Social

TEACHER EFFICACY OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Dr. Seema Menon K.P *1, Ms. Sobha K.2

*1 Assistant Professor, N.S.S. Training College, Ottapalam, Palakkad, Pin: 679101, India
2 M.Ed Student, N.S.S. Training College, Ottapalam, Palakkad, Pin: 679101, India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.824101

Abstract

The study aims to find out the teacher efficacy of secondary school teachers. The sample for the present study consisted of 350 secondary teachers of Kerala. In this study the investigators used a teacher Efficacy scale to measure the teacher efficacy of secondary school teachers. The study reveals that secondary school teachers possess an average level of teacher efficacy and also that there exist significant difference in the mean scores of teacher efficacy with respect to type of management and teaching experience, but no significant difference exist in the mean scores of teacher efficacy with respect to Gender and locale and Subject of specialization.
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1. Introduction

Education is the back bone of our society. Globally there is an overwhelming concern over the quality and relevance of education. Education plays a key role in molding, shaping, reforming and reconstructing the society from time to time. It facilitates realization of self-potential and talents of an individual. In education, this crucial and all pervasive role is played by the teachers. Teachers shape the destiny of children.

Teacher is the pivot of any educational system. The development of new generation is only possible through teachers. All committees and commissions have emphasized the importance of teachers and teacher educators. They have potential for enhancing the quality of education by bringing life to curriculum and inspiring students, making them curious and attempting self-directed. Their commitment, efficacy and their work is hence highly relevant. They have potential for enhancing the quality of education by bringing life to curriculum and inspiring students, making them curious and attempting self-directed. Their commitment, efficacy and their work is hence highly relevant.
2. Objectives

The objectives set for the study are the following.

1) To find out the percentage of Secondary School teachers with different levels of Teacher Efficacy.
2) To find out whether there exist any significant difference in the mean scores of Teacher Efficacy of secondary school teachers with respect to
   a) Gender
   b) Locale
   c) Type of management
   d) Subject of specialisation
   e) Teaching experience

3. Method

In order to accomplish the objectives of the study normative survey method was adopted.

4. Sample for the Study

The present study was carried out on a sample of 350 secondary school teachers, drawn by stratified sampling method, giving due representation to factors like gender, locale, type of management subject of specialization and teaching experience.

5. Tool used for Investigation

For measuring the variables of the study, Teacher Efficacy Scale was prepared by the investigators((Seema & Sobha, 2013).

The scale consisted of six constructs viz., Efficacy in instructional strategies, Efficacy in classroom management, Efficacy in participation in school activities, Efficacy in interpersonal relationship, Efficacy in self control, Efficacy in facing challenges. There were 64 statements in the five point scale constructed. For positive statements scores 5,4,3,2 and 1 were given for making responses viz., strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. Reverse scoring procedure was adopted in the case of negative statements. The reliability coefficient of the tool is 0.72 and Face validity was also ensured.

6. Procedure

After administering the tool to secondary school teachers the responses were scored carefully and subjected to statistical analysis. Percentage analysis, t test and ANOVA were the statistical Techniques used.
7. Results

Classification of secondary school teachers according to their teacher efficacy is given in Table I. The table also contains the number and Percentage of secondary school teachers with different levels of teacher efficacy.

Table 1: Data and results of Percentage Analysis of the scores of Teacher Efficacy for the total sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>68.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it is evident that 16.86% of the secondary school teachers possess High level of Teacher Efficacy, 68.86% possess Average level of Teacher Efficacy and 14.28% possess Low Teacher Efficacy. From the above table it can be concluded that majority of secondary school teachers possess average level of teacher efficacy.

To find out whether there is any significant difference in the mean scores of teacher efficacy of secondary school teachers with respect to gender, locale test was used. Anova was used to find out the significant difference in the mean scores of teacher efficacy of secondary teachers with respect to of management, subject of specialisation and teaching experience.

i. Between Male and Female secondary school teachers.

Table-2 represents the data and results of the test of significance of difference between the mean Teacher Efficacy for Male and Female Secondary School teachers.

Table 2: Data and results of test of significance of difference in the mean scores of Teacher Efficacy between male and female samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Critical Ratio ‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>257.13</td>
<td>259.15</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>259.15</td>
<td>259.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it is evident that the t value 0.697 is not significant even at 0.05 levels. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Teacher Efficacy of secondary school teachers with respect to gender. Thus it may be concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Teacher Efficacy of male and female teachers.

ii. Between secondary school teachers of Urban and Rural schools

Table 3 represents the data and results of the test of significance of difference between mean of Teacher Efficacy for the teachers from Urban and Rural Schools.
Table 3: Data and results of test of significance of difference in mean scores of Teacher Efficacy between Urban and Rural samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Locale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Critical Ratio ‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>256.75</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>260.69</td>
<td>25.09</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it is evident that the t value 1.55 is not significant even at 0.05 levels. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Teacher Efficacy of secondary school teachers with respect to locale of schools. Thus it may be concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Teacher Efficacy of teachers from urban and rural schools.

iii. Between Subsamples based on type of management

Further analysis was done to find out whether there is any significant difference in the mean scores of teacher efficacy of secondary school teachers with respect to type of management. Summary of one way ANOVA for Teacher Efficacy of the subsamples based on type of management is presented in table-4

Table 4: Summary of one way ANOVA for Teacher Efficacy of the subsamples based on type of management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>11173.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5586.62</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>183642.22</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>529.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194815.45</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it is evident that, the F value for df, 2/347 is 10.56 which is significant at 0.05 level. This indicates that there is a significant difference in the Teacher Efficacy between the groups of secondary school teachers belonging to different types of management. Thus it may be concluded that there is a significant difference in the mean scores of Teacher Efficacy between secondary school teachers of government, aided and unaided schools. Further, to find out the area where significant difference shows, investigator used the Scheffe’s Post Hoc Test.

Table 5: Summary of Scheffe’s Post Hoc test for the mean scores of Teacher Efficacy of secondary school teachers with respect to type of management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Management</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Subset for alpha = .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>255.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>255.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaided</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>268.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it is evident that the mean scores of teachers from unaided management is 268.30 which is significantly higher than that from aided and government management. Thus it
could be concluded that teachers from un-aided type of management possess high Teacher efficacy than the teachers from other type of management.

iv. Between Subsamples based on Subject of Specialisation

Summary of one way ANOVA for Teacher Efficacy of the subsamples based on subject is presented in table 6.

Table 6: Summary of one way ANOVA for Teacher Efficacy of the subsamples based on subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1437.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>718.99</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>193377.47</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>557.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194815.45</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above table shows that the calculated value of F is 1.29 which is lesser than the table value at 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the Teacher Efficacy between the groups of secondary school teachers belonging to different subject. Thus it may be concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Teacher Efficacy between secondary school teachers handling the subjects- science and maths, Social Science and language at both level of significance.

v. Between Subsamples based on teaching experience

Summary of one way ANOVA for Teacher Efficacy of the subsamples based on teaching experience is presented in table 7.

Table 7: Summary of one way ANOVA for Teacher Efficacy of the subsamples based on teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5761.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2880.64</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>189054.16</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>544.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194815.45</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it is evident that, the F value for df, 2/347 is 5.29 which is significant at 0.05 level. This indicates that there is a significant difference in the Teacher Efficacy between the groups of secondary school teachers having different teaching experience. Thus it may be concluded that there is a significant difference in the mean scores of Teacher Efficacy between secondary school teachers having below 10 year, 10 to 20 years and above 20 years teaching experience.

Further, to find out teaching experience where the teachers were having significant mean scores, Scheffe’s Post Hoc test was used. The details are given in table 8.
Table 8: The mean scores of Teacher Efficacy of Secondary school teachers with respect to teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Subset for alpha = .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20 years</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>254.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 10 yrs</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>260.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20 Years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>264.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it is clear that the mean scores of teachers having above 20 years of teaching experience is 264.44 which is significantly higher than that of below 10 years and 10 to 20 years of teaching experience. Thus it could be concluded that teachers having above 20 years of teaching experience possess high Teacher Efficacy than the teachers having teaching experience below 10 years and 10 to 20 years.

8. Conclusion

The study shows that Secondary school teachers possess Average level of Teacher Efficacy. Teacher Efficacy of secondary school teachers with respect to classificatory variables of gender, locale and subject of specialisation were not significantly different. But the study reveals that there exist significant difference in Teacher Efficacy of Secondary School Teachers with respect to type of management and teaching experience.
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