

TEACHING STYLE OF TEACHERS IN THE COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

By

ROBINSON

Assistant Professor of Psychology, Perunthalaivar Kamarajar College of Education, Karaikal, U.T. of Puducherry.

ABSTRACT

Teaching is deemed to be the noblest of all professions. The innovations in teaching techniques have placed the teacher educator's approach individualized and more learner-centred. The advancement of science and technology has provided the modern teacher with better teaching aids and exposure. The novel methods of group discussion, symposium, seminar, debate and quiz programmes have tremendous influence upon the teaching-learning process effectively. The present study has focused on the teaching style of 30 teachers from colleges of education in the Union Territory of Puducherry. The data have been collected from the subject teachers, the teachers of humanities and language. The data have been analyzed by employing 't' test and coefficient of concordance. The results reveal that their instructional planning varies. The rewarding result of the observation is that there continues to be a linking feature.

Keywords: Teaching Style, Instructional Planning, Teaching Methods, Teaching Environment, Evaluation Techniques.

INTRODUCTION

The age in which we live is an age of knowledge and information. The art of teaching calls for a high degree of flexibility and adaptability of mind. Teaching is an intricate, exacting and challenging job. Teaching style describes the manner in which a teacher manages instructions and the classroom environment. In permissive teaching style the teacher establishes few rules and is inconsistent in enforcing rules in the classroom. The other type of teaching style is known as authoritarian teaching style by which the teacher promotes the rules. Thus learning become teacher centered, the students' role is to obey the rules and carry out the tasks to the fullest satisfaction. In democratic teaching style the teacher reacts positively to students' desires, needs and reaction. An effective teacher is the one who helps in development of basic skills, understanding, proper work habits, desirable attitudes, value judgments and adequate personal adjustment of the students (Ryan 1969). Education is a cosmic process that plays a vital role in the social development of the personality of an individual. The present study is made to identify the teaching style of teachers in the colleges of education.

Objectives

- The object behind is to carryover a deep study on the varied modes of teaching.
- To ascertain the difference between the teaching style adapted by the teachers of science and humanities.
- To examine the difference between the teaching style of the teachers of language and other subjects.
- To find out the difference between the teaching style of the teachers of science and language.
- To know the relationship between the teaching style of different categories of (i) Instructional Planning (ii) Teaching methods (iii) Teaching environment and (iv) Evaluation technique.

Hypothesis of the Study

The following hypotheses are framed for the present study.

- There exists no significant difference between the teaching style of teachers of science and humanities.
- There exists no significant difference between the teaching style of language and other subjects.
- There exists no significant difference between the

teaching style of teachers in the faculty of science and language.

- There exists no significant relationship between the teaching style of instructional planning and the teaching methods followed by teachers.
- There exists no significant relationship between the teaching pertaining to the teaching methods and teaching environment of the teachers.
- There is hardly any significant relationship between the teaching environment and evaluation technique of the teachers.
- There is absolutely no relationship one can notice between the teaching style of instructional planning and evaluation technique handled by the teachers.

Methodology

The systematic study had been undertaken diligently for the teachers to gain foreground knowledge in the methods of teaching in the colleges of education in Puducherry Union Territory. The teaching style inventory has been evolved by Dunn and Dunn (1993) and validated according to Indian context with the aim of promoting ideal teaching methods.

Sample

About 30 teachers, teaching in colleges of education in Puducherry Union Territory, have been randomly selected for the study. The teaching style inventory comprised of four areas. (i) Instructional Planning (ii) Teaching methods (iii) Teaching environment and (iv) Evaluation techniques. Five-point scale has been used for the inventory.

Data analysis

The data were analyzed using the following statistical techniques.

- (i) 't' test
- (ii) Coefficient of concordance

As an outcome of the study it has been found out that there is significant difference between the teachers of science and humanities in their instructional planning (Table 1). The obtained t-value 2.30 is statistically significant since it is greater than the table 't' value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance.

Variable	Science Teachers			Humanities Teachers			't' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Instructional Planning	12	116.2	31.2	10	141.8	20.9	2.30	Significant at 0.05 level

Table 1. Distribution of 't' value between science and humanities teachers in their instructional planning.

Hence the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference in instructional planning is rejected.

The calculated 't' value 0.066 (Table 2) is lesser than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance and hence the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between the teachers of science and humanities and their teaching methods are accepted.

In Table 3, the calculated 't' value 0.707 is lesser than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance and hence the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between the teachers of science and humanities and their teaching environment is accepted.

In Table 4, the calculated 't' value 0.599 is lesser than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance and hence the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the teachers of science and humanities and their evaluation technique is accepted.

In Table 5, the calculated 't' value 1.98 is greater than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance and hence the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between language teachers and the teachers of other subjects in their instructional Planning is rejected.

Variable	Science Teachers			Humanities Teachers			't' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Teaching Methods	12	53.8	12.2	10	54.1	6.5	0.066	Not Significant

Table 2. Distribution of 't' value between teachers belonging to the faculty of science and humanities in their teaching methods.

Variable	Science Teachers			Humanities Teachers			't' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Teaching Environment	12	79.5	23.3	10	93.8	13.1	0.707	Not Significant

Table 3. Distribution of 't' value between science and humanities in their teaching environment.

Variable	Science Teachers			Humanities Teachers			t' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Evaluation Technique	12	85.7	26.8	10	93.6	33.1	0.599	Not Significant

Table 4. Distribution of 't' value between the teachers of science and humanities in their evaluation techniques.

Variable	Language Teachers			Other subject Teachers			t' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Instructional Planning	8	139	15.5	22	127.8	6.4	1.98	Significant at 0.05 level

Table 5. Distribution of 't' value between the teachers of language and other subject teachers in their instructional Planning.

It is found out that there was no significant difference between language teachers and the teachers of other subjects in their mode of teaching. The obtained 't' value 0.56 in Table 6 is statistically not significant since it is lesser than the table 't' value at 0.05 level of significance.

Hence the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between the teachers of language and the teachers of other subjects in their teaching method is accepted.

Table 7 reveals that there was no significant difference between the teachers of language and other subjects in their teaching environment. The obtained 't' value is 0.

Hence the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between the teachers of language and other

Variable	Language Teachers			Other subject Teachers			t' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Teaching Methods	8	52.2	5.6	22	53.9	10.7	0.56	Not Significant

Table 6. Distribution of 't' value between the teachers of Language and other subject teachers in their teaching method.

Variable	Language Teachers			Other subject Teachers			t' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Teaching environment	8	86	29.8	22	86	23.1	0	Not Significant

Table 7. Distribution of 't' value between language teachers and the teachers of other subjects in their teaching environment.

subjects in their teaching environment is accepted.

In Table 8, the calculated 't' value 0.330 is lesser than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance and hence the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between language teachers and subject teachers in their evaluation technique is accepted.

It is found out that there was significant difference between science and language teachers in their instructional planning. In Table 9, the obtained 't' value 2.16 is statistically significant since it is greater than the table 't' value at 0.05 level of significance.

Hence the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between science and language teachers in their instructional planning is rejected.

The calculated 't' value 0.39 (Table 10) is lesser than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance and hence the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between science and language teachers in their teaching methods is accepted.

In Table 11 the calculated 't' value 0.19 is lesser than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance and hence the null hypothesis that there exists no significant

Variable	Language Teachers			Other subject Teachers			t' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Evaluation Technique	8	83.6	25.8	22	89.3	69.5	0.330	Not Significant

Table 8. Distribution of 't' value between language teachers and the teachers of other subjects in their evaluation technique.

Variable	Science Teachers			Language Teachers			t' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Instructional Planning	12	116.2	31.2	8	139	15.5	2.16	Significant at 0.05 level

Table 9. Distribution of 't' value between science and language teachers in their instructional planning.

Variable	Science Teachers			Language Teachers			t' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Teaching Methods	12	53.8	12.2	8	52.2	5.65	0.39	Not Significant

Table 10. Distribution of 't' value between science and language teachers in their teaching methods.

difference between science and language teachers in their teaching environment is accepted.

The calculated 't' value 0.178 (Table 12) is lesser than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance and hence the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between the teachers of science and language teachers in their evaluation technique is accepted.

It is inferred from Table 13 that there was significant relationship between instructional planning and teaching methods (0.9867) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the formulated hypothesis shows there exists significant relationship between instructional planning and teaching methods of the teachers. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

It is also found out that there was significant relationship between teaching method and teaching environment 0.9891 calculated value and the table value is 0.3749 at

Variable	Science teachers			Language Teachers			't' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Teaching Environment	12	79.5	23.3	8	86	29.8	0.19	Not Significant

Table 11. Distribution of 't' value between science and language teachers in their teaching environment.

Variable	Science teachers			Language Teachers			't' value	Remark
	N	M	S.D	N	M	S.D		
Evaluation	12	85.7	26.8	8	83.6	25.8	0.178	Not Significant

Table 12. Distribution of 't' value between science and language teachers in their evaluation technique.

Category	N	df	Calculated T Value	Table Value	Remark
Instructional Planning & Teaching methods	30	28	0.9867	0.3749	Significant at 0.05 level
Teaching methods & Teaching Environment	30	28	0.9891	0.3749	Significant at 0.05 level
Teaching Environment & Evaluation Technique	30	28	0.9890	0.3749	Significant at 0.05 level
Instructional Planning & Evaluation Technique	30	28	0.9871	0.3749	Significant

Table 13. Co-efficient of correlation between the Teaching styles of teachers.

0.05 level of significance. Hence there exists significant relationship between the methods of teaching and teaching environment of teachers. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

It is found out that there was significant relationship between teaching environment and evaluation technique of the teachers at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the formulated hypothesis reveals that there exists significant relationship between teaching environment and evaluation technique of the teachers. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 13 shows significant relationship between instructional planning and evaluation technique 0.9871 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the formulated hypothesis reveals that there exists significant relationship between instructional planning and evaluation technique of the teachers. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

Findings & Conclusions

- The teachers of science and humanities significantly differ in instructional planning.
- The teachers of language and other subjects significantly differ in instructional planning.
- Science and language teachers significantly differ in instructional Planning.
- There is significant relationship between instructional planning and teaching methods of the teachers.
- There is significant relationship between teaching methods and teaching environment.
- There is significant relationship between environment and evaluation technique of the teachers.
- There is significant relationship between instructional Planning and evaluation technique of the teachers.

Conclusion

World Education Report (1998) points out that the young generation is entering a world, which is ever fluctuating in all spheres: scientific, technical, Political, economic, social and industry. So teachers should be aware of these transformations and adopt new techniques in teaching. The present study reveals that there were variations in the

teaching manner of teachers in their respective subjects. The teachers of science and humanities differ in their instructional planning. The reason may be that the mode of teaching advocated for science teachers is more practical oriented. But teaching humanities need more explanation to promote the sense of apprehension. Science and language teachers differ in their instructional Planning. There was no significant difference between the teachers of science and humanities in teaching methods and teaching environment and evaluation technique. The teaching methods and teaching environment should be learner centered. The teaching methods should be more individualized. The present study also highlights their instructional Planning, teaching methods, teaching environment and evaluation techniques which are always interlinked and the one without the other is absurd and meaningless.

References

- [1]. Best W. John & Kahn V. James (2001). *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
- [2]. Khanzode, V.V., (1995). *Research Methodology*. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.
- [3]. Kothari C.R., (2000). *Research Methodology, Methods & Techniques*. New Delhi: Wishwa Prakashan.
- [4]. Kochhar S. K., (2000). *Methods & Techniques of Teaching*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt.Ltd.
- [5]. Ramakrishnan. P., (2001). *Bio-Statistics*. Nagercoil: Saras Publication.
- [6]. Sexana Swrup & Oberoi S.C., (1999). *Technology of Teaching*, Meerut: Surya Publication.
- [7]. Vijayakumar Kaushik & Sharma S.R., (1997). *Essentials of teaching and learning*. New Delhi: Anmol Publication. Pvt. Ltd.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. S. Robinson holds a Master degree in Psychology and obtained Master of Education with specialization of Curriculum Development. He received Master of Philosophy and Doctor of Philosophy in Education. He is currently working as Asst. Professor of Psychology in Perunthalaivar Kamarajar College of Education, Karaikal. U.T. of Puduchery. His current area of research interests are Educational Psychology and Guidance and Counseling especially Adolescence Psychology. He has authorized several publications in these areas.

