Examining Patterns of Student-teacher Interaction in Secondary Schools

Ansa Jamil[1] & Muhammad Athar Hussain[2]

Abstract

Interaction between teachers and students in class room is the most important part of teaching and learning process. Interaction can be based on communication (verbal and non-verbal), learning and extracurricular activities in the classroom. The purpose of this study was to examine the patterns of student teacher interaction in secondary schools of Lahore. The sample of the study was 150 students of 9th grade and 50 teachers (both male and female) were the sample of this research. For data collection, two questionnaires were developed, one for the teachers and one for the students. The collected data were analyzed quantitatively using mean score and t-test. The results showed that student teacher interaction is made in form of classroom activities using AV aids , games, role playing and group discussion; methodology which involves asking question, accepting students' ideas, creating interest through participation; classroom environment which involves interaction in form of confident talking, freedom to talk and other related student teacher interaction exist but are not satisfactorily operational. Significant differences exist between male and female students and teachers (both male and female), interaction, classroom, level and patterns of interaction, learning process and classroom activities.

KEY WORDS: Student-teacher interaction, participation in classroom, patterns of interaction.

Introduction

Classroom interaction is referred as a process of passing information from a professional teacher towards students. It may refer to all interaction that takes place between the students and the teacher in classroom. Interaction among students and teacher is developed by various ways like talking to each other, by classroom activities or by questioning each other. These are called patterns of interaction. It is no

---

[1] M.Phil Scholar, Kinnaird College for Women University, Lahore. Ansa_ume@yahoo.com
[1] Assistant Professor, Early Childhood and Elementary Teacher Education Department, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad.

wonder that students in classroom want more interaction with their teachers that is there to affect their knowledge and experiences, including their learning and other activities (curricular and co-curricular) activities (Verda, Retrum and Kuenzi, 2010). Some researches point out that the teaching methodologies and teacher's behavior is the basic factor effecting the student-teacher interaction and the use of new technologies in classroom create an interactive and more literary environment (Moayeri, 2010) and teaching methodologies affect the level of classroom interaction and participation of students in coursework and in return learning outcomes will be much higher (Nunn, 1996)

Learning is societal, communal and rational incident, stated by various intellectual academics and truth-seekers, and researches are in the view that teachers and students both are responsible for the progress and learning experiences in classroom, if the teachers are not able to form an emotional, warm and supportive relationship with their students and even among the students in classroom. Teachers need to endeavor to form an eloquent and private relationship with students for increasing students' probabilities for their academic achievements and success (Murray, 2002).

In modern days, it is estimated that male and female students should get an equivalent attention in classroom from their teachers and institutes should provide handsome and equal rights to male and female students. So that male and female can equally prepare themselves for their better future and development. Some researchers point out that teachers' interaction with their male students is different and female students in their classroom (Holden, 1993; Hopf and Hatzichristou, 1999). Male students get more attentions in their classrooms and get more interacted with their teachers than female students do that is because of their activeness Female teachers at

secondary school are more sensitive and use to give more caution to students about their behavioral and communication problems than the male teachers do at their schools (Hopf and Hatzichristou, 1999).

Review of Literature

Deep and positive Student-Teacher relationship is only possible due to vulnerable, friendly and informational communication, as well as emotional and academic support that exist between students and teachers and mainly given to students by their teacher. Student-Teacher interaction becomes particularly imperative during early teenage years because students shift from the sympathetic mesosphere of their primary schools to more conservative, congested and rambling atmosphere of a secondary school or elementary level (Pianta, 1999). Students prefer to attend their class when they have positive interaction with their teachers and they get more endowed emotionally and intellectually towards the class and their fellows as well. Teachers who are in building positive relationship with their students enjoy the following benefits; students' interest and satisfaction of classroom level enhanced; students' academic achievement and success level enhanced and; the decreased level in the occurrences of classroom's environmental disruption and distraction (Murray, 2002).

Respectful sensitive and high level interactions

Direct and indirect approaches are a pattern to promote the high level student-teacher interaction in classroom. Direct promotion of positive social behaviors of students by their teachers with the help of organizing the interaction within a classroom is there to high up the level of interaction between students and teachers (Battistich et al. 2004). Students show more obedience and they become submissive of teachers, when teachers show a high commitment in the activities of classroom. (e.g., they themselves participate in classroom activities with great attentions), and this deep student-teachers interaction cause

students' great engagement to their learning and classroom activities. This practice improves the recognition of students with students in both present and upcoming times (Hughes & Kwok, 2007).

Research Methodology

Nature of this study was survey type. Two questionnaires were developed for the purpose of getting data from teachers and students as the perseverance of the study was to examine the teacher-student interaction. 50 teachers and 150 students were the respondents from 10 different government schools. 25 female and 25 male teachers were respondents. 75 male and 75 female students were chosen to get the dat. These teachers and students were from secondary level and specifically 9th grade. These all governments' schools were from District Lahore and had the same curricula. Both the questionnaires contain different statements to study the level and patterns of student-teacher interaction. Study was limited to 9th grade. The purpose of this research was to explore the level and patterns of student-teacher interaction at secondary level in district Lahore. All government boys and girls schools were chosen to select the participants. All the schools were located in urban area and shared common characteristics of being public sector schools. 25 schools of boys and 15 schools of girls were selected finally which had common curricula for 9th and 10th grade. Random sampling technique was applied to select the sample. 5 boys high schools and 5 five girls high schools were selected by using draw method of random sampling technique i.e all the schools name were written on separate piece of papers and then were drawn one by one till 5 boys high schools and 5 girls high schools were taken. 05 five teachers and 15 students were also selected by using this same paper draw random sampling technique from each school of secondary level. Thus total 50 teachers and 150 students were selected from 10 high schools as sample of the study

Research Instruments

Keeping in view the 'Literature Review', two self-constructed Questionnaires were developed under the guidance of higher researcher. One questionnaire was for the teachers to get their responses on student-teacher interaction that happen in the classroom. This questionnaire was based on student-teacher interaction framework given by Flander. This Student-teacher interaction questionnaire was consisted of patterns of interaction categories i.e Accommodating spirits and emotions, Admiring and cheering with encouragements, Silence plus confusion, Utilizing the thoughts and notions of students, Asking questions, Student's talk response, Preaching, Giving directions, Criticizing or justifying students, Student's talk initiation. Second questionnaire was developed for students to get their responses on student-teacher interaction that happen in classroom on the basis of Flander's frame work and same categories of interaction pattern. Each questionnaire was consisted of 25 statements. Both questionnaires had five sub-factors specifying student-teacher interaction patterns in the classroom. The sub-factors were communication in classroom, classroom activities, sense of ownership, atmosphere and teaching methodology. The statements were asked on five point Likert scales for which students and teachers were asked to respond against the options i.e Always, Frequently, Sometime, Seldom and Never. According to Brown, Likert scale is an order to one dimensional scale from which respondents choose one option that best aligns with their view. They generally remain between four and seven options. Five is very common. All options have labels although sometimes only a few are offered and the others are oblique. A common form is an assertion and avowal, with which the person may agree or disagree to varying and fluctuating degrees to their own accord. For scoring, numbers are usually assigned to options e.g 1 to 5. For data analysis the SPSS was

used, Frequencies, percentage and t-test were calculated. The students' and teachers' responses were analyzed with the help of this formula.

Table 1 *Communication in classroom*

Students	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	sig.
Male	75	2.13	.507	148	2.123	0.35
Female	75	2.32	.538			

The table 1 shows that there is difference between male and female students regarding communication practices in classroom. Statistically difference also exists as t value is 2.123 which is greater than tabulated value of 1.960 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Table 2 *Environment in Classroom*

Students	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	sig.
Male	75	2.51	.521	148	1.187	.237
Female	75	2.62	.654			

The table 2 shows that there is no significant difference between male and female students regarding atmosphere within classroom. Statistically difference also exists as t value is 1.187 which is smaller than tabulated value of 1.960 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Table 3 *Teaching Methodology*

Students	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	sig.
Male	75	2.11	.855	148	.512	.609
Female	75	2.19	.989			

Table 3 shows that there is no significant difference between male and female students about atmosphere within classroom. Statistically difference also exists as t value is 0.512 which is smaller than tabulated value of 1.960 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Table 4 *Sense of Belonging*

Students	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	sig.
Male	75	2.24	.695	148	.742	.459
Female	75	2.84	.574			

Table 4 shows that there is no significant difference between male and female students about sense of belongingness. Statistically

difference also exists as t value is   0.742 which is smaller than tabulated value of 1.960 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Table 5 *Activities in classroom*

Students	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	sig.
Male	75	2.62	.436	148	3.605	.000
Female	75	2.84	.364			

Table 5 shows that there is significant difference between male and female students about activities of the classroom. Statistically difference also exists as t value is   3.605 which is greater than tabulated value of 1.960 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Table 6 *Communication*

Teachers	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	sig.
Male	75	2.63	.562	148	.714	.478
Female	75	2.73	.449			

Table 6 shows that there is significant difference between male and female students about general communication. Statistically difference also exists as t value is   0.714 which is greater than tabulated value of .478 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Table -7 Classroom Activities

Teachers	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	sig.
Male	25	2.39	.481	48	1.192	.239
Female	25	2.57	.603			

Table 7 shows that there is no significant difference between male and female students about sense of belongingness. Statistically difference also exists as t value is   1.192 which is smaller than tabulated value of 2.00 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Table -8   Sense of Belonging

Teachers	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	sig.
Male	25	2.82	.686	48	.042	.966
Female	25	2.81	.645			

Table 8 shows that there is significant difference between male and female students about general communication. Statistically

difference also exists as t value is 0.042 which is lesser than tabulated value of 2.00 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Table -9   Environment

Teachers	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	sig.
Male	25	2.64	.725	48	.476	.636
Female	25	2.73	.550			

Table 9 shows that there is no significant difference between male and female students about sense of belongingness. Statistically difference also exists as t value is 0.476 which is smaller than tabulated value of 2.000 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Table -10   Teaching Methodology

Teachers	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	sig.
Male	25	2.48	1.094	48	.322	.749
Female	25	2.38	1.101			

Table 10 shows that there is no significant difference between male and female students about sense of belongingness. Statistically difference also exists as t value is 0.322 which is smaller than tabulated value of 2.000 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Table 11   Difference between male and female teachers

Teachers	N	Mean	SD	Df	t-value	sig.
Male	25	2.61	.452	48	.747	.460
Female	25	2.69	.243			

Table 11 shows that there is significant difference between male and female students about activities of the classroom. Statistically difference also exists as t value is 0.747 which is greater than tabulated value of 2.000 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Table 12 Difference between male and female students

Students	N	Mean	SD	Df	t-value	sig.
Male	75	2.32	.327	148	2.333	.021
Female	75	2.46	.376			

Table 12 shows that there is significant difference between male and female students about activities of the classroom. Statistically

difference also exists as t value 2.333 which is greater than tabulated value of 2.000 at the confidence level of 0.05.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The study concluded that the most important pattern of student-teacher interaction is talking to each other. Students feel discouraged and embarrassed when their mistakes are not amended in proper way. Arrangement of extracurricular activities under the supervision of teacher enhances the interaction. The level of student-teacher interaction becomes very low when students do not have freedom of expression in the classroom. The study revealed that the non-explanatory method of teaching exploits level the student-teacher interaction. Involvement of students in classroom activities (curricular and co-curricular) raises the level of interaction. Use of old and traditional methods is effecting the student-teacher interaction.

The study found that the calling or greeting students with their names enhances the level of student-teacher interaction. Students want to be greeted with their names, some freedom in their opinion and freedom in the selection of their subjects. Communication and discussion based learning in classroom increase the interaction and enhance the standard of education. Male and female teachers perceived student teacher interaction in the same way as there was no significant difference in their opinions but male students and female students had significant difference on student teacher interaction in the classroom.

It was recommended that teachers should use new techniques and methodologies of teaching (activity based learning, roll playing, discussion method, use of audio-visual aids etc) for developing interest of students in their studies. Workshops for teachers should be arranged in which they would be trained psychologically, how to behave with students and which behavior they should adopt to have a proper interaction with their students. Number of students in classroom should

be reduced by dividing them into groups or sections. Teaching methods should be adopted as per student's choice or subject's demand which help in clearing the concepts of subject and teaching learning would become more effective. Calling students by their names there is encouraged to enhance level of interaction in the classroom.

References

Battistich, V., Schaps, E., & Wilson, N. (2004). Effects of an elementary school intervention on students' "connectedness" to school and social adjustment during middle school. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 24*(3), 243-262.

Holden, C. (1993). Giving girls a chance; patterns of talk in co-operative group work gender and education. *Gender and Education, 5,* 179–189

Hopf, D. & Hatzichristou, C. (1999). Teacher gender-related influence in Greek schools. *British Journal of Educational Psychology. 69,* 1-19

Hughes, J., & Kwok, O. (2007). Influence of student-teacher and parent-teacher relationships on lower achieving readers' engagement and achievement in the primary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(1), 39-51.

Moayeri, M. (2010). *Classroom uses of social network sited; traditional practices or new literacies. Digital culture and Education, 2*(1), 25-43

Murray, C. (2002) *Supportive Teacher-student relationship: promoting the social and emotionally healthy of early adolescents with high incidence disabilities. Childhood Education, 78*, 285-290

Nunn, C.E. (1996). Discussion in the college classroom: Triangulating observational and survey results. *Journal of Higher Education. 67*(3), 243-66

Pianta, R. C. (1999). *Enhancing Relationship Between children and Teacher*. Washington, D.C American Psychology Association.

Verda, J. Retrum, J.H & Kuenzi, K. (2010). The influence of teaching methodology on student social interaction. *Journal of Public Affairs Education. 18*(4), 633–660