

**Teaching Effectiveness of Secondary School Teachers under  
Non-Teaching Background of Fathers**

**Nilam Sandhya Kujur,**  
Research Scholar, Banasthali University

**Dr. Sujeet Kumar Mishra,**  
Associate Professor, Guru Ghasidas Central  
University

**Abstract:**

*This study was aimed to study the teaching effectiveness of secondary school teachers under non-teaching background of fathers. The objective was to study and compare teaching effectiveness of secondary school teachers of Ranchi region and ascertain difference between teaching effectiveness of secondary school teachers with non-teaching background of fathers. Sample of study consisted of 226 secondary school teachers selected randomly furthermore it was also categorized by gender (male & female) of the selected teachers.*

**Keyword:** Teaching Effectiveness, Secondary School Teacher, Non-Teaching Background of Fathers.

Teacher plays an important role in shaping and moulding the habits, taste, manners and above all, the character of the students. The supreme task of the care and the guidance of the children have been entrusted in their hands. A good teacher is originally adaptable, forceful, healthy, honest, industrious, open minded, as well as well informed and progressive too. Recent findings suggest a business-like approach in the organization of class activities impartiality and willingness to adapt the class room situation, objectivity, resourcefulness and interest in teaching as the hallmark of a good teacher. So, in view of the above identification of a qualified, component teaching personnel who possesses originality, becomes one of the most important resource of all the educational concerns. (Jyothi, T. Nirmala, 6, July-December 2009: "Teacher effectiveness in the concept of privatization with special reference to teacher educators, GYAN: The Journal of Education, page no.-54). Since teacher occupies a central position in shaping and moulding the habits, taste, manners and above all, the character of the students, so effectiveness of teachers has great role to plays in the process of development of education. Therefore, here author focuses to outline the effective teachers.

**Effective Teaching:**

According to **Good's Dictionary of Education (1959)**; Teacher Education consists of all formal and informal activities and experiences that help to qualify a person to assume the responsibility as a member of Educational profession or to discharge his responsibility more effectively. (Good, Carter V, ed., 1959: "Dictionary of Education" New York; McGraw Hill

Company, P. 149). In the view of great importance of teaching and significant need for making it a true profession, adequate growth of specialization and expertise of teachers is essential.

**Rabindranath Tagore** has rightly said, "A teacher can never truly teach unless he is still learning himself." A lamp can never light another lamp unless it continues to burn its own flame. [w.w.w.google.co.in /quotes of Rabindranath Tagore on teacher/28.8.2016] Teachers should continue to develop their knowledge, skills, understanding, interest and so on, necessary for acquiring mastery over the subject in a particular area and competence of transmitting the same to the students. They have to improve their expertise through all kinds of means, media and methods. The quality of teachers produced in any institution largely depends upon the quality of curriculum offered to them during their training period. It is also true that the competence and quality of the teachers of teacher education too has its share in the quality of teachers trained by the institution. The aim of teacher is to improve the quality of education. It requires some specialized training and curricula which can be

defined as profession. Teaching requires conscious organization of learning activities and deliberate creation of a supporting learning environment. Student-teachers are provided practical training in teacher's education programmes. Teaching profession requires a lengthy period of study and training. It is based on a systematic body of knowledge which is influenced by social, psychological, historical, economical, religious and spiritual beliefs of a society. (*Journal of Teacher Education and Research, Volume-3, No.-1*)

The efficiency of any educational system depends largely on the efficiency of its teachers. Beside building, equipments, curriculum, books and teaching method, the quality of education imparted to children in schools depends to a great extent on the quality of teacher. However, no other aspects of education are as vital and significant as the human resources, teachers who lay the foundation for the personality development of children.

As the world has changed, so has the school, and so has what we mean by teaching and by learning. The teacher-student relationship is far more complex and demanding than ever before. The implication of this more diversified role for the teacher is what impelled a new view of the process of teacher education and training. Thus, teacher education is seen as a continuous process, beginning with a phase of initial training and continuing throughout the teacher's professional life throughout regular and sustained periods of in-service training. Maintaining the view that a teacher must remain a learner during the scope of their service is mandatory. Effective teaching should be reflected during classroom teaching learning process. To see this author has gone through few studies;

In the field of teacher education, many researches which have been conducted by different researchers, are as follows; **Gupta, Goggi (2013)** Teacher Effectiveness In Relation To Emotional And Social Intelligence(*Recent Researchers in Education And Psychology, Panchkula, Haryana, Vol-18, page no-77-80* ). The study was undertaken to investigate the relationship of teacher effectiveness of in-service teachers in relation to Emotional and Social intelligence. **Blomeke, Sigrid, Ute Suhl and Kaisu Gabriele (2011)**: "Teacher education effectiveness quality and equity of future primary teacher's mathematics and mathematics pedagogical content knowledge." *Journal of Teacher Education, Vol-62, No-2, March/April, page no-154-171* **Dakshinamurthy, K. (2010)**: "Effect of teachers Personality, attitude towards profession and teaching effectiveness on academic achievement of students" (*Edutrack, Neel Kamal Publication Pvt. Ltd. Hyderabad, Vol. 9, No. 9, Page No. 34*). **Dhillon, J. S. and Nanvdeep Kaur (2009)**: "Teacher effectiveness in relation to their value patterns" (*Edutrack, Neel Kamal Publication Pvt. Ltd. Hyderabad, Vol. 9, No. 3, Page No. 26-29*). **Jyothi, T. Nirmala (2009)**: "Teacher effectiveness in the concept of privatization with special reference to teacher educators" (*GYAN: The Journal of Education, Vol.6, July-December 2009, Page No.-54*). **Malik, Umender (2009)**: "Teaching effectiveness of secondary teachers in relation to their emotional intelligence" (*Journal of Teacher Education and Research, Vol. 4, No. 2, Page No. 98-105*). After the above review of related literatures, author has observed most of the researches in the field of teacher education either examined the existing system of teacher education institutes, teacher education programme, its impact and effectiveness or devised new curriculum, but none of the research exists which had been done on the effect of teaching by heredity causes. Author observed this area because heredity is one of the significant part of trait transformation in the life.

### **Objective of the Study**

After selection of problem author formulated the objective as follows -

To know the effect of non-teaching background of Fathers on teaching effectiveness of Secondary School Teachers, according to gender.

The objective of the study clearly point out the qualities of the teachers of non-teaching background of fathers in accordance with gender, where he/she can develop to fulfill the needs and responsibilities as a teacher for teaching effectiveness.

**Hypothesis**

On the basis of above objective, the hypothesis formed as,  
If teaching effectiveness is measured through Teacher Effectiveness Scale then there are different effects on teaching effectiveness of male & female teachers with non-teaching background of fathers.

**Methodology:**

For the present investigation, the author used the Survey.

**Sample and Data Collection**

The technique of random multistage sampling was employed to select the data of Secondary School Teachers for the Teaching Effectiveness Scale. For the present study the sample size of 226 Secondary school teachers were selected randomly and was categorized by gender (male & female).

**Tool**

For the fulfillment of objectives, Teaching Effectiveness Scale of teachers was used phase wise in the present study. Teaching Effectiveness as defined by the author is a way of teaching which reflect the routine of teachers of Secondary schools such as their professional life, attitude, communication, personal relationship, social life, spirituality and technology usage. The dimensions of teaching effectiveness were categorized into 12 dimensions.

**Analysis and Discussion:**

The mean and standard deviation for teaching effectiveness among male and female teachers were calculated separately. The t-value was calculated to determine the significance of the difference between means.

**Table1: t-test of effect on Locus of Control of male & female teachers with non-teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | σd   | t-value | Table value @ 0.05 | Remarks         |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------|---------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Male   | 56              | 19.66 | 2.75           | 0.34 | 0.42 | 0.81    | 1.97               | Not Significant |
| Female | 170             | 20.00 | 2.62           |      |      |         |                    |                 |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table1 shows that the t-value of Locus of Control of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 0.81. The t-value is less than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is no significant difference on Locus of Control of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers and therefore it is accepted which means that the effect on Locus of Control of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are quite closed.

**Table 2: t-test of effect on Interest of male & female teachers with non-teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | $\sigma_d$ | t-value | Table value @ 0.05 | Remarks         |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------------|---------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Male   | 56              | 21.13 | 2.77           | 0.43 | 0.43       | 0.99    | 1.97               | Not Significant |
| Female | 170             | 20.70 | 2.79           |      |            |         |                    |                 |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table 2 shows that the t-value of Interest of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 0.99. The t-value is less than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is no significant difference on Interest of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers and therefore it is accepted which means that the effect on Interest of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are quite closed.

**Table 3: t-test of effect on Planning of Teaching of male & female teachers with Non-teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | $\sigma_d$ | t-value | Table value @0.05 | Remarks         |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Male   | 56              | 22.00 | 2.77           | 0.46 | 0.43       | 1.07    | 1.97              | Not Significant |
| Female | 170             | 21.54 | 2.86           |      |            |         |                   |                 |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table 3 shows that the t-value of Planning of Teaching of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 1.07. The t-value is less than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is no significant difference on Planning of Teaching of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers and therefore it is accepted which means that the effect on Planning of Teaching of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are quite closed.

**Table 4: t-test of effect on Teaching Skills of male & female teachers with teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | $\sigma_d$ | t-value | Table value @0.05 | Remarks         |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Male   | 56              | 18.23 | 3.83           | 0.79 | 0.58       | 1.37    | 1.97              | Not Significant |
| Female | 170             | 17.44 | 3.45           |      |            |         |                   |                 |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table 4 shows that the t-value of Teaching Skill of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 1.37. The t-value is less than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is no significant difference on Teaching Skill of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of

fathers and therefore it is accepted which means that the effect on Teaching Skill of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are quite closed.

**Table 5: t-test of effect on Subject Knowledge of male & female teachers with non-teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | $\sigma_d$ | t-value | Table value @ 0.05 | Remarks         |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------------|---------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Male   | 56              | 17.14 | 4.08           | 0.59 | 0.61       | 0.96    | 1.97               | Not Significant |
| Female | 170             | 16.55 | 3.70           |      |            |         |                    |                 |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table 5 shows that the t-value of Subject Knowledge of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 0.96. The t-value is less than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is no significant difference on Subject Knowledge of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers and therefore it is accepted which means that the effect on Subject Knowledge of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are quite closed.

**Table 6: t-test of effect on Discipline Behavior of male & female teachers with Non-teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | $\sigma_d$ | t-value | Table value @0.05 | Remarks     |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------------|---------|-------------------|-------------|
| Male   | 56              | 17.00 | 2.75           | 1.00 | 0.43       | 2.35    | 1.97              | Significant |
| Female | 170             | 18.00 | 2.83           |      |            |         |                   |             |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table 6 shows that the t-value of Disciplinary Behavior of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 2.35. The t-value is greater than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is significant difference on Disciplinary Behavior of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers and therefore it is rejected which means that the effect on Disciplinary Behavior of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are different.

**Table 7: t-test of effect on Teacher Role Behavior of male & female teachers with Non-teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | $\sigma_d$ | t-value | Table value @0.05 | Remarks     |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------------|---------|-------------------|-------------|
| Male   | 56              | 20.73 | 2.51           | 1.00 | 0.44       | 2.30    | 1.97              | Significant |
| Female | 170             | 19.73 | 3.63           |      |            |         |                   |             |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table 7 shows that the t-value of Teacher Role Behavior of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 2.30. The t-value is greater than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is significant difference on Teacher Role Behavior of male and female teachers with non-teaching

teaching background of fathers and therefore it is rejected which means that the effect on Teacher Role Behavior of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are different.

**Table 8: t-test of effect on Awareness on Teacher Role of male & female teachers with Non-teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | $\sigma_d$ | t-value | Table value @0.05 | Remarks         |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Male   | 56              | 19.14 | 3.32           | 0.01 | 0.52       | 0.02    | 1.97              | Not Significant |
| Female | 170             | 19.15 | 3.64           |      |            |         |                   |                 |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table 8 shows that the t-value of Awareness in Teacher Role of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 0.02. The t-value is less than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is significant difference on Awareness in Teacher Role of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers and therefore it is accepted which means that the effect on Awareness in Teacher Role of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are quite closed.

**Table 9: t-test of effect on Making in Learning Atmosphere of male & female teachers with non-teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | $\sigma_d$ | t-value | Table value @0.05 | Remarks         |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Male   | 56              | 21.20 | 2.96           | 0.69 | 0.47       | 1.46    | 1.97              | Not Significant |
| Female | 170             | 20.51 | 3.35           |      |            |         |                   |                 |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table 9 shows that the t-value of Making in Learning Atmosphere of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 1.46. The t-value is less than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is no significant difference on Making in Learning Atmosphere of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers and therefore it is accepted which means that the effect on Making in Learning Atmosphere of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are quite closed.

**Table10: t-test of effect on Teaching Method of male & female teachers with Non-teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | $\sigma_d$ | t-value | Table value @0.05 | Remarks     |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------------|---------|-------------------|-------------|
| Male   | 56              | 22.00 | 2.70           | 1.00 | 0.43       | 2.33    | 1.97              | Significant |
| Female | 170             | 21.00 | 3.02           |      |            |         |                   |             |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table 10 shows that the t-value of Teaching Method of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 2.33. The t-value is greater than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is significant difference on Teaching Method of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers and therefore it is rejected which means that the effect on Teaching Method of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are different.

**Table 11: t-test of effect on Application of Teacher’s Capacity of male & female teachers with non-teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | Std  | t-value | Table value @0.05 | Remarks         |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Male   | 56              | 21.25 | 3.07           | 0.03 | 0.46 | 0.06    | 1.97              | Not Significant |
| Female | 170             | 21.22 | 2.81           |      |      |         |                   |                 |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table 11 shows that the t-value of Application of Teacher’s Capacity of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 0.06. The t-value is less than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is no significant difference on Application of Teacher’s Capacity of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers and therefore it is accepted which means that the effect on Application of Teacher’s Capacity of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are quite closed.

**Table 12: t-test of effect on Communication Behavior of male & female teachers with non-teaching background of fathers**

| Gender | No. of Teachers | Mean  | Std. Deviation | D    | Std  | t-value | Table value @0.05 | Remarks     |
|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|------|---------|-------------------|-------------|
| Male   | 56              | 21.91 | 2.86           | 1.09 | 0.44 | 2.48    | 1.97              | Significant |
| Female | 170             | 23.00 | 2.84           |      |      |         |                   |             |

**Interpretation on the basis of t-test**

Table 12 shows that the t-value of Communication Behavior of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers is found to be 2.48. The t-value is less than 1.97 of table value at 0.05 significant levels as shown in the above table. And according to null hypothesis, there is significant difference on Communication Behavior of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers and therefore it is rejected which means that the effect on Communication Behavior of male and female teachers with non-teaching teaching background of fathers are different.

**Conclusion:**

After analysis of Teaching Effectiveness the author discovered that there are difference between male and female teachers of non-teaching background of fathers in four variables, i.e., Disciplinary Behaviour, Teacher Role Behaviour, Teaching Method, and Communication Behaviour

**Suggestions:**

1. Identification needed for the teachers of non-teaching background of Fathers, after recruitment in teaching job at Secondary school teacher because Teaching Effectiveness affect the teachers of non-teaching background of Fathers. Subsequently non-teaching background of Fathers affected by Disciplinary Behaviour, Teacher Role Behaviour, Teaching Method and Communication Behaviour in teachers to be needed training and sensitization for effectiveness content teaching.
2. The study reveals that there is a need of gender wise strengthening of teachers of non-teaching background of fathers for better teaching effectiveness, to enhance the components of Disciplinary Behaviour, Teacher Role Behaviour, Teaching Method and Communication Behaviour in teachers.

**Reference:**

1. Best, John W. & Khan, James V. (2004): "Research in Education", Prentice-Hall of India, Private Ltd., New Delhi, page no.-308-311.
2. Blomeke, Sigrid, Ute Suhl and Kaisu Gabriele (2011): "Teacher education effectiveness quality and equity of future primary teacher's mathematics and mathematics pedagogical content knowledge." Journal of teacher Education, Vol-62, No-2, March/April, page no-154-171, Company. P. 149
3. Dakshinamurthy, K. (2010): "Effect of teachers Personality, attitude towards profession and teaching effectiveness on academic achievement of students" Edutrack, Neel Kamal Publication Pvt. Ltd. Hyderabad, Vol. 9, No. 9, Page No. 34.
4. Dhillon, J.S. and Nanvdeep Kaur (2009): "Teacher effectiveness in relation to their value patterns" Edutrack, Neel Kamal Publication Pvt. Ltd. Hyderabad, Vol. 9, No. 3, Page No. 26-29.
5. Good, Carter V, ed., 1959: "Dictionary of Education" New York; McGraw Hill
6. Gupta, Goggi (2013): "Teacher Effectiveness In Relation To Emotional and Social Intelligence"
7. Gupta, S.P. (2001): Statistical Method in Behavioral Science, Sharda Pustak Bhawan, Allahabad, page no-309 – 314.
8. Recent Researchers in Education And Psychology, Panchkula Haryana, vol-18, page no-77-80
9. Jyothi, T. Nirmala (2009): "Teacher effectiveness in the concept of privatization with special reference to teacher educators" GYAN: The Journal of Education, Vol.6, July-December 2009, Page No.-54.
10. Malik, Umender (2009): "Teaching effectiveness of secondary teachers in relation to their emotional intelligence" Journal of Teacher Education and Research, Vol. 4, No. 2, Page No. 98-105.