CHAPTER III
CHAPTER-III

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

3.0 JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

In the past, observers of classroom behaviour accepted that teachers taught and the children learned. Analyses of classroom behaviour did little to probe beyond such superficial descriptions. It is increasingly realized that the interactions of the classroom can have many more interpretations; that the behaviour of students and teachers carries important meanings about such fundamental matters as the nature of power, knowledge and the social system. Although the study of classroom is a thriving branch of educational research which has engaged psychologists, sociologists, linguists and anthropologists in recent years, yet the researchers have been running most frequently for theorising and politicizing instead of having a peep into the real and practical classroom situations. When researchers from different disciplines study the same substantive topics, they either fail to recognize that the topic was the same and ignore work from other specialists, or fight for possession of the topic, such struggles being characterized by mutual betterness and incomprehension. Both patterns can be found in the history of classroom research.
In the USA classroom researchers from different disciplines have ignored, or been unaware of work done by other specialists. For example, a social psychologist like Flanders (1970) makes no mention of a psychologists like Louis Smith (1968) or an anthropologist like Leacock (1969). In Britain, on the other hand, the researchers wage increasing guerilla warfare among themselves, the main vantage points of which are detailed in Chanon and Delamont (1975). Generally the details of academic disputes are of interest to no one but the participants and this is certainly the case with classroom studies. Very few researchers have made attempts to synthesize the disparate results.

In most vigorous tradition in classroom studies is American and social-psychological. The approach's best known exponent is Ned Flanders who gave specified categories for coding classroom talk (FIAC). The generic name for studies of this type is "interaction analysis". There are many small differences of detail between the various coding schedules used by interaction analysts, but they all rest on similar foundations. In the classroom the observer makes a coding of the talk every three seconds and records them sequentially. Once a large enough sample of public talk has been collected, the codings are manipulated arithmetically and various scores computed for the teacher. Central to interaction analysis are notions of freedom and
control. The more freedom the pupils have, the better the teacher's score. Good 'all American' teachers are integrating' not 'dominating' (Anderson, 1967), 'democratic' not 'authoritarian' (Lewin, 1967). But, this terminology is political despite the fact that adherents of the approach claim it to be scientific, objective and free from observer bias. But, it cannot be denied that in past the classroom had been 'black-box' for psychologists - extroverts went in and scores on programmed Maths came out. Many researchers trained in orthodox psychology and writing for an audience of psychologists could only justify a decision to observe if the observations were statistically reliable and valid. If the method produced numbers susceptible to factor analysis, so much the better. Those training teachers had rather different problems. They had always been present in classrooms while supervising their students, so observation was not a radical departure for them. But their student teachers complained that orthodox educational research was irrelevant, so they had strong motivation to adopt a research tradition that was classroom-based. While reviewing this field, Medley and Mitzel (1963, p.247) commented that

"The research worker limits himself to the manipulation or studying of antecedents and consequents.... but never once looks into the classroom to see how the teacher actually teaches or the pupil actually learns."
Even today this comment could be applied with justice to most educational research in India. Morrison Mac Intyre highlight the doubtful origins of this disregard for the classroom in their remark that 'it is almost a cliche of modern educational thinking that pupils' behaviour in the classroom derives largely from their lives outside it' (1969, p.119).

Once consequence of this neglect of classroom life is that teachers have remained largely in different, or even antagonistic, to the claims made for educational research. For insight into their daily lives they turned elsewhere, to 'travellers' tales' (e.g. Holt, 1969), to 'non-fiction novels' (e.g. Blisben, 1955) or to the compounded folk-tales, myths and mores of the staffroom.

The interaction analysis tradition has, despite recognisable strength, its own weaknesses. All but ten of the interaction analysis systems ignore the temporal and spatial context in which the data are collected. These systems are usually concerned only with overt, observable behaviour. They do not take directly into account the differing intentions that may lie behind such behaviour. Only the observer's interpretation is considered relevant. A comprehensive understanding of classroom life may, for example, depend upon the translation of 'silent languages' (Smith and Geoffery, 1968) or the uncovering of
'hidden curricula' (Snyder, 1971). Interaction analysis systems are expressly concerned with 'what can be categorised or measured'. They may obscure, distort or ignore the qualitative features which they claim to investigate by using crude measurement techniques. The interaction analysis systems focus on 'small bits of action or behaviour rather than global concepts'. These systems utilize pre-specified categories which are very likely to create an initial bias.

Basically classroom research aims to study the processes that take place within the classroom black box. Unquestionably, however, there is now a shift in research interest, with the classroom as the new focus. More and more recognition is being paid to the fact that an appreciation and understanding of classroom events is essential to any analysis of educational processes.

The notion that people hold specific expectations as to what constitutes appropriate social behaviour, links closely to the idea that teachers' expectations affect their pupils' behaviour. But research on this has failed to show the kind of ones that pupils pick up. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968, p. 162) admitted: 'We do not know how a teachers' expectations for a pupil's intellectual growth is communicated to the pupil'.
A major reason why educational researchers have avoided going into classroom is that classroom events are so complex. It is easy to pinpoint the fallacy in this kind of retreat from complexity. The situation in educational research has often been analogous to the old story of the drunk who lost his doorkey somewhere along a particularly dark stretch of the street but insisted on looking for it under the lamp — because the light was better there. Educational research has tried to find the key to understanding educational processes by staying outside the classroom, and administering tests and questionnaires to samples of 'subjects'. Such research is easy to carry out and the data are numerical, tidy and relatively easy to handle. But it is unclear whether there is any relation between such data and what goes on inside classrooms. Events in classrooms are complex. Almost insignificant or not very significant attempts have been made to explore precisely that complexity. Especially, the individual differences of pupils have stood ignored in most classroom studies. Not so much appreciable work has been done on how student learning behaviour in the classroom affects their academic performance. The investigator, with an intention and effort to bridge the gap in research on classroom, has chosen to investigate the classroom learning behaviour of students of different self-concepts and their achievement. Attempts to analyse and interpret such learning behaviours in the classroom
have been made less and less in social sciences and at secondary level. So, the researcher attempts to investigate such classroom learning behaviour of students in the subjects of Geography and at secondary level.

3.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of the study can be stated as follows:
CLASSROOM LEARNING BEHAVIOUR OF STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT SELF CONCEPT LEVELS AND THEIR ACHIEVEMENT IN GEOGRAPHY AT 10+2 STAGE.

3.2 DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Several terms have been used in the statement of the problem. It will be worthwhile to define them operationally for the purpose of the present study.

3.2.1 Student Classroom Learning Behaviour

The term student classroom learning behaviour includes both verbal and non verbal behaviour of students in classroom transactions in the process of learning from teacher instruction. In the present study, student classroom learning behaviour has been spited up into six areas, viz., attention, response, seatwork, soliciting teacher help, interaction and management.
3.2.2 Teacher Behaviour

Ryans (1969) defines teacher behaviour as the behaviour or activities of persons as they go about doing whatever is required of teachers, particularly the activities which are concerned with the guidance or direction of the learning of actions. For the present study, teacher behaviour may be defined as a set of observable teachers' classroom activities or behaviours aiming at creating a favourable environment to facilitate the pupil's learning. Teacher behaviour has been divided into six areas, viz., explanation questioning, response management, helping, supervision, and management.

3.2.3 Achievement

The term achievement refers to the scholastic or academic achievement of the student at the end of an educational programme. In the present study, achievement of the students has been taken by administering the achievement test in Geography.

3.2.4 Self-Concept

Self-concept is referred as one's attitude towards self. It is an organized configuration of perceptions beliefs, feelings, attitudes and values which the individual view as a part of characteristics of himself. It also signifies his way of thinking, feeling and behaving.
3.2.5 Variables Involved

In the present study, achievement of students constitute dependent variable, while different components of student classroom learning behaviour and teacher behaviour constitute independent variables.

3.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study purports to realise the following specific objectives which have been spelt out area-wise:

(A) Student Classroom Learning Behaviour and Student Achievement

1. To study the relationship between attention behaviour, response behaviour, seatwork behaviour, soliciting teacher help behaviour, interaction behaviour, involvement in classroom managerial activities, and achievement of students belonging to high and low self-concept levels.

(B) Teacher Behaviour and Student Achievement

2. To study the relationship between teacher explanation behaviour, questioning behaviour, response management
behaviour, helping behaviour, supervision behaviour, management behaviour and achievement of students belonging to high and low self-concept levels.

(C) **Student Classroom Learning Behaviour and Self-Concept**

3. To compare attention behaviour, response behaviour, soliciting teacher help behaviour, seatwork behaviour, interaction behaviour, involvement in classroom managerial activities of high and low self-concept groups of students.

(D) **Student Classroom Learning Behaviour in the Beginning and Towards the end of the Academic Session**

4. To compare student attention behaviour, response behaviour, soliciting teacher help behaviour, seatwork behaviour, interaction behaviour, in the beginning and towards the end of the academic session.

(E) **Teacher Behaviour in the Beginning and Towards the end of the Academic Session**

5. To compare teacher explanation behaviour, questioning behaviour, response management behaviour, helping behaviour, supervision behaviour, management behaviour, in the beginning and towards the end of the academic
session.

(F) Prediction of Achievement

6. To study the prediction of achievement of high and low self-concept students by their classroom learning behaviour and teacher behaviour.

(G) Proportion of Time

7. To study the proportion of time spent by students and teachers to different behaviours in the classroom.

3.4 HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant relationship between attention behaviour, response behaviour, seatwork behaviour, soliciting teacher help behaviour, interaction behaviour, students' involvement in classroom managerial activities and achievement of students belonging to high and low self-concept levels.

2. There is no significant relationship between teacher explanation behaviour, questioning behaviour, response management behaviour, helping behaviour, supervision behaviour, management behaviour and achievement of students belonging to high and low self-concept levels.
3. There is no significant difference between attention behaviour, response behaviour, seatwork behaviour, soliciting teacher help behaviour, interaction behaviour, involvement in classroom managerial activities, of high and low self-concept groups of students.

4. There is no significant difference between student attention behaviour, response behaviour, soliciting teacher help behaviour, seatwork behaviour, interaction behaviour, involvement in classroom managerial activities, in the beginning and towards the end of an academic session.

5. There is no significant difference between teacher explanation behaviour, questioning behaviour, response management behaviour, helping behaviour, supervision behaviour, management behaviour, in the beginning and towards the end of the academic session.

3.5 DELIMITATIONS

Due to limitation of time and resources, the present study has been delimited to the following aspects. School education comprises of three levels, namely, primary, secondary and senior secondary, but the present study has been confined to class XI at senior secondary stage in Gurgaon district only. Learning can
take place both inside and outside the classroom, but the present study confines itself to the learning behaviour of student inside the classroom only. The sample of observation of the classroom behaviour of students and teachers can be obtained throughout the whole academic session. However, in the present study the observations confine only to two different points of time, i.e., beginning of the academic session and towards the end of the academic session. Only four lessons during the whole academic session, that is two lessons in the beginning and two lessons towards the end of the academic session have been observed; classroom observation being a time consuming process, only 25 sections were taken in the present study for intensive observation of two students with highest self-concept and two students with lowest self-concept. Further the present study confines itself to study the classroom learning behaviour of students in relation to self-concept only.