

A Study on Government Schools' Classrooms Environment (Teacher - Student) for Learning English as a Subject in Telangana State, India

Dr. Thotapally Anjaneyulu, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D.
ICSSR – Post Doctoral Fellow

1. Introduction

In this paper a report of research explored the question in the context of government school education in English class. The aim of study is to investigate the relationship between psychosocial learning environment factors and deep learning in English classrooms. Sometimes we can't compare a society without language. Entire activity of human being depends upon the language. In learning mother tongue it is easy to explore the language, but if we think same about the second language that depends upon the instruction given in classrooms or get from environment. If we talk about Telangana state introduced English is taught as a compulsory subject from primary level to secondary level since 2015. But English language teaching and the outcome is not up to satisfaction from last few years. The students are passing their secondary education with good marks. But if we compare the marks of English subject only, they are getting only pass marks or passing with the help of grace marks in English subject. They are not able to communicate naturally even with each other. Learning includes many factors and classroom environment of learning is also one of those. It is very difficult to find out that what is the problem behind this and why the students are unable to understand the language. The present study highlights about the classroom environment for English learning in government schools in Telangana.

2. Literature Review

The research about to be reported grew out of a study of the effects of the classroom environment on deep learning. It was based on an implicit assumption that a teaching method based on a constructivist epistemology would be more likely to lead to worthwhile learning than a "transmission" teaching method. A constructivism-based approach would include student centered methods such as small-group discussion, building on prior learning, and encouraging student participation in decision-making about the curriculum content and processes. In the past researches in classroom learning environment made it possible and interesting to explore new aspects of classroom atmosphere. In a democratic classroom, students enjoy greater flexibility to interact with the teacher. They have liberty to work independently. In an autocratic environment,

students do not have choice to participate in the selection of learning activities. Work is imposed on them and teacher plays a restricted role. Research on classroom climate has focused on the proximal conditions affecting students' learning, focusing on students' and teachers' experiences of the school as a learning environment.

Bloom (1964) explored the variables pertaining to environment subscales as study habits, social pressure and reward for academic achievement. Moos (1974) developed various social climate scales for secondary school environments. These instruments attempted to get respondents' perceptions on classroom environment in a specific situation.

The student's achievement and attitudes are affected by the factors within the classroom. Their satisfaction with their learning, their classroom independence, involvement and task orientation are dependent on teacher's behaviors, instructional practices, learning setting and learning process (Zandvliet and Fraser, 2005).

3. Significance of the Study

English is known as world language because of its vast uses all over the world. The students from the rural area feel magical and mystical if they hear something in English. In Telangana state most of the students belong to the rural areas. They spend their twelve year with secondary education, but they are unable to communicate in English with others and peer-groups. Most students study English for the examination point of view only. To learn English they have to need practice. If one wants to come up in life, they must have required or acquired knowledge of English.

This study might have a great significance in the field of classroom environment. We can say that the environment of the classes is helping the students in learning or creating a problem to fulfill the aim of English learning. All the persons are involved in this whether policy maker, head masters, teacher-trainer and students in field of classroom environment learning English in government schools of Telangana State.

4. Objectives of the Study

Objectives of the study are as following:

1. To identify government school students' classroom environment for learning English.
2. To compare the environmental gender wise and location-wise if any causes in the problem of learning English.

4.1 Hypotheses

Null- the level of achievement in English of the students is medium.

5. Methodology

This research aims at studying various causes for the problems in learning a second language. Hence, this study involved data collection through survey method. The method of research opted for the research is quantitative. Both questionnaire and test will be used as research tool. Survey method will be used to collect data from the participants of this study. The nature of the study will be descriptive and correlation which aimed at looking into the relationship of classroom environment with the students. The quantitative research method and analysis will be used for investigating possible relationships, differences and associations among various variables.

5.1. Population of the Study

The population of this study comprised all the 10th grade students studying in government schools of Rangareddy, Hyderabad for urban areas, and Mahabubnagar and Nalgonda districts for rural areas of Telangana State.

5.2. Sample of the Study

The sample of the study will be 640 students from 32 schools of the four districts. Stratified random sampling technique will be used to get the sample of the study.

Among these 640 students, 320 will be urban who will further bifurcate into 160 males and 160 females. Similarly, 320 will be rural students divided into 160 males and 160 females. From each selected 16 urban and 16 rural schools were selected among these 32 of government schools. From each selected school, 20 students, 10 males and 10 females will be selected randomly with permission of the English class teacher. The sampling frame is given below in Table 1 to illustrate further details of the sample. Stratified sampling offers several advantages over simple random sampling.

Table 5.1 List of Samples collected for the Study

Location of School	Gender		Selected Schools	Total Samples {C=(A+B)}
	Male (A)	Female (B)		
Urban	160	160	16	320
Rural	160	160	16	320
Grand Total			32	640

6. Item-wise Analysis of Learning Environment of Classroom

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 19:1 January 2019

Dr. Thotapally Anjaneyulu, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D.

A Study on Government Schools' Classrooms Environment (Teacher - Student) for Learning English as a Subject in Telangana State, India

6.1 Making Friends in the Classroom

Spending time on areas that are not directly related to English language acquisition also allows students to share their experiences before they came to classes.

Table 6.1 Making Friends in the Classroom

Sl. No	Statement	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
1	I make friends among students in the classroom.	SA	241	37.8	3.92	1.193
		A	263	41.2		
		DA	36	5.6		
		UNC	100	15.4		
		N=640				

The table 6.1 reflects that 79% respondents agreed with the statement. Only 15.4% were uncertain in their responses, while 5.6% of the respondents disagreed. The mean score is 3.92; SD= 1.193.

6.2 Knowing Other Students in the Classroom

It helps very much about learning if students of the class know very well to each other. Because learning experiences built around student collaboration are not prevalent in lecture-based classes (the kind of classes that predominate in many school experiences), teacher may not have many models for designing an environment that prompts students to help each other learn.

Table 6.2 Knowing Other Students in the Classroom

Sl. No	Statement	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
2	I know other students in the classroom.	SA	178	27.8	3.64	1.256
		A	261	40.8		
		DA	147	23		
		UNC	54	8.4		
		N=640				

The table 6.2 shows that 68.6% respondents agreed with the statement. Only 8.4% were uncertain in their responses, while 23% of the respondents disagreed. The mean score is 3.64; SD is 1.256.

6.3 Students' Like Me in the Classroom

Students like and dislike of each-other also play a vital role in the learning of any subject or language. In the academic English language learning, learners are constantly in touch with

their friends and classmates. The table 5.3 showed the scale through frequencies, percentage, mean and standard deviation of the statement “Students in this class like me”.

Table 6.3 Students’ Like me in the Classroom

Sl.No	Statement	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
3	Students’ like me in the classroom.	SA	116	18.2	3.45	1.095
		A	204	31.8		
		DA	103	16.1		
		UNC	217	33.9		
		N =640				

The Table 5.3 reflects that 50% respondents agreed with the statement. Only 33.9% were uncertain in their responses, while 16.1% of the respondents disagreed. The mean score is 3.45; and SD is 1.095.

6.4. Teacher’s Interest in Problems (investigation)

For learning students are provided a lot of practice and exposure to the English language. If the teacher is interested in the problems of students, this method leads to individualization of learning, where teachers act as mentor, trainer and aspirant to facilitate learning.

Table 6.4 Teacher’s Interest in Problems (Investigation)

Sl.No	Statement	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
4	The teacher is interested in my problems (Investigation).	SA	206	32.2	3.80	1.247
		A	279	43.6		
		DA	122	19.1		
		UNC	33	5.1		
		N = 640				

The above table 6.4 reflects that 75.8% respondents agreed with the statement. Only 5.1% were uncertain in their responses, while 19.1% of the respondents disagreed. The mean score is 3.80; and SD is 1.247.

6.5 Opinions During Classroom Discussions (Involvement)

From among a variety of factors helping us reach the desirable level of cooperative and productive communication, intrapersonal variables are of much importance. Concepts such as self-confidence, self-determination, self-actualization and the like are dealt with as the most representatives of the importance of looking intra-personally.

Table 6.5 Opinions During Classroom Discussions (Involvement)

Sl. No	Statement	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
5	I give my opinions during class discussions (Involvement).	SA	161	25.1	3.43	1.398
		A	243	38		
		DA	185	28.9		
		UNC	51	8		
			N = 640			

The table 5.5 shows that 63.1% respondents agreed with the statement. Only 8% were uncertain in their responses, while 28.9% of the respondents disagreed. The mean score is 3.43; and SD= 1.398.

6.6 Teacher’s Questions for Me

Students learn by doing, making, writing, designing, creating, solving, passivity dampens students' motivation and curiosity.

Table 6.6 Teacher’s Questions for Me

Sl. No	Statement	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
6	The teacher asks me questions and I ask the teacher questions	SA	245	38.3	3.87	1.266
		A	241	37.6		
		DA	117	18.3		
		UNC	37	5.8		
			N = 640			

The above table 6.6 reveals that 75.9% respondents agreed with the statement. Only 5.8% were uncertain in their responses, while 18.3% of the respondents disagreed. The mean score is 3.87; and SD= 1.266.

6.7 Studying with Diagrams and Graphs

Start assigned readings by first reviewing any visual aids provided. This will lay the foundation for understanding the meet of students reading.

Table 6.7 Explaining Statements with Diagrams and Graphs

Sl. No	Statement	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
7	I explain the meaning of statements with diagrams and	SA	225	35.2	3.77	1.316
		A	241	37.7		
		DA	140	21.8		

	graphs.	UNC	34	5.3		
			640			

The above table 6.7 shows that 72.9% respondents agreed with the statement. Only 5.3% were uncertain in their responses, while 21.8% of the respondents disagreed. The mean score is 3.77; and SD= 1.316.

6.8 Learning from Others (Equity)

Some students equated communication skills with speaking or the four language skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking. Some students defined them as speaking and body language.

Table 6.8 Learning from others (Equity)

Sl. No	Statement	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
8	I learn from other students in classroom (Equity).	SA	160	25	3.61	1.333
		A	294	46		
		DA	136	21.3		
		UNC	50	7.7		
			N = 640			

The above table 6.8 reveals numerical values that 71% respondents agreed with the statement. Only 7.7% were uncertain in their responses, while 21.3% of the respondents disagreed. The mean score is 3.61; and SD= 1.333.

6.9 Working Together to Achieve Class Goals

Students will have mastered goal setting if they can identify a goal that will maintain or improve a learning related activity. The goal must be specific, measurable, attainable and realistic and completed in the time provided.

Table 6.9 Working Together to Achieve Class goals

Sl. No	Statement	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
9	Students work with me to achieve class goals.	SA	271	42.4	4.02	1.158
		A	240	37.5		
		DA	103	16.1		
		UNC	26	4		
			N = 640			

The Table 6.9 shows that 79.9% respondents agreed with the statement. Only 4% were uncertain in their responses, while 16.1% of the respondents disagreed. The mean score is 4.02; and SD= 1.158.

6.10 Encouragement from the Teacher (Responsibility)

Some students seem naturally enthusiastic about learning, but many need-or expect-their teacher to inspire, challenge, and stimulate them. Effective learning in the classroom depends on the teacher's ability to maintain the interest that brought students to the course in the first place.

Table 6.10 Encouragement from the Teacher (Responsibility)

Sl. No	Statement	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
10	I receive the same encouragement from the teacher as other students do (Responsibility).	SA	175	27.3	3.64	1.265
		A	265	41.4		
		DA	148	23.2		
		UNC	52	8.2		
		N = 640				

The Table 6.10 reveals that 68.7% respondents agreed with the statement. Only 8.2% were uncertain in their responses, while 23.2% of the respondents disagreed. The mean score is 3.64; and SD= 1.265.

6.2 Analysis of Learning Environment Scale

6.2.1 Gender-wise

The Table 6.11 shows that there is significant difference between male and female students about the level of achievement in English. The significant difference was observed through the calculation of t-test which indicated that the calculated value of $t = 3.032$ at 0.01 level is greater than the tabulated value= 2.526 at 0.01 level that led to the conclusion that male and female students had different level of student cohesiveness in their classroom. Therefore, the null hypothesis that “the level of achievement in English of the students is medium” is not supported.

Table 6.11 Difference between Male and Female student on the Level of Achievement in English

Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-value
Male	320	29.90	6.140	

Female	320	31.22	5.448	3.032
--------	------------	-------	-------	-------

df = .718; p <.01

Therefore, the null hypothesis that “the level of achievement in English of the students is medium” is not supported. It is further concluded by this analysis that the mean scores show that the female students have higher level of achievement in English that is they are closer to one another in their English classroom than the male students.

6.2.2 Location-wise

The Table 6.12 shows that there is statistically significant difference in the achievement in English of the rural and urban students. The significant difference was observed through the calculation of t-test which indicated that the calculated value of t= 2.716 at 0.01 level is greater than the tabulated value= 2.576 at 0.01 level that led to the conclusion that urban and rural students had different level of student learning in their classroom.

6.12 Difference between Urban and Rural Students on Student Cohesiveness

Location	N	Mean	SD	t-value
Urban	320	31.19	5.462	2.716
Rural	320	29.97	6.120	

df = 718; p < .01

Therefore, the null hypothesis that “there is a significant difference in the achievement in English of the rural and urban students” is supported. It is further concluded by the analysis that the mean scores show that the urban students mean= 31.19 are have more cohesiveness in their classroom than the rural students mean= 29.97.

7.1 Findings

The study focused on classroom environment, learning English as a foreign language. The major findings of the reviewed studies were:

1. Experienced great difficulty in making students understanding in English.
2. There was significant relationship between the problems faced by the students in difference variables regarding sex and locality.
3. Environment found is more helpful to English language in learning.

8. Recommendations

The govt. should often conduct training or workshops or conferences to the teacher of language teaching during their service. There should be given more importance to the practical communicative English in the place of theoretical based English. In the examination pattern government can divide few marks for the spoken English or classroom practice also that will encourage the students in speaking English. For improving the pronunciation school should arrange few reading classes separately where they can get time for improving their reading. English teacher have to encourage the students in spoken and do strictly in English mode premises of class or school. The teacher should converse in English inside or outside the classroom with the students. The mind of the students should be ready in learning always. School should provide them English newspaper, magazine and journals (fables) etc. for learning and reading. They should not study the English from the exam point of view they may not be able to write/speak from their own. They should try to converse with teachers, peers and their colleagues always in English. Finally, each school should have ensured that English laboratory and library which consists fable stories books, interest and curiosity novels and portraits.

References

- Anjaneyulu, T. 2017. *An Analysis of English Language Learning at School Level in Urban and Rural Areas in Andhra Pradesh*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, CALTS, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, Telangana State.
- Anjaneyulu, T. 2015. The Problem Faced by Teachers in Teaching English Language in Government Schools in Telangana. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 2015, Vol.3, Issue-3, pp. 225-231.
- Cook, V. 2001. *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Arnold Publication: London.
- Dr. Shruti Agarwal & Ram Krishan. 2014. Influence of Environments on the English Learning of Students in India. *International Journal on Arts, Management and Humanities*, Vol.3(1), pp.5-8.
- Fisher, D.L., & Rickards, T. (1998). Associations between Teacher-Student Interpersonal Behaviour and Student Attitude to Mathematics. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 10(1), 3-15.
- Fraser, B.J.(1998). Classroom Environment Instrument: Development, Validity and Applications. *Learning Environment Research*.1. 7-33.
- Fraser, B.J. 1982. Differences between Student and Teacher Perceptions of Actual and Preferred Classroom Learning Environment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 4: 511-519.
- Fraser, B.J. 1986. *Classroom Environment*. London: Croom Helm.
- Gunadevi, K. 2012. Marketing Students Perception and Their Experience During Industrial

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 19:1 January 2019

Dr. Thotapally Anjaneyulu, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D.

A Study on Government Schools' Classrooms Environment (Teacher - Student) for Learning English as a Subject in Telangana State, India

- Training on English Oral Communication Skills. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 66, 2012, pp. 283-289.
- Jill M Aldridge, Barry J Fraser and Rüdiger C Laugksch. 2011. Relationships between Resilient, Average and Nonresident Middle School Students. *In Reading. Education and Urban Society*, 46(2), 264 -283.
- Judit, H. 2008. The Influence of the Classroom Climate on Students' Empirical Studies in English Applied Linguistics. *UPRT- 2008*.
- Lau, S.W.H.2011. Relationship between Students Perceptions of Classroom Environment and Their Motivation in Learning English Language. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 1 No. 21, Special Issue - December 2011*.
- Moos, R. H. (1974). *The Social Climate Scales: An Overview*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychology Press.
- Moos, R.H. 1980. Evaluating Educational Environments: Procedures, Measures, Findings and School- Level and Classroom-Level, Environment in Secondary Schools in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, Vol. 31, pp. 127-144.
- Padron, Y.N., Waxman, H.C. & Lee, Y.H. (2014). Classroom Learning Environment Differences *Policy Implications*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tickoo, M.L. 2005. *Teaching and Learning English*. New Delhi: Orient Longman Pvt.
- Zandvliet, D. B., & Fraser, B. J. (2005). Physical and Psychosocial Environments Associated with Networked Classrooms. *Learning Environments Research: An International Journal*, 8, 1–17.

=====

Dr. Thotapally Anjaneyulu, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D.
 ICSSR- Post Doctoral Fellow
 Centre for Applied Linguistics Translation Studies
 School of Humanities
 University of Hyderabad
 Gachibowli, Hyderabad
 Telangana State -500046
anjaneyuluedu@gmail.com