

## **Verbal classroom teaching behaviour amongst teacher educators**

**Dr. Nazneen Mehraj**

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

---

### **Abstract**

The present study was an interactive study to find out the FIACS the verbal classroom teaching behaviour of male and female teacher educators. Considering the wider area of location of the colleges from various areas catering the larger population of teacher trainees in Jammu and Kashmir, six (06) teacher training institutes were randomly selected with equal number of 03 colleges from Jammu province. 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 male and 30 female 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 male and female foundation course teacher educators on Flanders verbal teaching behaviour were found significant on pupil talk; indirect teacher talk; pupil initiative ratio, teacher response ratio; teacher question ratio and pupil steady state ratio indices. Male foundation course teacher educators have more tendencies and the response received from the pupil. Male teacher elaborates these responses making it the basis of discussion as compared to female foundation course teacher educators who have fewer tendencies to react the ideas and responses of the students. Male teacher question ratio (TQR) was found high on female foundation course teacher educators. Male foundation course teacher educators make frequent use of question about their content.

**Keywords:** Verbal, Classroom Behaviour, Male and Female Teacher Educators, J&K

---

### **Introduction**

The importance of building teacher-student relationship is more interested students to learn, student to teacher cooperation, enhance student achievement and more motivated students (Jill & Joy, 2009). In addition, Myint (2005) teachers need to reduce negative emotions among the students such as anger, sadness, dissatisfaction, boredom, fear, and always encouraging, positive emotions such as confidence, enjoyed, appreciated and safe. This approach lead to increased student motivation. Teachers also serve to address student behavioural problems through the diversification of teaching strategies, planning and strengthening the delivery of variations (Supiah *et al.*, 2009). Teachers' role in society is general and in education has been changing with time but the importance of this position is same. The teacher is the backbone of the education system, the maker of mankind and the architect of the society. The teacher is the living ideal, the foundation head of knowledge and potential guide to provide directives for the growth and development of students of today as worthy citizens of tomorrow. The teacher is the pre-requisite of the success of educational programmes. The main quality of teacher is the positive attitude towards education. Teacher must have the ability to get satisfied from their respective jobs. It is the teachers who elucidate the realities to their students, illuminate the principles of successful living, explicate the values held high by the society and expound the laws and standards of living. A teacher can promote academic excellence and bring about positive behavioural changes in students by developing their hidden potentials. Agreement is widespread that teachers are keys to student learning and efforts to improve teacher quality have proliferated. Educational programme should inculcate the qualities in

teacher so that a teacher may be in his best position to impart education to students. Most initiatives however have focused on teacher recruitment and retention and on developing new pathways to teaching. The work of teaching includes broad cultural competence, relational sensitivity, communication skills and the combination of rigor and imagination fundamental to effective practice. Skillful teaching requires appropriately using and integrating specific moves and activities in particular cases and contexts based on knowledge and understanding of one's pupils and on the application of professional judgment. This integration also depends on opportunities to practice and to measure one's performance against exemplars. Performing these activities effectively is intricate work. Professional training should be designed to help teachers to learn enact these tasks skillfully. Such training would involve seeing examples of each task, learning to dissect and analyze the work, watching demonstrations and then practicing under close supervision and with detailed coaching aimed at fostering improvement. Teachers determine to a large extent the destiny of a nation. Of all the different factors which influence the quality of education and its contribution to national development, the quality, competence, personality and attitude of teachers are undoubtedly the most significant.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The following objectives were formulated for the present study:

1. To study the FIACS the verbal classroom teaching behaviour of male and female teacher educators.
2. To compare through FIACS the verbal classroom teaching behaviour of male and female teacher educators.

## Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for the present study:

1. There is no significant difference in the verbal teaching behaviour through FIACS among male and female teacher educators teaching foundation and methodology courses.

## Definition of terms and variables:

The variables under study has been operationally defined as

- **Interaction Analysis:** For the present study it refers to the observation and analysis of teacher talk, pupil talk and the silence categories of interaction as suggested by Flander and which formulate major domains of the interactional process.
- **Classroom behaviour:** For the present study classroom behaviour refers to the verbal and non-verbal aspects of teacher behaviour inside the classroom. It includes the verbal and non-verbal behaviour which can be analyzed as under:
- **Verbal behaviour:** It refers to the verbal aspect of the classroom behaviour and consists of three main dimensions, the teacher talk; pupil talk and the pause or silence observed by the teacher during the conduct of classroom.

## 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 male and 30 female 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) incase of male and Female teacher educators teaching prescribed foundation courses (N=30 each)

Indices	Group	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Teacher talk (TT)	Male	71.08	11.21	0.35	Not Significant
	Female	70.06	11.04		
Pupil talk (PT)	Male	28.96	4.21	2.44	Significant at 0.05 level
	Female	26.09	4.86		
Indirect teacher talk (ITT)	Male	27.28	3.89	3.36	Significant at 0.01 level
	Female	24.03	3.58		
Direct teacher talk (DTT)	Male	45.80	7.68	0.10	Not Significant
	Female	46.02	8.45		
Silence/ confusion (S/C)	Male	3.91	1.05	0.26	Not Significant
	Female	3.84	1.02		
Pupil initiative ratio (PIR)	Male	36.41	7.24	2.92	Significant at 0.05 level
	Female	30.90	7.36		
Teacher response ratio (TRR)	Male	55.03	8.25	2.03	Significant at 0.05 level
	Female	50.58	8.68		
Teacher question ratio (TQR)	Male	27.21	4.21	2.20	Significant at 0.05 level
	Female	29.87	5.08		
Content cross ratio (CCR)	Male	49.06	8.29	0.06	Not Significant
	Female	48.98	8.96		
Indirect/ direct ratio (I/DR)	Male	53.02	10.21	0.30	Not Significant
Vicious circle ratio (VCR)	Male	1.29	0.25	0.94	Not Significant
	Female	1.36	0.32		
Pupil steady state ratio (PSSR)	Male	20.60	3.45	6.94	Significant at 0.01 level
	Female	26.47	3.09		
Instantaneous teacher response ratio (ITRR)	Male	63.40	11.25	0.36	Not Significant
	Female	62.34	11.08		
Instantaneous teacher question ratio (ITQR)	Male	42.77	9.23	0.05	Not Significant
	Female	42.63	9.21		

## Discussion

The gender-wise comparison of foundation course teacher educators on their verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders categories. The analysis of the data showed that insignificant difference was found between male and female foundation

course teacher educators on teacher talk, direct talk and silence/confusion indices of classroom teaching on verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders categories. While, there is a significant mean difference was found between male and female foundation course teacher educators on pupil talk and

indirect teacher talk indices of classroom teaching (verbal behaviour). The results showed that the teacher-pupil interaction is higher side incase of class conducted by male foundation course teacher educators, whereas female foundation course teacher educators seemed to restrict in the student participation and interaction in the classroom. Male foundation 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.

Mean difference between the male and female foundation course teacher educators on various indices/ratios of classroom teaching on verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders. The analysis of the data showed that significant difference was found between male and female educators who teach prescribed foundation courses on pupil initiative ratio (PIR), teacher response ratio (TRR) and teacher question ratio (TQR) dimensions of verbal teaching behaviour. However, no significant difference was found between male and female teacher educators who teach prescribed foundation courses on content cross ratio (CCR) and indirect/direct ratio (I/DR). Proportion of pupil initiative ratio(PIR) is higher incase of male foundation course teacher educators and lower in case of female foundation course teacher educators. Male foundation course teacher educators have more tendencies and the response received from the pupil. Male teacher elaborates these responses making it the basis of discussion as compared to female foundation course teacher educators who have fewer tendencies to react the ideas and responses of the students. Male teacher question ratio (TQR) was found high on female foundation course teacher educators. Male foundation course teacher educators make frequent use of question about their content.

Male and female educators who teach prescribed foundation course compared on verbal teaching behaviour. The analysis showed that no significant difference was found between male and female educators who teach prescribed foundation course on vicious circle ratio (VCR); instantaneous teacher response ratio (ITRR) and instantaneous teacher question ratio (ITQR) indices of classroom teaching of verbal teaching behaviour of Flanders categories. However, the results was found significant difference between male and female foundation course educators on pupil steady state ratio (PSSR) indices of classroom teaching on verbal behaviours of Flanders categories. The results indicates that the pupil steady state ratio(PSSR) was found high on female foundation course teacher educators, therefore, female foundation teachers have a index of rapidity of teacher pupil interaction and interchange, the more the ratio the possibility of interaction as compared to male foundation teachers.

The findings of the above results are supported with the tune of the findings of the studies conducted earlier by Oluwag (2014) <sup>[12]</sup> who found that there is significant difference between the level of participation of male and female students in classroom interactions. Tassew (1992) found that most of the classroom verbal interactions were limited to the question-response pattern and silence and confusion. The flexibility in communication was observed to be higher in the classes of female teacher-trainees. Female teacher-trainees exerted extended direct influence more than male science teacher-trainees. Singh (1988) found that indirect influence, pupil talk, indirect-to-direct ratio, pupil initiation ratio, teacher response

and question ratios appeared to be significantly related to attitude towards in male and female groups, teaching-subject groups and teaching classes. Ummekusum and Khajapeer (1985) found that male teacher educators with BA/BSC and M.Ed. qualification were more effective than the female teacher educators with the same qualification. The female teacher educators with M.A./M.Sc. and M.Ed. Qualification were more effective than the female teacher educators who had seven and less than seven years of experience with M.A./M.Ed. Qualifications were more effective than those with the same level of experience but with B.A./B.Sc. and M.Ed. qualifications were more effective than those with the same level of experience but with M.A./M.Sc./M.Ed. qualification.

## Conclusion

The following conclusion has been drawn from the above findings:

1. Male and female foundation course teacher educators on Flanders verbal teaching behaviour were found insignificant on teacher talk, direct talk and silence/confusion, vicious circle ratio; instantaneous teacher response ratio; instantaneous teacher question ratio; content cross ratio; indirect/direct ratio; vicious circle ratio; instantaneous teacher response ratio and instantaneous teacher question ratio indices.
2. Male and female foundation course teacher educators on Flanders verbal teaching behaviour were found significant on pupil talk; indirect teacher talk; pupil initiative ratio, teacher response ratio; teacher question ratio and pupil steady state ratio indices.

## 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, XXIV(4).
14. Reddy G, Lokananda, Jevantham. *Curricular Factors in School Effectiveness And Learning Achievement At Primary Stage*; Edutracks, 2004, III.
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*. New Delhi Ministry of Education. Govt. of India, 1996, 1964-66.
18. Roy BN. *A analysis of teaching behaviour pattern of experienced science teachers*. *Indian education review*, 1992; XXVII(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, XXVI, 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 Abdollahimi 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 pupils 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.