



A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS: ANALYSIS OF MALE AND FEMALE SUBJECT SPECIALIST TEACHERS OF KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, PAKISTAN

Dr. Wilayat Bibi, Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Women University, Peshawar, Pakistan

Dr. Hafiz Muhammad Inamullah Professor, Institute of Education & Research, University of Peshawar

Haleema Akbar, PhD Scholar, Department of Education, Qurtuba University of science & information Technology, Hayatabad, Pakistan

Dr. Shehla Sheikh, lecturer, institute of education and research, Gomal University D.I. Khan

Rashid Mehmood, M.Phil Scholar, Institute of Education & Research, University of Peshawar

ABSTRACT- Teachers are considered the backbone of any educational system. They are expected to perform effectively. In this regard, a descriptive research was conducted to explore the teacher effectiveness among male and female subject specialist teachers at Higher Secondary School level. Therefore, sample of 141 subject specialists, both male (79) and female (62), were selected from 35 Higher Secondary Schools of district Peshawar through proportionate stratified random sampling technique. A self developed Teacher Effectiveness Scale was used for the collection of data.

The findings of the study revealed that male and female teachers differed in terms of teacher effectiveness; they possessed the same mental health status and finally the better mental health status improves teacher effectiveness and vice versa. Moreover, both male and female teachers prepared themselves for teaching, possessed knowledge of the subject matter and managed their classrooms. They possessed and utilized most of the time, though not always, the 'teacher's characteristics' with effective interpersonal relations with stakeholders. In short, both the groups were found to be effective in terms of teacher effectiveness. According to findings of the study some recommendations are suggested.

Keywords: Teacher effectiveness, Mental health, somatic problems, physical problems, Higher Secondary School teachers, Classroom management, Interpersonal relations, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

I. INTRODUCTION

Teaching is the primary task that aids in the achievement of educational goals. Effective instruction results in the accomplishment of school objectives. Successful instruction, on the other hand, is dependent on a variety of factors that contribute to the effectiveness of an instructor. These considerations could include appearance, teaching style, work satisfaction, mental health, ethnicity, place, and so on. According to the International Commission on Education's (1996) study, cooperation and active involvement of teachers is needed for any change to succeed. Teachers' environmental, social, and emotional well-being should be prioritised and valued.

An effective teacher with high aspirations produces positive social, academic, and behavioural consequences for society's well-being (Glass, 2011). In contrast, Parihar (2011) stated that a successful teacher often reflects on and produces student learning results, even if they are directly or indirectly related to student performance. According to the Government of Pakistan, the standard of teaching is determined by educational performance (Rahman, Jumani, Akhter, Chisthi, and Ajmal, 2011). The literacy rate of Pakistan is lowest at 57 percent in the world. Pakistan is also experiencing educational crisis, job crisis, and poor sociocultural conditions (Malik, Iqbal, Khan, Nasim, Yong & Abbasi, 2011).

According to Kulsum (2000), teacher effectiveness includes temperament, mood, disposition, and so on, as well as teacher-student engagement and teaching-learning outcomes, primarily student achievement.

Effective teachers respond appropriately to their students' actions. According to Kulsum (2000), the teacher effectiveness includes teachers character, personality, and attitude etc. as well as teacher-student interaction and teaching-learning outcomes, specifically students achievement. However, Anderson (1991) concluded that a successful instructor meets the targets set by him/her or others and has the ability to meet the objectives as well as use his/her skills in a systematic process to attain the objectives.

According to William and Mary (2007), learners gain greater levels of reading attainment while they are in the possession of more constructive teachers who work to develop their students' skills. In general, a successful instructor is someone who positively influences students' behaviour and assists them in developing the requisite skills, behavioral patterns, and personal style with a favourable attitude (Goel, 2015). Adaptability, goal-directedness, zeal, using formal feedback, student facilitation, degree of critique, instructional challenges, knowledge of teaching strategies and query types, evaluating student answers, and promoting student ideas are some variables of teacher behaviour that contribute to teacher effectiveness (Rosenshine and Furst, 1971).

By providing learning opportunities, educational institutions help students move from the gloom of ignorance to the light of knowledge. Teachers are core staff who perform this critical transformational role. According to Quality Concerns in Secondary Teacher Education, the central element in every educational framework is the teacher (NCTE, 1998). The quality of education is directly proportional to the quality of the teacher (Kareem & Ravirot, 2014). As a result, teachers are the most important part of any educational system. Teachers, as per Afe (2002) and Kiadese (2011), are the cornerstone of the educational system. According to Chetty et al. (2014), Rivkin et al. (2005), and Rockoff (2004), school-based tools, such as instructors, will assess students' academic performance and lifelong impact.

The term "effective" is derived from the Latin word "effectivus," which means "creative or effective." Effectiveness, according to Collin's English Dictionary (2017), is the degree of competence in achieving desired outcomes. Furthermore, effectiveness is the extent at which good and pleasurable outcomes can be produced. Some of the terms that have the same meaning as effectiveness are success, productivity, efficacy, and so on.

As a result, instructor efficacy refers to the opportunity to successfully execute instruction and improve students' abilities through research activities (Becenti, 2009). Teaching methodology, instructor standards, classroom facilities, and classroom management all have an effect on students' success (Campbell, Kyriakides, Muijs, and Robinson, 2004).

Successful teacher, according to Ko, Sammons, and Bakkum (2016), is someone who achieves expected targets and assigned tasks under school goals. In general, teacher effectiveness is associated with the behaviours and teaching activities of teachers that result in good student outcomes (Ko & Sammons, 2013). So while, according to Papanastasiou (1999), teacher effectiveness cannot be established due to insufficient teacher characteristics or attributes. Wenglinsky (2000), writing about teacher effectiveness, believes that instructional strategies and classroom experiences are essential in encouraging students' critical thought and active engagement. As per Toland and De Ayala (2005), an effective teacher's job is to smooth the process of teacher-student interaction, provide knowledge effectively, and increase pupils' learning. According to Clifford (1997), as quoted in Ün Açıkgöz (2004), if an instructor wishes to be successful, he or she should have certain specific qualities such as understanding of individual differences, knowledge of the subject matter, encouragement of students for learning, planning the teaching process with teaching-learning methods, effective communication, and realistic assessment.

An successful teacher motivates his or her students by initiating, sustaining, and concluding the communication process through the transformation of teaching technique, classroom formation, and type of assignment through verbal and nonverbal communication (Hotaman, 2005).

An successful instructor controls students' skills and information comprehension and anxiety. The teacher identifies and fills learning gaps. However, the teaching-learning process is tested in order to gain input on students' progress in order to close the difference. Since feedback serves as encouragement, direction, and inspiration (Sönmez, 2007). Similarly, one of the most significant influences in the classroom is the teacher's attitude (Sönmez, 2007; Gürkan, 1993). According to studies, teachers with an optimistic attitude positively influence their pupils, while teachers with a negative personality discourage their students from studying (Gürkan, 1993).

Teacher effectiveness has been studied on gender groups like male and female, and population group from urban to rural. Some pertinent research studies are reviewed and reported below:

Kyriakides (2005) examined teacher behaviour through the research on teacher effectiveness or research into teachers' interpersonal behaviour for developing a student's response questionnaire. The study revealed that students' ratings of the teacher behaviour and additional measures of pupils'

cognitive and affective outcomes were highly correlated. It indicated that students' measures can be a more practical and valid source of teacher evaluation.

Bansibihari and Surwada (2006) compared teacher effectiveness of the emotionally mature and immature group. The result of the study showed that gender-wise male and female teachers were not different on teacher effectiveness. The emotionally mature group has been found more effective in teacher effectiveness than an immature group.

Roul (2007) investigated the link between teacher effectiveness and organizational environment in two classes of college teachers: autonomous and non-autonomous. The study's results showed that autonomous college teachers outperformed non-autonomous college teachers in terms of instructor effectiveness. In terms of teacher productivity, male and female teachers differed greatly. Furthermore, it was discovered that autonomous college teachers were more successful than non-autonomous college teachers. There is no statistically meaningful relationship between organizational environment and college style and teacher effectiveness.

Sridhar and Badiei (2007) measured the effectiveness and emotional intelligence of 100 primary school teachers in south Mysore. According to the study's findings, teacher effectiveness and emotional intelligence are moderate. Teachers' ability to incorporate creativity, career satisfaction, student success, and successful instruction will both be associated with higher levels of emotional intelligence and teacher effectiveness. The findings also showed that teacher effectiveness deteriorated marginally with age. Young teachers had a high level of teacher effectiveness.

Walker (2008) identified twelve features of an effective teacher from the perspectives of pre-service and in-service teachers in his Longitudinal, Qualitative, Quasi-Research analysis. According to the findings, the most efficient teachers are often prepared to teach, have positive attitudes about students and teaching, do not show favouritism, are resourceful and creative in their classroom, treat students and marking fairly, are approachable, and make students feel safe in their classrooms, act with their students with empathy for their difficulties, make learning enjoyable, do not purposefully embarrass students, do not harbour dislikes, and easily forgive their mistakes.

Satwinderpal (2008) found a connection between occupational stress and teacher effectiveness in his research. The data was gathered using Kumar and Mutha's Teacher Effectiveness Scale (TES). The association between workplace stress and teacher productivity was tested on a total sample of efficient teachers, extremely effective teachers, and less effective teachers. The value of correlation coefficient was -.892 for total group of effective teachers, -.871 for highly effective teachers, and -.468 respectively for less effective teachers. Findings showed that an inverse relation was found between occupational stress and teacher effectiveness.

Dhillon and Navdeep (2010) investigated the effectiveness of teachers in relation to value patterns. There was no association between gender and teacher effectiveness and value trends, but there was a substantial relationship between government and private school teachers. Overall, there was no correlation between instructor efficacy and importance trends.

Sawhney and Kaur (2011) investigated the self-concept and effectiveness of elementary school teachers. The research discovered a major disparity in the self-concept of male and female teachers. Although no substantial differential in male and female teacher effectiveness has been identified. Furthermore, a major disparity in instructor productivity and self-concept was discovered between male and female students.

Henry, Bastian, and Fortner (2011) investigated the evolution of instructor effectiveness. According to the study's results, teachers' effectiveness increased with grade level, i.e. teachers' effectiveness increased in their second year of teaching but declined after three years.

In their descriptive research, Dash and Barman (2016) assessed the extent of teaching effectiveness. The results revealed that secondary school teachers were effective educators. There was also no significant difference in the degree of teaching effectiveness among secondary school teachers based on stream, gender, education, or training status, according to the findings.

Roy and Halder (2018) investigated high school teacher effectiveness. The study's findings revealed that location and gender have an impact on a teacher's effectiveness as well as intimate, educational, and intellectual aspects of teaching effectiveness. The findings have showed that the location

of the schools and gender had little impact on the tactics and social dimensions. A statistically important disparity in teaching effectiveness and all selected facets of teaching effectiveness was observed.

Objective of the study

Following was the objective of the study.

- To investigate teacher effectiveness between male and female teachers at higher secondary school level.

Hypothesis of the study

H_0 1= There is no significant difference between male and female teachers with respect to teacher effectiveness at higher secondary school level.

H_a 1= There is a significant difference between male and female teachers with respect to teacher effectiveness at higher secondary school level.

Delimitation of the Study

Keeping in view the nature of the population, the current study was delimited to male and female subject specialist teachers of Government Higher Secondary Schools in district Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Furthermore, due to COVID-19, the data was collected through an online questionnaire instead of visiting personally to the schools.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study being purely qualitative in nature utilizes descriptive research design. The descriptive research describes the phenomenon the way it is (Adams et al., 2007).

Population:

The population of the study was comprised of all the subject specialist teachers, both male and female, of Government Higher Secondary Schools of District Peshawar. According to EMIS (2015-16), there were 35 higher secondary schools in district Peshawar. Among which there were 21 boys schools while 14 girls schools. The number of male subject specialists were 158 while female subject specialists were 124 with total of 282 both male and female subject specialist teachers. Table 1.1. depict the population of the study.

Table 1.1.

Population of the study (EMIS, 2015-16)

School Teachers	Male	Female	Total
Higher Secondary Schools in District Peshawar	21	14	35
Subject Specialist Teachers	158	124	282

Sample:

For sample of the study proportionate stratified random sampling technique was used. Proportionate sampling is a sampling method in which a limited population (strata) is divided into subpopulations (stratum) and then the sample is selected from each subpopulation with the help of a random sampling technique to represent equal proportion in target population (Salkind, 2010). Therefore, through proportionate stratified randomly technique 50% proportion was selected randomly from both subpopulations, i.e. male and female subject specialist teachers, for equal representation as shown in table 1.2.

Table 1.2.*Sample size for the study*

School Teachers	Male	Female	Total
Subject Specialist Teachers	79	62	141
Higher Secondary Schools in District Peshawar	21	14	35
No. of Subject Specialist Teachers from each school	4	5	9

III. RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The Teacher Effectiveness Scale was self-developed questionnaire from the study of the Kulsum Teacher Effectiveness Scale by Kulsum (2000), Teacher Effectiveness Scale by Puri & Gakhar (2010), and Hafiz Inam Teaching Assessment Scale by Inamullah (2012). The study of Kulsum (2000) was based on five domains. These areas included management of the classroom, preparation before teaching, subject knowledge, interpersonal relations, and teacher characteristics. The study of Puri & Gakhar (2010) consisted of five categories i.e. preparation and presentation of lesson plan, professional knowledge and academic knowledge, and classroom management, behaviour towards pupils and stakeholders of the institute, benefiting of reward, punishment and motivation, and holistic development of pupils. The study of Inamullah (2012) consisted of lesson planning, classroom management, subject knowledge, personality, and evaluation.

There were basically five areas of teacher effectiveness scale. Table 1.3. shows the number of items that were included in each area of teacher effectiveness scale.

A. Preparation for Teaching

It involves items related to the preparation, planning, and organization of a teacher for teaching, with teaching aids, according to the course objectives.

B. Classroom Management

It assesses the capacity of a teacher to maintain discipline in the class, evaluate the teaching-learning process, motivate the students, and to perform effective communication.

C. Knowledge of Subject Matter

It involves the statements pertaining to the ability of a teacher to acquire, retain, and interpret the subject matter in the classroom.

D. Teacher Characteristics

Teacher characteristics involve the statement related to behavioural manifestations and the personality of a teacher within the framework of acceptance in the teaching profession.

E. Interpersonal Relations

It involves the statements related to skills to keep cordial relationship with students and stakeholders.

Table 1.3.*Dimensions of Teacher Effectiveness Scale*

Dimensions	Total No of Items
A. Preparation for teaching	11
B. Classroom Management	16

C.	Knowledge of Subject Matter	06
D.	Teacher characteristics	17
E.	Interpersonal Relations	11
Total		61

Each statement had five options i.e. 'Never', 'Occasionally', 'Sometimes', 'Often', and 'Always' with the numeric value of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively. The scale showed the lowest to highest teacher effectiveness with a total score from 61 to 305 respectively.

Validity & Reliability

Teacher Effectiveness Scale was forwarded by the supervisor to the educational experts for the validity of instrument. The recommended suggestions by the experts were incorporated in the research instrument. The reliability of the research instrument was determined through Cronbach's Alpha. The value of reliability was 0.933 (see table 1.4.).

Table 1.4.

Reliability Of Teacher Effectiveness Scale

Instrument	Gender	n	No of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Teacher Effectiveness Scale	Male	10	61	0.933
	Female	7		

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 4.2.1.11.

Theme wise Teacher Effectiveness of male & female teachers

Variable	Themes	Gender	n	Mean	SD
Teacher Effectiveness	Preparation for teaching	Male	79	4.01	0.22
		Female	62	4.16	0.26
	Classroom Management	Male	79	4.21	0.21
		Female	62	4.35	0.26
	Knowledge of the Subject Matter	Male	79	4.25	0.33
		Female	62	4.41	0.34
	Teacher Characteristics	Male	79	4.31	0.13
		Female	62	4.43	0.19
	Interpersonal Relations	Male	79	4.30	0.22
		Female	62	4.32	0.28

Table 4.2.1.11. depicts the overall mean and standard deviation of all five themes of teacher effectiveness scale. Results display that for male and female teachers, in the theme "Preparation for teaching", the mean score was 4.01 (SD= 0.22) and 4.16 (SD= 0.26) respectively. The figures interpret that in terms of preparation of teaching, the mean score result of male as well as female teachers appears to "Often" out of the five choices: Never, Occasionally, Sometimes, Often, and Always.

Results of the second theme, i.e. Classroom Management, display that for male and female teachers the mean score was 4.21 (SD= 0.21) and 4.35 (SD= 0.26) respectively. The figures depict in terms of classroom management, the mean score result of male as well as female teachers appears to "Often" out of the five choices: Never, Occasionally, Sometimes, Often, and Always.

Results of the third theme, i.e. Knowledge of the Subject Matter, display that for male and female teachers the mean score was 4.25 (SD= 0.33) and 4.41 (SD= 0.34) respectively. The figures interpret that

in terms of knowledge of the subject matter, the mean score result of male as well as female teachers appears to “Often” out of the five choices: Never, Occasionally, Sometimes, Often, and Always.

Results of the fourth theme, i.e. Teacher Characteristics, display that for male and female teachers the mean score was 4.31 (SD= 0.13) and 4.43 (SD= 0.19) respectively. The figures interpret that in terms of teacher characteristics, the mean score result of male as well as female teachers appears to “Often” out of the five choices: Never, Occasionally, Sometimes, Often, and Always

Results of the fifth theme, i.e. Interpersonal Relations, display that for male and female teachers the mean score was 4.30 (SD= 0.22) and 4.32 (SD= 0.28) respectively. The figures interpret that in terms of interpersonal relations, the mean score result of male as well as female teachers appears to “Often” out of the five choices: Never, Occasionally, Sometimes, Often, and Always.

H_0 = There is no significant difference between male and female teachers with respect to teacher effectiveness at higher secondary school level.

Table 4.3.3.

Comparing Teacher Effectiveness of male and female teachers

Gender	n	Mean	SD	T	p-Value
Male	79	4.2285	.42473	-1.82	0.012
Female	62	4.3429	.29204		

Table 4.3.3. shows that gender-wise, the number of male and female participants was 79 and 62 respectively. An independent sample t-test was used to compare the mean score of teacher effectiveness of male and female participants. Results show that there was a significant difference in teacher effectiveness of male (M=4.2285, SD=0.42473) and female (M=4.3429, SD=0.29204); $t(140)=-1.82$, $p=0.012$. These results suggest that the teacher effectiveness of male teachers was significantly different from female teachers. The p-value is 0.012, which is significant at the level of significant i.e. 0.05.

V. FINDINGS

Following are the major findings of the study:

1. In terms of “Preparation for teaching” mean for male and female teachers was **4.01** (SD= 0.22) and **4.16** (SD= 0.26) respectively on teacher effectiveness scale which depicts that both male and female teachers remain prepared for teaching most of the time, though not ‘always’.
2. In terms of “Classroom Management” mean for male and female teachers was **4.21** (SD= 0.21) and **4.35** (SD= 0.26) respectively on teacher effectiveness scale which depicts that both male and female teachers manage their classrooms most of the time, though not ‘always’.
3. In terms of “Knowledge of the Subject Matter” mean for male and female teachers was **4.25** (SD= 0.33) and **4.41** (SD= 0.34) respectively on teacher effectiveness scale which depicts that both male and female teachers have knowledge of the subject matter most of the time, though not ‘always’.
4. In terms of “Teacher Characteristics” mean for male and female teachers was **4.31** (SD= 0.13) and **4.43** (SD= 0.19) respectively on teacher effectiveness scale which depicts that both male and female teachers utilize teacher’s characteristics most of the time, though not ‘always’.
5. In terms of “Interpersonal Relations” mean for male and female teachers was **4.30** (SD= 0.22) and **4.32** (SD= 0.28) respectively on teacher effectiveness scale which depicts that both male and female teachers maintain interpersonal relationships most of the time, though not ‘always’.
6. The mean value of Teacher Effectiveness for male teachers was **4.22** (SD= 0.42) and for female teachers, the mean value was **4.34** (SD= 0.29) shows that both male and female teachers were found effective, but not highly effective, in terms of teacher effectiveness.
7. On teacher effectiveness, the mean of male teachers was (M=4.2285, SD=0.42473) and female teachers were (M=4.3429, SD=0.29204); $t(140)=-1.82$, $p=0.012$, which shows that there was a significant difference found among teacher effectiveness of male and female teachers. This means that the

teacher effectiveness of male teachers is significantly different from teacher effectiveness of female teachers.

VI. DISCUSSION

The result of the current study revealed that male as well as female teachers remain prepared for teaching most of the time, though not 'always'. This shows that male and female teachers most of the time prepare lesson plans, show punctuality, planning according to individual differences, and summarize lessons at the end of the class. The study of Taqi, Al-Darwish, Akbar, & Al-Gharabali (2015) opined that male teachers are noted as being better prepared for lessons, and better understand their students. In addition, the study of Zahorik, Halback, Ehrle, and Molnar (2003) and Jones et. al (2011) found that students' academic performance is despoiled if teachers are not prepared and give no clear lesson objectives. The researcher believes that the reason behind this finding might be that male as well as female teachers are more consistent, responsible, passionate, and caring about their tasks.

The study also revealed that male as well as female teachers manage their classrooms most of the time, though not 'always'. This reveals that male as well as female teachers often encourage students towards learning, provide motivation through different methods, do remedial teaching when needed, use a student-centered approach, present lessons clearly, maintain discipline, and provide assistance to students. In the same themes, findings by the stud of Erden, Aytaç, & Erden (2016), and Martin, Yin, and Mayall (2006). Martin, Yin, and Mayall (2006) and Erden, A., Aytaç, T., & Erden, H. (2016) reveal that female teachers are more sincere intrusively towards managing their classroom than male teachers. Whereas, the study of Martin and Yin (1997) revealed that male teachers are more intrusive towards students management and instructional management. However, Yüksel (2013), and Ünlü (2008) concluded that gender affects the competencies of classroom management. While, Martin, Yin, and Baldwin (1997), Gibbes (2004), Terzi (2001), Yüksel (2013), Ünlü (2008), Uç (2013), Sivri (2012), and Opdenakker and Damme (2006) pinpointed that between male and female teachers, there is no significant difference in terms of classroom management and can handle disruptive students. Interestingly, the researcher believes that female teachers are more collaborative, student-centered, shared authority, motivate students, and maintained control in the classroom with student-teacher interaction. However, male teachers are authoritative, dominant, and take control over class differently.

The study also found that both male and female teachers have knowledge of the subject matter most of the time, though not 'always'. This means that teachers most of the time have subject matter command, seek assistance from colleagues, and update their knowledge about the subject matter. In connection, the study of Taqi, Al-Darwish, Akbar, & Al-Gharabali (2015) revealed that male teachers are less knowledgeable than female teachers. However, in the study of Sali-Ot (2011), Haider, Qasim & Ameen, (2015), and Shakir & Adeeb, (2014) a significant difference was reported subject knowledge of teachers. Being a researcher it is believed that the reason behind this finding might be that male as well as female teachers are hardworking, consistent, highly educated, update their knowledge, and prepared before the lesson as the previous result showed.

Another finding of the study revealed that male as well as female teachers utilize teacher's characteristics most of the time, though not 'always'. This shows that male and female teachers often use proper attitude and behaviour, body language and gestures, following responsibilities, and have a sense of care and sympathy. In connection, the study of Marchbanks (2000) concluded that female teachers possess the basic personality traits that are needed to be effective teachers than males did. Furthermore, female teachers are found nurturing (Wood, 2012), expressive, supportive (Good & Brophy, 1973), open toward students and informal, and spend significantly more time with students (McDowell, 1993). Whereas, the study of Taqi, Al-Darwish, Akbar, and Al-Gharabali (2015) revealed that male teachers grasp more constructive personal characters, including kindness, friendliness, and fairness than female teachers. The researcher believes that female teachers are polite, student-centered, flexible, sympathetic, supportive, cooperative, and friendly with their students and others but male teachers are also good at their character.

The findings of the study also revealed that both male and female teachers maintain interpersonal relationships most of the time, though not 'always'. This means that teachers often participate in social activities, show loyalty with jobs, and facilitate others. However, the research of Taqi, Al-Darwish, Akbar, & Al-Gharabali (2015) and Van Petegem, Creemers, Rossel, & Aelterman (2005) reported that male teachers have interpersonal relationships than their counterpart i.e. female teachers.

Additionally, male teachers are more friendly, have a high sense of humor, and being less prejudiced than female teachers. Whereas, the study of Mehra, Kilduff, and Brass (1998) concluded that female teachers are strong in interpersonal relations than male teachers. While the study of Brophy (1985) and Meece (1987) specified a slight difference in the interpersonal relationships of male and female teachers in the classroom. Remarkably, male and female teachers are good at interpersonal relations. However, the researcher is of the view that the friendly, sincereness, helping, prejudice-free, and good character of male and female teachers leads to good interpersonal relations.

VII. CONCLUSION

According to findings it has been concluded that both male and female teachers prepared themselves for teaching, possessed knowledge of the subject matter and managed their classrooms. They possessed and utilized most of the time, though not always, 'teacher's characteristics' with effective interpersonal relations with stakeholders. However, the teacher effectiveness of male teachers is significantly different from teacher effectiveness of female teachers.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that both male and female teachers were found effective in terms of teacher effectiveness. Therefore, the head of the institute may keep in view the importance of teacher effectiveness and arrange regular workshops and seminars to improve teacher effectiveness of teachers. Moreover, principal may establish a collaborative environment for teachers to share the problems they face during the teaching-learning process. The present study was conducted on subject specialist teachers in District Peshawar only, therefore, its conclusions may not be universally valid. It is therefore suggested to conduct the study on other cadres to establish the results fairly. The study was conducted on teacher effectiveness only, further studies may be conducted to find relationship of teacher effectiveness with other variables like mental health, job satisfaction, teaching style, emotional intelligence, personality, etc.

REFERENCES

1. Afe, J. O. (2002). Reflection on becoming a teacher and the challenges of teacher education. Inaugural Lecture, series 64, University of Benin.
2. Anderson, L.W. (1991). *Increasing teacher effectiveness*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO. Retrieved from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000090126>
3. Bansibihari, P., and Surwade, L. (2006). The Effect of Emotional Maturity on Teachers Effectiveness. *Educational Tracks*, 6(1).
4. Bennett, N. (1976). *Teaching Styles & Pupil Progress*. London: Open Books.
5. Campbell, R. J., Kyriakides, L., Muijs, D., & Robinson, W. (2004). *Assessing teacher effectiveness: Developing a differentiated model*. Psychology Press.
6. Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., & Rockoff, J. E. (2014). Measuring the impacts of teachers II: Teacher value-added and student outcomes in adulthood. *American Economic Review*, 104(9), 2633–2679.
7. Collin's English Dictionary (2017). *Advanced English Dictionary*. HarperCollins Publishers. Retrieved from <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/efficacy>
8. Connelly, L. M. (2008). Pilot studies. *Medsurg Nursing*, 17(6), 411-2.
9. Dash, U. (2016). Teaching Effectiveness of Secondary School Teachers in the District of Purba Medinipur, West Bengal. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 21(7), 50–63. doi: 10.9790/0837-2107075063.
10. Dhillon, J. S., and Navdeep, K. (2010). A Study of Teacher Effectiveness in Relation to Their Value Patterns. *Recent Researchers in Education and Psychology*, 15(5), pp. III-IV.

11. EMIS-KP (2015-16). Retrieved from: <https://www.kpese.gov.pk/Downloads/ASC/ASC%202015-16.pdf>
12. Flanders, N. A. & Simon, A. (1969). Teacher Effectiveness. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 5(1), 18-37.
13. Follman, J. (1992). Secondary School Students Ratings of Teacher Effectiveness. *The High School Journal*, 75(3), 168-178.
14. George, D. and Mallery, P., (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
15. Glass, J. E. (2011). *The Promise and pitfalls of improving the teaching profession*. New York: Education Writers Association (EWA). Retrieved from: <http://bit.ly/eklp7k>.
16. Gliem, R. & Gliem, J. (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education.
17. Goel, S. (2015). *Teacher effectiveness in relation to job satisfaction, personality and mental health*. New Delhi, India: A.P.H Publishing Corporation.
18. Gürkan, T. (1993). *The relationship between teaching attitudes and self-concepts of primary school teachers*. Ankara: Sevinç MatbaasÖ.
19. Henry, G. T., Bastian, K. C., & Fortner, C. K. (2011). Stayers and Leavers. *Educational Researcher*, 40(6), 271-280. doi: 10.3102/0013189x11419042.
20. Hotaman, D. (2005). *The Degree of Body Language Use in Primary School Teachers*, XIV. National Education Sciences Congress, Pamukkale University Faculty of Education, 28-30 Eylül, Denizli.
21. Inamullah, H. M. (2012). Hafiz Inam Teaching Assessment Scale. Retrieved from: <https://research-education-edu.blogspot.com/2013/01/teaching-assessment-scale.html>
22. International Commission on Education. (1996). *Treasure within report to U N E S C O of the International commission on education for the twenty first century U.N.* Retrieved from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000109590>
23. Kareem, J., and Ravivot, B. (2014). A Study on the Self-Concept of Teachers Working in Government, Aided and Unaided Colleges in Bangalore. *The IUP Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, XIII(1), pp. 61-70.
24. Kiadese, A. L. (2011). An assessment of the teaching effectiveness of prevocational Subject Teachers in Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, 3(1), pp. 5-8.
25. Ko, J., & Sammons, P. (2013). *Effective Teaching: a Review of Research and Evidence*. Place of publication not identified: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse.
26. Ko, J., Sammons, P., & Bakkum, L. (2016). *Effective teaching*. Education Development Trust. Berkshire
27. Kulsum, U. (2000). Teacher effectiveness scale (KTES). Agra: *National Psychological Corporation*.
28. Kumar, P. (1992). Mental health check list (MHC). Agra: *National Psychological Corporation*.
29. Kyriakides, L. (2005). Drawing from Teacher Effectiveness Research and Research into Teacher Interpersonal Behaviour to Establish a Teacher Evaluation System: A Study on the Use of Student Ratings to Evaluate Teacher Behaviour. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 40(2), 44-66.
30. Malik, S. A., Iqbal, M. Z., Khan, M. M., Nasim, K., Yong, J., & Abbasi, M. M. H. (2011). Measuring job satisfaction, motivation and health issues of secondary school teachers in Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(33), 12850-12863. doi:10.5897/AJBM11.1702
31. NCTE (1998) in Quality Concerns in Secondary Teacher Education. Retrieved from: http://14.139.60.153/bitstream/123456789/2274/1/QUALITY%20CONCERNS%20IN%20SECONDARY%20TEACHER%20EDUCATION_D-10148.pdf

32. Papanastasiou, E. (1999). *Teacher evaluation*. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, East Lansing.
33. Parihar, R. (2011). *Concept of Teacher Effectiveness: Nursing education*. New Delhi, Jaypee Brother Publications.
34. Puri, S. and Gakhar S. C. (2010). Teacher Effectiveness Scale. *National Psychological Corporation*, Agra.
35. Rahman, F., Jumani, N. B., Akhter, Y., Chisthi, S. U. H., & Ajmal, M. (2011). Relationship between training of teachers and effectiveness teaching. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(4).
36. Rao, P. T. (1987). *Classroom Teaching of Effective Science Teacher –An Analytical Study*. Maharaja Sayajirao University, Baroda.
37. Rivkin, S., Hanushek, E., & Kain, J. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417–458.
38. Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research*. 2nd edition. Blackwell Publishing, Malden
39. Rockoff, J. (2004). The impact of individual teachers on student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *The American Economic Review*, 94(2), 247–252.
40. Rosenshine, B., and Furst, N. (1971). *Research on teacher performance criteria*. In B. O. Smith (Ed.), *Research in Teacher Education – A Symposium*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc. (pp. 37-72)
41. Roul, S. K. (2007). Teacher Effectiveness of Autonomous and Non-Autonomous College Teachers. *Journal of community guidance & research*, 24(3).
42. Roy, R. R., & Halder, U. K. (2018). Teacher Effectiveness: A Self-Report Study on Secondary School Teachers. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*, 5(3), 914z-919z.
43. Salkind, N. J. (2010). *Encyclopedia of research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412961288
44. Satwinderpal (2008). Occupational Stress in Relation to Teacher effectiveness among Secondary School Teachers. *Edutracks*, 7(10).
45. Sawhney, S., and Kaur, M. (2011). Teacher Effectiveness In Relation To Self-Concept of Elementary School Teachers. *Indian Streams Research Journal*, 1(III), pp. 13-14.
46. Shannon, D. M. (1998). Effective Teacher Behaviours in Higher Education and in LIS Education Programs: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 39(3), 163–174. doi: 10.2307/40324152.
47. Sönmez, V. (2007). *Teaching principles and methods*. Ankara: AnÕ YayÕncÕlÕk.
48. Sridhar, Y. N. and Badieli, H. R. (2007). Teacher Efficacy and Emotional Intelligence of Primary School teachers. *Edutracks*, 7(3).
49. Subbarayan, P. (1985). *A Study of Relationship between Teacher Effectiveness, Research and Publication and Self-concept*. Andhra University; India.
50. Toland, M. D., and De Ayala, R. J. (2005). “A multilevel factor analysis of students’ evaluations of teaching”. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 65(2), pp. 272-296.
51. Ün AçÕkgöz, K. (2004). *Etkili õ-retim (Effective teaching)*. õzmir: E÷itim DünyasÕ YayÕnlarÕ.
52. Walker, R. J. (2008). Twelve Characteristics of an Effective Teacher: A Longitudinal, Qualitative, Quasi-Research Study of In-Service and Pre-Service Teachers' Opinions. *Educational Horizons*, 87(1), 61–68.
53. Walls, R. T., Nardi, A. H., von Minden, A. M., & Hoffman, N. (2002). The characteristics of effective and ineffective teachers. *Teacher education quarterly*, 29(1), 39-48.

54. Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *How teaching matters: Bringing the classroom back into discussions of teacher quality*. Princeton, NJ: The Milken Family Foundation and Educational Testing Service.
55. Wilkinson, D., & Birmingham, P. (2003). *Using research instruments: A guide for researchers*. Psychology Press.
56. William and Mary (2007). *Why excellent teaching matters and what It looks like, tools for reporting on teaching: What to look in classrooms*. Retrieved From: <http://www.nbpts.org/>.