CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Educational research is social scientific research applied to educational problems. Its basic aim is to discover general explanations of natural events in a nomothetic manner. And most educational research is and has to be scientific because we want the behavioural laws discovered to be applicable, ideally, to whole classes or sets of individuals and settings.

'Better education' has remained a persistent call from ancient times. Better education aims to better the self. But Lindesmith & Strauss (1949), Rose (1962), Manis and Meltzer (1967) and Peter Kelvin (1970) have emphasized the fact that in a very fundamental sense the self is a product of a person's interaction with others. It is the social environment which is seen as fundamental. In short, it can be stressed that a person's self develops in relation to the reactions of other people to that person and that he tends to react to himself as he perceives other people reacting to him. That is to say, the self-system is not merely a function of a person's manipulation of the environment, but a function of the way in which a person is treated by others. The self is, therefore, a social product.
George Herbert Mead's (1934) great contribution was the recognition that the self is a social structure which rises through communication. In his terms, the primary element of communication is the gesture. For example, an animal in a state of anger will bare its teeth. In Darwinian terms such a gesture has adaptive value for survival, since the teeth are ready for action or counteraction. This can be termed as 'conversation of gestures'. According to Mead, the 'conversation of gestures' becomes communication when the gestures become significant, that is, when they arouse in the organism making the gesture the same response that the gesture arouses, or is intended to arouse, in the other organism. Therefore, self arises from the social experience of interacting with others.

Modern civilizations are in a state of flux. Sociology has changed dramatically in the past decade. Sociologists have provided an ever increasing diversity of empirical and theoretical approaches that are advancing our understanding of the complexities of societies and their educational arrangements. The over-simplification of the earlier sociological view can now be seen as the world running smoothly with agreed norms of behaviour, with institutions and individuals performing functions that maintained society and where even conflict was restricted to 'agreed' areas. Such a
normative view of society with its functionalist and conflict theories has now been augmented by a range of interpretive approaches in which the realities of human interaction have been explored by phenomenologists, ethnomethodologists and other reflexive theorists. The part that individual perceptions play in determining social reality has been emphasized and many of the characteristics of society that had been assumed to be 'given' have been challenged.

The new approaches have shown striking impact upon sociology of the school. Earlier work was characterized as incompletely examined assumptions about such matters as ability, opportunity and social class. Sociologists now question how a social system defines class, opportunities and achievement. Such concepts are seen to be products of the social system in which they exist. In study of the school, we can now explore the ways in which individual teachers' and students' definitions of their situation help to determine its social arrangements; how perceptions of achievement cannot only define achievement but also identify those who achieve; how expectations about schooling can determine the very nature and evaluation of schools. Specialists develop their own analyses of central issues like poverty, opportunity, comprehensive schooling, the
language and interaction of the classroom, the teacher's role, the ecology of education, and the ways in which education acts as an instrument of social control.

In the past arrangement, observers of classroom behaviour agreed that teachers teach and the students learn. Analyses of classroom behaviour did practically little to explore beyond such superficial descriptions. It has now been realized increasingly that the interactions of the classroom can have many more interpretations; that the behaviour of students and teachers bears significant meanings about such fundamental matters as the nature of power, knowledge and the social system. Sociologists have been gradually moving closer to a clearer understanding of classroom interaction. One of the available models of classroom interaction is drawn from the ideas of a group of authors, some sociologists and others social psychologists, who call themselves symbolic interactionists. It embodies an approach to the study of human life very close to the way we run our ordinary lives. At its simplest, being a symbolic interactionist means doing research by observation and participation and not by testing, measuring and experimenting. It is frequently called 'participant observation' because the observer talks to, and participates in activities with the people under study. Symbolic interactionists are found both in
sociology and social psychology areas because the set of theories they espouse transcends that division. They study situations of face-to-face interaction rather than producing theories about whole societies, or conducting artificial experiments. Educational institutions are, therefore, exactly the sort of topic for an interactionist approach. However, there are many other schools of thought in sociology and psychology whose exponents consider educational institutions appropriate research topics. Therefore, the study of classrooms is a thriving branch of educational research, which has engaged sociologists, psychologists, linguists and anthropologists. But when researchers from different disciplines study the same substantive topics, they either fail to recognize that the topic is the same and ignore work from other specialists, or fight for possession of the topic. 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 psychologist like Louis Smith (1968), or an anthropologist like Leacock (1969) and vice versa. But, the wise starting point in classroom research is to attempt a synthesis of the disparate results.
The most vigorous tradition in classroom studies is American and social-psychological. It stems from the work done between the late thirties and mid-fifties by Anderson, Lewin, Lippitt and White, Bales and Withall, and is documented by Amidon and Hough (1967). The best known exponent of this approach is Ned Flanders, whose categories for coding classroom talk (FIAC) are well discussed about. The generic name for studies of this type is interaction analysis and research done in interaction analysis systems is now so widespread in the USA, Britain, Australia, New Zealand and India that many people use 'classroom research' and 'interaction analysis' interchangeably. There are many small differences of detail between the various coding schedules used by interaction analysts, but they all rest on similar foundations. FIAC is the most widely used coding schedule. Central to interaction analysis coding schedules are notions of freedom and control. Teachers are assessed according to the limits they place on pupils' freedom of speech. The more freedom the pupils have, the better the teacher's score. Good 'all-American' teachers are 'integrating' not 'dominating' (Anderson); 'democratic' not 'authoritarian' (Lewin) or in Flanders' terms they use 'indirect' rather than 'direct' influence. So, the current status of interaction analysis consists of two main claims based on the findings of interaction analysis research: (a) that the more indirect influence the
teacher uses, the more favourable are the pupils' attitudes to
school work, and (b) the more the teacher uses indirect
influence, the more the pupils learn. In the USA interaction
analysis waxed strongly in the sixties and seems likely to hold
its place in the following decades. It has become an integral
part of many teacher training schemes and this gives it a much
more secure foothold in many institutions than it could ever have
had as a pure research technique. Simon and Boyer, who edited
the classroom researchers' pharmacopeia 'Mirrors for behaviour',
a catalogue of observation instruments, wrote in 1970 that over
half of the seventy-nine systems included 'have been transferred
from research to training instruments' (1970, p.27).

In Britain the development of classroom research took
place some ten years behind the American boom. But, there are
differences in the intellectual context of educational enquiry
which affected the rate of adoption for American fashions.
Interaction analysis appealed to psychologists and method
specialists because of its claims to scientific standards of
rigour and reliability. For psychologists trained in
experimental or psychometric techniques, going to watch real
humans being and behaving in real situations was a big step. In
the past the classroom had been a 'black-box' for psychologists
- extroverts went in and scores on programmed maths came out.
Those training teachers had strong motivation to adopt a research tradition that was classroom-based. In the USA these two groups would have been numerous enough to develop interaction analysis and other systematic observation systems into a major force. British classroom research has always had an interdisciplinary flavour. But, apart from the fending which is a frequent consequence of interdisciplinary involvement in the same substantive topic, the most noticeable feature of British classroom research is its neglect by sociologists of education (Rob Walker, 1972). Walker (1972) suggests that 'the metaphysical basis of research on education' in Britain focuses upon 'economic and social structures' — leading researchers away from the school into the home and ultimately the class structure.

Outside the interaction analysis tradition in the USA. There have been certain other important but widely neglected programmes of classroom research. Often described as 'anthropological', this work has developed beyond the margins of mainstream educational psychology and relates instead to social anthropology, psychiatry and participant observation research in sociology. No satisfactory name exists for this tradition. It has been described as 'microethnographical' (Smith and Geoffrey, 1968), naturalistic (MacDonald, 1970) and ecological (Parlett, 1969). Unlike the interaction analysis tradition, whose origins
are clearly rooted in behavioural psychology', the anthropological tradition has no established roots. Some of its members are 'straight' anthropologists (e.g. Jules Henry), some are sociologists (e.g. Howard Becker), some are psychiatrists (e.g. Zachary Gussow) and some are 'converts' from behavioural psychology (e.g. Philip Jackson, Malcolm Parlett, Louis Smith). In the U.S.A. this tradition is perhaps better known for its work in higher education. It contrasts strongly with interaction analysis and can be thought of as representing an alternative tradition: one that goes back to Malinowski, Thomas and Waller, rather than Watson, Skinner and Bales. While both interaction analysis and anthropological classroom research are concerned with developing 'Metalanguages' (Simon and Boyer, 1968, p.1) adequate to the complexity of the behaviour they countenance, the latter uses an approach based on ethnography rather than 'psychometry'; and a conceptual framework which considers education in broad socio-cultural terms or in 'cognitive' or 'affective' terms. In each case, 'knowledge', the 'curriculum' and even 'learning' are regarded differently. Methodologically, 'anthropological' classroom studies are based on participant observation, during which the observer immerse himself in the 'new culture'. That is they involve the presence of an observer or observers for prolonged periods in a single or a small number of classrooms. During that time the observer not only observes,
but also talks with participants; significantly, the
enthusiographer calls them informants, rather than subjects. Also,
the anthropologist does not make such a strong category
distinction between observer and observed as the interaction
analyst does. In addition to observing classroom life, the
researcher may conduct formal interviews with the participants
and ask them to complete questionnaires. Usually, to record his
observations, the observer compiles field-notes or, more
recently, field-recordings. Compared with the results of the
interaction analyst, the data of the anthropological researcher
are relatively unsystematic and open-ended.

The anthropologist uses a holistic framework. He accepts
as given the complex scene he encounters and takes this totality
as his data base. He makes no attempt to manipulate, control or
eliminate variables. Of course the anthropologist does not claim
to account for every aspect of this totality in his analysis. He
reduces the breadth of enquiry systematically to give more
concentrated attention to the emerging issues. Starting with a
wide angle of vision, he 'zooms' in and progressively focuses on
those classroom features he considers to be more salient.

'Anthropological' classroom research, like interaction analysis,
begins with description. But, whereas the former is governed by
pre-ordained descriptive categories (e.g. verbal, non-verbal,
teacher, pupil) the latter allows and encourages the development of new categories. Anthropological research can go freely beyond the status quo and develop new and potentially fertile descriptive languages. Unlike ethnographic classroom research, interaction analysis is often concerned with generating normative data i.e. in extrapolating from sample to population. An argument is advanced frequently against anthropological studies that their results cannot be generalized to other settings. This criticism refers only to statistical generalizations. To an anthropological researcher, the development of generally or universally applicable statements is quite a different task, one that is never achieved merely by carrying out a survey. Despite their diversity, individual classrooms share many characteristics. Through the detailed study of one particular context it is still possible to clarify relationships, pinpoint critical processes and identify common phenomena. Later, abstracted summaries and general concepts can be formulated, which may, upon further investigation, be found to be germane to a wider variety of settings. Case studies, therefore, are not necessarily restricted in scope. Indeed, unlike interaction analysis, they can acknowledge both the particulars and the universals of classroom life. In this respect, interaction analysis is akin to demography or census-taking whereas anthropological studies are equivalent to
the small-scale studies commonly reported in medical journals. Consequently, interaction analysis and anthropological traditions can be seen to differ in a number of respects. Interaction research has largely ignored classroom research included outside its own territorial preserve. For example, the A.E.R.A. curriculum evaluation monograph on classroom observation (Gallagher, 1970) contains no discussion or even acknowledgement of any of the anthropological literature related to curriculum evaluation (e.g., Russell, 1969; Smith and Keith, 1967). Also, 'Mirrors for behaviour' fails to acknowledge that there are (or even can be) "metalanguages" for describing communication of various kinds that are based on anything other than measurement or a priori categorization. Anthropological research has developed outside the prestige universities of the American east coast and is concentrated in the mid and far west.

1.2 FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF CLASSROOM RESEARCH

There are a number of essential issues which relate in general to the practice of classroom research:

(i) In its rush to the classroom, there is a danger that research would cease to consider the wider educational and social context of the classroom. The contrast of 'classroom' and 'society' seems to construct a false
opposition. While for research purpose it is possible to regard the classroom as a social unit in its own right, it can be regarded with considerable difficulty as self-contained. A proper classroom study must acknowledge and account for both the internal and external aspects of classroom life. Any description of classroom activities that cannot be related to the social structure and culture of the society is a conservative description (Walker, 1970, p.143). In particular, classroom research should not be treated as a substitute for studies which look at the broader societal aspects of education.

(ii) Development of audio-visual techniques has meant that much classroom research can work from recorded rather than ‘live’ data. While this leaves the scope of post hoc analysis, it is disadvantageous to the extent that one of the contextual data normally made available to the on-site observer may be lost. It is also believed that an elaborate technology can facilitate description of behaviour, it cannot furnish explanations for that behaviour. The methods themselves do not provide such a link nor do they supplant the conceptual processes needed to generate explanations. In the past the interaction analysis tradition had brought forth an endless stream of
comparative studies with the hope that conceptual clarity would emerge out of the plethora of information. But technological sophistication threatens to increase the flow of data without adding to our understanding.

(iii) Much of the classroom research has been simply behavioural. It has, therefore, encroached the meanings that behaviour entails. To the extent that classroom research claims to illuminate the processes associated with classroom life, it cannot afford to divorce what people do from their intentions. Students and teachers cannot be treated as objects because, then, it can only obtain partial results. Indeed when audio-visual systems are employed, the observer and the observed can be one and the same person. In this regard, interaction analysis as 'research' is fundamentally different from interaction analysis as 'training'. Also, the use of interaction analysis in training is much closer to the 'anthropological' research model.

(iv) Every classroom study develops from certain premises, suppositions and interests held by the researcher. It, then, would reflect the ethos of his times. So, there is a danger of an uncritical acceptance of techniques
developed from different standpoints — The mental hygiene' overtones, research methods and statistical techniques may bear the scars of earlier outdated regime.

(v) Much educational research is suffused with the congenital and manic optimism. Absolute truth is heralded as lying just beyond the horizon. Such optimism and its associated belief in rational man and the power of science has been of considerable consequence. But, it gives short-term reliability at the expense of long term validity.

The two fields of classroom research are not necessarily mutually exclusive, despite the fact that differences are clear and deep-rooted and the respective positions entrenched. For this reason, it is very likely that significant advances will ultimately depend, not on increased technological sophistication nor upon some kind of methodological convergence, but instead upon a reconceptualization and transformation of the dimensions which divide the two traditions. As different tools they are best suited to different tasks. A knowledge of their deficiencies is as important for their successful use, as an appreciation of their potential. Neither is, or can be, a universal panacea.
1.3 INTERACTION SETS IN THE CLASSROOM

Some researchers have tried to explain classroom life by supposing that it is determined by external constraints and pressures e.g. norms, values and group cultures etc. But this is only an attempt to oversimplify pupils' behaviour in the classroom. It has been established through various research endeavours that pupils with different teachers show behaviour changes across different situations within short periods of time. In case pupils' interaction is observed as it happens and if the researcher attempts to discover how pupils themselves see their behaviour, then their behaviour is seen as a continual adjustment to the changing social scene—not simply as 'determined' by whichever 'group' they spend time with. It is, therefore, evident that different teachers see 'different sides' of their pupils. So, an 'interaction set' concept is necessary to describe a group of pupils. Direct observation of teachers and pupils can reveal what no indirect questionnaire or testing methods can. It would be an attempt to capture the aspects of this complexity and to specify more closely the nature of the complexity. Not all pupils 'know' the same things about their school lives. They do not all form the same commonsense judgements about their teachers or the curriculum; they do not all see other pupils in the same way. So, a detailed
understanding of pupil interaction is required. Only then, it would be possible to go on to document what individuals or groups actually 'know'. Most classroom observation, whether 'systematic' or 'anthropological' seems to be directed at throwing light only on the teacher-pupil relationship. However, an attempt to redress that imbalance is most required.

Several researchers have applied a social psychological model to the study of schools. The process of pupil interaction in the classroom is assumed to take place within the context of peer groups or friendship groups, supposing that these groups have a 'culture' of norms and values which affect the pupils' whole school experience. But, this approach fails to examine how the pupils themselves see their social relationships. In social psychological approach, different groups are plotted and the norms and values associated with each group are measured. Thereafter, "central norms" are identified. Conformity to these central norms is explained in terms of 'social pressure' or 'power'. But, this model suffers on three major fronts. Firstly, interaction does not just 'happen' in friendship groups but is 'constructed' by individuals. When classes are observed, it becomes obvious that who interacts with whom can change from minute to minute depending on various circumstances. Pupil interaction in a classroom will not necessarily include all
friends at the same time, and it would frequently involve pupils who are not friends at all. Secondly, this model relates to the idea that norms and values would be consistent. Obviously, there is no consistent culture for a group of friends. Even the most delinquent pupils will be well behaved in certain circumstances. Teachers do not always invite the same amount of conformity or hostility. Finally, in this model, the individual has little choice in his action as he is controlled by the group which is an outside factor.

Interaction, in fact, means situations where individuals come to a common 'definition of the situation' by drawing on similar commonsense knowledge and make common assessments of appropriate action. Patterns of interaction can vary a great deal. Sometimes, the pupils act quite alone without obvious communication between them, apparently defining situations for themselves. At different times, interaction sets form, involving varying numbers of pupils and occasionally the whole class. Each interaction set relates to a specific definition; all the pupils interacting share the same commonsense knowledge of the situation and make common assessments of the appropriate action. There are other situations which illustrate different patterns of classroom interaction. Thus, objective assessment of classroom interaction can be obtained through the interaction
sets because action cannot be understood in terms of friendship groups for these are not the same as interaction sets where membership can vary from minute to minute. Consistent groups do not exist in reality and seemingly there is no consistent culture for a group of pupils. Norms and values relate to specific definitions of the situation and to typical interaction sets, rather than to a particular group of friends.

1.4 TEACHER-PUPIL INTERACTION & CLASSROOM TALK

Delamont (1976) examined how the individual teacher's personal style and subject matter affect classroom interaction. She argues that such complex, individual effects are central to classroom life. But, such effects cannot be tapped by orthodox research means. Systematic observation schedules can provide convenient data on certain aspects of classroom interaction i.e. the different teachers have different 'profiles' i.e. different overall characteristic ways of teaching. However, data on teachers' style of self-presentation is required to show why teachers differ on such measures. To understand the classroom talk, therefore, requires of a researcher to go beyond Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC). An examination of ten categories making up FIAC reveals certain assumptions about classroom interaction which underlie them, some of which are made explicit by Flanders himself while others have remained
implicit. The assumptions made explicit by Flanders include two points — (i) the system is designed for classifying interaction and (ii) the concentration on teacher talk in the design of the categories. Flanders explains that FIAC is intended as a method for studying teaching styles 'since the teacher has more authority than the pupil' and his communications are the 'most potent single factor' in establishing the tone of the interaction (Flanders, 1970 pp. 35-36). The stress, on the 'emotional climate' of the lesson, by Flanders gives implicit indications. Flanders believes that school children and students will learn more, and be happier, if their teachers behave democratically or integratively. But, the teacher's individual style requires several other themes to be organized and examined: the physical setting teachers create, their personal appearance, their pupils' opinion of them and extracts of dialogues from lessons. The FIAC can be sensitive research tool but it can be supplemented and strengthened by the addition of data collected by other, unstructured types of observation.

Also, what concerns most the sociological researchers is the inherent complexity of meanings communicated in the classroom. Walker and Adelman (1972) hold that the 'talk', which is rich in bizarre meanings and hidden jokes, can express important facets of classroom life. But, such facets are
accessible only to a researcher who has been present in the classroom over a long period. Such meanings are not accessible to non-observational research. Taking one example, there is serious import of humour in classroom life. Almost no work has been done on the social functions of jokes and humour as a means of social control of displaying social solidarity or of communicating covertly on a taboo topic. Social control has itself been insufficiently studied. There is insufficient information on the range of ways teachers use for keeping their pupils in line: orders, threats, warnings, pleas, reasonings, explanations - or jokes. Observational research has revealed that there are certain assumptions that seem to limit the applicability of available methods and techniques to the observational data. Not only is the teacher's role seen as central in the classroom, but varieties in pupil role within and between classrooms are scarcely considered. It seems that in different classrooms children adopt quite different roles and identities and these determine to a considerable extent the kind of interactions that are possible within that setting. The image of the teacher that emerges from much established research is therefore of a 'Performer'. But, teachers do have warmth and individuality of their relationships with children. They may not be all strong 'personalities in the performance sense, yet they might have strong personal relationships with their pupils and
this significant sociological distinction does not seem to be accounted for in the established research repertoire. The second assumption is that the social context for teacher pupil interaction is where one person talks at a time and where everyone else takes an audience role. However, the child-child talk into the normal flow of communication stands ignored. The radical changes in the contexts of talk involve different qualities of communication. Talk has to be seen to be a highly complex, problematic activity, rich in contradictory and bizarre meanings and frequently fraught with difficulties and confusions. The first problem concerns the inherent complexity of the meanings communicated by talk. The 'jokes' function as sparks which short-circuit the insulation between commonsense meanings and the other possibilities inherent in the talk. It is partly because jokes make it possible to communicate two kinds of meaning simultaneously that they are often used by teachers and children to invade aspects of personal identity that are not legitimate areas of classroom discourse. It is also important to emphasize that the culture of a class of private but shared world of meaning applies not only to words and phrases but also to events. So, in sustained formal classroom situations, although teacher-pupil talk is mainly public, and meanings are therefore shared, it is possible for pupils to create individual identities for themselves within the class through their ability to play
complex verbal games. In a class that has been together with the same teacher for a long time, each child can create a distinct identity which gives to teacher-pupil talk the quality of cryptic shorthand. The culture of the class becomes so strong, the meanings it assigns to particular items of talk so rich, that the talk itself becomes almost inaccessible to an outsider. So, jokes are used by the teachers as a means of social control.

The socio-linguistic concept also throws light on classroom behaviour and helps to analyse the teacher-pupil interaction in the classroom. Various social factors determine the individual speaker's use of language. Everyone is multidialectal or multistylistic in the sense that he adapts his style of speaking to suit the social situation in which he finds himself. For example, a teacher does not speak in the same way to his wife, his colleagues in the staffroom, and his pupils. So, the use of language differs in different situations e.g. who says what to whom? when? why? and how? and it determines various facets of classroom behaviour.

1.5 THE TEACHER'S ROLE

Teaching is a job, but in becoming a teacher one learns to occupy a role. Role is a key-concept in social science, discussed elaborately by Brown (1965) who says of it 'The word
role is borrowed from the theatre and there is little in its
social-psychological sense that is not prefigured in its
theatrical sense'. Rules prescribe certain ways of behaving but
also allow an amount of 'creative interpretation'. All teachers
come to the classroom with certain bargaining counters and
certain attitudes in common, because they are teachers. Against
this, because teaching is a highly segmented occupation, there
are deep cleavages between different branches of the profession.
These may be based on the level of school in which teaching is
done; the level of professional qualification; and the relative
status of the education sector in which they work. Yet there is
sameness in what they do -- "teaching". Classroom behaviour,
therefore, is the most crucial factor which defines and
determines the role of the teacher.

1.5.1 Immediacy and Autonomy

There are various themes which capture the essential
nature of teaching (Jackson, 1968) out of which two are
significant -- immediacy and autonomy. Quantitative studies of
classrooms show that the teachers may be engaging in a thousand
interpersonal exchanges every day. This urgency means that many
of the teacher's decisions have to be immediate. Allied to
privacy and immediacy is autonomy. The teacher is alone and in
control. He/she has power or authority over many aspects of pupils' lives: knowledge, behaviour, speech and clothing all come within the sphere of control.

1.5.2 Control over Knowledge

The teacher's most potent source is possession of, access to, and control over knowledge. The teacher has knowledge and defines what should and what should not be learnt, albeit within the educational context. A teacher is expected to know more than the pupils.

1.5.3 Vulnerability

The privacy, immediacy and autonomy of the teacher's working life are both potent resources, and vulnerable points in their defence systems. If control over content is the teacher's strongest resource, it is also his/her Achilles' heel. Threats to control over knowledge disturb teachers at all levels of the education system from infant school to university. "The control of content being a source of power and weakness" was given new meanings by 'Nuffield' approach to science teaching, which emphasized guided discovery rather than lecturing and demonstrating. The Nuffield science curricula (1976) demanded a shift in the teacher's role from lecturer/demonstrator to the stage manager of guided discovery processes. The teacher as
neutral chairperson also came to be practised.

1.5.4 Control over Pupils

Teachers have the right to monitor and control/correct pupil's talk in ways that differ sharply from the norms of everyday conversation. Teachers are also expected to monitor and correct pupils' behaviour. Teacher's sanctions range from physical violence through systematic humiliation (Woods, 1975 a) to the more sinister techniques of behaviour modification. Because of the rapidity of classroom events, teachers have to make decisions about whether or not to correct pupils' behaviour.

Teachers are constantly engaged in the social construction of their pupils. Professional training and experience serve as the rules for such social reconstruction. Teacher Perspectives are, therefore, most important. Given the immediacy of classroom events, teachers need to view pupils as stable and predictable. Also the staffroom labelling of particular pupils has meaning - conversation between teachers about individual pupils solidifies the individual perceptions into a reputation, which travels before the pupil into new classroom encounters. The perception of individual teachers about specific pupils they teach has also to be counted. In primary schools, where each teacher spends most of the time with
one class and they see only that teacher, then, the teacher’s perspectives may be crucial for the pupil’s school career. Here the concept of "self-fulfilling prophecy" becomes operative. The fundamental assumption is simple: that if teachers believe a child to be stupid they will treat it differently, the child will internalize that judgement and behave accordingly, and a vicious circle is set up.

1.5.5 Guilty Knowledge

The pupil’s personal fronts are not the only source of information for teachers. Society gives teachers the right of access to what can be called ‘guilty knowledge’ about pupils. School staff are allowed or expected to have access to information about pupils which is not publicly available. And a teacher’s classroom behaviour may be considerably altered by the possession of such private information. The teacher is constantly observing pupils, reacting to them, observing their reactions and so on. A classroom researcher must try to understand how the teacher perceives the job.

This, then, is the teacher. The occupant of a diffuse role, facing a large number of pupils who have to be controlled and, ideally, taught.
1.6 THE PUPILS' ROLE

Whereas the teacher's role is one of socially accepted—legitimate—dominance, the pupils' role is one of subservience. Pupils are expected to learn, and to behave in ways that will facilitate learning, whether this is by sitting quietly absorbing the teacher's lectures, or busying themselves with worksheets, apparatus and 'resources'. They are expected to let their speech, dress, morals and behaviour be monitored and corrected, and their state of knowledge constantly examined and criticized.

But, all pupils do not accept the constraints of the role and it would be dangerous to take teacher dominance for granted. Traditional classroom research of the type popularized by Flanders (1970) assumes that the teacher is the dominant influence on classroom interaction.

1.6.1 Pupil-Power and Friendship

The pupils' power is directly related to the numbers they can mobilize against the teacher. They need help from their friends in this activity. Pupil friendship groups, unlike those of teachers, have received a great deal of research attention. But, when studying classroom interaction we need a less static concept than the clique—a concept that helps us understand how
pupils sometimes act together to impose their 'definition of the situation' upon the teacher. "Interaction Sets" help us to understand this.

1.6.2 Status in the Classroom

There are two aspects of the pupil's status in the classroom: status with peers and with teachers. While it is true that in all schools the pupil who is too popular with the staff may be disliked by all the other pupils. In classrooms where the predominant perspective is anti-authority, anti-teacher, anti-school, high status in the peer group will guarantee unpopularity with the staff. In the hardworking top stream the reverse will be the case.

1.6.3 Youth Culture

Deep involvement in 'youth culture' will give high status in some peer groups. Knowledge of skilful dancing, fashionable cloths and successful relationships with the opposite sex can all help a pupil towards popularity.

1.6.4 Pupil Reputation

Status in the peer group relates to the staffroom action. Pupils know about the importance of their reputations, which are reified in the staffroom and travel before them into each new
classroom encounter. The pupil believed by the teacher to be of high ability has a head start in the classroom. As Brophy and Good (1974) have shown, teachers give ‘clever’ students every advantage over their classmates during instruction. This is, of course, how the self-fulfilling prophecy works: teachers encourage the clever pupil to think and rethink.

1.6.5 The Teacher’s Personal Front

Pupils quickly spot idiosyncrasies in the teacher’s speech and make judgement about teacher’s personality. Clothes are also an important element in the teacher’s personal front. Race and marital status too affect pupils’ opinion of their teachers.

1.6.6 Private lives and guilty knowledge

Pupils may perceive teachers more or less favourably on the basis of idiosyncratic features of their private lives. Pupils do not, normally, have access to ‘guilty knowledge’ about their teachers. They may fantasize about their teachers’ private lives and act accordingly.

Thus, all successful pupils must learn to size up teachers and the tasks they set, and then work out strategies to cope with the tasks.
1.7 COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION IN THE CLASSROOM

Education is a communication process. Students must use speaking, listening and writing communication skills to receive instruction, clarify their understanding and demonstrate learning. Yet, some pupils are handicapped in the classroom by severe anxiety about communicating. Apprehension of speaking before others is a phenomenon with numerous labels. The early research called it 'Stage fright' and focussed on the fear of public speaking. McCroskey (1976) coined the term 'communication apprehension' and defines it as a broad-based fear or anxiety related to the act of communication. The individual high in this apprehension is a person for whom apprehension about participating in communication outweighs the projected gain from communicating in a given situation. Phillips (1977) labels the phenomenon 'reticence'. Mulac & Sherman (1974) called it 'speech anxiety' and Zimbardo (1977) labels it 'shyness'. The communication apprehension which is a function of a particular communication situation, such as giving a public speech or interviewing for a new job, is called 'State' apprehension. 'Trait' apprehension is characterized by fear or anxiety with respect to many different communication situations. Writing apprehension is a general anxiety about writing. Daly and Miller (1975) suggested that in classrooms, pupils with writing
apprehension are individuals who consistently fail to turn in writing assignments. Another form of communication apprehension which can interfere with learning is receiver apprehension. Wheeless (1975) describes this as an apprehension about receiving information.

There are many causes of communication apprehension e.g. genetic predisposition, reinforcement, skill acquisition and modeling. The pupil with high communication apprehension is at a disadvantage in the classroom. He or she generally withdraws from the teacher and other students and may be labeled 'shy'. These shy pupils will probably choose classroom seats in the back and sides of the room, areas away from high interaction zones. Such pupils rarely volunteer to participate in classroom oral activities. This reluctance to communicate generally leads to poor educational achievement. Teachers' expectancies is also a potential explanation of the poorer academic achievement of high communication apprehensive students. Another reason for the high communication apprehensive pupil's poorer academic performance may be the attitudes of the pupils themselves. Lack of self-esteem is related to high communication apprehension although it is not possible to determine if it is a cause or an effect. Knutson and Lashbrook's (1976) research on Communication apprehension and social style found that pupils with high CA were
perceived as low in both assertiveness and responsiveness. McCroskey (1977) summarizes a group of studies to show that people with high CA are perceived as less socially attractive, less task attractive, less competent, less sexually attractive, less attractive as a communication partner, less sociable, less composed, and less extroverted, but of slightly higher character.

1.8 SELF-CONCEPT AND CLASSROOM COMMUNICATION

Self-concept is defined as the totality of descriptions which a person holds for self. When viewing teachers and pupils in the wide variety of instructional arenas, analysis of the breadth of self-concept is crucial. Rosenberg (1979) views the self-concept in three categories: (i) how you view yourself (the Extant Self); (ii) how you would like to see yourself (the Desired Self); and how you show yourself to others (the Presenting Self).

1.8.1 Behaviour Characteristics of High Self-concept Pupils

Researchers about behavioural indicators of self-concept development suggest that the following behaviours correlate positively with academic achievement. The pupil (i) is unafraid of a new situation, (ii) makes friends easily, (iii) experiments easily with new materials, (iv) trusts the teacher even when a
stranger, (v) is cooperative and usually follows reasonable rules, (vi) is largely responsible for controlling his or her own behaviours, (vii) is creative and imaginative, (viii) talks freely, (ix) is independent, and (x) seems for the most part to be a happy individual. These behaviours serve as supportive conditions for continued enhancement of self-concept and it becomes difficult to determine if self-concept can be identified as the cause or effect of academic achievement. Wattenburg and Clifford (1964) clarified the relationship between self-concept and achievement and suggested that levels of self-concept can induce differences in school performance. Pupils with high self-concept are characteristically confident in their communication skills and social interactions, talk less about themselves, have an optimistic attitude toward competition, and express and respond to compliments and criticisms in a graceful, accepting manner (Purkey, 1970).

1.8.2 Behaviour Characteristics of Low Self-Concept Pupils

Pupils with low self-concept use stereo-typed cliches and verbal expressions, are pessimistic about competitive situations and have difficulty in giving and accepting praise or criticism. Such pupils are experts in the art of the self put-down, a self-destructive behaviour.
1.8.3 Classroom Conditions to Enhance Positive Self-Concept

Based on the discussion of theories about the development of positive self-concept (Gerben 1971; Rosenberg 1979), there are at least six conditions for the teacher to address:

(i) the teacher must be perceived by the student as a "significant other",

(ii) the teacher must be perceived by the pupil as a credible appraiser and evaluator.

(iii) the teacher must be consistent in evaluations of the students.

(iv) the teacher must be accurate in evaluations and not exaggerate opinions of the student. Compliments must be genuine and traceable to behaviours actually accomplished by the student.

(v) the teacher must be perceived by the student as personally concerned with the student's development and interest.

(vi) the student must believe that he or she is responsible for personal achievements.

Reviewing the six factors described, each is in actuality both a condition and a goal for effective classroom interaction.
1.8.4 Teacher Behaviours and Instructional Programs

W.W. Purkey (1970) in his book *Self-Concept and School Achievement* poses a series of questions for teachers who are seeking to help pupils gain positive, realistic images of themselves. It has been suggested that the teacher should become a "significant other" in his life. The teacher's beliefs about self and about the pupils are important in his or her classroom communication and behaviour. Also one of the major ideas underlying programs designed to build self-concepts in the classroom is that the child should become his own source of reward and motivation (Coopersmith & Feldman, 1974). Developing positive self-concept in students centers on the teacher's own self-concept and the role model presented to the students.

What do the teachers do in the classroom? How do they interact? How do they carry out classroom transactions? What are the instructional resources available and how do they make use of them? Yet another related question is whether there are some ways which can be suggested to the teachers to exhibit teacher behaviour patterns to generate the desired level of learning in students. Can we provide guidelines to teachers about the effective classroom learning behaviour of students so that they can encourage students to develop such behaviour? The answer of these questions will be based on the answers to other
related questions, such as do students differ in their classroom learning behaviour? Do these different classroom learning behaviours produce different student achievement? How are these variables related to student achievement? Are the learning problems of students related to achievement? What type of variables can be generated in the areas of student classroom learning behaviour? Can students' classroom learning behaviour predict student achievement? How is teacher behaviour related to student achievement?

Based on the questions posed above, a new generation research on teaching involving several variables have emerged. It provides directions along which further efforts should be channeled for quality improvement in education. The variables are being conceptualised and researched. In India, the work on classroom learning behaviour of students is yet in its embryonic stage. The proposed study is directed to bridge the research gap in the area. In this study, the classroom learning behaviour of pupils belonging to different self-concept levels that include both verbal and non-verbal behaviours in classroom transaction in the process of learning from teacher instruction is analysed and their relationships with pupils achievement has been investigated.