

ANALYSIS OF CLASSROOM SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT RELATING TO STUDENT AND TEACHER PERCEPTION

Jameel Ahmed Qureshi^{1*}, Dr. Muhammad Ali Pasha², Dr. Sikandar Hussain Soomro³

¹Ph.D Scholar Faculty of Education, University of Sindh, Jamshoro

^{2,3} Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of Sindh, Jamshoro

* jameel.queshi@scholars.usindh.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Even though in the environment of the classroom, students and teachers stand the prime performers, but usually they possess dissimilar perceptions of relation and instructional characteristics of the classroom. Regarding the way and degree through which these perceptions touch possibly can diverge across changed school and class contexts. Opinions and individual characteristics as well as school and class context, are showing to affect teacher and student perceptions of their environment. As well, the study specifies the variances in perceptions that ensue not between students and teachers only, but also amongst individual students inside the classrooms. Despite these variances, this study confirms the perceptions of the superiority of the school classroom social environment contain suggestions for equal student and teacher consequences. Therefore, to comprehend the connection between outcomes and perceptions, it is more significant to comprehend the features that influence perceptions. So, the present research studied (1) the degree to which students and teachers in elementary and secondary institute settle nearby the social environment of the classroom, (2) the degree to which social environment of the classroom of elementary institute students' and teachers' perceptions of the social environment of classroom differ from secondary institute students' and teachers' perceptions, (3) and the degree to which classroom, schools, and individual student factors support to clarify student perceptions of their classroom social environment accordingly. Although, from sociocultural various public and private elementary and secondary schools, the sample included eighth- and ninth-grade students and teachers. Likert Scale questionnaire and interviews were used to analyze the result from ANOVA, chi-square test, and t-test to obtain mean value, standard deviation, percentage, and significant values respectively. Results indicated from these statistical analyzes that sociocultural arrangement and gender of the classroom, socioeconomic status of the school, as well as student and teacher beliefs, and demographics, affect both student and teacher perceptions of classroom social environment. The findings of this study can help researchers develop appropriate teaching strategies for specific teacher and student groups, as well as increase knowledge of the factors that affect youths' and teachers' experiences in the classroom.

Keywords

Social Environment; Classroom; Teacher Student Perception; Elementary School; Secondary School

Introduction

The social environment of the classroom is a multidirectional concept that contains social and theoretical components emphasis mainly on schoolchild education and achievement, whereas social components often emphasize relations and expressive support from both teachers and students. Both theoretical and social components in the schoolrooms are critical to knowledge and encouraging the social environment of the schoolroom for students. A positive social environment of classroom motivations on student knowledge and ability integrates a variety of effective instructional approaches that challenge and encourage students, and make available chances for good excellence relations amongst teachers and students. According to Mutlu & Yıldırım, (2019) that, the teaching and learning procedure would be a self-motivated and

cooperative procedure flanked by teachers and students to attain student success (Allodi, 2010).

Moreover, a teacher's perception of students is a dynamic role in a teacher's expectations, communications, hopes, and associations with his or her students. The study directs that they rarely contain the same perceptions of the classroom social environment, even though both teachers and students remain in the similar classroom. Regrettably, existing study shows not only teachers and students share some aspects, but they often have opposing perceptions about characteristics of the classroom social environment, as well as instructional performs and personal communications. Therefore, further study research work is required to understand entirely and completely both student and teacher perceptions of the social environment in the classroom for improving more awareness into what features of the social

environment of students and teachers viewing similarly or differently in the classroom (Mutlu & Yildirim, 2019).

It is most important to examine perceptions of the social environment in the schoolroom while converting from elementary to secondary school. Patrick & Ryan, (2003) described that during this conversion, student's involvement in school contextual variations, including changes to instructional performs, schoolroom structure, theoretical opportunities, and relations with teachers and peers. The social environment of the class has an important inspiration on schoolchildren's adjustment in school. The classroom social environment also has imperative inferences for teachers, especially the socio-emotional dimension (Patrick & Ryan, 2003). Bascia, (2014), gave suggestions that helpful teacher-student relations are interrelated with greater levels of teacher-reported satisfaction and inspiration, however, teacher-student relationships with high levels of conflict are associated with higher levels of teacher-reported negative feelings including unhappiness, stress, depression, lower self-efficacy, and tension (Bascia, 2014).

Objectives of the study

1. To examine the classroom's social environment concerning teacher and student perceptions.
2. To investigate the implications of the relationship between teacher prospects and perceptions of similar actions of school children in the social environment in the classroom, as well as educator demographics.
3. To compare elementary and secondary school children and teachers' perceptions of the social environment in the classroom from public and private sectors.

Purpose and Research Questions

The current study shows a qualitative and quantitative mixed-method to examine the perceptions of students and teachers regarding the social environment of the classroom included students of eighth class elementary school and students of ninth class secondary school.

Followings are the Research Questions

1. How perceptions of student and teacher of the social environment in the schoolroom differ from the perceptions of the student and teacher of the social environment in the schoolroom?

2. To what degree for teachers' and students' factors support examining the perceptions of the teacher and students of the social environment in the schoolroom?

Hypotheses of the study

Some null hypothesis was tested to study:

Null Hypothesis Ho₁: There is no ideal relationship between the perceptions of elementary and secondary school students and teachers in the social environment of the classroom.

Null Hypothesis Ho₂: There is no relationship between the perceptions of elementary and secondary students and teachers from public and private sectors regarding the social environment of the classroom.

Justification/rationale of the study

In the generating of the social environment in the classroom, a critical role is played by teachers to shape the encouraging and motivational framework and the nature of schoolchild collaboration. Current schoolroom perception studies are indicated by researchers to exist ignore the role of different influences that may be the outcome in educationalists for betterment (Wang, L. Degol, Amemiya, Parr, & Guo, 2020), and school psychologist discouragement the usefulness of instructional intercessions. A range of communicative and instructional decisions influences the social environment in the schoolroom by opinions about the goal line or determination or classroom strained relations, procedures (Wang, L. Degol, Amemiya, Parr, & Guo, 2020).

Therefore, it is to be used importance to think comprehension that perceptions of teacher and students to regulate that which schoolroom dimensions of teacher and student have lower or higher convergent. Characteristic of the schoolroom social environment will help to control that which teacher generate schoolroom environment that has been certainly construed by students. Additionally, the results and findings of this study will help for promoting the probabilities for school psychologists and administration to engage additional professionals and support development for teachers by generating a good classroom atmosphere for them and often their students respectively.

Statement of the Problem

The social environment in the classroom is a multifaceted framework that incorporates both educational and social elements. Educational components emphasize relationships with teachers and students, and emotional support, while social components emphasize relationships and emotional support with teachers and students. Students need to have both the educational and social elements of a healthy classroom social environment. In the social setting of the auxiliary classroom, Students' learning and competency are prioritized in a supportive classroom social setting. By incorporating many successful teaching strategies that challenge and motivate students, they provide opportunities for a high-quality relationship between teachers and students. The social environment in the classroom can have a big impact on how well students react to school, academic achievement, academic adjustment (ie, motivation, commitment, and effort), and social and emotional adjustment (i.e., self-efficacy, school-related, satisfaction, and behavioral compliance) are all among the academic and emotionally supportive students. Reported to be high. Classrooms. In a negative Social classroom setting students, on the other hand, reported lower levels of achievement, commitment, and motivation due to higher hostility and societal comparisons, as well as lower levels of teacher support. The social environment in the classroom has significant implications for teachers, especially in terms of social and emotional dimensions. For example, teacher-student-positive relationships are associated with high-level teacher satisfaction and motivation, while high-conflict teacher-student inferences are linked to high levels of negative emotions, including conflict, stress, and low suicide (Wang et al., 2020). This study aimed to analyze the student-teacher perceptions regarding the social environment of the classroom in taluka Kotri District Jamshoro, Sindh, Pakistan.

Significance of the study research

The significance study of this current research is useful for teachers. Students, researchers, experts and other all stockholder that will focus on perceptions of schoolchild and educators regarding the common atmosphere in

classroom individually. This research study will help to understand the changes to train the teacher and student psychology to resolve the problems, issues, and other related things for improving schoolroom common atmosphere.

My current research study will also useful and suitable work for the Pakistani Govt, head of the institute, principals, and other education officers to boost up the elementary and secondary schools for determining all the types of interaction amongst schoolchild and educators' perceptions, ideas, and views for a common environment in the schoolroom.

Delimitations of the study

There was no easy way to conduct research work for the researcher on the general environment of the elementary and secondary schools in Jamshoro while having no more time and income.

1. The study was surrounded by elementary students of the eighth class and secondary students of ninth class chosen by private and public sections
2. Teachers were selected by private and public sections of elementary and secondary schools. Taluka Kotri.

Literature Review

A good and suitable atmosphere of the school classroom creates better relationship amongst scholars and trainees (Conderrman in 2013), and most of the time in school they live to connect for learning purpose (Konings in 2014), learning environment of scholars and trainers mostly depends upon beliefs and demographics Ellis, 2018, perceptions and views can be based upon their past understanding being a successful or failure knowledge atmosphere (Ellis, 2018).

Current work represents the literature review regarding the perceptions of schoolchild and educators about the common atmosphere in the classroom individually. According to (Allodi, 2010), he gave suggestions that common atmosphere in the classroom has been maintained by the positive relations amongst educators and schoolchildren. Schoolrooms maybe mastery or presentation focused on

schoolchildren's perceptions of the classroom (Hofman, Hofman, & Guldmond, 2001). while examining the degree of essential constructions of the schoolroom goal.

Patrick and Ryan (2003), proving that the importance of educators they described performance styles for education and its relations toward the student performance and teacher instructional mirror observes (Patrick & Ryan, 2003). As described by (Patrick & Ryan, 2003), that the value of common atmosphere is the emotional feelings in the schoolroom towards the educators and scholars, Ryan & Patrick, 2003, which determining factor the socio sensitive situation of the schoolroom.

According to (Gillies, 2004), he established his ideas that common behavior and emotions of students are promoting that have also been understudied, despite the significant role of instructor which plays an appropriate role to foster a positive schoolroom atmosphere. While conducting a study of (Akey, 2006), explained their opinions about the common atmosphere of schoolroom that how scholar and educators intermingle to each other which is affected by common models, ethics, behavior that have been often cherished by their characters and displayed their aspects by the help of the teacher (Akey, 2006).

Teaching space is an encouraging socio-emotional atmosphere that tends to stand-in schoolchildren intelligence, sense, and wisdom of free population and civil community, that's have been boosting up to interact positively and esteem to new educated generations (Hust et al., 2013) for common atmosphere regarding pupil and trainer perceptions individually which show their ability and good characters of all (Hurst, Wallace, & Nixon, 2013).

Therefore, equality of gender, sex, and ethnicity are also the significant research study while conducting the work Fan et al., 2011; for perceptions of the scholars, trainers, and expert to avoid discriminations among them based on sex, race or ethnicity, society Villase and Bank., 2014; and other factors that are not relevant to your classwork and maintain the equality and remove the gender disparity amongst the scholars and trainers to make suitable relations between them in the schoolroom of the common atmosphere (Villase & Bank, 2014).

As also explained by Blazer and Kraft in 2017, that different gender like male and female may create a dynamic role to make good sense in the schoolroom for building up good ideas and perceptions of social environment about scholars and trainers which show the factors and characters of individual that influence the observations at multiple stages (Blazar & Kraft, 2017).

Methodology

The current study was based upon mixed procedures like qualitative (visual or non-numerical data) and quantitative (numerical data) has been selected for analyzing the set of data. The Survey technique has often been chosen by the researcher for completing this study work respectively.

Population

Current study based upon the following populations:

1. Students of the eighth class from the elementary section and students of the ninth class from the second section have been chosen by public and private sectors at Taluka Kotri.
2. Teachers have also been selected from elementary and secondary sections regarding public and private sectors at Taluka Kotri.

Sample Size and Sampling

The process of selecting the sample of the representative population to study research work is called sampling and selection of a subset of the representative population is called sample. In this current study, random probability sampling has been used to draw a sample to complete different statistical tests. The current sample is based upon public and private elementary and secondary sections mean 2 schools have also been chosen, and (32) students have been selected as a sample from both the sectors including (16) from each sector, while (08), teachers have often been chosen from public and private sections as a sample including (4) from each sector at Taluka Kotri.

Tool Development

Current research work was based upon the following tool developments:

- **Questionnaire** for the same students and teacher

Questionnaire for current study have been settled keeping in mind level of students approach to understand easily which comprises following objects:

- Open-ended
- Close-ended
- Likert Scale based on Five -point

Table 1. The current questionnaire was used in this study work.

| Analysis of Classroom Social Environment concerning Student and Teacher Perception. | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|----|---|----|
| S# | Statement | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
| 01 | The teacher makes a special effort to identify student's improvement, even if they are lower grade level. | | | | | |
| 02 | Teacher increases the capability of student perceptions of classroom social environment. | | | | | |
| 03 | The teacher ensures delivering of expertise through different methods | | | | | |
| 04 | The teacher ensures sharing of knowledge in the class. | | | | | |
| 05 | Teacher gives special freedoms to students who organize their work in the best way. | | | | | |
| 06 | The teacher shows the maximum effort for attaining the quality of schoolchildren as an example. | | | | | |
| 07 | Teachers support schoolchildren in understanding how their presentation and performance towards others. | | | | | |
| 08 | Teacher inspires schoolchildren for competing among them. | | | | | |
| 09 | The teacher often permits the schoolchildren to deliberate their work with class fellows. | | | | | |
| 10 | Instructors boost up schoolchildren to deliver their concepts and thoughts to each other in the schoolroom. | | | | | |

*SA =Strongly Agree A =Agree UD = Undecided D = Disagree SD = Strongly Disagree

Likert Scale Description

Table 2. Likert Scale Description

| Description | Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|-------------|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| Scores | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

A pilot study of the research Questionnaire

The current study was established by a questionnaire that was tested for the data collected from public and private sectors and pilot study work has also been led by the support of friends, researchers, and teachers for analyzing the validity as well as reliability of the questionnaire.

Reliability of the research tools

Research instruments were calculated, and reliability had also been attained as 0.790 by research questionnaire used for educators and 0.785 found by research questionnaire intended for school children. According to Lr. Gay, (2007) these calculations were found as reliable.

Collection of Data

For data collection preceding authorization had also been taken by Principals/Head of institutions at Taluka Rohri. Essential data had often been collected to draw a sample from elementary and secondary schools and the researcher himself went to collect a set of data from required schools.

Data Analysis

In the current study, data were analyzed by the questionnaire, and obtained data were shifted towards the excel program for the design percentage (%) also similar had been examined in the ANOVA trial, Chi-square test, and t-test by the support of computer software (SPSS) 23v. The different value was obtained amongst the value of means grounded on LSD 0.05 (significant) level.

Results

Results of Questionnaire

Question numbering 1 includes (Teacher makes a special effort to identify student's improvement, even if they are lower grade level in the *table. 3*) in which both private and public teachers and students their responses which present the interrelation among sector and population for instance S × P based on question numbering one. ANOVA, Chi-test & t-test have been used to analyses procurement mean, standard deviation, percentage, significant and non-significant values. That has been described in the given table. It might be got the consequence of the significance of

P ($P \leq 0.02$ used for SA & ≤ 0.03 meant for A), despite the consequence of S ($P 1.00$ designed for SA & 0.88 intended for A) and interrelation result of $P \times S$ ($P \leq 0.88$ aimed at A) that represent the non-significant result. Rendering towards the value of mean in table one that participants from both sectors gave their opinions as strongly agree 3.96 meant for private and public sectors as well 5.0 used for teachers and 3.87 intended for students. As concerning A, a set of data presents the variance amongst the public & private which might be gained 0.83 & 0.72 correspondingly. Moreover, 0.00 value of mean attained by the teacher and 0.84 mean value attained by the students as A. There is no response given by the participants about Undecided (UD), Disagree (D), & Strongly Disagree (SD).

Table 3. The teacher makes a special effort to identify student's improvement, even if they are lower grade level.

| Basis of Variableness | Scale of Likert | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----|------|
| | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
| Sectors (S) | 01.00 (ns) | 00.89 (ns) | .. ² | ... | ... |
| Populations (P) | 00.02** | 00.03** | | ... | ... |
| $S \times P$ | | 00.88 (ns) | | ... | ... |
| Sectors (Mean \pm SE³) | | | | | |
| Publics | 03.96 \pm 00.19 a | 00.83 \pm 00.15 a | | ... | |
| Privates | 03.96 \pm 00.19 a | 00.72 \pm 00.15 a | | ... | |
| Populations (Mean \pm SE) | | | | | |
| Teachers | 05.01 \pm 0.4b a | 0.00 \pm 00.37 b | -- | - | -- |
| Students | 3.87 \pm 00.14 b | 0.84 \pm 00.11 a | -- | - | -- |

¹ns, * (-non-significant) or (significant) on $P \leq 0.05$

²(Not appropriate)

³(Standard error)

Question numbering 2 includes (Teacher increases the capability of student perceptions of classroom social environment in the *table. 4*) in which both private and public teachers and students their responses which present the

Question numbering 3 includes (Teacher ensures delivering of expertise through different methods) in the *table. 5*) in which both private and public teachers and students their responses which present the interrelation among sector and population for instance $S \times P$ based on question numbering one. ANOVA, Chi-test & t-test have been used to analyses

interrelation among sector and population for instance $S \times P$ based on question numbering one. ANOVA, Chi-test & t-test have been used to analyses procurement mean, standard deviation, percentage, significant and non-significant values. That has been described in the given table. It might be got the consequence of the significance of P ($P \leq 0.24$ used for SA & ≤ 0.24 meant for A), despite the consequence of S ($P \leq 0.71$ designed for SA & 0.71 intended for A) and interrelation result of $P \times S$ ($P \leq 0.52$ aimed at SA & A) that represent the non-significant result. Rendering towards the value of mean in table one that participants from both sectors gave their opinions as strongly agree 3.69 meant for public and 3.60 intended for private sectors as well 3.06 used for teachers and 3.70 intended for students. As concerning A, a set of data presents the variance amongst the public & private which might be gained 1.12 & 1.05 correspondingly. Moreover, 1.56 value of mean attained by the teacher and 1.04 mean value attained by the students as A. There is no response given by the participants about Undecided (UD), Disagree (D), & Strongly Disagree (SD).

Table 4. Teacher increases the capability of student perceptions of classroom social environment.

| Basis of Variableness | Scale of Likert | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------|-----|------|
| | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
| Sectors (S) | 00.71 ns | 00.71 ns | | ... | ... |
| Populations (P) | 00.24 ns | 00.24 ns | | ... | ... |
| $S \times P$ | 00.52 ns | 00.52 ns | | ... | ... |
| Sectors (Mean \pm SE³) | | | | | |
| Publics | 03.69 \pm 00.21 a | 01.12 \pm 00.17 a | | ... | ... |
| Privates | 3.60 \pm 0.21 a | 1.05 \pm 0.17 a | | ... | ... |
| Populations (Mean \pm SE) | | | | | |
| Teachers | 3.06 \pm 0.53 a | 1.56 \pm 0.42 a | | ... | |
| Students | 03.70 \pm 00.16 a | 01.04 \pm 00.12 a | -- | - | -- |

¹ns, * (-non-significant or significant) at $P \leq 0.05$

²(Not appropriate)

³(Standard error)

procurement mean, standard deviation, percentage, significant and non-significant values. That has been described in the given table. It might be got the consequence of the significance of P ($P \leq 0.04$ used for UD & ≤ 0.02 meant for D), despite the consequence of S ($P \leq 0.00$ designed for SA & 0.01 intended for UD and 0.01 used for also D) and interrelation result of $P \times S$ ($P \leq 0.00$ aimed at

SA, 0.00 used for UD) that represent the the-significant result. Rendering towards the value of mean in table one that participants from both sectors gave their opinions as strongly agree 3.15 meant for public and 3.33 intended for private sectors as well 3.33 used for teachers and 3.24 intended for students. As concerning A, a set of data presents the variance amongst the public & private which might be gained 1.30 & 1.05 correspondingly. Moreover, 1.56 value of mean attained by the teacher and 1.04 mean value attained by the students as A. There is no response given by the participants about Strongly Disagree (SD).

Table 5. The teacher ensures delivering of expertise through different methods.

| Basis of Variablenes s | Scale of Likert | | | | |
|----------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----|
| | SA | A | UD | D | S D |
| Sectors (S) | 00.01 *** | 00.55 ns | 00.01 *** | 00.01 *** | - |
| Populations (P) | 00.87 ns | 00.08 ns | 00.04 * | 00.02 ** | - |
| S × P | 00.00 *** | 00.16 ns | 00.01 *** | 00.00 *** | - |
| Sectors (Mean ± SE³) | | | | | |
| Publics | 03.15 ± 00.22 a | 001.30 ± 00.17 a | 00.05 ± 00.05 a | 00.05 ± 00.03 a | - |
| Privates | 003.33 ± 00.22 a | 01.05 ± 00.17 a | 00.14 ± 00.05 a | 00.05 ± 00.03 a | - |
| Populations (Mean ± SE) | | | | | |
| Teachers | 03.33 ± 00.55 a | 00.44 ± 00.43 a | 00.33 ± 00.12 a | 00.22 ± 00.07 a | - |
| Students | 03.24 ± 00.16 a | 01.24 ± 00.13 a | 00.07 ± 00.04 b | 00.04 ± 00.02 b | - |

¹ns, * -(non-significant or significant) at $P \leq 0.05$

²(Not appropriate)

³(Standard error)

Question numbering 4 includes (Teacher ensures delivering of expertise through different methods) in the *table. 6*) in which both private and public teachers and students their responses which present the interrelation among sector and population for instance $S \times P$ based on question numbering

one. ANOVA, Chi-test & t-test have been used to analyses procurement mean, standard deviation, percentage, significant and non-significant values. That has been described in the given table. It might be got the consequence of the significance of P ($P \leq 0.00$ used for SA & ≤ 0.00 meant for A), despite the consequence of P ($P \leq 0.46$ designed for UD & 0.46 intended for D) and interrelation result of $P \times S$ ($P \leq 0.64$ aimed at SA, 0.64 used for A 0.81 for UD & D and 0.91 for SD) that represent the non-significant result. Rendering towards the value of mean in table one that participants from both sectors gave their opinions as strongly agree 2.52 meant for public and 2.75 intended for private sectors as well 4.72 used for teachers and 2.35 intended for students. As concerning A, a set of data presents the variance amongst the public & private which might be gained 1.66 & 1.62 correspondingly. Moreover, 0.22 value of mean attained by the teacher and 1.76 mean value attained by the students as A.

Table 6. The teacher ensures delivering of expertise through different methods.

| Basis of Variableness | Scale of Likert | | | | |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
| Sectors (S) | 00.64 ns | 00.64 ns | 00.81 ns | 00.81 ns | 00.91 ns |
| Populations (P) | 0.00 *** | 0.00 *** | 0.46 ns | 0.46 ns | 00.43 ns |
| S × P | 00.64 ns | 00.64 ns | 00.81 ns | 00.81 ns | 00.91 ns |
| Sectors (Mean ± SE³) | | | | | |
| Publics | 02.52 ± 00.23 a | 1.66 ± 0.18 a | 00.11 ± 00.05 a | 0.04 ± 0.03 a | 00.03 ± 0.02 a |
| Privates | 02.75 ± 00.23 a | 01.62 ± 00.18 a | 0.05 ± 00.05 a | 0.07 ± 00.03 a | 0.04 ± 00.02 a |
| Populations (Mean ± SE) | | | | | |
| Teachers | 04.72 ± 00.57 a | 00.22 ± 00.46 b | 0.00 ± 0.12 a | 0.00 ± 0.08 a | 0.00 ± 00.04 a |
| Students | 02.35 ± 00.17 b | 01.76 ± 00.14 a | 0.09 ± 0.03 a | 0.06 ± 0.02 a | 0.03 ± 0.01 a |

¹ns, * -(non-significant or significant) at $P \leq 0.05$

²(Not appropriate)

³(Standard error)

Question numbering 5 includes (Teacher gives special freedoms to students who organize their work in the best way in a *table. 7*) in which both private and public teachers and students their responses which present the interrelation among sector and population for instance $S \times P$ based on question numbering one. ANOVA, Chi-test & t-test have been used to analyses procurement mean, standard deviation, percentage, significant and non-significant values. That has been described in the given table. It might be got the consequence of the significance of P ($P \leq 0.00$ used for SA & ≤ 0.00 meant for A), despite the consequence of P ($P \leq 0.22$ designed for UD & 0.29 intended for D and 0.25 for SD) and interrelation result of $P \times S$ ($P \leq 0.89$ aimed at SA, 0.84 used for A 0.76 for UD & 0.86 D and 0.87 for SD) that represent the non-significant result. Rendering towards the value of mean in table one that participants from both sectors gave their opinions as strongly agree 2.48 meant for public and 2.06 intended for private sectors as well 4.72 used for teachers and 2.06 intended for students. As concerning A, a set of data presents the variance amongst the public & private which might be gained 1.12 & 1.73 correspondingly. Moreover, 0.22 value of mean attained by the teacher and 0.24 mean value attained by the students as A.

Table 7. Teacher gives special freedoms to students who organize their work in the best way.

| Basis of Variableness | Scale of Likert | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
| Sectors (S) | 00.42 ns | 00.25 ns | 00.76 ns | 00.8 6 ns | 00.87 ns |
| Populations (P) | 0.0** * | 0.0** * | 00.22 ns | 00.2 9 ns | 00.25 ns |
| $S \times P$ | 00.89 ns | 00.84 ns | 00.76 ns | 00.8 6 ns | 00.87 ns |
| Sectors (Mean \pm SE³) | | | | | |
| Publics | 02.48 \pm 0.23 a | 001.1 2 \pm 0.18 | 00.27 \pm 0.07. a | 00.1 3 \pm 0.04 . a | 00.07 \pm 00.02 . a |
| Privates | 2.07 \pm 0.23 a | 01.73 \pm 00.18 | 00.16 \pm 0.07 a | 0.09 \pm 00.0 4 a | 0.05 \pm 00.02 a |
| Populations (Mean \pm SE) | | | | | |
| Teachers | 04.72 \pm 0.56 a | 0.22 \pm 0.44 b | 0.00 \pm 0.18 a | 0.00 \pm 0.11 a | 0.00 \pm 0.06 a |

| | | | | | |
|----------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Students | 02.06 \pm 0.17 b | 1.53 \pm 00.13 a | 00.24 \pm 00.05 a | 00.1 2 \pm 0.03 a | 00.07 \pm 00.02 a |
|----------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|

¹ns, * -(non-significant or significant) at $P \leq 0.05$

²(Not appropriate)

³(Standard error)

Question numbering 6 includes (Teacher shows the maximum effort for attaining the quality of schoolchildren as an example in the *table. 8*) in which both private and public teachers and students their responses which present the interrelation among sector and population for instance $S \times P$ based on question numbering one. ANOVA, Chi-test & t-test have been used to analyses procurement mean, standard deviation, percentage, significant and non-significant values. That has been described in the given table. It might be got the consequence of the significance of P ($P \leq 0.00$ used for SA & ≤ 0.00 meant for A), despite the consequence of P ($P \leq 0.18$ designed for UD & 0.89 intended for D and 0.73 for SD) and interrelation result of $P \times S$ ($P \leq 0.27$ aimed at SA, 0.88 used for A 0.83 for UD & 0.24 D and 0.32 for SD) that represent the non-significant result. Rendering towards the value of mean in table one that participants from both sectors gave their opinions as strongly agree 2.39 meant for public and 1.94 intended for private sectors as well 4.17 used for teachers and 21.99 intended for students. As concerning A, a set of data presents the variance amongst the public & private which might be gained 1.08 & 1.66 correspondingly. Moreover, 0.22 value of mean attained by the teacher and 0.28 mean value attained by the students as A.

Table 8. The teacher shows the maximum effort for attaining the quality of schoolchildren as an example.

| Basis of Variableness | Scale of Likert | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
| Sectors (S) | 00.17 ns | 00.2 6 ns | 00.8 3 ns | 00.5 0 ns | 00.4 9 ns |
| Populations (P) | 00.00 *** | 0.01 *** | 0.18 ns | 0.89 ns | 00.7 3 ns |
| $S \times P$ | 00.27 ns | 00.8 8 ns | 00.8 3 ns | 00.2 4 ns | 00.3 2 ns |
| Sectors (Mean \pm SE³) | | | | | |
| Publics | 02.39 \pm 0.23 a | 01.0 8 \pm 0.18 b | 00.3 0 \pm 0.08 a | 00.1 4 \pm 0.05 a | 00.0 8 \pm 00.0 3 a |
| Privates | 1.94 \pm | 1.66 \pm | 0.22 \pm | 0.11 \pm | 00.0 7 \pm |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 00.23 a | 00.1 8 a | 0.08 a | 0.05 a | 00.0 3 a |
| Populations (Mean ± SE) | | | | | |
| Teachers | 04.17 ± 0.57 a | 00.2 2 ± 0.44 b | 00.0 0 ± 00.2 0 a | 0.11 ± 0.12 a | 0.06 ± 0.06 a |
| Students | 1.99 ± 0.17 b | 1.47 ± 0.13 a | 0.28 ± 0.06 a | 0.13 ± 00.0 3 a | 0.08 ± 00.0 2 a |

¹ns, * (-non-significant or significant) at P ≤ 0.05²(Not appropriate)³(Standard error)

Question numbering 7 includes (Teacher support schoolchildren for understanding how their presentation and performance towards others in the *table. 9*) in which both private and public teachers and students their responses which present the interrelation among sector and population for instance S × P based on question numbering one. ANOVA, Chi-test & t-test have been used to analyses procurement mean, standard deviation, percentage, significant and non-significant values. That has been described in the given table. It might be got the consequence of the significance of P (P ≤ 0.00 used for SA & ≤ 0.00 meant for A), despite the consequence of P (P ≤ 0.18 designed for UD & 0.18 intended for D and 0.36 for SD) and interrelation result of P × S (P ≤ 0.79 aimed at SA, 0.71 used for A 0.62 for UD & 0.62 D and no value for SD) that represent the non-significant result. Rendering towards the value of mean in table one that participants from both sectors gave their opinions as strongly agree 2.34 meant for public and 2.07 intended for private sectors as well 4.72 used for teachers and 1.99 intended for students. As concerning A, a set of data presents the variance amongst the public & private which might be gained 1.05 & 1.80 correspondingly. Moreover, 0.22 value of mean attained by the teacher and 1.53 mean value attained by the students as A.

Table 9. Teachers support schoolchildren in understanding how their presentation and performance towards others.

| Basis of Variableness | Scale of Likert | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
| Sectors (S) | 00.50 ns | 00.18 ns | 00.62 ns | 00.62 ns | 01.00 ns |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Populations (P) | 00.00* ** | 00.00 *** | 00.18 ns | 00.18 ns | 00.36 ns |
| S × P | 00.79 ns | 00.71 ns | 00.62 ns | 00.62 ns | -- |
| Sectors (Mean ± SE³) | | | | | |
| Publics | 02.34 ± 0.23 a | 01.05 ± 00.18 b | 00.35 ± 00.08 a | 00.14 ± 00.04 a | 00.07 ± 00.03 a |
| Privates | 02.07 ± 0.23 a | 01.80 0.18 a | 00.16 ± 00.08 a | 00.07 ± 00.04 a | 00.07 ± 0.03 a |
| Populations (Mean ± SE) | | | | | |
| Teachers | 04.72 ± 0.56 a | .22 ± .44 b | .00 ± 00.20 a | .00 ± 0.11 a | 00.00 ± 0.08 a |
| Students | 1.99 ± 00.17 b | 01.53 ± 00.13 a | 00.28 ± 00.06 a | .12 ± .03 a | .08 ± .02 a |

¹ns, * (-non-significant or significant) at P ≤ 0.05²(Not appropriate)³(Standard error)

Question numbering 8 includes (Teacher inspires schoolchildren for competing among them in the *table. 10*) in which both private and public teachers and students their responses which present the interrelation among sector and population for instance S × P based on question numbering one. ANOVA, Chi-test & t-test have been used to analyses procurement mean, standard deviation, percentage, significant and non-significant values. That has been described in the given table. It might be got the consequence of the significance of P (P ≤ 0.00 used for SA & ≤ 0.03 meant for A), despite the consequence of P (P ≤ 0.17 designed for UD & 0.57 intended for D and 0.64 for SD) and interrelation result of P × S (P ≤ 0.48 aimed at SA, 0.55 used for A 0.78 for UD & 0.94 D and 0.28 for SD) that represent the non-significant result. Rendering towards the value of mean in table one that participants from both sectors gave their opinions as strongly agree 2.23 meant for public and 1.89 intended for private sectors as well 3.89 used for teachers and 1.90 intended for students. As concerning A, a set of data presents the variance amongst the public & private which might be gained 1.12 & 1.62 correspondingly. Moreover, 0.44 value of mean attained by

the teacher and 1.45 mean value attained by the students as A.

Table 10. Teacher inspires schoolchildren for competing among them.

| Basis of Variableness | Scale of Likert | | | | |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
| Sectors (S) | 00.25 ns | .55 ns | 00.78 ns | 00.9 4 ns | 00.60 ns |
| Populations (P) | 0.00 *** | .03 ** | 00.17 ns | 0.57 ns | 0.64 ns |
| S × P | 0.48 ns | .55 ns | 0.78 ns | 0.94 ns | 0.28 ns |
| Sectors (Mean ± SE³) | | | | | |
| Publics | 02.23 ±.23 a | 01.12 ±.18 b | .32 ±.08 a | .16 ± 0.05 a | .10 ±.03 a |
| Privates | 1.89 ±.23 a | 1.62 ±.18 a | .22 ±.08 a | .14 ±.0 5 a | .07 ±.03 a |
| Populations (Mean ± SE) | | | | | |
| Teachers | 3.89 ± 00.57 a | .44 ±.44 b | 0.00 ± 0.20 a | 0.22 ± 0.13 a | 0.06 ± 0.07 a |
| Students | 01.90 ± 0.17 b | 1.45 ± 00.13 a | 0.29 ± 00.06 a | .15 ±.0 4 a | .09 ±.02 a |

¹ns, * -(non-significant or significant) at P ≤ 0.05

²(Not appropriate)

³(Standard error)

Question numbering 9 includes (Teacher permits the schoolchildren to deliberate their work with class fellows in the *table. 11*) in which both private and public teachers and students their responses which present the interrelation among sector and population for instance S × P based on question numbering one. ANOVA, Chi-test & t-test have been used to analyses procurement mean, standard deviation, percentage, significant and non-significant values. That has been described in the given table. It might be got the consequence of the significance of P (P ≤ 0.00 used for SA & ≤ 0.01 meant for A), despite the consequence of P (P ≤ 0.17 designed for UD & 0.83 intended for D and 0.60 for SD) and interrelation result of P × S (P ≤ 0.25 aimed at SA, 0.87 used for A 0.89 for UD, 0.23 used for D and 0.32 for SD) that represent the non-significant result. Rendering towards the value of mean in table one that participants from both sectors gave their opinions as strongly agree 2.30

meant for public and 1.89 intended for private sectors as well 4.17 used for teachers and 1.91 intended for students. As concerning A, set of data presents the variance amongst the public & private which might be gained 0.18 & 1.62 correspondingly. Moreover, 0.22 value of mean attained by the teacher and 1.43 mean value attained by the students as A.

Table 11. The teacher permits the schoolchildren to deliberate their work with class fellows.

| Basis of Variableness | Scale of Likert | | | | |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
| Sectors (S) | .10 ns | .26 ns | .89 ns | .56 ns | .56 ns |
| Populations (P) | .00 *** | .01 *** | .17 ns | .83 ns | .60 ns |
| S × P | .25 ns | .87 ns | .89 ns | .23 ns | .32 ns |
| Sectors (Mean ± SE³) | | | | | |
| Publics | 02.30 ±.23 a | .18 ± 0.18 b | .30 ±.08 a | .16 ±.05 a | .10 ±.03 a |
| Privates | 01.89 ±.23 a | 02 ±.1 8 a | .24 ±.08 a | .11 ±.05 a | .08 ±.03 a |
| Populations (Mean ± SE) | | | | | |
| Teachers | 4.17 ± 0.56 a | 0.22 ± 0.44 b | 0.00 ± 0.20 a | 0.11 ± 0.12 a | 0.06 ± 0.07 a |
| Students | 01.91 ±.17 b | 01.4 3 ±.1 3 a | .29 ±.06 a | .14 ±.04 a | .09 ±.02 a |

¹ns, * -(non-significant or significant) at P ≤ 0.05

²(Not appropriate)

³(Standard error)

Question numbering 10 includes (Instructor boost up schoolchildren to deliver their concepts and thoughts to each other in the schoolroom in the *table. 12*) in which both private and public teachers and students their responses

which present the interrelation among sector and population for instance $S \times P$ based on question numbering one. ANOVA, Chi-test & t-test have been used to analyses procurement mean, standard deviation, percentage,

| Qs | Sector | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
|-----|----------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Q1 | Publics | 82.7 | 17.3 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| | Privates | 84.1 | 15.9 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Q2 | Publics | 76.7 | 23.3 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| | Privates | 77.4 | 22.6 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Q3 | Publics | 68.2 | 26.6 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 00 |
| | Privates | 70.8 | 23.0 | 4.5 | 2.2 | 00 |
| Q4 | Publics | 52.8 | 35.1 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 3.1 |
| | Privates | 57.7 | 32.8 | 5.4 | 2.4 | 3.4 |
| Q5 | Publics | 58.9 | 25.6 | 5.6 | 4.2 | 2.7 |
| | Privates | 46.5 | 40.2 | 5.9 | 4.2 | 3.2 |
| Q6 | Publics | 54.9 | 24.1 | 8.5 | 4.5 | 4.0 |
| | Privates | 46.5 | 40.5 | 4.4 | 3.8 | 2.8 |
| Q7 | Publics | 56.2 | 25.6 | 9.9 | 4.5 | 2.8 |
| | Privates | 47.6 | 40.2 | 4.8 | 3.7 | 2.7 |
| Q8 | Publics | 55.7 | 26.6 | 9.1 | 5.1 | 3.5 |
| | Privates | 46.0 | 40 | 6.6 | 4.6 | 2.8 |
| Q9 | Publics | 70.7 | 6.9 | 10.9 | 6.3 | 4.2 |
| | Privates | 45.0 | 40.1 | 7.1 | 3.8 | 3.0 |
| Q10 | Publics | 56.2 | 28.1 | 9.3 | 4.6 | 3.8 |
| | Privates | 43.5 | 40.9 | 4.7 | 3.8 | 4.1 |

significant and non-significant values. That has been described the in the given table. It might be got the consequence of significant of P ($P \leq 0.00$ used for SA & ≤ 0.01 meant for A), despite the consequence of P ($P \leq 0.17$ designed for UD & 0.17 intended for D and 0.43 for SD) and interrelation result of $P \times S$ ($P \leq 0.26$ aimed at SA, 0.87 used for A 0.78 for UD, 0.78 used for D and 0.48 for SD) that represent the non-significant result. Rendering towards the value of mean in table one that participants from both sectors gave their opinions as strongly agree 2.25 meant for public and 1.80 intended for private sectors as well 4.17 used for teachers and 1.84 intended for students. As concerning A, a set of data presents the variance amongst the public & private which might be gained 1.05 & 1.62 correspondingly. Moreover, 0.22 value of mean attained by

the teacher and 1.43 mean value attained by the students as A.

Table 12. Instructor boost up schoolchildren to deliver their concepts and thoughts to each other in the schoolroom.

| Basis of Variableness | Scale of Likert | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
| Sectors (S) | .09 ns | .26 ns | .78 ns | .78 ns | .48 ns |
| Populations (P) | 0.00 *** | .01 *** | 0.17 ns | .17 ns | .43 ns |
| $S \times P$ | .26 ns | .87 ns | .78 ns | .78 ns | .48 ns |
| Sectors (Mean \pm SE³) | | | | | |
| Publics | 2.25 \pm .23 a | 1.05 \pm .18 b | .32 \pm .08 a | 0.14 \pm .05 a | 0.11 \pm .03 a |
| Privates | 01.80 \pm .23 a | 01.62 \pm .18 a | .22 \pm .08 a | .11 \pm .05 a | .12 \pm .03 a |
| Populations (Mean \pm SE) | | | | | |
| Teachers | 04.17 \pm 0.56 a | 0.22 \pm 0.44 b | .00 \pm .20 a | .11 \pm .12 a | .06 \pm .07 a |
| Students | 01.84 \pm 0.17 b | 01.43 \pm 0.13 a | .29 \pm .06 a | .13 \pm .03 a | .12 \pm .02 a |

¹ns, * (-non-significant or significant) at $P \leq 0.05$

²(Not appropriate)

³(Standard error)

4.2. Percentage of Questionnaire

Table 13. Percent values obtained for public and private sector schools

Summary

Results have been obtained by the above statistical analyzes from teachers and students having both public and private sectors regarding 10 different questions. From question numbering 1 and question numbering 2, almost all answers were found (S.A) and (A). though few answers had also been obtained as (UD) and (D) in questionnaire numbering 3, and containing (UD), (D), and (SD) in question numbering 4. Answers about the question numbering 5, educators and schoolchildren have given answers as SA and A, moreover, few answers of the participants were founded as UD, D, and SD. Though answers were received by question numbering 6 as SA and A while few participants have given answers like UD, D, and SD from both public

and private sectors. Regarding question number 7, almost all respondents have given ideas as (SA) and (A) but few further replies attained answers as (UD), (D), and (SD). Question numbering 8 contained responses from both of the schools public and private schools as SA and A also while some answers were given by respondents as UD, D, and SD. About question numbering 9, students and teachers from private and public schools provided results as SA and A whereas few responses contained UD, D, and SD. Finally, in question numbering 10 most of the students and teachers were answers as SA and A even though some participants answered as UD, D, and SD.

Findings

1. Answers from both the schools public and private schools were obtained and participants were found 100% agreed that Teacher makes a special effort to identify student's improvement, even if they are lower grade level (Table. 13.)
2. Answers from both of the schools public and private schools were also obtained and participants were found 100% agreed that that Teacher increases the capability of student perceptions of classroom social environment. (Table. 13.)
3. Answers from public schools were obtained and participants were found 97.8% agreed that Teacher ensures delivery of expertise through different methods, whereas 1.1% founded disagree and undecided while Answers from private schools were obtained and participants were found 95.8% agreed and 1.1% were founded disagree although 3.1% founded as undecided with the statement. In general, the majority agreed and settled (97.8% from public and 95.8% from the private sector) of the participants were of aspect that Teacher ensures delivering of expertise through different methods (Table 13).
4. Answers from public schools were obtained and participants were found 95.9% agreed that Teacher ensures sharing of knowledge in the class. whereas 1.6% founded disagree and undecided while Answers from private schools were obtained and participants were found 96.5% agreed and 2.4% were founded disagree although 1.1% founded as undecided with the statement. In general, the majority agreed and settled (95.9% from public and 96.5% from the private sector) of the participants were of aspect that Teacher ensures sharing of knowledge in the class. (Table 13).
5. Answers from public schools were obtained and participants were found 88.5% agreed that Teacher gives special freedoms to students who organize their work in the best way. whereas 4.9% founded disagree and 6.6% were undecided while Answers from private schools were obtained and participants were found 92.7% agreed and 3.4% were founded disagree although 3.9% founded as undecided with the statement. In general, the majority agreed and settled (88.5% from public and 92.7% from the private sector) of the participants were of aspect that Teacher gives special freedoms to students who organize their work in the best way. (Table 13).
6. Answers from public schools were obtained and participants were found 87% agreed that Teacher shows the maximum effort for attaining the quality of schoolchildren as an example. whereas 5.5% founded disagree and 7.5% were undecided while Answers from private schools were obtained and participants were found 90% agreed and 4.6% were founded disagree although 5.4% founded as undecided with the statement. In general, the majority agreed and settled (87% from public and 90% from the private sector) of the participants were of aspect that Teacher shows the maximum effort for attaining the quality of schoolchildren as an example. (Table.13).
7. Answers from public schools were obtained and participants were found 85.8% agreed that Teacher support schoolchildren for understanding how their presentation and performance towards others, whereas 5.3% founded disagree and 8.9% were undecided while Answers from private schools were obtained and participants were found 92.8% agreed and 3.4% were founded disagree although 3.8% founded as undecided with the statement. In general, the majority agreed and settled (85.8% from public and 92.8% from the private sector) of the participants were of aspect that Teacher support schoolchildren for understanding how their

presentation and performance towards others, (Table 13).

8. Answers from public schools were obtained and participants were found 85.3% agreed that Teacher inspires schoolchildren for competing among them, whereas 6.6% founded disagree and 8.1% were undecided while Answers from private schools were obtained and participants were found 89% agreed and 5.4% were founded disagree although 5.6% founded as undecided with the statement. In general, the majority agreed and settled (85.3% from public and 89% from the private sector) of the participants were of aspect that Teacher inspires schoolchildren for competing among them, (Table 13).
9. Answers from public schools were obtained and participants were found 81.6% agreed that Teacher often permits the schoolchildren to deliberate their work with class fellows, whereas 8.5% founded disagree and 9.9% were undecided while Answers from private schools were obtained and participants were found 89.1% agreed and 4.8% were founded disagree although 6.1% founded as undecided with the statement. In general, the majority agreed and settled (81.6% from public and 89.1% from the private sector) of the participants were of aspect that Teacher often permits the schoolchildren to deliberate their work with class fellows, (Table 13).
10. Answers from public schools were obtained and participants were found 85.3% agreed that instructors boost up schoolchildren to deliver their concepts and thoughts to each other in the schoolroom. whereas 6.4% founded disagree and 8.3% were undecided while Answers from private schools were obtained and participants were found 88.4% agreed and 5.9% were founded disagree although 5.7% founded as undecided with the statement. In general, the majority agreed and settled (85.3% from public and 88.4% from the private sector) of the participants were of aspect that Instructor boosts up schoolchildren to deliver their concepts and thoughts to each other in the classroom. (Table 13).

Conclusion

The present study showed the perceptions of educators and schoolchildren of the common atmosphere in the schoolroom, for investigating regarding the classroom, school and individual influences that on these aspects and perceptions. Results and findings also show the different conceptualization of the common atmosphere in the classroom amongst instructors and scholars that measures the emphasizing role of the need bases on the characters of educators and schoolchildren perceptions at the schoolroom level.

Moreover, all the factors like a classroom, school, and individual had erratic and valuable effectiveness on separate scopes to measure the schoolroom common atmosphere.

These results and findings demand more advanced research to regulate techniques and individual factors that are great prominent, relevant, and appropriate in the shape which influences both educator and schoolchild aspects and perceptions of the social environment of the classroom. Additionally, it is observed in the above findings that there is a need for the interrelation between the teachers and students to make more intellectualized and conceptualized in the social environment of the classroom for student learning outcomes and need to motivate and think logically for promoting good welfare and allow them to make their own decisions Individually.

Limitations and Future Studies

The research was limited only to 2 public and private schools at the elementary and secondary school level, only on taluka level, findings of the research study cannot generalize on whole district and province, Current work demands further study research to generate extra comprehensive approaches towards the common environment in the school classroom and factors or components that contribute a positive classroom environment for the perceptions of teacher and student individually.

Acknowledgment

The Authors thank all students and teachers public and private schools of taluka Kotri who participated in this study and cooperate with the researcher in all the process of data

collection. The authors also thank all the officials of the district education department who gave us permission for data collection and facilitate the research process.

References

- [1] Akey, T. M. (2006). and Academic Achievement : An Exploratory Analysis. *Mdrc*, (January), i–40.
- [2] Allodi, M. W. (2010). The meaning of social climate of learning environments: Some reasons why we do not care enough about it. *Learning Environments Research*, 13(2), 89–104. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-010-9072-9>
- [3] Bascia, N. (2014). The school context model: How school environments shape students' opportunity to learn. *Measuring What Matters, People for Education*, 1–21.
- [4] Blazar, D., & Kraft, M. A. (2017). Teacher and Teaching Effects on Students' Attitudes and Behaviors. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 39(1), 146–170. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373716670260>
- [5] Ellis, L. (2018). *Teachers ' Perceptions about Classroom Management Preparedness*. 1–232. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations%0Ahttps://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/4849/>
- [6] Hofman, R., Hofman, W., & Guldemon, H. (2001). Social context effects on pupils' perception of school. *Learning and Instruction - LEARN INSTR*, 11, 171–194. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752\(00\)00016-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(00)00016-5)
- [7] Hurst, B., Wallace, R., & Nixon, S. B. (2013). The impact of social interaction on student learning. *Reading Horizons*, 52(4), 375–398.
- [8] Mutlu, G., & Yıldırım, A. (2019). Learning Environment Perceptions and Student Background Variables as Determinants of Persistence in EFL Learning. *SAGE Open*, 9(4), 2158244019898805. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019898805>
- [9] Patrick, H., & Ryan, A. M. (2003). Identifying Adaptive Classrooms: Analyses of Measures of Dimensions of the Classroom Social Environment. *Indicators of Positive Development Conference*, (May), 1–49.
- [10] Villase, P., & Bank, W. (2014). *The different ways that teachers can influence the socio-emotional development of their students : A literature review*. (2013), 1–26.
- [11] Wang, M. Te, L. Degol, J., Amemiya, J., Parr, A., & Guo, J. (2020). Classroom climate and children's academic and psychological wellbeing: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Developmental Review*, 57(December 2019), 100912. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2020.100912>