

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SELF-REPORTED TEACHING METHODOLOGIES AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES OF PERMANENT AND VISITING FACULTY IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Dr. Sidrah Ilyas

Assistant Professor, Department of Education, NCBA&E Alhamra University Lahore Pakistan

Abstract

The research sought to examine the teaching and assessment practices used by both permanent and visiting instructors at the university. To achieve this goal, a null hypothesis was developed. The study was carried out within the positivist framework and utilized a quantitative method utilizing a survey research design. The population included all universities located in Lahore District, whereas the target population focused on two public universities: the University of the Punjab and the University of Education. From chosen common departments within these institutions, an available population of 10,428 university students and 425 university instructors was recognized. Two surveys were created for gathering data: one for permanent and visiting faculty and another for students. Teaching methods were analyzed using three frameworks: motivation skills, communication skills, and classroom management skills. Assessment methods were assessed using three components: formative assessment abilities, efficacy of feedback, and creation of assessment criteria. Experts evaluated both questionnaires to determine content validity. The reliability coefficient of Cronbach's alpha was .95 for the questionnaire given to students and .786 for the one administered to teachers. Data were examined using descriptive statistics, which comprised means and standard deviations, along with inferential statistics via the independent-samples t-test. The results showed statistically significant variations in communication skills, motivational abilities, and formative assessment practices based on teachers' perceptions. Nonetheless, no statistically significant variations were noted in the other constructs. Conversely, students' views showed statistically significant variations in the majority of teaching and assessment practice elements used by both permanent and visiting faculty.

Introduction

Effective teaching has broadly been understood as teaching that is oriented to and focused on students and their learning. Beyond that fundamental assumption, there are two broadly accepted components of effective university teaching: that it requires a set of particular skills and practices as identified by research and that it meets the requirements of the context in which it occurs (Devlin & Samarawickrema, 2010).

The term classroom teaching practices considered as the collections of notified as well as measured practices that a teacher follow to support the learners in his or her classroom. Good teachers have the bases of practices in which they remain engaged to make improve their academic performances and suitable behaviour of a teacher in classroom. Three basic teaching practices; I) Communicate academic instructions in detailed and arranged manners, II) applying the classroom management techniques those are supporting classroom environment, and III) having positive relationship with students, were identified for effective teacher (Freeman, MacSuga-Gage, Simonsen, & Briere, 2012).

Moreno (2010) stated that professional skills are the key skills for an effective teacher. Professional skills are further classified into following sub-domains as: Planning skills, the skills those are the foremost requirement for being an effective teacher. Communicational skills, the skills by which a teacher can communicate to the students effectively, it is commonly said that effective communication is the key component for effective leadership, and teacher is a leader while he is in classroom. Motivation skills the skills by which a teacher can stimulate the students to learn.

Assessment is a basic element for educational enterprise and also plays a role of pilot in learning. Most of the studies depicts single assessment tool that focused on instrument

validity and reliability. A few papers considered the role of expert judgment. Six factors were discussed in a study: 1) assessing the learning and professional development, 2) assessment demands motivated and skilled assessing personnel, 3) novice assessors value authentic and global assessment, 4) assessment evolving context-sensitive, 5) poor assessment causes the negative implications, and 6) assessment raises an emotional response (Jamieson, Palermo, Hay, & Gibson, 2018). Educational Assessment is the process of gathering and assembling the information from committed activities (tests on performance learning) to draw the conclusion about teaching-learning process, assessment is often used to do the comparison about some pre-established standards (Lamprianou&Athanasou, 2009). Educational assessment presents as a communicative tool among the educational world and the wider society. This beam of communication ranges from the informal communication to the peak level of formal communication, covering everything from school results to high stakes public tests, also taking charge from individual job interview to national monitoring. But the common element is the use of assessment data of any kind that is publicly acceptable for the quality assurance (Broadfoot& Black, 2004). Most of the educational institutes, especially universities are hiring two types of faculties for imparting the education: 1) Regular/ permanent faculty, 2) Visiting Faculty. In many cases permanent faculty does not compatible with the actual need in regard to programmes offered in the various universities and student-ratio. Therefore, visiting faculty is hired. The purpose of hiring the visiting faculty is to offer the opportunity to the fresh graduates to be experts in their field by doing the part time job in institute. It also helps the HR managers to make decision about hiring someone as a permanent by judging their performance while they're working as visiting faculty. Both faculties play vital roles in imparting education.

In this era the higher education teachers are intended to appraise their classrooms by evaluating the students' responses in class as well as by assessing the exams of the students. A few institutes are considering that their evaluation is not completed until they haven't filled the self-evaluations forms about the teachers (Seldin, 1982). Effective teaching is the kind of teaching which is not ignoring the passive learners but also including those students to make them active learners. An effective teacher has to focus each and every aspect of teaching, managing the class, and making the decision about classroom conflicts.

Australian Curriculum Team (2016) enlist the range of assessment types in the book published in 2016 titled as "Teachers' guide to assessment": 1) summative assessment; 2) formative assessment; 3) diagnostic assessment; 4) curriculum based assessment; 5) performance based assessment; 6) portfolio assessment; 7) continues assessment; 8) computer assisted assessment, 9) online assessment; 10) peer assessment; 11) self-assessment 12) small group assessment; 13) Standardized assessment; 14) criterion assessment; 15) High stakes assessment; 16) pre- assessment; and 17) post- assessment (ACT, 2016). Rockoff and Speroni (2011) focused on the subjective evaluation of the beginning teacher and also test the teachers' effectiveness through multiple sources of subjective evaluation. Moreno (2010) enlists following of the seven pre-requisite skills for effective teaching. Professional skills includes: Communicational skills, classroom management skills, motivational skills, planning skills, assessment skills, technology skills.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were to find out differences between:

1. Teaching practices of permanent and visiting faculty
2. Assessment practices of permanent and visiting faculty
3. Self-reported practices and students' perceptions about teaching

4. Self-reported practices and students' perceptions about assessment

Null Hypotheses

There is no statistically significant difference between:

- H₀1.1 Motivational techniques followed by permanent and visiting faculty
- H₀1.2 Communicational skills of permanent and visiting faculty
- H₀1.3 Classroom management skills of permanent and visiting faculty
- H₀2.1 Formative assessment techniques followed by permanent and visiting faculty
- H₀2.2 Feedback effectiveness provided by permanent and visiting faculty
- H₀2.3 Setting the standards for assessment by permanent and visiting faculty
- H₀3 Teachers' self-reported practices and students' perceptions about teaching
- H₀4 Teachers' self-reported practices and students' perceptions about assessment

Research Methodology

The current study carried out under the positivism paradigm of research. According to this philosophical paradigm of the research, the objects of the study are not under the control of the researcher, knowledge is find out and checked by actual observations, and facts are settled by being a part of the phenomenon to assess its sub parts (Krauss, 2005). Study was quantitative in nature, and survey research design was followed. A survey was conducted for data collection from students, permanent and visiting faculty. Data were gathered from students, permanent and visiting faculty. Total students as population of the study were 10428 and total permanent faculty was 195 while total number of visiting faculty was 230. The determined sample size for the students' population was almost 10% of total students (Gay, 2005). And for the determining the sample size of the permanent and visiting faculty the sample determining model suggested by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) was followed. They suggested that when the population is about 195 researcher may determine the sample size 130, this was the sample for permanent faculty. And when the population is about 230, researcher may determine the sample size 144 this was sample for visiting faculty.

Table 1

Sample of the Study

Institutes	Department	Sampled university students	Sampled permanent faculty	Sampled visiting faculty
University of the Punjab, Lahore	Institute of Education and Research	232	34	22
	Institute of Business Administration	119	10	12
	English	86	08	12
	Physics	36	10	07
	Botany	58	07	03
	Mathematics	46	12	02
	Urdu	18	04	03
	Economic	57	08	02

University of Education, Lahore.	Education	110	04	12
	Business Administration	33	02	15
	English	45	06	22
	Physics	52	08	05
	Botany	45	05	03
	Urdu	10	04	06
	Economics	35	02	11
	Mathematics	59	06	04
Total		1042	130	141

Two questionnaires were developed; one questionnaire was developed for permanent and visiting faculty, and the other was developed for the students. Questionnaires were divided into three sections: 1) demographic information of the respondents, 2) statements related to teaching effectiveness of permanent and visiting faculty; the perceptions of respondents about motivational skills, classroom management skills, and communicational skills. 3) Statements related to assessment conducted by permanent and visiting faculty; the perceptions of the respondents about assessment standards, formative assessment, and feedback effectiveness. The five point Likert-type scale used for having the perception of respondents against statements. Validity of the both questionnaires were ensured by experts' opinions of the relevant field at Institute of Education and Research and University of Education, Lahore whereas for determining the reliability of teachers' questionnaire, it was piloted on 30 teachers (permanent and visiting), while students' questionnaire was administered on 50 students. The obtained value of Cronbach's Alpha for university students' questionnaire was .96.

Table 2

Reliability Statistics of University Students' Questionnaire

<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>Number of Items</i>
Reliability Statistics of University Students' Questionnaire	
.956	42

Table 3

Reliability Statistics of University Teachers' Questionnaire

<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>Number of Items</i>
Reliability Statistics of University Students' Questionnaire	
.786	42

Data Analysis

The mean and standard deviation was observed under the descriptive statistics, while independent sample t-test was applied to have the comparison between teaching and assessment practices followed by the permanent and visiting faculty.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Motivational Techniques followed by the Permanent and Visiting Faculty in Students Perceptions

	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>
Category	1040	1.4288	.58596
M.T	1040	36.7058	10.83785

The table shows that there were total 1040 teachers from two universities. The mean for responding against the motivational technique was 36.70, and the std. deviation was 10.83. $H_{01.1}$ There is no statistically significant difference between motivational techniques followed by permanent and visiting faculty

Table 5

An Independent Sample t-Test to Measure the Mean Scores of Students' Perceptions about Motivational Skills by Permanent and Visiting Faculty.

Category	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Permanent	623	42.7496	5.46384	30.130	1038	.000
Visiting	417	27.3802	10.78106			

Independent sample t-test was applied to compare the motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in the perceptions of students. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent= 42.75, SD= 5.46), and (visiting= 27.38, SD= 10.78); $t(30.13)$. This is concluded that the hypothesis is rejected by applying the appropriate statistical techniques.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Communicational Skills followed by the Permanent and Visiting Faculty in Students' Perceptions

	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>
Category	1040	1.4288	.58596
C.S	1040	21.7606	7.05440

The table shows that there were total 1040 teachers from two universities. The mean for responding against the motivational technique was 21.76, and the std. deviation was 7.054.

$H_{01.2}$ There is no statistically significant difference between communicational skills of permanent and visiting faculty

Table 7

An Independent Sample t-test to Measure the Mean Scores of Students' Perceptions about Communicational Skills by Permanent and Visiting Faculty.

Category	N	M	SD	t	df	p
Permanent	623	25.2970	4.37180	25.741	1038	.000
Visiting	417	16.2395	6.90992			

Independent sample t-test was applied to compare the communicational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in the perceptions of students. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent= 25.29, SD= 4.37), and (visiting= 16.23, SD= 6.90); $t(25.74)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Classroom Management Skills Followed by the Permanent and Visiting Faculty in Students' Perceptions

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Category	1040	1.4288	.58596
C.M	1040	18.2625	5.73503

The table shows that there were total 1040 teachers from two universities. The mean for responding against the motivational technique was 18.26, and the std. deviation was 5.73.

H_{01.3} There is no statistically significant difference between classroom management skills of permanent and visiting faculty

Table 9

An Independent Sample t-Test to Measure the Mean Scores of Students' Perceptions about Management Skills by Permanent and Visiting Faculty.

Category	N	M	SD	t-value	df	p
Permanent	623	21.1990	3.28431	26.584	1038	.000
Visiting	417	13.6889	3.75679			

Independent sample t-test was applied to compare the management skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in the perceptions of students. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent= 21.19, SD= 3.28), and (visiting= 13.69, SD= 3.76); $t(26.584)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Formative Assessment Techniques followed by the Permanent and Visiting Faculty in Student's Perceptions

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Category	1040	1.4288	0.58596
F.A	1040	25.1192	8.03345

The table shows that there were total 1040 teachers from two universities. The mean for responding against the motivational technique was 25.11, and the std. deviation was 8.03.

H_{02.1} There is no statistically significant difference between formative assessment techniques followed by permanent and visiting faculty

Table 11

An Independent Sample t-Test to Measure the Mean Scores of Students' Perceptions about Assessing the Learners Formatively by Permanent and Visiting Faculty.

Category	N	M	SD	T	df	p
Permanent	623	29.3034	4.62234	27.412	1038	.000
Visiting	417	18.5827	7.90201			

Independent sample t-test was applied to compare the assessing the learners formatively by permanent and visiting faculty in the perceptions of students. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent= 29.30, SD= 4.62), and (visiting= 18.5, SD= 7.90); t (27.412). This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for effectiveness of feedback provided by the permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Category	1040	1.4288	.58596
F.E	1040	31.9779	10.54294

The table shows that there were total 1040 teachers from two universities. The mean for responding against the motivational technique was 31.97, and the std. deviation was 10.54.

H_{02.2} There is no statistically significant difference between feedback effectiveness provided by permanent and visiting faculty

Table 13

An Independent Sample t-Test to Measure the Mean Scores of Students' Perceptions about Feedback Effectiveness of Permanent and Visiting Faculty.

Category	N	M	SD	t-value	df	p
Permanent	623	37.2408	6.79629	25.689	1038	.000
Visiting	417	23.7802	10.00117			

Independent sample t-test was applied to compare the effectiveness of feedback provided by permanent and visiting faculty in the perceptions of students. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent= 37.24, SD= 6.79), and (visiting= 23.78, SD=10.00); t(25.68). This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics for Setting the Assessment Standards by the Permanent and Visiting Faculty Students' Perceptions

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Category	1040	1.4288	.585
Assessment Standards	1040	21.7269	7.156

The table shows that there were total 1040 teachers from two universities. The mean for responding against the motivational technique was 21.72, and the std. deviation was 7.15.

H_{02.3} There is no statistically significant difference between setting the standards for assessment by permanent and visiting faculty

Table 15

An Independent Sample t-Test to Measure the Mean Scores of Students' Perceptions about Setting the Assessment Standards by Permanent and Visiting Faculty

Category	N	M	SD	t-value	df	p
Permanent	623	25.4462	3.94902	27.118	1038	.000
Visiting	417	15.9531	7.23716			

Independent sample t-test was applied to compare the standards of assessment settled by permanent and visiting faculty in the perceptions of students. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent=25.44, SD= 3.94), and (visiting= 15.95, SD=7.23); $t(27.118)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.

H_{01.1} There is no statistically significant difference between motivational techniques followed by permanent and visiting faculty

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics for motivational skills followed by the permanent and visiting faculty in teachers' perceptions

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Category	268	1.5187	.500
M.T	268	41.0037	2.424

The table shows that there were total 268 teachers from two universities. The mean for responding against the motivational technique was 41.00, and the std. deviation was 2.42.

Table 17

An Independent Sample t-Test To Measure the Mean Scores of Teachers' Perceptions about Motivational Techniques followed by Permanent and Visiting Faculty

Category	N	M	S.D	df	t-value	p
Permanent	130	40.8413	2.18509	263.195	-1.248	.545
Visiting	141	41.21197	2.67106			

Independent sample t-test was applied to compare the motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in the perceptions of teachers. There is no statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent, M=40.84, SD=2.18), and (visiting, M= 41.21, SD2.67); $t(-1.24)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is accepted here.

Table 18

Descriptive Statistics for communicational skills followed by the permanent and visiting faculty in teachers' perceptions

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Category	268	1.5187	.50059
C.S	268	26.7873	1.65676

The table shows that there were total 268 teachers from two universities. The mean for responding against the communicational skills was 26.78, and the std. deviation was 1.65.

H_{01.2} There is no statistically significant difference between communicational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty

Table 19

An Independent Sample t-Test to Measure The Mean Scores of Teachers' Perceptions about Communicational Skills Followed by Permanent and Visiting Faculty.

Category	N	M	S.D	df	t-value	p
Permanent	130	26.6587	1.38658	256.91	-1.237	.074
Visiting	141	26.9091	1.84289			

Independent sample t-test was applied to compare the communicational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in the perceptions of teachers. There is no statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent, M=26.65, SD=1.38), and (visiting, M= 26.90, SD=1.84); t (-1.23). This is concluded that the null hypothesis is accepted here.

Table 20

Descriptive Statistics for Classroom Management Skills followed by the Permanent and Visiting Faculty in Teachers' Perceptions

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Category	268	1.5187	.50059
C.M	268	22.3918	1.45322

The table shows that there were total 268 teachers from two universities. The mean for responding against the classroom management skills was 22.39, and the std. deviation was 1.45.

H_{01.3} There is no statistically significant difference between classroom management skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty

Table 21

An Independent Sample t-Test to Measure the Mean Scores of Teachers' Perceptions about Classroom Management Skills followed by Permanent and Visiting Faculty.

Category	N	Mean	S.D	df	t-value	P
Permanent	130	22.3968	1.21378	269	.100	.045
Visiting	141	22.3788	1.64168			

Independent sample t-test was applied to compare the classroom management skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in the perceptions of teachers. There is no statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent, M=26.65, SD=1.38), and (visiting, M= 26.90, SD=1.84); t (-1.23). This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.

Table 22

An Independent Sample t-Test to Measure The Mean Scores of Teachers' Perceptions about use of Formative Assessment by Permanent and Visiting Faculty.

Category	N	M	S.D	df	t-value	P
Permanent	130	31.4762	1.55802	265.938	.354	.257
Visiting	141	31.4015	1.82376			

Independent sample t-test was applied to compare the formative assessment techniques followed by permanent and visiting faculty in the perceptions of students. There is no

statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent=31.47, SD=1.55), and (visiting= 31.40, SD=1.82); $t(354)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is accepted here.

H_{02.2} There is no statistically significant difference between effectiveness of feedback provided by permanent and visiting faculty?

Table 23

An Independent Sample t-Test to Measure the Mean Scores of Teachers' Perceptions about Effectiveness of Feedback Provided by Permanent and Visiting Faculty.

Category	N	M	S,D	df	t-value	P
Permanent	130	40.0714	1.49227	269	.716	.001
Visiting	141	39.9091	2.08760			

Independent sample t-test was applied to compare the effectiveness of feedback provided by permanent and visiting faculty in the perceptions of teachers. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent, M=40.07, SD=1.49), and (visiting, M= 39.90, SD=2.08); $t(.716)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.

H_{03.1} There is no statistically significant difference between teachers' self-reported practices and students' perceptions about teaching.

Table 24

Independent Sample t-Test to Compare the Means Between the Teachers' Self Reported Teaching Practices and Students' Perception about Teaching of Permanent And Visiting Faculty.

Category	N	M	S.D	df	t-value	P
Teachers	271	90.1919	4.08974	1310	11.806	.000
Students	1040	76.7339	18.64551			

An independent sample t-test was applied to compare the difference between teachers' self reported practices and students' perceptions about teaching of permanent and visiting faculty. There is statistically significant difference between the teachers' self reported practices and students' perceptions about teaching practices by permanent and visiting faculty, (teachers, M=90.1919, S.D= 4.08974), (Students, M=76.7339, S.D=18.64551), $t(11.806)$. So, the hypothesis is rejected here.

H_{04.1} There is no statistically significant difference between teachers' self reported practices and students' perceptions about assessment.

Table 25

Independent Sample t-Test to Compare the Means between the Teachers' Self Reported Assessment Practices and Students' Perception about Assessment Practices of Permanent and Visiting Faculty.

Category	n	M	S.D	df	t-value	P
Teachers	271	98.1882	3.66131	1310	12.892	.000
Students	1040	78.8396	24.62922			

An independent sample t-test was applied to compare the difference between teachers' self reported practices and students' perceptions about teaching of permanent and visiting faculty. There is statistically significant difference between the teachers' self reported

practices and students' perceptions about teaching practices by permanent and visiting faculty, (teachers, $M=98.1882$, $S.D.=3.66131$), (Students, $M=78.8396$, $S.D.=24.62922$), $t(12.892)$. So, the hypothesis is rejected here.

Findings

1. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent= 42.75, $SD=5.46$), and (visiting= 27.38, $SD=10.78$); $t(30.13)$. This is concluded that the hypothesis is rejected by applying the appropriate statistical techniques
2. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent= 25.29, $SD=4.37$), and (visiting= 16.23, $SD=6.90$); $t(25.74)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.
3. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent= 21.19, $SD=3.28$), and (visiting= 13.69, $SD=3.76$); $t(26.584)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.
4. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent= 29.30, $SD=4.62$), and (visiting= 18.5, $SD=790$); $t(27.412)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.
5. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent= 37.24, $SD=6.79$), and (visiting= 23.78, $SD=10.00$); $t(25.68)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.
6. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent=25.44, $SD=3.94$), and (visiting= 15.95, $SD=7.23$); $t(27.118)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here
7. There is no statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent, $M=40.84$, $SD=2.18$), and (visiting, $M=41.21$, $SD=2.67$); $t(-1.24)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is accepted here.
8. There is no statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent, $M=26.65$, $SD=1.38$), and (visiting, $M=26.90$, $SD=1.84$); $t(-1.23)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is accepted here.
9. There is no statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent=31.47, $SD=1.55$), and (visiting= 31.40, $SD=1.82$); $t(0.354)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is accepted here.
10. There is statistically significant difference between motivational skills followed by permanent and visiting faculty in students' perceptions (permanent, $M=40.07$, $SD=1.49$), and (visiting, $M=39.90$, $SD=2.08$); $t(0.716)$. This is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected here.
11. There is statistically significant difference between the teachers' self reported practices and students' perceptions about teaching practices by permanent and visiting faculty, (teachers, $M=90.1919$, $S.D.=4.08974$), (Students, $M=76.7339$, $S.D.=18.64551$), $t(11.806)$. So, the hypothesis is rejected here.
12. There is statistically significant difference between the teachers' self reported practices and students' perceptions about teaching practices by permanent and visiting faculty, (teachers, $M=98.1882$, $S.D.=3.66131$), (Students, $M=78.8396$, $S.D.=24.62922$), $t(12.892)$. So, the hypothesis is rejected here.

Conclusion

The study focused on comparing the self-reported teaching and assessment practices of permanent and visiting faculty members at the university level. To determine whether significant differences existed between the two groups, an independent-samples t-test was employed. The findings revealed that there were statistically significant differences in the teaching and assessment practices reported by permanent and visiting faculty members. However, students' perceptions did not indicate significant differences between the two categories of faculty, suggesting that students generally viewed the teaching and assessment practices of permanent and visiting teachers as comparable. A detailed analysis of the individual constructs showed mixed results. According to the faculty members' self-reports, significant differences were observed in certain aspects of teaching and assessment practices. However, no statistically significant differences were found in specific teaching-related constructs, namely motivational skills and communication skills. Similarly, within the assessment domain, the construct related to formative assessment practices (assessing learners formatively) also showed no significant difference between permanent and visiting faculty members. These findings suggest that while variations exist in some areas of teaching and assessment, both groups of faculty demonstrate similar practices in motivating students, communicating instructional content, and conducting formative assessment activities.

References

- Adriene, J. (2003). An effective teaching-learning environment. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 21(45), 411-419.
- Batool, S. S., Naz, B., Habib, S., Anjum, W., Goraya, F., Akram, M., ...Sadaf, A. (2015). Construction of effective teaching evaluation scale and students' perception of the characteristics of effective teachers. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 13(1), 28-35.
- Baxter, A. (1997). Evaluating your students. *Richmond*, 12(2), 137-151.
- Berk, A. R. (2005). Survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(1), 48-62.
- Broadfoot, P., & Black, P. (2004). Redefining assessment? The first ten years of assessment in education: Principles, policy & practice. *Routledge Tylor and Francis*, 11(1), 7-26.
- Centra, J. A. (1972). Self-ratings of college teachers: A comparison with student ratings. *Research Bulletin*, 12(72)-33.
- Cross Sectoral Assessment Working Party. (2011). *Teachers' guide to assessment*. Australia: Author.
- Dawson, P., Bearman, M., Boud, D. J., Hall, M., Molloy, E. K., Bannet, S., & Joughin, G. (2013). Assessment might dictate the curriculum, but What dictates assessment?. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal*, 1 (1), 107-111.
- Devlin, M., & Samarawickerema, G. (2010). The criteria of effective teaching in a changing higher education context. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(2), 111-124.
- Ding, C., & Sherman, H. (2006). Teaching effectiveness and student achievement: Examining the relationship. *University of Missouri-St. Louis*, 29(4), 11-25.
- Drew, J. C., Hardman, L. M., & Hosp, L. J. (2008). *Designing and conducting research in education*. California, United States of America: Sage.



- Falchiko, N., & Goldfinch, J. (2000). Student peer assessment in higher education: A meta-analysis comparing peer and teacher marks. *American Educational Research Association*, 70(3), 287-332.
- Fletcher, B.R., Meyer, H. L., Anderson, H., Johnston, P., & Rees, M. (2012). Faculty and students conceptions of assessment in higher education. *Springer*, 64(1), 119-133.
- Freeman, J., Simonsen, B., Brier, D. E., & MacSuga-Gage, A. S. (2013). Teacher and special Education. *The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 37(02), 106-120.
- Goudas, M., & Biddle, S. (2001). Perceived motivational climate and intrinsic motivation in school physical education classes. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 9(3), 241-250.
- Guliker, J. J. M., Bastiaes, T. M., & Krischer, P. A. (2004). *ETR&D*, 52(3), 1042-1629.
- Holzberger, D., Praetorius, A. K., Seide, T., & Kunter, M. (2019). Identifying effective teachers; The relation between teaching practices and students' development in achievement and enjoyment. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 39(8), 801-823.
- Jamieson, J., Palermo, C., Hay, M., & Gibson S. (2018). Assessment practices for dietetics trainee: A systematic review. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, 119(2), 272-291.
- Jang, E. E. (2008). A framework for cognitive diagnostic assessment. In C. A. Chappelle, Y. R. Chung & J. Xu (Eds.), *Towards adaptive CALL: Natural language processing for diagnostic assessment* (pp. 117-131). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.
- Krauss, S. E. (2005). Research paradigms and meaning making: A primer. *Journal of University of Malaya*, 10(4), 758-770.
- Khattak, G. S. (2012). Assessment in schools in Pakistan. *SA-eDUC Journal*, 9(2), 1-13.
- Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(45), 607-610.
- Lewllen, J. R. (2002). Systematic and effective teaching. *The High School Journal*, 47(1), 57-63.
- Lamprianou, I., & Athanasou, J. A. (2009). *A teacher's guide to educational assessment* (2nd ed.). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Lynn, C., Minor, Anthony, J., Onwuegbuzie, A. E., Witcher, & Terry, L. J. (2010). Pre-service teachers' educational beliefs and their perceptions of characteristics of effective teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(2), 116-127.
- Lu, J., & Law, N. (2012). Online peer assessment: Effects of cognitive and effective feedback. *Instructional Science*, 40(2), 257-275.
- Mcfarland, T. (2005). The determinants for an effective learning infrastructure. *Journal of Psychology of Education*, 12(56), 56-90.
- Mengal, S.K. (2000). *Advance educational psychology*. Berkely, CA: New Riders.
- Miller, D.M., Linn, L. R., & Gronlund, E. N. (2009). *Measurement and Assessment in Teaching* (4th ed.). United States of America, New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Moreno, R. (2010). *Educational psychology*. New Mexico, United States of America: John Wiley.