

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews related to student negative responses in English classroom instruction. It presents the concept covering student negative responses, and the factors contributing student negative responses. It then serves the previous and related studies which discussing the contrasts and similarities with this study.

A. The Form of Student Negative Responses

Student negative response is categorized as student resistance (Shekar et.all., 2015:597-609). Student negative response has been referred to as willful not-learning, school refusal, disengagement, alienation, apathy, noncompliance, attitude or defiance. McLaren (1985 in Hendrickson, 2012: 38) defines negative response as “oppositional student behavior . . . which contests the legitimacy, power, and significance of school culture in general and instruction in particular”. Not all student misbehavior can be attributed to negative response, but often the behaviors are similar. Hendrickson (2012: 38) specifies negative-responses behavior overcome by the students such as discussing out of topic with their peers, playing mobile phone, sleeping, always looking the watch or gazing the windows, busy to make up her appearance, doing the works which are not related to the subject, eating in the classroom which actually not allowed by the teacher, disturbing their peers by whispering or tapping parts of the body, mumbling, fanning her/himself with the textbook, reading novel, daydreaming, sleepy (yawning), often getting in and out class, and laughing with their peers.

Student negative response is an outcome, a motivational state in which students reject learning opportunities due to systemic factors. The presence of negative response signals to the instructor the need to assess the systemic variables that are contributing to this outcome in order to intervene effectively and enhance student learning (Tolman and Kremling 2017: 4).

Student negative response can fluctuate in reaction to events going on both in the students' lives and in the classroom. While some students may manifest negative response behaviors from the beginning of the course and are fairly consistently over time, the example of the reactive student informs that negative response is not limited only to those students who faculty might characterize as "unmotivated" (a trait characterization). Negative response can and does occur even in the "best" students, those who sincerely want to learn the material (Tolman and Kremling 2017: 5).

The more common concern of most instructors is student negative response or student resistance that is destructive in nature, behaviors that limit the learning of the students themselves and potentially other students around them. Burroughs et al., (1989) and Richmond and McCroskey, (1992) in Seidel (2013: 587) reported student behaviors were passive forms of negative response, such as "avoidance," defined as not attending class or sitting in the back of the room, or "ignoring the teacher," wherein a student attends class but ignores requests for participation or other instructions given by the instructor. The rest reported student negative response behaviors were more active, such as "disruption," wherein a student may purposefully interrupt class, "student rebuttal," wherein a student asserts that they know what will work for best them. This may each have

examples of destructive student negative response that have experienced in the teaching practices see table 1.

Table 1. Examples of what student negative response can look like

How students exhibit negative response	Sample student behaviors and/or language ...
Teacher advice	"I would offer the teacher advice by saying something like: 'Be more expressive.' or 'If you open up, we'll be more willing to do what you want.'"
Teacher blame	"I would resist by claiming that 'the teacher is boring.' or 'I don't get anything out of it.' or 'You don't seem prepared yourself.'"
Avoidance	Students drop the class; do not attend; do not participate.
Reluctant compliance	Students comply, but unwillingly.
Active resistance	Students attend class, but come purposefully unprepared.
Deception	"I'll act like I'm prepared for class even though I may not be." "I'll make up some lie about why I'm not performing well in class."
Direct communication	"I would talk to the teacher and explain how I feel and how others perceive him/her in class."
Disruption	"I would be noisy in class." "I would be a wise-guy in class."
Excuses	"I don't understand the topic." "The class is so easy I don't need to stay caught up."
Ignoring the teacher	"I would simply ignore the teacher." "I probably wouldn't say anything; just do what I was doing before."
Priorities	"This class is not as important as my others."
Challenging the teacher's power	"Do you really take this class seriously?"
Rallying student support	"I would talk to others to see if they feel the same." "I might get others to go along with me in not doing what the teacher wants."
Appealing to powerful others	"I would threaten to go to the dean."
Modeling teacher behavior	"If you're not going to make the effort to teach well, I won't make an effort to listen."
Modeling teacher affect	"You don't seem to care about this class. Why should I?"
Hostile-defensive	"Right or wrong that's the way I am."
Student rebuttal	"I know what works for me; I don't need your advice."

Revenge	“I’ll get even by expressing my dissatisfaction on evaluations at the end of the term.” “I won’t recommend the teacher/class to others.”
---------	--

adopted from Seidel, 2013: 588

The taxonomy of student negative response deals with student resistance. Weimer (2013: 153-156) characterizes student resistance into three basic levels: (1) passive, non-verbal, (2) partial compliance, and (3) open resistance.

Passive, Non-Verbal - Students exhibit an overall lack of enthusiasm as a way to assert their objection to the approach. Students may demonstrate passive, nonverbal resistance by not doing assignments but offering excuses, faking attention, or appearing to take notes while working on material from another class.

Partial Compliance - Students may demonstrate partial compliance by completing a task poorly, half-heartedly, or quickly, by putting forth minimal effort, or by being preoccupied with procedural details.

Open Resistance - On some occasions, students openly object to the approach. They may demonstrate open resistance by complaining, arguing, or objecting, and they generally do so in ways that are not constructive.

B. Factors Contributing Student Negative Response

Why people respond negatively in learning is a puzzlingly complex question, particularly when such negative response appears to come out of nowhere. Sometimes students appear to be truculent from the start of a course, seeming determined to sabotage the best attempts to engage them. At other times, however, they appear to be going along quite well and then suddenly resist doing something that seems like a fairly simple operation. However, if we can get a sense of where negative response springs from, then we are in a better position to

make an appropriate response. Even if no easy resolution suggests itself, knowing what's causing negative response is sometimes helpful, decreasing the demoralizing frustration which can easily slip into when it's encountered (Brookfield, 2006: 212)

One of the most frequent complaints heard on campuses around the country is that students aren't what they were, that they want an easy grade for no work, that they have no attention span, and that they lack any intrinsic interest in learning, negative response. It is framed as personal truculence, a choice made by individuals who just can't be bothered to work and who have no natural aptitude for learning. The truth is that resistance is a multilayered and complex phenomenon in which several factors intersect (Brookfield, 2006: 217). In the following section I explore a number of possible explanations for factors students' negative response used in this study according to Weimer (2002: 150-153; Brookfield, 2006: 218-224; Seidel 2013: 586-595).

1. Poor Self-Image as Learners

Many college-aged learners who have managed to negotiate a path to higher education have been stigmatized in their previous school careers as being too dumb for college. They may well have suffered persistent sarcasm, systematic humiliation, and peer ridicule for their apparent lack of intelligence or commitment. Others might have a command of academic skills but be full of self-doubt regarding their abilities. For all these learners the smallest disappointment, the least bump in the road, will quickly be taken as incontrovertible evidence of their unsuitability for college and lead to them either dropping out (at worst) or

struggling unconvincingly through a course (at best). They will resist efforts to move them forward, believing themselves incapable of the level of work conducted by their peers (Brookfield, 2006: 217).

Developing a strong self-image as a learner—regarding oneself as someone able to acquire new skills, knowledge, behaviors, and insights—is a crucial psychological underpinning to learning. It tends to function as a self-fulfilling prophecy. If people see themselves as learners, if this is a part of their identity, then the prospect of new learning is within their horizon of possibility (Brookfield, 2006: 218).

2. Fear of Looked Foolish in front of Public

Many people have a perverse wish only to learn things they know they already can do well. They will only play games they stand a good chance of winning, and they will only try to learn something new and difficult if they know this can be done in private. Students' egos are fragile creations and, this fragility is as characteristic of those who appear confident and successful as it is of those who have struggled with previous learning. So students' negative response to a particular learning activity may simply reflect their feeling that it is taking place in an overly public forum, rather than their dislike of the focus of the learning itself (Brookfield, 2006: 221).

Tartakovsky (2018) found that perfectionists performed more poorly than their counterparts in a writing task. It may be that perfectionists so dread receiving feedback that they don't develop the same writing skills as nonperfectionists (psychcentral.com, 01/08.18). When students fail at something the first time they

attempt it, they may not want to try a second time. If their self-confidence has taken a beating, the fear of failure can also keep them from trying new things. It can be a vicious circle—students don't take risks because they don't want to fail. But without trying, they can't succeed, either (understood.org, 01/08/18). Schintu (2017) states being scared of looked stupid is the foundation for every category of social anxiety. Most of the time just thinks looked stupid but actually don't really look stupid at all. This makes everyone rejects the activities which she/he deems less able to do

3. Feel of More Threatened

Abebe & Deneke (2015: 74) state in the context of English as a Foreign/Second Language (EF/SL) teaching and learning, students' verbal participation or engagement is essentially important in the classrooms. It is believed that when students engage in the classrooms with their teachers or among peers, they are compelled to be involved in the 'negotiation of meaning', that is to express and clarify their intentions, thoughts and opinions. Students who just come in the classroom only keep silent, they will get little oral feedback and learning process just in one way interaction.

Nevertheless, engaging students in the classroom discussion is one of the most problematic areas for students. Second/Foreign-language learners, especially Asian learners often seem passive and reticent in language classrooms. Students often do not respond to teachers' questions and they do not volunteer answers or initiate questions. Students tend to speak their L1 whenever the teacher is out of

earshot. Teachers also recognize the fact that students will not produce answers unless they are called on (Abebe & Deneke, 2015: 75).

Students respond negatively these learning because they are afraid. The old familiar scenario, played out across years of educational experience, with its predictable roles and expected student and faculty behaviors, no longer applies, or applies less, or applies differently, so what are students supposed to do? How are they supposed to behave? Who is responsible for what now? The teacher has opened Pandora's box and let out all sorts of unknown and unfamiliar policies, practices, assignments, and expectations not regularly encountered in other classes (Weimer, 2002: 151).

The fear becomes a major anxiety for students who face learning tasks without confidence in themselves as learners. Candy (1991, 382) believes the threat is related to not being able to figure out what the teacher "really wants" in an environment where so many of the learning parameters have been changed. In sum, some student negative response says more about self-perceptions than it does about the approaches (Weimer, 2002: 152). Abebe & Deneke, (2015: 72-89) proposes student feel threatened in the classroom which resulted low participation tends to be caused lack comprehension on the material discussed, less preparation, fear of making mistakes or being laughed at, fear of negative teacher trait, fear of negative teacher evaluation/correction, lack of confidence, low proficiency on English, feeling of foolish in class, and shyness.

4. Poor Interactions with Peers

Rather than demonstrating an opposition to innovative teaching approaches per se, student negative response may emerge from poor interactions between individual students and their classroom peers as a result of the increased classroom collaboration demanded by many of these pedagogical approaches. In almost all traditional teaching approaches, students sit quietly and individually, receiving information via lecture from the instructor. In contrast, a variety of active-learning strategies, ranging from simple pair discussions to more complex cooperative learning groups and class projects, require students to interact with peers in classrooms (Seidel 2013: 587).

With increased student–student interaction comes the possibility of poor interactions that could cultivate student negative response, not because of the pedagogy itself, but due to the accompanying interactions that result from these teaching approaches. One example of poor student–student interaction in a classroom that has been studied in a variety of fields, including marketing education, is social loafing, a term used to describe what happens when individuals working in a group do not participate equitably. Those students who are contributing less are considered social loafers. Social loafing, and the perceived unfairness of workload distribution within a group that it implies, can have a strong negative impact on student attitudes toward teamwork (Pfaff and Huddleston, 2003 in Seidel 2013: 588).

The previous study found that 53 % of students are afraid of speaking in front of others in class. More than sixty-eight percent of her subjects reported feeling more comfortable when they did not have to get in front of the class to speak. To speak in front of the whole class is a potentially risky business in many

students' eyes. However, students feel a lot better when they are not required to face the whole class (Abebe & Deneke, 2015: 79).

5. Instructor (Mis)behavior

It is convenient to assume that the factors of student negative response lie in classroom active-learning strategies themselves; however, many have suggested to look instead to instructor behavior, particularly the implementation process, as a more important consideration. Kearney et al., (1991: 313 in Seidel 2013: 588) and colleagues have investigated what teacher behaviors may provoke student negative response in college classroom settings. They asked more than 250 college students to identify teacher misbehaviors—“specific instances where teachers had said or done something that had irritated, demotivated, or substantially distracted them in an aversive way during a course” from all of their classroom experiences during their college career. From the almost 1800 student descriptions that were collected, 28 categories of teacher misbehaviors emerged, the top 20 of which are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Instructor misbehaviors that may elicit student resistance

Top 20 instructor misbehaviors	Sample instructor behaviors and/or language as reported by students...
Sarcasm and put-downs	“Is sarcastic and rude, makes fun of and humiliates students, picks on students, and/or insults and embarrasses students.”
Absent	“Does not show up for class, cancels class without notification, and/or offers poor excuses for being absent.”
Strays from subject	“Uses class as a forum for his/her personal opinions, goes off on tangents, talks about family and personal life and/or generally wastes class time.”
Unfair testing	“Asks trick questions on tests, exams do not relate to the lectures, tests are too difficult, questions are too ambiguous, and/or does not review for exams.”

Boring lectures	“Is not an enthusiastic lecturer, speaks in a monotone and rambles, is boring, too much repetition, and/or uses no variety in lectures.”
Tardy	“Is late for class or tardy.”
Keeps students overtime	“Keeps class overtime, talks too long and/or starts class early before all the students are there.”
Unresponsive to students’ questions	“Does not encourage students to ask questions, does not answer questions or recognize raised hands, and/or seems ‘put out’ to have to explain or repeat him/herself.”
Confusing/unclear lectures	“Unclear about what is expected, lectures are confusing, contradicts him/herself, jumps from one subject to another and/or lectures are inconsistent with assigned readings.”
Apathetic to students	“Doesn’t seem to care about the course or show concern for students, does not know the students’ names, rejects students’ opinions and/or does not allow for class discussion.”
Verbally abusive	“Uses profanity, is angry and mean, yells and screams, interrupts and/or intimidates students.”
Unprepared/disorganized	“Is not prepared for class, unorganized, forgets test dates, and/or makes assignments but does not collect them.”
Unfair grading	“Grades unfairly, changes grading policy during the semester, does not believe in giving A’s, makes mistakes when grading and/or does not have a predetermined grading scale.”
Does not know subject matter	“Doesn’t know the material, unable to answer questions, provides incorrect information, and/or isn’t current.”
Negative personality	“Teacher is impatient, self-centered, complains, acts superior and/or is moody.”
Shows favoritism or prejudice	“Plays favorites with students or acts prejudiced against others, is narrow-minded or close-minded, and/or makes prejudicial remarks.”
Inaccessible to students outside of class	“Does not show up for appointments or scheduled office hours, is hard to contact, will not meet with students outside of office time and/or doesn’t make time for students when they need help.”
Information overload	“Talks too fast and rushes through the material, talks over the students’ heads, uses obscure terms and/or assigns excessive work.”
Information underload	“The class is too easy, students feel they have not learned anything, and/or tests are too easy.”

Deviates from syllabus	“Changes due dates for assignments, behind schedule, does not follow the syllabus, changes assignments, and/or assigns books but does not use them.”
Adapted from Kearney <i>et al.</i> , 1991 in Seidel, 2013: 589)	

Some of the reported instructor misbehaviors (see table 2) seemed to reflect an unwillingness or inability of the instructor to engage with students: “apathetic to students,” “inaccessible to students outside of class,” and “unresponsive to students’ questions.” And it is caused student dislike to teacher. Other behaviors suggested that the instructors did not treat students collegially and respectfully: “verbally abusive,” “sarcasm and putdowns,” and “negative personality.” Questions about the instructors’ level of commitment to the course were evident from behaviors such as: “absent,” “tardy,” “unprepared/unorganized,” “keeps students overtime,” and “deviates from syllabus.” Issues of a perceived lack of instructor fairness were present: “unfair testing,” “unfair grading,” and “shows favoritism or prejudice.” Finally, several categories of instructor misbehavior reflected struggles with how many and which concepts to include in a course: “information overload,” “information underload,” and “does not know subject matter.” Interestingly, innovative teaching approaches being encouraged in undergraduate biology might successfully address the final three reported student frustrations: “boring lectures,” “confusing/unclear lectures,” and “strays from subject.” (Seidel & Tanner, 2013: 589).

The behaviors of the teachers as keeping distance, their indifferent and cold behaviors and lecturing fast and discouraging the students from attending the course are the most important two factors in the disorder of the classroom (Yildirim, Akan, & Yalcin, 2016: 1-12). Bolkan (2017) learned what some of

detrimental behaviors are defined as teacher misbehaviors. These include 31 specific misbehaviors organized into six categories including punctuality and absenteeism, the organization and structure of course material, insensitivity to students, being unavailable, unfair evaluation, and poor presentation.

C. Related Research

Studies conducted in the last several years indicated that student negative response is essentially field to study. Even though there are a lot of previous studies discussing on student negative responses in classroom. Ertmer & Newby (1996: 1-11) investigates students' negative responses are defined in terms of student rejection in learning activities in the classroom. Students don't perceive interest, relevance, and confidence for learning. This research is more focused on the types of student negative response.

By the same research objective, several studies just proposed that student negative responses only used for analyzing active learning instruction. Hamiloglu (2012) showed that student negative responses determined what the teacher should do for eliciting information further. Toni and Parse (2013: 564-569) focussed on the diverse strategies for anticipating student negative responses in the classroom. The types of student negative responses is more based on Weimer, (2002), passive (non verbal), partial compliance, and open resistance.

Those previous studies are strongly different with this research. This will focusses on the factors contributing student negative response in English classroom instruction. The student negative response is not only investigated in

the scope of the taxonomy but this will further deepen the origins why the student prefer to respond negatively during classroom instruction.