



# A Study of Teaching Aptitude of Student teachers in the Context of Their Teaching competency

SONIYABEN VANSIYA  
Researcher,  
Dept. of Education & Psychology,  
Gujarat University, Ahmedabad

DR. ASHWINBHAI D. SHAH  
Research Guide,  
Dept. of Education & Psychology,  
Gujarat University, Ahmedabad

## 1. Introduction

The quality of education that is provided to our student teachers depends on quality of our teachers and quality of teacher depends on their quality of teaching aptitude and teaching competency. A teacher with huge degrees and high-profile personality cannot necessarily termed as a good or qualified teacher. The performance of a good teacher depends of his/her knowledge and teaching skills.

To be a good and effective teacher one should have a good teaching aptitude. Teaching aptitude means one's intensity of interest in teaching. Teaching aptitude depends on knowledge and skills about teaching while a competency is more than just knowledge and skills. It involves the ability to meet complex demands by drawing on and mobilizing psychosocial resources in a particular context. Competence is important for a teacher's pursuit of excellence.

## 2. Objectives of the Study

1. To study the teaching aptitude of B.Ed. student teachers.
2. To study the teaching competency of B.Ed. student teachers.
3. To determine the level of teaching competency of B.Ed. student teachers.
4. To study the effect of level of teaching competency on teaching aptitude of B.Ed. student teachers.
5. To study the effect of level of teaching competency on teaching aptitude of B.Ed. student teachers in the context of area.

## 3. Hypotheses of the Study

- H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant difference between mean scores of teaching aptitude test of student teachers having higher and lower teaching competency.
- H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant difference between mean scores of teaching aptitude test of student teachers of Urban area having higher and lower teaching competency.
- H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no significant difference between mean scores of teaching aptitude test of student teachers of Rural area having higher and lower teaching competency.

## 4. Variables of the Study

The following variables are defined by the researcher.

### 4.1 Independent variables

Independent variables of present study are as follow.

#### 4.1.1 Area

- a. Urban
- b. Rural

#### 4.1.2 Level of teaching competency

- a. High

b. Low

#### 4.2 Dependent variable

Scores of Teaching Aptitude Test is dependent variable in present study.

### 5. Limitations of the Study

Limitations of present study are as follow.

- 1.The present Study was conducted on B.Ed. student teachers studying in B.Ed. colleges of South Gujarat.
- 2.The present Study was conducted on rural and urban area of South Gujarat.
- 3.Only self-finance colleges of South Gujarat region were taken in this study.

### 6. Research Method

For present study, the researcher used two different tools for data collection: 1) Teaching Aptitude Test and 2) Teaching Competency Scale. The researcher visited selected B.Ed. colleges and gave both tools to student teachers. The researcher gave all necessary information to student teachers before giving tools. The students were given two hours to complete both tools. After it, the researcher collected respondent sheets

### 7. Research Tool

The researcher used two different tools for present study:

#### 1.Teaching Competency Scale

This scale was constructed and standardized by the researcher. The scale is compiled of 62 items. These items were divided in seven factors. 1) Micro teaching, 2) Lesson planning, 3) Set induction, 4) Presentation of content, 5) End of content, 6) Evaluation and 7) Use of teaching aids. Each item has five responses: 1) Very Good, 2) Good, 3) Moderate, 4) Poor and 5) Very Poor.

#### 2.Teaching Aptitude Test

The researcher used a previously standardized Teaching Aptitude Test which was constructed and standardized by Satishprakash Shukla. This tool is demonstrated at the end of 5<sup>th</sup> chapter in appendix section.

### 8. Sample of the Study

The researcher randomly selected self-finance B.Ed. colleges from south Gujarat region of Gujarat state. The selected sample of study is represented in table 1.0.

**Table 1: Sample of the Study**

Area/Teaching Competency	Urban	Rural	Total
High	677	327	1004
Low	679	383	1062
Total	1356	710	2066

### 9. Data Collection

The data collection took more than 3 months as the researcher selected 2066 student teachers from 18 B.Ed. colleges selected from South Gujarat region. The researcher has personally visited each of the colleges and provided Teaching Competency Scales to the student teachers of B.Ed. colleges. The researcher has visited the principals and HODs of each college and obtained permission for data collection. The researcher then visited the colleges on the date and time given by the principals. Trainees were given about an hour to fill in the given scale. Trainees were given all the information on how to fill the scale before giving the scale to the trainees. The researcher has supported the trainees whenever they face any problem while filling the scale. Finally, the researcher has collected all the scales and packed them securely for further processing of the scales and data analysis.

## 10. Techniques of Statistical Analysis

The researcher constructed three hypotheses which were checked using t-tests.

## 11. Data Analysis

**H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant difference between mean scores of teaching aptitude test of student teachers having higher and lower teaching competency.**

**Table 2: Result of t-test between student teachers having higher and lower teaching competency**

Level	N	M	SD	SED	t
High	1004	173.56	21.05	0.91	24.69
Low	1062	151.07	20.32		
df	0.05	0.01			
2064	1.96	2.58			

Above table shows calculated t-value is 24.69. For df=2064, table t-values 1.96 at 0.05 level and 2.58 at 0.01 level. The calculated t-value is more than table t-values at both levels. Thus, hypothesis is rejected and there is a significant difference between mean scores of teaching aptitude test obtained students teachers having high and low teaching competency. Here, mean score of student teachers having high teaching competency is more than student teachers having low teaching competency. Thus, it is said that the teaching aptitude of student teachers having high teaching competency is more than student teachers having low teaching competency.

**H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant difference between mean scores of teaching aptitude test of student teachers of Urban area having higher and lower teaching competency.**

**Table 3: Result of t-test between student teachers having higher and lower teaching competency**

Level	N	M	SD	SED	t
High	677	182.30	20.22	1.10	25.77
Low	679	154.07	20.12		
df	0.05	0.01			
1354	1.96	2.58			

Above table shows calculated t-value is 25.77. For df=1354, table t-values 1.96 at 0.05 level and 2.58 at 0.01 level. The calculated t-value is more than table t-values at both levels. Thus, hypothesis is rejected and there is a significant difference between mean scores of teaching aptitude test obtained students teachers of urban area having high and low teaching competency. Here, mean score of student teachers of urban area having high teaching competency is more than student teachers of urban area having low teaching competency. Thus, it is said that the teaching aptitude of student teachers of urban area having high teaching competency is more than student teachers of urban area having low teaching competency.

**H<sub>03</sub>: There is no significant difference between mean scores of teaching aptitude test of student teachers of Rural area having higher and lower teaching competency**

**Table 4: Result of t-test between student teachers having higher and lower teaching competency**

Level	N	M	SD	SED	t
High	327	164.82	21.88	1.60	10.47
Low	383	148.06	20.53		
df	0.05	0.01			
708	1.96	2.58			

Above table shows calculated t-value is 10.47. For  $df=708$ , table t-values 1.96 at 0.05 level and 2.58 at 0.01 level. The calculated t-value is more than table t-values at both levels. Thus, hypothesis is rejected and there is a significant difference between mean scores of teaching aptitude test obtained students teachers of rural area having high and low teaching competency. Here, mean score of student teachers of rural area having high teaching competency is more than student teachers of rural area having low teaching competency. Thus, it is said that the teaching aptitude of student teachers of rural area having high teaching competency is more than student teachers of rural area having low teaching competency.

## 12. Major Findings

Major findings obtained from this study are as follow.

- 1.The teaching aptitude of student teachers having high teaching competency is more than student teachers having low teaching competency.
- 2.The teaching aptitude of student teachers of urban area having high teaching competency is more than student teachers of urban area having low teaching competency.
- 3.The teaching aptitude of student teachers of rural area having high teaching competency is more than student teachers of rural area having low teaching competency.

## 13. Conclusion

In present study, the researcher investigated teaching aptitude of student teachers of B.Ed. colleges in context of teaching competency. The researcher used two different tools, Teaching Aptitude Test and Teaching Competency Scale. The researcher selected a random sample of 2066 student teachers from south Gujarat B.Ed. colleges. The research revealed that the teaching aptitude of student teachers having high teaching competency is more than student teachers having low teaching competency.

## References

1. Bayyrapu, S. (2015). Study of Teaching Competencies in Mathematics among Secondary School Teachers (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Osmania University, Hyderabad.
2. Drucker (2012). Making innovation a core competency. The Journal for Hospital Governing Boards (Vol. 65:5), p.26-27.
3. Kaur, H. (2014). A Comparative Study of Teaching Aptitude of B.Ed. (General) Pupil Teachers of Kurukshetra District in Relation to Their Gender, Location, Stream and Professional Experience. Indian Journal of Research 3 (8), p.27.
4. Kerlinger, F. N. (1997). Foundation of Behaviour Research, (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), New Delhi Surjeet Publication. Page No. 18.
5. Kumar, S. and Gupta, M. (2012). A Comparative Study of Level of Educational Aspiration of Secondary Class Student teachers of Government and Non-Government Schools. International journal of technical and non-technical research (volume issue January, 2014). eISSN 0976-7967,p-ISSN 2319-2216, p.51.
6. Medley, D. M. (1982). Teacher competency testing and the teacher educator. New York: Longman, p.86.
7. Patel, A. M. (1989), Prayogik Patho ane Suparat Karyo ni Guru Chavi. Vallabh Vidyanagar Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University Publication, p.18.
8. Spearman, C. E. (1927). The Abilities of Man. New York: The Mac Millan Company, p.127.
9. Spencer & Spencer (2014). Competency Model. Retrieved from: <https://www.scribd.com/presentation/242376499/Competency-Model-Spencer-Spencer>
10. Srivastava, P. & Bhargava, A. (1996), Correlative of teaching competency, Journal of Education and social change (Vol. X), Indian Institute of Education, Pune, p.54.
11. Sukhia, S. P. & Mehrotra, P. V. (1966). Elements of Educational Research. Bombay Allied Publication Pvt. Ltd., p.75.
12. Warren, H. C. (1934). Dictionary of Psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, p.11.