of their mean score shows that this difference is in favour of arts students, as their mean score is higher than the commerce students. The result indicates that arts students have a more favourable perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system than the commerce students.

CHAPTER – V

MAJOR FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The present chapter concerns with the major findings, discussions, recommendations and suggestions for further research.

5.1.0 MAJOR FINDINGS

The following are the major findings of the present study.

5.1.1 Construction and standardization of teachers' perception scale on semester system:

Teachers' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram was constructed and standardized. There were 57 items out of which 34 items were positive and 23 items were negative. Spit half reliability was found to be .90 (after applying Spearman Brown's formula). The scale was given to 10 experts for content validity. Teachers' perception score was converted into z-score and was used for the norms to classify teachers.

5.1.2 Construction and standardization of students' perception scale on semester system:

Students' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram was also constructed and standardized. There were 27 items and all the items were positive. The reliability of the test was established using the test retest method and was found to be .801. The scale was given to 10 experts for content validity. Norms for the scale was established by converting students' perception score into z-score and was used for classifying the students.

5.1.3 Teachers' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram:

Maximum number of teachers had moderate perception on semester system. Only few teachers had extremely favourable perception as well as extremely unfavourable perception.

5.1.4 Comparing teachers' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation, stream of course and teaching experience:

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' overall perception on semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' overall perception on semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between Associate professors and assistant professors' overall perception on semester system.

iv) Science teachers had a more favourable overall perception on semester system than commerce teachers.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' overall perception on semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable overall perception on semester system than commerce teachers.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' overall perception on semester system.

viii) Short experienced teachers had a more favourable overall perception on semester system than long experienced teachers.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' overall perception on semester system.

5.1.5 Comparing teachers' perception on the different components of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation, Stream of course and teaching experience:

***(A) General observation component of semester system*:**

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the general observation component of semester

system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the general observation component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

viii) Short experienced teachers had a more favourable perception than long experienced teachers in the general observation component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced and long experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

***(B) Course of study component of semester system*:**

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the course of study component of semester system

iv) Science teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the course of study component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the course of study component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

viii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

***(C) Evaluation component of semester system*:**

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

iv) Science teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the evaluation component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the evaluation component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

viii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

***(D) Method of teaching component of semester system*:**

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the method of teaching component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

viii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

***(E) Choice Based Credit System component of semester system*:**

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

iii) Assistant professors had a more favourable perception than associate professors in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

vi) There is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

viii) Short experienced teachers had a more favourable perception than long experienced teachers in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

5.1.6 Students' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram:

The highest number of college students had moderate perception on semester system. There were only few students who had extremely favourable perception as well as extremely unfavourable perception on semester system.

5.1.7 Comparing students' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with respect to gender, locale and stream of study:

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' overall perception on semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the overall perception on semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' overall perception on semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the overall perception on semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the overall perception on semester system.

5.1.8 Comparing students' perception on the different components of semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender, locale and stream of study:

***(A) General observation component of semester system*:**

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the general observation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the general observation component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the general observation component of semester system.

***(B) Course of study components of semester system*:**

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the course of study component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the course of study component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than the commerce students in the course of study component of semester system.

***(C) Evaluation component of semester system*:**

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the evaluation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the evaluation component of semester system.

***(D) Method of teaching component of semester system*:**

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than the urban students in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than the science students in the method of teaching component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than the commerce students in the method of teaching component of semester system.

***(E) Choice Based Credit System components of semester system*:**

i) Male students had a more favourable perception than female students in the choice based credit system of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the choice based credit system of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

5.2.0 DISCUSSIONS ON THE FINDINGS

Some of the findings of the study are discussed as follows:

***Teachers' perception on semester system*:**

- With respect to teachers' level of perception, findings showed that the bulk of the teachers had moderate/average perception on semester system. Similar to the present findings, Garcha (2016) also found that teachers had average perception on semester system. Contrary to this finding, Jat (1970); Akhtar (1980); Mehmood et.al. (2014); Bista (2016) found that teachers had favourable perception on semester system. Dangi (2016) also found that teachers had unfavourable perception on semester system. The finding of the present study that teachers had moderate level of perception on semester system is not surprizing because as a rule people tend to be moderate/average in most human attributes be it intelligence, attitude, perception etc.

- With respect to overall perception as well as all the components of semester system, it was found that there was no significant difference between the male and female college teachers' perception on semester system. In agreement to the present findings, Garcha (2017) and Das (2018) also found no significant difference in teachers' perception on semester system. But, contrary to this finding, Tong (1977) found that male teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system than the female teachers. The people living in Mizoram are known as the Mizo. Mizo people are a close-knit community with not much sex discrimination or socioeconomic distinction in the society. Perhaps this may affect the perception of the teachers which gives rise to the present finding that there is no significant difference the teachers' perception on semester system. Besides, males and females from childhood to adulthood are more alike than different on most psychological variables. Semester system is an academic term which means division of an academic year in two parts. Therefore, even if there are no significant differences in the perception of male and female teachers on this matter, it is understandable.

- With reference to overall and different components of semester system, it was also found that no significant difference was found between teachers from urban and rural areas in their perception on semester system. Colleges in Mizoram are all situated in urban areas of all districts, mostly in the capitals of the district. Therefore,

teachers teaching in colleges of Mizoram, even if they hail from rural areas had the experience of living in urban areas and it is believed that they would be psychologically influenced by their familiarity of urban life. Consequently, their perception on semester system may not be so different from teachers from urban locality. Besides, semester system is merely a term which refers to the splitting of the academic year into two parts. So, the present finding that there is no significant difference in teachers' perception on semester system based on locality is not without a reason.

- With reference to overall as well as course of study components and evaluation components of semester system, it was found that science teachers view semester system more favourably than the commerce teachers. The plausible reason why commerce teachers perceive semester system more unfavourably than the science teachers could possibly be because commerce incudes papers like Financial Accounting, Business Laws, Economics, Taxation, Auditing, Cost Accounting, among others which needs plenty of time for completion of the course and since semester system had shorter duration, perhaps commerce teachers find it difficult to complete the course in time.

- It was also found that the arts teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the commerce teachers in overall and most of the dimension of semester system. Commerce stream is not as popular as the Arts stream in Mizoram which is evident from the fact that fewer students opted for the commerce stream. Perhaps arts teachers find that it is easier to manage the students in semester system because interaction between teachers and students increases in semester system and teachers have more information about the students. This type of interaction was not possible in the annual system as the number of arts students were so large. Now, in semester system, project work, seminars, field study etc. are introduced which brings the teachers and students closer to each other. Since there were lesser number of students in commerce stream, even before semester system was introduced, commerce teachers perhaps did not experience much difference after semester system was introduced. Hence, this could be the reason why arts teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system than the commerce teachers.

- With reference to overall as well as general observation component and choice based credit system component of semester system, it was found that short experienced teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system than the long experienced teachers. The finding of Tong (1977) oppose the present finding as Tong found that teachers' experience did not play any significant role in their attitude towards semester system. In the present study, short experienced teachers are those teachers having less than ten years of experience, and long experienced teachers are those teachers having more than twenty years of teaching experience. Now, short experienced teachers often find it difficult to plan and organize class teaching, but with the semester system come the seminar, assignment, project work, CBCS etc. which the students had to compulsorily undertake freeing the short experienced teacher from making plans for class teaching. Possibly, this may be the reason why short experienced teacher viewed the semester system more favourably than the long experienced teachers.

- The present study also found that assistant professors had a more favourable perception than associate professors in the choice based credit system component of semester system. It is a known fact that CBCS increased the workload of the teachers because of too much internal testing and evaluation exercises. Associate professors, because of their designation had more administrative responsibilities in the colleges apart from being involved with teaching, testing and evaluation exercises while the assistant professors have less responsibilities. This may perhaps be the rationale for the present finding that assistant professors had a more favourable perception on semester system than the associate professors.

***Students' perception on semester system*:**

- With respect to students' level of perception, findings showed that the maximum number of the students' had moderate perception on semester system. Contrary to this finding, Mehmood (2014), Dangi (2016), Lalrinsanga et.al (2021) found that students had favourable views on semester system. One can conclude that the typical person is moderate, but this does not mean that the typical person is moderate in everything. Chances are that we are all better at some things than the bulk of the population, then again, we are all worse at other things than the bulk of

the population, and we are all within one standard deviation of the average in majority of our life's attributes. Having moderate perception is therefore quite normal.

- It was found that with reference to overall and all components of semester system, rural students had a more favourable perception on semester system than the urban students. Reddy (2019) also found similar results. Now, majority of the under-graduate student in Mizoram hail from rural areas who got themselves admitted to colleges mostly situated in urban areas. In semester system students get more leaves and vacations as they get a semester break after the final examination of every semester. This is very advantageous for rural students as they were able to visit their home village twice every year. Consequently, this may be the probable cause for rural students having a more favourable perception on semester system than the urban students.

- It was also found that with respect to overall perception and all components of semester system except evaluation component, the arts students had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the science students. Contrary to the current findings, Haseena & Reddy's (2012) and Chaliha & Gogoi's (2019) findings shows that science students had a more favourable view on semester system than the arts students. Generally, students having good results in HSLC often take up the science stream, while arts stream is usually taken by low achieving students. Now, in semester system, if a learner fails in one or more papers, He/she can repeat the particular paper in which they fail. They do not need to repeat all the papers in a given semester. Now, this is very advantageous for many of the students from the arts stream who often fail in one or two subjects. The science students ordinarily do not need to repeat papers since many of them do not fail. Therefore, the reason why arts students favour the semester system more than the science students can be accounted to this.

- The present study found that with respect to overall perception and all components of semester system, the arts students had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the commerce students. Commerce as a stream of education is a study of trade and business activities such as the exchange of goods

and services from producer to final consumer. Conversely, the study of Arts or Humanities enables a student to develop critical, argumentative and creative skills. So, one can say that commerce defies comprehension, creativity and analysis while Arts is nothing but a culmination of all those. Now, in semester system, students were given assignments, seminars, project work etc. which really enhances critical and creative skills of the arts students. Thus, the probable reason why arts students had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the commerce students could be because the method of teaching employed in semester system enhances creativity of the arts students.

- 'Male students had a more favourable perception than female students in the choice based credit system of semester system' is another finding of this study. Deury (2015) found similar result, however, contrary to this finding, Mahakur et.al.(2019), Mal and Mahato (2021), found no significant difference in the observation of male and female students on Choice based credit system. CBCS makes education broad based and at par with global standards. Perhaps male students appreciate the idea that CBCS is at par with global standard that their perception on CBCS is more favourable compared to female students.

5.3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON THE FINDINGS

The present study found that science teachers and arts teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system than commerce teachers. Therefore it is recommended that:

1. Education and training sessions may be provided to the commerce teachers on the benefits of semester system. They may be explained on how semester system aligns with the needs of the modern economy and how it helps the students to achieve academic and professional success.
2. The concerns of the commerce teachers regarding the implementation of the semester system may be addressed. The commerce teachers' feedback may be heeded and actions could be taken to address any issue that arise.
3. Commerce teachers may be provided with the resources they need to practice the semester system effectively. This could include training materials, lesson plans, and support from other teachers who have successfully utilized the semester system.

4. Success stories of other institutions that are functioning under the semester system could be highlighted to the commerce teachers. Data and evidence that supports the benefits of the semester system, such as improved academic performance and higher graduation rates could be shared to them.
5. Engaging in an open and on-going dialogue with the commerce teachers about their concerns and experiences with the semester system could be taken up. This will help to build trust and foster a sense of collaboration and shared responsibility.

By implementing these strategies, it is possible to improve the perception of commerce teachers towards the semester system. Ultimately, this will help to create a positive and supportive learning environment for students, and prepare them for success in the 21st century economy.

The present study also found that long experienced teachers had a more unfavourable perception on semester system compared to middle and short experienced teachers. Therefore, the following are the few key steps that can be taken to change the perception of long experienced teachers/senior teachers on semester system:

1. First, it is important to acknowledge and address any concerns or reservations that these long experienced teachers may have about the semester system. This can be done through meetings or one-on-one conversations with college administrators. By actively listening to the concerns of these long experienced teachers, institutions can identify areas of improvement and work towards finding solutions that address these concerns.
2. Institutions can provide professional development opportunities to help these teachers understand the benefits of the semester system and how to effectively implement it in their classrooms. This can include training on how to create effective lesson plans, how to manage student workload, and how to provide meaningful feedback to students.
3. Institutions can encourage collaboration and peer mentoring among teachers. Teachers who have successfully managed the semester system can share their

strategies and best practices with their colleagues, and provide support and guidance as needed.

4. It is important to ensure that these teachers have the necessary resources and support to effectively cope with the semester system. This can include access to technology and instructional materials, as well as support from college administrators and other staff members.

5. Improving the perception of long experienced teachers on the semester system requires a collaborative effort that involves open communication, professional development, peer mentoring, and adequate resources and support.

The present study also found that urban students had a less favourable perception on semester system compared to the rural students. Improving the perception of urban students on the semester system can be a challenging task, but there are several strategies that can be employed to help change their perception:

1. Institutions can communicate the benefits of the semester system to students in a clear and concise manner. This can include highlighting how it allows for a more in-depth exploration of topics and provides greater opportunities for personalized learning. Colleges can also showcase the successes of students who have thrived under the semester system, such as those who have gone on to achieve academic success or participate in extracurricular activities.

2. Institutions can provide additional support to students who may struggle with the transition to the semester system. This can include offering tutoring or academic support services, providing additional resources and materials, and ensuring that students have access to the technology needed to succeed in a semester-based environment.

3. Institutions can involve students in the decision-making process while managing the semester system. By allowing students to have a voice in the process, they are more likely to feel invested in the system and motivated to succeed.

4. Institutions can also offer incentives or rewards for students who excel under the semester system. This can include academic recognition, scholarships, or other forms of recognition that motivate students to embrace the semester system.

5. Changing the perception of urban students on the semester system requires clear communication, additional support, student involvement in decision-making, and incentives for success. By employing these strategies, institutions can help students see the benefits of the semester system and feel empowered to succeed.

The present study also found that science and commerce undergraduate college students had more unfavourable perception on semester system compared to the arts undergraduate students. Changing the perception of science and commerce students on semester system towards favourable perception could be achieved through the following strategies:

1. Benefits of the semester system such as more time to understand and apply concepts, and better preparation for higher education could be highlighted to the science and commerce students.
2. Inter-disciplinary events and competitions to foster interaction between science, commerce and arts students could be organized. This will help break down barriers and promote understanding and collaboration.
3. Misconceptions that science and commerce students may have about the semester system could be addressed. Accurate information and evidence about the effectiveness of semester system and how it can be beneficial for them could be provided as well.
4. Role models from the science and commerce fields who have excelled under the semester system could be showcased. This can inspire other students and help change their perception.
5. Additional support for science and commerce students who may struggle with the semester system could be provided. This can include tutoring, academic support services, and additional resources and materials.
6. Involving science and commerce students in the decision-making process while practising the semester system will help them feel empowered and invested in the system.
7. By employing these strategies, institutions can help change the perceptions of science and commerce students towards semester system in a positive way. This will help foster a more inclusive and collaborative learning environment, where all students can thrive and reach their full potential.

5.3.1 GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Student-teacher ratio need to be maintained as suggested by UGC. A lower student-teacher ratio means that each student gets more personalized attention from the teacher. This can help students to clarify their doubts, get feedback on their performance, and receive guidance for academic and personal growth which will lead to better academic outcomes and higher levels of student satisfaction. It will also allow teachers to manage their classrooms more effectively, leading to fewer disciplinary issues and a more conducive learning environment. When teachers have fewer students to manage, they can create more interactive and engaging classroom activities that can help students to learn better and stay more engaged.

2. Regular training programs for teachers should be conducted by the appropriate authorities as this will help teachers stay up-to-date with the latest teaching methodologies, techniques, and technologies. This way, teachers will improve their teaching skills and provide better quality education to their students. Training will also help teachers learn effective classroom management strategies that will help reduce disciplinary issues and ensure that students are more engaged in the learning process. Regular training will also help teachers to adapt to changes in the education system, including changes in curriculum, assessment, and teaching practices, thus teachers will be well-prepared to meet the changing needs of their students and the education system.

3. Improved facilities such as computer labs, libraries, and laboratories can provide students with the resources they need to engage in effective learning. Access to technology and learning resources can enhance students' understanding of the subject matter and facilitate their academic success. A well-equipped library can attract quality faculty who are motivated to teach and conduct research. When faculty members have access to modern facilities and resources, they are more likely to remain engaged and committed to their work. Improving facilities can also help colleges to keep up with changing needs and trends in education. As technology and teaching methods evolve, colleges need to adapt and update their facilities to provide the best possible learning experiences to students.

4. Equalization in the standard of education system in all the colleges of Mizoram should be maintained so that mobility of students could be checked. This way, students can have the opportunity to receive quality education regardless of their geographic location or socio-economic status. If education standards are not equalized across colleges, students may face difficulty in transferring from one college to another. This can prevent students from pursuing their academic goals and limit their opportunities for success. By ensuring that all colleges maintain the same standards of education, students can be better equipped to enter the workforce. This can improve job opportunities for students, regardless of the college they attended.

5. Effective guidance and counselling service should be arranged in colleges for the students while choosing core papers. Choosing core papers is a critical decision that can impact a student's academic and professional career. Guidance and counselling services can help students make informed decisions when choosing core papers that align with their goals, interests, and abilities by providing them with information about various core papers, the potential career opportunities associated with each paper, and the requirements for pursuing those careers. Choosing core papers can be stressful and anxiety-inducing for some students. Therefore, effective guidance and counselling services can provide students with the support they need and reduce their anxiety and stress levels. Choosing the right core papers will also enable the students to be better equipped to succeed academically.

6. As and when problem arises in colleges, authorities, teachers and educators should have a positive attitude towards the semester system and should take up remedial measures in solution to the problem as soon as possible. This is important because it can help maintain academic integrity. When issues are ignored or not addressed, it can lead to academic dishonesty and compromise the quality of education. Positive attitude fosters a positive learning environment and this will help students feel more engaged, motivated, and supported in their academic pursuits. Taking up remedial measures will also enhance the reputation of the colleges. When students and stakeholders see that the college is proactive in addressing issues, it can improve their perception of the college and attract more students.

7. Seminars, Conferences, Workshops and Debates may be organized in colleges for effective development of semester system. This will provide opportunities for teachers and educators to enhance their skills and knowledge about the semester system. Besides, it will provide a platform for sharing and exchanging ideas about the semester system and encourage research and innovation in the field and lead to the development of new and effective strategies for managing the system. It will also bring together teachers, educators, and other stakeholders from different colleges and institutions and will promote collaboration and knowledge-sharing among individuals and institutions, leading to a more effective and efficient implementation of the semester system. By participating in debates, students can also develop critical thinking and analytical skills, while also gaining a deeper understanding of the benefits and challenges of the system.

8. Monitoring system for semester system should be strengthened because monitoring system helps ensure that colleges are complying with the regulations and guidelines set forth by the University. This can help ensure that the semester system is being implemented effectively and that students are receiving quality education. Monitoring system can also help identify issues or challenges that are hindering the effective implementation of the semester system and by identifying these issues, colleges can take corrective measures to address them and improve the overall quality of education. The monitoring system can also enhances transparency by providing stakeholders with information about the performance of colleges which will help build trust and confidence among stakeholders.

9. Feedback from teachers may be considered while framing the syllabus because teachers are experts in their respective subjects and have a deep understanding of the content and its relevance. Their feedback can provide valuable insights into the syllabus and ensure that it is comprehensive and up-to-date. Teachers' feedback can help ensure that the syllabus is aligned with the learning objectives of the course and that the syllabus covers all the necessary topics and skills required for the students to achieve the desired learning outcomes. Teachers' feedback can also ensure that the syllabus is relevant to the real world and addresses current issues and trends in the subject area and that the syllabus is flexible and can

be adapted to meet the needs of different students and classes. This can help ensure that the syllabus is relevant and effective for all students, regardless of their backgrounds and learning styles.

10. Teachers should be fair to minimize the chances of favouritism and bias in the semester system because fairness is an essential ethical standard that all teachers must uphold in their professional practice. Teachers are expected to act in the best interests of their students and provide them with a fair and equitable learning environment. Teachers who are fair and impartial are more likely to gain the trust and respect of their students. This can create a positive learning environment and foster a sense of belonging among students. Fairness can help minimize conflicts and disputes between students and teachers. When teachers are fair, students are less likely to feel aggrieved or unfairly treated.

11. Besides regular training programme, professional training should also be organised on semester system for teachers. Professional training can help teachers enhance their knowledge and skills in their respective subjects so that they stay updated with the latest developments in their field and improve their teaching effectiveness. Teachers would develop their technological skills, including the use of digital tools and online platforms for teaching and learning which will enable them to leverage technology to enhance student engagement and learning outcomes. Professional training can also help teachers advance their careers by developing new skills and expertise thus enabling them to take on new roles and responsibilities within their institutions and the wider education community.

12. Modern and updated teaching-learning aids must be made available in undergraduate institutions because in today's digital age, it is essential for undergraduate institutions to keep pace with technology. These aids can help institutions provide a relevant and up-to-date education to their students. It can help teachers become more effective in their teaching practices and help teachers convey information more clearly, illustrate complex ideas, and provide real-life examples of the concepts being taught. Smart board can also help facilitate a more effective and efficient learning process.

13. Teachers should be impartial in awarding sectional marks to students. Impartiality in marking ensures that all students are treated fairly and equitably. Students who have put in the same amount of effort should receive similar grades, irrespective of their personal characteristics or background. Grades should be based on the student's performance alone and not influenced by any other factors such as personal biases or emotions. Impartial marking helps maintain the credibility of the education system. If students perceive that their grades are not awarded fairly, it can undermine the trust and confidence they have in the education system. Impartial marking also ensures that the quality of education is maintained. If teachers engage in biased marking practices, it can lead to lower standards of education and suboptimal learning outcomes.

14. Teachers should encourage students to participate in co-curricular activities because it provides an opportunity for students to develop holistically, beyond their academic abilities. They can develop social, emotional, physical, and intellectual skills through participating in activities such as sports, music, drama, debate, and community service. Students would be able to interact with their peers, teachers, and members of the community and this can help students develop social skills such as teamwork, leadership, and communication. Co-curricular activities can provide students with skills and experiences that are valuable in the job market. Employers often look for candidates who have demonstrated leadership, teamwork, and communication skills, which can be developed through co-curricular activities.

15. Teachers should conduct descriptive tests during sessions because descriptive tests provide teachers with opportunities to provide feedback to students on their writing. This feedback can help students identify their strengths and weaknesses and improve their writing skills. Teachers also identify areas where students need additional support and tailor their instruction to meet students' individual needs. Descriptive tests can help students develop the skills they need to succeed in the real world. Effective communication skills, including writing skills, are essential for success in many careers and life situations.

16. For developing positive attitude among the students, there should be cooperation among policy makers, administrators and teachers. Teachers and administrators are role models for students, and when they exhibit positive attitudes, students are more likely to follow suit. By working together to model positive attitudes, policy makers, administrators, and teachers can create a culture of positivity and help students develop a positive outlook on life. Research has shown that students who have a positive attitude are more engaged in their learning and perform better academically. A positive attitude is also linked to better social and emotional wellbeing. By fostering a positive attitude among students, policy makers, administrators, and teachers can help create a supportive and inclusive environment where students feel valued, respected, and supported.

17. Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) system of evaluation should be made clear to the students. When students understand the CGPA system of evaluation, they are better able to track their academic performance and understand how their grades are calculated. By knowing that their grades will be used to calculate their CGPA, students may be more inclined to study harder and perform better in exams. Understanding the CGPA system can help students set academic goals for themselves. CGPA is often used as a basis for admission to higher education institutions. By understanding the CGPA system, students can plan their future education goals and work towards achieving the required CGPA to gain admission to the institution of their choice. Students can also assess the quality of education they are receiving. By comparing their own CGPA with the average CGPA of their peers or the CGPA of students in other institutions, students can gain a better understanding of the quality of education they are receiving.

18. Teachers should be fair and honest in their dealings with students, and they should not be exploited or influenced by anyone. Trust is an essential component of the teacher-student relationship. When teachers are fair and honest, they maintain the trust of their students and their parents. They also foster a positive learning environment. This is essential for effective teaching and learning. Teachers should not be influenced or exploited by anyone, including parents or other stakeholders. Conflicts of interest can compromise the fairness and integrity of the educational

process, and they can damage the reputation of the teacher and the school. Teachers are role models for their students. When teachers are fair and honest, they set an example for their students to follow. They teach their students the value of integrity, and they help them develop into responsible and ethical citizens.

19. The time duration for mid and final terms examinations should be according to the distribution of marks. If the distribution of marks for a particular exam is weighted towards a specific topic, then the time duration for that exam should reflect that weighting. This ensures that students have an adequate amount of time to complete all sections of the exam and to demonstrate their understanding of the topics covered. The time duration for an exam should be long enough to allow students to answer all the questions accurately and completely. If there is not enough time, students may feel rushed and may not be able to answer all questions to the best of their ability, which can impact the accuracy of the assessment. Students need adequate time to prepare for exams, including reviewing material and practicing problem-solving. If the time duration for an exam is not aligned with the distribution of marks, students may not be able to adequately prepare for all sections of the exam, which can negatively impact their performance. Ensuring that the time duration for mid and final term examination is aligned with the distribution of marks helps to maintain academic standards.

20. Colleges should develop rigorous and comprehensive assessment procedures that are aligned with the learning objectives of each course. Assessment procedures that are aligned with learning objectives help ensure that students are learning what they are supposed to learn. When assessments are designed to measure specific learning outcomes, teachers can determine whether students are meeting the course goals or not. Rigorous assessments can help teachers identify areas where their teaching may need improvement. If many students are struggling with a particular concept or skill, teachers can adjust their teaching methods and materials to better address that area. Rigorous and comprehensive assessments can help ensure fairness by providing students with an equal opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and skills.

5.4.0 EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study can help us understand the impact of the semester system on student learning outcomes and the effectiveness of this system in comparison to other academic systems. This information can be useful in modifications of the existing system.

The present study can help identify the challenges faced by students and teachers in the semester system, such as workload, time management, and assessment methods. This information can be used to design interventions to help students and teachers overcome these challenges.

The study can provide insights into teaching and learning strategies that are effective in the semester system. This information can be used to develop professional development programs for teachers or to modify existing teaching and learning strategies to better align with the semester system.

The present study can help identify factors that enhance student engagement and retention in the semester system. This information can be used to develop interventions to improve student engagement and retention rates, such as providing academic support services, improving the quality of teaching, or modifying the curriculum.

The study can help college teachers and administrators to schedule courses more efficiently. It can also help college teachers to modify their teaching methodologies to suit the needs and preferences of students and to adopt teaching strategies that are more effective in engaging and motivating students.

The study can help college teachers to assess student learning more accurately and to develop assessment tools that are aligned with the learning outcomes of each semester. The study can also help college administrators to provide better support services to students by identifying areas where students may need additional support and develop programs to address those needs.

5.5.0 SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH:

The following are the suggestions for further research:

1. Research work can be conducted on the problems faced by the teachers and students in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram under semester system.
2. The perception of Post Graduate students towards semester system in Mizoram can be studied.
3. The impact of perception under semester system on the academic performance of students can be studied.
4. The perception of undergraduate college students towards semester system of examination can be studied in relation to the socio-economic background of the students.

References:

Akhtar, P. R. (1980). *A critical study of the semester system in selected universities in India* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

Bista, M. (2016). *Opinion of teachers towards semester system in mathematics education*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan University. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1489

Chaliha, M. & Gogoi, P. K. (2019). A study on attitude towards semester system of students at the undergraduate level of general degree course. *Online Journal of Multidisciplinary Subjects, 12*(4), 479-484. http://www.researchguru.net/volume/Volume%2012/Issue%204/RG63.pdf

Dangi, N. (2016). *Students' attitude towards semester system implementation* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan university. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1598

Das, A. (2018). Attitude of teacher trainees towards semester system in West Bengal. *International Journal of Management, Technology and Engineering, 8*(7), 1545-1551. http://www.ijamtes.org/gallery/166.july%20ijmte%20-%20853.pdf

Deuri, C. (2015). Attitude towards choice based credit system of the postgraduate level students in higher education: A study on Gauhati University. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Science Society and Culture, 1*(2), 115–122. https://www.academia.edu/20119082/Attitude_towards_Choice_Based_Credit_System_of_Post_Graduate_Level_Students_in_Higher_Education_a_Study_on_Gauhati_University

Garcha, P. S. (2016). Attitude of pre service teacher trainees toward semester system: Role of stream. *GHG Journal of Sixth Thought, 3*(2), 54-57. http://www.ghgcollegesadhar.org/files/education/journal/j_12_9_2016.pdf

Garcha, P. S. (2017). Role of gender on attitude of teacher trainees toward semester system. *International Journal of Education, 7,* 61-65. http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.17195.28968

Haseena, S. & Reddy, L. K. (2012). Attitude of post graduate students towards semester system. *International Journal of Scientific Research, 3*(2), 506-507. http://dx.doi.org/10.15373/22778179/FEB2014/168

Jat, M. S. (1970). *A study of teachers' attitude towards semester system* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Meerut University.

Lalrinsanga, B., Sailo, Z. & Lalhlimpuii (2021). Attitude of government Aizawl West College students towards semester system at college level. *Mizoram Educational Journal, 7*(3&4), 72-78.

Mahakur, S., Baral, R. & Meher, V. (2019). Perception of Teachers and Students towards the Implementation of Choice Based Credit System at Undergraduate Level. *Issues and Ideas in Education. 7*(1), 1-10. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342432822_Perception_of_Teachers_and_Students_towards_the_Implementation_of_Choice_Based_Credit_System_at_Undergraduate_Level

Mal, S. & Mahato, U. (2020). Attitude Towards to Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) of Graduate Level Students in Higher Education: A Study on Degree Colleges under Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University in West Bengal. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research. 10*(6). http://s3-ap-southeast-1.amazonaws.com/ijmer/pdf/volume10/volume10-issue1(6)/3.pdf

Mehmood, T., Abdullah, Zaman, A. & Ali, S. (2014). Perceptions of students and teachers regarding semester system of examination in higher education in Pakistan. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences, 4*(8S), 122-126. https://www.textroad.com/pdf/JAEBS/J.%20Appl.%20Environ.%20Biol.%20Sci.,%204(8S)122-126,%202014.pdf

Reddy, B. Y. (2019). A study of semester system of engineering students with locality and father occupation. *GJRA- Global Journal for Research Analysis, 8*(7), 61-62. https://www.worldwidejournals.com/global-journal-for-research-analysis-GJRA/fileview/July_2019_1562331955_8707628.pdf

Tong, P. S. (1977). *A Study of Pre-University Student and Semester System in Thailand* [Unpublished master's thesis]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, one of the most pressing issues in the world of higher education has been the need for a fundamental shift in its underlying concepts and philosophies. Courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels have stayed constant for a very long time, accompanied by out-dated teaching techniques. All of this necessitates urgency in terms of flexibility, innovation, and new educational methodologies. Modernization, fundamental improvements in the teaching and learning processes, and much needed reforms in subject matter can go a long way toward bringing our higher education in line with the needs of a rapidly industrializing society. In this context, the semester system of higher education is considered as a suitable means of accomplishing the society's future goals. The semester system is one of the most popular educational structures in higher education. According to Pathak and Rahman (2013), the main goal of the semester system is "to focus on continuous assessment system and regular monitoring of students' progress, setting comprehensive and in-depth learning environment to build capacity of learners by developing required knowledge, skills, and attitudes to become an efficient and effective diversified citizen."

The semester system is the result of contemporary research in the realm of education. The term "semester system" refers to the division of a calendar year into two sessions, each lasting six months. In other words, a semester is a six-month period during which teaching activities are carried out. In a semester system, the final examination is conducted six months after the course has begun. In this arrangement, exams are therefore administered every other year rather than annually. It is now evident that the term "semester" refers to the separation of the academic year into two sections, each of which has its own set of course offerings. The semester-based academic year can occasionally be divided into three or four quarters, or trimesters.

At present many of the Indian universities have adopted the semester system as a progressive measure in undergraduate as well as post-graduate classes. The University Grants Commission had appointed a committee of few experts to give their ideas regarding the semester system. On the basis of the opinions of these

experts, UGC published a brochure entitled as 'Principles and Mechanics of the Semester System (1971)' for the sake of guiding the universities which are desirous to adopt the semester system. Experts felt that introducing the semester system in a planned and systematic manner would modernize and improve teaching and learning, as well as bring about much-needed reform and flexibility in course material and evaluation methodologies. Mizoram University has implemented the semester system for all of its affiliated colleges since 2011-2012.

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

The semester system of education has generated a lot of discussion in Indian universities. Administrators of higher education, professors, students, and members of the general public seem to have doubts about the relevance and success of the semester system, whether intentionally or unconsciously. Researchers have focused on identifying and studying the most significant components of the semester system, including its advantages and disadvantages, significance, and applicability. The field of education is one that is constantly subject to analysis and enquiry. Investigations of various studies reveal that no previous study has been undertaken on the perceptions of college teachers and students in Mizoram with reference to the semester system. To gain an in-depth understanding of the semester system in Mizoram, a thorough investigation is required.

The semester system was designed to provide students with opportunity for continuous assessment, evaluation, and feedback. This was the primary motivation behind the system's implementation. Throughout the academic year, students are required to participate for a longer amount of time, which helps them develop the habits of regular study, punctuality, and work ethic. While the benefits of the semester system are clear, there is still a long way to go before it can be successfully implemented in a nation like India, where resources and opportunity are scarce. The current research aims to better understand how students and teachers view the semester system in terms of their familiarity with the programme, its efficacy, and the challenges they confront during implementation.

Teachers and students are selected as the subject of this study because they are the primary stakeholders and benefactors of semester system implementation.

According to Pathak and Rahman (2013), the effectiveness of any system's execution is largely dependent on the level of beneficiary satisfaction. This indicates that measuring the perceptions of teachers and students is one of the measures of the semester system's effectiveness. . In order to have a comprehensive picture of the semester system, it is considered essential to study the perception of college teachers and students on the semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram. With this in mind, the following research questions have been formulated.

1. Has there been any scale constructed to find out the perception of stakeholders on semester system?
2. Do teachers and students perceive the semester system favourably?
3. Is there any difference in teachers' perception on semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' status, stream of course and teaching experience?
4. Is there any difference in student's perception on semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study?

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem under investigation reads as 'Perception of College Teachers and Students on the Semester System in Undergraduate Colleges of Mizoram'.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF THE TERMS USED IN THE TITLE

Perception: Perception in the present study refers to the way college teachers and students observe the different components of semester system such as General observation, Course of study, Evaluation, Method of teaching and Choice Based Credit System.

College teachers: For the present study, college teachers refer to the teachers teaching arts, science and commerce in undergraduate colleges under Mizoram University.

College students: College students for the present study includes those students studying arts, science or commerce in undergraduate colleges under Mizoram University.

Semester system: For the present study, semester system refers to the procedure where academic year is divided into two semesters of six months for the purpose of planning of academic work, delivery of teaching, evaluation and monitoring of the progress of the students. Semester system has been adopted by Mizoram University since 2011-2012.

Undergraduate college: For the present study, undergraduate college refers to those colleges/institutions under Mizoram University offering three years degree course in arts, science and commerce.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. ***Objective No.1:*** To construct and standardize teachers' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
2. ***Objective No.2:*** To construct and standardize students' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
3. ***Objective No.3:*** To find out teachers' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
4. ***Objective No.4:*** To compare teachers' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation, stream of course and teaching experience.
5. ***Objective No.5:*** To compare teachers' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation. Stream of course and teaching experience.
6. ***Objective No.6:*** To find out the students' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
7. ***Objective No.7:*** To compare students' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender**,** locale and stream of study.
8. ***Objective No.8:*** To compare students' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study.

HYPOTHESES

a) There is no significant difference in teachers' overall perception of semester system and different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' status, stream of course and teachers experience.

b) There is no significant difference in students' overall perception of semester system and different components of perception of semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A total of 80 reviews have been incorporated. There were 36 studies done in India and 44 from abroad. The review period ranges from 1970 to 2022.

METHODOLOGY

In the present study descriptive survey method has been adopted as it is to find out the perception of teachers and students on semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram; to compare the differences in the perception of teachers and students on semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram with reference to gender, locale, stream of study/course, teachers' designation and teaching experience.

POPULATION AND SAMPLES

The population of the study consist of all teachers and students teaching and studying in Undergraduate colleges of Mizoram. For the present study multistage random sampling technique is employed for collecting data. Colleges were randomly selected after which samples were randomly collected from the selected colleges. The sample consists of 221 college teachers and 823 college students. The following table – 1 shows the number of selected teachers and students sample based on different variables.

Table - 1

Number of selected sample of teachers and students based on different variables

Variables	Male	Female	Urban	Rural	Arts	Science	Commerce
Teachers N=221	104	117	143	78	113	76	32
Students N=823	451	372	252	571	435	183	205

TOOLS USED

For the present study, the following two tools were developed and standardized by the investigator:

(i) Teachers' perception scale on semester system.

(ii) Students' perception scale on semester system.

COLLECTION OF DATA

The perception scales were administered by the investigator through offline and online mode to the teachers and students. Google form was used for online mode. The investigator visited few colleges and obtained the required data after acquiring permission from the college Principals.

The data collected from the teachers and students were scrutinized and scored according to the scoring procedures. The scores obtained by each respondent were then entered in the tabulation sheet and these were statistically treated and analyzed.

MODE OF ANALYSIS

Keeping in view the objectives of the study, the investigator employed the following statistical techniques for analyzing the data.

Descriptive statistics such as the Mean, Standard deviation, percentages, z-score were employed to find out the nature of score distribution and for classifying the respondents into different categories.

Inferential statistics such as ‘t’ test and correlations were employed to find out the difference between the mean scores of different groups as well as for establishing validity and reliability of the constructed perception scale.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Objective No.1: To construct and standardize teachers’ perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.

Teachers’ perception scale on semester system was constructed and standardized. Initially 113 statements relating to semester system were collected which was narrowed down to 69 statements after it was given to experts. Then after

Item discrimination was done, the scale finally consists of 57 statements with 34 positive statements and 23 negative statements. The scale has five components (1) General observation (2) Course of study (3) Evaluation (4) Method of teaching (5) Choice Based Credit System. Reliability of the scale was established using the split half method and the reliability co-efficient turns out to be .90 (after applying Spearman Brown's formula) which is considered sufficient for the scale. Content validity was also established by giving the scale to ten experts in the field of education, and they all agreed on the validity of the content. Scoring was done on the basis of Likert's scoring pattern of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 for favourable statements and 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 for unfavourable statements. For establishing the norm, the score obtained from the perception scale was converted into z-score, and based on this, teachers were classified into seven categories from extremely favourable to extremely unfavourable perception.

Objective No.2: To construct and standardize students' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram

Students' perception scale on semester system was constructed and standardized. Initially 102 statements relating to semester system were collected which was narrowed down to 67 statements after it was given to experts. Then after Item discrimination was done, the scale finally consists of 27 statements with all the statements being positive. The scale has five components (1) General observation (2) Course of study (3) Evaluation (4) Method of teaching (5) Choice Based Credit System. Reliability of the scale was established using test retest method and the reliability co-efficient turns out to be .801 which is considered sufficient for the scale. Content validity was also established by giving the scale to ten experts in the field of education, and they all agreed on the validity of the content. Scoring was done on the basis of Likert's scoring pattern of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 since all the statements were positive statements. For establishing the norm, the score obtained from the perception scale was converted into z-score, and based on this, students were classified into seven categories from extremely favourable to extremely unfavourable perception.

Objective No.3: To find out teachers' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.

It was found that (38.46%) of teachers had moderate perception on semester system. There were more teachers who perceive semester system more favourably than those who perceive it unfavourably. Only few teachers had extremely favourable perception as well as extremely unfavourable perception.

Objective No.4: To compare teachers' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation, stream of course and teaching experience

It was found that:

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' overall perception on semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' overall perception on semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' overall perception on semester system.

iv) Science teachers had a more favourable overall perception on semester system than commerce teachers.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' overall perception on semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable overall perception on semester system than commerce teachers.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' overall perception on semester system.

viii) Short experienced teachers had a more favourable overall perception on semester system than long experienced teachers.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' overall perception on semester system.

Objective No.5: To compare teachers' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation. Stream of course and teaching experience

The findings are:

(A) General observation component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the general observation component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

viii) Short experienced teachers had a more favourable perception than long experienced teachers in the general observation component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced and long experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

(B) Course of study component of semester system.

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the course of study component of semester system

iv) Science teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the course of study component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the course of study component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

viii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

(C) Evaluation component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

iv) Science teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the evaluation component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the evaluation component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and

middle experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

viii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

(D) Method of teaching component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the method of teaching component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

viii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

(E) Choice Based Credit System component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

iii) Assistant professors had a more favourable perception than associate professors in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

vi) There is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

viii) Short experienced teachers had a more favourable perception than long experienced teachers in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Objective No.6: To find out the students' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.

It was found that (49.45%) of college students had moderate perception on semester system. There were more students who had favourable perception than

students who had unfavourable perception. There were only few students who had extremely favourable perception as well as extremely unfavourable perception on semester system.

Objective No.7: To compare students' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender, locale and stream of study

It was found that:

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' overall perception on semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the overall perception on semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' overall perception on semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the overall perception on semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the overall perception on semester system.

Objective No.8: To compare students' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study.

The findings are:

(A) General observation component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the general observation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the general observation component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the general observation component of semester system.

(B) Course of study components of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the course of study component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the course of study component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than the commerce students in the course of study component of semester system.

(C) Evaluation component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the evaluation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the evaluation component of semester system.

(D) Method of teaching component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than the urban students in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than the science students in the method of teaching component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than the commerce students in the method of teaching component of semester system.

(E) Choice Based Credit System components of semester system

i) Male students had a more favourable perception than female students in the choice based credit system of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the choice based credit system of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

DISCUSSION ON THE FINDINGS

Some of the findings of the study are discussed as follows:

Teachers' perception on semester system:

1. With respect to teachers' level of perception, findings showed that the bulk of the teachers had moderate/average perception on semester system. Similar to the present findings, Garcha (2016) also found that teachers had average perception on semester system. Contrary to this finding, Jat (1970); Akhtar (1980); Mehmood et.al. (2014); Bista (2016) found that teachers had favourable perception on semester system. Dangi (2016) also found that teachers had unfavourable perception on semester system. The finding of the present study that teachers had Moderate/average level of perception on semester system is not surprizing because as a rule people tend to be average in most human attributes be it intelligence, attitude, perception etc.

2. With respect to overall perception as well as all the components of semester system, it was found that there was no significant difference between the male and female college teachers' perception on semester system. In agreement to the present findings, Garcha (2017) and Das (2018) also found no significant difference in teachers' perception on semester system. But, contrary to this finding, Tong (1977) found that male teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system than the female teachers. The people living in Mizoram are known as the Mizo. Mizo people are a close-knit community with not much sex discrimination or socioeconomic distinction in the society. Perhaps this may affect the perception of the teachers which gives rise to the present finding that there is no significant difference in the teachers' perception on semester system based on gender. Besides, males and females from childhood to adulthood are more alike than different on most psychological variables. Semester system is an academic term which means division of an academic year in two parts. Therefore, even if there are no significant differences in the perception of male and female teachers on this matter, it is understandable.

3. With reference to overall and different components of semester system, it was also found that no significant difference was found between teachers from urban and rural areas in their perception on semester system. Colleges in Mizoram are all situated in urban areas in all the districts, mostly in the capitals of the districts. Therefore, teachers teaching in colleges of Mizoram, even if they hail from rural areas had the experience of living in urban areas and it is believed that they would be psychologically influenced by their familiarity of urban life. Consequently, their perception on semester system may not be so different from teachers from urban locality. Besides, semester system is merely a term which refers to the splitting of the academic year into two parts. So, the present finding that there is no significant difference in teachers' perception on semester system based on locality is not without a reason.

4. With reference to overall as well as course of study components and evaluation components of semester system, it was found that science teachers view semester system more favourably than the commerce teachers. The plausible reason

why commerce teachers perceive semester system more unfavourably than the science teachers could possibly be because commerce incudes papers like Financial Accounting, Business Laws, Economics, Taxation, Auditing, Cost Accounting, among others which needs plenty of time for completion of the course and since semester system had shorter duration, perhaps commerce teachers find it difficult to complete the course in time.

5. It was also found that the arts teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the commerce teachers in overall and most of the dimension of semester system. Commerce stream is not as popular as the Arts stream in Mizoram which is evident from the fact that fewer students opted for the commerce stream. Perhaps arts teachers find that it is easier to manage the students in semester system because interaction between teachers and students increases in semester system and teachers have more information about the students. This type of interaction was not possible in the annual system as the number of arts students were so large. Now, in semester system, project work, seminars, field study etc. were introduced which brings the teachers and students closer to each other. Since there is lesser number of students in commerce stream, even before semester system was introduced, commerce teachers perhaps did not experience much difference after semester system was introduced. Hence, this could be the reason why arts teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system than the commerce teachers.

6. With reference to overall as well as general observation component and choice based credit system component of semester system, it was found that short experienced teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system than the long experienced teachers. The finding of Tong (1977) oppose the present finding as Tong found that teachers' experience did not play any significant role in their attitude towards semester system. In the present study, short experienced teachers are those teachers having less than ten years of experience, and long experienced teachers are those teachers having more than twenty years of teaching experience. Now, short experienced teachers often find it difficult to plan and organize class teaching, but the introduction of semester system brings with it the seminar, assignment, project work, CBCS etc. which the students had to compulsorily undertake releasing the

short experienced teacher from making plans for class teaching. Possibly, this may be the reason why short experienced teacher viewed the semester system more favourably than the long experienced teachers.

7. The present study also found that assistant professors had a more favourable perception than associate professors in the choice based credit system component of semester system. It is a known fact that CBCS increased the workload of the teachers because of too much internal testing and evaluation exercises. Associate professors, because of their designation had more administrative responsibilities in the colleges apart from being involved with teaching, testing and evaluation exercises while the assistant professors have less responsibility. This may perhaps be the rationale for the present finding that assistant professors had a more favourable perception on semester system than the associate professors.

Students' perception on semester system:

8. With respect to students' level of perception, findings showed that maximum number of the students' had Moderate/average perception on semester system. Contrary to this finding, Mehmood (2014), Dangi (2016), Lalrinsanga et.al (2021) found that students had favourable views on semester system. One can conclude that the typical person is average, but this does not mean that the typical person is average in everything. Chances are that we are all better at some things than the bulk of the population, then again, we are all worse at other things than the bulk of the population, and we are all within one standard deviation of the average in majority of our life's attributes. Having Moderate/average perception is therefore quite normal.

9. It was found that with reference to overall and all components of semester system, rural students had a more favourable perception on semester system than the urban students. Reddy (2019) also found similar results. Now, majority of the under-graduate student in Mizoram hail from rural areas who got themselves admitted to colleges mostly situated in urban areas. In semester system students get more leaves and vacations as they get a semester break after the final examination of every semester. This is very advantageous for rural students as they were able to visit their home village twice every year. Consequently, this may be the probable cause for

rural students having a more favourable perception on semester system than the urban students.

10. It was also found that with respect to overall perception and all components of semester system except evaluation component, the arts students had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the science students. Contrary to the current findings, Haseena & Reddy's (2012) and Chaliha & Gogoi's (2019) finding shows that science students had a more favourable view on semester system than the arts students. Generally, students having good results in HSLC often take up the science stream, while arts stream is usually taken by low achieving students. Now, in semester system, if a learner fails in one or more papers, He/she can repeat the particular paper in which they fail. They do not need to repeat all the papers in a given semester. Now, this is very advantageous for many of the students from the arts stream who often fail in one or two subjects. The science students ordinarily do not need to repeat papers since many of them do not fail. Therefore, the reason why arts students favour the semester system more than the science students can be accounted to this.

11. The present study found that with respect to overall perception and all components of semester system, the arts students had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the commerce students. Commerce as a stream of education is a study of trade and business activities such as the exchange of goods and services from producer to final consumer. Conversely, the study of Arts or Humanities enables a student to develop critical, argumentative and creative skills. So, one can say that commerce defies comprehension, creativity and analysis while Arts is nothing but a culmination of all those. Now, in semester system, students were given assignments, seminars, project work etc. which really enhances critical and creative skills of the arts students. Thus, the probable reason why arts students had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the commerce students could be because the method of teaching employed in semester system enhances creativity of the arts students.

12. 'Male students had a more favourable perception than female students in the

choice based credit system of semester system' is another finding of this study. Deury (2015) found similar result, however, contrary to this finding, Mahakur et.al.(2019), Mal and Mahato (2021), found no significant difference in the observation of male and female students on Choice based credit system. CBCS makes education broad based and at par with global standards. Perhaps male students appreciate the idea that CBCS is at par with global standard that their perception on CBCS is more favourable compared to female students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Keeping in view of all the findings, the following are the recommendations for the improvement of semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram:

1. Student-teacher ratio need to be maintained as suggested by UGC.
2. Regular training programs for teachers should be conducted by the appropriate authorities.
3. Facilities such as computer, library books, furniture and laboratory for conducting teaching-learning and practical have to be improved in most of the colleges.
4. Equalization in the standard of education system in all the colleges of Mizoram should be maintained so that mobility of students could be checked.
5. Effective guidance and counseling service should be arranged in colleges for the students while choosing core papers.
6. As and when problem arises in colleges; authorities, teachers and educators should have a positive attitude towards the system and should take up remedial measures in solution to the problem as soon as possible.
7. To organise Seminars, Conferences, Workshops and Debates for effective development of semester system.
8. Strengthening the monitoring system effectively for semester system.
9. Feedback from teachers should be considered while framing the syllabus.
10. Teachers should be fair to minimise the chances of favouritism and biases.
11. Besides regular training programme, professional training should also be organised on semester system for teachers.

12. Modern update teaching learning aids must be made available in the institution.
13. Impartiality of teachers in awarding sectional marks to students.
14. Teachers should encourage students to participate in co-curricular activities.
15. To improve students writing skills, teachers should conduct descriptive tests during session.
16. Co-operation among the policy makers, administrators and teachers to develop positive attitude among the students.
17. Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) system of evaluation should be made clear to the students to be aware on their performance in examination.
18. Teachers should be fair and honest and not be exploited or influenced by anyone.
19. The time duration for mid and final terms examinations should be according to the distribution of marks.

SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The following are the suggestions for further research:

1. Research work can be conducted on the problems faced by the teachers and students in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram under semester system.
2. The perception of Post Graduate students towards semester system in Mizoram can be studied.
3. The impact of perception under semester system on the academic performance of students can be studied.
4. A comparison of the annual system with the semester system can be studied in different North Eastern states.
5. Whether National Education Policy 2020 can be successfully incorporated in the semester system can also be taken up as a field of study.

References:

Akhtar, P. R. (1980). *A critical study of the semester system in selected universities in India* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

Bista, M. (2016). *Opinion of teachers towards semester system in mathematics education* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan University. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1489

Chaliha, M., & Gogoi, P. K. (2019). A study on attitude towards semester system of students at the undergraduate level of general degree course. *Online Journal of Multidisciplinary Subjects, 12*(4), 479-484. http://www.researchguru.net/volume/Volume%2012/Issue%204/RG63.pdf

Dangi, N. (2016). *Students' attitude towards semester system implementation* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan university. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1598

Deuri, C. (2015). Attitude towards choice based credit system of the postgraduate level students in higher education: A study on Gauhati University. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Science Society and Culture, 1*(2), 115–122. https://www.academia.edu/20119082/Attitude_towards_Choice_Based_Credit_System_of_Post_Graduate_Level_Students_in_Higher_Education_a_Study_on_Gauhati_University

Garcha, P. S. (2016). Attitude of pre service teacher trainees toward semester system: Role of stream. *GHG Journal of Sixth Thought, 3*(2), 54-57. http://www.ghgcollegesadhar.org/files/education/journal/j_12_9_2016.pdf

Garcha, P. S. (2017). Role of gender on attitude of teacher trainees toward semester system. *International Journal of Education, 7,* 61-65. http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.17195.28968

Haseena, S., & Reddy, L. K. (2012). Attitude of post graduate students towards semester system. *International Journal of Scientific Research, 3*(2), 506-507. http://dx.doi.org/10.15373/22778179/FEB2014/168

Jat, M. S. (1970). *A study of teachers' attitude towards semester system* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Meerut University

Lalrinsanga, B., Sailo, Z., & Lalhlimpuii (2021). Attitude of government Aizawl West College students towards semester system at college level. *Mizoram Educational Journal, 7*(3&4), 72-78.

Mahakur, S., Baral, R., & Meher, V. (2019). Perception of teachers and students towards the implementation of Choice Based Credit System at undergraduate level. *Issues and Ideas in Education. 7*(1), 1-10. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342432822_Perception_of_Teachers_and_Students_towards_the_Implementation_of_Choice_Based_Credit_System_at_Undergraduate_Level

Mal, S., & Mahato, U. (2020). Attitude towards to Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) of graduate level students in higher education: A study on degree colleges under Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University in West Bengal. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research. 10*(6). http://s3-ap-southeast-1.amazonaws.com/ijmer/pdf/volume10/volume10-issue1(6)/3.pdf

Mehmood, T., Abdullah., Zaman, A., & Ali, S. (2014). Perceptions of students and teachers regarding semester system of examination in higher education in Pakistan. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences, 4*(8S), 122-126. https://www.textroad.com/pdf/JAEBS/J.%20Appl.%20Environ.%20Biol.%20Sci.,%204(8S)122-126,%202014.pdf

Pathak, T., & Rahman, M.A. (2013). Perception of students and teachers towards semester system: A study in some selected degree colleges of Nagaon town of Nagaon District of Assam. *Journal of Education and Practice, 4*(1), 84-91. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234633876.pdf.

Reddy, B. Y. (2019). A study of semester system of engineering students with locality and father occupation. *GJRA- Global Journal for Research Analysis, 8*(7), 61-62. https://www.worldwidejournals.com/global-journal-for-research-analysis-GJRA/fileview/July_2019_1562331955_8707628.pdf

Tong, P. S. (1977). *A study of pre-university student and semester system in Thailand* [Unpublished master's thesis]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX – I

TEACHERS' PERCEPTION SCALE ON SEMESTER SYSTEM

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Name : _____

College : _____

Designation : _____

Gender : **Male** ☐ **Female** ☐

Locale : **Rural** ☐ **Urban** ☐

Stream : **Arts** ☐ **Science** ☐ **Commerce** ☐

Teaching Experience : **1) Below 10 years** ☐

2) Between 10 - 20 years ☐

3) Above 20 years ☐

INSTRUCTIONS

Below is a list of statements aimed to study how you perceive the semester system. Please select the option on any one of the five boxes given below of each statement. If you strongly agree, select the option below **Strongly Agree**; if you agree, select the option and mark below **Agree**; if you are undecided or uncertain, select the option under **Undecided**; if you disagree, select under **Disagree** and if you strongly disagree, then select **Strongly Disagree**. Please respond to every item appropriately. Since this scale will be used for research purpose only, your responses will be kept confidential. Therefore, your frank and sincere answers will be very much appreciated.

ROSY LALRINSANGI
Research Scholar
Department of Education
MIZORAM UNIVERSITY

Sl. No.	Teachers' perception on general observation component of semester system	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	The average achievement of students on semester system is higher than annual system.					
2	*Students are overburdened with different activities in semester system.					
3	Semester system gives the students the opportunity to increase the depth of subject knowledge.					
4	Teachers have more information about their students in semester system.					
5	Semester system helps to increase teacher and student interaction.					
6	*Semester system does not help the students to gain mastery knowledge in their respective subject.					
7	Semester system develops confidence and communication skills among the students.					
8	*Semester system does not help to increase overall performance of students compared to annual system.					
9	It is easy to manage regular class in semester system.					
10	Courses can be completed within the allocated time in semester system.					
11	Policies and guidelines are clear when semester system was implemented.					
12	*In the semester system, teachers feel more stressed with more workload compared to annual system.					
13	Semester system develops research culture that helps students to improve their academic writing skills.					
14	Semester system improves the present day quality of education.					
15	*Competitive spirit is reduced among the students in semester system.					
16	There is a pedagogical shift from annual system to the semester system.					

17	*Students are made examination orientated in semester system as compared to the annual system.					
Sl. No.	**Teachers' perception on course of study component of semester system.**	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Undecided**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
18	The prescribed course of study in the semester system is relevant to the present needs.					
19	*Course distribution for each semester is not equalized.					
20	*The courses in semester system does not give enough scope for co-curricular activities for the students.					
21	The prescribed course in semester system gives provision for field work and project work.					
22	*The prescribed course in semester system is exhaustive.					
23	Prescribed course in semester system will help students prepare for different kinds of entrance examination.					
24	The courses in semester system will help the students become the best that he/she can possibly be.					
25	*The prescribed course in semester system does not have a clear objectives.					
26	Prescribed courses in semester system provides for the logical sequence of subject matter.					
27	*Time allotted to cover the whole course under semester system is very less.					
Sl. No.	**Teachers' perception on evaluation component of semester system.**	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Undecided**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
28	*Students develops anxiety because of recurrent examinations in semester system.					
29	Continuous and comprehensive evaluation of semester system ensures transparency in evaluation.					
30	*The system of evaluation in semester system limits the time of teaching for the teachers.					

31	Internal tests given in semester system assists the students prepare for their end semester examination.					
32	*Grading system is not an accurate representation of the performance and knowledge that the students gained.					
33	*External assessment is not reliable in that it only covers a part or partial course of study.					
34	Students' study habit improved in semester system because of internal assessment.					
35	Internal assessment used in semester system is reliable enough to measure students' academic achievement.					
Sl. No.	**Teachers' perception on method of teaching component of semester system.**	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Undecided**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
36	Semester System is more conducive for teaching and learning compared to the annual system.					
37	In semester system, power point presentations are more frequently used to promote students' learning.					
38	Teaching-learning is more organized in semester system compared to the annual system.					
39	*The scope for field work becomes less under semester system.					
40	Presentation of seminar papers employed in semester system promotes better presentation skills to the students.					
41	Assignments and frequent class tests given to the students in semester system improves students' reading and writing skills.					
42	*Regular use of Lecture method by teachers turn off students' motivation to learn.					
43	Semester system offers students more productive learning environment.					
44	*Students learn much less content in semester system compared to annual system.					
45	Seminars organized under semester system gives better opportunity for discussion among the students.					

46	*To help students' learning, discussion method are rarely employed by teachers in semester system.					
47	Students are more motivated to learn in semester system compared to annual system.					
48	Tutorials are useful in helping students learn what they did not understand in the class.					
Sl. No.	**Teachers' perception on Choice Based Credit System component of semester system.**	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Undecided**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
49	Choice Based Credit System provided under semester system is essential for higher education in the present context.					
50	*CBCS used in semester system is complicated, especially in view of shortage of teachers or infrastructures.					
51	CBCS under semester system permits standardization and comparability of the educational programmes across the country.					
52	CBCS provided under semester system offers opportunity to students to transfer the credit earned at one institution to another.					
53	CBCS used in semester system allows learners to choose according to their own learning needs, interests and aptitudes.					
54	*Numbers of courses are imposed in the CBCS provided under semester system, which overburdens the students.					
55	*The CBCS provided under semester system do not really give freedom to the students to choose subject of their choice.					
56	*In CBCS, much weightage is given to internal assessment resulting in lack of seriousness in examination among the students.					
57	Under semester system, stress and anxiety of learners can be reduced through CBCS.					

APPENDIX – II

STUDENTS' PERCEPTION SCALE ON SEMESTER SYSTEM

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Name : _____

College : _____

Semester : _____

Gender : **Male** ☐ **Female** ☐

Locale : **Rural** ☐ **Urban** ☐

Stream : **Arts** ☐ **Science** ☐ **Commerce** ☐

Age : **1) Below 16 years** ☐

2) Between 16 - 18 years ☐

3) Above 18 years ☐

INSTRUCTIONS

Below is a list of statements aimed to study how you perceive the semester system. Please select the option on any one of the five boxes given below of each statement. If you strongly agree, select the option below **Strongly Agree**; if you agree, select the option and mark below **Agree**; if you are undecided or uncertain, select the option under **Undecided**; if you disagree, select under **Disagree** and if you strongly disagree, then select **Strongly Disagree**. Please respond to every item appropriately. Since this scale will be used for research purpose only, your responses will be kept confidential. Therefore, your frank and sincere answers will be very much appreciated.

ROSY LALRINSANGI
Research Scholar
Department of Education
MIZORAM UNIVERSITY

Sl. No.	Students' perception on general observation component of semester system	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	Semester system has promoted the standard and knowledge structure of the students.					
2	Teachers are more active and regular in Semester system.					
3	Semester system makes the students more competitive.					
4	75% compulsory students attendance in semester system is fair enough.					
5	Semester system offers more opportunities for the students to have close interaction with their teachers.					
6	Students get Constructive feedback from teachers in semester system.					
Sl. No.	**Students' perception on course of study component of semester system**	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Undecided**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
7	The prescribed theoretical and practical aspect of the course in semester system is satisfactory.					
8	The prescribed course in semester system is flexible enough to provide students' interest and needs.					
9	There is a provision for project work and field study in the prescribed course in semester system.					
Sl. No.	**Students' perception on evaluation component of semester system**	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Undecided**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
10	It is easy to understand the CGPA system used in semester system.					
11	In semester system, teachers show scripts of internal test and assignments with marks regularly to students.					
12	Internal tests in semester system helps the students prepare for final examination.					
13	Internal assessment in semester system improves the students' study habits.					
14	Continuous and comprehensive evaluation in semester system ensures transparency in evaluation.					

15	Grade system removes unhealthy competition among high achievers.					
Sl. No.	**Students' perception on method of teaching component of semester system**	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Undecided**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
16	Assignments and frequent class tests in semester system develop students reading and writing skills.					
17	Seminars in semester System provides better presentation skills.					
18	Semester system offers students more productive learning environment.					
19	Learning is more organized in semester system.					
20	Students are more motivated to learn in semester system.					
21	Learning is more enjoyable in semester system.					
22	Seminars under semester system gives better opportunity for discussion among the students.					
23	In semester system, audio-visual aids are used to promote students' learning.					
Sl. No.	**Students' perception on choice based credit system component of semester system**	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Undecided**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
24	CBCS under semester system provides opportunity to students to transfer the credit earned at one institution to another.					
25	CBCS in semester system increases students' interaction with the teachers.					
26	Choice Based Credit System used in semester system is essential for higher education in the present context.					
27	CBCS used in semester system helps upgrade the educational and occupational aspiration of the upcoming generation.					

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abro, S. G. (2014, January 27). *Critical analysis of semester and annual system.* Wordpress. https://sheerazgul.wordpress.com/2014/01/27/research-critical-analysis-of-semester-and-annual-system/.

Abrol, M.(2016). Emerging trends of privatization of education. *International Journal of Education Administration,* 8(1), 1-6.

Aggarwal, J.C. (2012). *Development of education system in India*. New Delhi: Shipra Publications.

Aggarwal, J.C., & Gupta, S. (2010). *Right to education and revitalizing education*. Shipra Publications.

Al-Dossary, A. S., & Esmail, A. M. S. (2020). Comparison of the absence of the trainees in quarter and semester system. *Arab Journal for Scientific Publishing (AJSP), 2,* 346-362. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343817961_Comparison_of_the_Absence_of_the_Trainees_in_Quarter_and_Semester_Systems?enrichId=rgreq-1eb6d36a76f2c8ab96c47b46efc14cef-XXX&enrichSource=Y292ZXJQYWdlOzM0MzgxNzk2MTtBUzo5Mjc1NzM2NjQwOTIxNjFATU5ODE2MjIwMzY3OQ%3D%3D&el=1_x_2&_esc=publicationCoverPdfY292ZXJQYWdlOzM0MzgxNzk2MTtBUzo5Mjc1NzM2NjQwOTIxNjFAMTU5ODE2MjIwMzY3OQ%3D%3D&el=1_x_2&_esc=publicationCoverPdf.

Aithal, P. S., & Kumar, P. M. S. (2016). Analysis of choice based credit system in higher education. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Modern Education (IJERME), 1*(1), 278-284. http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161046.

Akhtar, B., & Hashmi, M. A. (2021). Exploring Problems Faced by University Students Regarding Semester System. *Global Social Sciences Review, VI*(I), 564-571. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2021(VI-I).57.

Akhtar, P. R. (1980). *A critical study of the semester system in selected universities in India* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

Akhund, S. A. (2021). Medical students' academic achievement differences in annual and semester-based examination systems: Anatomy subject scores as an example. *Cureus, 13*(11), e19775. https://dx.doi.org/10.7759%2Fcureus.19775.

Alam, K. & Halder, U.K. (2016). The emergence and impact of privatization of higher education: Indian overview. *Journal of Education and Development,* 6 (12).

Alkin, M.C. & King, J.A. (2016). The historical development of evaluation use. *American Journal of Evaluation,* 37(4), 568-579. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308124660_The_Historical_Development_of_Evaluation_Use

Altbach, P. G. (2001). Measuring academic progress: The course–credit system in American Higher Education. *Higher Education Policy*, *14*(1), 37–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0952-8733(00)00026-x.

Anuradha (2021). *What is the difference between semester and annual system.* Pediaa. https://pediaa.com/what-is-the-difference-between-semester-and-annual-system/

Aslam, H. D., Younis, A., Sheik, A. A., Maher, M. & Abbasi, Z. A. (2012). Analysing factors affecting students' satisfaction regarding semester system in universities of Pakistan. *Journal of American Science, 8*(10), 163-170. https://www.academia.edu/download/32344637/JOURNAL_OF_AMERICAN_SCIENCE.pdf

AyubBuzdar, M., Ali, A., Akhtar, A. H., Maqbool, S. & Nadeem, M. (2013). Assessment of students' learning achievements under semester system in Pakistan. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research, 3*(6), 79-86. https://www.textroad.com/pdf/JBASR/J.%20Basic.%20Appl.%20Sci.%20Res.,%203(6)79-86,%20 2013.pdf.

Azam, M., Ishaq, R., Iqbal, Q., Jan, S. U., Mengal, S. U., & Saleem, F. (2020). Frequency of anxiety, depression and stress among pharmacy undergraduates of annual and semester system: A cohort-based comparison. *Journal of Pharmacy Practice and Community Medicine, 6*(3), 35-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.5530/jppcm.2020.3.12

Bakhsh, K. Naz, B. A. & JavedIqbal (2021). Semester system practices in public sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Ilkogretim Online, 20*(5), 3032-3038. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=13053515&AN=150195530&h=ZOsUXSuCgXbWrXDuoXYLaRcIHo%2BoP7G%2Bv6VlKWr%2FsvMdH9rIsCCG8tU6FUSOP7d82ZNcbKDRfrLKQiQqUw4fYA%3D%3D&crl=c.

Baral, U. N., Chhetri, T. B., & Subedi, G. (2019). Semester system and its implementation at Prithvi Narayan Campus: What do postgraduate students say. *Prithvi Journal of Research and Innovation, 1,* 23-38. http://dx.doi.org/10.3126/pjri.v1i0.29886

Basharat, A., Qamar, M. M., Arshad, M., Anwar, H., Bashir, N., Anwar, T., Khalid, S., Batool, J., Zubair, H., Naz, S., Bashir, K. & Nawaz, R. (2018). Annual vs semester examination system in physio-therapy in Pakistan: A student Prospective. *International Journal of Physiotherapy and Research, 6*(1), 2600-26005. https://dx.doi.org/10.16965/ijpr.2017.261.

Batool, A., Ahmad, S. & Ch, A. H. (2017). A study of students' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of semester and annual examination system at Institute of Education and Research. *International Journal of Educational and Pedagogical Sciences, 11*(10), 2582-2585. https://zenodo.org/record/1340388/files/10009295.pdf.

Behera, S., Meher, V. & Baral, R. (2019). Perception of students and teachers towards the implementation of semester system of examination at undergraduate level. *(Ed.), Examination reforms for quality higher education in India: Challenges and pportunities (pp.246-252).* New Delhi Publishers. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333021239_Perception_of_Students_and_Teachers_towards_the_Implementation_of_Semester_System_of_Examination_at_Undergraduate_Level.

Bhattacharya, S. (2011). The 'Semesterisation' Impasse at Deihi University. *Economic and Political Weekly,*46(19), 22-25. https://www.epw.in/journal/2011/19/commentary/semesterisation-impasse-delhi-university.html.

Bhushan, S. (2009). *Restructuring higher education in India*. Rawat Publications.

Bista, M. (2016). *Opinion of teachers towards semester system in mathematics education*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan University. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1489

Biswal, S. (2019). Student's perception on semester system of examination at higher education level. In S. K. Rout (Ed.), *Examination reforms for quality higher education in India: Challenges and opportunities* (pp. 273-277). New Delhi Publishers.

Biswas, S. (2018). Choices based credit system (CBCS) - An analytical study. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews, 5*(3), 1362x-1368x. http://ijrar.com/upload_issue/ijrar_issue_1469.pdf

Brink, C.S. (2011). *A historical perspective of testing and assessment including the impact of summative and formative assessment on students achievement*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Southern Mississippi

Chalam, K. S. (2005). *Challenges of Higher Education*. Anmol.

Chaliha, M. & Gogoi, P. K. (2019). A study on attitude towards semester system of students at the undergraduate level of general degree course. *Online Journal of Multidisciplinary Subjects, 12*(4), 479-484. http://www.researchguru.net/volume/Volume%2012/Issue%204/RG63.pdf

Chanda, A., & Chanda, D. (2021). Privatisation of Higher Education in India. Parikalpana – KIIT, *Journal of Management*, 17(2).

Chandio, J. H., Sindher, R. H. & Gulrez, N. (2013). A Study on the Problems faced by University Academia in Semester System. *Journal of Educational Research, 16*(1), 65-70. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=10279776&AN=91919989&h=0lVfWh5%2FGziOYI7L%2BFK9UhBDjmL879mdDc116ky9m61vJkgZZC7hJC1oIbl11E5Pa9KWwZHO53Jui%2BxsmvB%2FGw%3D%3D&crl=c.

Chemjong, R. (2018). *Students' perception towards semester system in mathematics education* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan University. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1681.

Chongbang, K. B. (2014). Comparative study of semester system and annual system of faculty of education (mini research report). *Faculty of Education, Tribhuvan University.*

Clark, N. (2014). *Higher education reforms in India: Credits, semesters and access.* World Education News & Reviews. https://wenr.wes.org/2014/06/higher-education-reforms-in-india-credits-semesters-and-access/.

Constitution of India. (n.d.). Provision for free and compulsory education for children. https://www.constitutionofindia.net/constitution_of_india/directive_principles_of_state_policy/articles/Article%2045#:~:text=Article%2036%2C%20Draft%20Constitution%20of,the%20age%20of%20fourteen%20years.

Content Team. *Worldwide Academic Calendars.* https://i-studentglobal.com/student-lifestyle/worldwide-academic-calendars/

Corrada, R.L. (2013). Formative assessment in doctrinal classes: Rethinking grade appeals. *Journal of Legal Education*, 63(2), 317-329. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42894344

Craven, P. The 'Cambridge Approach' perceptive – e-assessment research and development 1989-2009. *History and challenges of e-assessment.* https://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/Images/138440-history-and-challenges-of-e-assessment-the-cambridge-approach.

.Das, A. (2018). Attitude of teacher trainees towards semester system in West Bengal. *International Journal of Management, Technology and Engineering, 8*(7), 1545-1551. http://www.ijamtes.org/gallery/166.july%20ijmte%20-%20853.pdf.

Das, R. (2016). A study on students' perception about the implementation of semester system in the undergraduate college [Unpublished master's thesis]. Dibrugarh University.

Dahal, R. K. (2018). Students' Perception towards Master of Business Studies (MBS) Semester System: A Case Study of Nepal Commerce Campus. *Pravaha*, *24*(1), 181–195. https://doi.org/10.3126/pravaha.v24i1.20237.

Dangi, N. (2016). *Students' attitude towards semester system implementation* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan University. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1598.

Dash, B.N. (2010). *Development of educational system in India.* Dominant Publishers & Distributors.

Deardorff, D.K., ed.at.(2012). *The saga handbook of International higher education*. Sag Publications.

Department of Examination, Mizoram University. (2011). *Mizoram University Under Graduate Syllabus.* Mizoram University.

Deuri, C. (2015). Attitude towards choice based credit system of the postgraduate level students in higher education: A study on Gauhati University. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Science Society and Culture, 1*(2), 115–122. https://www.academia.edu/20119082/Attitude_towards_Choice_Based_Credit_System_of_Post_Graduate_Level_Students_in_Higher_Education_a_Study_on_Gauhati_University.

Dhakal, S. (2009). Education and poverty: A gender analysis. *Economic Journal of Nepal*, *32*(1), 37-49.

Garcha, P. S. (2016). Attitude of pre service teacher trainees toward semester system: Role of stream. *GHG Journal of Sixth Thought, 3*(2), 54-57. http://www.ghgcollegesadhar.org/files/education/journal/j_12_9_2016.pdf.

Garcha, P. S. (2017). Role of gender on attitude of teacher trainees toward semester system. *International Journal of Education, 7,* 61-65. http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.17195.28968.

Garret, H.E. (1981). Statistics in Psychology and Education. Vakils, Feffer and Simons Ltd. Bombay.

Ghimire, R. C. (2017). Opportunities and challenges of assessment strategies implemented in Mathematics education (A comparative analysis between annual and semester systems in master in education, Nepal). *International Journal of Educational Science and Research (IJESR), 7*(6), 131-134. https://www.academia.edu/35617432/OPPORTUNITIES_AND_CHALLENGES_OF_ASSESSMENT_STRATEGIES_IMPLEMENTED_IN_MATHEMAT

ICS_EDUCATION_A_COMPARATIVE_ANALYSIS_BETWEEN_ANNUAL_AND_SEMESTER_SYSTEMS_IN_MASTER_IN_EDUCATION_NEPAL

Ghosh, S. & Mallik, P. S. (2015). A comparative case study on achievement variation in annual and semester system of examinations. *The Scholar, 1*(1), 7-12. http://journal.fakirchandcollege.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/7-12.pdf

Goldstein, E. B. (2020). *Sensation and perception*. Engage Learning.

Gupta, M. P. (1978). An Analytical Study of Semester System of Education. *Journal of Higher Education 4,* (1)*,* 41-47.

Haseena, S. & Reddy, L. K. (2012). Attitude of post graduate students towards semester system. *International Journal of Scientific Research, 3*(2), 506-507. http://dx.doi.org/10.15373/22778179/FEB2014/168

Hernandez, R.(2012). Does continuous assessment in higher education support student learning? *Higher Education,* 64(4), 489-502. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257568277_Does_continuous_assessment_in_higher_education.

Jadoon, Z. I., & Jabeen, N. (2006). Human resource management and quality assurance in public sector universities of Pakistan: The case of Punjab University. In Proceedings of 1st International Conference on Assessing Quality in Higher Education (pp. 11-13). http://www.hec.gov.pk/INSIDEHEC/DIVISIONS/QALI/OTHERS/CONFERENCES/ICAQHE/Documents/ICAQHE06-15.pdf.

Jain, P. (2017). A study about failure semester system for general courses in MP. *International Journal of Research Science & Management, 4*(6), 103-109. https://www.ijrsm.com/issues%20pdf%20file/Archive-2017/June-2017/11.pdf.

Jat, M. S. (1970). *A study of teachers' attitude towards semester system* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Meerut University.

Joshi, K. M., & Ahir, K. V. (2013). Indian higher education: Some reflections. *International Economics*, *7*(1), 42-53.

Kalhoro, F. A. & Lakho, M. K. (2020). Perception of university students regarding semester system and research: Case of Karachi University. *Salu-commerce & economics review*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4396090.

Kalita, G. (2017). Perception towards the semester system of education among the undergraduate students of Dibrugarh University, Assam. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Advanced Studies (IJIRAS), 4*(10), 205-212. http://www.ijiras.com/2017/Vol_4-Issue_10/paper_36.pdf.

Karki, R. (2016). *Teachers' and students' beliefs on practices of internal assessment in semester system: A case of university campus* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan University. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1558.

Kaur, H. (2008). *Development of education in India.* Common Wealth Publishers

Keay, F.E. (1972). *A history of education in India*. Oxford University Press.

Khan E.A., AfzaL A., Gillani I.G. & Shahjahana Y.(2021). Effect of Teachers Education Programs on Prospective Teachers' Attitude towards Teaching Profession. *Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology, 18* (7).

Khattak, H., Mughal, A. W., Marwat, M. K., Jan, S., Waseem, M., & Bibi, S. (2015). Perception of the students of Sarhad University regarding the impact of different systems of examination upon their academic performance. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education, 4*(2), 43-51. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dr-Mohibullah-Marwat/publication/348835060_Perception_of_the_Students_of_Sarhad_University_Regarding_the_Impact_of_Different_Systems_of_Examination_upon_Their_Academic_Performance/links/601278ac299bf1b33e2ddf18/Perception-of-the-Students-of-Sarhad-University-Rega rding-the-Impact-of-Different-Systems-of-Examination-upon-Their-Academic-Performance.pdf.

Khattak, S. M. S., & Khan, M. S. (2015). A case study of annual and semester systems of examination on Government College of Management Sciences, Peshawar, Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(4), 37-42

Khattak, Z. I., Ali, M., Khan, A. & Khan, S. (2011). A study of english teachers and students' perception about the differences between annual and semester system of education at postgraduate level in Mardan. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15*, 1639-1643.doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.345.

Koul, L., (2021). Methodology of Educational Research (pp.177) Vikas Publishing House.

Krishna Kanta Handiqui State Open University. (2019). *Block 1: History of education during pre-independence in India.* Krishna Kanta Handiqui State Open University.

Krohn, G. A., & O'Connor, C. M. (2005). Student effort and performance over the semester. *Journal of Economic Education, 36*(1), 3-28. http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JECE.36.1.3-28.

Kumar, P. S. & Sudarshan, M. (2021). Perception of undergraduate students towards implementation of Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) in India. *Development of Education, 4*(2), 54-64. DOI 10.31483/r-98563.

Kumar, S. (2020, May 29). *Semester vs annual system- which is better?* CollegeDekho. https://www.collegedekho.com/articles/semester-vs-annual-system-good-move-or-not/.

Lalrinsanga, B., Sailo, Z., & Lalhlimpuii. (2021). Attitude of Government Aizawl West College students towards semester system at college level. *Mizoram Educational Journal*, *7*(3&4), 72-78.

Lalrinzuali, F. (2017). *Choice based credit system at post graduate level in Mizoram University: A critical analysis* (Doctoral dissertation). Mizoram University.

Madhukhar, I. (2003). *Changing context of higher education*. Delhi: Authors Press.

Mahajan, K. (2017). What is the role of education in nation-building? Retrieved from https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-role-of-education-in-nation-building

Mahakur, S., Baral, R. & Meher, V. (2019). Perception of Teachers and Students towards the Implementation of Choice Based Credit System at Undergraduate Level. *Issues and Ideas in Education. 7*(1), 1-10. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342432822_Perception_of_Teachers_and_Students_towards_the_Implementation_of_Choice_Based_Credit_System_at_Undergraduate_Level

Mal, S. & Mahato, U. (2020). Attitude Towards to Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) of Graduate Level Students in Higher Education: A Study on Degree Colleges under Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University in West Bengal. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research. 10*(6).

http://s3-ap-southeast-1.amazonaws.com/ijmer/pdf/volume10/volume10-issue1(6)/3.pdf.

Malik, T., Avais, P., & Khanam, T. (2010). Comparative analysis of MA English results under annual and semester system: Quality assurance in Pakistan. *Language in India, 10*(5), 68-82. http://www.languageinindia.com/may2010/tayyaba1.pdf.

Mallik, P. S. (2013). A study on implementability of semester system of examination in under graduate course of Calcutta University. *Indian Journal of Applied Research, 3*(11), 122-124. DOI: 10.15373/2249555X/NOV2013/40.

Malsawmi, H. (2010). *Progress and expansion of education in Mizoram, an analysis*. Aizawl, Mizoram: JP Offset Printers and Publishers

Matlakala, M., Mgutshini, T., Greeff, W. J. & Chetty, D. (2019). Use of the semester system in undergraduate programmes for open distance education. *Africa Journal of Nursing and Midwifery, 21*(2). https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC-1a7fe4716c.

Mavina, G., Zivanai, S., & Mhandara, L. (2017). Factors affecting poor lecture attendance during the first three weeks of the semester: Agricultural Engineering Department, Chinhoyi University of Technology, Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Research in Social Science*, *7*(9).

Mazumdar, M. (2010). *Introduction of semester system in Indian colleges.* Grin. https://www.grin.com/document/177187

Meher, D. (2018). Opinion of undergraduate and postgraduate students of Gangadhar Meher University (GMU) Sambalpur regarding semester system in relation to gender and stream. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews, 5*(3), 171z-174z. http://ijrar.com/upload_issue/ijrar_issue_1840.pdf.

Mehmood, T., Abdullah, Zaman, A. & Ali, S. (2014). Perceptions of students and teachers regarding semester system of examination in higher education in Pakistan. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences, 4*(8S), 122-126. https://www.textroad.com/pdf/JAEBS/J.%20Appl.%20Environ.%20Biol.%20Sci.,%204(8S)122-126,%202014.pdf.

Ministry of Education. (1966). *Education and National Development: Report of the education commission, 1964-66.* National Council of Educational Research and Training.

Ministry of Education. (n.d.). National policy on education 1986, programme of action 1992. https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/upload_document/npe.pdf.

Mirunalini, M., & Anandan, K. (2012). Teacher Professional Perception of B.Ed Student Teachers*, Journal of Community Guidance and Research*, *29*(3), 473-480.

Mishra, S.P. (2017). Introduction of Choice Based Credit System: A new paradigm shift in higher education. *Scholarly Research Journal for Humanity Science & English Language,* 4(21). https://www.academia.edu/33375785/INTRODUCTION_OF_CHOICE_BASED_CREDIT_SYSTEM_A_NEW_PARADIGM_S

Mizoram University 2021-2022. *Annual Report Mizoram University 2021-2022.*

Mizoram University. *Regulations Governing the Choice-Based Credit and Grading System in Under Graduate Programmes (Constituent and Affiliated Colleges).* https://mzu.edu.in/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/New-Under-Graduate-CBCS-Regulation.pdf

Mohan, R. (2022, May 29). *Fall semester, Spring Semester & Winter Semesters abroad*. Fall semester, Spring semester & Winter semesters abroad. Retrieved March 27, 2023, from https://www.hotcoursesabroad.com/india/find-your-course/how-to-choose-the-right-study-abroad-destinations/different-semesters-in-different-countries-abroad/

Mohanty, J. (2003). *Teacher education.* Deep and Deep Publications Pvt. Ltd

Mondal, P. (2021). Relevance of the semester system of evaluation in Indian context. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research, 10*(7(8)), 100-102. http://ijmer.in.doi./2021/10.07.167.

Munnawar, S. & Awan, A. G. (2019). Problems of semester system in public sector universities of Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Humanities, 5*(4), 812-835.

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5767-6229.

Munshi, P., Javed, M. & Hussain, I. (2012). Examination in semester system: what is observation of faculty and students. *The Sindh University Journal of Education – SUJE, 41.* https://sujo-old.usindh.edu.pk/index.php/SUJE/article/view/1945.

Naqvi, A. S., & Fatima, S. (2015). Hybrid Semester System in MBBS Program-Ziauddin Medical College Experience. *Pak J Med Dent*, *4*(1), 78-80. https://pjmd.zu.edu.pk/images/pdf/volume4/issue1/14%20-%20REP%20-%20Hybrid%20semester%20system%20in%20MBBS%20Program_Ziauddin%20Medical%20College%20Experience%20.pdf

Nasreen, S., Abbas, J., Shahzad, M. A., & Rizwan, M. (2017). Assessment of students' learning achievements under semester system in Pakistan. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 7(10), 730-735. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2017.7.10.959

Natarajan, V. (1979). *Monograph on semester system for universities.* Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi.

National Institute of Open Schooling. (2020). *Module- 6A: Evolution of state in India*: *Towards formation of state* . http://digital.nios.ac.in/topic.php?id=315en29A.

National Institute of Open Schooling. (2020). *Module – 3: Modern India: Establishment of British rule in India till 1857.* http://digital.nios.ac.in/topic.php?id=315en16

Neog, A. (2020). A study on the effectiveness of semester system at undergraduate degree level with special reference to the colleges of Sonitpur district under Gauhati University. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine, 7*(8), 1569-1575. https://ejmcm.com/article_4330_e6f8e3ae06b113cdeb45c4850760dd4b.pdf.

Pabla, M. (2014). A Paradigm shift from semester system to annual System. *Indian Journal of Research, 3*(4), 173-174. https://www.worldwidejournals.com/paripex/recent_issues_pdf/2014/April/April_2014_1397566957_01068_56.pdf.

Pacel, D. (2011). Assessment in history: The case for "decoding" the discipline. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* 2(3), 107-119.

Padmanabhan, C. (2016). Endangering academic autonomy. *Economic and Political Weekly*, *51*(5), 20-22.

Pandey, A. (2015). *Semester vs annual system.* Educate Nepal. https://www.educatenepal.com/article_archive/print_it/435.

Pandey, H. (2016). *Problems and prospects: An evaluation of semester system in faculty of humanities and social sciences (M. A. English) of Tribhuvan University.* Preprints. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358039851_Problems_and_Prospects_An_Evaluation_of_Semester_System_in_Faculty_of

Parikh, S. N. (1972). *University Students and Semester System - An Opinion Study* [Unpublished master's thesis]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda

Patel, U. A. (1978). *A critical study of the present scheme of semester system and evaluation procedure at the B.Ed. and M.Ed. programme in the faculty of education and psychology* [Unpublished master's thesis]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda

Patgiri, B. K. (2019). Relevance of semester system in higher education. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 4*(4), 792-795. https://ijisrt.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/IJISRT19AP672.pdf.

Pathak, T., & Rahman, M. A. (2013). Perception of students and teachers towards semester system: A study in some selected degree colleges of Nagaon town of Nagaon District of Assam. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *4*(13), 84-91. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234633876.pdf.

Patil, V. T. (1984). *The semester system: Substance and problems*. Sterling Publication.

Paudel, P. (2019). University teachers' attitudes towards English language curriculum of M.Ed. semester system. *Journal of NELTA*, *24*(1-2), 107–125. https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v24i1-2.27683.

Paudel, R., & Campus, R. R. (2021). *Semester system at Tribhuvan University opportunities, challenges and brief experience.* Preprints.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354170814_Semester_System_at_Tribhuvan_University_Opportunities_Challenges_and_Brief_Experience.

Pervaiz, M., Sarwar, M. & Shah, A. A. (2020). Causes of and solution to the challenges in fair assessment in semester system at public universities of the Punjab, Pakistan. *International Journal of Distance Education and E- Learning (IJDEEL), 5*(2), 108-122.

Perveen, U.& Saeed, M. (2014). A comparative study of examination practices in annual and semester system in public sector universities of the Punjab Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development,* 3(1).

Plessis, E. D. & Pretorius, F. J. (2013). *Semesterisation: The downfall of a great system? A case study*.ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337648824_Semesterisation_The_downfall_of_a_great_system_A_case_study.

Pokharel, N., Jaishi, M., & Subedi, S. (2018). Perception study of teachers and students regarding the functionality of semester System in agriculture. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research,*9(9).

Powar, K. B. (2002). *Indian higher education: A conglomerate of concepts, facts and practices.* Concept Publishing Company.

Prakash, V. (2007). Trends in growth and financing of higher education in India. Economic and Political Weekly, *42*(31), 3249-3258. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4419875

Prakash, V., & Biswal, K. (Eds.). (2012). *Perceptive on education and development: Revisiting education commission & after.* Shipra Publication.

Rahman, G. & Riaz-ud-din (2011). A comparative study of the quality of education in annual and semester system in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Language in India, 11*(7), 203-217. http://www.languageinindia.com/july2011/semestercomparisonfinal.pdf.

. Rajivlochan, M., & Rajivlochan, M. (2017). Choice-based credit system and semester system in higher education. In N. V. Varghese, A. Pachauri & S. Mandal (Eds.), *India higher education report 2017: Teaching , Learning and quality in higher education*. SAGE Publication India Pvt Ltd.

Rana, A. M. K. & Perveen, U. (2013). A study to investigate the views of Punjab University students regarding semester system in Pakistan. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities, 2*(2), 79-83. http://www.ajssh.leena-luna.co.jp/AJSSHPDFs/Vol.2(2)/AJSSH2013(2.2-09).pdf.

Rao, D.B.(2003). *Higher education in the 21st century*. Discovery Publishing House. New Delhi.

Reddy, B. Y. (2019). A study of semester system of engineering students with locality and father occupation. *GJRA- Global Journal for Research Analysis, 8*(7), 61-62. https://www.worldwidejournals.com/global-journal-for-research-analysis-GJRA/fi leview/July_2019_1562331955_8707628.pdf.

Report of the Education Reforms Commission, Mizoram 2009-2010. *Towards an Enlightened and Inclusive Mizo Society*. Education Reforms Commission, Mizoram July 2010.

Roshiah, R. J. (1979). *A critical study of the perceptions of college communities about the desirability and feasibility of introducing semester system in their colleges in the city of Madras* [Unpublished Master's thesis]. M.S. University of Baroda.

Sanjay, R. J. (2017). *Right to education implementation and enforcement.* Kanishka Publishers & Distributors.

Sardar, I., Maqsood, Z., Jawad, S., Akhtar, R. & Latif, H. (2020). Factors affecting students' satisfaction regarding semester system: Evidence from Pakistani Universities. *Quest Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 1*(2), 192-201. https://doi.org:10.3126/qjmss.v1i2.27438.

Sarwat, S. (2006). Differences in the achievement goals of the students studying in annual and semester systems. *The Journal of Educational Research, 9*(4), 52-64. http://jer.iub.edu.pk/publications/6.pdf

Shabbir, A., & Hassan, M. U. (2014). Perception of students and teachers towards the implementation of semester system of examination at undergraduate level. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 36(1), 105-116

Sharma, B. (2004*). History of Indian education*. O.P. Vabra Vohra Publishers & Distributors. New Delhi

Sharma, N. P. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of Researches on Implementing the Semester System: The Way Ahead? *Tribhuvan University Journal*, *30*(2), 105–114. https://doi.org/10.3126/tuj.v30i2.25557.

Sharma, N. P. (2021). Assessment focus: A case of English language education tests in Tribhuvan University semester system. *Nepalese Journal of Educational Assessment, 3*(1), 28-39. https://www.ero.gov.np/upload_file/files/post/1614877513_738807797_Journal_2077%20for%20web.pdf#page=35.

Sharma, N. R., & Sharma, K. R. (2004). *Problems of education in India*. Atlantic Publishers.

Sharma, R. C. (1976). 'A study of traditional and semester examination. *Journal of Educational Research and Extension, 1,* 44-46.

Sharma, S. C. (2022). *Inducing quality and relevance in Indian higher institutions, some thoughts: In Reimagining Indian Universities.* Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi.

Sherpa, D., & Baraily, K. (2022). Faculties' perception on semester system at TU affiliated colleges, Nepal. *AMC Journal*, *3*(1), 101–113. https://doi.org/10.3126/amcj.v3i1.45465.

Shoukat, L. & Muhammad, W. (2015). Perception of teachers and students towards the functionality of semester system at university level in the context of Pakistani social and administrative set-ups. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, *III*(4), 68–80. https://doi.org/10.20472/te.2015.3.4.006.

Singh, J. D. (n.d.). *Higher education in India – Issues, challenges and suggestions.* https://www.universityofcalicut.info/news/higher_edu_jd_singh.pdf.

Singh, K. (2016). Perception of university students towards semester system – A survey. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, *6*(8).

Singh, K. V., & Kumar P. (2016). Challenges in Implementation of Semester system in Globalized World. *International Journal of Applied Research, 2*(3), 89-91. https://www.allresearchjournal.com/archives/2016/vol2issue3/PartB/2-2-97.pdf

Singh, Y.K. (2005). *History of Indian education system.* A. P. H. Publishing Corporation, New Delhi.

Solanki, G. D. (2019). Different between semester system and annual system. *International Journal of Research in all Subjects in Multi Languages, 7*(12), 36-38. http://www.raijmr.com/ijrsml/wpcontent/uploads/2020/02/IJRSML_2019_vol07_issue_12_Eng_11.pdf.

Sonwane, J. R. (2015). Something about semester system in education. *GYANODAYA - The Journal of Progressive Education*, *8*(2), 1. https://doi.org/10.5958/2229-4422.2015.00008.0

.Sridevi, K. V. (2012). A Study of Attitude of Teacher Trainees and Problems faced by Teacher Educators on Semester System of B. Ed Programme in Kerala. *Golden Research Thoughts, 1*(11), 1-5. http://aygrt.isrj.org.www.allresearchjournal.com/

Subedi, A. (2019). Perceptions of students and teachers towards the semester system of Tribhuvan University. *Interdisciplinary Research in Education, 4*(1), 19-34. https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/ire/article/download/25707/21469/77501.

Team, C. (2019, March 4). *Worldwide academic calendars*. iSTUDENTglobal. Retrieved March 27, 2023, from https://i-studentglobal.com/student-lifestyle/worldwide-academic-calendars/

TED News Desk. (2021). The evolution of Indian education system. *The Education Daily.* https://theeducationdaily.com/2021/11/indian-education-system.

Tilak, J. B. G. (1999). Higher education reforms in India. *Journal of Higher Education*, *70*(1), 1-18. DOI: 10.2307/2649265.

Tong, P. S. (1977). *A Study of Pre-University Student and Semester System in Thailand* [Unpublished master's thesis]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

Trivedi, J. C. & Soni, B. K. (2014). A study of semester system pattern in schools: An empirical study. *Prestige International Journal of Management and Research, 6/7*(2/1), 5-16. https://search.proquest.com/openview/5d66c65167c977c4dea4c16d94ce2c94/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2032264

UGC. (2008). From Chairman on examination reforms. D.O. No. F.1-2/2008(XI Plan), dated Jan 31, 2008: Annexure-II, Action Plan for Academic and Administrative Reforms.

UGC. (2009). From Chairman, D.O. No.F.1-2/2008 (XI Plan). On Examination Reforms, dated March 2009.

UGC. (2008). *Guidelines on adaptation of choice based credit system.* University Grants Commission.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1998). *Higher education in the twenty-first century: Vision and Action.* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000116345.

University Grant Commission. (2015). *Instructional template for facilitating implementation of Choice Based Credit System (CBCS).* https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/4426331_Instructional-Template.pdf

Varghese, N. V. (2018). *Indian higher education report 2017: Teaching, learning and quality in higher education.* Saga Publications.

Yadav, A., Sharma, R., Dangi, J., & Tiwari, P. (2016). A comparative study of students' performance between semester and annual examination system. DAVV, Indore.

Yousaf, A. & Hashim, M. (2012). A case study of annual and semester systems of examination on Government College of management sciences, Peshawar, Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 2*(9), 53-73. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Muhammad-Hashim-15/publication/265751215_A_Case_study_of_Annual_and_Semester_Systems_of_Examination_on_Government_College_of_Management_Sciences_Peshawar_Pakistan/links/57435b6b08ae9f741b3a184e/A-Case-study-of-Annual-and-Semester-Systems-of-Examination-on-Government-College-of-Management-Sciences-Peshawar-Pakistan.pdf

BRIEF BIO-DATA OF THE CANDIDATE

BRIEF BIO-DATA OF THE CANDIDATE

NAME	:	Rosy Lalrinsangi
FATHER'S NAME	:	Lalzawma
DOB	:	14.08.1972
ADDRESS	:	H.No. SK/A-34, Kanan Veng, Aizawl-796009 Mizoram.
GENDER	:	Female
RELIGION	:	Christian
OCCUPATION	:	Associate Professor, Department of Education, GovT. T. Romana College, Aizawl, Mizoram.
MARRITAL STATUS	:	Married
EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION	:	M. Phil.
MZU REGISTRATION NO.	:	1506297
PH.D. REGISTRATION NO. &DATE	:	MZU/Ph.D/925 of 19.04.2016.
TITLE OF THE THESIS	:	Perceptions of College Teachers and Students on the Semester System in Undergraduate Colleges of Mizoram.

PARTICULARS OF THE CANDIDATE

PARTICULARS OF THE CANDIDATE

Name of the Candidate	:	Rosy Lalrinsangi
Degree	:	Doctor of Philosophy
Department	:	Education
Title of thesis	:	Perceptions of College Teachers and Students on the Semester System in Undergraduate Colleges of Mizoram.
Date of Admission	:	06.08.2015
Approval of Research Proposal	:	
1) DRC	:	25.03.2016
2) Board of Studies	:	12.04.2016
3)School Board	:	19.04.2016
MZU Registration No.	:	1506297
Ph.D Registration No. & Date	:	MZU/Ph.D/925 of 19.04.2016.
Extension (if any)	:	Extended for two (2) years Vide No. 16-2/MZU (Acad)/20/431-33. Dated 19.04.2016 up to 18.04.2023.

(**PROF. LOKANATH MISHRA**)
Head
Department oF Education
Mizoram University

PERCEPTIONS OF COLLEGE TEACHERS AND STUDENTS ON THE SEMESTER SYSTEM IN UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGES OF MIZORAM

BY

ROSY LALRINSANGI
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SUPERVISOR
PROF.H.MALSAWMI

JOINT SUPERVISOR
DR. LALMUANZUALI

Submitted

In partial fulfillment of the requirement of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education of Mizoram University, Aizawl

ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, one of the most pressing issues in the world of higher education has been the need for a fundamental shift in its underlying concepts and philosophies. Courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels have stayed constant for a very long time, accompanied by out-dated teaching techniques. All of this necessitates urgency in terms of flexibility, innovation, and new educational methodologies. Modernization, fundamental improvements in the teaching and learning processes, and much needed reforms in subject matter can go a long way toward bringing our higher education in line with the needs of a rapidly industrializing society. In this context, the semester system of higher education is considered as a suitable means of accomplishing the society's future goals. The semester system is one of the most popular educational structures in higher education. According to Pathak and Rahman (2013), the main goal of the semester system is "to focus on continuous assessment system and regular monitoring of students' progress, setting comprehensive and in-depth learning environment to build capacity of learners by developing required knowledge, skills, and attitudes to become an efficient and effective diversified citizen."

The semester system is the result of contemporary research in the realm of education. The term "semester system" refers to the division of a calendar year into two sessions, each lasting six months. In other words, a semester is a six-month period during which teaching activities are carried out. In a semester system, the final examination is conducted six months after the course has begun. In this arrangement, exams are therefore administered every other year rather than annually. It is now evident that the term "semester" refers to the separation of the academic year into two sections, each of which has its own set of course offerings. The semester-based academic year can occasionally be divided into three or four quarters, or trimesters.

At present many of the Indian universities have adopted the semester system as a progressive measure in undergraduate as well as post-graduate classes. The

University Grants Commission had appointed a committee of few experts to give their ideas regarding the semester system. On the basis of the opinions of these experts, UGC published a brochure entitled as 'Principles and Mechanics of the Semester System (1971)' for the sake of guiding the universities which are desirous to adopt the semester system. Experts felt that introducing the semester system in a planned and systematic manner would modernize and improve teaching and learning, as well as bring about much-needed reform and flexibility in course material and evaluation methodologies. Mizoram University has implemented the semester system for all of its affiliated colleges since 2011-2012.

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

The semester system of education has generated a lot of discussion in Indian universities. Administrators of higher education, professors, students, and members of the general public seem to have doubts about the relevance and success of the semester system, whether intentionally or unconsciously. Researchers have focused on identifying and studying the most significant components of the semester system, including its advantages and disadvantages, significance, and applicability. The field of education is one that is constantly subject to analysis and enquiry. Investigations of various studies reveal that no previous study has been undertaken on the perceptions of college teachers and students in Mizoram with reference to the semester system. To gain an in-depth understanding of the semester system in Mizoram, a thorough investigation is required.

The semester system was designed to provide students with opportunity for continuous assessment, evaluation, and feedback. This was the primary motivation behind the system's implementation. Throughout the academic year, students are required to participate for a longer amount of time, which helps them develop the habits of regular study, punctuality, and work ethic. While the benefits of the semester system are clear, there is still a long way to go before it can be successfully implemented in a nation like India, where resources and opportunity are scarce. The current research aims to better understand how students and teachers view the semester system in terms of their familiarity with the programme, its efficacy, and the challenges they confront during implementation.

Teachers and students are selected as the subject of this study because they are the primary stakeholders and benefactors of semester system implementation. According to Pathak and Rahman (2013), the effectiveness of any system's execution is largely dependent on the level of beneficiary satisfaction. This indicates that measuring the perceptions of teachers and students is one of the measures of the semester system's effectiveness. . In order to have a comprehensive picture of the semester system, it is considered essential to study the perception of college teachers and students on the semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram. With this in mind, the following research questions have been formulated.

1. Has there been any scale constructed to find out the perception of stakeholders on semester system?
2. Do teachers and students perceive the semester system favourably?
3. Is there any difference in teachers' perception on semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' status, stream of course and teaching experience?
4. Is there any difference in student's perception on semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study?

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem under investigation reads as 'Perception of College Teachers and Students on the Semester System in Undergraduate Colleges of Mizoram'.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF THE TERMS USED IN THE TITLE

Perception: Perception in the present study refers to the way college teachers and students observe the different components of semester system such as General observation, Course of study, Evaluation, Method of teaching and Choice Based Credit System.

College teachers: For the present study, college teachers refer to the teachers teaching arts, science and commerce in undergraduate colleges under Mizoram University.

College students: College students for the present study includes those students studying arts, science or commerce in undergraduate colleges under Mizoram University.

Semester system: For the present study, semester system refers to the procedure where academic year is divided into two semesters of six months for the purpose of planning of academic work, delivery of teaching, evaluation and monitoring of the progress of the students. Semester system has been adopted by Mizoram University since 2011-2012.

Undergraduate college: For the present study, undergraduate college refers to those colleges/institutions under Mizoram University offering three years degree course in arts, science and commerce.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. ***Objective No.1:*** To construct and standardize teachers' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
2. ***Objective No.2:*** To construct and standardize students' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
3. ***Objective No.3:*** To find out teachers' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
4. ***Objective No.4:*** To compare teachers' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation, stream of course and teaching experience.
5. ***Objective No.5:*** To compare teachers' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation. Stream of course and teaching experience.
6. ***Objective No.6:*** To find out the students' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.
7. ***Objective No.7:*** To compare students' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender**,** locale and stream of study.
8. ***Objective No.8:*** To compare students' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study.

HYPOTHESES

a) There is no significant difference in teachers' overall perception of semester system and different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' status, stream of course and teachers experience.

b) There is no significant difference in students' overall perception of semester system and different components of perception of semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A total of 80 reviews have been incorporated. There were 36 studies done in India and 44 from abroad. The review period ranges from 1970 to 2022.

METHODOLOGY

In the present study descriptive survey method has been adopted as it is to find out the perception of teachers and students on semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram; to compare the differences in the perception of teachers and students on semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram with reference to gender, locale, stream of study/course, teachers' designation and teaching experience.

POPULATION AND SAMPLES

The population of the study consist of all teachers and students teaching and studying in Undergraduate colleges of Mizoram. For the present study multistage random sampling technique is employed for collecting data. Colleges were randomly selected after which samples were randomly collected from the selected colleges. The sample consists of 221 college teachers and 823 college students. The following table – 1 shows the number of selected teachers and students sample based on different variables.

Table - 1

Number of selected sample of teachers and students based on different variables

Variables	Male	Female	Urban	Rural	Arts	Science	Commerce
Teachers N=221	104	117	143	78	113	76	32
Students N=823	451	372	252	571	435	183	205

TOOLS USED

For the present study, the following two tools were developed and standardized by the investigator:

(i) Teachers' perception scale on semester system.

(ii) Students' perception scale on semester system.

COLLECTION OF DATA

The perception scales were administered by the investigator through offline and online mode to the teachers and students. Google form was used for online mode. The investigator visited few colleges and obtained the required data after acquiring permission from the college Principals.

The data collected from the teachers and students were scrutinized and scored according to the scoring procedures. The scores obtained by each respondent were then entered in the tabulation sheet and these were statistically treated and analyzed.

MODE OF ANALYSIS

Keeping in view the objectives of the study, the investigator employed the following statistical techniques for analyzing the data.

Descriptive statistics such as the Mean, Standard deviation, percentages, z-score were employed to find out the nature of score distribution and for classifying the respondents into different categories.

Inferential statistics such as ‘t’ test and correlations were employed to find out the difference between the mean scores of different groups as well as for establishing validity and reliability of the constructed perception scale.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Objective No.1: To construct and standardize teachers’ perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.

Teachers’ perception scale on semester system was constructed and standardized. Initially 113 statements relating to semester system were collected which was narrowed down to 69 statements after it was given to experts. Then after

Item discrimination was done, the scale finally consists of 57 statements with 34 positive statements and 23 negative statements. The scale has five components (1) General observation (2) Course of study (3) Evaluation (4) Method of teaching (5) Choice Based Credit System. Reliability of the scale was established using the split half method and the reliability co-efficient turns out to be .90 (after applying Spearman Brown's formula) which is considered sufficient for the scale. Content validity was also established by giving the scale to ten experts in the field of education, and they all agreed on the validity of the content. Scoring was done on the basis of Likert's scoring pattern of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 for favourable statements and 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 for unfavourable statements. For establishing the norm, the score obtained from the perception scale was converted into z-score, and based on this, teachers were classified into seven categories from extremely favourable to extremely unfavourable perception.

Objective No.2: To construct and standardize students' perception scale on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram

Students' perception scale on semester system was constructed and standardized. Initially 102 statements relating to semester system were collected which was narrowed down to 67 statements after it was given to experts. Then after Item discrimination was done, the scale finally consists of 27 statements with all the statements being positive. The scale has five components (1) General observation (2) Course of study (3) Evaluation (4) Method of teaching (5) Choice Based Credit System. Reliability of the scale was established using test retest method and the reliability co-efficient turns out to be .801 which is considered sufficient for the scale. Content validity was also established by giving the scale to ten experts in the field of education, and they all agreed on the validity of the content. Scoring was done on the basis of Likert's scoring pattern of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 since all the statements were positive statements. For establishing the norm, the score obtained from the perception scale was converted into z-score, and based on this, students were classified into seven categories from extremely favourable to extremely unfavourable perception.

Objective No.3: To find out teachers' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.

It was found that (38.46%) of teachers had moderate perception on semester system. There were more teachers who perceive semester system more favourably than those who perceive it unfavourably. Only few teachers had extremely favourable perception as well as extremely unfavourable perception.

Objective No.4: To compare teachers' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation, stream of course and teaching experience

It was found that:

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' overall perception on semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' overall perception on semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' overall perception on semester system.

iv) Science teachers had a more favourable overall perception on semester system than commerce teachers.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' overall perception on semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable overall perception on semester system than commerce teachers.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' overall perception on semester system.

viii) Short experienced teachers had a more favourable overall perception on semester system than long experienced teachers.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' overall perception on semester system.

Objective No.5: To compare teachers' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale, teachers' designation. Stream of course and teaching experience

The findings are:

(A) General observation component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the general observation component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

viii) Short experienced teachers had a more favourable perception than long experienced teachers in the general observation component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced and long experienced teachers' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

(B) Course of study component of semester system.

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the course of study component of semester system

iv) Science teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the course of study component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the course of study component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

viii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

(C) Evaluation component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

iv) Science teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the evaluation component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the evaluation component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and

middle experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

viii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

(D) Method of teaching component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between associate professors and assistant professors' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

vi) Arts teachers had a more favourable perception than commerce teachers in the method of teaching component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

viii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

(E) Choice Based Credit System component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male teachers and female teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

ii) There is no significant difference between urban teachers and rural teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

iii) Assistant professors had a more favourable perception than associate professors in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science teachers and commerce teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

v) There is no significant difference between science teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

vi) There is no significant difference between commerce teachers and arts teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

vii) There is no significant difference between short experienced teachers and middle experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

viii) Short experienced teachers had a more favourable perception than long experienced teachers in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

ix) There is no significant difference between middle experienced teachers and long experienced teachers' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

Objective No.6: To find out the students' level of perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram.

It was found that (49.45%) of college students had moderate perception on semester system. There were more students who had favourable perception than

students who had unfavourable perception. There were only few students who had extremely favourable perception as well as extremely unfavourable perception on semester system.

Objective No.7: To compare students' overall perception on semester system in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram with reference to gender, locale and stream of study

It was found that:

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' overall perception on semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the overall perception on semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' overall perception on semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the overall perception on semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the overall perception on semester system.

Objective No.8: To compare students' perception on the different components of semester system with reference to gender, locale and stream of study.

The findings are:

(A) General observation component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the general observation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the general observation component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the general observation component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the general observation component of semester system.

(B) Course of study components of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the course of study component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the course of study component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the course of study component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than the commerce students in the course of study component of semester system.

(C) Evaluation component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the evaluation component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

iv) There is no significant difference between science students and arts students' perception in the evaluation component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the evaluation component of semester system.

(D) Method of teaching component of semester system

i) There is no significant difference between male students and female students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than the urban students in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the method of teaching component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than the science students in the method of teaching component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than the commerce students in the method of teaching component of semester system.

(E) Choice Based Credit System components of semester system

i) Male students had a more favourable perception than female students in the choice based credit system of semester system.

ii) Rural students had a more favourable perception than urban students in the choice based credit system of semester system.

iii) There is no significant difference between science students and commerce students' perception in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

iv) Arts students had a more favourable perception than science students in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

v) Arts students had a more favourable perception than commerce students in the choice based credit system component of semester system.

DISCUSSION ON THE FINDINGS

Some of the findings of the study are discussed as follows:

Teachers' perception on semester system:

1. With respect to teachers' level of perception, findings showed that the bulk of the teachers had moderate/average perception on semester system. Similar to the present findings, Garcha (2016) also found that teachers had average perception on semester system. Contrary to this finding, Jat (1970); Akhtar (1980); Mehmood et.al. (2014); Bista (2016) found that teachers had favourable perception on semester system. Dangi (2016) also found that teachers had unfavourable perception on semester system. The finding of the present study that teachers had Moderate/average level of perception on semester system is not surprizing because as a rule people tend to be average in most human attributes be it intelligence, attitude, perception etc.

2. With respect to overall perception as well as all the components of semester system, it was found that there was no significant difference between the male and female college teachers' perception on semester system. In agreement to the present findings, Garcha (2017) and Das (2018) also found no significant difference in teachers' perception on semester system. But, contrary to this finding, Tong (1977) found that male teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system than the female teachers. The people living in Mizoram are known as the Mizo. Mizo people are a close-knit community with not much sex discrimination or socioeconomic distinction in the society. Perhaps this may affect the perception of the teachers which gives rise to the present finding that there is no significant difference in the teachers' perception on semester system based on gender. Besides, males and females from childhood to adulthood are more alike than different on most psychological variables. Semester system is an academic term which means division of an academic year in two parts. Therefore, even if there are no significant differences in the perception of male and female teachers on this matter, it is understandable.

3. With reference to overall and different components of semester system, it was also found that no significant difference was found between teachers from urban and rural areas in their perception on semester system. Colleges in Mizoram are all situated in urban areas in all the districts, mostly in the capitals of the districts. Therefore, teachers teaching in colleges of Mizoram, even if they hail from rural areas had the experience of living in urban areas and it is believed that they would be psychologically influenced by their familiarity of urban life. Consequently, their perception on semester system may not be so different from teachers from urban locality. Besides, semester system is merely a term which refers to the splitting of the academic year into two parts. So, the present finding that there is no significant difference in teachers' perception on semester system based on locality is not without a reason.

4. With reference to overall as well as course of study components and evaluation components of semester system, it was found that science teachers view semester system more favourably than the commerce teachers. The plausible reason

why commerce teachers perceive semester system more unfavourably than the science teachers could possibly be because commerce incudes papers like Financial Accounting, Business Laws, Economics, Taxation, Auditing, Cost Accounting, among others which needs plenty of time for completion of the course and since semester system had shorter duration, perhaps commerce teachers find it difficult to complete the course in time.

5. It was also found that the arts teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the commerce teachers in overall and most of the dimension of semester system. Commerce stream is not as popular as the Arts stream in Mizoram which is evident from the fact that fewer students opted for the commerce stream. Perhaps arts teachers find that it is easier to manage the students in semester system because interaction between teachers and students increases in semester system and teachers have more information about the students. This type of interaction was not possible in the annual system as the number of arts students were so large. Now, in semester system, project work, seminars, field study etc. were introduced which brings the teachers and students closer to each other. Since there is lesser number of students in commerce stream, even before semester system was introduced, commerce teachers perhaps did not experience much difference after semester system was introduced. Hence, this could be the reason why arts teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system than the commerce teachers.

6. With reference to overall as well as general observation component and choice based credit system component of semester system, it was found that short experienced teachers had a more favourable perception on semester system than the long experienced teachers. The finding of Tong (1977) oppose the present finding as Tong found that teachers' experience did not play any significant role in their attitude towards semester system. In the present study, short experienced teachers are those teachers having less than ten years of experience, and long experienced teachers are those teachers having more than twenty years of teaching experience. Now, short experienced teachers often find it difficult to plan and organize class teaching, but the introduction of semester system brings with it the seminar, assignment, project work, CBCS etc. which the students had to compulsorily undertake releasing the

short experienced teacher from making plans for class teaching. Possibly, this may be the reason why short experienced teacher viewed the semester system more favourably than the long experienced teachers.

7. The present study also found that assistant professors had a more favourable perception than associate professors in the choice based credit system component of semester system. It is a known fact that CBCS increased the workload of the teachers because of too much internal testing and evaluation exercises. Associate professors, because of their designation had more administrative responsibilities in the colleges apart from being involved with teaching, testing and evaluation exercises while the assistant professors have less responsibility. This may perhaps be the rationale for the present finding that assistant professors had a more favourable perception on semester system than the associate professors.

Students' perception on semester system:

8. With respect to students' level of perception, findings showed that maximum number of the students' had Moderate/average perception on semester system. Contrary to this finding, Mehmood (2014), Dangi (2016), Lalrinsanga et.al (2021) found that students had favourable views on semester system. One can conclude that the typical person is average, but this does not mean that the typical person is average in everything. Chances are that we are all better at some things than the bulk of the population, then again, we are all worse at other things than the bulk of the population, and we are all within one standard deviation of the average in majority of our life's attributes. Having Moderate/average perception is therefore quite normal.

9. It was found that with reference to overall and all components of semester system, rural students had a more favourable perception on semester system than the urban students. Reddy (2019) also found similar results. Now, majority of the under-graduate student in Mizoram hail from rural areas who got themselves admitted to colleges mostly situated in urban areas. In semester system students get more leaves and vacations as they get a semester break after the final examination of every semester. This is very advantageous for rural students as they were able to visit their home village twice every year. Consequently, this may be the probable cause for

rural students having a more favourable perception on semester system than the urban students.

10. It was also found that with respect to overall perception and all components of semester system except evaluation component, the arts students had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the science students. Contrary to the current findings, Haseena & Reddy's (2012) and Chaliha & Gogoi's (2019) finding shows that science students had a more favourable view on semester system than the arts students. Generally, students having good results in HSLC often take up the science stream, while arts stream is usually taken by low achieving students. Now, in semester system, if a learner fails in one or more papers, He/she can repeat the particular paper in which they fail. They do not need to repeat all the papers in a given semester. Now, this is very advantageous for many of the students from the arts stream who often fail in one or two subjects. The science students ordinarily do not need to repeat papers since many of them do not fail. Therefore, the reason why arts students favour the semester system more than the science students can be accounted to this.

11. The present study found that with respect to overall perception and all components of semester system, the arts students had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the commerce students. Commerce as a stream of education is a study of trade and business activities such as the exchange of goods and services from producer to final consumer. Conversely, the study of Arts or Humanities enables a student to develop critical, argumentative and creative skills. So, one can say that commerce defies comprehension, creativity and analysis while Arts is nothing but a culmination of all those. Now, in semester system, students were given assignments, seminars, project work etc. which really enhances critical and creative skills of the arts students. Thus, the probable reason why arts students had a more favourable perception on semester system compared to the commerce students could be because the method of teaching employed in semester system enhances creativity of the arts students.

12. 'Male students had a more favourable perception than female students in the

choice based credit system of semester system' is another finding of this study. Deury (2015) found similar result, however, contrary to this finding, Mahakur et.al.(2019), Mal and Mahato (2021), found no significant difference in the observation of male and female students on Choice based credit system. CBCS makes education broad based and at par with global standards. Perhaps male students appreciate the idea that CBCS is at par with global standard that their perception on CBCS is more favourable compared to female students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Keeping in view of all the findings, the following are the recommendations for the improvement of semester system in undergraduate colleges in Mizoram:

1. Student-teacher ratio need to be maintained as suggested by UGC.
2. Regular training programs for teachers should be conducted by the appropriate authorities.
3. Facilities such as computer, library books, furniture and laboratory for conducting teaching-learning and practical have to be improved in most of the colleges.
4. Equalization in the standard of education system in all the colleges of Mizoram should be maintained so that mobility of students could be checked.
5. Effective guidance and counseling service should be arranged in colleges for the students while choosing core papers.
6. As and when problem arises in colleges; authorities, teachers and educators should have a positive attitude towards the system and should take up remedial measures in solution to the problem as soon as possible.
7. To organise Seminars, Conferences, Workshops and Debates for effective development of semester system.
8. Strengthening the monitoring system effectively for semester system.
9. Feedback from teachers should be considered while framing the syllabus.
10. Teachers should be fair to minimise the chances of favouritism and biases.
11. Besides regular training programme, professional training should also be organised on semester system for teachers.

12. Modern update teaching learning aids must be made available in the institution.
13. Impartiality of teachers in awarding sectional marks to students.
14. Teachers should encourage students to participate in co-curricular activities.
15. To improve students writing skills, teachers should conduct descriptive tests during session.
16. Co-operation among the policy makers, administrators and teachers to develop positive attitude among the students.
17. Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) system of evaluation should be made clear to the students to be aware on their performance in examination.
18. Teachers should be fair and honest and not be exploited or influenced by anyone.
19. The time duration for mid and final terms examinations should be according to the distribution of marks.

SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The following are the suggestions for further research:

1. Research work can be conducted on the problems faced by the teachers and students in undergraduate colleges of Mizoram under semester system.
2. The perception of Post Graduate students towards semester system in Mizoram can be studied.
3. The impact of perception under semester system on the academic performance of students can be studied.
4. A comparison of the annual system with the semester system can be studied in different North Eastern states.
5. Whether National Education Policy 2020 can be successfully incorporated in the semester system can also be taken up as a field of study.

References:

Akhtar, P. R. (1980). *A critical study of the semester system in selected universities in India* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

Bista, M. (2016). *Opinion of teachers towards semester system in mathematics education* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan University. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1489

Chaliha, M., & Gogoi, P. K. (2019). A study on attitude towards semester system of students at the undergraduate level of general degree course. *Online Journal of Multidisciplinary Subjects, 12*(4), 479-484. http://www.researchguru.net/volume/Volume%2012/Issue%204/RG63.pdf

Dangi, N. (2016). *Students' attitude towards semester system implementation* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tribhuvan university. http://elibrary.tucl.edu.np/handle/123456789/1598

Deuri, C. (2015). Attitude towards choice based credit system of the postgraduate level students in higher education: A study on Gauhati University. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Science Society and Culture, 1*(2), 115–122. https://www.academia.edu/20119082/Attitude_towards_Choice_Based_Credit_System_of_Post_Graduate_Level_Students_in_Higher_Education_a_Study_on_Gauhati_University

Garcha, P. S. (2016). Attitude of pre service teacher trainees toward semester system: Role of stream. *GHG Journal of Sixth Thought, 3*(2), 54-57. http://www.ghgcollegesadhar.org/files/education/journal/j_12_9_2016.pdf

Garcha, P. S. (2017). Role of gender on attitude of teacher trainees toward semester system. *International Journal of Education, 7,* 61-65. http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.17195.28968

Haseena, S., & Reddy, L. K. (2012). Attitude of post graduate students towards semester system. *International Journal of Scientific Research, 3*(2), 506-507. http://dx.doi.org/10.15373/22778179/FEB2014/168

Jat, M. S. (1970). *A study of teachers' attitude towards semester system* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Meerut University

Lalrinsanga, B., Sailo, Z., & Lalhlimpuii (2021). Attitude of government Aizawl West College students towards semester system at college level. *Mizoram Educational Journal, 7*(3&4), 72-78.

Mahakur, S., Baral, R., & Meher, V. (2019). Perception of teachers and students towards the implementation of Choice Based Credit System at undergraduate level. *Issues and Ideas in Education. 7*(1), 1-10. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342432822_Perception_of_Teachers_and_Students_towards_the_Implementation_of_Choice_Based_Credit_System_at_Undergraduate_Level

Mal, S., & Mahato, U. (2020). Attitude towards to Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) of graduate level students in higher education: A study on degree colleges under Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University in West Bengal. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research. 10*(6). http://s3-ap-southeast-1.amazonaws.com/ijmer/pdf/volume10/volume10-issue1(6)/3.pdf

Mehmood, T., Abdullah., Zaman, A., & Ali, S. (2014). Perceptions of students and teachers regarding semester system of examination in higher education in Pakistan. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences, 4*(8S), 122-126. https://www.textroad.com/pdf/JAEBS/J.%20Appl.%20Environ.%20Biol.%20Sci.,%204(8S)122-126,%202014.pdf

Pathak, T., & Rahman, M.A. (2013). Perception of students and teachers towards semester system: A study in some selected degree colleges of Nagaon town of Nagaon District of Assam. *Journal of Education and Practice, 4*(1), 84-91. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234633876.pdf.

Reddy, B. Y. (2019). A study of semester system of engineering students with locality and father occupation. *GJRA- Global Journal for Research Analysis, 8*(7), 61-62. https://www.worldwidejournals.com/global-journal-for-research-analysis-GJRA/fileview/July_2019_1562331955_8707628.pdf

Tong, P. S. (1977). *A study of pre-university student and semester system in Thailand* [Unpublished master's thesis]. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.