



Humanistic Behaviours of Teaching Faculty: A Cross-Sectional Analysis

Mrs. R. Kayalvizhi¹, Dr. P. N. Lakshmi Shanmugam², Dr. R. Meenakshi³

¹Research Scholar, Department of Educational Psychology, Tamilnadu Teachers Education University, Tamil Nadu
Email: kayalraj19@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, Tamilnadu Teachers Education University, Tamil Nadu
Email: lakshmiadhavan28@yahoo.in

³Assistant Professor & Head i/c, Department of Education, School of Education, Madurai Kamaraj University Madurai – 625021, Tamil Nadu
Email: drmeenaeducation18@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Humanistic education provides an alternative to the traditional factory model of education that treats students as products on a 13-year conveyor belt. In these educational factories high standards are synonymous with standardization as all students are force-fed the same curriculum. The same facts and skills are attached to all students at pre-determined places as they march silently along in lock steps like cars moving down an assembly line. Efficiency, uniformity, and control of students and teachers are valued over creativity, innovation, individuality, and freedom.

In this study, a stratified random sampling technique was used for collecting data from the population of teaching faculty working from schools and colleges (Male and Female). The major findings displayed that there was a significant difference between school and college-level teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior. It indicated that teaching faculty at school levels play a vital role in humanistic approaches to their students. So, the government and educational policymakers plan to implement a humanistic way of curriculum transaction to the students at all levels.

INTRODUCTION

Most people believe that humans are inherently illogical, socialized, and harmful to both themselves and other people. Teachers play an increasingly significant role; one could even argue that they are our nation's builders. Education and morality are the cornerstones for every student, and both parents and instructors lay them. They frequently start instilling morals, attitudes, and behaviors in kids early on. In the demanding climate of today's schools and colleges, the teacher is the main factor in everything. The job of a teacher is becoming increasingly difficult. Instructors must have a warm, compassionate, and sociable personality to encourage students to ask for assistance when they need it.

For the humanistic educator, teaching starts with a relationship. Carl Rogers (1969) describes three conditions for learning based on his work in creating therapeutic relationships with his clients. They are; **Respected:** Each student is respected, what Rogers (1961) calls unconditional positive regard (UPR). Students are accepted for who they are, unconditionally. Note that this is much different from accepting unacceptable behavior. This respect for students helps to promote their own self-respect and sense of self-efficacy, which in turn enhances learning. **Empathetic Understanding:** Teachers strive to see things from the child's point of view. They understand what it feels like to be excited, lost, confused, frustrated, curious, anxious, confident, or bored. **Genuineness or Congruence:** Teachers teach from their real, authentic selves. They do not play a role or project what they believe a teacher should be. Rather, they are in touch with their feelings and reacting authentically. Genuine teachers don't have to rely on methods or techniques; instead, they can trust their own emotions and experiences to guide them.

The humanistic approach emphasizes the importance of individual life by not seeing the negative side of the individual and helps individuals increase their potential even in crises so that individuals can actualize themselves. **Diesmy Humaira Biruny and Izdiharmada Salsabila (2021)**. In today's society, the focus has been shifting from achieving academic purpose to self-actualization. The formation of acceptable social attitudes and the development of empathy are important if one of the goals of education is to enable students to become community leaders. **Arifi (2017)**.

NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

A country's ability to thrive and prosper is largely dependent on its high-quality educational system. At every level of school, a teacher's role in shaping young minds into different forms is quite important. For this reason, it has been argued that teachers shape a country's future through the educational process in the classroom. In addition to the necessary training and degree, teaching calls for a natural aptitude to communicate with students and the capacity to convey concepts to them in simple, understandable words. The best reward for a teacher is to wake up their indifferent students and watch their passion for learning develop.

Teachers' compassionate actions are perceived to have formative, professional, and philosophical aspects as they individually navigate the pressures imposed on them in various contextual settings. Everybody has some level of ambition, willpower, and desire whether high or poor. A person has a strong drive to succeed and a strong enthusiasm to establish himself in the field of interest. The personal aim is determined by these desires. Culture, which has been influenced by the environment, ancestry, inheritance, and other factors, is the foundation of society. The foundation of societal growth is the culture that a society adopts.

The investigators have been working in the field of the teaching profession for the past 15 years and they deal with different kinds of learners. So, the above discussion gave insight to the investigators to examine the humanistic nature of the teaching faculty at different levels.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

For the present study, the investigator has chosen one variable namely humanistic behavior. The present study is designed to explore the existing status of the humanistic behavior of teaching faculty from different levels. The study helps establish the importance of humanistic behavior in teaching professionals.

TITLE OF THE STUDY

“Humanistic Behaviours of Teaching Faculty: A Cross-Sectional Analysis”

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Humanistic Behaviour

Humanism is the belief in the capacity of our species to be rational and kind and in our ability to see ourselves and each other as the infinitely complex and miraculously improbable organisms we all are without anticipation of eternal punishment or reward.

“Humanism is a democratic and ethical life stance, which affirms that human beings have the right and responsibility to give meaning and shape to their own lives. It stands for the building of a more humane society through an ethic based on human and other natural values in the spirit of reason and free inquiry through human capabilities. It is not theistic, and it does not accept supernatural views of reality” (International Humanist and Ethical Union)

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The following are the objectives of the present study:

1. To find out the level of humanistic behavior of the teaching faculty at different levels.
2. To find out whether there is a significant difference among teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior concerning the background variables namely: (i) Gender (Men and Women), (ii) Year of Experience (10 years and below and 11 years and above), (iii) Subject Taught (Arts and Science), (iv) Nature of Management (Minority and Non-minority) and (v) Locality (Rural and Urban).
3. To find out whether there is a significant difference among humanistic behavior of teaching faculty working from the school level. (Primary, Secondary, and Higher Secondary).
4. To find out whether there is a significant difference among humanistic behavior of teaching faculty working from the college level. (Arts, Engineering, and Teacher Education).
5. To find out whether there is a significant difference between the humanistic behavior of teaching faculty working from the school level and college level.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The following are the hypotheses of the present study:

1. There is no significant difference between men and women teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
2. There is no significant difference between 10 years and below and 11 years and above experienced teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
3. There is no significant difference between arts and science subjects taught by teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
4. There is no significant difference between minority and non-minority management teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
5. There is no significant difference between rural and urban locale teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.

6. There is no significant difference among primary, secondary, and higher secondary school teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
7. There is no significant difference among arts, engineering, and teacher education college teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
8. There is no significant difference between the humanistic behavior of teaching faculty working from the school level and the college level.

METHOD USED FOR THE STUDY

For the present study, the survey method is employed. By administrating the questionnaires, necessary data will be collected.

TOOL USED IN THE STUDY

Humanistic behavior questionnaires were developed and used by the investigator to assess the humanistic nature of the teaching faculty at different levels.

SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

The teaching faculty of the schools and colleges of Dindigul District will be the population of the present study. From the population, 240 teaching faculty (120 teaching faculty from the school level and 120 teaching faculty from the college level) will be selected through a stratified random sampling technique. The sampling will be stratified based on the background variables.

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED

For analyzing the collected data, mean, standard deviation, 't' test, and ANOVA are employed.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Percentage Analysis -1

Level of humanistic behavior of the teaching faculty at the school level.

Table 1

Schools	Low		Moderate		High	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Primary	08	20	20	50	12	30
Secondary	10	25	16	40	12	30
Higher Secondary	16	40	16	40	08	20

It is inferred from the table that 20% of primary school teaching faculty have low humanistic behavior, 50% of them have moderate, and 30% of them have a high level of humanistic behavior. Whereas 25% of secondary school teaching faculty have low humanistic behavior, 40% of them have moderate and 30% of them have a high level of humanistic behavior. Although 40% of higher secondary school teaching faculty have low humanistic behavior, 40% of them have moderate and 20% of them have a high level of humanistic behavior.

Percentage Analysis -2

Level of humanistic behavior of the teaching faculty at the college level.

Table 2

Colleges	Low		Moderate		High	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Arts and Science	12	30	18	45	10	25
Engineering	14	35	16	40	10	25
Teacher Education	06	15	22	55	12	30

It is inferred from the table-1 shows that 30% of arts and science colleges' teaching faculty have low humanistic behavior, 45% of them have moderate and 25% of them have a high level of humanistic behavior. Whereas 35% of engineering colleges teaching faculty have low humanistic behavior, 40% of them have moderate and 25% of them have a high level of humanistic behavior. Although 15% of teacher education colleges teaching faculty have low humanistic behavior, 55% of them have moderate and 30% of them have a high level of humanistic behavior.

Null Hypothesis - 1

There is no significant difference between men and women teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.

Table - 3

Mean Score Difference between Men and Women Teaching Faculty in Their Humanistic Behaviour

Variable	Gender	Mean	SD	't' value	Remarks at 5% Level
Humanistic Behaviour	Men	109.25	9.11	2.949	S
	Women	111.42	11.47		

(At 5% level of significance, the table value is 1.96)

The above table shows that there is a significant difference between men and women teaching faculty in their humanistic behaviour as the calculated 't' value of 2.949 is greater than the table value of 1.96 at a 5% level of significance. While comparing the mean scores, women teaching faculty are higher in their humanistic behavior than the men teaching faculty. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

Null Hypothesis - 2

There is no significant difference between 10 years and below and 11 years and above experienced teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.

Table - 4

Mean Score Difference between 10 Years and Below and 11 Years and Above Experienced Teaching Faculty in their Humanistic Behaviour

Variable	Teaching Experience	Mean	SD	't' value	Remarks at 5% Level
Humanistic Behaviour	10 years and below	100.90	8.41	3.142	S
	11 years and above	106.42	10.62		

(At 5% level of significance, the table value is 1.96)

The above table shows that there is a significant difference between 10 years and below and 11 years and above experienced teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior as the calculated 't' value of 3.142 is greater than the table value of 1.96 at a 5% level of significance. While comparing the mean scores, 11 years and above-experienced teaching faculty are higher in their humanistic behavior than the 10 years and below-experienced teaching faculty. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

Null Hypothesis - 3

There is no significant difference between arts and science subjects taught by teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.

Table - 5

Mean Score Difference between Arts and Science Subject Taught Teaching Faculty in their Humanistic Behaviour

Variable	Subject Taught	Mean	SD	t value	Remarks at 5% Level
Humanistic Behaviour	Arts	107.58	11.15	2.61	S
	Science	113.36	10.98		

(At 5% level of significance, the table value is 1.96)

The above table shows that there is a significant difference between arts and science subjects taught by teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior as the calculated 't' value of 2.61 is greater than the table value of 1.96 at a 5% level of significance. While comparing the mean scores, science subject taught teaching faculty are higher in their humanistic behavior than the arts subject taught teaching faculty. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

Null Hypothesis - 4

There is no significant difference between minority and non-minority management teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.

Table - 6

Mean Score Difference between Minority and Non-Minority Management Teaching Faculty in their Humanistic Behaviour

Variable	Management Type	Mean	SD	't' value	Remarks at 5% Level
Humanistic Behaviour	Minority	105.63	12.63	3.08	S
	Non-Minority	111.59	10.27		

(At 5% level of significance, the table value is 1.96)

The above table shows that there is a significant difference between minority and non-minority management teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior as the calculated 't' value of 3.08 is greater than the table value of 1.96 at a 5% level of significance. While comparing the mean scores, non-minority management teaching faculty are higher in their humanistic behavior than minority management teaching faculty. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

Null Hypothesis - 5

There is no significant difference between rural and urban locale teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.

Table - 7**Mean Score Difference between Rural and Urban Locale Teaching Faculty in their Humanistic Behaviour**

Variable	Locality	Mean	SD	't' value	Remarks at 5% Level
Humanistic Behaviour	Rural	109.26	12.08	2.80	S
	Urban	102.27	10.42		

(At 5% level of significance, the table value is 1.96)

The above table shows that there is a significant difference between rural and urban locale teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior as the calculated 't' value of 2.80 is greater than the table value of 1.96 at a 5% level of significance. While comparing the mean scores, rural locale teaching faculty are higher in their humanistic behavior than urban locale teaching faculty. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

Null Hypothesis - 6

There is no significant difference among primary, secondary, and higher secondary school teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.

Table - 8**Mean Score Difference among Primary, Secondary, and Higher Secondary School Teaching Faculty in their Humanistic Behaviour**

Variable	Source of Variation	Sum of Square	Mean Square	Calculated 'F' Value	Remarks at 5% level
Humanistic Behaviour	Between	412.941	20.471	17.698	S
	Within	12681.004	11.666		

(At 5% level of significance, the table value is 3.00)

It is understood that there is a significant difference among primary, secondary, and higher secondary school teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior, as the calculated 'F' value of 17.698 was greater than the table value of 3.00 at a 5% level of significance. While comparing the alpha scores teaching faculty working from primary schools has better humanistic behaviour than the secondary schools and higher secondary schools teaching faculty. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected.

Null Hypothesis - 7

There is no significant difference among arts, engineering, and teacher education college teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.

Table - 9**Mean Score Difference among Arts, Engineering, and Teacher Education College Teaching Faculty in their Humanistic Behaviour**

Variable	Source of Variation	Sum of Square	Mean Square	Calculated 'F' Value	Remarks at 5% level
Humanistic Behaviour	Between	228.671	11.335	7.353	S
	Within	16903.301	15.550		

(At 5% level of significance, the table value is 3.00)

It is understood that there is a significant difference among arts, engineering, and teacher education colleges teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior, as the calculated 'F' value of 7.353 was greater than the table value of 3.00 at a 5% level of significance. While comparing the alpha scores teaching faculty working from teacher education colleges have better humanistic behaviour than the arts colleges teaching faculty and engineering colleges teaching faculty. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected.

Null Hypothesis - 8

There is no significant difference between the humanistic behavior of teaching faculty working from the school level and the college level.

Table - 10**Mean Score Difference between Humanistic Behaviour of Teaching Faculty Working from School Level and College Level**

Variable	Grade Level	Mean	SD	't' value	Remarks at 5% Level
Humanistic Behaviour	Schools	114.31	13.61	3.82	S
	Colleges	102.50	10.29		

(At 5% level of significance, the table value is 1.96)

The above table shows that there is no significant difference between teaching faculty working from schools and colleges in their humanistic behavior as the calculated 't' value of 3.82 is greater than the table value of 1.96 at a 5% level of significance. While comparing the mean scores, teaching faculty working from schools are higher in their humanistic behavior than the teaching faculty working from colleges. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

MAJOR FINDINGS

1. The level of humanistic behavior of primary school teaching faculty is higher than the secondary and higher secondary schools teaching faculty.
2. The level of humanistic behavior of teacher education colleges' teaching faculty is higher than the arts and engineering colleges' teaching faculty.
3. There is a significant difference between men and women teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
4. There is a significant difference between 10 years and below and 11 years and above experienced teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
5. There is a significant difference between arts and science subjects taught by teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
6. There is a significant difference between minority and non-minority management teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
7. There is a significant difference between rural and urban locale teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
8. There is a significant difference among primary, secondary, and higher secondary school teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
9. There is a significant difference among arts, engineering, and teacher education college teaching faculty in their humanistic behavior.
10. There is a significant difference between the humanistic behavior of teaching faculty working from the school level and the college level.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above findings, the following ends have been drawn by the investigators;

The results show that teaching faculty working from the school level have higher humanistic behavior when compared to the teaching faculty working from colleges. This is because the teaching faculty from school levels are crucial to molding the learners to adapt and achieve the rest of life. At the school level, the teaching faculty spent more time with the learners and also as a parent. The findings of the study convey that teaching the students becomes more important than teaching the curriculum. Traits that can be measured and quantified are valued over creativity, inspiration, and intuition. On this educational conveyor belt teachers are thought of as mere factory workers. They are told what to teach, how to teach, and when to teach it. Humanistic educators involve the whole human in the learning experience. Students would be asked to examine and explore how topics impacted or connected with their personal lives and experiences as well as the lives of other human beings. Art, drama, music, and other arts would be used as tools to explore or respond to information and ideas. Important pedagogical tools would include inquiry, discovery learning, social learning, and cooperative learning activities.

REFERENCE

- Arifi, Q. (2017). Humanistic Approach in Teaching Foreign Language (from the Teacher Perspective). *European Scientific Journal*. Prishtina 13(35), 194-20.
- Ayers, W. (2009). Teaching in and for democracy. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 46(1), 30-33.
- Firdaus, F. A., & Mariyat, A. (2017). Humanistic Approach in Education According to Paulo Freire. *At-Ta'dib* 12(2), 25-48.
- Frias, J. (2019). Improving learning experiences by using Humanism and Constructivism teaching approaches in the classroom. *Philosophy of Education*. T&L cert. John Wiley and Sons 1(1), 1-5.
- Jinga, D. (2012). Application of humanism theory in the teaching approach. *Higher Education of Social Science* 3(1), 32-36.
- Mishra, C. (2000). Humanistic approach to education. *Journal of NELTA*. 5, (2), pp.26- 29.
- Nath, A. Kumar, R. & Kumar Behura, A. (2017). Humanistic Approach to Education: A Look into the Humane Perspective of Teaching and Learning. *Global Journal of Engineering Science and Research*. ISSN: 2348 – 8034.
- Nava, R.G. (2001). *Holistic education: Pedagogy of universal love*. Brandon, VT: Foundation for Educational Renewal.
- Rogers, "Interpersonal Relationships: U.S.A. 2000," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 4 (1968):265-280.
- Rogers, C. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Rogers, C. (1969). *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.

Rogers, C.R. & Freiberg, H.J. (1994). *Freedom to learn* (3rd Ed). Columbus, OH: Merrill/Macmillan.

Rogers, *Client-centered Therapy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951), p. 386.