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ABSTRACT

The study was based on the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between the mean performance scores of Promoted and Selected Secondary School Teachers on the aspect of the classroom management”. Promoted and selected subject specialists are being posted in the higher secondary schools of the country. Selected subject specialists (SS) are those who are posted directly on the posts of subject specialists as compared to the promoted subject specialists who are teaching in the schools against the posts of senior English teacher (SET), when they are promoted they become subject specialists. Keeping in view these two modes of posting of these teachers, it was considered imperative to conduct a study to compare their performance. This study was basically of descriptive nature. The main objective of the study was to compare the classroom management skill of promoted and selected subject specialists. For this purpose a hypothesis was formulated and tested. This study was limited to the SS working in government higher secondary schools of DI Khan District since 2000. One observation schedule and three Likert type five point rating scales were developed, validated and used for data collection. For this purpose “t” test was used to analyze the data. The hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significance. It was concluded that the performance of promoted subject specialists was better than the selected subject specialists for the classroom management.
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INTRODUCTION

The education system of the country reflects the aspiration of people whom it is to serve. Every education system serves the social, cultural, economics and international objectives of the society. No doubt, quality of education is closely related to the educational policies and programmes, the curricula, facilities, equipment and administrative structures, but it is only the teacher who puts life into this skeleton. As it has been discussed in the Report of Commission on National Education (1959), if competent teachers can be obtained, likelihood of attaining desirable educational outcomes is substantial. On the other hand, although schools may have excellent material resources in the form of equipment, buildings and text books, and although curricula may be approximately adapted to community requirements if the teachers are misfit or are indifferent to their responsibilities, the whole programme is likely to be ineffective and largely wasted. The quality of education is directly related to the quality of its teachers. The role of teacher in teaching learning process and education system has been discussed in the Report of Commission on National Education (1959) as “A good teacher is able to break through the poorest system and even an excellent system would get corrupted if the teacher is not conscious of his responsibilities or does not care to discharge them properly”. That is why it is said, “No system of education is better than its teachers”.
Keeping in view the pivotal role of teachers, due attention should be paid to the recruiting and staffing process of the teachers. Only those persons should be selected who have high commitment and positive professional attitude towards their profession. Teachers training, their professional commitment, their knowledge and experience are the variables, which directly affect their performance. Taylor and Jenkins (1998) observed that "Teacher's educational level, their academic and pedagogical preparation and their years of teaching experience were regarded as indicators of their proficiency". Teachers learn different theories, methods, skills and strategies during their training, although they are taught how to teach in a classroom and how to tackle the students in different situations during the training. But regular teaching enables them to apply this theoretical knowledge and to improve their teaching. That is why it is said that experience helps the teachers to perform better during their live classroom teaching. Bhutta (2004) discussed that "The teachers sense of being experienced professionals seemed closely linked to a sense of being in control of the learning situation and being able to use firm classroom rules and clear instructions to create and maintain a stable and predictable work environment. To be an experienced teacher, theoretical knowledge is necessary". So the experienced teachers should teach effectively, but some times, there seems no impact of experience upon the teachers’ performance, as Bhutta (2004) states “Teaching experience has little or no effect on students’ achievement in classroom teaching”.

Sultana (2000) has defined the terms performance, tendencies, capabilities and competencies as:

1. Teacher Performance refers to observable behaviors, both verbal and non-verbal.
2. Tendencies refer to what the teacher typically does in the average or normal teaching situation.
3. Capabilities refer to what the teacher is able to do when, when trying his best.

The competencies include those attitudes, understanding, skills and behaviors believed necessary to facilitate the intellectual, social, emotional and physical growth of the children. It means the performance is a teaching behavior of the teacher, which some times appear as result or in the form of students’ achievement. But the students’ achievement is not considered as sum total of the performance of a teacher, it may be considered just as an aspect of teachers’ performance because there are so many other variables, which involve in the students achievement.

Sadker (1995) quotes about effective teaching as; "It is supreme art of the teacher to awaken joy in creative expression and knowledge" (Albert). “It is the supreme art” (Einstein). "The teacher is one who made two ideas grow, where only one grew before” (Elbert Hubbard). “The man who can make hard things easy is the educator” (Ralph Waldo Emerson).

As a prospective teacher, an awareness of the importance of the decision to enter the teaching field is essential. The teacher’s reasons for choosing teaching as a career will undoubtedly affect his attitude and behavior with his students when he eventually becomes a teacher. Whatever his reasons for wanting to teach, it might be helpful for him to consider what motivated others to become teacher. Pani (1987) states as: Teacher effectiveness refers to the abilities and expertise of teachers in promoting successful learning among their pupils. Such a concept of teacher effectiveness can be accepted as true and valid if the term learning is understood in its widest sense, learning leading to the development of the different aspects of the pupil's personality.

The performance of a teacher relates with the qualities and competencies of a teacher and his effective teaching. Nigel (1986) enlisted the qualities of a tutor/ teacher in this regard and said that the performance of a teacher as well as his effective teaching refers to his:

i. Ability to convey pride in achievement and excellence without daunting or patronizing students.

ii. Ability to be accessible, but not intrusive, so that student can learn from mistakes but don't feel neglected.

iii. Having demonstrable understanding of the various ways in which people learn, for example, following instructions, limitation, trial, and errors, deduction, incidental learning, and by process of investigation.

iv. Ability to break down complex skills into components and simple skills.

v. Ability to help people to see the wider implication and application of skill as they learn them.

vi. Ability to assess levels of competence and arrange individualized learning programmes around them.

vii. Ability to set realistic objectives which have a motivating effect on students.

viii. Ability to encourage cooperation between students rather than competition thus fostering peer learning.

ix. A wish to avoid adapting people to tasks and a desire to help them be able to effect.

Another aspect known as the classroom communication is considered to be the one of the most important communication form occurring in society. Mayor (1987) states, “The oral interaction which occurs in the classroom affects the personality development, intellectual development and social development of students and teachers”. The purpose of communication in classroom is to encourage and support learning which can be defined as a process of acquiring knowledge or changing attitudes, behavior and beliefs in some way. Although the roles of teachers and students are separately defined in a classroom but for effective teaching, apart from being a sender a teacher needs to be constantly receiving verbal and non-verbal messages for students (responded). As Perrot (1982) says, “It is important that the teachers should not ignore the significant emotional content of what pupils are saying and doing any more than they would ignore important cognitive statements.”

According to Morgan and Saxton (1991), “Knowledge of students' backgrounds makes a significant difference in a teachers’ effectiveness. Productive classroom discourse gives students opportunities to make connections with their own lives”. Morgan and Saxton (1991) discuss further the classroom communication as: Communication in a class is a matter not only of how the teacher sets up classroom relationships and discourse but also of how the students interpret and respond to what the teacher does. A student’s participation cannot arise solely from his individual characteristics i.e. his intelligence, articulateness or confidence but includes the effects of his attempts to understand the teacher and teacher’s attempts to understand and encourage him. According to Morgan and Saxton (1991), a teacher should try to create a communication climate having the characteristics of both his/her background and matching student’s backgrounds. He should also try to create and maintain the interest and motivation of the students by stimulating through a variety of methods and materials and by emphasizing their needs and aspirations. The effectiveness of the communication, which in turn is the effectiveness of teaching, depends upon the feedback given to the teacher by the students and by the teacher to students. The Morgan and Saxton (1991), states further as: Although Model shown indicates the direction of feedback only from receiver to the sender of message but I think in classroom communication it needs to be directed in both ways so that the students keep the teacher aware of their difficulties and the teacher keeps the student aware of the students’ progress and attempts to improve his/her teaching and to solve the problems students may have.

Keeping in view these two modes of posting of these teachers, it was considered imperative to conduct a study to compare their performance typically in the area of classroom management, because no such study seems to have been conducted in the past.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY
Following points highlight the significance of the study:

- It may help the educational decision makers and policy makers in better understanding of the classroom management of higher secondary school teachers in comparative perspective for devising functional policies and organizing effective training courses/programmes.
The study results may prove useful to the teacher educators and educational supervisors for making necessary improvements in their training and supervisory strategies.

The study results may prove significant for teacher trainers in identifying the training needs of higher secondary school teachers in their weak areas of classroom management.

The study results may provide basis for further research in this area.

**Hypotheses of the Study**

Following null hypothesis along with alternate hypothesis was developed and tested.

- **H₀** There is no significant difference between the mean performance scores of Promoted and Selected Subject Specialists on the aspect of the classroom management.
- **H₁** There is significant difference between the mean performance scores of Promoted and Selected Subject Specialists on the aspect of the classroom management.

**Procedure of the Study**

The study was conducted to compare the performance of Promoted and Selected Subject Specialists of D.I. Khan District. It was basically of descriptive nature, which required a survey to collect the required data. The population of the study consisted of all 90 male higher secondary school teachers working in 10 schools of D.I. Khan District. The number of Promoted and Selected SS was 70 and 20 respectively. The enrolment of the students at higher secondary level in these 10 schools was 1372. All these selected teachers were included in the sample. Same number i.e. 20 Promoted SS out of remaining population of SS from the same 10 schools were selected through random sampling technique. Another sample of 40 colleague SS of sample teachers and a group of 160 pupils, four pupils taught by each promoted and selected teacher were selected by random sampling from the same 10 schools. Ten head teachers from the same schools were also included as sample for the purpose of the study.

**Instruments**

An observation schedule and three five point Likert type-rating scales was developed, pilot tested and validated. These instruments were used to collect the data regarding performance (Classroom Management) of Promoted and Selected SS. The description of instruments is as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Observation Schedule</strong></td>
<td>To observe classroom management of sample teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Rating Scale for Student’s</strong></td>
<td>To get the opinion of the students with regard to sample teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Rating Scale for Colleagues’</strong></td>
<td>To gather data on the teacher’s colleagues opinion on the performance (Classroom management) of sample teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Rating Scale for Head Teachers</strong></td>
<td>To collect the opinion of the heads of institutions regarding the overall Classroom management of sample teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection**

The data were collected in person through observation during live classroom teaching by 40 sample teachers. Rating scales were personally got filled from the 40 colleagues, 10 head teachers and 160 respective students of the sample teachers.

**Scoring of Data**

The qualitative data was converted into quantitative form by scoring five point Likert scale i.e. excellent (05 scores), good (04 scores), average (03 scores), poor (02 scores), very poor (01 score).

**Analysis of Data**

The collected data were organized and analyzed to make comparison between performances of sample teachers. “t” test was used as statistical technique. On the basis of analysis findings were drawn, conclusions were reached and recommendations were made accordingly. The applied formula of test was as under:

\[
t = \frac{(x_1 - x_2) - (\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{S_p \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}
\]

With \( v = n_1 + n_2 - 2 \) d.f

Where \( S_p = \sqrt{\frac{n_1 - 1}{n_1} S_1^2 + \frac{n_2 - 1}{n_2} S_2^2} \)

\[
S_1^2 = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum (x_{1i} - \bar{X}_1)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad S_2^2 = \frac{1}{n_2} \sum (x_{2i} - \bar{X}_2)^2
\]

EXPLANATION OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Terms and Abbreviations used in the study are as under:-

a. **Ability**
   Just a skill to do something, e.g. writing ability means, writing skill. Although it is not in proper order.

b. **Capabilities**
   God gifted ability to perform or do something.

c. **Competency**
   The qualification or ability to handle a situation successfully, to achieve the required end.

d. **Performance**
   The output of capabilities and competencies, of teacher's work (in other words how a teacher performs his professional duties in the school).

e. **Promoted (In-Service Promoted Teachers)**
   Promotion from SET (Senior English Teacher) to subject Specialists (SS) on service seniority basis.

f. **Reliability**
   Consistency in results.

g. **Selected (Directly Selected Teachers)**
   Teachers who are recruited directly as SS by the N.W.F.P Public Service Commission.

h. **Subject Specialist (SS)**
   Teachers appointed for teaching to 11th and 12th classes having the degree of Master of Arts (M.A) or Master of Science (M. Sc) with B. Ed, known as Subject Specialists (SS) in the N.W.F.P.

i. **Validity**
   Appropriateness.

j. **GPS**
   Good Performance Score.

k. **MPC**
   Minimum Performance Criteria.

l. **MPS**
   Minimum Performance Score.

m. **N.W.F.P PCS**
   North West Frontier Province Public Service Commission.

n. **D.I. Khan**
   Dera Ismail Khan.

Performance criteria

Minimum performance indicators were identified with the help of literature and administration personnel of the education department and performance criteria was prepared. These indicators of teacher's performance were given to twelve expert educationists for their opinion and comments to check the content validity. It was improved in the light of their comment and observations. The minimum performance criteria are shown in the following table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Minimum Performance Indicators/Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S No.</td>
<td>Aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M.P Score:** Minimum performance score

**G.P Score:** Good performance score

**B.P Score:** Better performance score
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In the light of these criteria, an Observation form and three Likert type five points rating scales were developed for students, colleagues and head teachers respectively. Each rating scale was comprised of 04 items to collect the data on the minimum indicators of performance. The detail of the instruments is given below.

**Observation Form**
An Observation Form was developed to observe the classroom performance of sample teachers in accordance with the minimum performance criteria developed for this purpose. The instrument was pilot tested in two Boys higher Secondary Schools of D.I.Khan. Two head teachers observed the performance of teachers in live classroom situation. The inter observer correlation ranged between .87 and .91. In the light of the feedback received from the observers and experts, the improvements in the instrument regarding language, performance indicators and its formal format made.

**Rating Scale for Students**
Rating Scale for Students was developed to get the opinion of the students about the performance of their Teachers. This five point rating scale consisted of 04. Twenty students of two different schools for try out purposes filled this scale. The Rating Scale was improved in the light of feedback, difficulties and ambiguities pointed out by the students and in consultation with the experts in the relevant field. Its Urdu version was used to collect the data from the students.

**Rating Scale for Colleagues**
Rating Scale for colleagues was developed to get the opinion of the colleagues about the performance of sample teachers. This scale was got filled from six Secondary School Teachers of three different schools for try out purposes. The Rating Scale was improved in the light of difficulties and ambiguities pointed out by the teachers and also in consultation with the experts in the field.

**Rating Scale for Head Teachers**
A Rating Scale for Head Teachers consisting of 04 statements was developed to collect the opinions of heads of institutions regarding the performance of sample teachers. It was tried out in three higher secondary schools of D.I. Khan City as three head teachers used it and it was improved in the light of their observations.

**INTERPRETATION OF DATA**
The study aimed at comparing the performance of Promoted and Selected SS in D.I. Khan District. The main objective of the Study was to compare the performance of Promoted and Selected SS in the light of developed criteria of performance. This study was basically of descriptive nature and required a survey to collect the data.

**COMPARISON AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA COLLECTED THROUGH OBSERVATION SCHEDULE**
The analysis of data collected through "Observation Schedule" is presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MPC Mean</th>
<th>Group Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>t-tabulated</th>
<th>t-Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoted SS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected SS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table given above indicates that mean performance scores of Promoted and Selected SS groups were 16.91 and 15.50 respectively, which were higher than the mean score of 12 of minimum performance criteria (MPC). SD in the scores of two samples was 1.55 and 1.78 respectively. The obtained t-Calculated value 3.37 is greater than the t- tabulated 2.021 so we reject H₀ and accept H₁ and conclude that there is significant difference between mean performance scores of Promoted and Selected higher Secondary School Teachers on the aspect of the classroom management. The difference was in the favour of Promoted SS.
**COMPARISON AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA COLLECTED THROUGH RATING SCALE FOR STUDENTS.**
The analysis of data collected through "Rating Scale for students" is presented in the following table:

**Table:** Comparison of Attitude of Promoted and Selected SS towards the Classroom Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MPC Mean</th>
<th>Group Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>$t_{\text{tabulated}}$</th>
<th>$t_{\text{Calculated}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoted SS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected SS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56.88</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above table indicates that mean performance scores of Promoted and Selected SS groups were 68.25 and 56.88 respectively, which were higher than the mean score of 48 of minimum performance criteria (MPC). SD in the scores of two samples was 2.57 and 2.79 respectively. The obtained $t_{\text{Calculated}}$ value 6.58 is greater than the $t_{\text{tabulated}}$ 2.021 so we reject $H_0$ and accept $H_1$ and conclude that there is significant difference between mean performance scores of Promoted and Selected higher Secondary School Teachers on the aspect of the classroom management. The difference was in the favour of Promoted SS.

**COMPARISON AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA COLLECTED THROUGH RATING SCALE FOR COLLEAGUES**
The analysis of data collected through "Rating Scale for Colleagues" is presented in the following table:

**Table:** Comparison of attitude of Promoted and Selected SS towards the Classroom Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MPC Mean</th>
<th>Group Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>$t_{\text{tabulated}}$</th>
<th>$t_{\text{Calculated}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoted SS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected SS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.69</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above table indicates that mean performance scores of Promoted and Selected SS groups were 31.34 and 26.69 respectively, which were higher than the mean score of 24 of minimum performance criteria (MPC). SD in the scores of two samples was 3.59 and 4.05 respectively. The obtained $t_{\text{Calculated}}$ value 4.87 is greater than $t_{\text{tabulated}}$ 2.021 so we reject $H_0$ and accept $H_1$ and conclude that there is significant difference between mean performance scores of Promoted and Selected higher Secondary School Teachers on the aspect of the classroom management. The difference was in the favour of Promoted SS.

**COMPARISON AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA GATHERED THROUGH RATING SCALE FOR HEAD TEACHERS (PRINCIPLES)**
The analysis of data collected through "Rating Scale for Head Teachers" is presented as:

**Table:** Analysis of Attitude of Promoted and Selected SS towards the overall Performance as viewed by the Head Teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MPC Mean</th>
<th>Group Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>$t_{\text{tabulated}}$</th>
<th>$t_{\text{Calculated}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoted SS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62.78</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected SS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61.94</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above table indicates that mean performance scores of Promoted and Selected SS groups were 62.78 and 61.94 respectively, which were higher than the mean score of 50 of minimum performance criteria (MPC). SD in the scores of two samples was 6.67 and 6.52 respectively. The obtained $t_{\text{Calculated}}$ value 0.51 is less than $t_{\text{tabulated}}$ 2.021.
Thus accepting $H_0$ and rejecting $H_1$ we conclude that there is no significant difference between mean performance scores of Promoted and Selected higher secondary school teachers on the aspect of the classroom management. It shows that overall mean performance of the Promoted and Selected SS was similar.

**DISCUSSION**

On the basis of the analysis, the following null hypothesis was tested:

There is no significant difference between the mean performance score of Promoted and Selected higher Secondary School Teachers on the aspect of the classroom management. Therefore the hypothesis-1 was rejected because t-values of the researcher's observation, student's and colleague teacher's opinion score were calculated as 3.37, 6.58 and 4.87 respectively which were more than the standard t-value i.e. 2.021 at 0.05 level of significance.

**CONCLUSIONS**

It was concluded that the promoted SS had performed better on "classroom management". The better performance of the promoted SS may be due to the experience of Promoted higher Secondary School Teachers which helped them in better classroom management.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Following recommendations are made on the basis of conclusions of the study.

- All the promoted and selected secondary school teachers may be provided in-service professional training on pedagogy and contents on periodical basis to enable them to perform effectively during their classroom teaching.
- All the selected SS may be provided training and refresher courses on classroom management.
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