

“TEACHING COMPETENCY OF HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THANJAVUR DISTRICT”.

A.Karthika, Ph.D. Research Scholar (Part-time) Department of Pedagogical Sciences Tamil Nadu Teacher Education University Karapakkam, Chennai.

Email: harikrishna@gmail.com

Dr. A. Magalingam, Assistant Professor, Department of Pedagogical Sciences, Tamil Nadu Teacher Education University, Karapakkam, Chennai.

Email: magalingamarumugam@gmail.com

Abstract

The study aimed to evaluate Teaching Competency among High School Teachers in Thanjavur, examining how variables such as gender, community, and religion might affect their Soft Skills and Work Motivation. A 125-item questionnaire was developed to gather responses from the teachers. From both rural and urban areas of Thanjavur in Tamil Nadu, a random sample of 100 High School Teachers was selected from seven schools. The findings indicated that Soft Skills and Work Motivation are significant among High School Teachers. It is advised to foster a learning environment marked by a positive and supportive Teacher-Student relationship.

Keywords: Teaching Competency, Work Motivation, Discipline,

INTRODUCTION

Methodology has a major role in any research. It discusses the procedures and techniques adopted for the conduct of the study. It helps to conduct the research in a scientific and legitimate mode. “The whole research process is methodological. At the heart of all the interwoven research activities are endless of selection and in constantly

justifying this selection, a good methodology is more a critical design attitude to be found always at work throughout a study” (Kothari, 2004).

In the first two chapters, the conceptual framework, the problem and significance of the study, objectives and hypotheses of the study and the review of related literature were presented respectively. The first two chapters collectively helped the researcher to frame the research methodology and field study design. The present chapter discusses the research methodology followed in this study, along with the research design and strategies undertaken. It details the area, population, sample, process of development of the survey instrument - the questionnaire and the methods used in ascertaining its reliability and validity. It also discusses the basis analytical tools employed.

NEED AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The needs of the younger generation are not satisfied according to their aspirations. The youngsters are not satisfactorily fulfilling the expectations of the society. The gap between their education and needs of the society is broadened. Hence to catch the true spirit of the world in the various professional activities, eliminate the unhealthy competition in the economic life of a society. As we are recognized as the largest democratic country and to stride towards rapid developments in all fields, a strong foundation on democratic approach is essential. This warrants for enhancing favorable approaches that will prompt and propped ideals of discipline. We are living in a Secular Attitude and Emotional Maturity interlinked society.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

The investigator adopted the following operational definitions for the terms used in the title.

Teaching competency

In the present study, Teaching Competency is the ability of the higher secondary teachers to execute a mastery level in teaching with all the capacities and

capabilities that are needed to handle their profession. It refers to their performance level and skill in handling a topic to the best satisfaction of the learners. It includes the skill of planning, skill of motivation, skill of subject mastery, skill of presentation, skill of using of audio-visual aids, skill of using of relevant examples, skill of class room management, skill of closure of the lesson, skill of evaluation and skill of guidance of higher secondary teachers.

High School Teachers:

The investigator means by High School Teachers those teachers who are handling classes from VI to X.

Statement of the Problem

“Teaching Competency of High School Teachers in relation to Soft Skills and Work Motivation in Thanjavur District”.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To find out the Level of Teaching Competency among High School Teachers of Thanjavur.
2. To find out the significant difference in the mean scores of Teaching Competency of High School Teachers with respect to:
 - a) Gender : Male / Female
 - b) Type of school : Government / Non-Government
 - c) Locality of school : Rural / Urban
 - d) Medium of instruction : Tamil / English
 - e) Teaching subjects : Language/ Arts/Science
 - f) Teaching experience in years : Below 10/10-20/Above 21
 - g) Age in years : Below 25/26-50/Above 51
 - h) Marital status : Married / Unmarried
 - i) Type of family : Nuclear / Joint.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

1. The Level of Teaching Competency among High School Teachers of Thanjavur is high.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Teaching Competency of High School Teachers with respect to:
 - a) Gender : Male / Female
 - b) Type of school : Government / Non-Government
 - c) Locality of school : Rural / Urban
 - d) Medium of instruction : Tamil / English
 - e) Teaching subjects : Language/ Arts/Science
 - f) Teaching experience in years : Below 10/10-20/Above 21
 - g) Age in years : Below 25/26-50/Above 51
 - h) Marital status : Married / Unmarried
 - i) Type of family : Nuclear / Joint.

METHODOLOGY METHOD

Normative survey method was adopted in this study.

SAMPLE

As many as 100 High School Teachers of Thanjavur in Tamil Nadu has been chosen with the help of stratified random sampling technique as sample for the present study.

TOOL

1. Teaching Competency scale (TCS) constructed and standardized by Investigator. (2020).

Teaching Competency Scale (TCS)

Preparation of the Draft Tool Teaching Competency Scale

The investigator went through a number of tools and weighed the merits and demerits of the available tools and decided to construct tools. For the preparation of the tool the investigator went through books, journals and internet and prepared 125 statements for Teaching Competency Scale.

Content Validity

To establish content validity, the tool both in English and Tamil was well scrutinized and checked by the experts in the field of education. A few modifications were done based on their comments, regarding the language, suitability and relevance of the items. Thus, the content validity of the tool was affirmed.

Item Analysis

For the purpose of item analysis, the three tools were given to 100 high school teachers from Thanjavur district. The responses collected from the high school teachers were scored by the investigator. Each item was calculated through chi square test. A chi-square technique was used to select the items from the final tool. Investigator calculated total score of each respondent. The items with the chi-square test values above 9.488 were taken for final tool. Table -1 contains X^2 values calculated for 125 items given in the pilot study and 100 items selected for the final study.

Table -1
 X^2 VALUE OBTAINED FOR ITEMS ANALYSIS OF TEACHER
COMPETENCY SCALE (TCS)

| Item No | X^2 Value | Selected / Not Selected | Item No | X^2 Value | Selected / Not Selected |
|---------|-------------|-------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------------------|
| 1. | 66.5 | S | 66. | 21.3 | S |
| 2. | 39.5 | S | 67. | 7.35 | NS |
| 3. | 2.3 | NS | 68. | 22.5 | S |
| 4. | 15.8 | S | 69. | 16.7 | S |
| 5. | 54.3 | S | 70. | 10.7 | S |
| 6. | 8.1 | NS | 71. | 16.7 | S |
| 7. | 11.39 | S | 72 | 5.5 | NS |

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| 8. | 9.5 | S | 73. | 12.1 | S |
| 9. | 6.10 | NS | 74. | 12.5 | S |
| 10. | 39.9 | S | 75. | 14.35 | S |
| 11. | 27.5 | S | 76. | 6.4 | NS |
| 12. | 11.1 | S | 77. | 14.5 | S |
| 13. | 39.7 | S | 78. | 16.6 | S |
| 14. | 5.1 | NS | 79. | 2.4 | NS |
| 15. | 28.4 | S | 80. | 24.3 | S |
| 16. | 39.4 | S | 81. | 16.5 | S |
| 17. | 19.7 | S | 82. | 3.3 | NS |
| 18. | 17.3 | S | 83. | 17.05 | S |
| 19. | 7.9 | NS | 84. | 16.05 | S |
| 20. | 12.9 | S | 85. | 8.1 | NS |
| 21. | 22 | S | 86. | 27.6 | S |
| 22. | 28.1 | S | 87. | 3.9 | NS |
| 23. | 6.5 | NS | 88. | 13.4 | S |
| 24. | 16.1 | S | 89. | 12.4 | S |
| 25. | 12.45 | S | 90. | 11.9 | S |
| 26. | 4.9 | NS | 91. | 3.8 | NS |
| 27. | 12.9 | S | 92. | 14.9 | S |
| 28. | 24.3 | S | 93. | 14.1 | S |
| 29. | 9.9 | S | 94. | 10.9 | S |
| 30. | 4.3 | NS | 95. | 0.5 | NS |
| 31. | 17.05 | S | 96. | 14.5 | S |
| 32. | 21.8 | S | 97. | 13.1 | S |
| 33. | 10.9 | S | 98. | 3.6 | NS |
| 34. | 5.2 | NS | 99. | 22.2 | S |
| 35. | 13.7 | S | 100. | 23.8 | S |
| 36. | 12.7 | S | 101. | 9 | NS |
| 37. | 11.4 | S | 102. | 125 | S |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----|---|------|----|
| 38. | 4.8 | NS | 103. | 22.5 | S |
| 39. | 12.2 | S | 104. | 22.8 | S |
| 40. | 10.85 | S | 105. | 5.5 | NS |
| 41. | 19.8 | S | 106 | 13.2 | S |
| 42. | 11.3 | S | 107. | 23.5 | S |
| 43. | 8.4 | NS | 108. | 15.5 | S |
| 44. | 13.2 | S | 109. | 0.7 | NS |
| 45. | 10.9 | S | 110. | 20.9 | S |
| 46. | 13.1 | S | 111. | 14.2 | S |
| 47. | 16.3 | S | 112. | 3.7 | NS |
| 48. | 2 | NS | 113. | 19.9 | S |
| 49. | 13.9 | S | 114. | 15.1 | S |
| 50. | 23.9 | S | 115. | 5 | NS |
| 51. | 20.3 | S | 116. | 7 | NS |
| 52. | 12.3 | S | 117. | 12.8 | S |
| 53. | 8.47 | NS | 118. | 10.7 | S |
| 54. | 15.8 | S | 119. | 1.1 | NS |
| 55. | 28.5 | S | 120. | 12.5 | S |
| 56. | 3.6 | NS | 121. | 11.7 | S |
| 57. | 11.6 | S | 122. | 0.8 | NS |
| 58. | 12.5 | S | 123. | 18.8 | S |
| 59. | 9.5 | S | 124. | 12.2 | S |
| 60. | 6.9 | NS | 125. | 2.9 | NS |
| 61. | 40.8 | S | Chi-Square values 0.05 level is 9.488 above | | |
| 62. | 13.5 | S | S – Significant | | |
| 63. | 7.1 | NS | NS – Not Significant | | |
| 64. | 19.3 | S | | | |
| 65. | 17.3 | S | | | |

Preparation of Final Scale

The draft inventory TCS was administered on a sample of 100 HSTs for the purpose of item analysis. On the basis of Item analysis, 90 items qualify the **criteria** chi-square test values above 9.488 to be selected for the preparation of final Scale.

Mode of Answering

Teachers were asked to make their responses towards each statement Viz., Strongly Agree, Agree, Uncertainty, Disagree and Strongly Disagree by putting tick (✓) mark according to their opinion.

Scoring

Quantification of Teaching Competency Scale has been done by giving a score of 5,4,3,2 and 1 to all statements, for the responses 'Strongly Agree', 'Agree', 'Uncertainty', 'Disagree' and 'Strongly Disagree' respectively.

Validity

To establish the validity of the Teaching Competency Scale, content and face validity have been used. The tool has content validity. The draft items were distributed among subject experts in the field of Education to get their opinion on appropriateness of the items and to remark on the un-ambiguity of the language. After getting the reports and suggestions, the required and relevant items were revised and re-modified, and the finalization of the tool was done. Thus, face validity of the Teaching Competency Scale also established.

Reliability

To ensure reliability of the Teaching Competency Scale, the investigator considered Cronbach Alpha and Guttman Split-Half Coefficient. The values obtained for items are 0.880 and 0.844 respectively, which indicates the data obtained from the Scale is reliable.

Interpretation of Scores – Teaching Competency

On the basis of the following table, the scores can be interpreted

| Scores | Interpretation |
|---------------|--------------------------------|
| 0 - 90 | Very Low Teaching Competency |
| 91 - 180 | Low Teaching Competency |
| 181 - 270 | Medium Teaching Competency |
| 271 - 360 | High Teaching Competency |
| 361 - 450 | Very High Teaching Competency. |

CONCLUSION

Teaching Competency among High School Teachers of Thanjavur is high. Most of the Countries made it mandatory for teachers to undergo formal course on education principles where the concepts of learning and teaching are taught. As such, many institutions are moving towards problem-based learning as a solution to producing graduates who are creative; think critically and analytically to solve problems, If the focus is on using multimedia technology as an innovative teaching and learning strategy in a problem-based learning environment by giving the students a multimedia project to train them in this skill set.

REFERENCES:

- 1) Bass. Centra, J.A., (1993). Reflective faculty evaluation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 2) Benson, L., Schroeder, P., Lantz, C., and Bird, M., (n.d.). Student Perception of Effective Professors. Retrieved www.usfca.edu/ess/sym2001/PDFbooks/
- 3) Bingimlas, K.A., (2009). Barriers to the successful integration of ICT in teaching and learning environments: A review of literature. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 5(3), 235-245.
- 4) Cradler, J., (2002). Finding research-based information about technology in teaching and learning. Learning and Leading with Technology, 29(7), 46-49.
- 5) Dave, R.H., (1975). Developing and writing Behavioural Objectives-Educational Innovators Press.

- 6) Ryan, K.E., (Ed). Evaluating teaching in higher education: A vision for the future. New directions for teaching and learning, 83, 109-123. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.