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ABSTRACT

The quality of an educational system depends, first and foremost, on what happens inside the classroom, in particular on the behavioural skills of the teachers themselves, their relationship with both individuals and with classes, their ability to motivate pupils, and their overall management of classroom activity. The teaching-learning process has been viewed in various ways by the teachers, educational philosophers and psychologists.
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INTRODUCTION

However, it can rightly be viewed as an interaction in the trinity of the teacher, the students and the content. Here the main focus is on the teacher, the instructional agent, who has two important functions: (i) to create a positive socio-emotional climate in which the learner will feel comfortable, and learning will be facilitated, and (ii) to manipulate and control the content in ways that will facilitate learning to achieve the learning objectives. These functions call for a competent teacher. It can be inferred that teacher behaviour is an important factor responsible for the socio-emotional climate of the classroom required for conductive teaching-learning atmosphere. Evidently, the socio-cultural homogeneity and the socio-economic characteristics of the pupil population and teaching personnel influence the behaviour of both the teachers and the pupils. The school organization, no doubt, plays an important part in the development of the children’s motivation to perform well in school. More vital than this is the teacher’s behaviour which is directly related to activities and pupils’ attitude towards their education and school. School administrators and other supportive personnel play vital roles in a school and school system, but the critical point in the enactment of the educational programme is the point of direct contact with the pupils namely, the classroom teacher.

Anderson, et al., (1946) stated that “the behaviour of the teacher, more than that of any other individual, sets the climate of the class”. It is true that teacher plays a major role in influencing the school climate and the classroom interaction in a more positive manner, and thus results in better pupils’ performance. The study of Kaul (1977) indicated that the classroom behaviour of popular teacher has a good indirect influence on his and the school’s effectiveness, and thereby makes the school environment more pleasing for the children and caters to their needs. Teachers’ behaviour has a positive role in the development of certain effective as well as cognitive abilities of the pupils. On the other hand, teacher’s behaviour is capable of either maximising or minimising the learning situation. The behaviours of teachers are stimuli which elicit responses from students, while other teachers’ behaviours do cause students to be
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either active or passive, and thus largely determine both overt and covert involvement, that is, interaction with stimuli. However, teachers’ behaviours, on occasions, are said to be aversive stimuli which evoke respondent type of behaviour in students, and thus interferes with verbal learning. Pressure put on pupils by teachers in relation to their achievement behaviour, may form a source of achievement related anxiety in pupils. Teachers’ behaviours are also said to influence pupil’s perception of education and its objectives, their awareness of the steps involved for achieving the objectives and interest and satisfaction in working towards the objectives.

The presence of the pressure of various professional problems faced by teachers, lead to behaviour influence of anxiety in teachers, which in turn are capable of affecting pupils’ aspiration and achievement in school. It is also presumed that teachers’ behaviour are influenced and changed by their attitude towards teaching and pupils etc. Other factors that are capable of influencing teacher’s behaviour are, self-concept, personal characteristics and situation in which teaching takes place, the extent to which the teacher exercises his control over the classroom conditions, class size, physical plant, academic programme, teaching techniques adapted, facilities available, incentives, motivation, etc., have obvious influence on teachers’ behaviour. More powerful than these are believed to be the attitude of the administration and supervisory personnel responsible for rating teachers. It is further stated that teachers’ age, recency of training and experience, marital status, subject taught etc., influence their behaviour.

In the light of what has been discussed in the preceding paragraphs, it is relevant to study the problems faced by teachers and their attitude towards their job which are capable of influencing their classroom behaviours and thus can determine pupils’ academic performance. Such study has more relevance in today’s fast changing society where the value system of society and educational programme keep changing and hence, make teaching more complex.

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The problem of the study may be stated as *Cumulative and Relative Contributions of Different Components to the Total Problems of Elementary School Teachers.*

**OBJECTIVE**

The main objective of the investigation is to study the relative contributions of various components of problems of elementary school teachers to the total problem.

1. To study the relative contributions of components of problems on total problems of elementary school teachers.

**Method**

The present study is a descriptive research which deals with the relationship between the variables, the testing the hypotheses, and the development of generalizations, principles or theories that have universal validity.

Descriptive research has been divided into several types, however, they are all attempting to find generalizable attitudes, and they all deal with present conditions.

**Sample**

Elementary school teachers of Hyderabad-Karnataka region is taken as a unit for the present study. All the teachers working in elementary level including school assistants, language teachers, and headmasters of elementary schools constitute the population. From this population only 1400 teachers who are teaching at elementary level were included in the present study.
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Tool Used

For the purpose of the present study, the investigator used Inventory on Problems of Elementary Education Teachers was constructed and validated by the investigator.

Collection of Data

Data relating to problems of elementary school teachers was obtained by administering tools to the 1400 elementary school teachers. The data were collected by administering the tool personally to the selected sample during July/August 2018. The investigator personally gave the instructions to the teachers regarding the tool and assured that the data will be used only for research purpose.

Statistical Technique

Multiple Regression analysis was used to predict the relative contributions of each of the components of the problem to the total problem.

Results

Relative Efficiency of Components of Problems in Predicting Overall Problems of Elementary School Teachers - An Analysis

The linear regression coefficients obtained for the each component of the problem and totality of the problems of elementary school teachers are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β’ Coefficient</th>
<th>SE of Coefficient</th>
<th>β’ Reg. Coefficient</th>
<th>SE of Reg. Coefficient</th>
<th>t’ value</th>
<th>P’ value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.546</td>
<td>5.0742</td>
<td>5.4286</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>0.1351</td>
<td>0.0592</td>
<td>1.8686</td>
<td>0.8188</td>
<td>2.2821</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0.1298</td>
<td>0.0604</td>
<td>1.3215</td>
<td>0.6150</td>
<td>2.1490</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>0.1050</td>
<td>0.0599</td>
<td>1.0763</td>
<td>0.6141</td>
<td>1.7526</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0.1404</td>
<td>0.0584</td>
<td>1.6175</td>
<td>0.6728</td>
<td>2.4041</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. Programmes</td>
<td>0.1488</td>
<td>0.0589</td>
<td>1.4846</td>
<td>0.5879</td>
<td>2.5263</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>0.1408</td>
<td>0.0603</td>
<td>1.5002</td>
<td>0.7391</td>
<td>2.3350</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The linear regression predicting Problems of Elementary School Teachers in terms of Components of Problems such as School, Students, Parents, Government Programmes and Administration found to be as under:

Regression Equation

Problems of Teachers = 27.546 (Constant) + 1.8686 (School) + 1.3215 (Students) + 1.6175 (Parents) + 1.4846 (Govt. Programmes) + 1.5002 (Administration)

The multiple R of the linear regression equation is 0.3727. For testing the multiple correlation coefficient, the F ratio (7.8759) was found to be significant at 0.01 level. Thus, the significance of R suggests that estimation of problems of elementary school teachers is possible on the basis of five predictor components, namely, school, students, parents, Government programmes and administration. Further, the regression equation shows that ‘School’ factor has a greater impact (1.8686) than all other predictors. ‘School’, ‘Students’, ‘Parents’, ‘Government Programmes’ and ‘Administration’ can be used to predict the
problems of elementary school teachers with the coefficient of multiple determination $R^2$ as 0.1389. It can, therefore, be said that 13.89 per cent of the variation in the problems of elementary school teachers can be accounted for by the factors ‘School’, ‘Students’, ‘Parents’, ‘Government Programmes’ and ‘Administration’.

The $SE_{\text{est}}$ for the regression equation is 10.1117. This means that each time the regression equation for the sample is used to predict problems of elementary school teachers the chances are about 1 to 100 that predicted problems of elementary school teachers will not miss the actual problems of elementary school teachers by more than $\pm$ 10.1117.

The index of forecasting efficiency \[E=100(1-\sqrt{1-R^2})\] was found to be 7.21. This means that predictions by means of regression equation is 7.21 per cent better than those made merely from a knowledge of the mean of the problems of elementary school teachers.

The relative contributions of the six components in terms of proportions of coefficient of determination predicted by each are given by the corresponding ($\beta \times r$) values and are presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$\beta$ Values</th>
<th>$r$ Values</th>
<th>$\beta \times r$</th>
<th>% of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>0.1351</td>
<td>0.0253</td>
<td>2.5331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0.1446</td>
<td>0.1298</td>
<td>0.0188</td>
<td>1.8769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>0.1285</td>
<td>0.1050</td>
<td>0.0135</td>
<td>1.3490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0.1616</td>
<td>0.1404</td>
<td>0.0227</td>
<td>2.2689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. Programmes</td>
<td>0.1999</td>
<td>0.1488</td>
<td>0.0297</td>
<td>2.9745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>0.2050</td>
<td>0.1408</td>
<td>0.0289</td>
<td>2.8858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the above table that about 13.8833 per cent of the criterion variable i.e., total problems is accounted for by the variance in the six predictors in case of problems of elementary school teachers. Out of this, about 2.9745 per cent of the criterion is accounted for by the variation in ‘Government Programmes’, about 2.8858 per cent by the ‘Administration’, about 2.5331 per cent by the ‘School’, about 2.2689 per cent by the ‘Parents’, about 1.8769 per cent by the ‘Students’, and about 1.3490 per cent by the ‘Teachers’. Thus, ‘Government Programmes’ seems to be the highest predictor of all the predictor components. The next predictors in the order of priority are ‘Administration’, ‘School’, ‘Parents’, ‘Students’, ‘Teachers’ respectively.

CONCLUSION


EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

1. Establishment of Elementary Schools on the basis of the actual educational needs of an area with adequate and equal supply of physical and academic facilities, basing on the nature of the educational programme.
2. Involvement of parents and community in school programme and educating them.
3. Laying out school programme (academic and non-academic) relevant to the needs of the learner and society by trained and competent personnel involving the ground level workers (teachers).
4. Uniform pattern of employment (teachers) on the basis of requirement, talent, interest and merit. A separate Education Service Commission for selection of the teachers and conducting various examinations related to Elementary School teaching.

5. Adequate provisions for professional training in-service training and making the same compulsory for all. To make the training programme relevant to the educational programme, needs of the teachers and students based on socio-cultural background of the learners. Regular supervision, follow-up programme and feedback need to be emphasized.

6. Revision of service conditions from time to time keeping in view parity with other jobs in the State, with special reference to pay, promotion, facilities, etc.

7. Involvement of teachers in institutional and higher level planning and decision making. Non-interference of politicians and other administrative officials in academic work and personal life of teachers (academic freedom).

8. Recognition of teachers’ outstanding quality and service to society by way of according status in society and giving meritorious award.

9. Proper organization and distribution of academic work and workload in school on the basis of teachers’ specialization of subject.
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