

LOCALITY BASED DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS' INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR AT SECONDARY LEVEL

Abid Khan*, Dr. Rahmat Ullah Shah**

ABSTRACT

The main aim of the study was to compare teacher instructional behaviors as perceived by their students at secondary level. The respondents of the study were 480 students including both male and female in district Bannu and Lakki Marwat. The researcher self-developed questionnaire was used to collect the data for the study. In order to find out the locality based differences among teachers instructional behavior at secondary level Independent sample t-test was used. Lesson clarity, instructional variety, teacher task orientation, teacher students' interaction and students' engagements in learning process all these five domains were compared locality wise as teachers' instructional behaviors. Result showed that no significance differences were found between the opinions of urban and rural students on these four domains while significant differences were found between instructional behaviors of rural and urban respondents. The major recommendation of the study is as the result reveals that there was a significance difference between urban and rural teacher's views regarding lesson clarity domain of teacher instructional behavior. The p-value of rural teachers instructional behavior showed that the teacher do not make the lesson clear. For these purpose some sort of training should be arranged for rural teachers in these regards.

Keywords: Teacher, Instructional behavior, Lesson clarity, Student engagement, Teacher task orientation.

*M. Phil Scholar, Email: kabid816@yahoo.com

**Assistant Professor, Email: rahmatullahshah@gmail.com

Institute of Education & Research, University of Science & Technology, Bannu, Khyber Pakhtukhwa, Pakistan

INTRODUCTION

It is a recognizable fact that human behavior can be desirably changed through the process of education. It is also defined as the process of overall development of a child. The most important objective of educational process is the transmission of knowledge to that generation (Gedler, 2001).

The techniques required to maintain well-managed classrooms include group alerts, recklessness, overlapping, using minimal intervention principles and creating smooth transitions and importance to students' academic achievements (Nye, Konstantopoulos and Hedges, 2004). Particularly teacher support, participation, and classroom management are often referred to as teacher learning, teacher participation and classroom management which are often cited as the key determinants of classroom learning environments (Alton-Lee, 2003; Opdenakker and Van Damme, 2009). The instructional behavior of teachers is often mentioned to support in this regards. It particularly reviews on the whole system of educational effectiveness.

A best teacher is probably being dedicated to his work. He always has the competency to compelling as creativity. In the process of teaching teacher personality has a significant factor in the teacher's instructional behavior. The teacher's instructional behavior has greatly effect on student's academic achievement. Hayonin (1989) states that students 'instructional behavior, attitude and achievement are less effective in their classrooms in terms of the teachers who possess professional and interpersonal skills. Everyone student has a variability of attitudes which may be positive or negative. It can be based on the preferences of the students. The students' different attitudes depend on the attitude of the object. Luthans (1993) said that teacher professional attitudes in many valuable ways can also serve a lot in students attitudes. In various environment individuals behavior response is different from time to time. Various authors define behavior in their own words.

Taneja (1989) pointed out that "the meaning of behavior is to act or to carry their own. Or behavior is what we look after particularly in response to outside stimuli."

Joyce (1980) also defines "behavior is legal and is influenced by environmental variables." He additionally defines that behavior is evident and recognizable phenomenon."

UNESCO (1986) records "anything that an organism does including actions and responses to stimuli."

Instructional process is a means of transferring curriculum material by the teacher to his student. It can include communication skill, audio visual aids, correspondence and classroom management. But several authors have defined the Instructional process in these words.

Taneja (1989) defined the concept of instruction which "refers to specific teaching skills training rather than to education in a broader sense may be audio visual aids, Correspondence, individuals etc."

According to Bailey (2006), Teachers' classroom performance and teaching quality are often evaluated or evaluated by administrators for problem solving or development purposes. Teachers' teaching behaviour or presentation defines as "the teacher in the classroom to display the skills or ability to emphasize the ability of teachers to perform teaching tasks" (Wang 2007). It is accepted that teacher evaluation is directly related to teacher effectiveness (Bailey 2006). Stodolsky (1984) asserts that teacher evaluation relies on good or effective teacher characteristics that are known or identifiable hypotheses.

Most educationists rely on that teaching instructional effectiveness indicates the level of teachers' teaching behaviour or performance.

Lesson clarity refers that how a teacher clearly and precisely present the lesson is to the class (Borich 2010). There are multiple indicators which teachers can harness in order to be clear in their presentation. Being clear consists of several factors of creating a sound lesson plan as well as understanding the audience whom the lesson will be presented to. An effective teacher will inform the learners of the lesson objectives and give directives slowly and distinctly. Additionally, effective teachers will provide students with advance organizers, examples, illustrations, and demonstrations to

explain or clarify. Much time and effort can go into creating a lesson with various learning materials to help further learning. This time and effort may be for nothing if the teacher does not understand their students. Finally, at the end of each lesson teachers that are effective in providing lesson clarity will incorporate a review or summary of the whole lesson. All these are indicators for lesson clarity and are used by effective teachers. I hope to incorporate these aspects of lesson clarity in order to better present information and to make ideas clear to learners in various levels of understanding.

In the whole educational system teacher instructional variety or teaching methodology of teacher are very important. There is various teaching methodology in the whole educational system. Different educationists have their own concept about teaching. There are various views about teacher teaching methodology. Plato believes that teachers can help students by asking them to contact their questions. Socrates believes that teacher methodology is in that way to help students to solve their own problems. Aristotle regards teaching as an activity that helps students create and store images in their memories. They recall and retrieve them from the warehouse if necessary. Dewey emphasized the role of experience, continuity, and interaction in teaching and learning. He places greater emphasis on free and self-directed events. Frere criticizes the concept of banking in traditional education. He proposes strategies such as specificity, self-sufficiency, and self-development.

Modern teaching philosophy more pressurized the students. It covers student learning and interaction with teachers, peers and parents. It also includes the academic facets of human development. Modern teaching concepts provide the subject of knowledge and understanding. There are various reports and research findings on different aspects of teaching.

Teacher task orientation is a behavior that how much a time the teacher assigns to instruct an academic subject. Borich in (2010,) states, "When a teacher gives more time allotted to teaching an exact topic, then the students have a greater the opportunity to learn". For teacher task orientation effective teachers will determine many skills. Several simple aspects which are not necessarily easy to achieve are

how a teacher handles administrative and clerical interruptions. The teacher stops or prevents misbehaviors with minimum class interruption (Borich, 2010). With regards to misbehavior students teachers should have established some sort of rules and consequences. Additionally, active teachers will change a lesson plan that reveals the most appropriate sorts of the curriculum. From this purpose, the most appropriate instructional model for the objectives being taught can be selected by the teacher. As a final end, an effective teacher clearly defined events such as weekly or monthly review, feedback, or testing for the purpose builds the unit outcomes. This can be done by establishing a schedule where the classroom activities are beginning and ending with events that are clearly visible and known to the students. Generally, it is very important to allow students adequate time on specific topics. They stay focused on the key points of the lesson and should summarize the lesson at the end of the class.

In contrast to superficial participation, apathy or lack of interest engagement stands for active involvement, commitment and concentrated attention. Student engagement is been define as “participation in educationally effective practices. It leads to a range of measurable outcomes both inside and outside the classroom,” (Kuhet *al.*, 2007). Similarly “the extent to which students are engaging in activities that higher education research has shown to be linked with high-quality learning outcomes” (Krause and Coates, 2008,).

Academic achievement is defined as “a level of ability attained in academic work or as properly attained knowledge in school subjects that is often epitomized by percentage of marks obtained by students in examinations (Kohli, 1975).

Purpose of the Study:

The main aim or purpose of the study is to compare teacher’s instructional behavior as perceived by their students at secondary level in Bannu division. The study aims at to compare teachers’ instructional behavior on these five main domain i-e Lesson clarity, instructional variety, teacher task orientation, teacher- student interaction and student engagement in learning process.

Hypothesis of the Study:

Ho1: There is no significant difference between instructional behaviors of rural and urban teachers.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**Population of the Study:**

All the students of Government secondary schools in Bannu division constituted the population of the study.

Sample of the Study:

Four hundred and eighty (N=480) students were taken as respondents. Stratified random sampling technique was employed for the selection of respondents from the population. There are two districts in Bannu division. The researcher randomly selected sixteen schools from each district, eight rural and eight urban and four male and four female in each strata. Then the researcher randomly selected 15 students from each school. The sample of the study was 480. The sample size was determined on the formula of (L.R Gay, 2003).

Data Collection:

The data were collected through administering the questionnaire. The researcher individually goes to the sampled institutes and respondents and got 100% response from the respondents.

Data Analysis Techniques:

In the light of the research purpose the collected data was tabulated, analyzed and interpreted. To find out the locality based differences among teachers instructional behavior at secondary level Independent Samples t-test was used.

RESULTS

Table 1: Locality based differences of the perceptions of students regarding lesson clarity domain of teacher's instructional behavior

S .N	Locality	N	Mean	Std	t	df	p-value
1	Urban	240	39.78	3.94	-2.61	478	.009
2	Rural	240	40.69	3.64			

Table 1 shows the testing of significant difference between the views of urban and rural student's about lesson clarity dimension of teacher instructional behavior. Since $p\text{-value} = 0.009 < \alpha = 0.05$, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the opinions of urban and rural students about lesson clarity dimension is rejected. This means that rural and urban students' views are different on lesson clarity domain of teachers' instructional behaviour. This is concluded that school locality makes difference in teachers' lesson clarity domain of teacher's instructional behavior.

Table 2: Locality based differences of the perceptions of students regarding instructional variety domain of teachers' instructional behaviour

S .N	Locality	N	Mean	Std	t	df	p-value
1	Urban	240	39.61	4.11	-.642	478	.521
2	Rural	240	39.84	3.84			

Table 2 illustrates the testing of significant difference between the views of urban and rural student's about instructional variety dimension of teacher instructional behavior. Since $p\text{-value} = 0.521 > \alpha = 0.05$, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the opinions of urban and rural students about instructional variety dimension of teacher instructional behavior is accepted. Both urban and rural students hold similar views about instructional variety dimension of teacher instructional behavior. This insignificant difference between the opinions

of urban and rural students reflects that teachers make effective use of instructional variety techniques.

Table 3: Locality based differences of the perceptions of students regarding teacher student's interaction domain of teacher's instructional behavior

S.N	Locality	N	Mean	Std	t	df	p-value
1	Urban	240	35.40	3.92	-.922	477	.357
2	Rural	240	35.72	3.69			

Table 3 illustrates the testing of significant difference between the views of urban and rural students about teacher student's interaction dimension of teacher instructional behavior. Since $p\text{-value} = 0.357 > \alpha = 0.05$, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the opinions of urban and rural students about teacher student's interaction dimension of teacher instructional behavior is accepted. Both urban and rural students hold similar views about teacher student's interaction dimension of teacher instructional behavior. This insignificant difference ensures that locality does not differentiate teachers and students interaction in the classroom.

Table 4: Locality based differences of the perceptions of students regarding teacher task orientation domain of teachers' instructional behavior

S.N	Locality	N	Mean	Std	t	df	p-value
1	Urban	240	36.93	4.69	-1.179	476	.239
2	Rural	240	37.42	4.35			

Table 4 illustrates the testing of significant difference between the views of urban and rural student's about teacher task orientation dimension of teacher instructional behavior. Since $p\text{-value} = 0.239 > \alpha = 0.05$, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the opinions of urban and rural students about teacher task orientation dimension of

teacher instructional behavior is accepted. Both urban and rural students hold similar views about teacher task orientation dimension of teacher instructional behavior. This insignificant difference between the opinions of urban and rural students reflects that there is positive promotion of teacher task orientation dimension.

Table 5: Locality based differences of the perceptions of students regarding student's engagements in learning process domain of teachers' instructional behavior

S.N	Locality	N	Mean	Std	t	df	p-value
1	Urban	240	36.30	4.05	-.928	478	.354
2	Rural	240	36.65	4.00			

Table 5 illustrates the testing of significant difference between the views of urban and rural student's about student's engagements in learning process dimension of teacher instructional behavior. Since $p\text{-value} = 0.354 > \alpha = 0.05$, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the opinions of urban and rural students about students engagements in learning process dimension of teacher instructional behavior is accepted. Both urban and rural students hold similar views about students' engagements in learning process dimension of teacher instructional behavior. This insignificant difference between the opinions of urban and rural students reflects that locality does not affect student's engagements in learning process.

Table 6: Locality based differences of the perceptions of students regarding teacher's instructional behavior

S.N	Locality	N	Mean	Std	t	df	p-value
1	Urban	240	1.880	18.92	-1.354	478	.176
2	Rural	240	1.903	18.13			

Table 6 illustrates the testing of significance difference between the views of urban and rural student's regarding teacher instructional

behavior. Since $p\text{-value} = 0.176 > \alpha = 0.05$, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the views of urban and rural students about teacher instructional behavior is accepted. Both urban and rural students hold similar views about teacher instructional behavior. This insignificant difference between the opinions of urban and rural students reflects that both urban and rural school teacher's instructional behaviors are up-to- the mark.

DISCUSSION

The teacher has been a very important role in whole system of education. The teaching-learning activity openly hinges upon the success of the whole education system. It includes the preparation of the instructional aims and objectives. The teacher's presentations of lesson, teaching methodology and teacher student interaction have been described to be a very important variable in students' achievement. Both urban and rural students hold different views about lesson clarity dimension by locality regarding teacher instructional behavior. Both urban and rural students hold similar views about instructional variety, teacher student interaction, teacher's task orientation and student's engagement in learning process dimension of teacher instructional behavior.

CONCLUSION

Both urban and rural students hold different views about lesson clarity dimension of teacher's instructional behavior. Both urban and rural students hold similar views on instructional variety dimension, teacher student interaction dimension, teacher's task orientation dimension and student engagement in learning process dimension of teacher instructional behavior.

RECOMMENDATION

The major recommendation of the study are, as the result showed that there was significant difference between urban and rural teachers views regarding lesson clarity domain of teacher instructional behavior. The $p\text{-value}$ of rural teachers instructional behavior showed that the teacher do not make the lesson clear. For these purpose some sort of training should be arranged for rural teachers in these regards. The

present study was conducted in Bannu Division. Similar studies may also conduct in other districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

REFERENCES

- Alton-Lee, A. (2003). Quality teaching for diverse students in schooling: Best evidence synthesis. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education, Medium Term Strategy Policy Division.
- Bailey, K. M. (2006). Language teacher supervision: A case-based approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Borich, G.D. (2010). *Effective teaching methods: research-based practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Gay, L.R. (2003) "Educational research" London: Competencies for analysis and applications (7th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Gredler, M.E. (2001). Learning and instruction: Theory into practice. (4th ed.) Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.P57-59.
- Hayon, L. K. (1989). The International Encyclopedia of Teacher Education. Paragon
- Joyce, B. (1980). Models of Teaching.Printice Hall Co., Englewood Cliffs. U.S.A.pp. 307-308.
- Kohli, T. K. (1975). Characteristic Behavioural and Environmental correlates of Academic Achievement of over and Under Achievers at different levels of intelligence.Punjab University, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. P. 48.
- Krause, K. and Coates, H. (2008) Students' Engagement in First-Year University. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. 33 (5), pp. 493–505.
- Kuh, G.D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J.A., Bridges, B.K. and Hayek, J.C. (2007) *Piecing Together the Student Success Puzzle: Research, Propositions, and Recommendations*.ASHE Higher Education Report, Vol 32, No 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Luthans, F. (1993).Organizational Behaviour.6th Ed. McGraw-Hill. New York. USA.P. 59.
- Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S., & Hedges, L.V. (2004).How large are teacher effects? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 26, 237-257.
- Opdenakker, M.-C., & Van Damme, J. (2009).Chapitre 3.L'efficacité des classes dansl'enseignement secondary. In V. Dupriez& X.

- Dumay (Eds.), L'efficacité dans l'enseignement: promesses et zones d'ombre (pp. 55-72). Antwerpen: De Boeck.
- Stodolsky, S. S. (1984). Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. *Educational Researcher*, 13(9), 11–22.
- Taneja, R. P. (1989). *Anmol's Dictionary of Education*. Anmol Publications New-Delhi, India. P.5,22, 122.
- UNESCO. (1986). *Glossary of Educational Technology Terms*. UNESCO. Paris. P.18, 59.
- Wang, W. (2007). Evaluation of alternative teacher performance appraisal program in Shanxi, People's Republic of China. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(7), 1012–1023.