

DEVELOPING COMPETENCE IN SOCIAL DIALOGUE THROUGH JURISPRUDENTIAL INQUIRY MODEL

Veer Pal Singh

The present article is the report of an experiment conducted to find out the effectiveness of Jurisprudential Inquiry model (JIM) of teaching on competence in social dialogue of school students. The experiment was conducted on 40 students of class IX. They were divided into four parallel groups on the basis intelligence and socio-economics status (SES) namely - high intelligence and high SES, high intelligence and low SES, low intelligence and high SES and low intelligence and low SES. During the experimentation, the students were tested and assessed three times for social dialogue skill. Hence, three-way factorial design (2x2x3) of trend analysis was followed to analyse the data. The findings indicate that socio-economics status effect the improvement in competence in social dialogue as low SES students possessed higher scores than high SES students. Moreover, the trend of improvement with different levels of intelligence and occasions was linear and the direction of trend was upward. Overall, the trend of improvement on different testing occasions was linear and direction of it was upward. It means that the competence in social dialogue went on increasing with the treatment of JIM.

INTRODUCTION

Education is a process that develops the personality and inherent capabilities of a child. It socialises her or him to play adult roles in society and provides the necessary knowledge and skills required for a responsible citizen and member of the society. It has been stated that education is the consciously controlled process whereby changes in behaviour are produced in the person and through the person within the group. It has an implication that through educational process the changes in the behaviour of the person are brought about not by the internal forces but by those external forces which are latent in the environment. When a child learns any new activity like putting on dress, eating food, putting his/her viewpoint, solving problem or any behavioural act, the environment and the child's close relations are key-figure in the learning process. Thus, school or classroom environment play an important role in learning of a particular behaviour or an act by an individual. If we want to bring any desirable change in the behaviour of a child then specific environment is needed because behaviour of a child is the by-product of his social perceptions, understanding and reasoning on the one hand and conceptions of other pupils, self, relationship between pupils and social rules (moral and traditional) on the other hand. According to Baron & Byrne (1977), 'the behaviour, feelings or thoughts of an individual are influenced or determined by the behaviour or characteristics of others in the group.' Moreover, various individual characteristics like ability to analyse social issues, competence in social dialogue, verbal ability etc. effect the behaviour of others in a group. Hence, for developing individuality and commitment among children specific environment is needed. Highlighting the need of commitment, National Curriculum Framework - 2005 categorically mentions:

“Education should aim to build a commitment to certain values like democracy and the values of equality, justice, freedom, concern for others well-being, secularism, respect for human dignity and rights, which are based on reason and understanding. The curriculum, therefore, should provide adequate experience and space for dialogue and discourse in the school to build such commitment in children.” (NCERT2005, pp.10-11)

Further, this document pinpointed the importance of nurturing an enabling environment and said that

“As public spaces, schools must be marked by the values of equality, social justice and respect for diversity, as well as of the dignity and rights of children. These values must be consciously made part of the perspective of the school and form the foundation of school practice. An enabling learning environment is one where children clarify their doubts and ask questions, they will not engage with learning. If, instead of ignoring children's comments or sealing their tongues with strict rules of silence and restrictions on the language to be used, teachers encourage children to talk, they would find that the

classroom is a more lively place and that teaching is not predictable and boring, but rather an adventure of interacting minds. Such an environment will facilitate the self-confidence and self-esteem of learners of all ages; it will also go a long way in improving the quality of learning itself.”(NCERT 2005 pp.81-82)

It means that teacher should adopt such a method of teaching where specific climate in the classroom is generated through which the desirable characteristics or qualities could be developed among children. In other words, to develop the desirable characteristic behaviours in a child, specific climate is needed. Certain characteristics like ability to analyse social issues, competence in dialogue, verbal fluency etc. are desirable among the children to cope with the situation of the competitive society and global adjustment. Hence, such a method of teaching is required through which the social characteristics could be developed among the children. There may be various methods like lecture, silent sitting, role-playing, simulation, story telling etc. But these methods have their own limitations and proved unable to develop the desirable behavioural characteristics among the children. In this connection, Jurisprudential Inquiry Model (JIM) of teaching is tested keeping in view its own advantages. One notable advantage of this method is that open climate for discussion is there, which is a major feature of child-centered approach in the classroom. Another advantage is that the teacher is very powerful person who initiates the questions or inquiry during the process. This is the reason that the method can easily be linked with the climate of school as the teacher plays a dominant role. Hence, because of its simplicity and application in the Indian classroom settings, Jurisprudential Inquire Model of teaching was used to develop the ability of social dialogue among children which is most desirable to solve day to day problems in life. The specific features of this model are given in proceeding paragraphs.

JURISPRUDENTIAL INQUIRY MODEL OF TEACHING

The dictionary meaning of Jurisprudence is science or philosophy of law, or the knowledge or skill to deal with issues in legal fashion. Oliver & Shaver (1974) created this method-meant Jury process of resolving complex controversial issues within the context of productive social order. In other words, it is a process of inquiry for solving controversial issues as is held by a Supreme Court judge. The judge first of all listens the case which is followed by evidences, then analyses the legal position taken by both the sides, weighs these positions and evidences, assesses the meaning and position of law and finally makes the best possible decision. When a similar role is played by the teacher along with the students in the classroom to analyse the social problem or public policy issues, then it becomes Jurisprudential way of teaching. This model helps the students in understanding the complexity of the problems so that they can be able to make their position reflect that complexity. The main purpose of this method is to help students learn how to formulate defensible stances on public policy issues. Following this model, the students get opportunities to develop public policy stances and dialogue skill by using three types of competence that is (i) an understanding of the value's framework of Indian creed; (ii) mastery of the intellectual skills of legal reasoning; and (iii) knowledge of contemporary public issues. This method involves conception of values and productive dialogue as well as curriculum and pedagogical consideration. During the process of dialogue, student takes a position and the teacher challenges the position with questions. The teacher's questions are designed to push students' thinking about their stance and to help them learn. The teacher orients the class to the case and students usually become emotionally involved in the analysis, making the discussion intense and personal. With more practice, it is hoped that their positions will become more complex and well formulated. In a nutshell, the specific features of this model help the students to develop competency in social dialogue and comprehend the values involved in a particular social situation.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

To find out the effect of Jurisprudential Inquiry Model of teaching on social dialogue of students belonging to different intelligence and socio-economic status (SES) groups.

HYPOTHESIS

There is no significant effect of Jurisprudential Inquiry model of teaching on competency in social dialogues of students belonging to different intelligence and socio-economic status (SES) groups.

RESEARCH DESIGN

In order to see the effect of Jurisprudential Inquiry model of teaching on dependent variable of competency in social dialogues, three-way (2x2x3) factorial design of trend analysis was followed. (Edward 1950, p.70) Here, the treatment group was having two levels of intelligence viz. high and low. Each level of intelligence was having two groups of students that is high and low socio-economic status. Further, each student was tested on three occasions. In this ways, there were $2 \times 2 \times 3 = 12$ combinations. The schematic presentation of the design is given in Figure 1.

Figure 1

Sample

The students of class IX were administered Raven's Progressive Matrices and Kulshreshtha's socio-economic status scale (Urban A). On the basis of mean and S.D., the students were divided into four parallel groups-high intelligence and high SES, high intelligence and low SES, low intelligence and high SES and low intelligence and low SES. Each of the group was having 10 students. Thus, the sample was comprised of 40 (10x4) students.

Tools used

*The Raven's Progressive Matrices to measure the intelligence of the students.

*The Kulshreshtha's Socio-economic status scale (SES) to measure the socio-economic status of the students.

*The Dialogue Observation Scale developed by the investigator to observe the behaviour of the students during discussion or dialogue in the classroom.

Variables

Two types of variables were worked out. The independent variables were: (a) Jurisprudential Inquiry model of teaching; (b) Levels of intelligence – high and low; (c) Levels of SES – high and low; and (d) Occasions of testing. The dependent variable was Competence in Social dialogue

Data Collection

The Data were collected in between the experimentation. The students were observed by their peers in tetrad group on dialogue observation scale. In others words, each student in the tetrad group was observed by three peers at a time. The average score of these peers was considered as the score for first occasion. In total, there were three different occasions for each student to be observed by their peers in tetrad group in between the experimentation. Thus, there were three occasions for each student to be assessed.

Statistical techniques used

In order to see the effect of Jurisprudential Inquiry Model of teaching on competency in social dialogue, the data were analysed with the help of three-way (2x2x3) factorial design of 'Trend Analysis'. Further, the results were supplemented with the help of linear coefficients for each testing occasion so as to find out the trend of linearity. These linear coefficients obtained by multiplying the trial sums for each levels

of intelligence by orthogonal coefficients for linear comparison (D_1). These linear coefficients were further supplemented for linear interaction in order to test the significance of linear components on trend. The graphs were plotted wherever F-ratio was found significant for overall trend and linear interaction among variables.

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

The results for summary of three ways ANOVA ($2 \times 2 \times 3$) for the competency in social dialogue

indicated that F-ratio (6.49) was significant for df 1/36 for the effect of socio-economic status in case of competency in social dialogue at 0.05 level of significance. In this connection, it was observed that high SES students possessed low scores ($M=50.36$) than low SES students ($M=54.09$). It means that low SES students achieved higher scores than high SES students. It reflects that low SES students could effectively communicate, argue and think logically than their counterparts when exposed to Jurisprudential Inquiry Model of teaching.

The results for summary of three ways ANOVA ($2 \times 2 \times 3$) for the competency in social dialogue revealed that the F-ratio (88.76) was significant for df 2/72 for testing occasions. In order to interpret this result, the significant F-ratio was supplemented with linear coefficients for each occasion so as to find the trend of linearity. In this connection, it was found that F-ratio (174.94) is significant for df 1/72 at 0.01 level of confidence. This connotes that overall mean scores have a significant linear trend. The direction of the trend was upward as linear coefficient ($D_1= 570.68$) is positive. It means that there was continuous improvement in competency in social dialogue of the students. The continuity of improvement in social dialogue may be attributed to the process of social analysis that such a model follows. Figure 2 depicts the trend.

Figure 2

It was also evident from the results summary of three ways ANOVA ($2 \times 2 \times 3$) for the competency in social dialogue that interactional effect of levels of intelligence and testing occasions ($A \times C$) was significant ($F= 5.33$) for df 2/72 in case of competency in social dialogue at 0.01 level of significance. This has a connotation that the trend of scores on different occasions is effected due to level of intelligence when taught through JIM. In order to interpret this result, the F-ratio was supplemented with linear coefficients for each occasion so as to find the trend of linearity. In this connection, it is observed that F-ratio=3.21 for df 1/72 is approaching to words significance. This connotes that overall occasion mean scores have a linear trend with respect to different levels of intelligence. The direction of the trend was upward as linear coefficients are positive ($D_1= 323.99, 246.69$) in case of high and low intelligent students respectively. This, in other words, indicates that scores of the students belonging to different levels of intelligence for competency in social dialogue go on increasing with the treatment of JIM. The linear component in case of high intelligent students was more (2624.24) than the linear component (1521.39) of low intelligent students. It means, level of intelligence has its contribution towards the scores in case of competency in social dialogue. Figure 3 clarifies this trend.

Figure 3

FINDINGS

Socio-Economic Status effects the improvement in mean scores of the students for competence in Social dialogue significantly when taught through JIM. Low SES students possessed higher scores than high SES students. The trend of improvement on different testing occasions was linear and the direction of the

trend was upward. In other words, mean scores for competence in social dialogue went on increasing with the treatment of JIM. The trend of improvement with different levels of intelligence and occasions was linear and the direction of the trend was upward. It connotes that mean scores with different levels of intelligence at different occasions for the competence in social dialogue went on increasing with the treatment.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The findings of the study reveal that Jurisprudential Inquiry Model of teaching was having direct bearing on the improvement in competency in Social dialogue of the students belonging to different levels of intelligence and socio-economic status. It has an implication that this method of teaching may be adopted by the teachers if they wish to improve the Competence in Social dialogue of the students which is most desirable in this competitive world for the adjustment in the society throughout life.

REFERENCES

- Baron, R.A. & Byrne, D. (1977) *Social Psychology: Understanding Human Interaction*. Allyn and Bacon, Boston.
- Bruce, J. & Well, M. (1985) *Models of Teaching*. Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
- Edward, A.L. (1996). *Experimental Design in Psychological Research*. Rinehart and Winston, Holt, New York.
- Kulshrestha, S.P. (1970) *Socio-Economic Status Scale for Rural and Urban*. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Lewis, D.G. (1968) *Experimental Design in Education*. University Press, London.
- Oliver, D. & Shaver, J. P. (1974) *Teaching Public Issues in the High School*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- NCERT (2005) *National Curriculum Framework-2005*. Author, New Delhi.
- Raven, J.C. (1960) *Guide to the Standard Progressive Matrices Sets A B C D and E*. Lewis and Co, London.
- Singh, L. C. & Bhalwankar, A. G. (1986) *Orientation in Models of Teaching: A Monograph*. NCERT, New Delhi.
- Weil, M. and Bruce, J. (1978) *Social Models of Teaching*. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.