# ACHING COMPETENCY OF PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN RELATION TO THEIR LOCUS OF CONTROL 


#### Abstract

The present study aims at investigating the teaching competency of primary school teachers in elation to their locus of control. The sample consists of 400 primary school teachers from Tirunelveli listrict. A Teaching competency scale, a Locus of control scale and a Personal information form were sed for collecting the data. The survey method was used for the study. The data was analysed using percentage analysis, ' $t$ ' test and correlation. The results revealed that there is significant difference in eaching competency between primary school teachers with reference to gender. There is no significant elationship between teaching competency and locus of control of primary school teachers with reference o gender and locality of school.


## RODUCTION

Primary education is understood as a basic stage ucation which is either a self-contained phase or one h forms part of a longer cycle of general education. Vaik (1982), an eminent educator observed, "The ress of primary education is an index of the general, and economic development of the country as a e". Primaryeducation plays an important role in laying roper foundation of a child's cultural, emotional, lectual, moral, physical, social and spiritual lopment. The teachers are responsible for the dations of the students.

The teacher is a dynamic force of the school. A ol without a teacher is just like a body without the a skeleton without flesh and blood, a shadow without tance. Rabindranath Tagore has defined the term her comprehensively: "A teacher can-never truly unless he is still learning himself. A lamp can never another lamp unless is continues to burn its own flame. leacher who has come to the end of his subject, who o living traffic with his knowledge, but merely repeats udents can only load their minds, he can not quicken m."

Effective teaching requires a feeling of satisfaction. de other hand a feeling of dissatisfaction affects one's ency, one's thinking, and emotional reactions, in fact fality of one's behaviour.

Competency means adequacy and sufficiency. Teacher competencies (plural form of competency) are the skills, knowledge, values which a teacher posseses; they are the tools of teaching. Only the teacher who possesses all the skills, knowledge and values can function effectively in a teaching situation and is said to be competent to teach in that situation.

## SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The attitudes of students are changing rapidly day - by - day, and the methods of teaching technologies are also changing continuously. So, in order to meet the present state of students' attitudes, the teacher should adopt new methods and techniques in teaching. If a teacher is effective in his classrooms, he will bring the students up to the expected levels in every educational area.

Teaching involves a conceptual understanding of how people learn and the ability to translate this understanding into constructing and delivering learning opportunities to diverse audiences. Teaching competency plays a vital role in teachers. If a teacher is competent, learning is effective.

[^0]Locus of control is understood as the ability of an individual to control and manage his own behaviour by some factors pertaining to his own inner self-that is the internal factors like personal effort, ability etc or the factors from external sources like luck, chance, fate etc.,

Locus of control either internal or external plays a dominant role in making or moulding a personality into an assertive one or a submissive one. As a result locus of control is considered to be an integral part of any individual. Locus of control plays an important role in developing competencies in teaching. Hence, the investigator wants to study the relation between teaching competency and locus of control.

## OBJECTIVES

1. To study the level of teaching competency of primary school teachers with reference to gender and locality of school.
2. To study the locus of control of primary school teachers with reference to gender and locality of school.
3. To find out the significant difference, if any, in the teaching competency of primary school teachers and its dimensions with reference to gender and locality of school.
4. To find out the significant difference, if any, in the locus of control of primary school teachers and its dimensions with reference to gender and locality of school.
5. To find out the significant relationship between teaching competency and locus of control of primary school teachers with reference to gender and locality of school.

## HYPOTHESES

1. The level of the teaching competency of primary school teachers with reference to gender and locality of school is average.
2. The locus of control of primary school teachers with reference to gender and locality of school is internal.
3. There is no significant difference between the primary school teachers in their teaching competency and its
dimensions with reference to gender and locality of school.
4. There is no significant difference betweengy school teachers in their locus of contro COM dimensions with reference to gender and COM school.

GEN
5. There is no significant relationship betweer Ba competency and locus of control of primey grot teachers with reference to gender and locality $\frac{\text { Varia }}{\text { Gend }}$

## METHOD USED FOR THE RESEARCH <br> Loca

The survey method was followed fc investigation. Since it is a fact finding expedition, ith Thi was adopted by the investigator.

## POPULATION FOR THE STUDY

The population for the study consistspring teachers of aided, government, and unaidedst, It 1 Tirunelveli district.

## SAMPLE FOR THE STUDY

The investigator visited 120 schoolsint educational districts of Tirunelveli district. Theind $\mathbf{I F}$ used simple random sampling technique to $\mathbf{H}$ teachers in 120 schools. Thus the sample cor 400 primary school teachers.

## TOOLS

The following tools were used for collati4i for the present study. They are
(1) Teaching Competency Scale prepared and by Y. Daniel, S. Francisca and A.Amalra),
(2) Locus of Control Scale adopted from Pus Chandrakumar.

## STATISTICALTECHNIQUES

For analyzing the data, statistical tectur) percentage analysis. ' $t$ ' test, and correlation'

## ANALYSIS OF DATA

## Table 1

THE LEVEL OF THE TEACHING COMPETENCY OF PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH REFERENCE TO GENDER AND LOCALITY OF SCHOOL

| Back <br> ground <br> Variables | Cate <br> gories | Low |  |  | Average |  | High |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cou <br> nt | \% | Cou <br> nt | \% | Count | \% |  |  |
| Gender | Male | 23 | 20.9 | 68 | 61.8 | 19 | 17.3 |  |  |
|  | Female | 53 | 18.3 | 190 | 65.5 | 47 | 16.2 |  |  |
| Locality <br> of school | Rural | 43 | 19.3 | 144 | 64.9 | 35 | 15.8 |  |  |
|  | Urban | 29 | 16.3 | 120 | 67.4 | 29 | 16.3 |  |  |

The above table reveals that $20.9 \%, 61.8 \% 17.3 \%$ rale and $18.3 \%, 65.5 \%, 16.2 \%$ of female primary rol teachers have low, average and high level of hing competency respectively.

It is inferred from the above table that $19.3 \%$, $\% 15.8 \%$ of teachers and $16.3 \%, 67.4 \%, 16.3 \%$ of hers of rural and urban schools have low, average high level of teaching competency respectively.

Table 2
HE LOCUS OF CONTROLOF PRIMARY CHOOL TEACHERS WITH REFERENCE D GENDERAND LOCALITY OF SCHOOL

| Back <br> ground <br> Variables | Categories | External |  | Internal |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ |
| Gender | Male | 52 | 47 | 58 | 53 |
|  | Female | 120 | 41 | 170 | 59 |
| Locality <br> of school | Rural | 106 | 48 | 116 | 52 |
|  | Urban | 66 | 37 | 112 | 63 |

The above table reveals that $47 \%, 53 \%$ of male $41 \%, 59 \%$ of female primary school teachers have nal and internal locus of control respectively.
It is observed from the table that $48 \%, 52 \%$ of rers and $37 \%, 63 \%$ of teachers of rural and urban ols have external and internal locus of control ctively.

Table 3

## DIFFERENCE IN PRIMARY

## SCHOOL TEACHERS' TEACHING

## COMPETENCYAND ITS DIMENSIONS WITH REFERENCE TO GENDER

| 1 | Subject <br> Competency | Male | 49.76 | 9.98 | 110 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female | 50.09 | 10.02 | 290 | 0.29 | NS |
| 2 | Motivation | Male | 49.18 | 11.13 | 110 |  |  |
|  |  | Female | 50.31 | 9.54 | 290 | 0.94 | NS |
| 3 | Organization | Male | 50.75 | 10.51 | 110 |  |  |
|  |  | Female | 49.71 | 9.8 | 290 | 0.9 | NS |
| 4 | Use of Learning Materials | Male | 48.3 | 10.85 | 110 |  |  |
|  |  | Female | 50.64 | 9.6 | 290 | 1.99 | S |
| 5 | Classroom <br> Management | Male | 48.7 | 10.83 | 110 |  |  |
|  |  | Female | 50.49 | 9.64 | 290 | 1.52 | NS |
| 6 | Communication | Male | 48.59 | 11.39 | 110 |  |  |
|  |  | Female | 50.53 | 9.38 | 290 | 1.6 | NS |
| 7 | Personality | Male | 48.24 | 10.48 | 110 |  |  |
|  |  | Female | 50.67 | 9.75 | 290 | 2.11 | S |
| 8 | Total Teaching Competency | Male | 48.08 | 10.46 | 110 |  |  |
|  |  | Female | 50.73 | 9.74 | 290 | 2.3 | S |

(Table Value at 5\% level $=1.96$ )
NS - Not Significant (Null Hypothesis is accepted)
S - Significant(Null Hypothesis in not accepted)
Table 4
DIFFERENCE IN PRIMARY SCHOOL
TEACHERS' TEACHING COMPETENCY AND ITS DIMENSIONS WITH REFERENCE TO LOCALITY OF SCHOOL

| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { SI. } \\ \text { No. } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Dimensions | Locality of school | Mean | S.D, | N | $\begin{gathered} \text { 't' } \\ \text { Value } \end{gathered}$ | Rem ark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Subject <br> Competency | Rural | 50.68 | 9.59 | 222 |  |  |
|  |  | Urban | 49.15 | 10.5 | 178 | 1.5 | NS |
| 2 | Motivation | Rural | 48.93 | 9.88 | 222 |  |  |
|  |  | Urban | 51.34 | 10 | 178 | 2.41 | S |
| 3 | Organization | Rural | 50.62 | 10 | 222 |  |  |
|  |  | Urban | 49.22 | 9.95 | 178 | 1.4 | NS |
| 4 | Use of Learning Materials | Rural | 47.85 | 9.64 | 222 |  |  |
|  |  | Urban | 52.68 | 9.82 | 178 | 4.92 | S |
| 5 | Classroom <br> Management | Rural | 49 | 9.72 | 222 |  |  |
|  |  | Urban | 51.25 | 10.2 | 178 | 2.24 | S |
| 6 | Communication | Rural | 48.99 | 9.98 | 222 |  |  |
|  |  | Urban | 51.26 | 9.92 | 178 | 2.27 | S |
| 7 | Personality | Rural | 49.17 | 9.9 | 222 |  |  |
|  |  | Urban | 51.04 | 10.1 | 178 | 1.87 | NS |
| 8 | Total Teaching Competency | Rural | 48.59 | 9.65 | 222 |  |  |
|  |  | Urban | 51.76 | 10.2 | 178 | 3.17 | S |

(Table Value at $5 \%$ level = 1.96)
NS - Not Significant (Null Hypothesis is accepted)
S - Significant (Null Hypothesis is not accepted)

## Table 5

DIFFERENCE IN PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' LOCUS OF CONTROL AND ITS DIMENSIONS WITH REFERENCE TO GENDER

| SI. <br> No. | Dimen sions | Gender | Mean | S.D. | N | 't' <br> Val <br> ue | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rem } \\ \text { ark } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | School | Male | 50.87 | 9.88 | 110 | 1.08 | NS |
|  |  | Female | 49.67 | 10.04 | 290 |  |  |
| 2 | Family | Male | 49.13 | 10.15 | 110 | 1.07 | NS |
|  |  | Female | 50.33 | 9.94 | 290 |  |  |
| 3 | Society | Male | 49.57 | 9.56 | 110 | 0.55 | NS |
|  |  | Female | 50.16 | 10.17 | 290 |  |  |
| 4 | Total <br> Locus of Control | Male | 49.72 | 10.23 | 110 |  |  |
|  |  | Female | 50.11 | 9.93 | 290 | 0.34 | NS |

(Table Value at $5 \%$ level $=1.96$ )
NS - Not Significant (Null Hypothesis is accepted)

## Table 6

DIFFERENCE IN PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' LOCUS OF CONTROL AND ITS DIMENSIONS WITH REFERENCE TO LOCALITY OF SCHOOL

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SI. } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Dimen sions | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Locality } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { School }\end{array}$ | Mean | S.D. | N | $\begin{gathered} \text { 't' } \\ \text { Value } \end{gathered}$ | Rem ark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | School | Rural | 49.76 | 10.27 | 222 | 0.55 | NS |
|  |  | Urban | 50.3 | 9.67 | 178 |  |  |
| 2 | Family | Rural | 50.93 | 9.92 | 222 | 2.08 | S |
|  |  | Urban | 48.84 | 10.01 | 178 |  |  |
| 3 | Society | Rural | 48.88 | 9.34 | 222 | 2.49 | S |
|  |  | Urban | 51.4 | 10.63 | 178 |  |  |
| 4 | Total <br> Locus of <br> Control | Rural | 49.74 | 9.67 | 222 | 0.58 | NS |

(Table Value at $5 \%$ level $=1.96$ ) NS - Not Significant


Rese (Null Hypothesis is accepted)
S - Significant (Null Hypothesis is not accepted omp
Table 7 lassr
RELATIONSHIPBETWEEN each TEACHING COMPETENCYAND LO, choo OF CONTROL OF PRIMARY SCHO ${ }_{6}$ TEACHERS WITH REFERENCE T $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{ach}}$ GENDERAND LOCALITY OF SCHO

| Sl. | Back <br> ground <br> No. <br> Variables | Catego <br> ries | $\mathbf{N}$ | Calcu <br> lated ' $\mathbf{r}$ ' <br> value | Tablea) <br> value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Gender | Male | 110 | 0.015 | 0.174 |
|  | Female | 290 | 0.033 | 0.113 |  |
| 2 | Locality of <br> School | Rural | 222 | 0.026 | 0.1113 0 $)$ |
|  | Urban | 178 | 0.074 | 0.1388 |  |

NS - Not Significant (Null Hypothesis is ${ }_{2}$

## FINDINGS

1. The level of teaching competency of priman he teachers with reference to gender and localityo on is average.
2. The Locus of Control of primary school teadil $\mathbf{E}$ reference to gender and locality of school isi
3. (a) There is no significant difference betwe e and female primary school teachers in theirli competency - subject competency, mot 1 organization, classroom managemee communication - with reference to gender.
(b) There is a significant difference betweens? female primary school teachers in their competency - use of learning $m$ personality and total teaching competer reference to gender.
4. (a) There is no significant difference beth and urban primary school teachers in the competency - subject competency, orf and personality with reference to school.

There is a significant difference between rural and urban primary school teachers in their teaching competency - motivation, use of learning materials, classroom management, communication and total teaching competency - with reference to locality of school.

There is no significant difference in primary school teachers' locus of control and its dimensions with reference to gender.
(a) There is no significant difference in primary school teachers' locus of control and its dimensionsschool and total locus of control with reference to locality of school.
(b) There is a significant difference in primary school teachers' locus of control and its dimensionsfamily and society with reference to locality of school.

There is no significant relationship between teaching competency and locus of control of primary school teachers with reference to gender and locality of school.

## TERPRETATIONS

The ' t ' test results reveal that the female teachers better in the use of learning materials, personality and ching competency than male primary school teachers. is may be due to the fact that female teachers are more erested in teaching with teaching aids and generally they more dedicated, committed and sincere in their teaching fession. They are more motivated to achieve higher in ching. They are very meticulous in any work.

The ' $t$ ' test results reveal that the urban school chers are better in motivation, use of learning materials, ssroom management, communication and teaching apetency. This may be due to the fact that urban school hers are much exposed in everything in relation to the labus. So it is easy for the teachers to motivate students. In the urban area it is easier to get needed
teaching aids than in the rural area. In urban area schools most of the students are coming from a standard atmosphere and an educated family background. So their communication is good, which helps the teacher to communicate with them well.

The ' $t$ ' test results reveal that the rural primary school teachers are better in locus of control in family situation than urban school teachers. This may be due to the fact that the rural school situation brings about more hardships for the teachers which prepares them for more emotional stability. They are exposed to more problem solving situations in the schools which helps them negotiate with unexpected problems and difficulties in the family.
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