



A Study on Social Maturity and Teaching Competency of Students Teachers in Economic Subject

Dr.S.K.Panneer Selvam

Associate Professor, Department of Education
Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli-T.N

skpskpbd@gmail.com

Abstract

A new concept social maturity with its significance is more important for one's daily life. It may be defined as one's unitary ability to know, feel, judge, behave and cooperate with a person's thinking process for behaving in a proper way with the ultimate realization of happiness in him and in others. In view of its wide significance from the individual as well as social angles, it becomes quite imperative that serious efforts should be made for its proper development right from early childhood among human beings.

Key Words: *competency, aptitude, maturity, intelligence, individual, maturity.*

INTRODUCTION

Every difference of environment means a difference in one's habit and one's way of living in so far as these differences create a different environment, a dynamic equilibrium of life is maintained through a processing of constant selections and constant adaptations. The society is not the world but is directly related to every one's life and maturity. The more complex the adaptation with society becomes, the more complex the social maturity of intelligence, maturity according to the need. Society is significant medium where certain quality of life and certain types of activity and occupation are provided with the aim of securing child's development based on the social needs. Since is a stem of growth characteristics of teacher trainees should adapt to the society which we live and to which he is expected to adjust and contribute, the social maturity receives importance at the present context. The conduct of many individual in the society tells about the trainees social maturity through which he can respond right according to the teaching situation.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

“A Study on Social Maturity and Teaching Competency of Students Teachers in Economic Subject”

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

A person's social maturity helps him much in all spheres of life. Social maturity also helps a person to understand and give direction to live a very healthy life. Social maturity is related to teaching competency. A competent teacher can execute their work very effectively. So teachers should have good teaching aptitude and teaching competency. The primary level of education is a significant stage to import various skills like listening, speaking and writing. Unless the teachers are very competent they may not perform their work properly. So it is significant to know the teaching competency of the teacher trainees at this level.

OBJECTIVES

The following objectives are set for the present study.

1. To find out the significant difference between male and female teacher trainees on their social maturity.
2. To find out the significant difference between male and female teacher trainees on their components of teaching competency
3. To find out the significant difference between Economic teacher trainees on their social maturity.
4. To find out the significant difference between Economic teacher trainees on their components of teaching competency.
5. To find out the significant difference between teacher trainees belonging to nuclear and joint families on their social maturity.
6. To find out the significant difference between teacher trainees belonging to nuclear and joint families on their components of teaching competency.
7. To find out the significant difference between teacher trainees from rural and urban area on their social maturity.
8. To find out the significant difference between teacher trainees from rural and urban area on their components of teaching competency.

LIMITATIONS

The present investigation has the following limitations.

1. The investigation is limited to Economic students.
2. The study is restricted to three institutions.
3. The sample is restricted to 400 students.
4. Standardized test materials alone were used in this investigation.
5. The investigation was restricted only teacher trainee student of the study.
6. Students were chosen from 3 institutions.

DESCRIPTION OF THE TOOLS USED

To verify the framed hypotheses the following tools and techniques were used in the present investigation.

- Social Maturity Scale
- Teaching Competency Scale

DESCRIPTION OF THE TOOL

The maturity outcomes of school going population can best be estimated in the light of paucity of such essential increasing instruments. The social maturity scale was developed by "Dr.Nalini Rao", Department of Education, and Bangalore University. The frame work for the integrated conceptual virtues of social maturity was adapted from the psychological structure. It was formulated by Green Berger et al. The final form of the questionnaire consists of 90 items known as "Rao's Social Maturity Scale" RSMS).

Scoring Key of the Questionnaire According to the Nature of Items

Nature of Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree
Positive 17, 21, 24, 26, 36, 39, 41, 42, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56,	4	3	2	1

57, 59, 63, 74, 77, 89, 90				
Negative 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 55, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88	1	2	3	4

PILOT STUDY

A pilot study was conducted on 50 students to establish the reliability and validity of the different tools used in the present study.

ESTABLISHING RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

The reliability of a test may be defined as the degree of consistency with which the test measures what it does measure. A test score is called reliable to be stable and trustworthy.

The reliability of the tool was calculated using Spearman Brown's formula for split half method.

$$r_{11} = \frac{2r_{hh}}{1 + r_{hh}}$$

r_{11} = Reliability coefficient of the whole test.

r_{hh} = Reliability coefficient of the half-test, found experimentally.

SCORING PROCEDURE

The sum of the ratings against all the items constitutes the score on General Teaching Competency (GTC Score) of the teacher being observed. The maximum possible score is 147 and minimum is 21.

TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis: 1

There is a significant difference between male and female teacher trainees on their social maturity.

Table 1: The Table Showing the 'T' Value of Male and Female Teacher Trainees on Their Social Maturity

Variable	Gender	No. of student	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	't' Value	Level of Sig.
Social Maturity	Male	100	203.46	23.645	2.364	4.617	0.01
	Female	300	214.58	19.859	1.147		

Interpretation

The calculated value of "t" 4.617 is greater than the table value, so there is significant difference occur at 0.01 level. Thus the Hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis: 2

There is a significant difference between male and female teacher trainees on their components of teaching competency.

Table 2: The Table Showing the 'T' Value of Male and Female Teacher Trainees on Their Components of Teaching Competency

Variable Teaching Competency	Gender	No. of student	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	't' Value	Level of Sig.
Planning	Male	100	18.03	5.981	.598	1.737	NS
	Female	300	19.32	6.553	.378		
Presentation	Male	100	46.88	13.409	1.341	2.329	0.05
	Female	300	50.64	14.178	.819		
Closing	Male	100	10.32	4.075	.407	.256	NS
	Female	300	10.50	6.496	.375		
Evaluation	Male	100	9.92	3.784	.378	1.154	NS
	Female	300	9.48	3.160	.182		
Management	Male	100	9.66	3.742	.374	.017	NS
	Female	300	9.65	3.186	.184		

Interpretation

From the table it is observed that there is significant difference occur on the teaching component of presentation. So the empirical hypothesis partially accepted. All other components in teaching competency do not difference each other. As far as presentation is concerned the female teacher trainees perform well than their male counterparts.

Hypothesis: 3

There is a significant difference between Economic teacher trainees on their social maturity.

Table 3: The Table Showing the 'T' Value of Economic Teacher Trainees on Their Social Maturity

Variable	Type of Institute	No. of student	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	't' Value	Level of Sig.
Social Maturity	DIET	199	217.37	20.251	1.436	5.35	0.01
	Private	201	206.29	21.105	1.489		

Interpretation

The calculated value of "t" 5.35 is greater than the table value, so there is significant difference occur at 0.01 level. Thus the Hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis: 4

There is a significant difference between Economic teacher trainees on their components of teaching competency.

Table 4: The Table Showing the 'T' Value of Economic Teacher Trainees on Their Components of Teaching Competency

Variable Teaching Competency	Type of Institution	No. of student	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T Value	Level of Sig.
Planning	DIET	199	20.76	5.268	.373	5.66	0.01

	Private	201	17.25	6.992	.493		
Presentation	DIET	199	55.37	11.812	.837	8.73	0.01
	Private	201	44.09	13.899	.980		
Closing	DIET	199	11.68	7.393	.524	4.18	0.01
	Private	201	9.23	3.770	.266		
Evaluation	DIET	199	10.22	2.985	.212	3.82	0.01
	Private	201	8.97	3.533	.249		
Management	DIET	199	10.42	2.975	.211	4.70	0.01
	Private	201	8.90	3.491	.246		

Interpretation

The calculated value of 't' is greater than the all table value, so there is significant difference occur at 0.01 level. Thus the Hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis: 5

There is a significant difference between teacher trainees belonging to nuclear and joint families on their social maturity.

Table 5: The Table Showing the 'T' Value of Teacher Trainees Belonging to Nuclear and Joint Families on Their Social Maturity

Variable	Category	No. of Students	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	't' Value	Level of Sig.
Social Maturity	Nuclear	211	215.53	22.749	1.566	3.74	0.01
	Joint	189	207.64	18.971	1.380		

Interpretation

The calculated value of 't' 3.74 is greater than the table value, so there is significant difference occur at 0.01 level. Thus the Hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis: 6

There is a significant difference between teacher trainees belonging to nuclear and joint families on their Components of Teaching Competency.

Table 6: The Table Showing the 'T' Value of Teacher Trainees Belonging to Nuclear and Joint Families on Their Components of Teaching Competency

Variable Teaching Competency	Category	No. of Students	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	't' Value	Level of Sig.
Planning	Nuclear	211	19.21	6.276	.432	.701	NS
	Joint	189	18.76	6.609	.481		
Presentation	Nuclear	211	51.10	13.721	.945	2.115	0.05
	Joint	189	48.14	14.320	1.042		
Closing	Nuclear	211	10.13	4.974	.342	1.131	NS
	Joint	189	10.81	6.927	.504		
Evaluation	Nuclear	211	9.49	3.027	.208	.600	NS
	Joint	189	9.69	3.638	.265		
Management	Nuclear	211	9.67	2.960	.204	.114	NS
	Joint	189	9.63	3.706	.270		

Interpretation

From the table it is observed that there is significant difference occur on the teaching component of presentation. So the empirical hypothesis partially accepted. All other components in teaching competency do not difference each other.

Hypothesis: 7

There is a significant difference between teacher trainees from rural and urban area on their social maturity.

Table 7: The Table Showing the 'T' Value of Teacher Trainees from Rural and Urban Area on Their Social Maturity

Variable	Category	No. of Students	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	't' Value	Level of Sig.
Social Maturity	Rural	214	216.42	20.239	1.383	4.750	0.01
	Urban	186	206.49	21.499	1.576		

Interpretation

The calculated value of 't' 4.75 is greater than the table value, so there is significant difference occur at 0.01 level. Thus the Hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis: 8

There is a significant difference between teacher trainees from rural and urban area on their Components of Teaching Competency.

Table 8: The Table Showing the 'T' Value of Teacher Trainees from Rural and Urban Area on Their Components of Teaching Competency

Variable Teaching Competency	Category	No. of Students	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	't' Value	Level of Sig.
Planning	Rural	214	20.36	5.382	.368	4.653	0.01
	Urban	186	17.43	7.160	.525		
Presentation	Rural	214	54.32	12.289	.840	7.519	0.01
	Urban	186	44.39	14.138	1.037		
Closing	Rural	214	11.41	7.221	.494	3.470	0.01
	Urban	186	9.35	3.847	.282		
Evaluation	Rural	214	10.01	3.006	.206	2.773	0.01
	Urban	186	9.10	3.608	.265		
Management	Rural	214	10.21	3.031	.207	3.601	0.01
	Urban	186	9.02	3.546	.260		

Interpretation

The calculated value of 't' is greater than the all table value, so there is significant difference occur at 0.01 level. Thus the Hypothesis is accepted.

MAJOR FINDINGS

The major findings are presented below.

- It was found that significance difference occurred on the social maturity and teaching competency of male and female teacher trainees.

- It was found that significant difference occurred on the social maturity and teaching competency of Economic students.
- It was found that significant difference occurred on the social maturity and teaching competency of teacher trainees from joint and nuclear family of the teacher trainees.
- It was found that there is a significant difference between Economic teacher trainees with respect to their social maturity and teaching competency on the basis of their community.
- It was found that there is a significant difference between Economic teacher trainees with respect to their social maturity and teaching competency on the basis of their urban and rural area.
- It was found that there is no significant difference between Economic teacher trainees with respect to their social maturity and teaching competency on the basis of parental qualification.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

- Social maturity and teaching competency is an aspect that makes an individual adjusted to the society at large.
- It is related to the development of the personality of a student. Students studying in Economic are forced to adhere to institution regulations as well as social activities.
- We find that if the students fall in line with the social relationship system and obeying its regulations they may possess a higher social maturity and teaching competency.
- Therefore for teacher trainees social maturity and teaching competency is essential for their daily life to adopt the classroom situation.

CONCLUSION

This study is aimed to know the social maturity and teaching competency of Economic students. In this chapter the hypotheses and major findings were given also further analysis has been recommended.

BIBLIOGRAPH

- Adhiesehiah, W.T.V. and Pavanasam,R. (1974). *Sociology in Theory and Practice*, Shanthi Publishers, New Delhi, p.38.
- Adi Seshiah W.T.A. and Mrs.Sulochana Sekar (1977). *Educational and Social Research*, Nekan Pathipagam, Coimbatore.
- Albert and James Gardon ward. "Teacher competency and testing: A natural affinity". *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice I* (Summer 1982):6-9,26.1982 ED, Pp.223-716
- Barr A.S. (1950). "Teaching Competencies". *Encyc. Ed. Res.* New York, Macmillam, Pp.1446-1454.
- Flippo, Rona F. and Carol R. Foster. "Teacher competency Teaching and Its Impact on Educators". *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35 (March – April 1984), Pp.10-13.
- Joki, Russell A. "Make Teacher Competency your policy". *American School Board Journal* 169, (November 1982): P.32.
- Kukreti(1994).Job motivation and teacher competency.A correlation and study. *Experiments in education. Indian Educational Abstract Issue*, Pp.2. 22(1):10-14.

- Newton, E.H. and Brathwarte, W.E. (1987). "The importance of Teaching Competency". *Perspectives in Education* 3: Pp.169-180.
- Patraman Jempengern (1986). *Social maturity of higher secondary students in Thailand*, Dissertation Abstract International.
- Ronald, T. (1984). "Teacher Competence: The Logic, The Law and the Implications". *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35, Pp.14-18.
- Sadhya Giri Rajan (1985). *Competency and personality. Motivation and profession perception of college teachers. Fourth serve of research in education, 1983-1988. Vol.11.*
- Schacter, Richard, T. (1983). *Sociology*, Mc Graw_Hill Inc. New York, P.328.
- Sharma, S.K. (1981). "The various relationship between Teaching Competency and Intelligence". *Indian Psychological Review*, 36(5): Pp.75-83.
- Smith, B.O. (1985). "Teaching: Definitions". In *Ency. of Educ. Res. Vol.9, T-2*, Peregamon Press, New York, Pp.5097-5101.
- Stevens, S.S. (1939). "Psychology and the science of science". *Psychol. Bull.* 36:221-63.
- Sweeney, Jim and Richard Manatt. "Teacher Competence: The Past, Present and Future of its Assessment". 1982 ED, Pp. 223.716.
- Tamil mani. P. (1990). *Teacher competency and teacher personality in relation to achievement of High School. Students in science V Survey of Educational Research* 11: Pp.19-26.