

## Teaching Abilities of Student Teachers (B.Ed)

<sup>a</sup>N.Ananthi, <sup>b</sup>S.Malathi

<sup>a</sup>M.Ed.,Scholar, <sup>b</sup>Associate Professor N.K.T National College Of Education, Tamilnadu, Chennai – 600 123., India

---

### Abstract

Teaching Abilities are the strategies which are used by the teachers to enable the children to learn something ‘worthwhile’ like facts, skills, values, concepts, how to live harmoniously. Social change and demands for qualification at the higher level has played a tremendous role on the teacher. Therefore the teacher is expected to use the skills for teaching effectively, so that the foundations laid are strong to face the technological and bureaucratic society. The demand for skillful teachers is increasing. The quality of teacher too is improving. The status of student teachers is assumed to be one of the major and sharp indicators of the future of the country. The objective of this research is to find out the level of teaching ability of student teachers. Stratified random sampling technique was adopted for the selection of sample. Research results revealed that teaching ability of student teachers are low in nature. There is significant difference in teaching ability based on gender and type of college and in other categories they do not differ significantly.

**KEYWORDS:** Teaching ability, Student teachers, Classroom management, Teaching skill, Teaching goal

---

### INTRODUCTION

#### “Good Education requires Good Teacher”

Good teachers are keen and enthusiastic, well organized and firm, fair and stimulating, know their stuff and are interested in the welfare of the students and want to move from the traditional to progressive nature. Classroom management is largely about discipline. It is about maintaining order and control, which is based on students acting in ways that support their own learning as well as that of others. Once classroom discipline is established, the next big trick is to transfer what is in your head into theirs. Observation of class room, various research studies and different theories of learning specify a group of teaching acts or behaviors intend to facilitate pupils learning directly or indirectly which are basic to teaching skill. At the minimum teaching is of basic functional skills, showing them how to do things by rote, repeating actions and words until, given a suitable stimulus, they are able to reproduce an effective response. Subject knowledge is a basic for teaching. In this article the investigator is focusing on the needed abilities for student teachers and suggestions to enhance their abilities to bring the quality.

The teaching Abilities are defined as a group of teaching acts or behaviors intended to facilitate students learning directly or indirectly.

Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) is a course offered for those interested in pursuing career in teaching. The B.Ed degree is mandatory for teaching in high schools and higher

secondary schools. B.Ed., course can be opted by an individual having under graduation or the post graduation in the field of arts or science. As a part of B.Ed., program students have to undergo training period as a part of graduation.

Professional competence would include rapid growth in the acquisition of knowledge, in fulfilling the demands of the society in terms of the types of employment, leisure, accountability, wider development in the educational field and information technology as well as broadening the role of the Teacher who has to accommodate change and not only improve but also renew the old practice. An effective teacher should possess knowledge and understanding of the content of the subjects and topics being taught, as well as the ability to manage a class, explain clearly, ask intelligent & appropriate questions, monitor and assess learning. Teaching Abilities is essential for the teachers to be effective in their profession. Effective teachers can be an inspiring teacher for the students in the learning environment. Hence the investigator aimed at finding the level of teaching abilities of student teacher in the present study.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

To find out the level of teaching abilities of student teachers.

To find out whether there is any significant difference in the teaching Abilities of student teachers with respect to their gender ,age, major subject, medium of instruction, family system, type of college, marital status.

### **Hypotheses of the study**

The level of teaching abilities of student teachers are average in nature.

There is no significant difference in the teaching Abilities of student teachers with respect to their Gender.

There is no significant difference in the teaching Abilities of student teachers with respect to their age.

There is no significant difference in the teaching Abilities among their major subject.

There is no significant difference in the teaching Abilities of student teachers with respect to medium of instruction.

There is no significant difference in the teaching abilities of Student teachers with respect to their family system.

There is no significant difference in the teaching abilities of Student teachers with respect to their type of college.

There is no significant difference in the teaching abilities of Student teachers with respect to their marital status.

## **Methodology**

### **sample**

A stratified random sampling technique was adopted for the selection of sample. The Institutions selected for the study are Government and Self – financing Institutions. The sample of 300 B.Ed., Student teachers were taken for the study.

### **Tool**

Teaching abilities of student teachers scale (Dr.S.MALATHI 2015)

The Teaching Abilities questionnaire used was constructed with three dimensions related to class room management, teaching skill, teaching goal. Teaching Abilities scale is a five point scale of 63 questions. Each statement has five options **ALWAYS(A), VERY OFTEN(VO),SOMETIMES(ST),RARELY(R),NEVER(N)** out of which one has to be selected. The weightage is given as 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 for alternatives Always, Very Often, Sometimes, Rarely, Never respectively for a positive statement.

### **Administration**

The investigators approached the Head of Institutions and obtained permission to collect the data. The investigator instructed the B.Ed., Student teachers to fill the scale without omitting any of the items.

### **Pilot Study**

Pilot study was conducted to determine the suitability of the tools used in the present investigation. 50 B.Ed., student teachers were selected for the pilot study for establishing the Reliability and the Validity. Cronbach's alpha reliability method was used and the reliability was found out to be .67 the validity was found out by computing the square root of the reliability co-efficient which worked out to be.81

## **Analysis of Data**

**Table 1:** Table showing the difference among the student teachers based on gender in their teaching ability.

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D</b>	<b>St.Error</b>	<b>t value</b>	<b>L.S</b>
<b>Classroom management</b>	Male	150	69.1267	10.80163	.88195	2.026	.05
	Female	150	72.0533	14.01379	1.14422		
<b>Teaching skill</b>	Male	150	68.8933	9.88603	.80719	.423	N.S
	Female	150	69.4800	13.83397	1.12954		

<b>Teaching goal</b>	Male	150	73.6400	12.62217	1.03060	3.204	.01
	Female	150	79.0133	16.20506	1.32314		
<b>Over all Teaching ability total</b>	Male	150	211.6600	21.90977	1.78893	2.617	.05
	Female	150	220.5467	35.34976	2.88630		

From the above table, it is inferred that there is significant difference in the Classroom management, Teaching goal & ability total among the student teachers based on their gender in their teaching ability. It is further inferred that, there is no significant difference in teaching skill among the student teachers based on their gender in their teaching ability.

**Table 2:** Table showing the difference among the student teachers based on age in their teaching ability.

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D</b>	<b>St.Error</b>	<b>t value</b>	<b>L.S</b>
<b>Classroom management</b>	20 to 30	154	69.9286	11.47666	.92482	.935	N.S
	31and above	146	71.2877	13.64524	1.12929		
<b>Teaching skill</b>	20 to 30	154	68.7662	10.74286	.86568	.622	N.S
	31and above	146	69.6301	13.23267	1.09514		
<b>Teaching goal</b>	20 to 30	154	77.3052	13.98380	1.12685	1.181	N.S
	31and above	146	75.2945	15.49423	1.28231		
<b>Over all Teaching ability total</b>	20 to 30	154	216.0000	27.95234	2.25246	.062	N.S
	31and above	146	216.2123	31.52365	2.60892		

From the above table, it is inferred that there is no significant difference in the Classroom management, Teaching skill, Teaching goal & ability total among the student teachers based on their age in their teaching ability.

**Table-3 ANOVA** table showing difference among the student teachers based on major subject in their teaching ability.

Variable	Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Level of significance
Major subject	Between groups	500.513	3	166.838	1.055	N.S
	Within groups	46788.057	296	158.068		
	Total	47288.570	299			
	Between groups	242.203	3	80.734	.558	N.S
	Within groups	42861.344	296	144.802		
	Total	43103.547	299			
	Between groups	469.855	3	156.618	.718	N.S
	Within groups	64562.132	296	218.115		
	Total	65031.987	299			
Between groups	2963.700	3	987.900	1.122	N.S	
Within groups	260676.096	296	880.662			
Total	263639.797	299				

From the above table, it is inferred that there is no significant difference in the Teaching ability among the student teachers based on their major subject.

**Table 4:** Table showing the difference among the student teachers based on medium of instruction in their teaching ability.

Dimension	Medium of instruction	N	Mean	S.D	St.Error	t value	L.S
<b>Classroom management</b>	Tamil	149	70.7651	13.26109	1.08639	.239	N.S
	English	151	70.4172	11.90314	.96866		
<b>Teaching skill</b>	Tamil	149	69.2617	12.74299	1.04395	.107	N.S
	English	151	69.1126	11.27507	.91755		
<b>Teaching goal</b>	Tamil	149	75.2282	13.78362	1.12920	1.283	N.S
	English	151	77.4106	15.61122	1.27042		
<b>Over all Teaching ability total</b>	Tamil	149	215.2550	30.23202	2.47670	.491	N.S
	English	151	216.9404	29.22995	2.37870		

From the above table, it is inferred that there is no significant difference in Classroom management, Teaching skill, Teaching goal & Ability total among the student teachers based on their medium of instruction.

**Table 5:** Table showing the difference among the student teachers based on family system in their teaching ability.

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Family system</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D</b>	<b>St. Error</b>	<b>t value</b>	<b>L.S</b>
<b>Classroom management</b>	Joint	150	71.4867	14.18560	1.15825	1.236	N.S
	Nuclear	150	69.6933	10.70153	.87378		
<b>Teaching skill</b>	Joint	150	69.4867	12.55631	1.02522	.432	N.S
	Nuclear	150	68.8867	11.46488	.93610		
<b>Teaching goal</b>	Joint	150	75.8333	14.82534	1.21048	.579	N.S
	Nuclear	150	76.8200	14.70291	1.20049		
<b>Over all Teaching ability total</b>	Joint	150	216.8067	31.75593	2.59286	.410	N.S
	Nuclear	150	215.4000	27.56737	2.25087		

From the above table, it is inferred that there is no significant difference in Classroom management, Teaching skill, Teaching goal & Ability total among the student teachers based on their family system in their teaching ability.

**Table 6:** Table showing the difference among the student teachers based on type of college in their teaching ability.

Dimension	Type of college	N	Mean	S.D	St. Error	t value	L.S
Classroom management	government	150	69.1267	10.80163	.88195	2.026	.05
	Self finance	150	72.0533	14.01379	1.14422		
Teaching skill	government	150	68.8933	9.88603	.80719	.423	N.S
	Self finance	150	69.4800	13.83397	1.12954		
Teaching goal	government	150	73.6400	12.62217	1.03060	3.204	.01
	Self finance	150	79.0133	16.20506	1.32314		
Over all Teaching ability total	government	150	211.6600	21.90977	1.78893	2.617	.05
	Self finance	150	220.5467	35.34976	2.88630		

From the above table, it is inferred that there is significant difference in the Classroom management, Teaching skill, Teaching goal & ability total among the student teachers based on their type of college they are study in their teaching ability. Hence the above hypothesis is rejected.

It is further inferred that, there is no significant difference in teaching skill among the student teachers based on their type of college in their teaching ability.

**Table 7:** Table showing the difference among the student teachers based on marital status in their teaching ability.

Dimension	Marital status	N	Mean	S.D	St.Error	t value	L.S
Classroom management	Married	148	70.0743	13.04680	1.07244	.700	N.S
	Un married	152	71.0921	12.12209	.98323		
Teaching skill	Married	148	68.6284	10.58319	.86993	.794	N.S
	Un married	152	69.7303	13.25949	1.07549		
Teaching goal	Married	148	76.5811	15.14376	1.24481	.294	N.S
	Un married	152	76.0789	14.39763	1.16780		
Over all Teaching ability total	Married	148	215.2838	28.07886	2.30807	.471	N.S
	Un married	152	216.9013	31.25896	2.53544		

From the above table, it is inferred that there is no significant difference in Classroom management, Teaching skill, Teaching goal & Ability total among the student teachers based on their marital status in their teaching ability.

### Major findings of the study

Research results revealed that teaching ability of student teachers are low in nature.

There is significant difference in the teaching ability based on gender and type of college.

There is no significant difference in the teaching ability of student teachers with respect to their age, major subject, medium of instruction, family system, marital status.

### **Educational Implication**

The demand for skillful teachers is increasing. The quality of teacher too is improving. Good teachers are keen and enthusiastic, well organized and firm, fair and stimulating their ability and interested in the welfare of the students. Teaching ability is essential in order to cope up with the existing demands of the learning communities. During the course of training apart from academics various ability required for enhancing their teaching abilities should be made mandatory in the B.Ed., curriculum.

### **Conclusion**

Teachers have to be skillful not only in terms of content but also in terms of setting the tone of the class, building interactions and interpersonal relation which will in turn help learning, thinking, understanding and lead to insight while observing, assimilating and accommodating what is being taught.

### **References**

1. **Cabrera, E. F., & Cabrera, A. (2005).** Fostering knowledge sharing through people management practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(5), 720-735.
2. **Brinson, D., & Steiner, L. (2007).** *Building collective efficacy: How leaders inspire teachers to achieve (Issue Brief)*. Washington, DC: Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement.
3. **Chen, I. Y., & Chen, N. S. (2009).** Examining the Factors Influencing Participants' Knowledge Sharing Behavior in Virtual Learning Communities. *Educational Technology & Society*, 12(1), 134-148.
4. **Fransen, J., Kirschner, P. A., & Erkens, G. (2011).** Mediating team effectiveness in the context of collaborative learning: The importance of team and task awareness. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(3), 1103-1113. [www.ccsenet.org/ass](http://www.ccsenet.org/ass) Asian Social Science Vol. 10, No. 4; 2014