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Abstract
This research work has focused on the investigation of The Impact of Teacher Effectiveness on Students’ Engagement at the University Level. A quantitative research design was adopted to collect data from the respondents who included the teaching faculty of Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan. The major objectives of the study were to investigate the impact of teachers’ qualification and experience on the students’ engagement. It also investigated the gender-wise difference of teachers’ effectiveness on students’ engagement. Findings of the study show that teachers’ qualification and experience has no direct impact on the students’ engagement.
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Introduction
Enthusiasm for understudy engagement has developed in the course of recent decades; albeit there is considerable variety, by the way, it has been characterized and measured. Early studies characterized understudy engagement essentially by perceptible practices, for example, interest and time on an errand (Brophy 1983; Natriello 1984). Specialists have likewise consolidated enthusiastic or full feeling angles into their conceptualization of engagement (Connell 1990; Finn 1989). These definitions incorporate sentiments of having a place, delight, and connection. All the more, as of late, researchers have considered parts of psychological engagement, for example, understudies' interest in learning, constancy despite difficulties, and utilization of profound as opposed to shallow methods (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris 2004). Some have additionally included self-regulation (the degree to which understudies show control over their learning activities) as a part of intellectual engagement (Pintrich and DeGroot 1990; Miller et al. 1996). Researchers have proposed hypothetical models recommending that understudy engagement predicts.

Teachers’ interest in the class and their subject command and preparation are a few of the pre-requisites for creating and catering for an active classroom environment. Researchers have shown that there is a positive relationship between teachers’ performance and students’ engagement.

Statement of the Problem
This study focused on the investigation of the impact of teacher effectiveness on students’ engagement at the university level.

Objective of the Study
The following were the objectives of the study.
1. To identify the impact of teachers’ qualification on student’s engagement.
2. To know about the impact of teachers’ experience on student’s engagement.
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3. To investigate the gender-wise difference of the relationship of teachers’ effectiveness with classroom engagement of the students.

**Research Questions**

1. What role does teachers’ qualification play on students’ engagement?
2. What is the impact of teachers’ experience on the academic engagement of students?
3. What is the gender-wise difference in the relationship of teachers’ effectiveness with students’ academic achievement?

**Review of Related Literature**

Enthusiasm for understudy engagement has developed in the course of recent decades; albeit there is considerable variety, by the way, it has been characterized and measured. Early studies characterized understudy engagement essentially by perceptible practices, for example, interest and time on an errand (Brophy 1983; Natriello 1984). Specialists have likewise consolidated enthusiastic or full feeling angles into their conceptualization of engagement (Connell 1990; Finn 1989). These definitions incorporate sentiments of having a place, delight, and connection. All the more, as of late, researchers have considered parts of psychological engagement, for example, understudies' interest in learning, constancy despite difficulties, and utilization of profound as opposed to shallow methods (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris 2004). Some have additionally included self-regulation (the degree to which understudies show control over their learning activities) as a part of intellectual engagement (Pintrich and DeGroot 1990; Miller et al. 1996). Researchers have proposed hypothetical models recommending that understudy engagement predicts. One of the most punctual speculations of engagement was the investment ID model (Finn 1989). This hypothesis characterizes engagement in school as "having both a behavioural segment, termed investment and an enthusiastic part, termed recognizable proof [emphasis in original]" (Finn and Voelkl 1993, p. 249).

Operationalization’s of engagement have been offered from a variety of theoretical and practise approaches, leading reviewers to conclude that it is a met construct encompassing multiple dimensions of attraction to or involvement in school (Fredricks et al., 2004). However, two important areas of confusion remain. The first focuses on the distinction between indicators versus facilitators of engagement (Sinclair et al., 2003). Beliefs about the self can be distinguished from engagement. This distinction is important because in the larger literature on academic engagement, a group of constructs with the common theme of interpersonal relationships (e.g., school attachment, school bonding, and school belonging) has been classified as a dimension of engagement itself (Jimerson et al., 2003).

Another compelling model was created by Connell and his partners (Connell 1990; Connell and Wellborn 1991; Skinner and Belmont 1993), who recognize two closures of a continuum: engagement and antagonized patterns of activity. Connected with understudies show behavioral inclusion in learning and positive, passionate tone; they drive forward even with test (Connell 1990; Connell and Wellborn 1991). Interestingly, separated or repelled understudies are inactive, don't make a decent attempt, are exhausted, surrender effortlessly, and present negative feelings, for example, outrage, fault, and foreswearing (Skinner and Belmont 1993). In a survey of the writing on understudy engagement, Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris (2004) propose that understudy engagement has numerous measurements: behavioral, passionate, and subjective.

- Behavioral engagement draws on the thought of support and incorporates inclusion in scholastic, social, or extracurricular dynamic ties; it is viewed as urgent for accomplishing positive scholarly results and avoiding dropping out (Connell and Wellborn 1990; Finn 1989).
- Emotional engagement concentrates on the degree of positive (and negative) responses to instructors, cohorts, scholastics, and school. Positive, enthusiastic engagement is attempted to make understudy binds to the establishment and impact understudies' eagerness to work (Connell and Wellborn 1990; Finn 1989).

Cognitive engagement is characterized as the understudy’s level of interest in learning; it incorporates being keen and deliberate in the way to deal with school assignments and being willing to apply the exertion important to grasp complex thoughts or troublesome expert abilities (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris 2004).
In the guideline, the term understudy engagement has grown in reputation in late decades, without a doubt happening due to an extended appreciation of the part that certain smart individual, energetic, behavioral, physical, and social variables play in the learning strategy. A valid example, a wide combination of investigation studies on learning have revealed the relationship between implied "non-mental variables" or "non-savvy capacities" (e.g., motivation, premium, premium, commitment, determination, constancy, air, work inclinations, self-regulation, social aptitudes, et cetera.) and "subjective" learning results (e.g., upgraded academic execution, test scores, information audit, mastery acquisition, etc.). The thought of understudy engagement commonly develops when educators discuss or compose informational methods and training techniques that address the keen individual, enthusiastic, behavioral, physical, and social segments that either redesign or undermine learning for understudies.

It should be seen that educators may hold different points of view on understudy engagement, and it may be described or deciphered remarkably as opposed to placing to put. A valid example, in one discernible school practices, for instance, going to class, listening carefully, taking an enthusiasm for talks, turning intake a shot at a time, and taking after fundamentals and headings may be seen as sorts of "engagement," while in another school the thought of "engagement" maybe for the most part seen similarly as internal states, for instance, vitality, interest, positive considering, motivation, or side interest.

While the thought of understudy engagement seems, by all accounts, to be clear, it can take truly complex structures before long. The going with cases demonstrate two or three courses in which understudy engagement may be analyzed or had a tendency to in schools.

**Scholarly Engagement**

To extend understudy engagement in a course or subject, educators may make lessons, assignments, or endeavors that connect with understudy diversions or that animate their advantage. A valid example, educators may give understudies more choice over the subjects they are gotten some data about (so understudies can pick a subject that especially premiums them), or they may let understudies pick the way they will analyze a subject or show what they have understood (a couple of understudies may choose to form a paper, others may make a short component or sound account, and still others may make a blended-media presentation). Teachers may, in like manner, present a unit of study with an issue or request that understudies need to clarify. A valid example, understudies may be requested to inspect the reasons from an adjacent natural issue, centre the sorts of a dark animal from a few short depictions of its physical qualities and practices, or produce a robot that can complete a specific errand. In these cases, beginning understudy premium can manufacture "engagement" in the learning technique. For related dialogues, see genuine learning, gathering based learning, detachment, altered learning, endeavor based learning, essentialness, and understudy voice.

**Passionate Engagement**

Teachers may use a wide blend of methodology to propel positive sentiments in understudies that will support the learning strategy, minimize negative practices, or keep understudies from dropping out. A valid example, classrooms and other learning circumstances may be moved up to make them more supportive for learning, teachers may take a stab at watching understudy dispositions and asking them how they are feeling, or school tasks may give exhorting, partner drilling, or distinctive organizations that generally hope to give understudies the reinforce they need to succeed academically and feel positive, confident, or amped up for school and learning. Systems, for instance, advisories, for case, are proposed to develop more grounded associations amidst understudies and adults in a school. The crucial speculation is that understudies will be more inclined to succeed if no under one experienced childhood in the school is meeting with an understudy routinely, getting some information about academic and non-insightful issues, giving her proposal, and taking an excitement for her out-of-school life, individual premiums, future desires, and unmistakable learning troubles and needs.

**Behavioral Engagement**

Educators may develop classroom timetables, use solid signs, or consign understudies’ parts that develop rehearse more accommodating for learning. A valid example, essential instructors may use prompts or signs that help
energetic understudies refocus on a lesson in case they get involved or wild. The instructor may praise three times or raise a hand, for case, which banners to understudies that now is the ideal time to stop talking, return to their seats, or begin another activity. Instructors may moreover develop solid timetables that help understudies keep centred or stay attracted in the midst of a class. Case in point, the class, may routinely isolate into little social affairs or move their seats into a circle for a get-together examination, or the teacher may ask understudies on a swinging reason to lead certain activities. By bringing mixture into a classroom plan, teachers can decrease the monotony and potential withdrawal that may happen when understudies sit in the same seat, doing similar assignments, for widened times of time. Research on cerebrum based learning has also given affirmation that mixed bag, interest, and physical development can engage and improve learning. For a related talk, see classroom organization.

Physical Engagement

Educators may use physical activities or calendars to engage in learning or premium. For example, "kinesthetic learning" suggests the usage of physical developments and activities in the midst of the learning technique. Instead of asking for that understudies answer addresses so anybody may listen, an instructor may ask for that understudies to walk around to the writing board and answer the request verbally while moreover creating the answer on the heap up (for this circumstance, the theory is that understudies are more inclined to review the information when they are using different parts of the cerebrum meanwhile, i.e., the diverse parts focused on talking, structure, physical development, et cetera.). Educators may moreover present brief times of physical activity or quick exercises, particularly in the midst of the essential years, to decrease eager, uneasy, or involved practices. Likewise, more schools all through the United States are keeping an eye on the physical needs of understudies by, for occurrence, offering all understudies free breakfasts (in light of the way that withdrawal in learning and poor educational execution have been joined with longing and wretchedness) or starting school later at a later time (in light of the fact that adolescent rest samples and needs shift from those of adults, and young people may be better prepared to learn later in the morning).

Social Engagement

Educators may use a blended sack of methods to sustain engagement through social cooperations. A valid example, understudies may be joined or accumulated to work synergistically on undertakings, or educators may make insightful difficulties that understudies battle in—e.g., an intriguing contention in which gatherings of understudies create robots to complete a specific errand in the most constrained measure of time. Academic and co-curricular activities, for instance, verbal meeting gatherings, apply independence clubs, and science fairs in like manner unite learning experiences and social cooperations. Besides, strategies, for instance, shows of learning or capstone undertakings may oblige understudies to give open presentations of their work, habitually to sheets of pros from the adjacent gathering, while methods, for instance, gathering based learning or organization (adjusting through volunteerism) can bring the city and social issues into the learning methodology. In these cases, getting some answers concerning societal issues, or sharing successfully for social reasons, can upgrade engagement.

Schools may make element moves to make understudies from the different social establishment’s, particularly starting late arrived specialist or outsider understudies and their families—feel welcomed, recognized, safe, and regarded. A valid example, executives, educators, and school staff may give one of a kind acquaintance session with their New-American peoples or offer elucidation organizations and illuminating materials deciphered into various lingos. Understudies, families, and close-by social pioneers from diverse establishments maybe gotten some data about their experiences to understudies and school staff, and teachers may deliberately change lessons to join the history, composition, expressions, and perspectives of the understudy ethnicities and nationalities identify within their classes. School activities may, in like manner, join multicultural tunes, moves, and shows, while blurbs, standards, and other informational materials highlighted all through the school may reflect the social contrasts of the understudies and school bunch. The general goal of such frameworks would be to diminish the suppositions of disarray, alienation, division, or dismissal that a couple of understudies and families may encounter, and in this way, grow their engagement in scholastics and school works out. For
related dialogues, see twofold tongue guideline, English-lingo learner, multicultural preparing.

**Nature of the Study**

It was the descriptive type of research, which simply indicates the broad field of study depending upon the availability of literature and information. This study concentrated on the investigation of those factors which have some influence on student’s engagement in the class.

Survey type descriptive research method was used in this study. It involves the collection, tabulation and interpretation of data through a questionnaire.

**Population**

The population of the study was all the male and female teaching staff of the departments of and social sciences of the university.

**Sampling**

The sample for the study consisted of 25 male and 25 female faculty members of both science and social science departments.

The questionnaires were distributed among the faculty members, and these were collected after two days.

**Analysis of the Data**

Collected data were fed into SPSS version 16 and was statistically analyzed by applying Mean, Standard Deviation and T-test. On the basis of findings, conclusions were drawn, and recommendations were made.

**Analysis of Data**

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of data obtained by the investigator through a questionnaire from the faculty members of the departments of science and social science.

**Results**

The gender-wise difference between the means of Male and Female staff is 15:16 with an SD of 2.78 & 1.51, respectively. The P-value of 0.19 (0.38 for the 2-tailed test), which is greater than 0.05 and is not significant, does not support the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that gender has no role in the interest and regularity of the students in the class.

Similarly, the gender-wise difference between the means of Male and Female staff is 10.24:10.64 with an SD 2.61 & 2.09, respectively. The P-value of 0.27 (0.554 for the 2-tailed test), which is greater than 0.05 and is not significant, does not support the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that gender has no role in the class participation and group activities of the students in the class.

**Results**

The gender-wise difference between the means of Male and Female staff is 7.36:7.16 with an SD 1.5 & 1.46, respectively. The P-value of 0.32 (0.64 for the 2-tailed test), which is greater than 0.05 and is not significant, does not support the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that gender has no role in getting responses/feedback from the students in the class.

Similarly, the gender-wise difference between the means of Male and Female staff which is 7.32:6.88 with an SD 1.86 & 1.56 respectively. The P value 0.18 (0.37 for 2-tailed test) which is greater than 0.05 and is not significant does not support the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that gender has no role in the completion of class assignment of the students.

Similarly, the gender-wise difference between the means of Male and Female staff which is 12.72:13.64 with an SD 2.97 & 2.87 respectively. The P value 0.13 (0.72 for the 2-tailed test), which is greater than 0.05 and is not significant, does not support the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that gender
has no role in the independent work of the students.

**Results**

The means of the qualification of the staff which is 16:15.77 with an SD 2.11 & 2.7 respectively. There is no significant difference between the SD the two mean which is concluded that qualification has no role in creating interest in the students and making them regular in the class.

Similarly, the means of the qualification of Male and Female staff, which is 10.57:12.33 with an SD 2.69 & 2.07 respectively, which is not significant, does not support the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that qualification of the staff has no direct role in motivating students for participation in group activities.

Similarly, the means value for a qualification which is 7.17:7.3 with an SD 1.58 & 1.44, respectively, shows that there is no significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that qualification has its role in getting a response from the students.

Similarly, the means value for a qualification which is 6.87:6.3 with an SD 1.71 & 1.72, respectively, shows there is no significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that qualification has its role in the assignment completion of the students.

Similarly, the means value for a qualification, which is 13.9:12.56 with an SD 3.1 & 2.6, respectively, shows that there is no significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that qualification has its role in the independent work of the students.

**Results**

The gender-wise difference between the means of the experience of the staff is 15.57:16.10 with an SD 2.76 & 1.77, respectively. There are significant mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that experience has its role in creating interest in the students and making them regular in the class.

Similarly, the means of the qualification of Male and Female staff, which is 10.67:10.28 with an SD 2.47 & 2.29 respectively and is not significant between the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that experience of the staff has no direct role in motivating students for participation in group activities.

Similarly, the means value for a qualification, which is 7.17:7.3 with an SD 1.58 & 1.44, respectively, shows no significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that experience has no role in getting a response from the students.

Similarly, the means value for a qualification, which is 6.87:6.3 with an SD 1.71 & 1.72, respectively, shows that there is no significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that experience has no role in the assignment completion of the students.

Similarly, the means value for a qualification, which is 13.9:12.56 with an SD 3.1 & 2.6, respectively, shows that there is no significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that experience plays no role in the independent work of the students.

**Findings**

The following are the findings of the study:

i. The means of Male and Female staff is 15:16 with an SD 2.78 & 1.51 respectively. The P-value of 0.19 (0.38 for the 2-tailed test), which is greater than 0.05 and is not significant, does not support the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that gender has no role in the interest and regularity of the students in the class.

ii. Gender-wise difference between the means of Male and Female staff which is 10.24:10.64 with an SD 2.61 & 2.09 respectively. The P value 0.27 (0.554 for 2-tailed test) which is greater than 0.05 and is not significant does not support the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that gender has no role in the class participation and group activities of the students in the class.

iii. The gender-wise difference between the means of Male and Female staff is 7.36:7.16 with an SD 1.5 & 1.46 respectively. The P-value of 0.32 (0.64 for the 2-tailed test), which is greater than 0.05 and is not
iv. Similarly, the gender-wise difference between the means of Male and Female staff is 7.32:6.88 with an SD 1.86 & 1.56, respectively. The P-value 0.18 (0.37 for the 2-tailed test) which is greater than 0.05 and is not significant, does not support the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that gender has no role in getting responses/feedback from the students in the class.

v. Similarly, the gender-wise difference between the means of Male and Female staff which is 12.72:13.64 with an SD 2.97 & 2.87 respectively. The P value 0.13 (0.72 for 2-tailed test) which is greater than 0.05 and is not significant does not support the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that gender has no role in the completion of class assignment of the students.

vi. The means of the qualification of the staff which is 16:15.77 with an SD 2.11 & 2.7 respectively. There is no significant difference between the SD the two mean which is concluded that qualification has no role in creating interest in the students and making them regular in the class.

vii. The means of the qualification of Male and Female staff, which is 10.57:12.33 with an SD 2.69 & 2.07 respectively which is not significant does not support the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that qualification of the staff has no direct role in motivating students for participation in group activities.

viii. The means value for a qualification which is 7.17:7.3 with an SD 1.58 & 1.44, respectively, shows that it there is no significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that qualification has its role in getting response from the students.

ix. The means value for qualification which is 6.87:6.3 with an SD 1.71 & 1.72 respectively shows that it there is no significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that qualification has its role in the assignment completion of the students.

x. Similarly, the means value for qualification which is 13.9:12.56 with an SD 3.1 & 2.6 respectively shows that it there is significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that qualification has its role in the independent work of the students.

xi. The difference between the means of the experience of the staff which is 15.57:16.10 with an SD 2.76 & 1.77 respectively. There is significant the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that experience has its role in creating interest in the students and making them regular in the class.

xii. The means of the qualification of Male and Female staff which is 10.67:10.28 with an SD 2.47 & 2.29 respectively and is not significant between the mean values of the two groups. It is therefore concluded that experience of the staff has no direct role in motivating students for participation in group activities.

xiii. The means value for qualification which is 6.67:7.69 with an SD 1.6 & 1.22 respectively showing no significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that experience has no role in getting response from the students.

xiv. The means value for qualification which is 6.86:7.28 with an SD 2.08 & 1.41 respectively shows that it there is a significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that experience has its role in the assignment completion of the students.

xv. Similarly, the means value for qualification which is 13.52:12.93 with an SD 3.01 & 2.90 respectively shows that it there is no significant difference between the two means. Thus it is concluded that experience plays no role in the independent work of the students.

**Recommendations**

Keeping in view the conclusion of the study the following recommendations are made.

i. It is recommended that students’ interest and regularity in the class should be take care of whether male or female staff.

ii. It should also be kept in mind that class participation and group activities are very important therefore both male and female staff should concentrate on these aspects so that students might be involved as much as possible.
It should also be focused that teachers should encourage their students in order to get responses and take feedback from them.

iii. Care should be taken that all students’ assignments should be checked, and as findings of the study show that students complete their assignments irrespective of gender. Similarly, they also do not depend on their teachers while doing their independent work.

iv. Students’ interest and regularity should be secured in the class, whether by a less or more qualified staff member. Similarly, their participation in the class and group activities should also take care of.

v. Findings of the study show that qualification has significant role in getting responses from the students; therefore, they should be encouraged to get them involved so as to elicit responses from them in a better way. Similarly, qualification of the staff has also significant role in the assignment completion of the students; it is therefore recommended that teachers should also utilize their academic and scholarly expertise in order to get their assignments completed well in time.

vi. Finding show that independent work of the students depends on the qualification of their teachers, therefore teachers should utilize it for the optimum benefit of their students.

vii. Findings also show that experience play its role in creating interest in the students therefore it is recommended that experienced staff should be appointed in the university as well as inexperienced staff should be trained so that they may also create interest in the students as well as make them regular in the class.

viii. It is found out that students’ motivation is not dependent on teachers’ experience; it is therefore recommended that students should be motivated for getting them engaged in the class. Similarly, students’ responses and their feedback are not dependent on teachers’ experience. It is recommended that students’ engagement should be secured anyway.

ix. Findings show that experience plays its role in getting students’ assignments completed. It is recommended teachers’ experience should be utilized for the maximum benefit of the students.

x. It is also found out that experience plays no role in the independent work of the students. It is recommended that such strategies should be adopted that they would complete their work independently.
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