

Verbal classroom teaching behaviour of teacher educators with respect to their experience

Dr. Nazneen Mehraj

Lecturer, DIET, Department of Education, Kashmir, J&K

Abstract

The aim of the study was to examine the FIACS the verbal classroom teaching behaviour of teacher educator with respect to their experiences. The total sample for the present study consists of 60 teacher educators selected randomly from different teacher training colleges of education of J&K with equal number of 30 more experience and 30 less experience teacher educators. In order to assess the interaction analysis of classroom behaviour of teacher educators an observation schedule based on Flanders interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS) was administered to record the verbal behaviour of the teacher educators in accordance with the ten categories enunciated by Flander. The findings of the study revealed that more experienced foundation course teacher educators put more question in the classroom as compared to less experience foundation course teacher educators they make frequent use of question about content. More experienced foundation course teacher educator laid more stress on content coverage as compared less experienced foundation course teacher educators. The more experienced foundation course teacher educators took a very active role in the discussion and the interaction in the classroom was purely content-oriented than less experienced foundation course teacher educators. More and less teaching experience foundation course teacher educators were found significant on pupil talk; direct teacher talk; teacher response ratio, teacher question ratio, content cross ratio and indirect/direct ratio; instantaneous teacher response ratio dimension of classroom verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders categories.

Keywords: Verbal, Classroom Behaviour, Teacher Educators, Experience, J&K

Introduction

The process of teaching and learning keeps an important place in the field of education. Teaching and learning are the two component of education. These cannot be separated from each other. There are mainly two concepts of teaching: Teaching is the act of imparting instructions to the learners in the class room situation. According to this concept the teacher gives instructions to the students or one student reads from the text book and others follow him silently. But this concept of education is not accepted by the modern educationists and philosophers. According to modern concept teaching is to cause the child to learn and acquire the desired knowledge, skills and also desirable ways of living in the society. It is a process in which learner, teacher, curriculum and other variables are organized in a systematic and psychological way to attain some pre-determined goals.

Teacher education programme is must in order to have efficient and really capable teachers. The saying "Teachers are born not made" is an out dated saying now. That does not hold good use in the present day situations when we need a large number of teachers for ever expanding education-countries. According to Indian education commission: A sound programme of professional education of the teachers is essential for the qualitative improvement of education. Teacher education involves all those educational experiences which prepare an individual to teach in a school. For this, course is fixed in an institution according to which people interested in teaching ability.

Teacher infact, should be taken as the corner stone of educational development. It is teacher who is responsible to carry out programmes of education and possesses a pivotal position in any educational system, the destiny of any educational system is directly linked with him, is an accepted

fact. Thus teacher involvement is not the only essential but indispensable factor for well performance of student. We can obtain not only tangible but also marvellous results if teachers are fully, and solly involved in this profession. Teaching is very much goal oriented and a purposeful activity. It sets into motion a system of strategies for the realization of certain definite and predetermined objectives. These objective may be formulated in accordance with the prevailing social philosophy, the intellectual level of student, the stage of education which teaching is done and the demand which the student will have to meet in later life, or in the light of certain social and personal considerations. The concept of good or effective teaching is generally governed by its efficiency in achieving the desired result. A teacher has to organize and skillfully manipulate conditions for learning so that the children under his care may make the maximum use of their potentialities. This is not an easy job. The teaching learning process is considered to be one of the most delicate, complex, challenging and significant social process. In the area of school education the major problem is to influence and improve the classroom instructional process. It is only when the instructional process is improved that the benefits of new curricula, new text books and innovations may bear fruits. For the proper educational growth of the child the communication skill of the teacher in the classroom have been found to be mainly responsible. The teacher is also expected to direct the pupils in activities outside the classroom in order to bring about necessary changes in their thinking and acting.

Objectives of the Study

The following objectives were formulated for the present study:

1. To study the FIACS the verbal classroom teaching behaviour of teacher educators with respect to their experience.
2. To compare through FIACS the verbal classroom teaching behaviour of teacher educators with respect to their experience.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for the present study:

1. There is no significant difference in the verbal teaching behaviour through FIACS of teacher educators with respect to their experience.

Sample

Considering the wider area of location of the colleges from various areas catering the larger population of teacher trainees, six (06) colleges of education were randomly selected with equal number of 03 colleges from Jammu province namely: 1) Govt. College of Education Jammu, (2) Vishwa Bharti

College of Education Jammu & (3) Gandhi Memorial College of Education Jammu and similarly 03 from Kashmir province namely: 1) Govt. College of Education Srinagar, (2) Rehmat Aalam College of Education Anantnag & (3) Muslim Educational Trust (MET) Sopore. The total sample for the present study consists of 60 teacher educators selected randomly from above teacher training colleges of education with equal number of 30 more experience and less experience of teacher educators.

Tools Used

The following tools were employed for the purpose of data collection:

1. An observation schedule based on Flanders interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS) was administered to record the verbal behaviour of the teacher educators in accordance with the ten categories enunciated by Flander (1971)

Analysis of the Data

Table 1: Showing the mean difference between the various indices/ratios of classroom teaching (verbal Behaviour) in case of more and less teaching experience of teacher educators teaching prescribed foundation courses (N=30 each)

Indices	Group	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Teacher talk (TT)	More	57.24	10.28	0.62	Not Significant
	Less	55.61	9.85		
Pupil talk (PT)	More	34.88	9.76	3.10	Significant at 0.01 level
	Less	32.14	9.13		
Indirect teacher talk (ITT)	More	25.19	4.97	1.46	Not Significant
	Less	24.21	4.62		
Direct teacher talk (DTT)	More	42.91	7.21	9.73	Significant at 0.01 level
	Less	33.66	6.48		
Silence/confusion (S/C)	More	7.74	2.73	0.50	Not Significant
	Less	8.17	3.45		
Pupil initiative ratio (PIR)	More	36.69	6.62	0.69	Not Significant
	Less	35.53	6.23		
Teacher response ratio (TRR)	More	62.16	9.36	7.73	Significant at 0.01 level
	Less	53.50	6.40		
Teacher question ratio (TQR)	More	28.63	5.78	5.84	Significant at 0.01 level
	Less	27.60	5.69		
Content cross ratio (CCR)	More	41.65	9.48	3.87	Significant at 0.01 level
	Less	38.37	9.09		
Indirect/ direct ratio (I/DR)	More	40.40	9.22	5.13	Significant at 0.01 level
	Less	36.02	9.43		
Vicious circle ratio (VCR)	More	1.92	0.72	0.24	Not Significant
	Less	1.97	0.85		
Pupil steady state ratio (PSSR)	More	9.28	3.25	0.79	Not Significant
	Less	8.64	2.96		
Instantaneous teacher response ratio (ITRR)	More	86.85	10.23	2.01	Significant at 0.05 level
	Less	81.64	9.85		
Instantaneous teacher question ratio (ITQR)	More	10.36	2.87	1.87	Not Significant
	Less	9.08	2.41		

Discussion

More and less teaching experience of foundation teacher educators can be compared on their verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders categories. The results revealed that no significant difference was found between more and less teaching experience who teach prescribed foundation course on teacher talk (TT), indirect teacher talk (ITT) and silence/confusion(S/C) dimensions of classroom behaviour. The results indicate that both more experience and less experience foundation course teacher educators have similar

classroom teaching behaviours like teacher talk(TT) and indirect teacher talk (ITT). The results further showed that significant difference was found between more experienced and less experienced foundation course teacher educators on pupil talk (PT) and direct teacher talk (DTT) dimension of classroom behaviour and mean favours more experienced methodology course teacher educators which implies that more experienced foundation course teacher educators have better classroom behaviour on pupil talk (PT) and direct teacher talk (DTT) as compared to less experienced

foundation course teacher educators. The analysis also revealed that teacher-pupil interaction is high in case of the class conducted by more experienced foundation course teacher educators, whereas less experienced foundation course teacher educators seemed to restrict in the student participation and interaction in the classroom. More experienced foundation course teacher educators restricts student's participation.

Further, compared more and less teaching experience of foundation course teacher educators on their verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders categories. The analysis revealed that no significant difference was found between more and less experienced foundation course teacher educators on pupil initiative ratio (PIR) dimensions. While, significant difference was found between more experienced and less experienced foundation course teacher educators on teacher response ratio (TRR), teacher question ratio (TQR), content cross ratio (CCR) and indirect/direct ratio (I/DR) dimensions of classroom teaching behaviour (verbal behaviour). Therefore the analysis shows that more experienced foundation course teacher educators have better teachers. More experienced foundation course teacher educators have more tendencies and the response received from the pupil. More experienced foundation course teacher educators elaborates their responses making it the basis of discussion as compared to less experienced foundation course teacher educators who have fewer tendencies to react the ideas and responses of the students. Teacher question ratio (TQR) was found high on more experienced foundation course teacher educators. Therefore, more experienced foundation course teacher educators put more question in the classroom as compared to less experienced foundation course teacher educators they make frequent use of question about content. More experienced foundation course teacher educator laid more stress on content coverage as compared less experienced foundation course teacher educators. The more experienced foundation course teacher educators took a very active role in the discussion and the interaction in the classroom was purely content-oriented than less experienced foundation course teacher educators. More experienced foundation course teacher educators have more indirect influence upon student as compared to less experienced foundation course teacher educators.

The mean difference between the various indices/ratios of classroom of verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders categories among more and less teaching experience who teach prescribed foundation course. It is clear that no significant difference was found between more experienced and less experienced foundation course teacher educators on vicious circle ratio (VCR), pupil steady state ratio (PSSR) and instantaneous teacher question ratio (ITQR) dimensions of classroom teaching verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders categories. However, it was found that significant difference between more and less foundation course teacher educators on instantaneous teacher response ratios dimension of classroom teaching on verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders categories. The results further revealed more experienced foundation course teacher educators have more tendencies to praise or integrate ideas and feelings in the classroom discussion. The findings of the above results are supported with the tune of the findings of the studies conducted earlier by Singh (1989) found that teachers with less number of years in service were indirect in their teaching behaviour was compared to teachers

who had put in more years of service. Extravert and introvert teachers did not differ in their teaching behaviour patterns significantly. Students taught by indirect teachers achieved significantly more and showed greater liking for their teachers taught by direct teachers.

Conclusion

The following conclusion has been drawn from the above findings:

1. More and less teaching experience foundation course teacher educators were found insignificant on teacher talk, indirect teacher talk and silence/confusion; pupil initiative ratio; vicious circle ratio, pupil steady state ratio and instantaneous teacher question ratio dimensions of classroom verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders categories.
2. More and less teaching experience foundation course teacher educators were found significant on pupil talk; direct teacher talk; teacher response ratio, teacher question ratio, content cross ratio and indirect/direct ratio; instantaneous teacher response ratio dimension of classroom verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders categories.

References

1. Amidon EJ, Powell E. Interaction analysis as a feedback system in teacher preparation. Philadelphia: Temple University, 1967.
2. Ana LF, Assar s. Student Learning Styles Adaptation Method based on Teaching Strategies and Electronic Media, Educational Technology and Society, 2009; 12(4):15-29.
3. Anderson LW, Burns RB. Research in Classrooms: The study of teachers, Teaching and Instruction' McGraw Hill Book Co. New York, 1983.
4. Constantine C, George V. An Analysis of Published Process-product Research on Physical Education Teaching Methods, International Journal of Applied Sports Sciences. 2011; 23(1):271-289.
5. Crawford DS. Analysis of verbal and non-verbal behaviour of teachers. Monographs and American Psychology Association, Stanford University Press. 1980.
6. Cristina Dogarel, Amalia Nitu. Teacher's Behaviour in the classroom, 2009.
7. Onwioduokit FA, Oranu Philomena Chika. Relative Effectiveness of Classroom Interaction Techniques on Senior Secondary Students' Silence and Confusion in Government Classrooms in Port Harcourt Metropolis. Medetarian journal of social science university of Nigeria department of education technology. 2012.
8. Fereshteh A, Davood B. The Effects of Cooperation Teaching Method on Learning of Students in Primary Schools, World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, 2010.
9. Flander N. Teacher Influence in the Classroom. Interaction analysis: theory, research, and application, London, 1963.
10. Nadeem NA, Kuchay. Manual of Non-verbal teaching behaviour checklist unpublished. University of Kashmir, 1994.
11. Nengah Kumpul. Classroom Interaction Analysis In Bilingual Science Classes In Sman 4 Denpasar.

- Unpublished Doctorail thesis Ganesha University of education Singaraja, 2013.
12. Oluwag bohunmi MF. Gender Issues in Classroom Interaction and Students' Achievement in Social Studies. *International journal of innovative research and development*. 2014; 3(5):742.
 13. Rastogi A. Biology teachers of public and government schools- comparative verbal and non-verbal interaction analysis. *Indian Education review*, 1989; 24(4).
 14. Reddy G, Lokananda, Jevantham. Curricular Factors in School Effectiveness and Learning Achievement at Primary Stage; *Edutracks*, 2004, 3.
 15. Reddy R, Jayaprakash. *Methods of Teaching*; A.P.H. Publishing Corporation, New Delhi; 2004, 13-14.
 16. Remiett S. *The Question as a measure of Classroom Practice*, 2002.
 17. Report of Education Commission (1996). New Delhi Ministry of Education. Govt. of India, 1964-66.
 18. Roy BN. A analysis of teaching behaviour pattern of experienced science teachers. *Indian education review*, 1992; 27(1).
 19. Ruchay N. Interaction analysis of classroom behaviour of effective teachers. Unpublished doctorate thesis, University of Kashmir, 1995.
 20. Ruduramamba B. *Problems of Teaching*; APH Publishing House, New Delhi, 1973.
 21. Sneha Archana. *Invocations in Teaching Environmental Science At Primary Level*; *Quest In Education* 2002; 26(14).
 22. Sola AO, Oja OE. Effects of Project, Inquiry and Lecture-Demonstration Teaching Methods on Senior Secondary Students' Achievement in Separation of Mixtures Practical Test, *Educational Research & Review*, 2007; 2(6):124-132.
 23. Solmaz Abdolrahimi Javid, Adel Zahed-Babelan, Yusef Namvar. A Study on the State of Teacher-Student Verbal Interactions during Teaching Process and Its Relationship with Academic Achievement of Middle School Students in Ardabil. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*. 2013; 4(7):1909-1913.
 24. Subbarayan PA. A study of the relationship between teacher effectiveness research and publication and self-concept. Abstract in forth survey and research in education, New Delhi, NCERT, 1986.
 25. Swann J, Graddol D. Gender inequalities in classroom talk. *English in Education*, 1988; 22:48-65.
 26. Tewksbury, Harris. *Objectives and Research Methods Chapter III*; New York, 1982.
 27. Victoria A. Collaborative Research Methodology for Investigating Teaching and Learning: The Use of Interactive Whiteboard Technology, *Educational Review*, 2005; 57(4).
 28. Walia JS. *Educational Technology*, Tondon Publications, Ludhiana, 2008.
 29. Walker R. Interaction analysis in informal classroom: a critical comment on the Flander's system, 1975.
 30. Wang M, Haertel G, Walberg H. Towards a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 1993; 63:249-294.
 31. Woolfolk AH, Brooks DM. *Nonverbal Communication in Teaching*, Macmillan & Co. New York, 1993.
 32. Yadav, Yadav. *Secondary Education and School management* Tondon Publications, Ludhiana, 2004.
 33. Yadav. Interaction analysis of classroom behaviour of high school biology teachers in relation to pupil's achievement and attitude. Ph.D. Edu. Govt. university 1978 abstract, 1987.
 34. Younger M, Warrington M. Differential achievement of girls and boys: Some observations from the perspectives of one school. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. 1996; 17:299-314.
 35. Younger M, Warrington M, Williams J. The gender gap and classroom interactions: Reality and rhetoric? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. 1999; 20:325-344.