

Interpersonal relations of teachers in relation to their teaching subjects essay ...

[Psychology](#), [Behaviorism](#)



School is an institution created by society for the transmission of culture and intellectual heritage to the oncoming generations and it is entrusted with the responsibility of “shaping the kind person” (Rubin 1973) needed for the maintenance and progress of the society. Therefore it becomes a prerequisite to understand the various processes undergoing in its own system. The present education system is structured in a hierarchical manner into groups called grades and classes, where the individuals called the teachers perform the activity of cultural transmission. Teacher is the backbone of the entire process of education and is responsible for the integrated growth of the child. It is essential that the teacher’s philosophy of life should be in perfect consonance with the philosophy on which education system is based. Teacher characteristics like their age, sex, teaching experience, personality make up, interpersonal relationship with their family, colleagues, Head Master (HM), students and their parents are of importance. Teacher characteristics have significance not only for parents and school administration but also for Social Planners, Policy Makers, Teacher Educators and Academicians. Major systematic research on teacher characteristics began in United States during 1950’s, though the research conducted was not non theoretical and fragmented, the findings consistently revealed that good teacher possess positive personality characteristics and interpersonal skills. A Research study on the characteristics of teachers by Ryans 1960, not only assessed teacher personality characteristics but also broadened the way we think about the teaching learning process, by focusing on the observable behavior of teachers in the class room. Ryans also raised the

question of which categories of behavior were associated with the most effective teaching.

Questions related with the quality of teacher efficiency and teaching process instantly come forth and demand attention. Improvement in the quality of teaching process could be attempted through analyzing the interaction, which goes on between the teachers and their students. It is found that the teachers behave in their class room in relation to their own characteristics, of their students and the subject matter is being taught. From this one can assume that the teacher's behavior is determined by his personality characteristics and interpersonal relations with in the educational system. In the present study the interpersonal relationship(I. P. R.) of the teacher with their family, colleagues, HM, students and their parents are taken into consideration. **PROBLEM OF THE STUDY:**

The problems posed by the study are:

1. To establish relationships between the dimensions of teacher interpersonal relations.
2. To test the teacher interpersonal relations in relation to their teaching subjects. To answer the above, the researcher adopted suitable tool to measure the interpersonal relationships of teachers.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

1. To adopt suitable tool to measure interpersonal relations of teachers.
2. To find out the relationship between different dimensions of interpersonal relations of teachers.
3. To find out the significant difference between

different demographic variables in respect of interpersonal relations of teachers. HYPOTHESIS:

In the present study the investigator has proposed the following hypothesis for testing in the form of null hypothesis. (Agarwal 1990). 1. There is no significant difference between the teachers with their teaching subject in respect of interpersonal relations and its dimensions. SUBSIDIARY

HYPOTHESIS:

1. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Biology and teachers teaching Mathematics in respect of interpersonal relations. 2. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Biology and teachers teaching Physics in respect of interpersonal relations. 3. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Biology and teachers teaching Social Studies in respect of interpersonal relations. 4. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Biology and teachers teaching Languages in respect of interpersonal relations. 5. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Mathematics and teachers teaching Physics in respect of interpersonal relations. 6. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Mathematics and teachers teaching Social Studies in respect of interpersonal relations. 7. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Mathematics and teachers teaching Languages in respect of interpersonal relations. 8. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Physics and teachers teaching Social Studies in respect of interpersonal relations. 9. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Physics and teachers

teaching Languages in respect of interpersonal relations. 10. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Social Studies and teachers teaching Languages in respect of interpersonal relations. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

1. This study is limited only to teachers of different Secondary Schools in East and West Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh.
2. Teachers who are teaching the school subjects are included in this sample.
3. To measure the interpersonal relations of teachers, teachers self rating scale is used.

PROCEDURE:

1. In order to test the hypothesis the investigator planned and executed the following procedure.
2. Adopted a standardized tool to measure interpersonal relations which are developed by Dr. K. Ganeshwara Rao.
3. Used appropriate statistical methods to find out " r' and " t" values.

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS INVENTORY:

In the present study the interpersonal relations inventory, which was developed and standardized by Dr. K. Ganeshwara Rao., was considered to measure the interpersonal relations of teachers. Since it is more suitable and appropriate, it was tried out successfully on the same population. The interpersonal relations inventory consists of 50 items belonging to 5 dimensions namely Family, Student, Colleagues, Head Master and Parents. Each dimension consists of 10 items each to measure interpersonal relations . i. e., 20% of weightage is given to each dimension. COLLECTION

OF DATA AND SCORING:

The tool was administered on 200 subject teachers of different secondary schools in East and West Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh. The responses are scored according to the key as suggested in likert's 5 point scale. For the entire positive items it scores from 5 to 1.

SAMPLING:

The sample selected for the present study consists of 200 subject teachers of different Secondary Schools working in Ravulapalem, Ramachandrapuram, Malkipuram, Bhimavaram, Rajahmundry, Tadepalligudem of East and West Godavari districts of Andhra Pradesh. Random sampling technique is followed to draw the sample.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:

Any scientific procedural research mainly depends on the statistical treatment and its interpretation. So in the present study the results are analyzed and interpreted in the following ways. The major hypothesis states that there is no significant difference between subject teachers in respect to interpersonal relations of teachers. For the extensive presentation of the data the researcher framed subsidiary hypothesis along with the dimensions of I. P. R.'s of teachers. Mean and S. D. of all the distributions are calculated. 't' values are calculated for testing the subsidiary hypothesis.

First Subsidiary Hypotheses analysis details are shown in the Table -1. Table -1: Showing significance of difference of means between teachers, teaching Biology and Mathematics in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R.

Subjects	Biology	Mathematics	Result	Dimensions	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	' t' Value		
Family	41.09	5.04	42.70	4.44	1.56	Students	40.60	4.63	40.15	5.22	0.40
Colleagues	40.30	4.72	39.72	5.64	0.50	H. M.	37.76	5.23	38.03	6.94	0.19
Parents	37.78	5.32	37.70	5.99	0.07	Total	197.55	15.97	198.30	19.88	0.18

It is found that there is no significant difference in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

Second Subsidiary Hypotheses details are shown in the Table-2. Table -2:

Showing significance of difference of means between teachers, teaching Biology and Physics in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. | Subjects |

Subjects	Biology	Physics	Result	Dimensions	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	' t' Value		
Family	41.09	5.03	37.55	4.32	2.22	Students	40.60	4.64	40.33	4.00	0.18
Colleagues	40.30	4.72	39.89	4.60	0.50	H. M.	37.76	5.23	39.33	6.63	0.67
Parents	37.78	5.32	36.89	4.43	0.54	Total	197.55	15.97	194.00	18.75	0.54

From the above table values, it is found that there is no significant difference between Biology Teachers and Physics in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. of teachers. Hence the hypothesis is partially accepted

Third Subsidiary Hypotheses details are shown in the Table -3. Table -3:

Showing significance of difference of means between teachers, teaching Biology and Social Studies in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. |

Subjects	Biology	Social Studies	Result	Dimensions	Mean	S. D.	Mean
----------	---------	----------------	--------	------------	------	-------	------

S. D.	' t' Value	Family	41. 09	5. 03	41. 19	4. 81	0. 11	Students
40. 60	4. 64	41. 13	3. 99	0. 71	Colleagues	40. 30	4. 71	40. 46
4. 82	0. 19	H. M.	37. 76	5. 23	38. 26	6. 79	0. 50	Parents
37. 78	5. 32	38. 47	4. 89	0. 79	Total	197. 545	15. 97	199. 51
16. 98	0. 71							

Form the above table value it is found that there is no significant difference between Biology Teachers and Social studies teachers, in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. of teachers. Hence the hypothesis is accepted

Fourth Subsidiary Hypotheses details are shown in the Table -4. Table-4:

Showing significance of difference of means between teachers teaching

Biology and Language in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. | Subjects |

Biology	Language	Result	Dimensions	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	' t' Value
Family	41. 09	5. 03	36. 00	3. 74	2. 25	Students	40. 60	4. 63
Colleagues	40. 30	4. 71	35. 00	2. 16	3. 79	H. M.	37. 76	5. 23
Parents	37. 78	5. 32	38. 33	0. 47	0. 72	Total	197. 54	15. 97

From the above table values, it is found that there is significant difference between Biology Teachers and Language Teachers in respect of only family, Colleagues and HM dimensions of I. P. R of teachers and there is significant difference in respect of students and parent dimensions. Hence the hypothesis is partially rejected

Fifth Subsidiary Hypotheses details are shown in the Table-5. Table-5:

Showing significance of difference of means between teachers, teaching

Mathematics and Physics in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. | Subjects
 | Mathematics | Physics | Result | | Dimensions | Mean | S. D. | Mean | S. D. | '
 t' Value | | Family | 42. 69 | 4. 44 | 37. 55 | 4. 32 | 3. 14 | | Students | 40. 15 |
 5. 22 | 40. 33 | 4. 00 | 0. 11 | | Colleagues | 39. 73 | 5. 64 | 39. 88 | 4. 60 | 0.
 08 | | H. M. | 38. 03 | 6. 94 | 39. 33 | 6. 63 | 0. 51 | | Parents | 37. 69 | 5. 99 |
 36. 88 | 4. 43 | 0. 44 | | Total | 198. 30 | 19. 87 | 194. 00
 | 18. 75 | 0. 60 |

From the above table values it is found that there is no significant difference between Mathematics teachers and Physics teachers in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R of teachers except family dimension, where there is a significant difference. Hence the hypothesis is partially accepted.

Sixth Subsidiary Hypotheses details are shown in the Table-6. Table -6:

Showing significance of difference of means between teachers, teaching Mathematics and Social Studies in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. |
 Subjects | Mathematics | Social Studies | Result | | Dimensions | Mean | S. D. |
 Mean | S. D. | ' t' Value | | Family | 42. 69 | 4. 44 | 41. 19 | 4. 81 | 1. 65 | |
 Students | 40. 15 | 5. 22 | 41. 13 | 3. 99 | 0. 98 | | Colleagues | 39. 72 | 5. 64 |
 40. 46 | 4. 82 | 0. 67 | | H. M. | 38. 03 | 6. 94 | 38. 26 | 6. 79 | 0. 16 | | Parents
 | 37. 69 | 5. 99 | 38. 47 | 4. 90 | 0. 67 | | Total | 198. 30 | 19. 88 | 199. 51 | 16.
 98 | 0. 31 |

Form the above table values it is found that there is significant difference between Mathematics teachers and social studies teachers in respect of all

the dimensions of all the dimensions of I. P. R of teachers. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

Seventh Subsidiary Hypotheses details are shown in the Table -7. Table -7:

Showing significance of difference of means between teachers, teaching

Mathematics and Language in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. |

Subjects | Mathematics | Language | Result | | Dimensions | Mean | S. D. |

Mean | S. D. | ' t' Value | | Family | 42. 69 | 4. 44 | 36. 38 | 3. 74 | 2. 91 | |

Students | 40. 15 | 5. 22 | 38. 00 | 4. 32 | 0. 81 | | Colleagues | 39. 73 | 5. 65 |

35. 00 | 2. 16 | 2. 97 | | H. M. | 38. 03 | 6. 94 | 31. 00 | 2. 16 | 4. 04 | | Parents

| 37. 69 | 5. 99 | 38. 33 | 0. 47 | 0. 59 | | Total | 198. 30 | 19. 88 | 178. 33 | 7.

58 | 3. 58 |

Form the above table values it is found that there is significant difference between Mathematics teachers and Language teachers in respect of family, colleagues and HM dimensions of I. P. R of teachers. Hence the hypothesis is partially rejected

Eighth Subsidiary Hypotheses details are shown in the Table-8. Table -8:

Showing significance of difference of means between teachers, teaching

Physics and Social Studies in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. |

Subjects | Physics | Social Studies | Result | | Dimensions | Mean | S. D. |

Mean | S. D. | ' t' Value | | Family | 37. 55 | 4. 32 | 41. 19 | 4. 81 | 2. 39 | |

Students | 40. 33 | 4. 00 | 41. 13 | 3. 99 | 0. 57 | | Colleagues | 39. 88 | 4. 60 |

40. 46 | 4. 82 | 0. 35 | | H. M. | 39. 33 | 6. 63 | 38. 26 | 6. 79 | 0. 46 | | Parents

| 36. 89 | 4. 43 | 38. 47 | 4. 89 | 0. 01 | | Total | 194. 00 | 18. 75 | 199. 51 | 16. 98 | 0. 85 |

From the above table values it is found that there is not significant difference between Physics teachers and Social studies teachers, in respect of students, colleagues, HM and parent dements of I. P. R of teachers. But significant difference is observed in respect of only family dimension. Hence the hypothesis is partially accepted.

Ninth Subsidiary Hypotheses details are shown in the Table -9. Table -9: Showing significance of difference of means between teachers, teaching Physics and Language in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. | Subjects | Physics | Language | Result | | Dimensions | Mean | S. D. | Mean | S. D. | ' t ' Value | | Family | 37. 55 | 4. 32 | 36. 00 | 3. 74 | 0. 59 | | Students | 40. 33 | 4. 00 | 38. 00 | 4. 32 | 0. 82 | | Colleagues | 39. 88 | 4. 60 | 35. 00 | 2. 16 | 2. 47 | | H. M. | 39. 33 | 6. 63 | 31. 00 | 2. 16 | 3. 28 | | Parents | 36. 89 | 4. 43 | 38. 33 | 0. 47 | 0. 96 | | Total | 194. 00 | 18. 75 | 178. 33 | 7. 58 | 2. 05 |

From the above table values it is found that there is significant difference between Physics teachers and Language Teachers in respect of colleagues and HM dimension of I. P. R of teachers. Hence the hypothesis is partially rejected.

Tenth Subsidiary Hypotheses details are shown in the Table-10. Table -10: Showing significance of difference of means between teachers, teaching Social Studies and Language in respect of all the dimensions of I. P. R. | Subjects | Social Studies | Language | Result | | Dimensions | Mean | S. D. |

Mean	S. D.	' t' Value	Family	41. 19	4. 81	36. 00	3. 74	2. 34	
Students	41. 13	3. 99	38. 00	4. 32	1. 23	Colleagues	40. 46	4. 82	
	35. 00	2. 16	4. 08	H. M.	38. 26	6. 79	31. 00	2. 16	5. 11
Parents	38. 47	4. 90	38. 33	0. 47	0. 24	Total	199. 51	16. 98	178. 33
	58	4. 50							

From the above table values it is found that there is significant difference between Social studies teachers and Language Teachers in respect of family, colleagues and HM dimensions of I. P. R of teachers. Hence the hypothesis is partially rejected.

FINDINGS:

1. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Biology and teaching mathematics in respect of I. P. R.
2. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Biology and teaching Physics in respect of I. P. R.
3. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Biology and teaching Social Studies in respect of I. P. R.
4. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Biology and teaching Languages in respect of I. P. R.
5. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Mathematics and teaching Physics in respect of I. P. R.
6. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Mathematics and teaching Social Studies in respect of I. P. R.
7. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Mathematics and teaching Languages in respect of I. P. R.
8. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Physics and teaching social in respect of I. P. R.
9. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Physics and teaching

Languages in respect of I. P. R. 10. There is no significant difference between teachers teaching Social Studies and teaching Languages in respect of I. P. R.

11. There is no significant difference between Biology teachers and Mathematics teachers in respect of all dimensions of I. P. R. 12. There is no significant difference between Biology teachers and Physics teachers in respect of all dimensions except family dimension of I. P. R. 13. There is significant difference between Biology teachers and Social Studies teachers in respect of all dimensions of I. P. R. 14. There is no significant difference between Biology teachers and Languages teachers in respect of only family colleagues and H. M. dimensions of I. P. R. 15. There is no significant difference between Mathematics teachers and Physics teachers in respect of all dimensions of I. P. R. except family dimension where there is significant difference.

16. There is no significant difference between Mathematics teachers and Social Studies teachers in respect of all dimensions of I. P. R. 17. There is significant difference between Mathematics teachers and Languages teachers in respect of family, colleagues and H. M. dimensions of I. P. R. 18. There is no significant difference between Physics teachers and Social Studies teachers in respect of students, colleagues, and H. M. and parent dimensions of I. P. R. But a significant difference is observed in respect of only family dimension. 19. There is significant difference between Physics teachers and Languages teachers in respect of colleagues and H. M. dimensions of I. P. R. 20. There is significant difference between Social

Studies teachers and Languages teachers in respect of family, colleagues and H. M. dimensions of I. P. R. CONCLUSIONS:

In interpersonal relationships of teachers and teaching subjects of different categories of teachers, the two parameters are conceived as non-overlapping and independent yet interrelated and mutually reinforcing. The study was also concerned with the measurement of interpersonal relationships and teaching subjects of school teacher's multi component variables. Hence the present study is an attempt to understand the relationship between interpersonal relations and teaching subjects. It is understood that out of 10 combinations of teachers, teaching Biology, Mathematics, Physics, Social Studies and Languages, 6 combinations show significant difference with respect to family dimension. All the four combinations of Language teachers show the existence of difference in family colleagues and Head Master relationships.

REFERENCES:

1. Arun k. Gupta: A Study of Classroom Teaching Behaviour and Creativity, New Delhi 1980.
2. Buch R. N.: A Study of Student Teacher Relationship 1942.
3. Chander . R. (1976): Relationship of Attainments in Theory Subjects in B. Ed course with Attitude as a Teacher and Teaching Efficiency, P. HD. Ed.
4. Hyges, Marie, and others:" Teaching is interaction" The Elementary School Journal 58. May 1958.
5. Quarishi, S. M. (1972) Personality Attitudes and Class room Behaviour of Teacher. P. hD, Ed.