



A STUDY ON PERCEPTION OF SCIENCE TEACHER TRAINEES ABOUT EXPECTED PERFORMANCES

Smt. Sunanda

Guest Lecturer, Dept. of Studies and Research in Education ,
Mysore University , Karnataka.



ABSTRACT:

This paper is a study of difference in the perception of History teacher and supervisors about expected performances aimed to find out such differences for appropriate planning.

KEYWORDS : teaching skills and role performances , History teaching.

1. INTRODUCTION:

Perception that teachers have about teaching skills and role performances are observed as basic requirement in the effective History teaching. During pre-service training, roles have been assigned to History teachers at theoretical level. Such roles are not usually performed and so there is a difference in the perceptions of History teachers (ST) and supervisory staff (SS) about expected performances of a History teacher. The present study aimed to find out such differences so that appropriate planning or modification can be made for teacher-education programme.

2. HYPOTHESIS:

There will not be found any significant difference between the perceptions of SS and ST in relation to expectations about the different dimensions of History teaching.

3. TOOL:

Expected performance of History teacher scale (EPHTS) was developed by the investigator. This scale consisted of 80 performances under Ten dimensions, expected from History teachers of high school.

4. SAMPLE:

The sample of the present study consists of randomly selected 200 History teacher of high schools of Mysore districts and 120 supervisors. These supervisors were teacher educators related with History teaching, B.R.C. coordinator, DIET Lecturers and Block Resource persons of Mysore district. Out of these, 109 Science teachers and 94 supervisors responded.

5. DATA ANALYSIS:

In the present study, statistical analysis was done item wise as well as dimension wise. Since the data was in discrete number and distribution was not normal, non-parametric statistical technique of analysis was employed. To find differences between two groups, Median test was applied.

6. RESULT AND DISCUSSION:

TABLE: Difference in Perception between SS and ST about dimensions of Science Teaching.

Name of Dimension	Rank of Dimension	χ^2	Direction of Difference	Level of significance
Teaching-planning	9	4.103	SS > ST	0.05
Classroom teaching	8	4.103	ST > SS	0.05
Demonstration	2	0.640	ND	0.05
Correlation in History	10	4.464	SS > ST	0.05
Home-work	1	4.275	SS > ST	0.05
Practical work	5	0.311	ND	0.05
Co-curricular activities	6	6.370	SS > ST	0.01
History library	7	4.103	SS > ST	0.05
Evaluation	4	0.099	ND	0.05
Remedial work	3	0.463	ND	0.05

The result pertaining to the analysis is given in the table. The table reveals that out of Ten dimensions of History teaching, there exists no significant difference in the perceptions of ST and SS on three dimensions at .05 level. These four dimensions were Practical work, Evaluation and Remedial work.

On two dimensions the difference in perceptions is significant at .01 level. ST perceive laboratory organisation as more important than what SS perceived, whereas SS perceives co-curricular activities as more important than what ST perceived. As regard remaining five dimensions the difference in perceptions is significant at .05 level. ST perceive classroom teaching as more important than what SS perceived whereas SS perceived teaching, planning, correlation in Science, Home work and Science library as more important than what ST perceived.

It is important that the classroom teaching and laboratory organisation to which ST emphasised more favourably than SS are of low rank and of very much traditional in nature. Out of those dimensions to which SS emphasized more favourably than ST, the dimension of co-curricular activities is of special mention, as the difference in the perceptions among SS and ST is maximum. In modern History teaching, co-curricular activities are supposed to have good role in achieving the objectives of History teaching, but visualizing no direct impact of this dimension upon the achievement in History, perhaps ST find it less important.

The above discussion reveals that though significant differences between the perceptions of ST and SS in relation to expectation about the different dimension of History teaching were found but such differences were not consistent and uniform. Moreover, differences in the perceptions were not significant in case of all the dimensions. Hence the null hypothesis formed in the beginning has been partially accepted.

7. CONCLUSION:

It is advised that during pre-service programme teacher-educators should communicate to pupil-teachers specifically about expected performances of History teacher. Teacher-educators must organise themselves the performances before pupil-teachers in a manner in which they are expected to organise by the pupil-teachers. This will develop the proper perceptions among Science teachers about various performances of Science teachers.

REFERENCES

1. Best, John, W.: Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall Inc., 1959.
2. Aggrawal, J.C. (2008) "Teacher Education- Theory and Practice" Doaba House, Delhi.

3. Agrawal, J.C. (1995) "Teacher and Education in a developing society", Vikas Publishing house pvt. Ltd, New Delhi
4. Dr. Asthana Bipin (2011) "Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education" Agrawal Publications, Agra.
5. Garrette, H.E (2006) "Statistics in Psychology and Education" Surjeet Publications, Delhi.
6. John, A; Khan, T.A; Raeside, R (2007) "Research methods for graduate business and social science students", David white Sage Publications Ltd, London.