Asian Social Studies and
Applied Research (ASSAR)
Published by ASAR Council

Volume 2 Issue 4
November, 2021
ISSN (E): 2709-9229

Effect of Teachers' Perception about Responsibility for Student's Achievement in General and Special Education at the Secondary Level

KASHIF IQBAL
Lecturer, Govt Training College for Teachers of Blind Lahore
Email:Kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

GHAZALA ISHRAT
Lecturer, University of Management and Technology
Email: ghazalah.ishrat@umt.edu.pk

SONIA FAREED KHAN
Ph.D. Scholar, Institute of Special Education, University of the Punjab.
Email: sonia.fareed.khan@gmail.com

Abstract

Teachers and their mastery reveal the work efficiency in education. Such mastery requires developed personality, appropriate qualification, unbiased attitudes and positive thinking, which lead the teacher and student both at acme in the field of education. When teachers feel their responsibilities to work for the betterment of students then it is resulted in real success. However, at some extent, if students do not experience success then it is taken in different aspects. This study aimed to compare teachers' perceptions about responsibility for their student's achievement in general and special education at secondary school level. A total of 310 teachers from general (n=151) and special education teachers (n=159) were taken as sample. An adopted questionnaire was used for data collection. Statistical data were analyzed with two-way analysis of variance. Findings of the research depicted that teachers in general education take more responsibility for the achievement of students than the teachers of special education. However, it has been recommended strongly that teachers in general and special education must be provided with special ethical and professional training on regular basis to develop responsibility for success and failure of their student.

Key words: *Responsibility, Success, Failure, General Education Teacher, Special Education Teacher.*

Introduction

Teacher plays an important role in the development of his students at school. For this reason, positive behavioral change is always remained important in teaching and learning process. In 21st century, teachers and students experience various confronts for preparation of post-secondary education, profession and being civilized. Teachers are the advocate of implementing student centered approach which is the right direction to meet these challenges (Keiler, 2018). The basic objective of every teacher is to find the best achievement for his students. However, failure of student is not accepted like success of his student. A significant and constant factor is academic failure for students who study in any institute. This is the way of getting experience in failure for their future success and persistence (Ajjawi et al., 2019).

In general, various individual differences from psychological perspective are found among students. Therefore, comprehension of students is observed on basis of such individual differences. Individual difference is the characteristics that develop a learner's personality diverse from other learner and it influences in such a way in which they behave in their matrix or even in classroom (Griffiths, 2019). However, in special education, students with disabilities are restricted to learn normally. This distinguishes the behavior, attitude and perception of the teacher in both system of education. Although, general and special education teachers work on their students to succeed in life (Dettmer, Knackendoffel, Thurston, 2013). Additionally, deficiency in meeting the educational needs of student with impairment can be the consequence of teacher's poor interest (Dettmer et al., 2013).

It has been focused predominantly in the research that student's achievement is affected by teachers regardless of the fact that there is an equal importance of the behaviors and attitude for their long term success (Blazar, Kraft, 2017). Therefore, existing literature provides the foundation to compare the teachers' perception about responsibilities for their student's achievement in general and special education at secondary school level.

In this unique situation, "assuming liability for student triumphs and disappointments" is an imperative and meddling idea that Guskey (1981) has introduced to the writing. As per Guskey (1981), who hold positive convictions of adequacy in their calling accept accountability for scholarly achievement and disappointment of students, however those with low dimensions of convictions of viability ascribe student inability to outside elements. Therefore, it demonstrates that there is a low dimension of connection between assuming responsibility for progress and failure, and that who assume responsibility for progress may not consider themselves in charge of failure. There is a significant impact of teacher's behavior on student's academic performance (Hassan, Zaman, 2018). When all is said in done it is proposed that in spite of the fact that teachers assume responsibility for progress, they credit failure to different components (Guskey, 1981, 1987).

Background of the Study

In connection to the above-mentioned scenario, it is the simplest fact that teachers are much responsible for the success or failure of their students. However, a special education teacher perceives his student's success or failure in a different way and a general education teacher perceives the success or failure of his student in different aspects. It is because of individual differences and other variants. Therefore, this dissertation will compare the perceptions of the teacher regarding their student's achievement in general and special education exclusively. Though, success and failure are two different aspects. Nevertheless, this research will highlight the comparison of the teacher's perception with regard to the own ness of students' success or failure in general and special education.

Literature Review

The sentence "General Education" is referred to the foundation of education with proficiencies, information, habits of mind, and norms which organize students for success in their all aspects of lives after graduation.

General knowledge and intellectual concepts are imparted to students for the development of various skills and attitudes which any concern faculty believes that all literate should acquire (Higher Learning Commission, 2003).

Special Education refers to the especially structured teaching and learning approaches which are used for students with disabilities and learning challenges. Specific attitude is also found here in, because positive attitude is much significance among teachers to be efficient special educationist. Special education is the system to understand the needs of children with disabilities and students with learning challenges. It means that adaptation in instructions due to the needs of students with special needs is contemplated as special education (National Department of Education, 1993).

Researches on mentioned background have highlighted the sense of responsibilities as motivational driving force for any person's endeavors. A task is related to a person for which he is responsible. Notwithstanding, being taken as internal responsibilities are there for person's responsibility. However, in everyday performance, people are often attributed with this responsibility. But the scenario is totally different in schools where task and liabilities are considered ill-defined.

According to Werner, (2006), teachers are only who are involved in various daily activities and their responsibilities are specific to them which they relate to themselves. Idea taken By self-determination theory, this becomes the strong motivational and driving force for self-determination of teachers. (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963; Müller, 2009; Ryan &Deci, 2000), but people are attributed for this responsibility by extrinsic motivation. (Lauermann&Karabenick, 2011).however, been hypothesized to cause burnout (Fischman et al., 2006).

Success of the student as responsibility is owned by the teachers mostly as compare to failure and it is possible with responsible teachers who are well prepared, organized and if they are supported and encouraged by administration of school. Additionally, the environment of school, and the socioeconomic context (Diamond, Randolph, & Spillane, 2004), size (Lee & Loeb, 2000) and perceived family influences (Thrupp, Mansell, Hawksworth, & Harold, 2003) except impact of culture which does not become the hurdle in their professional identity. (Barrett, 2005; Karakaya, 2004) established about impacts of culture put scratches perception of te teachers and turn it into restrictions for responsibility. Fischman, DiBara and Gardner (2006), Though, established that comparatively to other professions, responsibility is taken by teachers because they are ready. On the base of sense of responsibility, teachers are involved in counteracting the missing of explicit teaching instructions and behavioral norms progressively. This refers to students who are main focus of responsibility, performed by teachers. Teachers are always supposed to perform top leveled academic, communal, emotional and developmental requirements for their students with unconvincing surroundings with the expansion of endeavors and responsibility.

After the birth of Pakistan, education was considered as top priority. National Education Commission (Pakistan Ministry of Education, 1959) took initiative for the first time in history to bring notice for Handicapped in the country. However, this commission's initiative was not enough to bring suitable measure for Handicapped until education policy 1972- 1980 took suitable steps for the improvement of education for handicapped (Dani, 1986). A resolution by Government of Pakistan was passed on December 30, 1958 regarding establishment of the commission. There were initially 10 prominent educationists and this commission was inaugurated by president of Pakistan. January 15, 1959 was the first day of commission to work and 1st report was presented on August 26, 1959 to president. It was established soon that Government is only responsible for training of teachers from which handicapped will be served. Following major areas were focused by Commission:

i. Doctors, psychologist, speech therapist, physiotherapist and other professional will share their responsibilities with the responsibilities of teachers for the education and rehabilitation of children with special needs.

ii. ii. Vocational training in general education may be recommended for better earning of person with all kinds of disabilities.
iii. iii. Responsibility for the education of students with disability will be owned by the society.
iv. iv. Organization who work for professional, medical, education and vocational rehabilitation for PWDs, are more helpful in this regard. Such organization should be encouraged.
v. Another recommendation was there to have collaboration between the government and various organizations to make fine agencies to work on the betterment of People with disabilities.
vi. vi. It was also suggested that Government is responsible to provide specialized training for the personnel, working with the handicapped to make them active citizens.

Therefore, this study aimed:

(i) To determine the teachers' level of Responsibility for Student Achievement.
(ii) To find out the effect of background variables (gender, age, qualification and school level) on teachers' responsibility for student achievement for general and special education teachers.
(iii) To find out the effect of background variables (gender, age, qualification and school level) on teachers' responsibility for student failure (a sub-factor of achievement) for general and special education teachers.
(iv) To find out the effect of background variables (gender, age, qualification and school level) on teachers' responsibility for student success (a sub-factor of achievement) for general and special education teachers.

This study will be beneficial for all teachers, both in general education and special education to strengthen their perspective of academic achievement either success or failure. Additionally, this study will be useful for educators in general education and special education for maintaining result oriented approach with regard to academic achievement. It will provide base for further research in discovering the perception of teachers about academic achievements i.e., failure and success for students with special needs in Pakistan. It will provide awareness to the concerned authorities and policy makers on the development and provision of all relevant resources in education system for improving the standards of academic achievements through governmental approach.

Research Methodology

Research Design

The purpose of the study was to compare the teacher's perception about responsibilities for their student's achievement in general and special education at secondary school level. This was a descriptive quantitative research. This study was conducted in different special education and general education public schools of Punjab. There were (n=52231) (Punjab Education Department, 2019) public sector schools and (n=294) (Directorate of Special Education, 2021) special education public schools in Punjab. 20 general education schools and 20 special education schools were selected by using convenient sampling technique and 9 to 13 teachers were selected from each school. There were total 310 participants who respond the research instrument in which 159 teachers were from special education public schools whereas 151 teachers were from general education public schools.

Table 1 shows that distribution of sample was processed through characteristics of samples. It was institute wise distribution of general and special education. In above mentioned table, special education teachers were 159(51 %). However, general education teachers were 151 (49%).

Table 1: Distribution of sample on the basis of characteristics of demographical information

Demographical Variables	*n=310*
Institute	
Special Education	159(51%)
General Education	151(49%)
Gender	
Male	131(42%)
Female	149(58%)
Age	
25-30	115(37%)
30-35	95(30%)
35-40	52(16%)
40 above	48(15%)
Academic Qualification	
BA/BSc	30(9%)
MA/M.Sc./ BS(Hon)	225(75%)
M.Phil.	55(17%)
School Level	
Primary	94(30%)
Middle	109(35%)
Secondary	107(34%)

There were 149(57%) female teachers and 131(42%) teachers were male. Additionally, 115 (37%) teachers were between 25 – 30 years of age, 95(30%) teachers were of 30 – 35 years of age, and 48(15%) teachers were above 40 years of age. There 225(72%) teachers were having M.A/M.Sc./B.S (H) qualification and 55(17%) teachers were with M.Phil. qualification, and 30(9%) teachers were with BA/BSC qualification. There were 109(35%) teachers from middle school, 107(34%) teachers were from secondary school and 94(30%) teachers were from primary school.

Research Instruments

Questionnaire consists of two parts one part was having demographical information related to background characteristics of the participants. It included information related to participants' institute name, designation, city, district, gender, school level, school type, age, job experience, academic qualifications and professional qualification and the 2nd part was adapted developed by T. Guskey in 1981 because of most relevant to the topic, sample and questions of the study.

Table 2: Description of "The Responsibility for Student Achievement Questionnaire"

Sr.no	Sub Factor	Items	Serial number	Reliability
1	Responsibility for students' success (R+)	15	1b, 3b, 5a, 6a, 7a, 10b, 13a, 15a, 18a, 19b, 21a, 22b, 23a, 26b, 27b	0.68
2	Responsibility for Students' failure (R-)	15	2a, 4a, 8b, 9b, 11b, 12a , 14b, 16b, 17a, 20a, 24a, 25b, 28b, 29a, 30b	0.67
3	Total Responsibility	30	Total of R+ and R-	0.81

Data were collected by an adapted questionnaire "The Responsibility for Student Achievement Questionnaire" (TRSAQ) developed by T. Guskey in 1981 for measurement of responsibility teachers assume for academic successes and failures in the classroom. It consisted of 30 statements with two given options as (a) and (b) for every stem. Details are given in table 2. The participants were guided to answer each option in percentage with the total of 100 percent against each stem. They were asked to give a weight or percent to each of the two choices according to their preferences. For example:

Stem: If most students complete a home assignment you make, is it usually

a) Because of their personal motivation or
b) Because you were very clear in making the assignment?

The teacher may feel that student's complete assignments more because of personal motivation than because of teachers' clarity in making the assignment. In that case, a teacher might answer 80% for (a) and 20% for (b) or the respondent may feel quite the opposite. The percentage will vary according to how strongly the respondent feels about each alternative. The two must always add to 100%.

Data Collection

The researcher reviewed the literature and then set the objectives, research questions and significance of the study. Convenient sampling was used to select the sample. Primary and secondary methods were used for data collection by researcher. However, total 322 questionnaires were given to the selected participants. From which, 310 (96.27 %) were collected back. After data collection it was tabulated and analyzed by using SPSS data analysis techniques.

Data Analysis

After collection of the data, data were analyzed through computer software called SPSS for descriptive analysis and two-way ANOVA. Detail of data analysis is given in table.

Table 3

Research Questions	***Analysis***
How much responsible do general education teachers held themselves for students' achievement?	Descriptive analysis
How much responsible do special education teachers held themselves for students' achievement?	Descriptive analysis
Is there a difference in effect of gender on responsibility of students' achievement for general and special education teachers?	Two-way ANOVA
Is there a difference in effect of age on responsibility of students' achievement for general and special education teachers?	Two-way ANOVA
Is there a difference in effect of qualification on responsibility of students' achievement for general and special education teachers?	Two-way ANOVA
Is there a difference in effect of school level on responsibility of students' achievement for general and special education teachers?	Two-way ANOVA

Table 4: Descriptive Analysis of General Education Teachers' Responsibility for Students Achievement

	n	*Min*	*Max*	*M*	*SD*
Responsibility for student success	151	34.67	86.20	57.37	8.87
Responsibility for students failure	151	14.53	71.13	46.41	8.32
Responsibility for students achievement	151	38.33	74.77	51.89	5.59

Table 4 depicts descriptive analysis of the two sub-scale i.e., success and failure which constitute overall construct of responsibility for student achievement. Total number of respondents is 151 who belong to general education schools. Higher mean score on responsibility for student success (M=57.37, SD= 8.87) as compared to lower score on responsibility for student failure (M= 46.41, SD= 8.32) shows that teachers in general education held themselves more responsible for students success as compared to that for their failure. Mean score on overall responsibility for students achievement is (M= 51.89, SD= 5.59) which shows that general education teachers held themselves a little more than half responsible for their students' achievement whereas half of the credit lies with factors beyond their own control and limits.

Table 5: Descriptive Analysis of Special Education Teacher's Responsibility for Students Achievement

	n	*Min*	*Max*	*M*	*SD*
Responsibility for student success	159	43.33	87.80	58.34	8.71
Responsibility for students failure	159	14.80	65.33	42.07	9.40
Responsibility for students achievement	159	38.07	64.33	50.21	4.42

Table 5 depicts descriptive analysis of the two sub-scale i.e., success and failure which constitute overall construct of responsibility for student achievement. Total number of respondents is 159 who belong to special education schools. Higher mean score on responsibility for student success (M=58.34, SD= 8.71) as compared to lower score on responsibility for student failure (M= 42.07, SD= 9.40) shows that teachers in special education consider themselves more responsible for students success as compared to that for their failure. Mean score on overall responsibility for students achievement is (M= 50.21, SD= 4.42) which shows that special education teachers held themselves half the responsible for their student's achievement whereas half of the credit lies with factors beyond their own control and limits.

Table 6: Descriptive Analysis of Responsibility for Students Achievement for School Type and Gender

School type	*Gender*	*M*	*SD*	*n*
special education	Male	50.66	5.02	48
	Female	50.01	4.15	111
	Total	50.21	4.42	159
general education	Male	52.30	6.13	83
	Female	51.39	4.86	68
	Total	51.89	5.59	151
Gender	Male	51.70	5.78	131
	Female	50.54	4.47	179
	Total	51.03	5.09	310

Two-way ANOVA was applied to find out if there is a difference in effect of gender on responsibility of students' achievement for general and special education teachers' between groups. Table 6 shows descriptive analysis of responsibility for students' achievement across school type and gender. There were 159 special education teachers and 151 general education teachers. They were 310 in total. There were 83 males in general education and 48 in special education while there were 111 females in special

education and 68 in general education who participated in this research. Mean score and standard deviations are also given for male and female teachers teaching in both general and special education schools.

Table 7: Effect of School Type on Responsibility for students' Achievement for Male and Female Teachers

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	f	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	264.46[a]	3	88.15	3.47	.01	.03
Intercept	738095.27	1	738095.27	29118.35	.00	.99
School type	161.77	1	161.77	6.38	.01	.02
Gender	42.37	1	42.37	1.67	.19	.00
School type * Gender	1.25	1	1.25	.05	.82	.00
Error	7756.52	306	25.34			
Total	815398.94	310				
Corrected Total	8020.98	309				

Table 7 shows that a two-way ANOVA between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of school type and gender on the levels of Responsibility for students' Achievement as measured by TRSAQ. Subjects were divided into two groups according to their school type (General and special education) and gender (Male and female). The interaction effect between gender and school type was not statistically significant, F (1, 306) = 1.25, P= 0.82. However, there was a statistically significant main effect for school type F (1, 306) = 6.38, P= 0.01. The teachers in general education take more responsibility of students' achievement as compared to those in special education. The main effect for gender F (1, 306) = 1.67, P= 0.19 did not reach statistical significant.

Table 8: Descriptive Analysis of Responsibility for Students Achievement for School Type and Age.

School type	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	n
special education	25-30 years	50.3869	3.68570	56
	30+ to 35 years	50.2672	5.19744	68
	35+ to 40 years	48.5722	3.59585	24
	40+ and above	52.5727	3.41285	11
	Total	50.2130	4.42852	159
general education	25-30 years	52.7576	5.83025	59
	30+ to 35 years	50.9765	5.43218	27
	35+ to 40 years	51.7714	5.07183	28
	40+ and above	51.2955	5.74635	37
	Total	51.8980	5.59906	151
Total	25-30 years	51.6032	5.02637	115
	30+ to 35 years	50.4688	5.24592	95
	35+ to 40 years	50.2949	4.69500	52
	40+ and above	51.5882	5.29762	48
	Total	51.0338	5.09489	310

Two-way ANOVA was applied to find out if there is a difference in effect of age on responsibility of students' achievement for general and special education teachers. Table 8 shows descriptive analysis of responsibility for students' achievement across school type and age.

Table 9: Effect of School Type and teacher's age on Responsibility of student's Achievement

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	MS	F	Sig.	PES
Corrected Model	428.	7	61.151	2.432	.01	.05
Intercept	592316.48	1	592316.48	23558.7	.00	.98
School type	88.76	1	88.768	3.531	.06	.01
Age	111.41	3	37.139	1.477	.22	.01
School type * Age	135.62	3	45.207	1.798	.14	.01
Error	7592.92	302	25.142			
Total	815398.94	310				
Corrected Total	8020.98	309				

Table 9 shows that a two-way ANOVA was conducted to discover the effect of school type and gender on the levels of responsibility for students' achievement as measured by TRSAQ. Respondents were distributed into two groups with reference to their school type (General and special) and four groups regarding their age level (ranging from 25- 40+). The interaction effect between age and school type was not statistically significant, F (3, 302) = 1.80, P= 0.14. There was neither a statistically significant main effect for school type F (3, 302) = 3.53, P= 0.06. The main effect for age F (3, 302) = 1.47, P= 0.22 was not statistically significant either.

Table 10: Descriptive Analysis for School Type and Qualification of teachers for Responsibility of Students Achievement

school type	Academic Qualification	M	SD	n
special education	BA/BSc	50.3333	5.04189	8
	MA/MSc/ BS(H)	50.2692	4.72021	118
	M.Phil.	49.9828	3.12088	33
	Total	50.2130	4.42852	159
general education	BA/BSc	51.7455	4.99911	22
	MA/MSc/ BS(H)	51.9159	5.53718	107
	M.Phil.	51.9636	6.64393	22
	Total	51.8980	5.59906	151
Total	BA/BSc	51.3689	4.96351	30
	MA/MSc/ BS(H)	51.0523	5.17936	225
	M.Phil.	50.7752	4.88847	55
	Total	51.0338	5.09489	310

Two-way ANOVA was applied to find out if there is a difference in effect of qualification on responsibility of students' achievement for general and special education teachers. Table 10 shows descriptive analysis of responsibility for students' achievement across school type and qualification.

Table 11: Effect of School Type on Responsibility for students' Achievement for Teachers of Different Qualification

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	222.77[a]	5	44.55	1.73	.12
Intercept	355125.97	1	355125.90	13843.97	.00
School type	96.11	1	96.19	3.75	.05
A_Qualification	.62	2	.31	.01	.98
School type *Qualification	1.67	2	.83	.03	.96
Error	7798.21	304	25.65		
Total	815398.94	310			
Corrected Total	8020.98	309			

Table 11 shows that a two-way ANOVA was conducted to ascertain the effect of school type and teachers' qualification on the levels of responsibility for students' achievement as measured by TRSAQ. Respondents were distributed into two groups with reference to their school type (General and special education) and three groups regarding their qualification level (ranging from graduation to M Phil). The interaction effect between qualification and school type was not statistically significant, F (2, 304) = 0.03, P= 0.96. Contrarily, there was a statistically significant main effect for school type F (2, 304) = 3.75, P= 0.05. The teachers in general education take more responsibility of students' achievement as compared to those in special education. The main effect for qualification F (2, 304) = 0.01, P= 0.98 was not statistically significant.

Table 12: Descriptive Analysis of Responsibility for Students Achievement for School Type and School Level

School type	*School level*	*M*	*SD*	*n*
special education	Primary	49.6874	5.55093	37
	Middle	50.5273	4.32967	72
	Secondary	50.1493	3.61655	50
	Total	50.2130	4.42852	159
general education	Primary	51.9070	5.75975	57
	Middle	51.0243	5.30596	37
	Secondary	52.4561	5.64598	57
	Total	51.8980	5.59906	151
Total	Primary	51.0333	5.75259	94
	Middle	50.6960	4.66520	109
	Secondary	51.3782	4.92179	107
	Total	51.0338	5.09489	310

Two-way ANOVA was applied to find out if there is a difference in effect of school type on responsibility of students' achievement for general and special education teachers. Table 12 shows descriptive analysis of responsibility for students' achievement across school type and school level.

Table 13 shows that a two-way between-groups ANOVA was conducted to ascertain the effect of school type and school level on responsibility for students' achievement as measured by TRSAQ. Respondents were distributed into two groups with reference to their school type (General and special education) and three groups regarding their school level (ranging from primary to secondary).

Table 13: Effect of School Type on Responsibility for Students Achievement for Teachers of Different School Levels

Source	Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	PES
Corrected Model	283.43[a]	5	56.68	2.22	.05	.03
Intercept	759843.02	1	759843.02	29853.42	.00	.99
School type	205.11	1	205.11	8.05	.00	.02
School level	18.15	2	9.07	.35	.70	.00
S_type * S_level	51.20	2	25.60	1.00	.36	.00
Error	7737.54	304	25.45			
Total	815398.94	310				
Corrected Total	8020.98	309				

The interaction effect between school level and school type was not statistically significant, F (2, 304) = 1.00, P= 0.36. Contrarily, there was a statistically significant main effect for school type F (2, 304) = 8.05, P= 0.00. The teachers in general education take more responsibility of students' achievement as compared to those in special education. The main effect for school level F (2, 304) = 0.35, P= 0.70was not statistically significant.

Conclusion

It is concluded that teachers in general education held themselves more responsible for students' success as compared to that for their failure. Teachers in special education held themselves more responsible for students' success as compared to that for their failure. Similarly, gender was not a source of variation in teachers' scores on responsibility for students' achievement either. However, the teachers in general education take more responsibility for students' achievement as compared to those in special education. It is found that the school type, teachers' age, and interaction effect of both did not cause any difference in responsibility of students' achievement. It is concluded that the teachers in general education take more responsibility for students' achievement as compared to those in special education. Contrarily, it is found that teachers' qualification and interaction effect of qualification and school type did not cause any difference in responsibility of students' achievement. The teachers in general education take more responsibility for students' achievement as compared to those in special education. Contrarily, it is found that school-level and interaction effect of school level and school type did not cause any difference in responsibility of students' achievement.

Discussion

This study was intended to answer the questions

"How much responsible do general education teachers held themselves for students' achievement?" and "How much responsible do special education teachers held themselves for students' achievement?" The finding for both questions is that teachers in general education and special education teachers held themselves more responsible for student's success as compared to that for their failure. From perspective of (Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 2000; Jonassen, &Grabowski, 1993) that teaching is the foundation which includes interests and abilities of an individual with consequence of higher learning. The powerful motivational process is interest which strengthen learning process, directs towards educational and career paths with significant academic success (Harackiewicz et al., 2016).

Additionally, from the finding of overall responsibility, general education teachers and special education teachers held themselves a little more than half responsible for their students' achievement whereas half of the credit lies with factors beyond their own control and limits. According to Werner, (2006), teachers are only those who are involved in various daily activities and their responsibilities are specific to them which they relate to themselves. These findings are also supported by concept of "Taking responsibility for students' success", which is related to the concept of locus of control and coined by Guskey (1981, while teachers whose perceptions of teaching efficacy are positive take responsible for students' success and failure, teachers with low perceptions of teaching efficacy attribute students' failure to external factors.

Another research question "Is there a difference in effect of gender on responsibility of student's achievement for general and special education teachers?" with regard to its finding reveals that teacher's age does not have an effect with regard to the responsibility for student's achievement. However, there is strong contradiction in (International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, July 2013), the results have shown that both gender and experience variables positively and significantly predict education process self-efficacy perception and perception of responsibility from student success. Influencing student scholastic execution, are relied upon to accept responsibility in their calling as they are viewed as a sign of the nature of an instructive framework and they lead to changes in instructive arrangements (Alnabhan, Al-Zegoul and Harwell, 2001).

The research question "Is there a difference in effect of age on responsibility of students' achievement for general and special education teachers? "was intended to answer that it is revealed that there is no difference of age. However, there is strong contradiction from Gusky1981, it thus seems that these two orientations may be quite different, regardless of the age of an individual. It also adds support to the suggestion of Crandall and his associates that self-responsibility for successes and failures may be learned separately and therefore applied differentially.

Additionally, qualification of teacher's in general education and special education does not have impact on student's failure or success. Same happens with another variable for the research which is age. It is shown in data interpretation that age of the teachers does not have any influence on student's success or failure.

Recommendations

Teachers of general education must be provided with particular ethical training to have acceptance for their student's success and failure. Teachers must be provided with adequate proficiencies to promote positive learning among their students and their needs. Training modules of teachers in special education must be upgraded as per the modern needs of students with special needs. Monthly trainings programs with moral development content and skill enhancement methods must be promulgated at public and private sectors among teachers.

Recommendations for Future's Researches

Followings are recommended for researches in future:

1. Researches on such topic should be published to enhance the concept of responsibility.
2. Students from various grades should be encouraged to participate to evaluate their achievements with regard to responsibility of their teacher.

References

Ajjawi, R., Dracup, M., Zacharias, N., Bennett, S., &Boud, D. (2020).Persisting students' explanations of and emotional responses to academic failure. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *39*(2), 185-199.

Blazar, D., & Kraft, M. A. (2017).Teacher and teaching effects on students' attitudes and behaviors. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, *39*(1), 146-170.

Del Schalock, H. (1998). Student progress in learning: Teacher responsibility, accountability, and reality. *Journal of personnel Evaluation in Education*, *12*(3), 237-246.

Griffiths, C., &Soruç, A. (2020). *Individual differences in language learning*.Springer International Publishing.

Guskey, T. R. (1981). Measurement of the responsibility teachers assume for academic successes and failures in the classroom. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *32*(3), 44-51.

Harackiewicz, J. M., Smith, J. L., &Priniski, S. J. (2016). Interest matters: The importance of promoting interest in education. *Policy insights from the behavioral and brain sciences*, *3*(2), 220-227.

Jonassen, D. H., & Grabowski, B. L. (2012). *Handbook of individual differences, learning, and instruction*.Routledge.

Keiler, L. S. (2018). Teachers' roles and identities in student-centered classrooms. *International journal of STEM education*, *5*(1), 1-20.

Powell, J. P. (1983). Higher Education Research & Development, Volume 2, Number 2, 1983. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *2*(2), 127-224.

Rashid, M. A. U. H., &Zaman, S. (2018). Effects of teacher's behavior on academic performance of students. *ShaheedZulfikar Ali Bhutto Institute of Science and Technology (SZABIST), Islamabad, Pakistan*.