Educational Administration: Theory and Practice
2020, 26(1), 344-352
ISSN: 2148-2403
https://kuey.net/

Research Article

Teaching Proficiency in Diverse Landscapes of Locality: A Study

Prof. Rajeev Rattan Sharma[1*], Minakshy Sharma[2]

[1*]Professor, Head of Department, University of Jammu, E-mail: rajeevrattanjmuuni@gmail.com
[2]Research scholar Department of Education Department, University of Jammu, E-mail: sharmaminakshy@gmail.com, Contact- 9906022366

Citation: Prof. Rajeev Rattan Sharma, et.al (2020). Teaching Proficiency in Diverse Landscapes of Locality: A Study, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 26(1) 344-352,
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v26i1.9916

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The paper deals with proficiency in teaching among teacher trainees in relation to locality. All the government and private colleges of teacher education in Jammu province was the population of the study. The data was collected from 120 teacher trainees of different Colleges of Education in the Jammu Province. The data was randomly collected from 5 districts of Jammu province including Jammu, Kathua, Samba, Udhampur and Reasi through survey method. The self constructed rating scale for teacher trainees' proficiency in teaching was used to collect the data. Statistical techniques used for the analysis were Mean, Standard Deviation and T-test. Results show that there is no significant difference in proficiency in teaching and various dimensions of proficiency in teaching of teacher trainees with reference to Locality. This study, therefore, aims to provide insight into educational community at large about the significance of teacher training for proficiency in teaching as well as to clear their understanding regarding the locale of the teacher has nothing to do with the proficiency in teaching of the teacher.

Keywords: Proficiency in teaching, Teacher trainees, Locality of teachers

INTRODUCTION

Teacher plays an enormous role to make the students as informed citizens and well noble social being. A good teacher has always been a source of inspiration and stage settler for the future students. Teachers act as an architect to mould students' potentialities and abilities. Such teachers are formed and trained by teacher training colleges through the teacher preparation Programme. The capacity of every nation to produce high-quality teacher trainees depends on the caliber of its teacher education institutions.. It is noteworthy to acknowledge that to be teachers or teacher trainees would have a major influence on the educational standard of future learners. Proficient teacher educators are responsible for making efficient teachers Paul (2016). Maende (2012) revealed that teacher' professional learning that is context specific, job embedded and content-based is particularly important for addressing the diverse needs of students in differing settings. Lardizabal (1999) noted that professional development is essential to the success of anyone's career. Pritchard and Woollard (2010) reported that teachers involved in skills, knowledge sharing presentation skills, explanation and collaborative practices adopted during training, shape the abilities of the teacher to perform better in the classroom practices.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

Proficiency in teaching

Proficiency in teaching refers to competence in skills and knowledge in teaching. In the present study proficiency in teaching refers to 12 dimensions of proficiency in teaching.

Teacher trainees

In the present study Teacher trainees' are those students who are enrolled in teacher training colleges of education pursuing the B.Ed. Programme in Jammu province.

Copyright © 2020 by Author/s and Licensed by Kuey. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Locality

In the present study locality refers to the place of residence of Teacher trainees either Urban or Rural, pursuing B.Ed. programme in teacher training colleges of Jammu province.

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

Teachers are the essence of any teaching learning process which takes place in any corner or any field of the world. The role of teachers in building knowledge economy is inevitable. They act as trainers', conditioners, instructors, coach, mentors, practioners or in any sphere and profession; a professional, who takes the legacy of knowledge, culture and heritage from a generation to next. As teacher is such a catalyst for the world to progress, his/her training is of utmost importance. In India Colleges of Education are responsible for the training of would be teachers or Teacher Trainees who later on turned out to be the teacher educators or the teachers in the different recognized schools. Hence the Teachers' professional mastery of the subject goes a long way in bringing about improved students' academic performance as well as better academic achievement in the students Maende (2012)**.** In India , generally the teaching profession is not the Ist choice and hence the most of the rejected lot tries the hand to be the teachers. The Urban students generally don't fall in the Ist Choice but rather it is believed that the students belonging to the rural areas are preferring the teaching profession and as such the present study is an attempt to understand the hypothesis that the teaching profession is a ist Choice among the rural students. In addition, the rural area teachers and those who have received training were found to be more receptive of their approaches to teaching, Suliman et.al, (2019). In India , the teacher training institutes are available all over places –rural as well as urban centres and hence the students of both of these areas can enter the teaching profession which in India is considered as a profession by chance and not by choice. In this era of the unemployment and mass awareness , many of the students prefer in India to be teachers because the teaching is considered the most secured , easy profession particularly for the Girls. Teacher education Institutes, in every year train teacher trainees from Urban and Rural Areas. The training they receive is almost equal in every context. After the training they become skilled in how to impart instruction in an effective and efficient way, contributing to their proficiency in teaching. Hence the investigator intended to explore the proficiency of teacher trainees in teaching and exploring that the teachers coming from different localities have any difference in their teaching proficiency.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To study the difference in Proficiency in teaching of teacher trainees based on Locality.
2. To study the difference in Dimensions of Proficiency in teaching of teacher trainees based on Locality.

HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

1. There will be no significant difference in Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.
2. There will be no significant difference in Dimensions of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

METHODOLOGY

The current research included 120 teacher trainees from government and private teacher training colleges of Jammu province. A random strategy was applied. The researcher randomly selected five districts from Jammu province of ajmmu & Kashmir (India). Out of the Jammu Province, the following districts wereselected as the sample units Jammu, Kathua, Samba, Udhampur and Reasi. Out of these districts ,the government and private colleges were selected with equal representation in sample. A sample of 120 teacher trainees was selected for the final data collection. The sample is distributed into two categories of Urban and Rural. Self constructed 'Rating scale for Teacher Trainee's Proficiency in Teaching' was administered on the sample to assess their proficiency. The scale is a nine point scale has twelve dimensions as proficiency in language, in communication, content mastery, methodology, skills oratory, time use, teaching aids, use of blackboard, explanation, technology with traditional teaching and interaction with the students; with 1 rating showing low rating to end with 9 having highest rating on the proficiency scale.

The split-half approach was used to calculate the Proficiency in teaching. The test-retest coefficient of 0.89 demonstrates the scale's high reliability. The descriptive survey approach was employed to determine the mean, standard deviation and t-test in this study for the Analysis.

RESULTS

OBJECTIVE: 1. To study the difference in Proficiency in teaching of teacher trainees based on Locality.

The first objective of the study was to analyze the difference in Proficiency in teaching of teacher trainees based on Locality. To achieve this objective, the Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of Jammu province was compared using t-test. Means, Standard deviation and Summary of t-test have been presented in the table 1

HYPOTHESIS: 1. There is no significant difference in Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Table 1 Difference in Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural Teacher trainees.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in Teaching	**Urban**	**60**	66.6	10.91756	0.158827	**Not-significant**
	Rural	**60**	69.55	9.270739		

The table 1 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 66.6 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 69.55 it means, both are Above average proficient in teaching as supported by (Paul, 2016) in his study found that the level of teacher proficiency of teacher educator is average, also the scores of male and female teachers with respect to their location (rural/urban) is average effectiveness. Islahi and Nasreen (2013) and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 10.91 and that of rural teacher trainees was 9.27 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.158 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges as supported by Patel and Dass (1984) found that teachers from rural and urban areas are more or less equal with respect to teacher effectiveness.

OBJECTIVE: 2. To study the difference in Dimensions of Proficiency in teaching of teacher trainees based on Locality.

The second objective of the study was to analyze the difference in the difference in Dimensions of Proficiency in teaching of teacher trainees based on Locality. For this objective the scores of different dimensions of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of Jammu province were compared using t-test. To achieve this objective, the various dimensions Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of Jammu province were compared using t-test. Means, Standard deviation and Summary of t-test have been presented in the table 1**.** The different dimensions of Proficiency in teaching are as under:

1. Proficiency in Language (Dimension I)
2. Proficiency in Communication (Dimension II)
3. Proficiency in Content Mastery (Dimension III)
4. Proficiency in Methodology (Dimension IV)
5. Proficiency in Skills (Dimension V)
6. Proficiency in Oratory practices (Dimension VI)
7. Proficiency in Time usage (Dimension VII)
8. Proficiency in using Teaching Aids (Dimension VIII)
9. Proficiency in Use of Blackboard (Dimension IX)
10. Proficiency in Explanation (Dimension X)
11. Proficiency in using Technology with Traditional Teaching (Dimension XI)
12. Proficiency in Interacting with the students (Dimension XII)

HYPOTHESIS: 2. There is no significant difference in Dimensions of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

2.1 There is no significant difference in Dimensions I of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension I of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension I of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared using t-test. Means, Standard deviation and Summary of t-test have been presented in the table 2

Table 2 Difference in Dimension I of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension I	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in Language	**Urban**	**60**	4.716667	1.303082	0.312559	**Not-significant**
	Rural	**60**	4.966667	1.251533		

The table 2 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in language as Dimension I, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 4.71 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed.

colleges was 4.96 it means, both are average proficient in language usage in teaching supported by Sunardi et al. (2018), that limited language proficiency impedes students in understanding literary texts especially classical ones. Language proficiency of the teacher incorporates teaching proficiency among the teachers. This leads to better understanding among the students and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 1.30 and that of rural teacher trainees was 1.25 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.312 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension I of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

2.2 There is no significant difference in Dimensions II of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension II of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension II of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared by the statistical methods & have been presented in the table 3

Table 3 Difference in Dimension II of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension II	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in Communication	**Urban**	**60**	4.966667	1.365019	0.246162	**Not-significant**
	Rural	**60**	5.216667	0.940459		

The table 3 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in Communication as Dimension II, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 4.96 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.21 it means, both are average proficient in communicating while teaching and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 1.36 and that of rural teacher trainees was 0.94 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.246 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension II of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

There is no significant difference in Dimensions III of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension III of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension III of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared and have been presented in the table 4

Table 4 Difference in Dimension III of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension III	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in Content Mastery	**Urban**	**60**	5.6	1.27824	0.482762	**Not-significant**
	Rural	**60**	5.75	1.114238		

The table 4 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in content mastery as Dimension III, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.6 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.75 it means, both are above average proficient in content mastery while performing teaching as supported by Maende (2012) and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 1.27 and that of rural teacher trainees was 1.11 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.48 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension III of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

2.3 There is no significant difference in Dimensions IV of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension IV of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension IV of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared using t-test. Means, Standard deviation and Summary of t-test have been presented in the table 5

Table 5 Difference in Dimension IV of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension IV	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in Methodology	**Urban**	**60**	5.333333	1.284413	0.165347	**Not-significant**
	Rural	**60**	5.666667	1.159583		

The table 5 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in methodology as Dimension IV, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.33 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.66 it means, both are above average proficient in adopting suitable methodology in teaching as supported by Pritchard and Woollard (2010) and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 1.28 and that of rural teacher trainees was 1.15 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.165 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension IV of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

2.4 There is no significant difference in Dimensions V of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension V of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension V of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared by the statistical methods & have been presented in the table 6

Table 6 Difference in Dimension V of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension V	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in Skills	**Urban**	**60**	5.616667	1.708321	0.348402	**Not-significant**
	Rural	**60**	5.916667	1.476272		

The table 6 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in Skills as Dimension V, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.61 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.91 it means, both are above average proficient in various skills of teaching as supported by Pritchard and Woollard (2010) and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 1.70 and that of rural teacher trainees was 1.47 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.348 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension V of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

2.5 There is no significant difference in Dimensions VI of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension VI of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension VI of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared by the statistical methods & have been presented in the table 7

Table 7 Difference in Dimension VI of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension VI	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in Oratory practices	Urban	60	5.616667	1.595456	0.208579	Not-significant
	Rural	60	5.95	1.28122		

The table 7 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in Oratory practices as Dimension VI, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.61 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.95 it means, both are above average proficient in oratory practices in teaching and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 1.59 and that of rural teacher trainees was 1.28 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.208 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension VI of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

There is no significant difference in Dimensions VII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension VII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension VII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared using t-test. Means, Standard deviation and Summary of t-test have been presented in the table 8

Table 8 Difference in Dimension VII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension VII	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in Time usage	Urban	60	5.85	1.412115	0.391587	Not-significant
	Rural	60	6.083333	1.309278		

The table 8 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in Time usage as Dimension VII, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.85 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 6.08 it means, both are above average proficient in time management in teaching and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 1.41 and that of rural teacher trainees was 1.30 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.391 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension VII of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

2.6 There is no significant difference in Dimensions VIII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension VIII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension VIII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared by the statistical methods & have been presented in the table 9

Table 9 Difference in Dimension VIII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension VIII	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in using Teaching Aids	Urban	60	5.433333	1.430499	0.154597	Not-significant
	Rural	60	5.833333	1.542249		

The table 9 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in using teaching aids as Dimension VIII, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.43 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.83 it means, both are above average proficient in using teaching aids in teaching and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 1.43 and that of rural teacher trainees was 1.54

respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.154 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension VIII of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

2.7 There is no significant difference in Dimensions IX of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension IX of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension XI of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared by the statistical methods & have been presented in the table 10

Table 10 Difference in Dimension IX of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension IX	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in Use of Blackboard	Urban	60	5.633333	1.413814	0.615554	Not-significant
	Rural	60	5.766667	1.465613		

The table 10 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in use of blackboard as Dimension IX, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.63 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.76 it means, both are above average proficient in using blackboard in teaching as supported by Pritchard and Woollard (2010) and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 1.41 and that of rural teacher trainees was 1.46 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.615 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension IX of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

2.8 There is no significant difference in Dimensions X of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension X of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension X of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared by the statistical methods & have been presented in the table 11

Table 11 Difference in Dimension X of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension X	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in Explanation	Urban	60	5.816667	1.545816	0.187727	Not-significant
	Rural	60	6.183333	1.34658		

The table 11 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in Explanation as Dimension X, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.81 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 6.18 it means, both are average proficient in explanation in teaching as supported by Pritchard and Woollard (2010) and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 1.54 and that of rural teacher trainees was 1.34 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.187 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension X of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

2.9 There is no significant difference in Dimensions XI of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension XI of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension XI of Proficiency in

teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared by the statistical methods & have been presented in the table 12

Table 12 Difference in Dimension XI of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension XI	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in using Technology with Traditional Teaching	**Urban**	**60**	5.9	1.398546	0.898132	**Not-significant**
	Rural	**60**	5.933333	1.38841		

The table 12 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in using technology with traditional teaching as Dimension XI, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.9 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 5.93 it means, both are above average proficient in using technology with traditional methods in teaching and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 1.39 and that of rural teacher trainees was 1.38 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.898 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension XI of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

There is no significant difference in Dimensions XII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of teacher training colleges.

Further the researcher studied the difference in Dimension XII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province. For this, the scores of Dimension XII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees of training colleges of Jammu province were compared by the statistical methods & have been presented in the table 13

Table 13 Difference in Dimension XII of Proficiency in teaching of Urban and Rural teacher trainees

Dimension XII	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Proficiency in Interacting with the students	**Urban**	**60**	6.116667	0.561455	0.561455	**Not-significant**
	Rural	**60**	6.283333	1.378917		

The table 13 showed the mean difference between urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges of Jammu province in proficiency in interacting with the students as Dimension XII, of proficiency in teaching scores. The table shows that the mean score of urban teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 6.11 and the mean of rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges was 6.28 it means, both are average proficient in interacting with the students in teaching as supported by Pritchard and Woollard (2010) and standard deviation of urban teacher trainees was 0.56 and that of rural teacher trainees was 1.37 respectively. The t-value was found to be 0.561 which was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there was an insignificant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. The hypothesis stands rejected. So, this study revealed that there is no difference in Dimension XII of Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees as supported by Patel and Dass (1984).

MAJOR FINDINGS

From the study it was found that there was a no significant difference in Proficiency in Teaching of urban and rural teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. So, this study revealed there is neutral effect of locality on Proficiency in Teaching of teacher trainees of B.Ed. colleges. In case of various Dimensions of Proficiency in Teaching of teacher trainees the results are not significant. It can be interpreted that locality has nothing to do with proficiency in teaching and in all the dimensions of teaching whether it may be methodology, skills, interaction, explanation and many more. It really don't matter from where the teacher is coming from, as far the concern is his/her efficiency in teaching and how proficient he/she is in teaching. Islahi and Nasreen (2013) revealed that there were no significant differences in the effectiveness of the groups: rural male, urban male, rural female and urban female teachers.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The finding of the study is proficiency in teaching is neutral as far as the locality of the teacher is related. The findings are in line to Patel and Dass (1984), Yang (2014) and Suliman et.al,(2019). This finding opposes Mahmud and Bray (2017), who state that the quality of teachers is often lower in rural than urban areas because better qualified personnel prefer to live in cities. But there preference to live is their choice, may be initially they are from rural locale and after job they migrated to cities for better avenues. The teachers whether belonging the rural or the urban areas are very enthusiastic about teaching and willing to try various approaches that may suit their teaching best Yang (2014).The ideas and suggestions of rural teachers may differ from the urban area teachers who are more into traditional pedagogical skills as cited in Freeman and Anderman (2005). The scores of male and female teachers with respect to their location (rural/urban) is average effectiveness. Islahi and Nasreen (2013).Effectiveness and proficiency are both the terms related with teaching profession but may not be misinterpreted effectiveness with proficiency. Proficiency is concerned with the expertise in skills, methodology, communication, strategies, techniques and teaching tactics applied by the teacher to make maximum use of his/her potentialities to facilitate the learning among the students whereas effectiveness is related with the achievement of the students as per the set objectives of the teacher. Thus, the present study reveal that the effect of Locality is neutral on the proficiency in teaching as well as on all the dimensions of teaching and it means that the teachhers belonging to the rural or the urban areas are equally proficient in teaching and the myth that the rural teachers are better teachers is not clear .

CONCLUSION

The present study is an eye-opener for an internalized stigma of the people being developed over the centuries that teachers from urban areas are good teachers as compared to the Teachers from rural background. In this era of technology and innovation, there remain a very less difference in as far as the locality is concerned. If the teacher trainees receive the equal training, equal skills, equal prospects and they opted teaching by choice. So there is very less scope for their teaching not proficient. It is admitted that teacher effectiveness may be affected by the locality as far as the resources and infrastructure is a concern. But proficiency in teaching is mainly related with the skills, potentialities, methodologies, and practices being attained by the teachers through regular teacher training. In a study Suleiman et.al,(2019) revealed that regardless of locality, training and teaching experience, teachers employ different kinds of approaches in teaching. Teachers should be more optimistic and dare to take risks in developing content, adopting efficient skills and practices for teaching the students with latest innovation, methodologies, software packages, Digital tools and Artificial Intelligence.

REFERENCES

1. Bodhe, C.D., and Jankar, D. S. (2015). Teaching effectiveness: how do students evaluate their teacher? *International Journal of healthcare and Biomedical Research*, 63(02), 155-159.
2. Freeman, T. M. & Anderman, L. H. (2005). Changes in Mastery Goals in Urban and Rural Middle School Students. Journal of Research in Rural Education, 20, (1), 1 - 12.
3. Islahi, F. and Nasreen. (2013).Who Make Effective Teachers, Men or Women? An Indian Perspective. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 1(4): 285-293, 2013 DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2013.010402
4. Lardizabal (1991), Principles of Teaching of Theory and Practice:Lydia L. M. and Nosongo J.W. (2009)
5. Maende, B. J. (2012). Influence of professional development on teacher effectiveness in public secondary schools in Mumias District, Kenya. An unpublished M.Ed. Thesis: Maseno University.
6. Mahmud, R. & Bray, M. (2017). School factors underlying demand for private supplementary tutoring in English: urban and rural variations in Bangladesh. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 37, (3), 1 – 11.
7. Patel J. K and Dass, P. A (1984). A study of the Teacher Effectiveness as a function of age, sex, Area and Qualifications. Journal of Educational Psychology, 42:45-48.
8. Paul . A. A, (2016). TEACHER PROFICIENCY OF TEACHER EDUCATORS. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences,* 6(9), 127-137.
9. Pritchard. A., Woollard. J. (2010). Psychology for the Classroom:Constructivism and Social Learning. New York: Routledge.
10. Suliman . A., Yunus .M.M., Nor.M.Y.M. (2019). The Influence of Locality, Training and Teaching Experience on the Approaches to Teaching Literature. *Arab World English Journal* , 10(01), 31- 46. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no1.3
11. Sunardi, Akil. M., Arafah, B. & Salija, K. (2018). Looking at the Shared Conception of Teaching Literature in an Indonesian ELT Setting. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 9, (2), 316-327.
12. Sundara, R. G., Bhaskara, R. D. (2009). "Teacher Effectiveness, An Observational Study". The Educational Review, 57(2), 29-33.
13. Yang, Y. (2014). Study of the Urban and Rural Education's Fairness in the Field of Public Service. Chinese Studies, 3, (1), 4 - 7.