

Impact of Teacher's Background and Behavior on Students Learning

Abida Khalid

Assistant Professor, University of Education, Bank Road, Campus, Lahore, Pakistan

E.mail: khalidabida@yahoo.co.uk

Shabana Yasmin

Researcher, University of Education, College Road, Township, Lahore, Pakistan

Muhammad Azeem

Assessment Expert, Punjab Education Assessment System (PEAS), University of Education

College Road, Township, Lahore, Pakistan

E.mail: knowledge_jhumra@yahoo.com

Received: October 10, 2011 Accepted: November 9, 2011 Published: November 1, 2011

doi:10.5296/ijhrs.v1i2.1101

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v1i2.1101>

Abstract

The major purpose of the study was to identify the impact of teacher's background and teacher's behavior on students learning. The present study is descriptive in nature. The data were collected from the wide verity of sources. Due to the financial constraint, it was delimited to two districts of Sahiwal division, i.e., Pakpattan and Sahiwal. The population of the study comprised of 4746 teachers, 164876 students and 237 secondary and higher secondary schools in public sector in the division of Sahiwal. The present study aimed to explore the data about the teachers' background and their behavior on students learning. In order to determine these variables, the researcher developed a questionnaire on the five point Likert scale. Supervisor and other educational experts were consulted during the development of instrument before the finalization and validation of questionnaire. Questionnaires were distributed among the students of two districts of Sahiwal division. The instrument of study revised through piloting the items the data were collected by researcher personally and with the help of brothers and friends. The data were analyzed by using SPSS version 16. Finally 850 questionnaires were returned back to the respondents representing the sample of the study. It was survey type study. This is an in-depth study of students learning in English subjects regarding the teacher's background and teacher's behavior. The study generated following major findings that majority of teachers follow text books while teaching;

provide information other than text book, they regular and punctual, their style of teaching help the students in learning. These teachers are co-operative with students but they did not ignore the mistakes of their students. However, they care about the emotions of students and give them moral training. Moreover the overall impact of teachers' behavior on students learning was not significant.

Keywords: Teachers' Behavior, Behavior and Learning

Introduction

More and more projects dealing with the problem of the social interaction of teachers with students and young people are devoted to the question of the connection between the teachers' and the promotion of the capacity for students learning and responsible independent action, towards performance. In these considerations a prominent and important part is also played by the effect of the teachers' whether it be of a fumitory, confirming, or reinforcing nature. Education is systematic instruction for the development of character or mental power. Rao (2001, p. 45) quoted that in an education conference, Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah father of the nation, addressed that education does not merely mean academic education. There is immediate and urgent need for giving scientific and technical education to our people in order to build up our future (Rao 2001, p. 45).

The greatest challenge being faced by Pakistan today is to create an environment where every child can go to school. Pakistani education system has divided children in different categories. To bridge the gap, not only it is important to provide education to every child but also it should be free, uniform and equality education that opens up equal opportunities of progress and prosperity for everyone. There is no doubt that only education can liberate children from poverty and deprivation and Pakistan from fundamentalism, intolerance, corruption, terrorism and herald an era of progress (SPARC, 2006: pp. 95-96). School is recognized by sociologists and social psychologists as second to family; as an agent of socialization and organization. In this respect, probably, the teacher is the most important element in the child life span.

The teaching profession is currently viewed ill-founded and out of date in a world (Crowther, et al, 2002, p. 3). The challenge of the teacher of today is to discover the problem of students learning. It is important to train prospective teachers so that they are skillful to minimization of discipline and learning in a positive manner because the teacher in order to effectual element for pupil improvement that the teachers are those who influence on students learning (Gabriel, 2005: p.11).

The study was designed to identify the impact of teachers' professional & academic background on students' learning behavior at elementary level.

Objectives of the Study

Following objectives of the study are suggested:

1. To find out the academic background of elementary teachers working in secondary or higher secondary schools.
2. To explore the teachers' behavior in the classroom at elementary level.
3. To assess the learning of 8th grade students in the subject of English (respondents of the study).
4. To see the impact of teachers' background and behavior on students learning at

- elementary level.
5. To suggest improvements in teachers' behavior on the basis of findings of the study.

Significance of the Study

The present study provided empirical data to educators working in different capacities about teachers. It also helped to the authorities concerned with the pre-service and in-service training of teachers to make proper change in the curricula. This study revealed a number of information about the teachers' background and its effects on students learning which will be helpful for formulating different strategies to overcome the problems of students and teachers. In short, this study may prove much helpful to know the impact of teachers' background and on the students' learning of elementary level students.

Research Questions

This study deals the following research questions:

- What is the teachers' academic background at elementary level?
- What is the teachers' behavior at elementary level?
- What is the impact of teachers' academic background on students learning at elementary level?
- What is the impact of teachers' behavior on students learning at elementary level?

Delimitations

Due to time and financial constraints this study was delimited to teachers and students of elementary level

Review of Literature

The quality of education depends upon the quality of its citizens and the quality of citizens depends on the quality of their education and quality of education besides other factors depends upon teacher's back ground and teacher's behavior on student learning. Thus to enhance the quality of education it is necessary to improve the teacher's attitude and behavior towards students learning. Those factors are needed to be identified which effects these characteristic (Kochnar, 2000, p. 172). Bolman and Deal (2003, p. 19) describes teacher as a manager and school as an organization in new perspective, or provides frames to understand and manage organization. As they defined frames are both windows open to the world and lenses that brings the world into focus. Teachers' behavior has received significant attention in studies of the work place. This is due to the general recognition that this variable can be major determination of this performance (Angle, 1981; Riketta, 2002, pp. 4-9) and effectiveness of teaching (Iaschinger, 2000; Miller, 1978: pp. 25-40). Many scholars have defined teachers commitment e.g. Kenter (1986, p. 18), views teachers commitment as the willingness of teachers to devote energy and loyalty towards students and their learning. According to Cook (2001, p. 36) purposes of teaching and learning guide and counseling services for school children are to:-

- Improve academic qualification.
- Foster positive attitudes and towards school, learning and work.

Ansari (1980, p. 76) found that teachers' background and teachers are both significant

variables which determine the academic performance of the students?

As religions knowledge forms the basis of understanding and dealing with life, Muslims look to the Sunnah of the Prophet (S.A.W) as guide lines to which knowledge is essential? Obligatory duty of Muslims is to educate their children. As for the information of aspect of education, this of course depends upon the capability of teacher and the more knows, the better educated their children will be. The child first begins to learn by repetition and invitation (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 19).

Murphy (2005, p. 14) quoted that teachers are those who influence the students and adults in the school setting. Teacher was identified who reached out to other with encouragement technical knowledge to solve classroom problems and enthusiasm for learning new things. The definition of teacher proper and those they are contributing to school reform or students learning. Influencing others to improve their professional practice .We characterize teacher as an individual who are actively involved in promoting change and effectively communicate with students (Haris, 2002, p. 102).

Ahmad (2005, p. 74) expresses and uses a global understanding of students in schools wire and his associates identified four typical concepts of teaching as: labor, as craft, a profession, and an art. So teacher is person who teachers others. Teacher is a reformer, teacher is a creature, and teacher is a human engineer. He works like a farmer. Teacher is the name of transfer of knowledge (Ahmad, 2005, p. 74). A part from this professional training for this purpose the teacher should behave adequate academic education. Whenever possible he should posses B.Ed or preferable M.Ed. Those teaching child psychology should have high academic qualifications in this subjects combined with teaching experience. Gordon (2000, P.35) focused on traits of teacher personality that are favored and more noticed by students during learning and teaching process. Powerll and Peel (2000, p. 34) of in his Rhetoric, Aristocracy states that the speaker's character is one of his most effectiveness of the lecture. The good lectures show that he has the interest of his listeners at heart. Darling-Hammond (2000) concludes in his article Teacher qualifications: Effects of certification, degree, and experience on 8th-grade student achievement that the effects of well-prepared teachers on student achievement can outweigh teacher background factors including poverty, language background, and minority status. Further, she contends that measures of teacher quality are more strongly related to student achievement than other kinds of Investments, including reduced class sizes, overall spending on education, and teacher salaries. Using a very different conception of teacher quality They conclude from their analysis of 400,000 students in 3000 schools that while school quality is an important determinant of student achievement, the most important predictor is teacher quality. Hanushek (1992) estimates that the difference between having a good teacher and having a bad teacher can exceed 8th grade-level equivalent in annual achievement growth. Further, they contend that lower achieving students are the most likely to benefit from increases in teacher effectiveness. In the current policy climate of Standards-based reform, these findings make a strong case for gaining a better understanding of what really accounts for these effects. Of particular interest is the impact of policy relevant teacher qualifications such as degree level, certification, and content-specific expertise. Existing research provides some direction regarding the Impact of attributes of elementary school teachers. While quasi-experimental studies have been plagued historically by inconclusive findings regarding the impact of teacher degree at the elementary level (Harnisch, 1987; Monk, 1994), more recent studies that have attended to the subject area in which the advanced degree was earned have been relatively consistent in their findings of a positive effect of teacher degree on high school

student achievement.

Goldhaber and Brewer (1997b, 2000) draw on nationally representative data provided to estimate the impact of teachers' holding masters degrees on high school students' English achievement. These studies demonstrate the importance of the subject area in which the degree was awarded. The researchers found that student achievement gains in English were positively associated with those assigned to teachers who earned their masters degree in English, controlling for student and teacher characteristics. No effect was evident in cases where the teachers had no advanced degree or where the degree was earned in a subject other than English. Their findings suggest that general measures of teacher degree level are not related to high school student achievement in math, science, English or history. However, in English subject-specific degrees earned were found to have a positive impact on student test scores in those subjects. This was the case for both bachelors as well as master's degrees. Further, teachers holding both a bachelor's and a master's degree in the subject area taught were the most effective.

While the researchers did not distinguish the level of the degree earned, the subject-specific degree variable was a positive predictor of 8th grade student achievement in all specifications of the model tested. While fewer in number, studies of high school teacher certification parallel those of degree level, with positive effects limited to subject-specific credentials. Goldhaber and Brewer's (1997a) analysis of data revealed that students assigned to teachers who were certified in English, or had earned a bachelor's or master's degree in English, had higher test scores than those assigned to teachers who lacked these subject specific credentials, controlling for other student and teacher characteristics. In contrast, Darling-Hammond (2000) equates teacher quality with specific qualifications and their expected effects on achievement. This study did find that black students assigned to teachers holding at hat the English scores of students assigned to teachers with master's degrees or certification in subjects other than English were no different than scores of students assigned to teachers with fewer qualifications, further underlining the importance of subject-specific credentials. While a clear picture is beginning to emerge regarding the effect of teacher degrees and certification at the elementary level, the evidence at the elementary level remains mixed and inconclusive. The existing evidence of a positive effect of teacher degree level on elementary student achievement is overshadowed by the many studies that find either no discernable effect (Link & Ratledge, 1979; Murnane & Phillips, 1981), or even a negative effect (Eberts & Stone, 1984; Kiesling, 1984; Rowan, Correnti, & Miller, 2002) of teachers' holding master's degrees on elementary student achievement. While most studies estimating the effect of teacher qualifications have focused on the characteristics of the student's current teacher, several efforts have been made to understand whether the qualifications of the full school faculty might have a contextual effect on student achievement. One argument supporting this notion of school-level effects of teacher qualifications is that teachers learn from one another, so any negative effect associated with having a low-quality teacher might be reduced in schools where there are other teachers who are supportive, more knowledgeable and more skilled. No similar studies of multilevel effects associated with teacher qualifications could be found for elementary education. In an effort to address these gaps in the literature, this study draws on national data.

The analysis parallels the work of researchers who have studied the relationship between teacher qualifications and student achievement at the high school level (most notably, the work of Goldhaber & Brewer, 1997b, 2000). In doing so, the study provides much needed empirical evidence about teacher quality at the elementary school level Teacher

qualifications. This study gives information about the qualifications of children's 8th grade teachers, including highest degree attained, degree type, certification status, coursework related to teaching, and the number of years that teachers have taught different grades. We were especially interested in developing a set of variables that would parallel variables used in studies that examined the effects of teacher qualifications on achievement at the secondary school (Goldhaber & Brewer 1997, 2000).

Consistent with these studies, we constructed an indicator of teacher's certification status (regular or alternative vs. none, temporary, provisional, emergency or probation) and two indicator variables of teacher's experience (beginning teachers with zero through 2 years of experience teaching 8th-grade and more veteran teachers with 5 or more years of experience teaching 8th grade).

Prior researches linking student achievement to teacher quality, as represented by observable characteristics such as teacher background, credentials, certification and experience has had mixed results (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2007; Goldhaber & Brewer, 2000; Hanushek, 1986, 1997). However, recent studies that focus on the impact of teacher quality on student achievement by specifically evaluating teacher knowledge demonstrate considerable consensus. These studies generally proxy teacher knowledge by specific subject matter, certification, course grades, GPA, or NTBS certification (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2007; Goldhaber & Brewer, 1997, 2000; Kukla-Acevedo, 2009; Monk, 1994).

Not surprisingly, direct measures of teacher knowledge have also demonstrated significant positive effects on student learning (Carpenter et al., 1988; Hill et al., 2005; Moats & Foorman, 2003). An important element related to the purposes of the California Professional Development Institutes CPDI is that teacher quality is unevenly distributed among schools (Heck, 2007; Hill & Lubienski, 2007).

Nature, Population and Sampling of Study

Present study is descriptive in nature as its aim is to formulate the research questions to precede the research for current situation of elementary teaches. All The elementary teachers and students reported by P.M.I.U. Lahore, Punjab, 2009 of Sahiwal Division are the population of the study. Eighty six schools, (56 rural and 30 urban), 210 teachers (100 rural and 110 urban) and 850 students (400 rural and 450 urban) were selected randomly.

The detailed distribution of sample is given below in table:

Districts of Sahiwal Division	Schools				Student		Teacher	
	Rural		Urban		Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Pakpattan	8	8	5	5	200	250	50	60
Sahiwal	20	20	10	10	200	200	50	50
Sub-Total	28	28	15	15	400	450	100	110
Total	56		30		850		210	

Instrumentation

The teachers' background and behavior was measured in term of students' opinions. Four students were asked about the background and behavior of his\ her English teacher. In order to measure the teachers' background and behavior, the researcher developed a five point likert scale questionnaire. This questionnaire consisted of the various components of teachers' background and behavior. The teachers' background was inquired through five items like teachers' academic / professional qualification, experience, locality and gender. The teachers' behavior was found with the help of remaining thirty four items like teacher's instruction and use of instructional aids. Teaching professionalism and style, teacher's co-operation, teachers behave students with open-mindedness, punishment, motivation through creating interest, bullying and abuses and reinforcement. The supervisor and other educational experts review this questioner before finalization and validation. The instrument of study was pilot tested for reliability. For the pilot testing the local eight public schools were selected from Sahiwal and Pakpattan Districts. The researcher personally visited and administered the questionnaires among the student of schools.

The items of questionnaires were computed on SPSS package for the reliability of questionnaire. The computer runs item analysis. Initially the reliability was 0.78, however the four very week items were deleted and then reliability increased up to 0.90.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

The researcher collected data herself and with the help of her relatives from sampled schools. The researcher distributed questionnaires among male and female students of rural and urban sampled schools for collection of data. The 850 questionnaires returned back from the respondents.

The collecting data computed by using the statistical package of social sciences (SPSS) version 16. Then the data were tabulated, analyzed and interpreted.

The responses were given in total of each items was shown in tabular form. The level of confidence used in the study was 0.05 for the statistical treatment of data. Chi-square test was applied for analysis and interpretation of data. Test in order to determine that observed frequencies are significantly different from the expected frequencies, therefore Chi-Square test was applied.

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

Following findings were drawn from this research.

Both male and female students follow their teachers in the same way. Male teachers use text books more frequently as compared to female teachers. Female teachers are ahead in providing information other than text books. Female teachers use computer more frequently as compared to male teachers. Male teachers are more punctual as compared to female teachers. Regularity of male and female teachers perceived as similar as by students. Teaching style of male and female teachers is as similar as perceived by students. Male teachers show happiness as compared to female teachers. Female teachers consider teaching as a burden in comparison of male teachers. Female teachers are more co-operative as compared to male teachers. Male and female teachers give individual attention similarly as perceived by the students. Female teachers try more to know students problem as compared to the male teachers. Male and female teachers try to solve students' problems similarly as compared to male teachers. Male teachers are ahead to talk's students affectionately than female teachers. Female teachers bear self criticism as compared to male teachers. Female teachers forgive students for naughtiness as compared to male teachers. Both male and female teachers become happy while teaching as similar as perceived by students. Male teachers ignore students' mistakes as compared to female teachers. Male and female teachers behave students sympathetically as compared to the female teachers. Male and female teachers care students' emotions as similar as perceived by students. Male teachers treat students affectionately similarly. Both male and female teachers give moral training in the same way. Both male and female teachers punish students for not doing homework in the same way. Female teachers forgive students for not doing homework as compared to the male teachers. Female teachers punish students as compared to the male teachers. Male teachers more develop interest in reading as compared to the female teachers. Female teachers encourage students for doing good work as compared to male teachers. Female teachers are more ahead in creating interest with funny talks while teaching as compared to male teachers. Female teachers scold students most frequently as compared to the male teachers. Female teachers call ill names as compared to male teachers. Both male and female teachers abuses students in the same way. Female teachers show anger as compared to the male teachers. Female teachers praise students as compared to the male teachers. Female teachers more give prizes as compared to the male teachers. Urban teachers followed by their students as compared to the rural teachers. Both rural and urban teachers use text books similarly. Urban teachers provide more information other than textbooks as compared to the rural teachers. Urban teachers use computer as compared to the rural teachers. The qualities of punctuality of rural and urban teachers are in the same way. The qualities of regularity of rural and urban teachers are in the same way. Both rural and urban teachers' teaching style is more effective as similar as perceived by the students. Both rural and urban teachers teach happily. Rural and urban teachers consider teaching as a burden in the same way. Urban teachers co-operate students as compared to the rural teachers. Urban teachers give individual attention as compared to the rural teachers. Both rural and urban teachers try to know students problems similarly as perceive by students. Both rural and urban teachers try to solve students' problems similarly. Both rural and urban teachers talk students affectionately in the same way. Urban teachers bear self criticism as compared to rural teachers. Urban teachers forgive students for naughtiness as compared to the rural teachers. Both rural and urban teachers become happy for questioning as perceived by the students. Both rural and urban teachers

ignore students' mistakes in the same way. Both rural and urban teachers behave students sympathetically as similar as perceived by the students. Both rural and urban teachers care students' emotions similarly. Rural teachers treat students affectionately as compared to the urban teachers. Urban teachers give moral training as compared to rural teachers. Urban teachers punish students for not doing homework as compared to rural teachers. Urban teachers forgive students for not doing homework as compared to the rural teachers. Both urban and rural teachers punish students in the same way. Both rural and urban teachers develop interest in the same way. Urban teachers encourage students as compared to the rural teachers. Urban teachers create interest with funny talks as compared to the rural teachers. Rural and urban teachers scold students as similar as perceived by the students. Urban teachers call students by ill names as compared to rural teachers. Both rural and urban teachers abuses students for not doing homework in the same way. Both rural and urban teachers become angry with students similarly. Both rural and urban teachers praise students orally in the same way. Both rural and urban teachers give prizes in the same way. Instructions of B.A. teachers mostly followed by their students as compared to the M.A teachers. M.A teachers use more text books as compared to the B.A teachers. Both teachers having qualification of B.A and M.A in provision information other than text books are similar. Both teachers having qualification of B.A and M.A use computer, are punctual, are regular, are teaching, teach happily, as similar as perceived by the students. Teachers having qualification of M.A. take teaching as a burden as compared to the B.A teachers. Teachers having qualifications of B.A. are more co-operative as compared to the M.A teachers. Both teachers having qualification of B.A and M.A give attention individually, try to know students problems, try to solve students' problems, are talking with students affectionately, forgive students for naughtiness, becomes happy, ignore students 'mistakes, behave students sympathetically, care students' emotions, treat students 'affectionately, give students' moral training, punish students for not doing homework, forgive students, develop interest, encourage students, scolds' students, calls students' ill names, abuses students, becomes angry with students, praise orally to the students, give prizes to the students, as similar as perceived by the students. Both teachers having qualification of B.Ed and M.Ed their instructions followed by their students, use more textbook, provide more information other than text books as compared to the B.Ed teachers. Both teachers having qualification of B.Ed and M.Ed teachers use computers, are punctual, are regular, teaching with same style, teach happily, consider teaching as burden, co-operate with students, give individual attention individually, try to know students' problems, try to solve students' problems talk students affectionately, bear self criticism, forgive students for naughtiness, become happier for questioning during teaching, ignore students' mistakes, behave students' sympathetically, care students 'emotions, treat students affectionately, moral training, punish students for not doing homework, forgive students for not doing homework, develop interest and encourage students, create interest with funny talks more frequently, scold's students, call students ill names, abuses students, as similar as perceived by the students. Teachers having qualification of B.Ed becomes angry with students as compared to the M.Ed teachers. Both teachers having qualification of B.Ed and M.Ed praise students in the same way. M.Ed teachers give prize like pencils and copies etc to the students more frequently as compared to the B.Ed teachers.

Conclusions

Following conclusions were drawn from the findings of the study. The detail of gender, locality, academic and professional qualification wise conclusions are as follows:

1. There is significant difference between male and female teachers regarding the use

- of text books, provision information other than text books, use of computer, quality of punctuality, teaching with happiness, taking teaching as a burden, co-operation, knowing students problems, talking students affectionately, bearing self criticism, forgive students for naughtiness, ignore students mistakes, forgive students for not doing homework, developing interest in reading, encouraging students for doing good work, creating interest with funny talks, scolding students, calling ill names, showing angriness, praise students and giving prize.
2. There is no significant difference between male and female teachers for following teachers' instructions, quality of regularity, teaching style, giving individual attention, trying to solve students problems, teaching with happiness, caring for students emotions, treating students affectionately, giving moral training, punish students for not doing home work, abuses students.
 3. There is significant difference between rural and urban teachers for following their teachers' instructions; provision information other than text book, use of computer, co-operation, giving individual attention, bear self criticism, forgive students for naughtiness, treat students affectionately, giving moral training, punishing and forgiving students for not doing homework, encouraging students, creating interest with funny talks.
 4. There is no significant difference between rural and urban teachers regarding the use of text book, quality of punctuality, regularity, teaching style, teaching happily, take teaching as a burden, knowing students problems, solving students' problems, talking students with affectionately, become happy for questioning while teaching, ignoring students' mistakes, behaving sympathetically, caring students' emotions, punishing, developing interest, scolding and calling ill names, bullying and abuses, becoming angry with students, praise orally and give prize to the students.
 5. The findings of the study revealed that there is significant difference between B.A and M.A teachers for following their teachers' instruction, taking teaching as a burden, co-operation, become angry with students.
 6. There is no significant difference between B.A and M.A teachers with respect in provision information other than text book, use of computer, punctuality, regularity, teaching style, teaching happily, giving individual attention, knowing problems, solving problems of students, talking affectionately, bearing self criticism, forgiving naughtiness, becoming happy for questioning, ignoring students mistakes, behave sympathetically, caring students emotions, treating affectionately, giving moral training, punishing, forgiving students for not doing homework. Punishing, developing interest, encouraging students, creating interest with funny talks, scolding, calling ill names, abusing, praising orally and giving prizes.
 7. It concluded that there is significant difference between B.Ed and M.Ed teachers in term of using of text books, provision information other than text book, creating interest with funny talks, becoming angry with students and giving prizes to the students.
 8. There is no significant difference between B.Ed and M.Ed teachers for following their teachers' instructions, using computer, punctual, regular, teaching style, co-operative, giving individual attention, knowing and solving students problems, talking affectionately, bearing self criticism, forgiving naughtiness, becoming happy for questioning, ignoring mistakes, behaving sympathetically, caring emotions, treating affectionately, giving moral training, punishing, and forgiving students for not doing homework, punishing, students, developing interest, scolding, calling ill names, abusing students and praising orally

9. It concluded that teachers' behavior as perceived by the students has no significant impact on students learning.

Recommendations

The important suggestions and recommendations are given below which must be implemented, if they want to make the teacher community a happy community. On the basis of findings and conclusion of this study following recommendations are made.

1. In order to meet today's challenges policy makers should revise the educational policies continuously for developing knowledge, understandings, values, attitudes and skills.
2. The research should be conduct to taking these variables in the area of secondary education.
3. The detail research studies should be conducted on the behaviour and academic background using triangulation methods of research.
4. The department should provide incentives for teachers showing good behaviour and results.
5. Program should be starts for improvement of the education department. Government should have to be arranged in service training courses for school teachers.
6. Head teachers should provide opportunities for increasing their professional qualification at elementary and secondary level.
7. For close monitoring of rural schools to monitor the teaching/ learning process. Higher authorities of education department should be visited the rural school for encouragement of students and teachers.
8. The friendly environment should create among students, teachers and school heads for bringing improvement in behavior.
9. Special seminars and workshop should be arranged by the government with the collaboration of private or public sectors and through (both electronic and print media).
10. The teacher should develop study habits and positive attitudes towards the students which determine the academic performance of the students.
11. D.E.O/ E.D.O. should appreciate the teacher with respect to their good behavior and showing good results.
12. They should give them additional incentive to enhance the interest of teaching.
13. Teacher need to continue their professional development by participating in workshop and taking additional courses that will equip them to meet the needs of their students.

References

- Ahmad, G. P. (2005). A model of in-service Training for University Teachers. Gomal University, *Journal of Research*, 21, 74-7
- Al-Afandi, M. H. & Block, N. A. (1980). *Curriculum and teacher education*. Jeddah: King Abdul Aziz University.
- Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Horsey, C. (1997). From first grade forward: Early foundations of high school dropout. *Sociology of Education*, 70(2), 87– 107.
- Allin, L. & Turner, (2007). Assessment in the workplace for work based supervisor. Retrieved July 2, 2008 from www.practicebasedlearning.org.htm
- Ananthakrishman, N. (1993). Micro teaching As Vehicle of teacher training. Its Advantages and Disadvantages. *Journal of Postgraduate Medicine* 39 (3) 142-3.
- Anastasi, A. (1990). *Psychological testing*. New York: Macmillan publishing Co.
- Anderson, R. C., & Freebody, P. (1981). *Vocabulary knowledge*. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews*. New York: International Reading Association.
- Ansari, Z. A. (1980). *Study habits and attitudes of students development and validation of questions measures Islamabad*: London: National Institute of Psychology.
- Armstrong, D. G. (1981) *Education; an introduction*. New York: Macmillan publishing Co, Inc.
- Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. New York: Longman.
- Ausubel, D. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. New York: Holt.
- Best, W. J. (1983). *Research in Education (4th edition)*. New Delhi: Printed Hall of India Pvt. Ltd..
- Bhatnager, A. & Gupta N. (1999). *Guidance and counseling (Vol. II)*, New Delhi: National Council of Education.
- Bloom, B. (1976). *Handbook of formative and summative evaluation of students learning*.

New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bowd, D. (1986). *Implementing student self assessment*. Sydney: Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia.

Breti, S. (2003). *Rights of the child in Pakistan Report on the implementation of the convention on the rights of the child by Pakistan*. Geneva. OMCT World Organization against torture.

Britannica, (1988). World Book Encyclopedia Chicago, USA: World Book, Inc.

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Bruceckman, Jack, G. & Stanley, (1997). *Competence based industrial arts teacher education*. New York: American Council on Industrial Arts Teacher Education.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge: MA. Harvard University press.

Brwon, G. & Atkis, M. (1988). *Effectives teaching in higher education*. London: Methuen

Bull, P. (2004). *Communication under the microscope: the Theory and practice of micro analysis*. New York: Rutledge.

Burchinal, M. R., Peisner-Feinberg, E., Pianta, R. C., & Howes, C. (2002). Development of academic skills from preschool through second grade: Family and classroom predictors of developmental trajectories. *Journal of School Psychology*, 40(5), 415–436.

Carlisle, J., Correnti, R., Phelps, G., & Zeng, J. (2009). Investigating teachers' knowledge of language structure and its relation to students' reading achievement. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 22, 457–486.

Charis, K. (1986). *Effective teaching in school*, London: Basil Black-Well Limited.

Charles T. R. (2001). Customers vs. Products: Adopting an effective approach to business students, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 9 (2), 110-115.

Chowdary, S. B. J. R. & Raju, N. (2004). *Master of teaching skills*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.

Cohen, D. K., Raudenbush, S. W., & Ball, D. L. (2003). Resources, instruction, and research.

- Connor, C. M. (2002a). Preschool children and teachers talking together: The influence of child, family, teacher, and classroom characteristics on children's developing literacy. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Connor, C. M., Morrison, F. J., & Petrella, J. N. (2004b). Effective reading comprehension instruction: Examining child by instruction interactions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(4), 682– 698.
- Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching*, (3rd ed.) New York: Arnold.
- Cooper, H., & Hedges, L. (1994). *The handbook of research synthesis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cooper, S. (1997). *Cooper smith self esteem inventories*. Palo Alto, Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Cord, M.J. (1996). Unintended consequences of punishment in pediatrics, official journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics. Nov.4-Retrived on November 4, 2006 from <http://www.pediatrics.org>
- Crow & Crow, (1960). *An introduction to guidance basic principles and practices* (2nd Ed). New York: American Book Company.
- Crowther, F, Kaagan, S.S, Ferguson, M. & Hann, L. (2002). *Developing teacher leaders: how teacher leadership enhances school success*. California: Crown Press Inc, Thousand Oaks, Californian.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Educational Policy Analysis and Archives*, 8(1).
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Journal of Education Policy Analysis*, 8(1).
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Inequality and the right to learn: Access to qualified teachers in California's public schools. *Teachers College Record*, 106(10), 1936–1966.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining highly qualified teachers Q: What does scientifically based research Q actually tell us? *Educational Researcher*, 31(9), 13– 25.

- Dasgupta, D. N. (2002). *Practice teaching*. Jaipur: Pointer Publishers.
- Davey, G. (2004). *Complete psychology*. Dubai: Book Point Ltd.
- Dean, J. (2000). *Improving children's learning*. Effective teaching in the primary schools. London: Routledge.
- Dhammi, S. K. (2009). A study of attitude of elementary school teachers of Punjab in relation to sex, location, teaching experience and qualification. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 1(1) 2825-2827.
- Dickinson, D. K., & Tabors, P. O. (2001). *Beginning literacy with language*. Baltimore7 Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- DOE (2002). Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge. Washington DC7 U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Office of Policy Planning and Innovation. 372 C. McDonald Connor et al. / *Journal of School Psychology* 43 (2005) 343–375
- DOE. (2004a). Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge: The secretary's third annual report on teacher quality. Washington DC7 U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education.
- DOE. (2004b). No child left behind: A toolkit for teachers. Washington DC: US Department of Education, Office of the Deputy Secretary.
- Dorman J. (2002). Classroom environment research: progress and possibilities" Queensland. *Journal of Educational Research* 18.
- Duncan, G. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1999). Assessing the effects of context in studies of child and youth development. *Educational Psychologist*, 34(1), 29–41.
- Duncan, G. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2001). The well-being of children and families: Research and data needs. In A. Thornton (Ed.), *The well-being of children and families: Research and data needs*. Ann Arbor, MI7 University of Michigan Press.
- Dunn, T. G., & Shriener, C. (1999). Deliberate practice in teaching: what teachers do for self-improvement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 631–651.

- Earnest, J. S. (2004). Action research for staff professional development. A case study of a school in Uganda “research unit for the societies in change, Curtin University of Technology.
- Eberts, R. W., & Stone, J. A. (1984). *Unions and public schools*.
Economics of Education Review, 13(1), 1–17.
- Eggan, P., & Keachak, D. (2001). *Educational psychology windows on classrooms*, (5th Ed). New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inch [Http://www. Spearfish.K12. sd.us/west/master/peters/pagel.html](http://www.spearfish.k12.sd.us/west/master/peters/pagel.html).
- Eggleton, & Travis (2001). *Discipline in the schools*. Opinion Papers. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 451554.
- Fadali, M. S., Bryand, N. V., & Robinson, M. (2004). *Work in progress-is attitude towards mathematics a major obstacles to Engineering Educations*. In IEEE frontiers in Education Conference October 20-23.
- Ferguson, R. F. (1991). Paying for public education. Harvard: *Journal on Legislation*, 28(2), 465–498.
- Ferguson, R. F., & Ladd, H. F. (1996). How and why money matters: An analysis of Alabama schools. In H. F. Ladd (Ed.), *Holding schools accountable: Performance-based reform in education* (pp. 265–298). Washington, DC: Brookings.
- Ferguson, R., & Ladd, H. (1996). *How and why money matters: An analysis of Alabama schools*. In Helen Ladd (Ed.), *Holding schools accountable*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press.
- Fontana, D. (1995). *Psychology for teachers* (3rd ed.) London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Foorman, B. R., Francis, D. J., Fletcher, J. M., Schatschneider, C., & Mehta, P. (1998). The role of instruction in learning to read: Preventing reading failure in at risk children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 37– 55.
- for teacher preparation* (Opinion paper 120). Baltimore, MD: International Dyslexia Association.

- Forsyth, D. R. (1986). *Social psychology*. California: Wadsworth Inc.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuch, D., & Phillips, N. (1994). The relation between teachers' beliefs about the importance of good student work habits, teacher planning, and student achievement. *The Elementary School Journal*, 94(3), 331–345.
- Gabriel, J. (2005). *How to thrive as a teacher leader*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Gag, L. R. (1997). *Educational research* (5th ed.) Islamabad: National Book Foundation.
- Garret, H.E. (1981). *Statistics Psychology and Education* (4th Ed.) India: Vikas House.
- Goldhaber, D. (2002). The mystery of good teaching: Surveying the evidence on student achievement and teachers' characteristics. *Education Next*, 2(1), 50–55.
- Goldhaber, D. D., & Anthony, E. A. (2007). Can teacher quality be effectively assessed? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89(1), 134–150.
- Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (1997). Why don't schools and teachers seem to matter? Assessing the impact of unobservable on educational productivity. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 32(3), 505–523.
- Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (1997a). Why don't schools and teachers seem to matter? Assessing the impact of unobservable on educational productivity. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 32(3), 505–523.
- Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (1997b). *Evaluating the effect of teacher degree level on educational performance*. In W. J. Fowler (Ed.), *Developments in School Finance*, 1996. Washington, DC: US Department of Education.
- Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (1998). When should we reward degrees for teachers? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 134–138.
- Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (1999). *Teacher licensing and student achievement*. In M. Kasteroroon, & C. E. Finn (Eds.), *Better teachers, better schools*. Washington DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), 129–146.

- Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), 129–146.
- Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22, 122–145.
- Goldschmidt, & Phelps (2007). *Does teacher professional development affect content and pedagogical knowledge: How much and for how long?* CSE Technical Report No. 711. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE), University of California.
- Good, C.V. (1973) *Dictionary of education*, (3rd ed.) New York: McGraw Hill; Book Company.
- Gordon P.A. (2000). *Students Evaluations of college instruction*. An overview partial requirements for PS Y 702, conditions of learning, Vladosta State University.
- Govt. of Pakistan (1959). National Educational Report of commission. Karachi ministry of Education.
- Govt. of Pakistan (1998). National education policy 1998-2010. Islamabad: Ministry of Education.
- Goyal, I.C. (1984). *Relationship between teacher attitude and achievement journal education research and extension*, 20(3), 165.
- Graue, E., Clements, M. A., Reynolds, A. J., & Niles, M. D. (2004). More than teacher directed or child initiated: Preschool curriculum type, parent involvement, and children's outcomes in the Child–Parent Centers. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12.
- Green, J., Dixon, C., Lin, L., Floriani, A., Bradley, M., & Paxton, S., et al., Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group. (1992). In H. H. Marshall (Eds.), *Redefining student learning* (pp. 119–150). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- Greenwald, R., Hedges, L. V., & Laine, R. D. (1996). The effect of school resources on student achievement. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(3), 361–396.
- Greenwald, R., Hedges, L., & Laine, R. (1996). The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement. *Review of Education Research*, 66(3), 361–396.

- Greydanus, D. E. (2003). corporal punishment in schools, position paper of the society of the adolescent medicine in journal of adolcent health. New York: Elsevier Inc.
- Griffin, N., Aguirre-Muñoz, Z., Goldschmidt, P., Amabisca, A., Miyoshi, J., Swigert, S. (2003a). *Evaluation of the California Professional Development Institutes in English language arts: Primary grades year two report* (February). Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE), University of California.
- Griffin, N., Aguirre-Muñoz, Z., Miyoshi, J., Roberson, I., & Amabisca, A.
- Hale, B. (2006). Understanding children's rights: Theory & practice. *Family Court Review*, 44. Association of Family & Conciliation Courts. University press Limited.
- Hambleton, R., Swaminathan, H., & Rogers, H. J. (1991). *Fundamentals of item response theory*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hanif, A., & Saba, K. (2000). A study of effectiveness of trained and untrained teachers at elementary level. Lahore: Unpublished master thesis, University of the Punjab.
- Hanushek, E. A. (1986). The economics of schooling: production and efficiency in public schools. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 24(3), 1141–1178.
- Hanushek, E. A. (1992). The trade-off between child quantity and quality. *Journal of Political Economy*, 100, 84–117.
- Hanushek, E. A. (1992). The trade-off between child quantity and quality. *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(1), 84–117.
- Haris, A. & Muijs, D. (2002). Teacher leadership, A review of Research. Nottingham: National college for school leadership.
- Haris, A. (2002). *School improvement*. What, sin it for school? London: Flamer press.
- Harnisch, D. L. (1987). Characteristics associated with effective public high schools. *Journal of Educational Research*, 80, 233–241.
- Hawk, P. P., Coble, C. R., & Swanson, M. (1985). Certification: It does matter. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(3), 13– 15.

- Hewstone, M., Stroebe, W., Codol, J. P. & Stephenson, G. M. (1992). *Introduction of social psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hill, H. C., & Lubienski, S. (2007). Teachers' mathematics knowledge for teaching and school context a study of California teachers. *Educational Policy*, 21(5), 747–768.
- Hill, H. C., Rowan, B., & Ball, D. L. (2005). Effects of teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42, 371–406.
- Hoyle, R. H. (Ed.). (1995). *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA7 Sage Publications.
- Hymen & Ronald, (1993). *Corporal punishment*. Just what is it? And what should we do about it? ERIC No. ED 421737.
- Jencks, C., & Phillips, M. (1998). *The Black–White test score gap*. Washington, DC7 Brookings Institute.
- Jenkins, P. & Marie (1997). *Sparing the rod; schools, discipline & children's rights in multicultural Britain*. Paper presented at the Conference of the South Asian Education Law and Policy Association. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 421737.
- Jenkins, P. & Marie (2003). *Children's rights & wrongs: lessons from Strasbourg on classroom management*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002). ERIC Document Reproduction Service No .ED 468126.
- Johnson, D. W. Johnson, R. T. & Houlbec, E. J. (1993). *Circles of learning Co-operation in the classroom* (4th Ed). Edina Min Interaction.
- Juel, C., & Minden-Cupp, C. (2000). Learning to read words: Linguistic units and instructional strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35(4), 492–498.
- Kanstoroom, M., & Finn, C. E. (Eds.). (1999). *Better teachers, better schools* (pp. 65– 97). Washington DC7 Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Katzemeyer, M, & Moller, (2001), *G Awakening the seeping giant, help teacher develop as a leader*. Thousand oaks, California: crown press Inc.
- Kaul, L. (1984). *Methodology of Education Research*. India: Vikas Publishers House Ltd.

- Kearcney, P. & Plax, T.G. (1992). Students resistance to control. Inv. P. Ridonond and J. C. M croskey (edsl, Power in classroom. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Khan, Z. A. (1992). An overview of research as on in-Service teacher education in USA with implications for Pakistan. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, X.V (2) 36-45.
- Kiesling, H. J. (1984). Assignment practices and the relationship of instructional time to the reading performance of elementary school children. *Economics of Education Review*, 3(4), 341–350.
- Klem, L. (2000). Path analysis. In L. G. Grimm, & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics* (pp. 65– 97). Washington DC7 American Psychological Association.
- Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York. The Guilford Press.
- Kochnar, S. K. (2000). *Educational and vocational guidance in secondary schools*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited.
- Kukla-Acevedo, S. (2009). Do teacher characteristics matter? New results on the effects of teacher preparation on student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 28(1), 49–57.
- Lachinger, H. (2000). *The impact of workplace commitment, organizational trust on staff nurse' work satisfaction and organizational commitment, health care management review*, 26. (3), 365-73.
- Leinhardt, G., & Smith, D. (1985). Expertise in mathematics instruction: Subject matter knowledge. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 247-271.
- Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). Moving on up: Neighborhood effects on children and families. In M. H. Bornstein, & R. H. Bradley (Eds.), *Socioeconomic status, parenting, and child development* (pp. 79– 135). Ma Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Finance Association, Orlando, FL.
- Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company. Ehrenberg, R. G., & Brewer, D. J. (1994). Do school and teacher characteristics matter? Evidence from High School & Beyond.

- Link, C. R., & Ratledge, E. C. (1979). Student perceptions, I.Q., and achievement. *Journal of Human Resources*, 14, 98–111.
- McBer, H. (2002). *Research into teacher effectiveness: A model of teacher effectiveness*. Retrieved October 9, 2006 from <http://www.dfes.gov.uk /esearch/data/upload files/RR216.doc>
- McCutchen, D., & Berninger, V. (1999). Those who know, teach well: Helping teachers master literacy-related subject-matter knowledge. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 14(4), 215–226.
- McCutchen, D., Harry, D. R., & Cox, S. (2002). Reading teachers knowledge of children's literature and English phonology. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 52, 207–228.
- Mercer, L. D., Mercer, A. R. (1998). *Teaching Students with learning problem*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Meyer, J. & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, Research, & application* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miller, D. (1978). Career planning and management in organizations. *Advance Management Journal*, 43 (2) 33-43.
- Moats, L. (1994). The missing foundation in teacher education: Knowledge of the structure of spoken and written language. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 44, 81–102.
- Moats, L. (2000). *Speech to print: Language essentials for teachers*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.
- Moats, L., & Foorman. (2003). Measuring teachers' content knowledge of language and reading. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 53.
- Moats, L., & Lyon, R. (1996). Wanted: Teachers with knowledge of language. *Topics of Language Disorders*, 16(2), 73–86.
- Moller, G. (2005). *Teacher leaders. The administration and supervision of special programmes of education*. (2nd ed) In ed. A. Pankak, M. Littleton, and G. Schroth: Duburvae, A: Kendelly Hunt.
- Monk, D. H. (1994). Subject area preparation of secondary mathematics and science teachers and student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 13(2), 125–145.

- Monk, D. H. (1994). Subject area preparation of secondary mathematics and science teachers and student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 13(2), 125–145.
- Moon, B., Mayes S. S., & Hutchinson, S. (2004). *Teaching learning and curriculum in secondary schools*. London: Rutledge Palmer.
- Moor, A. (2004). *The good teacher: Dominant discourses in teaching and teacher education*. London: Rutledge Palmer.
- Morris, C. G. & Maisto, A. A. (2001). *Understanding psychology*. (5th ed). New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Muhammad, T. & Ismail, M. (2001). *Violence against children within the family & in schools*. Committee on the Rights of the Child. September 28. OHCHR, Geneva: NGOs Coalition on Child Rights-Pakistan. No. 2.
- Murphy, J. F. (2005). *Connecting teacher leadership and school and school improvement*; London: Crawin Press Inc.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). (2001). *Middle childhood generalist standards* (2nd ed). Washington, DC: Author.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). *Teacher quality: A report on the preparation and qualifications of public school teachers*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110 (2002).
- Neil, M. J. M. (1985). *Introduction to psychology*. USA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- Newton, P. D. (2002). *Talking sense in science: helping children understand through talk*, New York: Routledge flamer.
- Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S., & Hedges, L. (2004). How large are teacher effects? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26(3), 237–257.
- Phelps, G. (2006). *Investigating the validity of content knowledge for teaching reading measures: A consistency analysis and study packet*. In Consortium for policy research in education, study of instructional improvement, research report. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Phelps, G. (2009). *Just knowing how to read isn't enough! What teachers know about the content of reading*. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability*, 21(2),

137–154.

- Phelps, G., & Schilling, S. (2004). Developing measures of content knowledge for teaching reading. *Elementary School Journal*, 105(1), 31–48.
- Phillips, M. (2000). Understanding ethnic differences in academic achievement: Empirical issues. In D. W. Grissmer, & J. M. Ross (Eds.), *Analytic issues in the assessment of student achievement* (pp. 103–132). Washington, DC: US Department
- Piaget, J. (1972). *The psychology of the child*. New York: Basic Books.
- Podell, D. M., Kaminisky, S. & Crowl, T. K. (1997). *Educational psychology*. WI Dubuque: Brown & Bench Mark Publishers.
- policy issues in education (pp. 29–58). Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Ramsburg & Dawn (1997). *The debate over spanking*. ERIC Clearing house on Elementary and Early Childhood Education Urbana 11. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 405139.
- Ransburg & Down (1997). *Pakistan panel lode*. XLV of 1860. Lahore: Umer Khrum Printers.
- Rao, B. (2001). *Science education in Asia and the pacific*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (1987). Application of hierarchical linear models to assessing change. *Psychological Bulletin*, 104(3), 396–404.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models. Applications and data analysis methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Raven, B. H. & Rubin, J. Z. (1983). *Social psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rice, J. K. (2003). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effects of teacher attributes*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Rikketa, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta analysis. *Journal of Organizational* 23, 257-66.
- Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417–458.

- Robert, P., Vechio, Hearn, G., & Southey, G. (2000). *Organizational* (2nd ed.) Islamabad: Robhani Art press.
- Robert, T. B. (1975). *Four psychologies applied to education: Freedman-Behavioural-humanistic transpersonal-Cambridge*: massachusetts publishing co, Inc.
- Rockoff, J. E. (2004). The impact of individual teachers on student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *American Economic Review*, 94(2),
- Rogosa, D. R., Brandt, D., & Zimowski, M. (1982). A growth curve approach to the measurement of change. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92, 726–774.
- Rothstein, R. Pamela (1990). *Educational Psychology* New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Sadler (2004). *Leadership*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India
- Sharma, R. A (1993). *Advanced educational technology*, Merrut, Loyal Book Depot.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 1–22.
- Singer, J., & Willet, J. (2003). *Applied longitudinal data analysis: Modeling change and event occurrence*. Oxford University Press.
- Skinner, B. F. (1968). *The technology of teaching*. New York: Meredith Corporation.
- SPARC. (2006). *The State of Pakistan's children 2005*. Islamabad: SPARC
- Stephens J. M. (1860). *Educational psychology*. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Strenberg, R. J (2001). *Psychology in search of the human mind*. New York: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Strong, J. H. (2002). *Analysis of service performance dimension in relation to the Interstate new teacher assessment and support consortium*. Ph.D. College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

- Sundel, M. & Sundel, S. S. (2005). *Behaviour change in the human services*. London: Sage Publications Thousands Daks.
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*, New York, Harcourt, Brace & World Inc.
- Thompson, P.B. (1981). *Child Psychology*. Delhi: Surjeet Publications.
- UNICEF. (2001). *Corporal punishment in schools in South Asia*. Submitted to the Committee on the Rights of the Child. Regional Office for South Asia.
- UNICEF. (2005). *Disciplining the child practices & impacts*. NWFP: School & Literacy Department.
- Vecchio, R. P., Hearn, G. & Southey, G. (2000). *Organizational behaviour* (2nd Ed.). Islamabad: Roohani Art Press.
- Veer, A. (2004). *Modern teacher training*. New Delhi: Anmol Publications.
- Verma, M. (2006). *Teacher education*. New Delhi, Murari Lal & Sons.
- Walker, J. E, & Shea, T.M (1991). *Behaviour management: A practical Approach for educators* (5th Ed). New York :Macmillan company Ltd.
- Whitney, B. (1996). *Child protections for teachers and school*. London: 120Pentonville Road, Kogan Page Ltd.
- Williams, L. J. & Hazer, T. T. (1982). Antecedents and concourses of satisfaction and commitment in turn over muddles: a reanalysis using latent variable auctorial equation methods, *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Wilson, R. M. (2000). A Study of Attitude towards Corporal Punishment as an Educational Procedure from the Earliest times to the Present. Retrieved from http://www.zona_pellucida.com/wilson01.html.
- Wilson, S. M., & Wineberg, S. S. (1988). Peering at history through different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history. *Teachers College Record*, 89(4), 525–539.

-
- Wilson, S. M., Shulman, L., & Richert, A. (1987). *150 different ways of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teaching*. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring teachers' thinking* (pp. 104–123). Eastbourne, England: Cassell.
- Wineburg, S. S., & Wilson, S. M. (1991). *Subject-matter knowledge in the teaching of history*. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching* (Vol. 2). JAI Press: Greenwich, CT.
- Wong-Fillmore, L., & Snow, C. E. (2002). *What teachers need to know about language*. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7–54). McHenry, IL: Delta Systems Co., Inc.
- Wood, W. J. (1984). *Adapting instruction for the main street*, New York: Merrill Macmillan Company limited.
- Wright, P., Horn, S., & Sanders, W. (1997). Teachers and classroom heterogeneity: Their effects on educational outcomes. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11(1), 57–67.

Teachers' Behavior Measurement Scale

I am M.Phil scholar from University of Education Lahore. I am doing research for the attainment of my degree. The following research topic: Impact of teachers' background and teacher's behavior on students learning. All the information will be kept secret and it will be used for research purposes only. Thanking you in anticipation.

Researcher
Shabana Yasmin

Demographic Variables

Teacher's Information	Student's Information
School Name: _____	Student Name: _____
Teacher Name: _____	Class: _____
Qualification Ac: _____	Subject: _____
Qualification Pro: <input type="checkbox"/>	Obtained Marks: <input type="checkbox"/>
Teaching Experience: <input type="checkbox"/>	Total Marks: <input type="checkbox"/>
Gender: Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>	Gender: Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>
Area: Rural <input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input type="checkbox"/>	Area: Rural <input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input type="checkbox"/>

Sr.#	Statements	Always	Often	Some time	Rarely	Never
Teacher's instruction and use of instructional Aids						
1	You follow your teacher's instruction					
2	Your teacher teach with the help of textbooks					
3	Your teacher provides information other than text book.					
4	Your Teacher teaches you with help of computer					
Teaching Professionalism & style						
1	Your teachers are punctual					
2	Your teacher takes classes regularly					
3	Your teachers teaching style helps you in learning					
4	Your teacher teaches happily					
5	Your teacher takes teaching as burden					
Teachers' cooperation						
1	Your teacher cooperate with students					
2	Your teacher gives individual attention					
3	Your teacher tries to know students problem					
4	You teacher tries to solve students problems					

Sr.#	Statements	Always	Often	Some time	Rarely	Never
Teacher behaves with open mindedness						
1	Your teacher talks students affectionately					
2	Your teacher bears self criticism					
3	Your teacher forgive students for naughtiness					
4	Your teacher becomes happy for questioning during teaching					
Teacher shows compassion and care for students						
1	Your teacher ignores students mistakes					
2	Your teacher behaves with students sympathetically					
3	Your teacher cares of students emotions					
4	Your teacher treat students affectionately					
5	Your teacher gives students moral training					
Punishment						
1	Your teacher punish students for not doing homework					
2	Your teacher forgives students for not doing homework					
3	Your teacher punish students					
Motivation through creating interest						
1	Your teacher develop interest in reading					
2	Your teacher encourages students for doing good work					
3	Your teacher creates interest while teaching with funny talk.					
Bullying and abuses						
1	Your teacher scolds students					
2	Your teacher calls students ill name and un civilized names					
3	Your teacher abuses students for not doing work					
Reinforcement						
1	Your teacher becomes angry with students					
2	Your teacher praise students orally					
3	Your teacher gives prizes pencils; books and copies etc.					