CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

Studies in teacher effectiveness have been reported by Flanders and Simon (1969) under two headings namely (a) teacher behaviour as criterion variable and (b) teacher behaviour as a co-variante. Studies having teacher behaviour as criterion variable have been termed by them as presage-process studies, whereas the name process-product has been given to the studies having teacher behaviour as co-variante.

'Presage-process' studies link some aspect of teaching process with something that existed before the teaching process started. That is, these studies point out relationship between teacher traits (teacher personality and attitudes) and some process variables of teacher behaviour. In this connection studies of Davies (1961), Ringness and others (1964), Wilk and Edson (1963) and Smith (1965) are important. The researches of Bowers and Soar (1961), Gage (1963), Flanders (1963), Soar (1966) and Allen and others (1966) established the relationship of the kind of training, experience of pre-service and in-service teachers with the process variables of teacher behaviour. Windham (1969) conducted a study in which he used classroom climate as the resultant of years of college teaching experience, academic rank, level of classes, age of college
teachers and size of college classes. In India Buch and Santhanam (1971), Santhanam (1972), George (1975) explored the relationship of age, sex and marital status of teachers as presage variable of teacher classroom behaviour.

On the other hand, the process-product studies give the relationship between teacher classroom behaviour and pupil growth. Flanders (1965), Lashier (1965), Parakh (1965), Johns (1968) and Dodl (1966) conducted studies in which they used 'the use of pupil's ideas' during lesson as process criterion and pupil attitude and achievement as product criterion. Cogan (1963) found statistically significant results for the same process-product relationship, with the data from a questionnaire administered to 987, junior high school pupils in thirty three classes.

Reed (1961, 1962) attempted to investigate the relationship between the 'use of teacher's praise statements' in the classroom and the product variables like pupil interest in the subject and pupil adjustment. Similarly Hugh (1959), Travers and others (1961), Flanders (1965) and Coats (1966) took teacher talk as the process variable and pupil initiative as product
variable. But in all these studies, the product variables had only been concerned with the activities of pupils. It is in this context that Morrison and McIntyre (1969) have recommended that along with pupils, all those personnels should also be included for product variables who come in contact with the teacher under social and organisational frame work of the school.

The approaches of the studies reported above were either presage-process or process-product regarding variables of teacher behaviour. The major basis of all these studies had been that amongst the host of factors which determined the work in the classroom, the teacher occupied the central position (Jenkins, 1960). As the role of the teacher occupies a pivotal position in the classroom, the factors that influence the teacher behaviour and the discourses which are in turn affected by teacher behaviour need a thorough investigation, so that the findings of the study may contribute practical suggestions to enrich classroom teaching. "Undoubtedly, the area of classroom behaviour is the most important area of educational research. Neglecting it we perish and researching it we may redeem the profession by making it a scientific discipline. Since the quality of classroom
transaction will determine the quality of our future
generation and so our future world! (Buch, 1975). Keeping
in view the important role of teacher and in order to
have more comprehensive look into the important area
of teacher classroom behaviour, studies are required,
which can connect presage, process and product variables
together. It was in this connection that present study
was planned and conducted.

The present study 'Teacher Classroom Behaviour in
Relation to Presage Variables of Teacher Attitude and
Adjustment, and Product Variables of Students liking and
Perceived Behaviour by peers, Principals and Self' em-"ploys presage-process-product variable approach to
understand the teacher behaviour. This investigation
is one of the team approaches attempted as a part
of the major areas of teaching and teacher behaviour,
undertaken by the Centre of Advanced Study in Education,
M.S. University of Baroda (1975) for the development of
teaching theory. In this presage-process-product study,
the presage-process part considered demographic factors
(age, sex and qualifications), professional factors
(subject taught, teaching experience and professional
status), attitude (as measured by the Minnesota Teacher
Attitude Inventory), and Adjustment (home, health, social,
emotional and occupational, as measured by the Bell
Adjustment Inventory) of the teacher as co-variates, and
teacher classroom behaviour (Indirect/direct behaviour
observed through the Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System) as criterion variables. For the process product part, the teacher behaviour was considered as co-variates, whereas criterion variables were students liking (for teacher behaviour with the students inside the class, students outside the class, colleagues and management), and the ratings of peers, principals and self (for teacher behaviour with the students inside the class, students outside the class, colleagues and management). The choice in favour of these variables was based upon conceptual thinking and review of literature discussed below.

1.1.0 PRESAGE-PROCESS VARIABLES

The objective of the first part of the study was to find out relationship between presage and process variables. The presage variables namely demographic factors, professional factors, attitude and adjustment of the teacher are considered as co-variates. The process variables pertaining to teacher behaviour are considered as criterion variables.

1.1.1 Demographic and Professional Factors and Teacher Behaviour

There are a number of factors like age, sex, qualifications, teaching experience, subject taught and professional status, which affect the teacher behaviour.
Ryans (1958) after reviewing the research linking some non-personality variables related to teacher with teacher effectiveness, gave a comment, "Age of the teacher and amount of teaching experience seem to manifest an overall negative relationship with teaching effectiveness - Sex differences in teacher effectiveness do not appear to be pronounced among elementary teachers although at secondary level it appears that women as a group may be more effective than men as a group on specified criterion dimension." But quite a contrasting statement is made by Windham (1969) that no significant differences in classroom climate existed according to academic rank, years of college teaching experience, years of public school teaching experience, level of classes, sex of college teachers, age of the college teachers or size of college class. Both the statements thus mentioned do not give a consistent account of demographic and professional factors taken in this study. For this purpose related/ regarding the required factors have been discussed below for more comprehensive understanding.

1.1.1.1 Demographic Factors and Teacher Behaviour

Out of a number of demographic factors, which affect the behaviour of a person, age, sex and
qualifications are generally considered important. For the 'Age' factor studies of McIntyre, Morrison and Sutherland (1966) are important, which reported that younger teachers show more concern with the classroom behaviour and they associate more with students. The findings were linked sociologically in the sense that as the man grows old, he becomes more authoritative and teachers stand no exception to it. The same has been supported in the Indian context by the study of Buch and Quraishi (1970), which exhibited that older age is associated more with teacher talk and markedly smaller indirect behaviour. Similar results were drawn by Passi and Malhotra (1974) in the sense that aged teachers give directions and criticise the students more than the younger teachers. Most of the studies so far mentioned concern primary teachers. But difference in pattern of teacher behaviour may be present at other levels of teaching, specially at higher secondary stage. It was in this connection that the present study aimed at answering the question, 'Is age of the teacher related to teacher classroom behaviour at the grade XI?'

The fact that females are more tender hearted, has given rise to another hunch that female teachers are more indirect in their classroom behaviour than their counterparts. Good, Sikes and Brophy (1973) supported the hypothesis
through their study, that male and female teachers behaved differently in certain teacher-student interactions. Ryan (1960) and Getzels and Jackson (1963) reported that at the secondary school level women teachers have been found to be more friendly, responsible, stimulating and more democratic in the classroom procedures than men teachers. In the Indian context, Buch and Santhanam (1971) supported the above findings. They concluded that male teachers exhibited more content emphasis and female teachers more capacity to generate student talk and also to question. The similar results were obtained by Santhanam, Quraishi and Lulla (1970), Roy (1971), Anand (1972) and Santhanam (1972) in the sense that female teachers had greater flexibility of communication than male teachers. Another issue to be examined is about the qualifications of the teachers. Regarding this, the findings of Buch and Quraishi (1970) are important. They found that teachers with masters degree talked four per cent more than the graduate teachers and their proportion of I/D (indirect and direct behaviour ratio) was also less as compared with the graduate teachers. But the above study is concerned with primary school level, where lesser knowledge of subject matter is required. At higher secondary stage, where more knowledge is to be imparted to the students; teachers with masters degree seem
to be better suited and this may be bringing change in their classroom behaviour. This hunch needs to be examined.

1.1.1.2 Professional Factors and Teacher Behaviour

Like demographic factors, the other factors which are considered important for influencing teacher behaviour, are subject taught, experience and professional status of the teacher. The factors of subject taught contribute effectively in shaping teacher behaviour because teachers impart information to students according to the nature of the subject. That is arts subjects which are of theoretical nature, provide lesser activity on the part of the students than the subjects of science and mathematics. This has been supported by the study of Jorkasky (1971) which revealed that social-studies teacher laid greater stress on lecturing, because they were more concerned with giving information and structuring problems. Whereas mathematics teachers made great use of those questions which required all the students to answer at the same time. In the similar way Santhanam (1972) found that history teachers talked the most and the mathematics teachers talked the least. These studies show that teachers influence their students differently in different subject areas. But all the above studies have been restricted to the primary level and there is a need to explore this field at the higher secondary level.
Another professional factor likely to influence teacher behaviour is teaching experience. Many studies have been conducted which took experience and training as co-variates to teacher behaviour. Hawkins and Stoops (1966) stated that training and experience have no significant advantage or disadvantage over teaching competence. In the Indian conditions Buch and Quraishi (1970) observed that all the elementary school level teachers with an experience more than ten years talked nearly four per cent less and were less positive towards children than teachers with experience less than ten years. These findings need further exploration and replication at various stages, especially at the higher-secondary level.

Professional status is another factor which seems to be related to teacher behaviour. In the higher secondary schools, generally two types of status are ascribed to the teachers who teach the higher secondary classes. These are Post Graduate Teachers (PGTs) and Trained Graduate Teachers (TGTs). The PGTs have Masters degree, whereas the TGTs may or may not have Masters degree. This status does not depend upon qualifications or experience alone, but is ascribed by the selection committees. Such a status may be bringing change in teacher classroom behaviour. Thus there is a need to
test this hypothesis.

1.1.2 Attitudes, Adjustment and Teacher Behaviour

Along with demographic and professional factors, the other factors which seem to be influencing teacher behaviour are conative and cognitive domains of the teacher. In this field, the important question to be answered is, 'How are teacher attitude and teacher adjustment related to his performance in the classroom?' To investigate such problem, the direct observation of teacher classroom behaviour has been strongly recommended by researchers like Rosenshine (1971). It was in this connection that the present study planned to find out the relationship of teacher attitudes and adjustment with his classroom behaviour.

(a) Attitudes: Social psychologists believe that attitude measurement serves as a guide to the understanding and prediction of human behaviour (Murphy and others, 1937). So also in case of teachers, Leeds (1950) demonstrated that the teacher pupil relations in the classroom were associated with teacher attitude. The teachers who have positive attitude in teaching mean that they want to maintain better student teacher relationship and work with the pupils in a social atmosphere of co-operative endeavour. Further Cook, Leeds and Callis (1951)
and Felsenthal (1970) summed up that teacher behaviour is reflected through teacher attitude.

Simon (1966) tested the relationship between teacher preference for a class and verbal behaviour using Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS). She found that more praise statements appeared in the preferred classes, but the vast majority of communication of the two types of classes was similar. Randall (1969) contradicted Simon's (1966) results regarding classroom communication. He used the same observational tool that is FIACS. He found that teachers with modern belief in the child control, favourable opinion about children, and permissive about child misbehaviour showed less concentration on subject matter and were less lecturing. But both the studies agreed on the point that teachers having favourable attitude towards children were having less direct verbal behaviour. It was further clarified through Flanders (1965) observations that most constructive and independent attitudes were associated with indirect pattern of teacher influence, and the indirect teacher influence was more concerned with students statements than direct teacher influence. The teachers with such behaviour accepted and clarified students ideas to a greater extent.

Rodriguez (1967), Nair (1967), Sreenivasan (1967) and Chacko (1967) conducted studies on 'An Investigation into Classroom Climate.' Their sample consisted of the teachers of
standards four, six, eight and nine respectively. Classroom observation of these teachers was supplemented by an attitude inventory modelled after MTAI. They got positive correlation between classroom behaviour scores of teachers and attitude inventory for primary classes. But at the high school level, there was very low correlation between classroom behaviour of teachers and their attitude. From these four studies, it may be concluded that correlation between classroom behaviour of teachers and their attitude is high in lower classes and less in the higher classes.

Singh (1973) conducted her study on a sample of 500 B.Ed. students. She used FIACS for coding teacher behaviour and MTAI for measuring attitude of the teachers. She found significant relationship between teacher attitude and classroom verbal behaviour of teachers. Her study further revealed that attitude of the teachers was related to indirect teacher behaviour and pupil participation in the class.

All the above studies supported the findings of Sprinthall, Whiteley and Mosher (1966) and Samantroy (1971), that cognitive flexibility (an attitude) and effective teaching (a behaviour) were related. But Giebink (1967) contradicted these findings. His study has the basic assumption that teachers who scored high on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) were more supportive and permissive and student centred. While those who scored low were more likely to maintain control in the classroom by directions and criticism, and they will be more direct in
their approach. Geibink's (1967) sample consisted of twenty-seven female teacher. He recorded the behaviour of these teachers through the FIACS categories. No correlation was found to be significant between the FIACS and the MTAI scores. The conclusion made from the findings was that there was no relationship between attitude measured by the MTAI and observed teacher behaviour. Strikingly similar findings were obtained by Campbell (1973). He reported that little relationship was found to exist between the attitude of student teachers as expressed at the end of a student teaching experience and the rating of characteristics desired by the school administrator.

The above studies have reported contradictory findings about attitudes and teacher classroom behaviour. Pareek and Rao (1970), Santhanam (1972), Verma (1974) and Buch (1975) studied the patterns of teacher behaviour and pointed out the prevailing defects in Indian classrooms, and Rodriguez (1967), Nair (1967), Sreenivasan (1967) and Chacko (1967) found that correlation coefficient between classroom behaviour of teachers and their attitude decreased as the grade for which the teacher taught increased. Barr (1948), Domas and Tiedman (1950), Castetter et al. (1954), Morsh and Wilder (1954), Waters (1954), Tomlinson (1955) and Ryans (1960) have concluded that correlation coefficient between teacher attitude and teacher behaviour have been at a low level of significance.
But Quraishi (1972) and Singh (1973) have found significant correlation between teacher behaviour and teacher attitude. In majority of these investigations, the definition given for teacher behaviour, the tools used, the nature and composition of sample, the technique of analysis of data and cultural and social background were different from one another. The review of these inconsistancies leads to conclusion that by exploring the field of teacher attitude in relation to teacher classroom behaviour, at different grade levels and cultural settings, some aspect of teacher behaviour can be predicted. More researches are required to explore the relationship between teacher attitude and teacher behaviour, so that consistent relationships are discovered for the different grade levels.

(b) Adjustment : The other factor thought to be the predictor of teacher behaviour was teacher adjustment. Psychologically it is felt that a man who is well adjusted to his surroundings is warm and accepting in his behaviour. Is this true in case of adjustment of teachers and their classroom behaviour, also?. The answer to this question is important.

Samantroy (1971) and Pandey (1972) investigated the area of teacher adjustment. They studied it in relation to teacher efficiency. Samantroy (1971) got positive
relationship between teacher adjustment and teacher efficiency. He used teacher efficiency in terms of pupil gain and pupil achievement. But along with teacher efficiency, the teacher classroom behaviour is also an important field of study. So there is a need to explore the area of teacher adjustment in regard to teacher behaviour.

Researchers like Barr (1929), Gotham (1945), Rostker (1945), Rolfe (1945), Hellfritzch (1945), Ryans (1960), Davies (1961), Seibal (1967), Hanny (1967), Ober (1967), Evans (1969) and Quraishi (1970) explored the aspect of teacher personality (using various techniques) in relation to teacher classroom behaviour. They used teacher adjustment as one of the traits of teacher personality, while studying it as a factor related to teacher classroom behaviour.

The investigators viewed teacher adjustment in different aspects. Prasad (1970) in his study associated adjustment with physical, intellectual and emotional equipments. Whereas Ramji (1968) while analysing Gandhian statements, found greater importance for physical and mental health as change bringing factors in behaviour. So also Adaval (1952) considered the physical efficiency of the teacher as an important factor while giving some suggestions for improving the quality of teachers.

Morgan (1967) found the sociability of the teacher
as one of the factors related to teacher behaviour. His study concluded that sociability of the teacher was related to praise and encouragement statements in the class. Another factor of adjustment, considered important was job satisfaction, by the investigators; Anand (1972).

Many other researchers gave importance to the facet of emotional adjustment, while exploring the field of teacher behaviour. Barr (1929) found that good teachers as compared with the poor teachers were emotionally more stable. By good teachers he meant the teachers who were sympathetic, pleasant and appreciative, happier as they worked with pupils and appeared to be more interested in pupil responses. So also Ryans (1959) got positive relationship between emotional stability and teacher's role in the classroom, when he studied the difference in personal characteristics of teachers of elementary and secondary schools. He further concluded that understanding and sympathetic classroom behaviour were closely associated with emotional stability.

There are a number of other facets of adjustment which have been investigated for their relationship with teacher behaviour. But great importance is given to the adjustments related to physical, intellectual, emotional (Adaval, 1952; Ramji, 1968; and Prasad, 1970), occupational
(Anand, 1972) and social (Barr, 1929 and Ryans, 1959). Most of these investigators have made use of one facet or the other, while studying teacher personality as it is related to teacher behaviour. However, there is a gap between the specific study of teacher adjustment and teacher behaviour, which needs investigation.

1.2.0 PROCESS AND PRODUCT VARIABLES

The objective of the second part of the study was to find out the relationship between process and product variables. The process variables pertain to teacher behaviour (as covariate) and product variables concern liking of students and rating by peers, self and principals for the teacher behaviour (as criterion variable).

1.2.1 Teacher Behaviour and Students liking

The findings of separate but mutually supporting studies on classroom climate suggest that two distinct patterns of teacher behaviour can be identified. In case of Anderson (1939) they were 'Integrative and Dominative', Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939) used the terms 'Authoritarian and democratic', Withall (1949, 1951) named them 'Student Centred and Teacher Centred', Cogan (1956) called them 'Inclusive and Preclusive' and Flanders (1960) subsequently labelled them 'Indirect and Direct'. All these studies generalise that while dealing with the class, it is the
teacher behaviour which causes pupils' liking or disliking towards the teacher.

Wagner (1971) has asserted that instructor's actual behaviour will be filtered through the preconception of his campus reputation through a variety of congruences between himself and his students and through the habits and biases of student personality structures. He further illustrated, 'If a student had heard that professor Jones is amusing or boring, or brilliant, he is likely to emerge from the professor's lecture, feeling that it was amusing or boring or brilliant'. His statement was based upon the principle of social psychology which connotes that individual's preconception strongly determines what he will select to perceive and his selection tends to confirm his preconceptions. The same is true in case of students, who do perceive the teacher with many preconceptions which they get from their friends or senior students before they enter the school or college. This has been supported by Kelley's (1949) experimental study, in which a temporary teacher was presented to the students in three separate classes. He used biographical sheet as a plausible device to inform half of the students that the instructor was 'rather cold' and the other half that the instructor was 'very warm'. In an identical twenty minutes class session, those introduced to him as warm found him significantly more considerate,
informal, humane, humorous and mature than did those introduced to him as cold.

Another force that controls the pupil’s liking for the teacher is the pupil’s personality. The same teacher can be differently perceived according to the nature of the student’s personality and his history of personal relationship. Wispe (1951) and Smith (1955) have shown that psychologically different types of students identified by personality test have different reaction to the same teacher behaviour patterns, when the students were exposed to the two contrasting patterns used in each of his study. These patterns were by no means identical to Anderson’s (1939) dominative-integrative contrasts, but in many ways similar to that. So also Gage (1956) in his study of elementary school children, found that pupil’s perception of the same teacher were different according to whether the pupils could be classified as tending to seek ‘effective’ or ‘cognitive’ response from the teacher. Offchus and Gnagey (1963) reported in the study that a girl who reported that her father or mother was highly critical of her behaviour described the class instructor as less willing to permit student disagreement with his opinion than did a girl whose parents were less critical. The study shows that experiences of students with parents as authority figures are transferred into the new authority figure in the classroom. In another
study reported by Rezler (1965) the male undergraduates with nurturant inclination (generous, affectionate and quick to offer help) tended to see their instructors as able in their subject, good at stimulating intellectual superiority and lacking in personal peculiarities, than their less generous fellow men.

A student's academic record also is likely to be intricately involved in the perception of his teacher. It is generally presumed that an able student hears the teacher more accurately than a poor student. Also the students who get below average scores complain more about their teachers than those who earn above average scores (Spaights, 1967). This has been further supported by Morsh and Wilder (1954) who found evidence that if the instructor teaches for bright students, he will be approved by them and there will be a positive correlation between ratings and grades; if he teaches for weaker students, he will be disapproved by the bright students and a negative coefficient will be obtained. Moreover, the grade of the students, in which they study also attributes towards pupils perception of the teacher. In this connection Marino (1965) obtained significant results in favour of third and fourth grade children, who perceived their teachers more favourably than did fifth and sixth graders. His study contradicted the results of the studies of Brown (1966), Farrall (1968), Yee (1968), McDill (1971) and
Kvidahl (1970) and established that students ratings for behavioural characteristics do not depend upon teacher's sex, age, marital status and number of years of teaching experience.

Student's evaluation of teacher performance has been questioned as subject to bias by sex, course grades and personal qualities of teachers by Caffrey (1969). A factor analysis of the form showed that student evaluation of desirable teacher characteristics were free from any bias. Personal qualities of teacher, sex of the students and grade in the class were not found to influence student's assessment of teacher performance. Rayder (1968) also got similar results and suggested that student's sex, age, grade point average and the grades received from the instructor have little relationship to student ratings.

The results of Musgrove and Taylor (1969) showed that all children gave most weight to the good teachers teaching and the least weight to his personal qualities. The only difference among children were that junior school children placed more emphasis than secondary school children on the good teacher's discipline, and the secondary school children placed more weight than juniors on the good teacher's personal qualities, particularly on his being cheerful, good tempered and having a sense of humour. So also at the college level
Mueller, Roach and Malone (1971) found that students tended to rank knowledge of subject matter, interest in the subject and flexibility as utmost important and appearance as least important. Further at college level French-Lazovic (1974) found through reduced-rank regression analysis that items dealing with clarity of expression, arousal of student's interest and stimulation or motivation to intellectual activity, carried greater weight in predicting students evaluation of effective teaching.

Witty (1947, 1950) established through his study of 12000 letters submitted on the topic; 'The Teacher Who Has Helped Me Most', that there was a great consistency among pupils as to the traits most admired. Generally speaking, warm, friendly relations with the students and well adjusted personality were the most important traits in the eyes of students. Strikingly similar results were obtained by Bendig (1953, 1954, 1955), Coffman (1954), Gibb (1955), Lovel and Haner (1955), Medley and Klein (1956) and Gupta (1960), when they factor analysed the student's ratings. The factors involved were empathy (friendly, democratic teacher behaviour) and competence (Systematic organised behaviour).

Almost all the studies reported above are in agreement to Heider's (1958) theory of cognitive balance,
"We will tend to like some one whom we recognise as liking us" that is warm teachers are perceived by students as liking them and the students tend to reciprocate the affection. The same has been supported by Evans (1968), when he summarized the results of various studies as:

Children like teachers who are kind, friendly, cheerful, patient, helpful, fair, have a sense of humour, show an understanding of children's problems, allow plenty of pupil activity and at the same time maintain discipline. On the other hand, they dislike teachers who use sarcasm and ridicule, are domineering and have favourites, who punish to secure discipline, fail to provide for the needs of individual pupils and have disagreeable personality peculiarities.

Out of all these traits liked by students, the main behavioural character which was found by Flanders (1967) to be directly related to students likings, is the teacher influence that encourages pupil participation in the lesson. It can be further clarified through Lawson's (1971) findings that students tend to rate higher those teachers who (a) lecture in response to student talk (b) allow students' freedom to initiate discussion and (c) use praise extensively in rewarding students. On the other hand students tend to rate less favourably those teachers who (a) permit silence in the classroom to continue for prolonged period of time (b) give directions for extended period of time (c) prolong
an activity and (d) ask questions for prolonged period. In another study Patel (1973) concluded that the pupils dislike to a great extent teacher's failure to praise and acknowledge student's participation in the lesson. Her study supported the theory put forward by Vakil (1971) that 'when people are rewarded with praise in the presence of others, they develop positive attitude for both the rewarder and those present at the time-reward is given. So also pupils whose teachers use praise and encouragement have the positive and constructive attitude for the teacher and his classroom activities.

The above studies show a trend that authoritarian teachers are not generally liked by their students, whereas democratic teachers are considered socially nearer to their students. The concept of students liking towards the teacher about the teacher behaviour, probably cannot be culture free. This may be especially so in a culture with transitory character. It is in this context that present study aimed at answering the question 'what type of teacher behaviour, indirect or direct, is being liked by the students in our present day schools?'

1.2.2 Teacher Behaviour and Ratings by Peers, Principals and Self

In the classroom, the teacher is in direct contact over an extended period of time with his pupils.
But beyond the classroom there are other persons like headmaster and other teacher-colleagues, with whom the teacher normally develops formal and informal relationships. These relationships may be based on the teacher's classroom behaviour because all these persons form their opinion about him through his classroom discourse. Their opinion about the teacher is not only an important feature of teacher's life but also have considerable influence on his daily school routines. Thus, there exists an interaction between the role of the teacher in the school and its judgement by the colleagues and administrators. This area needs thorough investigation, so that the findings may offer practical suggestion to find out the teaching process which gets positive attitude of peers and principals.

(a) Peers Ratings: Leaving aside the students, it is the colleagues with whom the teacher develops relationship outside the classroom. This relationship might be affected to a great extent by the classroom behaviour of the teacher. As Morrison and McIntyre (1969) established that the teacher who encourages pupils to be friendly and outspoken in the class, presents a clear threat to other teacher's chances of establishing direct relationship with the pupils. Again, the classroom experiences of one teacher guides another's behaviour in the classroom. The interaction carried on due to each other's classroom practices, seems reciprocal, which
may be shaping opinion about each other. Thus if the teachers and peers are asked to rate each other regarding behaviour, their ratings will be biased to the classroom procedures of one another.

A few studies have been conducted in this field. Rosenshine (1971) reported two studies by McCall and Krause (1959) and Morsh and others (1955) in which teachers were ranked by peers. These studies related pupil achievement and rating of peers on the basis of single question. In another study by Aleamoni and Yiemer (1973) teaching ability and teaching were rated by colleagues, which were found related to academic rank and instructor's reputation. But McNeil and Popham (1973) pointed out that the scales used in most of studies in this field were vaguely worded and were not concerned with teacher classroom behaviour.

The reason for so little exploration of this important field may be attributed to Dreeban's (1973) observations that because of work schedule and spatial dispersion of classrooms, teachers have so few opportunities to see each other at work and accordingly cannot either judge or be helpful on the basis of direct observation. This is not to deny that teachers talk shop and talk about each other's problems; they cannot do so, however, on the basis of shared visible and audible experiences. They lack, moreover, written media for communicating about their work, because the occupation has no counterpart to scholarly research traditions of university
in which knowledge is circulated in books and journals, to a collective body of precedents (of lawyers) in court reports, to case record (of physicians) that document the accumulation of tests and prior medical decisions and to published design (of architects). And since mostly educational research is carried out by academics (without involvement of teachers) and is published in scholarly and technical journals, teachers tend not to become consumers of it. The fragmentation of the colleague group through spatial isolation and the absence of a written traditions of work reports, make teaching a very solitary and private kind of work.

Though the teachers do not visit the classrooms of each other, yet they get information about one another through students and managements reactions about the teacher, their own experiences with the teacher and teacher classroom problems. Further it has been observed and experienced that teachers do think and talk a lot with colleagues and administrators in the context of their classroom experiences. All these informations (through the above sources) help the peers in forming opinion about each other. This shows that by exploring the field of teacher behaviour as related to perception of peers, some aspects of teacher behaviour, which are liked by peers, can be predicted, which in turn may help in creating a good social atmosphere in the school.
The field of peers rating being an important area of teacher to teacher interaction, needs to be further explored with the help of reliable and valid measuring instrument.

(b) Principals Ratings: The other important person who forms a weighted opinion about the teacher is the principal. The researchers like Wandt (1954), McCall and Krause (1959) related principal's ratings with teacher attitude and found that teachers with most favourable attitudes towards administrators received superior ratings from the principals. Similarly, Yee (1970) found that in the middle class situation principals rated superior those teachers who expressed positive effective attitudes towards pupils. But contrary to it, Leeds (1952) and Callis (1953) found that principals ratings of pupil-teacher rapport do not agree constantly with teacher attitude scores.

The above studies are concerned with teacher attitudes and principal ratings. Similarly, it is observed that teachers are accountable to the principal through their classroom activities. A few studies like that of Robbins (1967) established relationship between observed classroom behaviour of the teacher and principal's ratings. He revealed that principals and the observer agreed on teacher behaviour to a limited degree. While only a few
rank correlations reached conventional level of significance, almost all showed a positive trend. Further examination of ranking revealed that correlations were generally lowered by the fact that there were usually one or two teachers about whom the observer and principals could not agree. On the other hand there was general agreement on the most direct and most indirect teachers. He concluded that principal was most accurately aware of teachers, in the situation in which most indirect and least talkative teachers were to be found.

Again the reason for little exploration of this field may be, as pointed out in N.E.A. report (1964) that principals have many other responsibilities in addition to supervision of teachers, because their work schedule and job demands are such. But, however, they do spend some part of their time for visiting classrooms and form impression about the teacher through time to time information, received through colleagues and students. Moreover, principal is the legitimate judge and direct observer of the teacher's activities by virtue of his hierarchical position. Most of the studies quoted above show the relationship between teacher attitude and principals rating. This, further indicates that specific studies in the area of teacher behaviour and principals ratings are a few. Moreover, no Indian study has been found in this particular area. Therefore, there is a need to explore this field to establish the motive of interaction
between the principal, who is supervisory in capacity and the teacher who puts himself before him, through his classroom teaching.

(c) Self Ratings: Another useful question to be answered regarding teacher behaviour is, 'how teachers rate themselves regarding their own teacher behaviour'. Theoretically persons want to evaluate themselves in order to obtain an accurate picture of their own (Festinger, 1954). Further what a person thinks and how he behaves is largely determined by the concept he holds about himself and his abilities (Combs and Smygg, 1959). Does it apply in case of teachers also, is an important question to be examined.

Weiner and Kukla (1970) reported that there are only a few studies indicating that some teachers are self-directing in their learning and expand efforts in judging their behaviour on the basis of the consequences of their teaching as revealed by the actions of pupils. In this context Salomon and McDonald (1970) summarized the results from the studies of Allen, McDonald and Orme (1966), and Waimon and Ramseyer (1970), concerning the effect of self viewing or video tape or film on teacher effectiveness, and reported that there was a tendency of instructors to over rate themselves and there was negligible relationship of self-assessment with other criteria such as student rating and measures of student gain. But contrary to it McCall and Krause (1959), Medley
and Mitzel (1959) and Aspy (1969) found significant relationship when they studied teacher's self-ratings in context of students achievement. Alongwith pupil achievement, teacher classroom behaviour is also an important field of study which needs further investigation regarding aspect of teacher self rating on the reliable and validated tools.

Researchers like Peek (1971) administered a questionnaire to the teachers. The questionnaire constituted a self analysis of lesson taught by each teacher and it was compared with Flanders Interaction category Analysis System. He concluded that teachers did not appear to be able to self analysis their overall verbal behaviour except in the area of praising and encouraging the students. Teaching, by virtue of nature of school hierarchy and of characteristics of classroom activities tends to be self-directed. Thus self rating is one of the important aspects of teacher behaviour and needs further investigation.

The review of studies mentioned above reveals that there is contradiction in the findings of the researchers. Alongwith it there exists lack of studies, where liking and rating of teacher behaviour by students, peers, principals and self have been undertaken. Going through the related literature it was further noticed that presage-process and process-product studies were available but there existed gap of presage-process-product studies. In the light of the
variations in research findings and lack of comprehensive studies covering presage-process-product approach, the present study was undertaken in order to fill up the gap cited above.

1.3.0 Statement of the Problem

The problem reads as follows:

"Teacher classroom behaviour in Relation to Presage Variables of Teacher Attitude and Adjustment, and Product Variables of Students Liking and Perceived Behaviour by Peers, Principals and Self."

In order to have specific and clear picture of the problem, the meaning of important concepts involved in the title of the study, in the light of the operational definitions given by Good (1959) have been given below:

i) Teacher : According to Good, a teacher is a person employed in an official capacity for the purpose of guiding and directing the learning experiences of students in an educational institution. But in the present study, a teacher is that who teaches, arts and science subjects to the eleventh grade students of higher secondary schools. He (teacher) aims at developing cognitive, affective and psychometric aspects of pupil personality.

ii) Classroom Behaviour : According to Good, classroom is the place of interaction between the students and the
instructor through lecture, discussion and other means. To Flanders (1970), classroom behaviour means the interaction which goes on within and between the pupils and also the teacher. In the present study, classroom behaviour of the teacher has been regarded as the pattern of influence in terms of indirect/direct behaviour (measured through the FIACS) that teacher exhibits in the classroom. This classroom behaviour has been further regarded as teacher behaviour which exists in context of social interaction between teacher-students, peers, principals and self.

(iii) Presage Variables: Like Flanders and Simon (1969) these variables stand for all the different types of traits of teacher personality, which existed before the teaching process started. In the present study meaning is restricted to only demographic factors (age, sex and qualifications), professional factors (teaching experience, professional status and subject taught), teacher attitudes and adjustment, which predict the teacher classroom behaviour.

a) Teacher Attitudes: According to Good's dictionary meaning, attitudes are a readiness to react towards or against some situation, person or thing in a particular manner. In the present study the scores on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory represent the attitudes of the teacher.

b) Adjustment: To Good, adjustment is the process of
finding and adopting mode of behaviour suitable to the environment. In present study its meaning is restricted to home, health, social, emotional and occupational adjustment of the teacher.

iv) Product Variables: Flanders and Simon (1969) consider these variables, as all the variables concerned with pupil growth. But for present study, product variables deal with students liking and perception by peers, principals and self.

(a) Students Liking: According to Good, students are those who attend an educational institution of secondary level. In the present study, the students are all the pupils who study in the class of a teacher. The liking expressed by the students on the 'Students Liking Scale' (SLS) having various aspects of teacher behaviour (with students inside the class, students outside the class, with colleagues and with management).

(b) Perception: To Good, perception is the awareness of conditions and relationships. But in the present study perception is restricted to the awareness of teacher behaviour (with students inside the class, students outside the class, with colleagues, and with management).

(c) Peers: To Good, peers means the persons similar in respect to status or education. But in the present study,
all the teacher-colleagues teaching a class are considered as peers to the teacher (For example: To a class, five teachers, A, B, C, D and E are teaching. If 'A' is considered as a teacher, then 'B, C, D and E' are considered as peers to the teacher 'A'. Next time, when 'B' is considered as a teacher, then rest four teachers 'A, C, D and E are considered as peers to the teacher B. This is done in rotation; so in this class where five teachers teach, one is considered as a teacher, and rest four as peers). The rating by peers for teacher behaviour on the Teacher Rating Scale (TRS) is their perception about the teacher.

(d) Principals: According to Good, the principal is the administrative head and professional leader of a school division. In the present study, its meaning is restricted to only heads of those schools, where the teacher (as explained above) teaches. The rating by this principal for teacher behaviour on the Teacher Rating Scale (TRS) is his perception about the teacher.

(e) Self: The present study accepts the definition given by Good, that self perception is the views a person has of himself. But it is restricted to teachers rating about his own behaviour on the Teacher Rating Scale (TRS); which represents self perception of the teacher.
1.3.1 Basic Assumptions

The present study is based on the following assumptions:

i) In a normal classroom situation, it is the verbal communication, which is predominant. The verbal statements of a teacher are constant with his non-verbal gesture, and in fact represent his total behaviour (Flanders 1965, 1966).

ii) Verbal behaviour is an adequate sample of teacher behaviour (Flanders, 1960), and therefore, it can be used for the analysis of teacher behaviour in general.

iii) The teacher classroom behaviour can be observed by the use of observational techniques, designed to 'Catch' the natural modes of behaviour, which will also permit the process of measurement with minimum disturbance of normal activities of the group of individuals (Wrightstone, 1958).

iv) The teacher has a great deal of influence on the pupils (Filson, 1957). The most important aspect of teacher behaviour as far as the influence on the pupil is concerned, is his classroom behaviour (Flanders, 1960).

v) Beyond the classroom there are other persons namely, principals and colleagues, with whom the teacher has formal or informal relationship. These persons are likely to form opinion as to how the teacher does his job through his verbal classroom behaviour.
vi) Colleagues and principals can rate the behaviour of the teacher with students, peers and management (Robbins, 1967).

vii) Teachers can analyse their own classroom behaviour.

1.3.2 Delimitations

The present study has the following delimitations:

i) The study included higher secondary schools of the Urban centres of Punjab, and the findings are applicable to grade XI only.

ii) The teachers teaching science and arts subjects to the grade XI, through the medium of Hindi, Punjabi and English were included in the study. The findings are not applicable to the teachers, who are on the academic periphery of the school namely, physical education teachers, music teachers and work experience teachers. Also the study did not include teachers in whose classes there was lesser interaction namely, fine arts classes and science practical classes.

iii) The study was based on only twenty minutes observation of the teacher classroom behaviour and did not control the change in the behaviour of the teachers due to the presence of the observer in the class.

iv) The study was limited to verbal behaviour of the
teacher and the non-verbal activities on the part of the teacher were not included.

1.4.0 Objectives

The study was conducted keeping in view the following five objectives:

i) To find out the relationship between demographic (age, sex and qualifications) and professional (teaching experience, professional status and the subject taught) variables on the one hand, and the indirect-direct teacher classroom behaviour on the other.

ii) To determine the relationship between teacher attitudes and adjustment on one hand and indirect-direct teacher classroom behaviour on the other.

iii) To find out the relationship between indirect-direct teacher behaviour and students liking about their teachers.

iv) To find out the relationship between indirect-direct teacher behaviour on the one hand and the perception of teacher behaviour by peers, principals and self on the other.

v) To study the factorial structure of the test-space of presage-process-product variables through multivariate approach.

1.5.0 HYPOTHESES

To fulfil these five objectives, the following sets of
hypotheses were formulated:

Hypotheses related to the demographic variables and teacher behaviour.

i) Young teachers are more indirect in their classroom behaviour than old teachers.

ii) Female teachers are more indirect in their classroom behaviour than male teachers.

iii) There is no difference between classroom behaviour of the teachers with masters degree and the teachers with bachelors degree.

Hypotheses related to professional variables and teacher behaviour:

iv) Teaching experience of the teachers has no relationship with indirect teacher classroom behaviour.

v) Trained Graduate Teachers (TGTs) are more indirect in their classroom behaviour than Post-Graduate Teachers (PGTs).

vi) Science teachers are less direct in their classroom behaviour than arts teachers.

Hypotheses related to teacher attitudes and Adjustment and teacher behaviour:

vii) Teachers with positive attitudes towards students are more indirect in their classroom behaviour than teachers with
negative attitudes.

viii) Teachers who are well adjusted are more indirect in their classroom behaviour than poorly adjusted teachers.

Hypothesis related to teacher behaviour and students liking:

ix) Teachers who are indirect in their behaviour in the classrooms are more liked by the students than the teachers who are direct in their behaviour.

Hypotheses related to teacher behaviour and rating by peers, principals and self.

x) Teachers with indirect classroom behaviour get higher peers rating score for their behaviour in the school, than teachers with direct behaviour.

xi) Teachers with indirect classroom behaviour are rated higher by principals for their behaviour in the school, than teachers with direct behaviour.

xii) Teachers who are indirect in their classroom behaviour rate themselves higher for their behaviour in the school, than teachers with direct behaviour.