



ISSN Print: 2394-7500  
ISSN Online: 2394-5869  
Impact Factor: 5.2  
IJAR 2015; 1(8): 651-654  
www.allresearchjournal.com  
Received: 14-05-2015  
Accepted: 16-06-2015

**Dr. AC Lal Kumar**

Assistant Professor for M.Ed.,  
G.E.T. College of Education,  
Vidyasankara Puram Village,  
Paradarami Post, Gudiyattam  
Taluk, Vellore District, 632  
603, Tamil Nadu, India.

**Dr. R Krishna Kumar**

Professor of Education,  
Department of Education,  
Annamalai University,  
Annamalai Nagar,  
Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu,  
India.

**Correspondence:**

**Dr. AC Lal Kumar**

Assistant Professor for M.Ed.,  
G.E.T. College of Education,  
Vidyasankara Puram Village,  
Paradarami Post, Gudiyattam  
Taluk, Vellore District, 632  
603, Tamil Nadu, India.

## A Study of Teacher Effectiveness of Primary School Teachers

**AC Lal Kumar, R Krishna Kumar**

### Abstract

The present study aims to examine whether there was any significant difference in teacher effectiveness of primary school teachers in terms of certain background variables. In this study, data were collected with the help of Teacher Effectiveness Scale by Umme Dixit (1993). The investigator has selected 300 primary school teachers in Vellore District as sample with random sampling technique. For analyzing the data Mean, SD't' test and 'F' test were used. The findings show that i) there is no significantly affected by sex, type of institution, group of study, nature of school, location of the school, marital status, age, teaching stream and type of family of primary school teachers towards teacher effectiveness.

**Keywords:** Study, Teacher Effectiveness, Primary School

### 1. Introduction

Education enables a person to facilitate one's duties and responsibilities to oneself, to the family, to the society and to the Nation and help him to live a successful and meaningful life that inspires and guides the younger generation. Both the laypersons and professional educators believe firmly that the effectiveness of an educational programme is largely determined by the quality of teachers as they interpret, imbibe and transmit knowledge and intellectual traditions from generation to generation. The importance of teacher in the process of education is of great value. "Of all the different factors, which influence the quality of education and its contribution to National Development, the quality, competence and characters of teachers are undoubtedly the most significant (Indian Education Commission 1964-66). In the words of Kothari D.S. "A right kind of teacher is one who possesses a vivid awareness of two missions.

### Meaning of Teacher Effectiveness

The term teacher effectiveness refers to the measure of success of teacher in carrying out institutional and other specified duties demanded by the nature of his/her position. Teacher effectiveness include efficacy in strategies of instruction, etc student and classroom management, inter personal relations, evaluation and feedback.

The teacher effectiveness is made up of two familiar words 'teacher' and 'effectiveness'. Teacher is a person who teaches i.e. impart knowledge or skills to the learner. 'Effectiveness' is the quality of being successful in producing an intended result' (Collin's English Dictionary)

The term teaching effectiveness implies the effectiveness of teaching within given unit, whereas the term teacher effectiveness refers to individual teacher performance. Teacher effectiveness is a nebulous concept as no universally acceptable formula can be given to define 'an effective teacher' what are the qualities and characteristics of effective teachers? How can these qualities be identified? These questions remain unanswered satisfactorily even after several years of research in this area conducted in different countries by large number of educationists. Until and unless these questions are successfully answered the right type of pre-service and in-service training to accomplish the dream of moulding effective teachers would not be possible.

**Five Dimensions of Teacher Effectiveness**

Teacher effectiveness scale selected for the study mainly depends on five factors, which are:

- **Personal Factors:** It refer to be dynamic and energetic, clarity of instruction and good modulation, maintaining cordial relationship with students, effective work style etc
- **Professional Factors :**It include behavioral problem of the students, good study habits and work patterns, clear cut objectives, motivating students by providing new learning experiences etc.
- **Intellectual Factors:** It refer to command over subject, thorough in subject matter content, being conversant with up to date knowledge etc
- **Strategies of Teaching:** It refers to classroom teaching techniques, selection of suitable teaching methods to suit individual difference, adoption of child centred approach, arranging group activates, display techniques etc.
- **The Social Aspects:** It includes maintaining good social relationship with colleagues, active participation in social and cultural activities participating willingly in health programmes, educating people about health and hygiene etc.

It can be concluded with the above discussion that the teacher effectiveness will be considered with the professional skills and professional quality of a teacher. Therefore, the professional competency has a significant role in teacher effectiveness

**Title of the Study**

A Study of Teacher Effectiveness of Primary School Teachers.

**Operational Definition  
Teacher Effectiveness**

The term teacher effectiveness refers to the measure of success of teacher in carrying out institutional and other specified duties demanded by the nature of his/her position. Teacher effectiveness include efficacy in strategies of instruction, etc student and classroom management, inter personal relations, evaluation and feedback.

**Objectives of the Study**

To find out whether there is any significant difference in teacher effectiveness of primary school teachers in terms of certain demographic variables

- 1) Sex : Male / Female
- 2) Type of Institution : Government/ Private/ Aided
- 3) Group of Study : Arts / Science
- 4) Nature of School : Girls / Boys / Co Education
- 5) Location of the School : Rural / Urban
- 6) Marital Status : Married / Unmarried
- 7) Age : Below 30 / Above 31
- 8) Teaching Stream : Science / Maths / Arts
- 9) Type of Family : Nuclear / Joint

**Hypotheses of the Study**

1. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of teacher effectiveness between male and female.
2. There is no significant difference among sub samples of type of management with respect to their teacher effectiveness of primary school teachers.
3. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of

teacher effectiveness between arts and science.

4. There is no significant difference among sub samples of nature of school with respect to their teacher effectiveness of primary school teachers.
5. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of teacher effectiveness between rural and urban.
6. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of teacher effectiveness between married and unmarried.
7. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of teacher effectiveness between age below 30 and above 31.
8. There is no significant difference among sub samples of teaching stream with respect to their teacher effectiveness of primary school teachers.
9. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of teacher effectiveness between nuclear and joint family.

**Methodology**

The Descriptive Survey method was used in this study.

**Sample of the Study**

For the present study the investigator select 300 primary school teachers in Vellore District by the method of Random Sampling.

**Tools used for the Study**

Teacher Effectiveness Scale by Umme Dixit (1993).

**Statistical Techniques Used**

Mean, SD, ‘t’ and ‘F’ value was calculated for the analysis of the data.

**Description of the Tool**

**Scoring Procedure of the Teacher Effectiveness**

The scale is self-administrable. There is no time limit and there is no right or wrong responses. Hence the teachers are free to express their responses as they perceive, keeping in view the maximum possible effectiveness (high) of teachers and the least possible effectiveness (low) of teachers, as frame of references for individual rating. The scale had 60 statements. It is Likert type, scale range from poor, fair, good, very good and excellent. Score range from 1,2,3,4 and 5. Total score of the respondent ranges from 0 to 300.

**Reliability and Validity of the Teacher Effectiveness**

The spilt-half reliability co-efficient correlation was found to be 0.68. After applying the Spearman- Brown prophecy formula, the reliability co-efficient went up to 0.94. Criterion related validity has been established for the scale. Correlations of the teacher effectiveness rating scale and teacher effectiveness scale comes out to be 0.85.

**Analysis and Interpretation of the Data**

**Differential Analysis –Teacher Effectiveness**

**Table 1:** ‘t’ test between Mean Scores of Male and Female Primary School Teachers towards Teacher Effectiveness

Gender	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value	Level of Significance
Male	157	136.57	50.37	0.028	NS
Female	143	136.40	58.72		

It is evident from the Table 1, the calculated‘t’ value is 0.028, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the

framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between male and female primary school teachers with respect to their teacher effectiveness.

**Table 2:** ‘F’ test among the Sub- samples of Type of Management with Respect To Their Teacher Effectiveness

Type of Management	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	df	‘F’ Value	Level of Significance
Between Groups	30473.228	15236.614	2	5.291	NS
Within Groups	855247.768	2879.622	297		
Total	885720.997		299		

It is evident from the Table 2, the calculated ‘F’ value is 0.048, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among sub samples of type of management with respect to their teacher effectiveness of primary school teachers.

**Table 3:** ‘t’ test between Mean Scores of Arts and Science Primary School Teachers towards Teacher Effectiveness

Course of Study	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value	Level of Significance
Arts	199	140.80	54.51	1.93	NS
Science	101	128.00	53.51		

It is evident from the Table 3, the calculated ‘t’ value is 1.93, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found between arts and science of primary school teachers with respect to their teacher effectiveness.

**Table 4:** ‘F’ test among the Sub- samples of Nature of School with Respect To Their Teacher Effectiveness

Nature of School	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	df	‘F’ Value	Level of Significance
Between Groups	3606.165	1803.083	2	0.607	NS
Within Groups	882114.832	2970.084	297		
Total	885720.997		299		

It is evident from the Table 4, the calculated ‘F’ value is 0.607, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among sub samples of nature of school with respect to their teacher effectiveness of primary school teachers.

**Table 5:** ‘t’ test between Mean Scores of Rural and urban Primary School Teachers towards Teacher Effectiveness

Location of School	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value	Level of Significance
Rural	116	141.86	53.11	0.228	NS
Urban	184	133.11	55.11		

It is evident from the Table 5, the calculated ‘t’ value is 0.228, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference

found out between rural and urban primary school teachers with respect to their teacher effectiveness.

**Table 6:** ‘t’ test between Mean Scores of Married and Unmarried Primary School Teachers towards Teacher Effectiveness

Marital Status	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value	Level of Significance
Married	189	136.00	55.28	0.071	NS
Unmarried	111	137.33	53.17		

It is evident from the Table 6, the calculated ‘t’ value is 0.071, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between married and primary school teachers with respect to their teacher effectiveness.

**Table 7:** ‘t’ test between Mean Scores of age below 30 and age above 31 Primary School Teachers towards Teacher Effectiveness

Age	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value	Level of Significance
Below 30	238	133.84	53.45	0.386	NS
Above 31	62	146.69	57.30		

It is evident from the Table 7, the calculated ‘t’ value is 0.386, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between age below 30 and age above 31 of primary school teachers with respect to their teacher effectiveness.

**Table 8:** ‘F’ test among the Sub- samples of Teaching Stream with Respect To Their Teacher Effectiveness

Teaching Stream	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	df	‘F’ Value	Level of Significance
Between Groups	2280.314	1140.157	2	0.383	NS
Within Groups	883440.683	2974.548	297		
Total	885720.997		299		

It is evident from the Table 8, the calculated ‘F’ value is 1.383, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among sub samples of teaching stream with respect to their teacher effectiveness of primary school teachers.

**Table 9:** ‘t’ test between Mean Scores of Nuclear Family and Joint family towards Teacher Effectiveness

Type of Family	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value	Level of Significance
Nuclear	140	137.26	56.04	0.228	NS
Joint	160	135.82	53.14		

It is evident from the Table 9, the calculated ‘t’ value is 0.207, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between nuclear and joint with respect to their teacher effectiveness.

### **Major Findings of the Study**

1. There is no significant difference found out between male and female primary school teachers with respect to their teacher effectiveness.
2. There is no significant difference among sub samples of type of management with respect to their teacher effectiveness of primary school teachers.
3. There is no significant difference found between arts and science of primary school teachers with respect to their teacher effectiveness.
4. There is no significant difference among sub samples of nature of school with respect to their teacher effectiveness of primary school teachers.
5. There is no significant difference found out between rural and urban primary school teachers with respect to their teacher effectiveness.
6. There is no significant difference found out between married and primary school teachers with respect to their teacher effectiveness.
7. There is no significant difference found out between age below 30 and age above 31 of primary school teachers with respect to their teacher effectiveness.
8. There is no significant difference among sub samples of teaching stream with respect to their teacher effectiveness of primary school teachers.
9. There is no significant difference found out between nuclear and joint with respect to their teacher effectiveness.

### **References**

1. Best, John W. Research in Educations” Englewood Cliffs Prentice Hall Inc, 1977.
2. Dibapile, Waitshenga Tefo Smitta. “A Report of the Response of Botswana Junior Secondary School Teachers on the Three Subscales of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale”; Journal Articles’, Reports Research, Journal of International Education Research. (TSES), (EJ 982693) 2012; 8:2.
3. Guilford JP. Fundamental statistics in Psychology and Education” New York, Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, Inc, 1956.
4. Lokesh Kowl. Methodology of Educational Research” (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd, 1990.
5. Sorlie, Mari-Anne’, Torsheim, Torbjorn. School effectiveness and school improvement, Journal Articles, Reports-Research. 2011; 22(2):175-191.
6. Subbrayan P. A Study of Relationship between Teacher Effectiveness, Research and Publication and self-concept Ph. D Edn Andhra University, 1985.