Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom
Volume No. 3, Issue No. 1, January 2024
e-ISSN: 2959-0825, p-ISSN: 2959-0817
http://pjlaw.com.pk

Exploring the Quality of Teaching at the College Level in Punjab: Students' Comparative View Gender Wise and Locality wise

Mirza Zafarullah Farmayash
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Education, Minhaj University Lahore
zafarbaigmul@gmail.com

Muhammad Irshad
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Education, Minhaj University Lahore
Muhammadirshad1989@gmail.com

Shahid Iqbal
Subject Specialist, Quaid e Azam Academy for Educational Development Punjab Lahore, Pakistan

Abstract

The most important aspect of education is the quality of teaching. This research aimed to investigate students' perspectives on the teaching quality at the college level. The research was quantitative in nature, and convenient sampling techniques were used to choose a sample for data collection. The data was gathered from 540 B.S. students from public and private colleges from district Vehari. The information was gathered using a closed-ended 5-Likert scale questionnaire from 540 BS programs students. Data analysis showed that students were satisfied with the quality of teaching in colleges. The study finds there was no significant difference based on gender and public and private colleges. Based on the finding it is recommended that colleges need to bring changes for the betterment of teaching and students' learning also. In this regards the management of colleges should take various initiative for the betterment of teaching of teaching and including involvement in content and delivery methods, giving students challenging assignment nature of students.

Keywords: *Perception of Students, Quality of Teaching*

Introduction

Quality of teaching focused on student achievements (including social outcomes) and encourages, increased needs to understudy outcomes for diverse cultures of understudies. The nature of educating people of an organization can be defined as how much the understudies and the establishment value the aftereffects of instructing. Organizations must establish guidance or showing measures as direction to decide the nature of instructions for educators performing their tasks, according to this definition.

Several pedagogical techniques that contribute to student learning outcomes are used in addition to providing high-quality instruction (Hénard, Diamond, & Roseveare, 2012). The successful planning of educational programmed and course content, an assortment of learning settings are all pedagogical techniques that lead to quality teaching (Hénard & Roseveare, 2012).

In addition to the aforementioned points, the concept of quality teaching encompasses a well-adapted learning environment. The majority of students gauge good teaching based on their satisfaction with pedagogy, particularly when educators foster motivation and encouragement for

more effective learning, leading to improved educational outcomes. These aspects are identified as students' external or extrinsic motivation (Buchmann, 2010).

For effective determination of the educational landscape, a comprehensive quality assurance framework, encompassing program monitoring (Hénard, 2009). Moreover, it plays a pivotal role in delivering high-quality education, which, in turn, is crucial for a nation's capacity to shape and advance society. As a result, teachers can play a positive role in society change (Manueke, 2014). There is an excessive amount of literature written on teaching quality, which is a large part of a debate based on student learning and teaching quality. As a result, the subjective and relative environment of teaching quality and complexity. Teaching quality cannot be defined in a few words. The quality of teaching cannot be defined in a few lines. Numerous studies have attempted to expand on this list to determine what the concept means (Ramsden, 2003).

To achieve higher student outcomes, a high-quality teacher who can bring his or her professional abilities and skills into the classroom is insufficient. Without well-prepared instruction and strong support, quality teaching is impossible. One of the real workouts embraced by educational professionals in advanced education institutions is instructing. As a crucial action, instructing must be carried out in a long-term manner to ensure high show execution (Alderman, Towers, & Bannah, 2012). Estimating the nature of instructing is anything but straightforward, even though advanced education institutions must make every effort to improve teaching quality. In the area quality and evaluation is good tool for learning.

The fundamental subject and goal of instructing are to help understudies create learning advantages that will motivate them to take quality. It does not only imply that you should think about the major areas of human thinking and solicitation. It's wonderful to have the option of using academic ideas and abilities as tools to manage consistent, real-world challenges. Understudies should imagine themselves alone or in collaboration with others (Goe, Biggers, & Croft, 2012). It may also be beneficial to employ information to clarify and create an issue, or to conclude the origins of a current social approach.

Philosophical debates and the presence of mind support the belief that the instructor's topic knowledge influences their efforts to assist understudy in learning the issue. If teachers lack topic understanding, they will be unable to convey effectively (Jadama, 2014). Teachers may assign these defective plans to pupils if they have inaccurate or incomplete data or perceive information in a skewed manner. Gradually, an instructor's information organization shapes their instruction, the kind of questions they ask, the notions they strengthen, and the types of projects they delegate. Although early attempts to validate these judgments and demonstrate the work of instructors' topic information through observation were ineffective and unsuccessful. Continuing research into teaching and mentor learning is revealing behaviors’ that have an impact on student learning. The instructor's comprehension, as well as their expectation. Because of the experts' calculated work on measures of information about the issue, work that is advancing the field past the considered perceptibly credit a proportion of trainer learning, this examination is representative productive, to a limited level.

Three classifications of material learning - topic contains information, educational substance learning, and curricular substance information - are at the core of a substantial part of the present demand (Floris, 2010). To begin, we must understand that teachers' mastery of course content, classroom assessment methodologies, and, most importantly, the curriculum is an important component of high-quality teaching and student learning. Tutors must not just be educators; they must also be capable of separating for understudies the entire realities of a field. They should also be able to explain why given advice is well-justified, why it belongs in the knowledge, and how it

compares to other ideas.

This type of comprehension includes an understanding of the topic's intellectual texture and personification. For example, while English language educators must consider specific authors and their works, as well as abstract approaches, they must also include analysis. A history teacher needs detailed and listed information on past and present events, events, and people, but they must also understand what history is. Why is it necessary to teach it?

Understanding a topic strengthens the educator's abilities and, as a result, raises the possible learning outcomes of his specialization. It is not a new concept to research an instructor's content. The most recent analysts labeled the outstanding educator learner as looking into the connection between instructor learning and understudy success. At the upper and advanced education levels, topic learning is a critical component of high-quality instruction. Educators will use a variety of learning methods to teach at a higher level.

For example, the fusion of actual academic learnings and setting knowledge (understandings of instructor's understudies) for clear themes and educational substance learning. Teachers must have a deeper understanding of the subject because they are in charge of future understudies (Park, Choi, & Reynolds, 2020). Teaching necessitates a variety of skills and knowledge, including an understanding of teaching and learning methodologies, supervision, resources, and evaluation, as well as topic expertise.

Assessment in the classroom is connected to student learning outcomes and instructor feedback. Classroom assessment is the process of determining what students know and how well they know it. Skills are assessed in a variety of methods. With the use of classroom evaluation feedback, teachers may increase students' motivation in studying. With correct classroom evaluation feedback, teachers may also improve their students' learning and outcomes. As a result, classroom evaluation aids students in improving their learning and abilities. Classroom assessment is a technique for determining what pupils are learning in class. And how it enables him to have a deeper understanding of teacher knowledge. Through excellent teaching planning and tactics, teachers provide a better manner of assessing student learning (Linn & Miller, 2005).

Emphasize that classroom evaluation entails gathering information about a student's performance and learning progress. Classroom evaluation is a method of evaluating a student's development and gathering information about his or her learning achievements (Dhindsa, et a., 2007). It is an important aspect of excellent teaching, and a skilled teacher would always examine students' knowledge and abilities in the classroom using various assessment approaches to improve student learning (Engemann & Gallagher, 2006). Student evaluation is also a means of motivating students to enhance their learning in the future.

In the classroom, learning settings have an important impact on student learning. It has an influence on student learning in a variety of ways. Learning that is both positive and healthy students benefit from a positive environment (teachers' supportive conduct, high-quality learning materials), whereas a poor environment (teachers' behavior, uncomfortable seating, and a lack of learning resources) has a detrimental impact on student learning. Students learn better and attain their goals more readily when teachers provide a physical learning environment, a psychological learning environment, and a good instructional environment.

When teachers offer a helpful, welcoming, and high-quality learning environment in the classroom, students learn better and faster (Dorman, Aldridge, & Fraser, 2006). "Instructors have relevant information about the course and programed, clear learning goals for students and positive feedback from teachers after student’s evaluation, chances for students to develop social skills, and tactics to assist students to achieve" is the name of the learning environment (Wright & Linn,

2011).

Numerous factors influence teaching quality, with paramount considerations being subject expertise, instructional methods, assessment approaches, and the learning setting. This quantitative study aimed to understand college students' perspectives on teaching quality, employing convenient sampling to collect data from 540 college students in both public and private colleges in district Vehari. Utilizing a closed-ended 5-Likert scale questionnaire, information was gathered on subject matter knowledge, instructional plans, assessment techniques, and the learning environment. This research contributes insights into students' perceptions of teaching quality at the college level, facilitating a comprehensive examination of various instructional elements. Collected data was analyzed and following results were found:

Table 1.

T-test to see the difference gender-wise as perceived by students

Category	College	Students	M	S. D.	*t-value*	*P*
Subject matter knowledge	Male	309	3.576	.50879	-.147	.883
	Female	231	3.583	.52251		

The t-test was conducted to examine gender-based differences in students' perceptions of subject matter knowledge. The mean scores for males (M = 3.576, SD = 0.50879) and females (M = 3.583, SD = 0.52251) were close, with a negligible t-value of -0.147. The p-value was found to be 0.883, indicating no statistically significant difference between male and female perceptions. Therefore, in this sample, there is insufficient evidence to suggest a gender-related disparity in how students perceive subject matter knowledge. The results suggest a similar perception of subject matter knowledge among both male and female students in the respective colleges.

Table 2.

T-test to see the difference gender-wise as perceived by students

Category	College	Students	M	S. D.	*t-value*	*P*
Instructional planning and strategies	Male	309	3.697	.57237	1.187	.236
	Female	231	3.636	.61526		

The t-test aimed to assess gender-based variations in students' perceptions of instructional planning and strategies. Results revealed a mean score of 3.697 (SD = 0.57237) for males and 3.636 (SD = 0.61526) for females. The t-value of 1.187, coupled with a p-value of 0.236, suggests no statistically significant difference in perceptions between male and female students. While males had a slightly higher mean, the result does not reach significance. Therefore, within this sample, there's insufficient evidence to support the presence of a substantial gender-related distinction in how students perceive instructional planning and strategies across the respective colleges.

Table 3.

T-test to see the difference gender-wise as perceived by students

Category	College	Students	M	S. D.	*t-value*	*P*
Assessment techniques	Male	309	3.664	.54264	1.405	.160
	Female	231	3.598	.55144		

The t-test aimed to evaluate gender-based differences in students' perceptions of assessment techniques. Among males (M = 3.664, SD = 0.54264) and females (M = 3.598, SD = 0.55144), a modest disparity was observed. The t-value of 1.405, with a corresponding p-value of 0.160,

indicates that the difference is not statistically significant at the conventional significance level (e.g., $p < 0.05$). While there is a numerical difference in mean scores, it does not provide enough evidence to conclude a substantial gender-related distinction in how students perceive assessment techniques. The findings suggest a degree of similarity in perceptions across genders within the respective colleges.

Table 4.

T-test to see the difference gender-wise as perceived by students

Category	College	Students	M	S. D.	*t-value*	*P*
Learning environment	Male	309	3.743	.5556	.307	.759
	Female	231	3.728	.5756		

The t-test aimed to assess gender-based differences in students' perceptions of the learning environment. The mean scores for males (M = 3.743, SD = 0.5556) and females (M = 3.728, SD = 0.5756) were close, and the t-value was 0.307. The associated p-value was 0.759, indicating a lack of statistical significance at the conventional level (e.g., $p < 0.05$). Thus, the results suggest no significant difference in how male and female students perceive the learning environment in the respective colleges. The findings imply a similarity in perceptions of the learning environment between genders, based on the given sample data.

Table 5.

T-test to see the difference gender-wise as perceived by students

Category	College	Students	M	S. D.	*t-value*	*P*
Quality of Teaching	Male	309	3.6707	.36841	1.009	.314
	Female	231	3.6366	.41372		

The t-test aimed to explore gender-based differences in students' perceptions of the quality of teaching. For males (M = 3.6707, SD = 0.36841) and females (M = 3.6366, SD = 0.41372), the mean scores were close. The t-value of 1.009, coupled with a p-value of 0.314, indicates no statistically significant difference at the conventional significance level (e.g., $p < 0.05$). Thus, within this sample, there is insufficient evidence to support the presence of a substantial gender-related distinction in how students perceive the quality of teaching. The findings suggest a similarity in perceptions across genders regarding teaching quality in the respective colleges.

Table 6.

T-test to see the difference locality-wise as perceived by students

Category	College	Students	M	S. D.	*t-value*	*P*
Subject matter knowledge	Public	299	3.5467	.52213	-1.653	.099
	Private	241	3.6201	.50238		

The t-test aimed to examine locality-based differences in students' perceptions of subject matter knowledge. Among public (M = 3.5467, SD = 0.52213) and private (M = 3.6201, SD = 0.50238) colleges, a numerical difference was observed. The t-value of -1.653, with a corresponding p-value of 0.099, suggests that the difference is not statistically significant at the conventional significance level (e.g., $p < 0.05$). While there is a trend indicating potentially lower perceptions in public colleges, the evidence is not strong enough to assert a significant locality-related distinction in how

students perceive subject matter knowledge. Further investigation may be needed to confirm any potential patterns.

Table 7.

T-test to see the difference locality-wise as perceived by students

Category	College	Students	M	S. D.	*t-value*	*P*
Instructional planning and strategies	Public	299	3.6394	.58145	-1.399	.162
	Private	241	3.7109	.60218		

The t-test aimed to explore locality-based differences in students' perceptions of instructional planning and strategies. The mean scores for public (M = 3.6394, SD = 0.58145) and private (M = 3.7109, SD = 0.60218) colleges were observed, with a numerical difference. The t-value of -1.399, coupled with a p-value of 0.162, suggests that the difference is not statistically significant at the conventional significance level (e.g., $p < 0.05$). Consequently, there is insufficient evidence to support a significant locality-related distinction in how students perceive instructional planning and strategies between public and private colleges. Further investigation may be needed to discern any potential patterns or trends.

Table 8.

T-test to see the difference locality-wise as perceived by students

Category	College	Students	M	S. D.	*t-value*	*P*
Assessment techniques	Public	299	3.5972	.52340	-1.851	.065
	Private	241	3.6846	.57214		

The t-test aimed to investigate locality-based differences in students' perceptions of assessment techniques. The mean scores for public (M = 3.5972, SD = 0.52340) and private (M = 3.6846, SD = 0.57214) colleges were observed, indicating a numerical difference. The t-value of -1.851, with a corresponding p-value of 0.065, suggests that the difference is approaching statistical significance, but it does not reach the conventional threshold (e.g., $p < 0.05$). Thus, there is some indication of a potential locality-related distinction in how students perceive assessment techniques, with public colleges showing slightly lower scores. Further investigation and a larger sample size may be necessary to confirm the significance of this trend.

Table 9.

T-test to see the difference locality-wise as perceived by students

Category	College	Students	M	S. D.	*t-value*	*P*
Learning environment	Public	299	3.7352	.56679	-.097	.923
	Private	241	3.7400	.56123		

The t-test aimed to explore locality-based differences in students' perceptions of the learning environment. The mean scores for public (M = 3.7352, SD = 0.56679) and private (M = 3.7400, SD = 0.56123) colleges were very close. The t-value of -0.097, with a corresponding p-value of 0.923, indicates no statistically significant difference at the conventional significance level (e.g., $p < 0.05$). Therefore, within this sample, there is insufficient evidence to support the presence of a substantial locality-related distinction in how students perceive the learning environment. The findings suggest a similarity in perceptions across public and private colleges regarding the learning environment.

Table 10.

T-test to see the difference locality-wise as perceived by students

Category	College	Students	M	S. D.	*t-value*	*P*
Quality of Teaching	Public	299	3.6296	.37543	-1.767	.078
	Private	241	3.6889	.40235		

The t-test aimed to assess locality-based differences in students' perceptions of the quality of teaching. The mean scores for public (M = 3.6296, SD = 0.37543) and private (M = 3.6889, SD = 0.40235) colleges were observed, indicating a numerical difference. The t-value of -1.767, with a corresponding p-value of 0.078, suggests that the difference is approaching statistical significance but does not reach the conventional threshold (e.g., $p < 0.05$). Therefore, there is some indication of a potential locality-related distinction in how students perceive the quality of teaching, with public colleges showing slightly lower scores. Further investigation and a larger sample size may be necessary to confirm the significance of this trend.

Main conclusions

Subject matter knowledge: The research identified that there is no statistically significant distinction between the perceptions of male and female students concerning the quality of teaching, specifically in relation to subject matter knowledge. Both genders expressed a high level of agreement on this particular aspect.

Instructional planning and strategies: The study revealed that there is no statistically significant difference in the perceptions of male and female students regarding the quality of teaching, particularly with respect to instructional planning and strategies. Both groups demonstrated a high level of agreement on this dimension.

Assessment techniques: The research uncovered no notable difference between male and female students in terms of their perceptions of teaching quality concerning assessment techniques. Although male students tended towards a high level of agreement, females showed a slightly lower level of agreement.

Learning environment: The study identified no statistically significant difference between male and female students in their perceptions of teaching quality with respect to the learning environment. Both genders exhibited a high level of agreement on this dimension.

Regarding the overall quality of teaching, encompassing subject matter knowledge, instructional planning, assessment techniques, and the learning environment, male students demonstrated a higher level of agreement compared to female students. However, this difference was not statistically significant. The research underscores that, based on students' perceptions, there are no significant variations in the quality of teaching between genders or among students from public and private colleges.

Recommendations emerged from this study:

1. Develop and implement professional development programs for educators focusing on subject matter knowledge, instructional planning, assessment techniques, and creating an optimal learning environment. This can ensure continuous improvement and standardization of teaching practices across both genders.
2. Encourage the use of inclusive instructional strategies that cater to diverse learning styles and preferences. This can be achieved through trainings by emphasizing the importance of adapting instructional methods to accommodate various student needs.

3. Establish a systematic evaluation and feedback system for teaching quality that involves student input.
4. Promote collaboration among educators, both within and across genders, to share best practices and innovative teaching strategies. Collaborative efforts can contribute to a collective improvement in teaching quality, creating a supportive environment for professional growth.
5. Base teaching policies on comprehensive research findings, taking into account the perceptions of students from both public and private colleges. This ensures that educational policies are grounded in evidence and tailored to address the specific needs and expectations of diverse student populations.

References

Goe, L., Biggers, K., & Croft, A. (2012). Linking Teacher Evaluation to Professional Development: Focusing on Improving Teaching and Learning. *Research & Policy Brief, 5*(9), 209-231

Hénard, F., & Roseveare, D. (2012). Fostering quality teaching in higher education. *Policies and practices, 8*(12), 7-11.

Hénard, F., Diamond, L., & Roseveare, D. (2012). Approaches to internationalization and their implications for strategic management and institutional practice. *Journal of Policy Research, 11*(12), 2013-2029.

Buchmann, M. (2010). The use of research knowledge in teacher education and teaching. *Teacher Education, 92*(4), 421-439.

Alderman, L., Towers, S., & Bannah, S. (2012). Student feedback systems in higher education: A focused literature review and environmental scan. *Review of Quality Education, 18*(3), 261-280.

Manueke, S. (2014). Quality of teaching performance in higher education institutions in North Sulawesi Indonesia. *Journal of Total Quality, 9*(16), 209-231.

Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education*: New York: Routledge.

Jadama, L. M. (2014). Impact of subject matter knowledge of a teacher in teaching and learning process. Psychology of Learning, *7*(1), 111-130.

Floris, F. D. (2010). Developing a Teacher-Training Program in the Indonesian Context. *Journal of Social Sciences Review, 4*(2), 116-134.

Park, S., Choi, A., & Reynolds, W. M. (2020). Cross-national investigation of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) in the US and South Korea: what proxy measures of teacher quality are related to PCK? *International Journal of Education, 42*(15), 2630-2651.

Linn, R., & Miller, M. (2005). *Measurement and evaluation in teaching. Upper Saddle River,* NJ: Merrill: Prentice-Hall.

Dhindsa, H. S., Omar, K., & Waldrip, B. (2007). Upper secondary Bruneian science students' perceptions of assessment. *Science Education Review, 29*(10), 1261-1280.

Engemann, J., & Gallagher, T. (2006). The conundrum of classroom writing assessment. *Teaching Reflection Journal, 16*(1), 39-59.

Dorman, J. P., Aldridge, J. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2006). Using Students' Assessment of Classroom Environment to Develop a Typology of Secondary School Classrooms. *Technology Review, 7*(7), 906-915.

Wright, G. B., & Linnm, I. H. (2011). Student-centered learning in higher education. *Journal of Educational Research, 23*(1), 92-97.