INTERACTIONAL VERBAL BEHAVIOUR OF TEACHER EDUCATORS TEACH PRESCRIBED FOUNDATION AND METHODOLOGY COURSES OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMME THROUGH FIACS

Nazneen Mehraj[1] and Prof. Neelofar Khan[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Education, University of Kashmir.

[2]Director, Directorate of Distance Education, University of Kashmir.

Abstract

The aim of the present study is to findout the interaction verbal behaviour of teacher educators who teach prescribed foundation and methodology courses of the training programme through FIACS. The sample of the study consisted of 120 teacher educators in which 60 were prescribed foundation course and 60 were prescribed methodology course teacher educators. All the 120 teachers educators were selected randomly. Flanders interaction Analysis for observing and measuring classroom interaction patterns. The instrument has been develop by Ned A. Flander and is used widely. Mean, S.D. and t-test were used for the statistical treatment. The findings of the study revealed that there is a significant mean difference between foundation course teachers and methodology course teachers on vicious circles ration and pupil steady state ration and there is significant mean difference between foundation course teachers and methodology course teachers on instantaneous teacher response ration and instantaneous teachers question ratio. It was also found that there is insignificant difference between foundation course teachers and methodology course teachers on teacher talk (TT) and Silence/Confusion (S/C) indices of classroom teaching behavior (verbal). It was also found that there is a significant difference between pupil talk (PT), indirect teacher talk (ITT) and direct teacher talk (DTT) indices of classroom teaching (verbal behavior).

Keywords: *Interaction, verbal behaviour, teacher educators, foundation and methodology course*

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 is 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 once other variables are organized in a systematic and psychological way to attain some pre-determined goals.

With the development of society, education has taken many shapes, such as: (a) child education (b) Adult education (c) Technical education (d) Education in the humanities and social science (e) Education in the arts and crafts (f) Health education (g) Physical classification of education could be Formal education; Informal education and Non-formal education. Formal education starts from a theoretical or conceptual frame work and leads to practical or actual field work. In this type of education there is a fixed or pre-decided curriculum. The audience in this type of education is homogeneous with common goals. Teaching is vertical and curriculum centered. In this type of education there is strict adherence to institutional norms and no free choice for the learners. This education is of specialized nature, i.e., class-oriented, subject centered once degree oriented. In this type of education, learners are taught directly by the teachers. In other words, formal education is basically an institutional activity, uniform and subject – oriented, full-time, sequential, hierarchically structured, leading to certificates, degree and diplomas. Informal education type of education there is a lack of planning and programming as found in formal education. In this education the learner remains unaware whether he is learning something or not. He learns from the experiences. For this education no set curriculum, time, goals and place are fixed. Non-formal Education type of education is a midway between both the above types of

education. In this type of education, the curriculum is prepared by keeping in view the needs of learner. So, it can be considered as learner centered.

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.

Different perspectives and theories provide different definitions of communication. In terms of data processing theories, it is considered a method to decrease doubts, increase confidence and to act as a entry point particular situation and state. As a result and based on the proposed perspectives, it could be defined as follows: "communication is a flow through which two or more interactive agents are involved with each other so to provide the possibility to exchange messages and codes in a flexible way and thus to achieve a goal". Interaction is the same as inter-personal communication and it is a process through which information, meanings, and emotions are expressed through verbal and non-verbal messages (as cited in Zahed, 2010). In order to establish interaction, at least two people need to be involved in a series of dynamic and constant events in which each person leaves an effect on and is affected by the other one within a framework of a mutual determining system. Therefore, interaction refers to the actions and reactions of group members towards one another; in better words, members of groups are influenced by each other (Safari, 2010). As a result, before learning teaching methodology, teachers should learn the principles of establishing relationship well and to apply these principles to their lessons (Jackson, 1990).

Most researchers are of the conviction that the quality of teacher-student interactions plays a major role in the effectiveness of the teaching and learning (Needles, 1988; Darling Hammond, 2007; Gordon, Kin and Stager, 2006). Efficient teachers who are able to establish good relationships with their students play vital roles at schools (Luck, 2004). One of the main

features of a good teacher is the ability to establish interaction in the classroom as the majority of concerns observed in classes arise out of lack of proper interaction. Insisting on this issue, it has been stated that teaching happens only when a teacher establishes interactions with one (or a number of) students. One of the methods that is easy to implement and has good reliability and validity with regard to interpretation of results is Flanders method (Snooze & Hornberger, 2008; Saba, 2007; Ragh, 2002; Fathi Azar, 2003; High & Bee, 2006). According to Flanders (1970), almost two third of classroom time is spent on lectures when the teacher delivers a one-sided and linear speech. Walker (2002) believes that if students start talking, that speech would be within a particular framework; that is they answer the teacher's questions and express their opinions in a few words. Black et al. (1996) conducted a study titled "verbal interaction between teachers and students" and concluded that on average the aforementioned ratio has been a bit higher than 3 to 1. This ratio is almost fixed in all subjects and the content of teachers' speeches were mainly on explanation and delivery of materials and discussions. When a teacher teaches, he uses the language in order to define facts and realities, explain issues, interpret and analyse, provide instructions and the like. More interestingly, nowadays, many curriculums focus on dynamic education methodologies and teaching centers around creating logical and independent thinking in learners.

Poontcrof (1993) is convinced that few verbal interactions occur during a teacher's lesson. Teachers speak for about 70 percent of the class time on average. Therefore, this approach needs to be changed and instead students' participation during the process of teaching needs to be taken into consideration. Even if some learners are in the unconscious state of daydreaming during lessons, teachers need to direct the interaction into a targeted one and keep learners in the state of absolute consciousness during the interaction through their behaviour. Kell and Chan (1994) believe that interaction is a fundamental element of teaching and plays a fundamental role in an efficient lesson. In fact, the strength or weakness of a teacher's lesson is embodied in the way teacher-student interaction is handled. As a result, Kadivar (2002) considers the ability to establish a positive and effective relationship with the students' one of the main skills required by teachers. The type of relationship teachers have with their students could result in a higher degree of students' participation in learning (Good & Barafi, 1986), create a positive image of

learning in them, and turn class atmosphere into a friendly and desirable one. The studies conducted by Rosenstein (1971) and Duncan and Biddle (1974) showed that there was a positive correlation between teachers' talk time and their way of talking and their students' education achievement. However, it should be noted that the quality of teacher's talk is more important than its quantity and there is a great positive correlation between clarity of speech, the ability to attract students' attention, organization of speech, and the use of warning statements and reactions and students' educational achievement. In order to enhance learning in classrooms, the relationships are usually defined in terms of teacher-student, student-student, and student-material (Zamani, Azimi, 2005).

Objectives Of The Study

The following objectives were formulated for the present study:

To analyze the verbal interactional behaviour of teacher educators who teach the prescribed foundation courses of the training programme through FIACS.

To analyze the verbal interactional behaviour of teacher educators who teach the prescribed methodology courses of the training programme through FIACS.

Sample

The sample of the study consisted of 120 teacher educators in which 60 were prescribed foundation course and 60 were prescribed methodology course teacher educators. All the 120 teachers educators were selected randomly from Kashmir valley (J&K).

Research Instrument And Tool Of The Study

After going through the related literature, the researcher, with help of supervisor discussed the instruments, Flanders interaction Analysis for observing and measuring classroom interaction patterns. The instrument has been develop by Ned A. Flander and is used widely. The items in the Flanders interaction analysis has been changed in an observational sheet. This sheet is called coding chart.

Analysis, Interpretation And Discussion Of The Results

Table 1.1: Showing the mean difference of teacher educators between the various indices/ration of classroom teaching (verbal behaviour) in case of foundation and methodology course teachers (N=60 each)

Indices	Group	Mean	S.D	t-test	Level of significance
Teacher talk (TT)	FCT	70.25	10.4	0.69	Not Significant
	MCT	68.92	10.7		
Pupil talk (PT)	FCT	27.81	5.72	2.15	Significant at 0.05 level
	MCT	25.62	5.81		
Indirect teacher talk (ITT)	FCT	25.89	4.78	3.42	Significant at 0.01 level
	MCT	28.91	4.89		
Direct teacher talk (DTT)	FCT	47.36	8.85	2.36	Significant at 0.05 level
	MCT	44.83	9.23		
Silence/ confusion (S/C)	FCT	3.92	1.47	1.63	Not Significant
	MCT	4.44	1.98		

FCT= Foundation course teachers;   MCT= Methodology course teachers

Table 1.1 shows the mean difference of teacher educator between various indices/ration of classroom teaching (verbal behavior) in case of foundation and methodology course teachers. The results of the indicates that there is insignificant difference between foundation course teachers and methodology course teachers on teacher talk (TT) and Silence/Confusion (S/C) indices of classroom teaching behavior (verbal). The results also indicates that there is a significant difference between pupil talk (PT), indirect teacher talk (ITT) and direct teacher talk (DTT) indices of classroom teaching (verbal behavior). The analysis revealed that on dimensions of 'Pupil talk (PT)` Teacher-pupil interaction is on the higher side in case of the class conducted by foundation course teachers, whereas methodology course teachers seemed to restrict in the student participation and interaction in the classroom. In dimension `Indirect teacher talk (ITT)` Methodology course teacher educators use an indirect method of teacher involvement inside the classroom and encourages and supports students participation and accepts, classifies, praises and develops the ideas feelings expressed by the pupils. In dimension `Direct teacher talk (DTT)` While foundation course teacher restrict students participation.

Table 1.2: Showing the mean difference of teacher educators between the various indices/ration of classroom teaching (verbal behavior) in case of foundation and methodology course teachers (N=60 each)

Indices	Group	Mean	S.D	t-test	Level of significance
Pupil initiative ratio (PIR)	FCT	34.09	7.36	3.61	Significant at 0.01 level
	MCT	29.26	7.28		
Teacher response ratio (TRR)	FCT	53.01	10.65	0.75	Not significant
	MCT	51.54	10.82		
Teacher question ratio (TQR)	FCT	26.70	5.14	2.50	Significant at 0.05 level
	MCT	29.30	6.20		
Content cross ratio (CCR)	FCT	52.14	9.36	1.97	Not significant
	MCT	49.29	9.53		
Indirect/ direct ratio (I/DR)	FCT	51.30	10.32	0.89	Not significant
	MCT	52.56	10.96		

FCT= Foundation course teachers;   MCT= Methodology course teachers

Table 1.2 shows the mean difference of teacher educators between the various indices/ration of classroom teaching (verbal behavior) of foundation and methodology course teachers. The analysis indicates that there is a insignificant mean difference between teacher response ration, content cross ration and indirect/direct ration indices of classroom teaching (verbal bahaviour). The analysis also indicates that there is a significant mean difference between pupil initiative ration and teacher question ration indices of classroom teaching. In dimension `Pupil initiative ratio (PIR)` Proportion of pupil initiative ration is higher in case of foundation course teachers and lower in case of methodology course teachers. In dimension `Teacher question ratio (TQR) ` Teacher question ration was found high on methodology course teachers. Therefore, methodology course teachers put more question as compared to foundation course teachers they make frequent use of question about content.

Table 1.3: **Showing the mean difference of teacher educators between the various indices/ration of classroom teaching (verbal behavior) in case of foundation and methodology course teachers (N=60 each)**

Indices	Group	Mean	S.D	t-test	Level of significance
Vicious circles ratio (VCR)	FCT	1.69	0.68	3.43	Significant at 0.01 level
	MCT	2.29	1.17		
Pupil steady state ratio (PSSR)	FCT	20.65	4.21	5.33	Significant at 0.01 level
	MCT	24.63	3.96		
Instantaneous teacher response ratio (ITRR)	FCT	64.89	10.14	2.35	Significant at 0.05 level
	MCT	60.50	10.32		
Instantaneous teacher question ratio (ITQR)	FCT	39.50	8.84	1.99	Significant at 0.05 level
	MCT	42.77	9.23		

FCT= Foundation course teachers;   MCT= Methodology course teachers

Table 1.3 shows the mean difference of teacher educators between the various indices/ration of classroom teaching (verbal behavior) in case of foundation and methodology course teachers. The analysis indicates that there is a significant mean difference between foundation course teachers and methodology course teachers on vicious circles ration and pupil steady state ration and significant 0.01 level and there is significant mean difference between foundation course teachers and methodology course teachers on instantaneous teacher response ration and instantaneous teachers question ratio and the significant at 0.05 level. In dimension `Vicious circles ratio (VCR)` Methodology course teachers restrict the freedom and student participation more than the effective teachers. In dimension `Pupil steady state ratio (PSSR)` Pupil steady state ration was found high on methodology course teachers; therefore, these teachers have a index of rapidity of teacher pupil interaction and interchange, the more the ratio the possibility of interaction. In dimension `Instantaneous teacher response ratio (ITRR)` Methodology course teachers have more tendency to praise or integrate ideas and feelings in the class discussion.

In dimension, `Instantaneous teacher question ratio (ITQR)` Instantaneous teacher question ration was found higher on methodology course teachers, thereby indicating that methodology course teacher have shown more tendency to response to pupil talk with question based in his own ideas, compared to his tendency to lecture.

1.   Conclusion

1.   It was found that there is insignificant difference between foundation course teachers and methodology course teachers on teacher talk (TT) and Silence/Confusion (S/C) indices of classroom teaching behavior (verbal). It was also found that there is a significant difference between pupil talk (PT), indirect teacher talk (ITT) and direct teacher talk (DTT) indices of classroom teaching (verbal behavior).

2.   It was found that 'Pupil talk (PT)` Teacher-pupil interaction is on the higher side incase of the class conducted by foundation course teachers, whereas methodology course teachers seemed to restrict in the student participation and interaction in the classroom. In dimension `Indirect teacher talk (ITT)` Methodology course teacher educators use an indirect method of teacher involvement inside the classroom and encourages and supports students participation and accepts, classifies, praises and develops the ideas feelings expressed by the pupils. In dimension `Direct teacher talk (DTT)` While foundation course teacher restrict students participation.

3.   It was found that there is an insignificant mean difference between teacher response ration, content cross ration and indirect/direct ration indices of classroom teaching (verbal bahaviour). It was also found that there is a significant mean difference between pupil initiative ration and teacher question ration indices of classroom teaching.

4.   It was found that on dimension `Pupil initiative ratio (PIR)` Proportion of pupil initiative ration is higher incase of foundation course teachers and lower in case of methodology course teachers. `Teacher question ratio (TQR)` Teacher question ration was found high on methodology course teachers. therefore, methodology course teachers put more question as compared to foundation course teachers they make frequent use of question about content.

5.   It was found that there is a significant mean difference between foundation course teachers and methodology course teachers on vicious circles ration and pupil steady state ration and there is significant mean difference between foundation course teachers and methodology course teachers on instantaneous teacher response ration and instantaneous teachers question ratio.

6.   It was found that 'Vicious circles ratio (VCR)` Methodology course teachers restrict the freedom and student participation more than the effective teachers.

7.   It was found that `Pupil steady state ratio (PSSR)` Pupil steady state ration was found high on methodology course teachers; therefore, these teachers have a index of rapidity of teacher pupil interaction and interchange, the more the ratio the possibility of interaction.

8.   It was found that `Instantaneous teacher response ratio (ITRR)` Methodology course teachers have more tendency to praise or integrate ideas and feelings in the class discussion.

9.   It was found that `Instantaneous teacher question ratio (ITQR)` Instantaneous teacher question ration was found higher on methodology course teachers, thereby indicating that methodology course teacher have shown more tendency to response to pupil talk with question based in his own ideas, compared to his tendency to lecture.

Reference

Azizi Yahaya (2005). Cognitive applications in education. NSW: PTS Professional Publishing Co., Ltd.

Bales, R.F. (1991) Interaction process analysis: a method for the study of small groups, Cambridge.

Bellack, A, (1991). The language of the Classroom. Paul Brokers, London.

Berenson, S.R. (1980) the skills of teaching: Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.

Flander, N.A. Interaction analysis in the classroom-a mannual for observers, University of Michigan.

Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behaviour.* Massachusetts: Addison Wesley Publishing.

Frisen, A., Jonsson. A., & Persson, C.(2007) Adolescents perception of bullying: who is the victim? Who is the bully? What can be done to stop bullying?. *Adolescence* ,42(168), 749-761.

Gage, N.C. (1983) "The Scientific Bases for the Art of Teaching." New York.

Kamaruddin Husin & Siti Hajar Abdul Aziz (2004). Basic pedagogical education. Kuala Lumpur: Kayazano Enterprise.

Ragsa, C.Y. (2008). A Comparison of Computer Assisted Instruction and the Traditional Methods of Teaching basic Statistics, *Journal of Staistics Education,* vol. 16, no. 1,pp.1-10

Woolfolk, A. H, and D. M Brooks, (1993) Nonverbal Communication in Teaching, Macmillan & Co. New York.

Yadav & Yadav (2004) "Secondary Education and School management" Tondon Publications, Ludhiana.