7

Golden Reseach Thought

Volume - 6 | Issue - 2 | August - 2016

International Recognition Multidisciplinary Research Journal

4.6052(UIF) 2231-5063

INFLUENCE OF TEACHER STUDENT RELATIONSHIP ON STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AMONG THE B.ED. STUDENTS

Sreelatha, K.

Dr. Sreelatha, K.

Assistant Professor in Education, Mahathma College of Education, Nileshwar, Kasaragod, Kerala.

ABSTRACT:-This paper is an attempt to study the influence of "Teacher Student Relationship" on "Student Engagement" among the student teachers in the B.Ed. institutions. The findings show that the Student Engagement is significantly influenced by Teacher Student Relationship. The Teacher Student Rel.....

Editor - in - Chief - Dr. T. N. SHINDE

ISSN: 2231-5063 Impact Factor : 4.6052(UIF) Volume - 6 | Issue - 2 | August - 2016

GRT Golden Research Thoughts

INFLUENCE OF TEACHER STUDENT RELATIONSHIP ON STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AMONG THE B.ED. STUDENTS

Dr. Sreelatha, K.[1] and Dr. Amruth G. Kumar[2]
[1]Assistant Professor in Education, Mahathma College of Education, Nileshwar, Kasaragod, Kerala.
[2]Associate Professor, Department of Education, Central University of Kerala, Kasaragod, Kerala.

ABSTRACT

This paper is an attempt to study the influence of "Teacher Student Relationship" on "Student Engagement" among the student teachers in the B.Ed. institutions. The findings show that the Student Engagement is significantly influenced by Teacher Student Relationship. The Teacher Student Relationship is able to differentiate students belonging to high, average and low student engagement even after equating the groups by controlling the factors such as Gender, Marital status, Age and Type of management of the Institution.

KEYWORDS : *Student Engagement, Teacher Student Relationship, B.Ed. Students.*

INTRODUCTION

According to HEFCE (2008), "Student Engagement is the process whereby institutions and sector bodies make deliberate attempts to involve and empower students in the process of shaping the learning experience". 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 Teacher Student Relationship. According to Painta and Steinberg (1992) "the teacher's mental representation of their own relationships with student is capable of predicting students" academic performance and adjustment in school". Teachers are responsible for bringing this secure base in the class room. Secure base denotes the sensitiveness, accessibility and responsibility of the

teacher in providing anxiety free social and cognitive learning in the classroom. Teachers bring to the classroom behavioral patterns. This behavioral pattern should reflect their feelings and expectations through their interactions with the students.

This study is dealt with the influence of Teacher Student Relationship on Student Engagement based on selected subsamples such as gender, marital status, age group and type of management of the institution.

OBJECTIVES

• To study the Teacher Student Relationship on the Student Engagement of the student teachers pursuing B.Ed. program.

HYPOTHESES

1. Within an unselected group of student teachers there will be significant difference in mean scores of High, Average and Low Student Engagement based on Teacher Student Relationship.
2. Within an unselected group of student teachers based on the Teacher Student Relationship.
• The mean score of High Student Engagement will be significantly greater than the mean score of Average Student Engagement;
• The mean score of High Student Engagement will be significantly greater than the mean score of Low student engagement;
• The mean score of Average student engagement will be significantly greater than the mean score of Low Student Engagement.
3.Within three equated groups drawn from three levels of Student Engagement based on the Teacher Student Relationship.
•The mean score of High Student Engagement will be significantly greater than mean score of Average Student Engagement;
•The mean score of High Student Engagement will be significantly greater than mean score of Low Student Engagement;
•The mean score of Average Student Engagement will be significantly greater than mean score of Low student engagement.

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 'Teacher Student Relationship 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 Teacher Student Relationship scale, it was found that the reliability value of Cronbach's Alpha was 0.912 and that of Guttman Split-Half Coefficient was 0.917. There were 36 items in Teacher Student Relationship Scale.

The sample of the study was 1601 students pursuing B.Ed. course which gave due

representation to factors such as Gender, Marital status, Age and Type of management of the institution. It is quite plausible that their representative nature will be affected by grouping into high, average and low groups. There are possibilities for the students to accumulate more in high group from the government colleges than from the private colleges. There are chances for the independent variables to be affected by the over or under representation of these factors. This over or under representation of factors may lead to the impairment of the results obtained from the test of significance of means for the unselected group of sample. So it was decided to equate the group by controlling Gender, Marital status, Age and Type of Management of the institution.

The method used to draw the equated group is given below.

All the subsamples had adequate number of representatives. For equating the group it was decided to draw subjects with similar characteristics in all the aspects for the study. In this study females those who are married, belonging to the age limit of 20-25, studying in the private institutions are selected from high group. Sample with same description was selected from average and low groups. The above groups were selected because they represented maximum numbers of subjects compared to their counterparts in respective groups.

This method yielded 44 cases in the high group, 205 in average group and 41 in low group. To make all the group equated 3 cases from the high group and 164 from the average group were eliminated randomly. This technique yielded 41 students for Teacher Student Relationship. Mean and standard deviation was calculated for Teacher Student Relationship at three levels. Correlation between the scores of the compared groups was required for the application of the test of significance for dependent groups. So the correlation between each scores were calculated for each pair and applied for the test. Test of significance between means of large dependent samples was applied to analyze the data obtained for the equated groups.

Analysis

Levene's test was undertaken to see the equality of variance. Result of the Levene's test is given below.

Table 1: Result of Levene test for Student Engagement of B.Ed. students with different levels of Teacher Student Relationship

Variable	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Teacher Student Relationship	2.764	2	1598	0.063

The Levene's Statistic for Teacher Student Relationship was 2.764 which have a significance value as 0.063. This value is not significant at 0.05 level and so the variance are equal and this result indicates that the assumption of homogeneity is satisfied.

As the data fulfills the above said criteria, ANOVA and Independent sample t-test were done for the sample. It was done with the corresponding scores of the dependent variable for the high, average and the low groups of Teacher Student Relationship. The results are shown in below tables with interpretations.

Table 2: Results of ANOVA for Teacher Student Relationship

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Teacher Student Relationship	Between groups	83657.828	2	41828.914	95.661	.001
	Within groups	698744.688	1598	437.262		
	Total	782402.516	1600			

From Table-2, it can be seen that for Teacher Student Relationship, the mean square value of between groups is 41828.914 and that of the within group is 437.262. The F value is 95.661, which is significant (P<0.001). It means that the high, average and low group of Teacher Student Relationship has a significant influence on the Student Engagement. Or it can be said that the difference in the means of between groups and within groups based on the Teacher Student Relationship on student engagement is significant. It means that the Teacher Student Relationship can differentiate the total group into students with high engagement, average engagement and low engagement. Thus the manipulation of this variable can make a low engaged student into an average engaged student or an average engaged student to a high engaged student.

The results of ANOVA will express whether mean difference exists among the groups. But it will not express which group or groups cause the difference. By doing mean difference test the group or groups which produces this difference can be identified. So the test of significance of difference between means for different levels of student engagement such as high, average and low were applied separately for each pair. The one- tailed test of significance for difference between means of large independent sample is applied here. The results are given below for each pair.

Table 3: Test of Significance of Difference between Mean Scores of Groups with High and Average Student Engagement (Unselected Group)

Independent Variables	Groups						Critical Ratio	P-value
	High			Average				
	N	μ	σ	N	μ	σ		
Teacher Student Relationship	291	232.15	21.203	1109	218.45	20.366	10.122*	.001

*Significant at 0.05 level.

It can be seen from Table-3, that the mean of high group is 232.15 with a standard deviation of 21.203 and the mean of average group is 218.45 with a standard deviation of 20.366. The t value of this group is 10.122 which is significant (P<0.001). It shows that this group of Teacher Student Relationship has a significant influence on the student engagement.

Table 4: Test of Significance of Difference between Mean Scores of Groups with High and Average Student Engagement (Equated Group)

Independent Variables	Groups						'r'	Critical Ratio	P-value
	High			Average					
	N	μ	σ	N	μ	σ			
Teacher Student Relationship	41	237.73	21.160	41	208.22	22.668	0.292	7.240*	.001

*Significant at 0.05 level

Table-4 shows that, the mean of the High group is 237.73 and its standard deviation is 21.160. The mean of Average group is 208.22 with the standard deviation of 22.668. The correlation value is 0.292. The value of t- is 7.240 which is significant (P<0.001). It means that the influence of this group teacher on the Teacher Student Relationship on the Student Engagement is significant.

Table 5: Test of Significance of Difference between Mean Scores of Groups with High And Low Student Engagement (Unselected Group)

Independent Variables	Groups						Critical Ratio	P-value
	High			Low				
	N	μ	σ	N	μ	σ		
Teacher Student Relationship	291	232.15	21.203	201	206.13	23.323	12.838*	.001

*Significant at 0.05 level

It can be seen from Table-5, for Teacher Student Relationship, the mean and standard deviation of high group is 232.15 and 21.203 respectively. For low group it is 206.13 and 23.323 respectively. The t value for this group is 12.838 which is significant (P<0.001). This shows that this group of Teacher Student Relationship has a significant influence on the Student Engagement.

Table 6: Test of Significance of Difference between Mean Scores of Groups with High And Low Student Engagement (Equated Group)

Independent Variables	Groups						'r'	Critical Ratio	P-value
	High			Low					
	N	μ	σ	N	μ	σ			
Teacher Student Relationship	41	237.73	21.160	41	213.61	25.876	0.973	21.438*	.001

*Significant at 0.05 level

From Table-6 it can be observed, for Teacher Student Relationship, the high group has a mean of 237.73 and a standard deviation of 21.160. The low group has a mean of 213.61 and standard deviation of 25.876 It has a correlation value of 0.973. Its t value is 21.438 and is significant (P<0.001). This shows that this group based on the Teacher Student Relationship has a significant influence on the Student Engagement.

Table 7: Test of Significance of Difference between Mean Scores of Groups with Average and Low Student Engagement (Unselected Group)

Independent Variables	Groups						Critical Ratio	P-value
	Average			Low				
	N	μ	σ	N	μ	σ		
Teacher Student Relationship	1109	218.45	20.366	201	206.13	23.323	7.018*	.001

*Significant at 0.05 level

Table-7 says for Teacher Student Relationship, the Average group has a mean of 218.45 and its standard deviation is 20.366. The low group has its mean as 206.13 with a standard deviation of 23.323 This group has its t value as 7.018 which is significant (P<0.001). This also shows that there is significant influence on the Student Engagement by this group of Teacher Student Relationship.

e 8: Test of Significance of Difference between Mean Scores of Groups with Average and Low Student Engagement (Equated Group)

Independent Variables	Groups						'r'	Critical Ratio	P. value
	Average			Low					
	N	μ	σ	N	μ	σ			
Teacher Student Relationship	41	208.22	22.668	41	213.61	25.876	0.242	-1.150*	.257

*Significant at 0.05 level

From Table-8 it can be seen that, for Teacher Student Relationship, the mean of Average group is .22 with a standard deviation of 22.668. The mean and standard deviation of low group is 213.61 25.876 respectively. The correlation value is 0.242. The t value for this is (-1.150) which is significant).257). The significant level shows that the influence of this group on teacher student relationship is - significant.

DINGS

All the p-values from table 3 to 7 are significant at 0.05 level. It means that, the Teacher Student ationship is able to differentiate students belonging to high and average student engagement even r equating the groups by controlling the factors such as Gender, Marital status, Age and Type of nagement of the Institution. All the means in the high group are higher than the means in the rage group for both in unselected groups as well as in equated groups. All the means in the high up are higher than the means in the low group for both in unselected groups as well as in equated ups. It means that students with high better Teacher Student Relationship are engaged much in the d. course than the students those who are in an average and low circumstance regarding Teacher dent Relationship. Studies of Ladd et al (1999), Ryan & Patrick (2001), Marks (2000), Farrell (1990), e (1991), Wehlage et al (1989), Fraser and Fisher (1982), Moos (1979), Feldlaufer, Midgley&Eccles 88), Midgley, Feldlaufer&Eccles (1989), Stipek (2002), Turner, Meyer, Cox, Logan, Dicintio& Thomas 98), Guthrie Wigfield (2000), Roeser,Midgley&Urdan (1996), Connel& Wellborn (1991), Skinner & mont (1993) conducted studies on the Teacher Student Relationship and the Student Engagement ows that stronger the Teacher Student Relationship, higher will be the Student Engagement. The esent study corroborates the literature.

In Table-8, the p value is greater than 0.05 it means that this variable is not able to differentiate e students belonging to average and low student engagement after equating the group. It is notable t this variable was able to differentiate the groups into average and low when the test was done in an selected group. This reveals the fact that some of the factors such as Gender or Marital status or Age Type of the management are influencing the mean difference. And also the mean of the lower group s greater than the mean of the average group and so the t value is in negative, which confirms that e mean difference is influenced by some other factors involved as subsamples. Exploration for ating the exact factors and its magnitude of influence is not within the interest of this study. So that empt is not carried out in this research. It would be desirable to carry out such studies in future.

CONCLUSION

The role of teacher student relationship on the engagement of students in the learning proces is an unquestionable aspect from the ancient period itself. There is a belief in Indian system that the teacher student relationship must be a boundary- less relationship as that of mother- child relationship. If the teacher shows a little interest in the personal as well as academic matters of the students it will be an add-on for their high involvement in the course. As pragmatic philosophers say, teacher should be a friend, philosopher and guide to a student. The academic freedom that the teacher gives to a student, the intimacy that the teacher shows towards the students will encourage even a weak student to perform well in their studies and through that more engaged in their course. On the other hand if the teacher is so rigid, non- flexible and non -approachable person then even a capable student will tend to show disengagement in the course and even will lose interest in the subjects taught by that teacher itself. With regards to B.Ed. program, a student may be able to acquire content knowledge from the textbook without even the support of a teacher but cannot be molded as a good teacher without the support from a good quality teacher. The present study also supports these truths.

REFERENCES

1.Coates, H. (2005) The Value of Student Engagement for Higher Education Quality Assurance. Quality in Higher Education. 11 (1), pp. 25–36

2.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.

3.Farrell, E. (1990). Hanging in and dropping out: Voices of at-risk students. New York: Teachers College Press.

4.Feldlaufer, H., Midgley, C., & Eccles, J. S. (1988). Student, teacher, and observer perceptions of the classroom environment before and after the transition to junior high school. Journal of EarlyAdolescence, 8, 133-156.59–109.

5.Fine, M. (1991). Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban high school. Albany: State University of New York Press.

6.Fraser, B. J., & Fisher, D. L. (1982). Predicting students' outcomes from their perceptions of classroom psychosocial environment. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 498-518.

7.Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), Handbook ofreading research (Vol. 3, pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

8.HEFCE (2008) Tender for a Study into Student Engagement. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council for England.

9.Ladd, G. W., Birch, S. H., & Buhs, E. S. (1999). Children's social and scholastic lives in kindergarten: Related spheres of influence. Child Development, 70, 1373-1400.

10.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.

11.Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. S. (1989). Student teacher relations and attitudes toward mathematics before and after the transition to junior high school. Child Development, 60, 981-992.

12.Moos, R. H. (1979). Evaluating educational environments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

13.Pianta, R. C., & Steinberg, M. (1992). Teacher–child relationships and the process of adjusting to school. In R. C. Pianta (Ed.), Beyond the Parent: The role of other adults in children's lives: New directions for child development (pp. 61–80). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

14.Roeser, R., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. C. (1996). Perception of the school environmentand early

adolescents' psychological and behavioral functioning in school: The mediating role of goals and belonging. Journal of Educational Psychology, 88, 408-422.

15. Ryan, A. M., & Patrick, H. (2001). The classroom social environment and changes in adolescents' motivation and engagement during middle school. American Educational Research Journal, 28, 437-460.

16. Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. Journal of Educational Psychology, 85 , 571–581.

17. Stipek, D. (2002). Good instruction is motivating. In A. Wigfield & J. Eccles (Eds.),\Development of achievement motivation. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

18. Turner, J. C., Meyer, D. K., Cox, K. E., Logan, C., DiCintio, M., & Thomas, C. T. (1998). Creating contexts for involvement in mathematics. Journal of Educational Psychology, 90, 730-745

19. Wehlage, G. G., Rutter, R. A., Smith, G. A., Lesko, N. L., & Fernandez, R. R. (1989). Reducing the risk: Schools as communities of support. Philadelphia: Farmer Press.