Journal of edagogic Researches and Renovations

NAS Publishers
Perinthamni P.O., Chelour
Malappuram Dt., Kerala, India
naspublishers@gmail.com,
www.naspublishers.com

ISSN: 2277-7881
IJMER, Volume 5, Issue 9(3), September 2016
Impact Factor: 4.527, IC Value: 5.16, ISI Value :2.286

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research®

(Humanities, Social Science, Commerce, Management, Engineering, Law, Technology and Sciences)

Monthly - International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research

Indexed & Listed at :
Ulrich's Periodicals Directory @, ProQuest.U.S.A
International Regd. &
Peer Reviewed

Editor-in-Chief
Dr.Victor Babu Koppula

Dr. K. VICTOR
M.A.,M.A.,M.Phil
Faculty of Philosophy a
Studies & Editor-in-Chi
International Journal of
Educational Research (
Sucharitha: A Journal o
Religion
Andhra University, Visa
Pin - 530 003 , Andhra

Editorial.....

You will
publication of I
many interdiscip
knowledge with
all my heart, I
profound thanks
continues to nu
associated with i

We as a t
readers and achi
improve. We ack
the publications
and comments
Editor –in-Chief
Board members
everyone.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
ISSN : 2277-7881; IMPACT FACTOR – 4.527; IC VALUE:5.16; ISI VALUE:2.286
VOLUME 5, ISSUE 9(3), SEPTEMBER 2016

A STUDY ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE BASED ON SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AMONG THE B.Ed STUDENTS

Dr. Sreelatha K
Assistant Professor in Education
Mahathma College of Education
Nileshwar , Kasaragod
Kerala, India

Dr. Amruth G Kumar
Associate Professor
Department of Education
Central University of Kerala
Kasaragod, Kerala, India

Abstract

This paper is an attempt to study the relationship between "student engagement and "Institutional climate", among the student teachers based on the subsamples, gender, Marital status, Age and Type of Management. The findings show that there exists a significant positive correlation between these two variables.

Keywords : Student Engagement, Institutional climate,, B.Ed. students, gender, marital status, age, Type of management, correlation etc.

Introduction

According to Harper and Quaye (2009), "Engagement is more than involvement or participation. It requires feelings and sense making as well as activity". This is applicable for Student Engagement also. If the students are able to involve physically, mentally and emotionally in the process of learning, then it can be said that they are 'engaged' in learning, because through this process, the learning will become meaningful. Hence, this kind of engagement is needed in all the aspect of education especially in teacher education, because of the importance of teachers in the teaching-learning process. According to Coates (2005), "The concept of student engagement is based on the

constructivist assumption that learning is influenced by how an individual participates in educationally purposeful activities. Learning is seen as a 'joint proposition', however, which also depends on institutions and staff providing students with the conditions, opportunities and expectations to become involved. However, individual learners are ultimately the agents in discussions of engagement". It is clear from this statement that 'there are other personal and environmental factors involved in the engagement by the student'.

One among these factors is Institutional Climate which influences the academic performance among the students. Findings of the Studies conducted by Desales (1978), Ekambaram (1980) and Chopra (1982) supports this argument. According to Litwin and Stringer (1968) "Climate in an institution comprises the structure, responsibility, warmth, support, reward, conflict, standards, identity, and risk existing in the institution.

This study is dealt with the relationship existing between the student engagement and Institutional Climate based on selected subsamples such as gender, marital status, age group and type of management of the institution.

Objectives

1. To test whether there exists any significant correlation between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate for the total sample
2. To test whether there exists any significant correlation between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on Gender of the B.Ed students
3. To test whether there exists any significant correlation between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on marital status of the B.Ed students

4. To test whether there exists any significant correlation between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on age group of the B.Ed students
5. To test whether there exists any significant correlation between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on type of management of Institutions of the B.Ed students

Hypotheses

1. There exists significant correlation between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate of student teachers for the total sample
2. There exists significant correlation between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on gender of the B.Ed students
3. There exists significant correlation between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on marital status of the B.Ed students
4. There exists significant correlation between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on age group of the B.Ed students
5. There exists significant correlation between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on type of management of the institutions of the B.Ed students

Methodology

The data was collected from 1601 students pursuing B.Ed. course in various colleges in Kerala State. The sub-samples selected for the study were Gender (male & female), Marital Status (married & unmarried), Age (20-25 & above 25) and Type of Management of the Institution (government supported & private). The size of the sub samples were as

follows. Male- 126 & Female-1475, Married-719 & Unmarried-882, Age between 20-25 is 1258 & above 25 years -343 and Government supported college students- 698 & Private college students-903. The data was gathered using two standardized tools. The tools used were 'Student Engagement Scale' by Sreelatha and Amuth G Kumar (2015) and' Institutional Climate scale' by Sreelatha and Amruth G Kumar (2015). Both the tools were standardized using item analysis and the reliability was established using split half method. For the Student Engagement Scale there were 58 items. It was found that the reliability value of Cronbach's Alpha was 0.850 and that of Guttman Split – Half Coefficient was 0.875 and that of Guttman Split- half coefficient was 0.903. For the Institutional Climate scale, it was found that the reliability value of Cronbach's Alpha was 0.956 and that of Guttman Split – Half Coefficient was 0.932. There were 64 items in Institutional Climate Scale. Correlations were calculated for the total sample as well as for the sub samples. The results are discussed below.

Result

Table 1

Relationship between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate for the total sample

Variable		N	R	Significance level	Confidence level		Shared variance
					Lower limit	Upper limit	
Institutional Climate	Total sample	1601	0.387*	0.001	0.345	0.427	14.7

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 1 can be interpreted as follows. The correlation value obtained between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate is 0.387 for the total sample which is found to be significant. The 0.05 confidence interval for the total sample is found to be between 0.345 and 0.427. The shared variance of Student Engagement with Institutional Climate is 14.97 for total sample.

Table 2

Relationship between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on Gender

Variable		N	R	Significance level	Confidence level		Shared variance
					Lower limit	Upper limit	
Institutional Climate	Male	126	0.299*	0.001	0.131	0.45	8.94
	Female	1475	0.399*	0.001	0.356	0.441	15.92

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 2 can be interpreted as follows. The correlation value obtained between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate for male is 0.299 and for female it is 0.399 which is found to be significant. The 0.05 confidence interval is found to be between 0.131 and 0.45 for male and 0.356 and 0.441 for female. The shared variance of Student Engagement with Institutional Climate for the subsample male is 8.94 and for female it is 15.92.

Table 3

Relationship between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on marital status

Variable		N	R	Significance level	Confidence level		Shared variance
					Lower limit	Upper limit	
Institutional Climate	Married	719	0.406*	0.001	0.344	0.465	16.48
	Unmarried	882	0.373*	0.001	0.315	0.428	13.91

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 3 can be interpreted as follows. The correlation value obtained between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate for married is 0.406 and for unmarried it is 0.373 which is found to be significant. The 0.05 confidence interval is found to be between 0.344 and 0.465 for married and 0.315 and 0.428 for unmarried. The shared variance of Student Engagement with Institutional Climate for the subsample married is 16.48 and for unmarried it is 13.91.

Table 4

Relationship between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on age group

Variable		N	R	Significance level	Confidence level		Shared variance
					Lower limit	Upper limit	
Institutional Climate	Age20-25	1258	0.396*	0.001	0.349	0.441	15.68
	Age above25	343	0.352*	0.001	0.256	0.441	12.39

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 4 can be interpreted as follows. The correlation value obtained between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate for the age group (20-25) is 0.396 and for age above 25 is 0.352 which is found to be significant. The 0.05 confidence interval is found to be between 0.349 and 0.441 for age group 20-25 and 0.256 and 0.441 for age above 25. The shared variance of Student Engagement with Institutional Climate for the age group 20-25 is 15.68 and for above 25 it is 12.39.

Table 5

Relationship between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate based on Type of Management of the Institution

Variable		N	R	Significance level	Confidence level		Shared variance
					Lower limit	Upper limit	
Institutional Climate	Govt.Supported	698	0.268*	0.001	0.198	0.335	7.18
	Private	903	0.470*	0.001	0.418	0.519	22.09

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 5 can be interpreted as follows. The correlation value obtained between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate for students belonging to Government supported institution is 0.268 and for students belonging to private institution it is 0.470 which is found to be significant. The 0.05 confidence interval is found to be between 0.198 and 0.335 for government supported institutions and 0.418 and 0.519

for private institutions. The shared variance of Student Engagement with Institutional Climate for Government supported institution is 7.18 and for private institutions it is 22.09.

Findings

All the correlation values are significant at 0.05 level and have a p value of 0.001 for the total sample as well as for the subsamples. It means that there exists a real relationship between the variables. All the values are positive. When the relationship is positive it means that an increase in one variable will result a corresponding increase in the other variable. The relationships between the variables can be verbally interpreted as moderate correlation except for the subsamples Male, Government & Government Aided. For these two subsamples the obtained correlation can be said as low correlation from its values of correlation. Hence any improvement in Institutional Climate will results in the increase in Student Engagement. The lower and upper limits of Confidence interval at 0.05 level shows that if the correlation is worked out for the same variable for the whole population, the resulting correlation will be between these intervals at 0.05 level of probability. The shared variance gives the percentage of what is measured by Institutional Climate is related to Student Engagement.

The relationship between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate is found to be significant for the total sample as well as for the sub samples based on Gender, Marital Status, Age, and Type of Management. The correlation obtained for the total sample and for all sub samples are positive and moderate. For the subsamples male and Government supported the correlation can be considered as low. The percentage of overlap is ranging from 7.18 to 22.09. From these findings it can be concluded that there exists a significant positive relationship between Student Engagement and Institutional Climate of B.Ed. Students. This finding appears to be consistent with the findings

of the earlier researches as well. The studies conducted by Connel (1990), Marks (2000), Nystrand&Gamoran (1991), Connel& Wellborn (1991), Fredricks, Blumenfeld, Friedel& Paris (2002), Moos (1979), Fraser (1991), Brophy&Everston(1976) and Doyle (1986) support the finding of the present study. The reason behind this is a well-known fact that the background setup will have direct relationship with any outcome.

Conclusion

From the above results and findings it can be concluded that the academic and non- academic climate provided in the B.Ed. institutions has a positive relationship with the Engagement of Students in their course. A good academic climate with freedom, democracy, mutual respect, sensible rules and regulations, shared responsibilities, moral and personal supports will lead a student to involve more in the course. The correlation values of the subsamples also tell the same. The Gender, Marital Status, Age and Type of Management based on the Institutional Climate are also positively correlated with Student Engagement. All the relationships are positive. It means an improvement in the Institutional Climate will improve the Engagement of B.Ed. students in their course irrespective of Gender, Marital Status, Age and Type of Management. There is an opposite way of interpretation for this result, which is the Student Engagement will decline if the Institutional Climate is poor.

References

1. Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C. M. (1976). *Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
2. Chopra, R.K.(1982). A study of the organisational climate of schools in relation to job satisfaction of Teachers and Student Achievement, Ph.D. Edu., Agrau.
3. Connell, J. P. (1990). Context, self, and action: A motivational analysis of self-system processes across the life-span. In D. Cicchetti

(Ed.), *The self in transition: Infancy to childhood* (pp. 61-97). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

4. Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-system processes. In M. Gunnar & L. A. Sroufe (Eds.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology* (Vol. 23). Chicago: University ofChicago Press.
5. Coates, H. (2005) The Value of Student Engagement for Higher Education Quality Assurance. Quality in Higher Education. 11 (1), pp. 25–36
6. Desales, M .(1978). An Investigation in to the Factors Affecting Classroom climate in relation to Pupils' Development, Ph.D. Edu., MSU.
7. Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organisation and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 392-431). New York: Macniillan.
8. Ekambaram, B. (1980). **A** study of an Experiment in Creating an Effective School Climate, Ph.D. Edu., SGU
9. Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. B., Friedel, J., & Paris, A. (2002). *Increasing engagement in urban settings. An analysis of the influence of the social and academic context on student engagement.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
10. Fraser, B. J. (1991). Two decades of classroom environment research. In B. J. Fraser and H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Educational environments: Evaluations, antecedents anconsequences.* New York: Pergamon Press.
11. Harper, S. R., and S. J. Quaye, eds.(2009). Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations. New York: Routledge
12. Litwin, G.H. and Stringer, R.A. (1968). Motivation and Organizational Climate. Harvard Business School.
13. Marks, H. M. (2000). Student engagement in instructional activity: Patterns in the elementary, middle, and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal, 37,* 153-184.
14. Moos, R. H. (1979). *Evaluating educational environments.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
15. Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (1991). Instructional discourse, student engagement, and literature achievement. *Research in the Teaching of English, 25,* 261-290.