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ABSTRACT
This honor’s thesis presents a case study of student behavioral profiling and behavioral/classroom management in Pakistan. This research discusses the ways in which selected educators with a minimum of ten years of experience, working in a middle-class community-based school, perceive, analyze and contend with student behavior in a classroom setting. This was achieved by specifically looking at explicit and implicit forms of behavior profiling and the strategies employed by the teachers in their attempts to manage the behaviors of their students. Drawing on primary research findings and a thorough literature review, this research explores how students may be explicitly or implicitly profiled and labelled in a classroom, and whether teachers’ strategies are appropriately responsive to the challenges posed by the need to motivate but also discipline students. Finally, support strategies and suggestions to further promote positive classroom dynamics are examined.
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INTRODUCTION

It is estimated that around 18% of adolescents suffer from depression and the ratio of girls suffering from depression is higher than the ratio of the boys (Praslă, 2012). In Pakistan, depression and anxiety can be found in 34% of the population and similar to the Western context, the prevalence of depression is higher in girls than in boys. Various factors may lead to depression, including social, cognitive and psychosocial factors. It is important also to realize that adolescents’ anxiety affects behavior among peers, with family and at school (Praslă, 2012). Since school is a crucial socializing agent, the role it plays in shaping identities is pivotal. Teachers identify and classify students based on the way they behave and perform in class, and in light of the prevalence of mental issues affecting teens, this can be very problematic, given the negative impacts of labeling by teachers. Thus, it is important to understand the forms of behavioral profiling used by teachers and the ways in which they set out to manage and analyze student behavior. Teaching comes with loads of challenges including the need to motivate, but also discipline students, considering a teacher’s partial awareness of their subjective struggles, personalities and home-life circumstances. How this is done, is important and has direct bearing on the school performance of students, on their self-esteem and on their level of engagement in school.

Student behavior management poses an ethical and socio-cultural challenge, faced by most schools (Nooruddin, 2014). Behavior problems in some students such as disruptive behavior, violence, bullying and other undesired behavior, foster a poor learning environment for students in general; thus, effective behavior and classroom management strategies are very important to produce conditions which promote inclusive and engaged classroom dynamics. However, it is crucial to recognize that the strategies employed by teachers are impacted by the way they formulate opinions and perceptions regarding a child’s behavior and performance. In order to understand the behavior, teachers often indirectly or directly, unconsciously or consciously, subjectively or objectively profile and categorize students, based on the perception of their “problematic behavior” or “inadequate performance.” This, in turn, might lead to explicit or implicit forms of classification and labelling, which in the long run can have nefarious effects on the child/teen.

The labels ascribed to students in classrooms are often internalized by children, impacting them for many years, perhaps until adult life, and this can have important incidental effects on students’ engagement in the classroom, depending on the nature of the label. Thus,
the purpose of conducting this research is first, to understand how educators and educational representatives working in a school, tend to profile the behavioral and performance patterns of children and teens under their tutelage. It also aims to understand how student may be categorized and monitored in classrooms, and whether teachers are aware of their own behavioral management practices.

**Research Questions**

1. How do educators and educational representatives working in a school in Karachi Pakistan, profile the behavior of their students?
2. What behavior management strategies are employed by various teachers and are their practices informed by an awareness of student needs?
LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review draws from multi- and inter-disciplinary scholarship. It covers key notions on the role of schools in the socialization process, issues surrounding student labelling and profiling by teachers, behavior management and the construction and mitigation of deviance, or the theorization of deviant behavior and it’s link to self-ascription and identity development, teachers’ expectations and their “self-fulfilling prophecy effect,” the pygmalion and anti-pygmalion effect, stigmas and prejudices, as well as solutions proposed to common problems in classroom management. The scholarship reviewed here does not constitute a comprehensive review, as the body of knowledge is too vast to summarize as part of this project. However, the selected literature was chosen because it forms solid and relevant groundwork, to answer the research questions mentioned above, and to begin framing the methodology of this research.

School as a primary socializing agent

The basic purpose of school is to pass on the culture of a society which includes a society’s norms, values, believes and expectations to the children. This process is known as the ‘transmission of culture’ (Saldana, 2013). Contemporary societies have established three agents of socialization which includes family, media, and school. After the family, and depending on media exposure, the school remains one of the most important socializing agents, where a child spends a majority of his active hours. As a primary socializing agent, the school plays a crucial role in shaping youth identities.

Schools are responsible for socializing young children on specific values and traits that are dominant in society and since every society functions differently, the socialization of children will vary from school to school. It is important to understand that the school is expected to train an individual for his/her practical life and equip him/her with specific skills and teach them social norms. Thus, the school has the power to reinforce conformity and power relationships in the process of socialization (Saldana, 2013).

Havighurst and Davis (1943), argue that socialization “refers to the selection by a society of certain specific behaviors out of all the psychological responses and cultural forms possible to human beings” (Havighurst, Davis, 1943, pp.29). Based on this definition, the school as well as the household, is a primary site of socialization, where teachers are formally charged with the administration of rewards and punishment, and the task of identifying and
curtailing behaviors deemed inappropriate or unhealthy. Teachers categorize and compare students based on their behaviors, perceived personality traits and general performance in school. In general, the knowledge of teachers, pertaining to the personal issues and struggles of students, let alone their home-circumstances, can be limited. However, it is often the teachers, who set the tone for judgments on, and standard “reactions” to, what constitutes ‘normal’ or ‘proper’ behavior/performance, as opposed to “abnormal” and “inappropriate” student attitudes.

Teachers, for the most part, have a relatively high degree of independence in performing these mental and social tasks and they rarely receive feedback or training on the impacts of their behavioral management strategies. This is especially true in Pakistan’s context, a developing country where education is grossly under-funded, and where traditionalist paradigms regarding child control and discipline largely reign supreme. As such, managing behavior based on old traditional precepts of discipline, might lead to forms of labeling that could have nefarious impacts on children and teens. Socialization theories have developed substantively, and more recent scholarship concedes that children are not passive recipients of content. According to Social Learning Theory (SLT), children learn new things from their interactions with others in a social context by watching and imitating others (Nabavi, 2012). This shows that they actively engage in their own learning process and knowing how to generate and reproduce this engagement is the crux of pedagogical excellence.

**Labeling Theories**

Solomon strongly believes that “labeling is ascribed through agents of social order or control” (Solomon, 2015, pp.1), and it mainly concerns the ways in which these institutions of social control, such as the school and the educators respond to various sets of behavior (Skopalova, 2010). Labeling is ascribing a descriptor to a person based on a particular, selected behavioral trait, often with little consideration as to their complex causes, or the implications of the label, for the person being labelled. When an individual is assigned a label, he/she is placed into a specified group, or categorized, with others’ who display similar characteristics. Also, it enables the society to distinguish the individual from others, based on mechanisms of social ascription, regardless of the accuracy of this representation (Gold & Richards, 2012). Labeling, in order to categorize and respond to student behavior in classrooms, is still a common practice in Pakistan and little awareness of its impacts exists amongst educators, especially in the public education sector of Pakistan, where professional education is not subject to substantial investments by educational administrations.
In order to understand the role of labeling and its impacts on students, it is important to first look at labeling theories. Many original studies regarding labeling theories offer explanations as to the processes through which individuals or groups are labeled.

Howard Becker’s work on symbolic interactionism and his interactionist theory of deviation later came to be known as a labeling theory (Skopalova, 2010). Labeling theories are derived from an interactionist perspective which focuses on the interactions that are taking place between the individuals and small groups, and the meanings associated with these exchanges. Labeling is based on the idea that human identity is formed through these interactions (Skopalova, 2010), where we tend to associate value, often in dichotomous oppositions such as, good versus bad, proper versus improper, obedient versus disobedient, etcetera. According to Jorgenson (1997), the interactionist tradition sees society as a constructed reality, where meanings emerge from symbolic exchanges between people (Jorgenson, 1997). Since labels are socially constructed, once the majority of the people decide what kinds of behavior are “unlawful” or go against the societal norms, any individual displaying such behavior will be considered as deviant (Gold & Richards, 2012).

**Deviance, Labeling and Symbolic Interaction**

Recent studies revisited original and earlier labeling theories, and they confirmed that these theories are substantiated by strong evidence, linking labels and an understanding of deviance (Moustakim, 2010). A majority of labeling theorists believe that deviance, is a reaction to the social situation and since every society has a different set of codes and values, what may be considered deviant, tends to change across time and locations (Solomon, 2015). This idea can be further understood by looking at Lemert’s use of the term ‘sociopathic phenomenon’, which he used to refer to, and differentiate between different behaviors such as ‘normal’ and ‘pathological’ behaviors (Skopalova, 2010). In essence, Lemert believed that an individual’s behavior at a certain time and place may be socially approved, but the same behavior may break societal norms at a different time and place (Skopalova, 2010). This also helps to frame deviance as a contextual relation between dominant cultural norms, and the manifestation of behavior/traits that are different from these norms.

Building on Lemert’s idea, Brown explained that “mobility through various social contexts revealed differing acts considered to be undesirable or deviant” (Solomon, 2015, pp.4). Thus, being labeled as deviant depends on the society/group an individual belongs too. Moreover, there are often explicit or implicit sets of rules, which are meant to regulate behavior amongst all members of the society/group, and these have to be adhered to. Pushing boundaries
may lead to chastisement, expulsion, or sometimes, cultural/structural change. Normality is institutionalized in matrices of formal and informal rules, all operationalized through every day practice, and in patterns of interactions/expectations, with/towards the world and others. Hence, as Becker states “the compliance to one set of rules could very well be the infringement on another set of rules within the same society” (Solomon, 2015, pp.5).

Deviance is defined by the society/group in which the rules of engagement are formed and whereas violating those rules, leads to being assigned a label that signifies one’s ‘deviance’. For Becker,

Social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an offender. (Moustakim, 2015)

Similarly, within a structural functionalist mindset, Durkheim referred to deviance as any action or behavior which is not acceptable by the collective majority, which in return, attracts punishments. Thus, deviance is socially constructed, and a person is labeled as ‘deviant’ when another person perceives his/her behavior as deviant (Solomon, 2015).

The problem, which then surfaces, is the nefarious effects of “deviant labels” on children, at a time when they are forming their personal and social identities, a time when they are internalizing their sense of self, in part, out of their subjective appropriation of what they think, others think of them. The theory of the looking glass self, by Charles Horton Cooley, a pioneer of social interactionism, (Rahim, 2010), becomes a key instrument of analysis to address the compounding negative effects of labeling “difference” and assigning negative connotations to it, on the process of identity. Labelling may therefore incur unproductive effects in and out of the classroom, such as low self-esteem, incidents of panic and anxiety attacks, tendencies to act out and rebel, risks of isolation and disengagement, etc.

**Lemert’s Sequential Model and the sense of self**

Lemert’s Sequential Model explains the process through which an individual is ascribed a deviant status, which Lemert refers to as ‘self–defining junctures’ (Solomon, 2015). Early labeling research, observed that an individual, especially in his childhood will act in a non-conformist way; a way that will not be approved by the society and these patterns of difference will fall in the category of primary deviation (Skopalova, 2010). This is the first juncture, where a “deviant” label may be learned and internalized, thereby generating a
continued pattern of inappropriate behavior (Solomon, 2015). During this process, the individual does not start to see himself/herself as deviant and there is no substantive engagement with a label. But, the situation radically changes when the individual’s deviant acts are discovered by significant others, family members, peers, teachers, etc., who together may collectively stigmatize and vilify certain traits/characteristics/behaviors (Skopalova, 2010).

Public and collective reactions to one’s deviance/difference, become the turning point, which may lead an individual to more deeply internalize the label. This refers to the passage from primary deviation to secondary deviation, which is where labeling works to marginalize individuals by virtue of powerful social reactions towards perceived traitsbehavior (Moustakim, 2015). Lemert also argued that an individual who becomes socially defined by a negative label may turn into a “secondary deviant.” The progressive internalization of the “deviant” label ascribed to them, alongside their pre-existing personal fears, in turn may cement their sense of difference, and therefore in some cases, lead to heightened deviant behavior, or myriad psychological, psychopathological, and psychosomatic problems, especially if the labeling was experienced as traumatic. (Solomon, 2015).

Once deviation is recognized, socially and self-ascribed, it starts to become a part of the individual’s both, personal and social identity. Skopalova (2010), gives the example of a child/teen, labeled as a ‘hooligan’, ‘vandal’ or ‘drug addict,’ and who may be particularly susceptible to stigmatizing responses and reactions that, in turn, could further reinforce those labels. This is the additional juncture, where the individual starts to internalize those labels and starts to integrate them as a part of his/her identity (Solomon, 2015).

As stated previously the theory of the ‘Looking Glass Self’ comes into play, whereby individuals internalize ideas about themselves based on what they think others think of them. (Rousseau, 2002) If those judgments are perceived to be held with consistency by significant others, it is likely that the person will internalize those beliefs and judgments as a part of his sense of self (Solomon, 2015).

According to Berger and Luckmann (1991), “internalization occurs only as identification occurs” (Berger & Luckmann, 1991, pp. 151-1520). A child tends to internalize the roles of his significant others’ and make them his own. In other words, there is always an existing dialectic between objectively assigned and subjectively appropriated identity, meaning, how others identify us and how we identify ourselves. It is plausible that the self, is a self-reflecting identity and the child becomes what he is classified as by his significant others (Berger, Luckmann, 1991). Children tend to imitate the behavior, the values and the attitudes of their significant others’ to gain approval and acceptance from them. Labels, in sum, are risky
things to play with, since unjust and harsh appraisals may well affect an individual’s sense of self, especially youth who lack positive feedback at home. One should never assume that the negative labels produced in one environment (the school) are “cancelled out” or “counter-balanced” by positive feedback received in another environment.

**Normality and Stigma**

According to contemporary historians, the role of “the school” has always been primarily, one of social control. (Saldana, 2013). Similarly, since school is an institution of social control, it expects the students to “behave” according to normative expectations (Skopalova, 2010). It has the power to define good and bad behaviors depending on the student’s attitude and talents. Being put into categories of good and bad by the teachers play a significant role in managing classroom behaviors. Teachers tend to have a yardstick that helps them classify behavior as ‘normal’ or ‘different’ and they also, have different ways to manage and control behavior that at times, can be regarded as disturbing or disruptive. In this way, as Skopalova mentions, “they distinguish ‘striking’ behaviors from those that might be considered ‘psychological problems’ or the consequences of a parental approach or even predict whether there is a ‘risk of criminal behavior’” (Skopalova, 2010, pp.333). Teachers have therefore, played a tremendously important role in observing and identifying the patterns of behavior of their students.

In this process, teachers or educators use categories they are familiar with, and labels that carry powerful meanings, to respond to student behaviors, which in turn incur an indelible stain, because once an individual is consistently labeled, it may become a ‘master status’ (Moustakim, 2010). The weight of social ascription can make it difficult for children and youth to “act” differently, which leaves the student no choice, but to endure the label and the expectations that come with it. (Solomon, 2015).

There is a possibility that the labels ascribed might be shaped by prejudices and stigmas ingrained in the teachers, which may influence how teachers deal with the same behavior in different students (Skopalova, 2010). Stigma, according to Erving Goffman refers to an “undesired differentness” (Goffman, 1963), and “bodily signs designed to expose something unusual and bad about the moral status of the signifier” (Goffman, 1986, pp.1), the person to whom the stigma is attributed. When we first meet someone, we create an image of the individual with certain character and personality traits. This first impression is called a ‘virtual social identity’; whilst, the actual traits of the individual, are known as a ‘real social identity’ and this identity often largely differs from what one had imagined as a first impression.
(Skopalova, 2010). Simply, it is an undesirable trait that is associated with the person as a label or worse, as if an essential characteristic of that person.

**Teacher expectations and self-fulfilling prophecy**

Goffman claimed that the process of labeling can produce the effect of a self-fulfilling prophecy (as cited by Moustakim, 2010). This means that once a consistent label is ascribed, a student might perform the way their teacher expects them to. According to a research by Brophy and Good (1970), these differentiated teacher expectations function as self-fulfilling prophecies, where, when a teachers expected a better performance from students, students began to perform better, as they received concordant positive and constructive feedback. In other cases, when expectations remained low, and when disruptiveness was anticipated from a student, behavior tended to be reinforced, hence, students might find it hard to fight those labels, and in the end, they may feel as if they are being forced into maintaining the role of the misfit, or the class clown, etcetera (Skopalova, 2010). Given that teachers have a subjective sense of judgment; the students marked by labels and stigmas will most likely react in the way they are expected too, and in this way, it may seem as if labeling generates a self-fulfilling prophecy (Gold & Richards, 2012). It matters therefore that we investigate how teachers communicate these differential expectations; and whether this process is intentional and conscious, or not? Teachers, are generally presumed to manage student behavior in a manner which ideally encourages student learning, however, when unjust and rash judgment is passed on a student, teachers attitude may subtly shift along with their expectations, and students tend to react by fulfilling these lowered expectations, as opposed to surpassing them. (Brophy & Good, 1970).

**Pygmalion and anti-Pygmalion effect**

In 1968, Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson introduced the idea of Pygmalion effect (also known as the Rosenthal effect), where “teachers unwittingly communicate their expectations of what a student is capable of achieving, and thereby introduces this self-fulfilling prognosis into their student’s minds” (Skopalova, 2010, pp.334). Rosenthal and Jacobson believe that a teacher’s expectations served as self-fulfilling prophesies.

According to Chang, (2011), if teachers hold negative expectations towards the children, they are likely to be punished or disciplined, which in turn affects the overall conditions in which the student is expected to learn and perform. By contract, if teachers hold positive expectations towards children, these children will be given greater opportunities and
placed in environments more conducive to learning, where they are more likely to receive detailed feedbacks and praises. According to another study, teachers unconsciously communicate higher expectations to some students, demonstrating that teachers, are prone to treating students differently, based on very subtle cues, that reveal their tendency to favor “brighter students.” Overall, teachers were found to favor some students, by smiling at them more often, establishing more eye contact with them, and speaking directly to them. The results showed that students who were the subjects of these subtle forms of attention by their teachers, tended to enjoy school more and worked harder to improve (Roger, 2015).

If the teacher believes that a student is incapable to perform well and has a disapproving view of his/her behavior, the teacher may subtly neglect or ridicule the child, and this may not be done consciously or intentionally. Thus, a teacher might have differing expectations for different groups of students, different classrooms and different individuals, based on widespread social stigma, or prejudice, for example related to gender, ethnicity, religion and class. These will intersect with the teachers’ perceptions based on first and later impressions left by the student. This explains why teachers may treat students very differently. (Skopalova, 2010).

According to Chang (2011), there exists a phenomenon known as ‘anti-Pygmalion effect’ whereby you do not always get what you expect. Brophy and Good mentions other authors such as Thorndike (1968), Snow (1969), Silver and Barber (1968) who think that the ‘expectancy effect’ or the Pygmalion effect is not as consistent as its interpretations suggest. Brophy and Good (1970), argued that “Rosenthal and Jacobson[’s] work remains only a demonstration of the existence of expectancy effects; their study did not address itself to any of the events intervening between the inducement of teacher expectations and administration of the criterion achievement test” (Brophy & Good, 1970, pp.2).

Furthermore, the theory of Pygmalion effect is taken up by several related studies that complete the picture (Brophy and Good, 1970) and as Chang (2011) believed, a student’s achievement can be influenced by many other factors besides teacher’s expectations including other forms of behavioral reinforcement at home, among peers and through media, depending on the perceived value of the desired/undesired behavior. The findings presented in the following sections contribute to the debate surrounding teacher’s biases and elucidate whether they are critically aware of their prejudice and incumbent behaviors/attitudes.
Actions and Reactions

Teachers usually have some, but potentially limited, insights about the social setting and environment of their students, which includes some knowledge on their family background, social class, cultural background and neighborhood. Although the depth of insight varies widely from one student to another. The student’s social background may, to a large extent determine which aspects of school will be experienced by the child/youth, as either rewarding or disparaging (Havighurst & Davis, 1943).

It is noteworthy to mention the concept of rewards and punishment/sanctions in order to understand how norms (socially produced and reproduced) within a society are adhered to. Members of the community attach meanings to objects/actions/sign/symbols. Primarily through their interactions, the children of the community start learning and integrating/internalizing shared ideas and beliefs. However, in order to produce conformity, normative patterns of social behaviors are associated to sets of rewards and sanctions, which are experienced subjectively, based on how social actors abide by these norms. Those who abide by them are rewarded and those who fail to abide by them are punished, and this, serves to reinforce the construction and maintenance of societal/group expectations towards members (Solomon, 2015).

The same scenario is at play in a classroom setting. Since maintaining classroom discipline is one of the most important responsibilities of teachers, they usually formulate certain rules and regulations; and when those rules are broken, certain consequences befall. Hakim (2017) observed that teachers had to cope with a range of common misbehavior by students, including humming, murmuring, students poking each other, using cell phones and creating turmoil. She also observed, that teachers’ in most cases reacted in disturbing and disappointing ways, by shouting/screaming or discouraging the students. Such outbursts, as Hakim mentions, brought about aggression in the students and nefarious effects (backlash) towards the teacher (Hakim, 2017).

Repeated negative reactions towards a student’s behavior, can lead to behavior reinforcement, as opposed to behavior change, as this can begin to constitute a normative mechanism of social ascription that can imply latent or explicit behavior profiling. As Skopalova (2010) wrote, “the individual then creates a negative image of her/himself, especially as a consequence of being negatively defined by others that are significant and emotionally close to the individual” (Skopalova, 2010, pp.330). In order to understand the social psychology of labeling, one must understand the ongoing process of action and reaction.
This dialectic exchange of antagonistic/confrontational responses and counter responses play a very influential role in producing deviant behavior (Schur, 1969). Schur also posited that “the self-conceptions of the deviating individual should be considered a crucial dependent variable, to which we should pay more attention than to the deviating behavior itself” because identities can be transformed (Schur, 1969).

When the disruptive or deviant student behavior becomes the focus of attention within the patterns of classroom interactions, should one assume that teachers are, and can always remain inherently objective, fair or without bias? We know this is rarely the case. Teachers’ assessments of student behavior, when conveyed without productive and constructive feedback, could be detrimental to students who underperform (Riden, 2017). The institutionalized injustice of labelling students and profiling them based on their class behavior speaks to a teacher’s selective perception of reality, whereas disruptive students are systematically viewed more negatively, while obedient and quiet students are perceived more positively (Skopalova, 2010). The idea of profiling student behavior is very common. Ozsoy (2004) defines it as

> Conceptual abstraction that may or may not provide a portrayal of the empiric existence of the student. From this perspective, the aim of the attempts to develop student profiles comes to be the identification, quantification, and statistical representation of certain characteristics of the individuals who are in a particular type and at a certain level of education as much as possible (Ozsoy, 2004).

In short, it is a process by which teachers attach meanings, to student behavior and performance, and this is reflected in mannerisms, discourse, and symbolic interactions. However, this is done, largely, without a clear understanding of the attitudes and responses of teachers, in their efforts, or lack thereof, to productively and ethically address the issues behind the poor behavior/performance.

The school is thus a social context in which the power of labelling creates divisions between students, through categorizations that shape identities (Skopalova, 2010). Teachers are frequently unaware of the subtle differences in their attitudes and behavior towards different students. It is in these situations that teachers tend to communicate their differential expectations to the students, and this can be problematic. The behaviors of teachers are observable as well as measurable and therefore, can be modified and controlled in order to bring about positive change (Brophy & Good, 1970).
Strategies and Solutions

In order to manage student behaviors’ healthily, the educators need to come up with strategies and methods that promote a positive classroom environment. According to Dreikurs, the act of behavior issues is a self-justifying practice by the students who feel discouraged or dispirited (Hakim, 2017). Hakim (2017), also states that handling such situations can be challenging thus, the classroom should have suitable disciplining and effective management strategies.

The first step, according to Kuhlenschmidt and Layne (1999), is to clarify the problem by identifying the context in which the behavior occurs. Next, factors that add to classroom disruption should be reviewed and then decisions should be made rather than giving an immediate reaction to challenging behaviors (Kuhlenschmidt & Layne, 1999). The requirement of the learners should be observed and one of their basic need is to be treated with love and care. This would give room for a classroom environment which is humane, fair and free from unproductive critique and labels (Hakim, 2017). Being demanding and applying disturbing sanctions can cultivate more hurt than benefit. Thus, teachers should examine the labels that they assign to students, and learn to focus on the behavior, as opposed to a character trait. For example, instead of labeling a child as shy, a teacher can focus on the observed behavior emphasizing that the child does not participate in class. Focusing on the behavior allows to more easily find strategies to reinforce the preferred tendency, as a way to manage challenging behaviors (Kuhlenschmidt & Layne, 1999).

Kuhlenschmidt & Layne (1999) also addressed questions that can help teachers self-reflect, before profiling students or taking rash decisions. They include questions like, what is the behavior? When does it happen? What is going on before, during and after the behavior? Is the behavior harmful? How do you feel about the behavior? What can be done? Etc. (Kuhlenschmidt & Layne, 1999). Lastly, effective psychological techniques can be used by the teacher to have control over the levels of motivation or demotivation of the student and their performances (Hakim, 2017).
METHODOLOGY

Key Concepts

Student behavioral profiling: It is believed that the term “profiling” was first coined in 1970’s by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to identify the characteristics of individuals, notably those who commit criminal acts. But, profiling has been used for much longer than this. Palermo and Kocsis (2005), explain profiling as a natural process, where every individual tends to automatically assess the behavior of people they interact with and form opinions based on their personality, perceived intentions and character traits (as cited from Wet, 2008). Since the term ‘behavioral profiling’ lacks uniformity and is interchangeably used with other concepts, this study will specifically look at the way educators create behavioral profiles, either explicitly or implicitly, drawing on their observations, and interactions with their students. It will also explore the role of behavioral profiling in managing student behavior.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals states that profiling student behavior aims to “classify” students based on their characteristics and observable behavior in order to identify students who might initiate violent acts (NASSP, 2001). But, according to Ozsoy, student profiles are not limited to identifying students that are only disruptive and violent, rather, it is a holistic process where they are viewed as a ‘conceptual abstraction’ which aims to identify, quantify, qualify and statistically represent characteristics of an individual (Ozsoy, 2005). The reasons to do so, may include the identification of youth who may be at risk of dropping out, or youth who may have special needs, or those that are in abusive families; therefore, how teachers produce and process these profiles becomes an ethical issue, one of civic responsibility, and one that requires special and trained awareness and skills.

Student behavioral profiling is used as a tool which helps the teachers understand a child’s capabilities, potential and problem areas in order to develop an effective curriculum, which inculcates effective strategies for behavior management (Kraivixien, Wongwanich & Sujiva, 2014). For Oberg, this attempt of collecting a detailed description of a student, which includes his behavioral patterns and character traits will help teachers understand their students better and this should inform how they can improve the quality of their lessons, their pedagogical strategies, and their assessment processes (Kraivixien, Wongwanich & Sujiva, 2014). Student behavioral profiling, may indeed represent an interpretation of meanings attached to sets of categories of behavior ascribed to students (Ozsoy, 2005). It is more important to perhaps see how these interpretations are produced and used, and whether teachers
are aware of the processes at play, and of their role in the production and maintenance of meanings associated to students’ labels/profiles.

**Classroom and Behavior management:** According to the American Psychological Association, classroom management is a process whereby teachers create and support a system, which reinforces appropriate and positive behavior in classroom settings (Kratochwill, DeRoos & Blair, n.d.). Also, it refers to a range of strategies and techniques meant to be used by teachers to help keep the students organized and disciplined. American educational reforms over the years, have redefined a teacher’s role as a mentor in facilitating student learning (Glossary of Education Reform, 2014).

Moreover, given their overlap, we often tend to confuse the term “classroom management” with “behavior management.” Even though these terms are related, they refer to very different sets of processes. (Webster, 2019) Whereas “"Classroom management” means creating systems that support the kind of positive behavior across a classroom. "Behavior management” is made strategies and systems that will manage and eliminate difficult behaviors that prevent students from succeeding in an academic environment” (Webster, 2019). Behavior management specifically refers to managing and responding to problems in a manner which requires behavioral adjustments. To do this, many techniques can be used, drawing on research conducted in the fields of psychoanalysis, psychology, psychiatry, various schools of thought in psycho-therapy, social psychology, and as well as clinical sociology. Depending on their training, teachers may, or may not, have access to relevant knowledge, which ostensibly would allow them to explore a different range of techniques, as possible intervention options to consider.

Behavior management is one of the most crucial part of classroom management, because, when done properly, it helps to shape classroom dynamics and enhance the learning environment by providing productive interventions to help individual students better control their behavior, so they can remain engaged in classroom activities, without compromising the engagement of others. The management of problematic behavior has been identified as a persistent issue in schools (Colvin, Kameenui & Sugai, 1993). Eliminating a disruptive behavior is not easy and imposing punishments and negative consequences is sometimes useful to curb the behavior, however, deeper engrained patterns of behavior cannot always be changed with sanctions, and proactive measures may be required to help modify such behaviors (Webster, 2019).
This study focuses on the strategies employed by teachers to manage and modify student behavior by identifying their proactive and reactive approaches. It also examines the ways in which these strategies vary from teacher to teacher, and from one grade to another.

Key Theories

Constructionism and Constructivism: Piaget’s constructivism or theory of cognitive development focuses on how individuals construct their realities through the use of reason, from infancy, through childhood and teen years, all the way to adulthood. This is where meaning-making takes place, based on an individual’s own knowledge and experiences (as cited in Ackerman, 2001). Since the goal of this theory is to understand how children construct and apply meanings to the world around them, then experience discrepancies between what they have already learnt and what they discover from their surroundings (McLeod, 2018), constructivism may be applicable to the way teachers “infer” meanings to those particular behavioral patterns and understand those discrepancies, specifically in the context of the knowledge they hold about the child. This includes his/her background or the way they frame their own understanding of the patterns of behavior they observe. This theory is important as it has a relevance to the way teachers engage with the relative stages of development of children, for example in choosing forms of interventions, that are appropriate to manage behavior.

Whereas, Papert’s constructionism focuses on how knowledge is built through progressive internalizations of actions (as cited from Ackerman, 2001). Moreover, constructionism entails a collective or social component, whereby a characteristic’s meaning(s) is(are) collectively constructed and recognized, most often within cultural frames of reference that set expectations by gender, class, ethno-linguistic background, religion, etc. These theories, complementarily, provide important foundational precepts that can elucidate how teachers construct what normal or deviant behaviors consist in, and this will then affect their behavior and class management practices; and why reactions to behaviors may vary or not, in the specific context of their interactions with students. Both constructivism and constructionism (which are sometimes used without proper distinction and interchangeably) are deemed useful for this study, as these lenses will provide insight into the ways in which educators make-meaning, both personally and socio-culturally out of the behaviors they observe, monitor and attempt to regulate as part of their behavior management practices, and out of the classroom dynamics they create, as part of their broader classroom management practices. In turn, this will also help us understand how teachers categorize student behavior,
subjectively, based on their own ideas and subjective understanding (constructivist lens), and based on dominant socio-cultural tropes (constructionist lens).

Symbolic interactionism and semiotics: Symbolic interactionism is a theoretical framework that is popular in interpretive sociology, and which focuses on the interactions between the people and the meanings they attach to their surroundings and exchanges with the social world. According to this perspective, interactions and the experience drawn from these are embedded in the meanings attached to symbolic exchanges, which may for example communicate approval or disapproval, acceptance or rejection, blame, shame, or patience and empathy, in various ways. As such, the interactions that take place between teachers and students may speak to the set of expectations which teachers hold as normative, and which may influence students’ performance. The relevance of symbolic interactionism in the study of teacher/student relations is stated clearly in the scholarship reviewed previously, including the concept of the looking-glass self, which deconstructs how/why people garner ideas about themselves through the perceptive filters and interpretations, which configure what they think others think of them.

This process of meaning-making is a semiotic process where people make sense of the world through the interpretation of symbols and the relation between signifier and signified, which are both observable and non-observable (Fast, 2012). Secondly, this process of meaning-making may have a significant influence on children’s learning processes and behavior patterns (Fast, 2012). Thus, it constitutes a vital lens to analyze how teachers impart knowledge, respond to behavior and form opinions based on the student’s performances and actions. With the help of these paradigms, student behavior can be understood as the subject of signifying practices by teachers engaged in normative classroom management practices, as well as ad hoc and contextualized behavior management strategies, in order to (in theory/ideally) facilitate learning for all the students present. Moreover, because the process of meaning-making is subjective, this study applies symbolic interaction to an analysis of observational data, as well as testimonies.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sampling and study site

This case study was conducted in a Community Based School in Karachi, where the students, teachers and the staff are primarily from the lower and middle income strata. For the purpose of maintaining confidentiality, the name of the school will not be divulged. The school was selected on the basis of convenience and purposive sampling, notably, easy accessibility in terms of proximity, previous collaboration and established trust with school administrators.

The research sample was restricted to educators who had at least 10 years of teaching experience. This criterion was established for a variety of reasons: first, teachers with more experience have faced a wider breadth of behavioral patterns in students, and have had the time to develop their own techniques and strategies related to their classroom management practices, as compared to their more junior counterparts. As such, they are better prepared for the challenges posed by students’ disruptive behaviors.

Secondly, teachers with over 10 years of experience, especially, years of experience in the same school, are also more likely to reflect on the transformation of children’s behavior patterns over time by observing them on school grounds, between classes in the hallways or at special school events. Teachers with 10-plus years of experience, have insight into the way their own opinions of children may change overtime, which speaks to an engagement with the effects of time on behavior (trans-)formation. Teachers were selected from both, the primary and secondary sections of the school in order to get diversified opinions regarding behavior management as different ages, and to explore how classroom management strategies differ from lower grades to higher grades. Teachers were solicited to participate in the research and five volunteers among them were selected for this study. Based on their assigned pseudonym, there was Anila and Nadia from the Secondary section, and Nimra, Rida and Shabina from the Primary section.

Field Observations

In order to account for the way teachers, interact and respond to varied student behaviors, I used field observations to get direct exposure and to gather empirical evidence for student-teacher interactions. Multiple instances of classroom observation would thus allow me to witness first-hand, how teachers involved in this study manage behavior in their classroom. Conducting the observations in the classroom was a great opportunity to observe the teachers’ approach in content delivery, body language and tonality. I was able to notice how different
patterns of student behaviors elicited different kinds of reactions, which varied from teacher to teacher, and how students counter-reacted their teacher’s reactions.

Three observation sessions were conducted for each of the 5 selected teachers. The repeated number of observation sessions helped normalize my presence in class, which obviously had some influence on both teachers and students. My presence in the classroom, although necessary also serves as a considerable limitation, insofar as teachers knew why the classroom was being observed and tried consciously to “handle student behavior” as best they could. Teachers knew they would be interviewed subsequently and had a chance to reflect on their practices through the research methodology. Overt observation was considered more ethical and still yielded important findings. However, with every new observation session, the children and the teacher seemed to act more naturally, and at times seemed to ignore my presence.

Observations were structured by an observation grid, and a floor plan to indicate the placement of students from session to session. (see appendix C). In order to minimize interference, I was seated at the back of the classroom behind the students and alphabetical codes were assigned to children, to avoid engaging with their names, and because their seating placement could change from one session to the next.

Children’s behaviors were observed, as a corollary to class management practices and only insofar as teachers interacted with, or reacted to students. Students names were not recorded, and descriptions of events rather than student names were used in later interviews/conversations with teachers.

Lastly, observations made outside the classrooms were also noted down in my field notes to draw inferences and most importantly to provide supporting evidence. With structured classroom observations, interviews with teacher and the principal, as well as fieldnotes, triangulation may serve to infer additional validity. In reference to specific students, all observation notes, as well as interview transcripts were anonymized – and the use of pseudonyms in interview transcripts, was favored over the alphabetical code given during observation sessions.

**Respondent Interviews**

Classroom observations helped me develop the interview guide, which was largely aimed at discussing the classroom and behavioral management practices I witnessed. I avoided leading questions by referring to specific instances of observed behaviors (students and
teachers), as opposed to leaning on assumptions regarding classroom dynamics. A focus on open-ended inquiry allowed the interview to be conversational in style.

Interviews were conducted specifically with the Principal of the school and five volunteer teachers, with ten years or more of teaching experience. The respondents were cooperative and accommodated me even in their tightly packed schedule.

The interviews were semi-structured and open-ended questions were designed in order to engage the participants to their fullest. Consent forms were previously signed by the respondents, which gave the permission to audio record interviews and take intensive notes to record as much data as possible. The duration of the interviews lasted from twenty-five minutes to one hour. The data was compiled, transcribed and coded, to extract themes, commonalities, differences and recurring patterns. (see interview guide in Appendix B)

Data Management

It is of utmost importance to keep the data safe and secured. For this purpose, the data gathered and the findings from the research are kept secure on a USB device offline. To protect the confidentiality of the research participants and the institution, all the data is made anonymous and only pseudonyms are used in all electronic files. Microsoft Word and Excel were used to transcribe, code and manage the data. All the notes that were handwritten were scanned and hard copies, destroyed. The digital data will be stored for ten years and the findings might be used for future research purposes, keeping the identities of the participants confidential in the future as well.

Coding

The data was coded in three steps. Firstly, open coding was used where the transcriptions and observation logs were read thoroughly. From this reading, major themes related to the research questions were identified, as well as relevant applications of the key concepts and theories which are outlined above. These themes, were further divided and/or clustered, for coherence, as well as filtered based on similarities and differences between cases. This helped in identifying specific issues and patterns that stood out.

Secondly, during qualitative data analysis, axial coding was used, where broader and core themes were broken down into smaller sections. This allowed for more depth, on understanding experiences and interactions, for which data was available. During this process, the data was color coded to help identify major streams of findings, and the data was sorted to highlight the most salient portions of the transcribed text.
Lastly, selective coding was used to form connections between different codes. Here, themes were linked to theories and concepts and attention was placed on additional inductive findings and their implications on core findings and conclusions.
ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND REFLEXIVITY

Limitations and challenges

Throughout the research, I came across several challenges and limitations. A few of the challenges that I faced while conducting my observations were experienced as a result of the seating arrangement of the students. The Secondary section’s classrooms were elongated and narrow. The seating arrangements (as shown in appendix C) created hindrances to observe every child, specifically those that were seated in the very front. Also, the classrooms of the primary section were more compact and tightly packed with chairs and desks. The only space where I was able to sit to conduct my observation was near the door. Due to this setting and my proximity with the students, the teachers, seemed more consistently aware of my presence thus, dramatically changing the class dynamics and student behavior.

Another limitation pertained to the location of the interviews. The respondents that taught in the secondary section were interviewed in their staff room where a few other teachers were working as well. This might have caused the research participants to be a little more careful while answering. Although this posed the problem of anonymity and confidentiality, this location was chosen voluntarily by the respondent, and conducted as well as recorded with informed consent. The rest of the respondents that taught the primary section were not able to give their interview in their staff room because it was much smaller in size. Since all the classes were full, the interviews were conducted in a very compact corner of the stair case. Even though this provided me and the interviewee complete privacy, there was a lot of noise in the background because of classes nearby. This led to some problems in transcribing the interviews where, due to the disturbance in the background, some statements were inaudible and unclear.

Since my interviews were conducted in Urdu, and due to these time constraints, I was only able to transcribe and translate them directly into English. Special attention was placed on transliteration and conformity in meaning. While transcribing the interviews, I came across Urdu words that had no literal translation in English. Even if there were popular equivalents, they did not mean the same thing, as in the context they were used. For example, in one case the teacher used the word masti, which literally means intoxicated or drunk. In reality, the meaning that the teacher was trying to imply by using this word was ‘naughty’ or ‘belligerent’, rather than ‘intoxicated’.

The topics that the interviews touched upon required “sensitive engagement,” as they elicited extreme emotions such as hurt, anger as well as profound happiness. Two of the
respondents displayed high levels of emotions by crying during the interview. Lastly, the results and findings of this study are not generalizable since the research consisted of a small sample of respondents working in the specific context of a community-based school, in Karachi Pakistan. Research findings may not be applicable to other schools, although the methodology could be replicated in other schools and with larger numbers of teachers across curricular subjects and grades.

Implementation of risk mitigation strategies

Certain steps were taken in order to reduce my biases towards the study. These steps included cross-checking the interview questions with my research supervisor, prior to the interviews to eliminate leading and biased questions. Secondly, I used the Online Oxford Dictionary several times to translate some Urdu words to English. Since a huge difference can be found in the meanings and grammar while switching from Urdu to English and vice versa, I had to pay close attention to Urdu words and expression that had no direct translation or no clear meaning in English. I tried my best to provide the most accurate and relevant meaning as was intended by the participants. Lastly, follow-ups were taken through phone calls, for respondents who manifested overwhelming emotions, in order to ensure they didn’t experience any post-participation effects/setbacks.

Ethics

This research kept all personal information provided by respondents, confidential. Any information that could lead to any of the participants or the school has been kept cut out, or changed slightly – to remove private details. Since this research is a case study of teachers working in a community-based school, the name of the school is kept anonymous in order to protect the institution as well as the teachers. This research is based on teacher’s practices related to student behavior analysis and classroom management. As such, all observations made of students (who were not the main subjects of the research but who were also observed), were only used in relation to teachers’ modes of interactions with the class. Observations focused on class and behavioral management and the school communicated with the parents of students in the selected classes, in order to inform them. No parental objections were raised. The school signed an agreement to guarantee access to the researcher and to obtain informed consent by the highest school authorities (see appendix D).

The interviewees participation was completely voluntarily and the participants which includes the teachers and the school principal, informed that they were free to withdraw at any
time, without penalty. Pseudonyms were assigned to all participants, the students and the school to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. Signed consent forms were obtained from every party including the educators and the school. (see appendix D and E). Finally, access to the data collected will be restricted to the researcher and the researcher’s supervisor (for the purpose of evaluation and audit trail review).
RESEARCH OUTCOMES

Results and Findings from observations

In this study, participant observation (the structured observation of participants within a classroom setting) revealed how teachers and students interacted with each other over three classes, each of forty-five minutes. This helped in identifying certain behavioral patterns empirically, involving students and teachers in complex patterns of interaction/exchange, and clear series of actions and reactions. A few of the things that stood out, specifically in the observation sessions were the way the teachers interacted with the students using various methods of communication for example, using varying tones and gestures to directly and indirectly tackle different behaviors, and infer meanings to the behaviors they were managing. These ‘symbols’ – tones as well as gestures are culturally and interpersonally configured, so in time, people, and in this case, students, come to learn and know what they mean, coming from their teachers.

Role of tonality in behavior management:

Tones are a vital component of effective communication in a classroom. The respondents of the study interacted and communicated with the students using various tones as a response, or way to tackle different behaviors. I observed different teachers using similar tones to react to different behaviors, as if these were triggers. Teachers also used different tones to react to recurrent kinds of behavior, indicating an evolution in some teachers’ strategic engagement with students’ behavioral patterns.

Every teacher I observed, used a different set of tone, while communicating with their students, though patterns in their use clearly emerged. Teachers like Nimra and Nida, spoke in a louder voice throughout the class, whereas Shabina spoke softly and raised her voice only when the children stopped following instructions or if they started disrupting the class. The tones used by the teachers have been divided into two broad categories. The first consist of polite, diplomatic and softer tonal variations, while the second consisted of louder and more imposing and authoritative tones in the class. Each of these tonal categories were used by all teachers but in different ways and frequency.

The use of soft and polite tones:

According to Karimnia and Khodashenas (2017), instructors use either face threatening acts or face-saving acts to communicate with their students (Karimnia & Khodashenas, 2017). Face-saving acts include the use of politeness and softness in tone, which make children feel more comfortable in class. Karimnia and Khodashenas (2017) argue that:
Politeness is an important aspect of pragmatic competence. [It] is “the expression of the speakers’ intention to mitigate face threats …” (Mills, 2003, p.6). As a sub-branch of pragmatic studies, politeness theories maintain[s], develop[s], and promote[s] harmonious social relations (Culpeper, 1998). […] Also Watts (2003) contends that politeness is the ability to please others through interpersonal conduct. (Karimnia & Khodashenas, 2017, pp.71)

I noticed how Shabina’s voice softened when she talked about ‘death’ while discussing one of the stories from the curriculum, to emphasize perhaps the need to engage respectfully and politely with the subject matter, and mark the sensitive nature of the topic. Teachers also used a polite tone when they had to urge the class to complete their work, and when a few kids became disruptive in class. Rayaan, who Anila identified as a “naughty child” was often treated politely, when he caused disruptions in class. When I asked Anila for the reason behind her politeness, she responded that she has to make them feel special. She said that “a child once asked me, ‘miss who is your favorite child?’ My favorite child is the one who studies well, but I named Rayaan who does not work, does not study. I said Rayaan is my favorite. And he went home and told his parents and I believe that this affected his behavior positively” (Anila, 2019).

It is important to note that Rayaan’s behavior reflected self-fulfilling prophecy, where he started to react in the that was expected from him.

The use of loud tones:

The teachers raised their voices on various occasions in order to grab the students’ attention. I observed how Nimra had to raise her voice when the children kept asking the same questions again and again. The loudness in her voice was often accompanied by little signs of irritation in her facial expression. With every question, her voice seemed to get louder and more irritated. Children that were consistently working slower than most, were often called out loudly and told to work faster. In other cases, when students broke into loud conversations or stopped listening altogether, the teachers had to raise their voice and often reprimand the students explicitly for such interruptions. While some teachers dealt with disruptive kids politely, others tended to more often use shaming, behavior condemnation, punishments and stern tones, and sometimes to the point of yelling at them.

Role of gestures in behavior management:

Communicating through gestures falls under non-verbal communication. As Maecetta (1999) explains, that feelings are sometimes more efficiently communicated through non-verbal communication which includes body language and facial expressions as well as
acts/gestures, as compared to verbal communication, which means communicating through language. Respondents used a wide range of facial expressions to communicate subtle cues to students, some to indicate approval, disapproval, confusion, etc. Teachers used their hands to signal to students the expectation that they should maintain silence at a specific moment in time. The hand gesture to stop talking (which could be a finger in front of the lips, or a finger or the whole hand, the palm, lifted up in direction of the disrupting student, as if a traffic officer to an oncoming car), could be accompanied by the widening of eyes and overt expression of annoyance or even anger (with frowning); thus to serve as a final warning before explicit verbal intervention. In some instances, the children redressed, but others just ignored the teachers signs as some were quite distracted. However, when teacher garnered the students’ attention, and motioned them to remain quiet with a polite smile, the students systematically obeyed.

Teachers also used their facial expression to communicate feelings of disappointment and disregard. One of the teacher asked the students to bring their books with them, but few did, so she shook her head with disappointment, and moved on with the lesson. Whether such non-verbal displays of disappointment are effective would require further investigation. In another case, gestures were used to acknowledge the students. The children of class three had a habit of showing their work to the teacher after short exercises, so the teacher would give a quick glance and nod her head, in acknowledgment as she moved around the children. This way, she was able to acknowledge every child.

Lastly, gestures, as Castellon (2006) believes, can even be an alternative to speech, and teachers use them strategically to save time. An angry glance saves much more time then scolding or overtly and explicitly addressing the child in the middle of a lecture. Castellon (2006) confirms the finding from classroom observation, that teachers that used non-verbal communication in their class were able to manage the class much more efficiently, allowing them to stay focused on the curricular content while also subtly minimizing interruptions, as compared to those who relied more heavily on verbal communication, to explicitly reprimand or call attention to a child distracted by other children. It is important to note that these interactions, in the form of symbols, convey subtle messages of how the teacher perceives a child. Subsequently, the students, following ‘Cooley’s looking self’, tend to formulate their identities based on those perceptions. More systematic studies on gestures and body language in teacher-student relations would be informative insofar as data is required to determine whether these may constitute sets of strategies that will consistently generate desirable outcomes in the classroom.
Results and Findings from Interviews

The interviews were conducted to explore some of the teachers’ behavior and classroom management practices, as observed in the classroom sessions. However, additional findings specifically appeared in the interviews. These will be discussed in relation to core findings.

Challenges faced by the teachers:

The teachers faced a number of challenges that hindered their process of behavior and performance management in their classrooms. These limitations repeatedly appeared in five out of the six interviews. One of the biggest challenge teachers faced was the lack of time. They felt overburdened with their hectic schedules, and were not able to provide extra time to students who were lagging behind, or those that had behavioral issues requiring closer attention. Rida felt that there were so many things to be taught outside the curriculum but “what can I do in one period?” she questioned, “should I teach him or make him see all these things?” Similarly, Anila mentioned that she wanted to help a child but wasn’t able to due to her consecutive periods in other classrooms. In additional to time pressures, the principal also disclosed that the low salary was also one of the reasons, which made it hard for the teachers to be expected to invest extra time in supporting students’ behavioral adjustments outside of class. “Who can be ready to give more time with such a low salary? We have to work hard at convincing them to do this or that” (Nayab, 2019).

Lastly, Nayab and Shabina discussed the lack of space in classrooms. The small size of the classrooms made it very difficult for them to plan and conduct any creative activities that would mobilize the students’ attention in class. Nayab said that if there would have been space, she could have divided the students into groups for various activities. In one case, a child in Shabina’s class sat uncomfortably at the very front of the class near the front board, having to constantly turn to look back to see the teacher. According to the teachers, classroom size and setup were in part to blame for some of the difficulties they faced in managing their classrooms and to ensure the adequate progress of their students.

General Discussions

Managing and Analyzing Student Behavior:

Understanding a child’s behavior can be challenging since there are many aspects to be considered before reaching conclusions or making judgments that will inform appropriate actions/responses. The challenge to get to know the students and their specific patterns also concerns dissonances in behaviors between school and the home. This discrepancy was highlighted by Nimra who said that “when I talk to families in meetings, the parents say that their child is scared to speak in the classroom but that he talks a lot in the house” (Nimra,
As Arky (n.d), also suggested, at school, rewards and punishments are applied more consistently, and this can be challenging for students who develop fears related to discipline, which they may lack at home. Moreover, as Nimra mentioned that students may fear school teachers, therefore they are more careful at school (therefore more quiet, obedient, etc.) as compared to home. However, this is not to insinuate that fear should be inculcated in students, but rather that teachers may not have enough familiarity with their students’ personalities, to gauge what is “normal” for one child versus another.

Similarly, in the process of understanding teachers’ behavior management practices, it was observed that students behaved differently for different teachers and each teacher may perceive their behavior differently. Rida mentioned that “the children are good with some teachers but they misbehave with others” (Rida, 2019). This misbehavior was reported to be more common in classes where the teacher was new. Anila shared an instance where a new teacher wanted to leave the school due to the disruption caused by the students. One of the respondents mentioned that having spent a lot of time with the students helped her to develop strategies through which she was able to discipline and manage behavior more efficiently. Indeed, understanding the children they are working with constitute an ideal scenario for teachers, who normally must develop classroom management strategies with little insight into what may be troubling different students at different times of the school year, as student engagement may rise and fall depending on their on-going experiences with siblings, peers, parents, teachers, etc.

**Strategies employed by the teachers to manage behavior:**

**Use of Indirect approaches:** The majority of respondents used indirect approaches to impart ethical and moral values in the kids and to shape their behavior positively. These approaches include sharing their personal experiences, providing religious teachings and making them learn their lesson through practical examples, and in ways which the children can relate to. These lessons and values are imparted through short films, stories, poetry and religious-type sermons. While teaching division as part of a math class, one of the respondents reminded the children to always divide and share food with their siblings and to always give them the larger part. In another, case while teaching the concept of household bills, the respondent advised the children to always save money, rather than being spendthrift. For these teachers, behavior management is more than just a momentary engagement in class discipline; it meant inculcating values that will help students make better choices in actions, in daily life and in the future. The tendency to indoctrinate their own morals and values played a significant role in the process of shaping behaviors beyond the classroom.
One of the teachers was very concerned because the boys in her class used to cheat in their exams to receive good grades. She mentioned in the interview that she disliked the habit and tried to make the students realize this by connecting it with their religious values. She said,

*It is not fair to get an A grade through cheating. This is not what our God wants. I also tell our kids that you have to make God happy, so they should learn, understand, write the assignment through their own hard work. Not that you cheat and get an A grade and feel happy about that.* (Anila, 2019)

Although in some cultures it would be taboo to bring up God to inculcate morals in a classroom, but in Pakistan, a country where “public religiosity” is highly praised, this is still a common strategy for many teachers. Furthermore, one of the respondents mentioned that she learned to tackle problematic behavior by reflecting on the ways she dealt with her own children. She shared that when she replicated her ‘motherly’ behavior in her class, the children reacted in the same way, her kids did. She said that

“sometimes I reprimand my daughter a lot at home, but on days when I speak to her with love, after being angry at her, she completely changes. So I think to myself that, the students from my classes are of the same age as my daughter once was. So I think that if I can treat him more gently, rather than yelling at him, than I can also try it with my class, and MashaAllah, I have received good results so far” (Nimra, 2019).

I also observed how some of the teachers used stories and poetries with morals to work on behaviors that bothered them in class. Through the process of storytelling, the kids can learn a wide range of lessons, such as problem solving, ethical values and empathy. The children are able to relate the story to themselves and as Rahim (2012) argues, stories leave enough room for children to also draw their own lessons, in a fun way.

*Use of rewards and punishments:* According to a study conducted by Sahin et al. (2016), teachers thought that rewards were important to reinforce positive behavior and punishments were necessary to eliminate deviant behavior. This tradition of punishing or rewarding the child to manage their behavior is very traditional and still common around the world. As such, strategies and techniques that serve as rewards and punishment, are easily compiled (Sahin et al. 2016). Yet strategies commonly employed to reward and/or punish students change as they moved from primary to secondary schooling.

In the case of this study, the respondents from the primary section focused more on concrete rewards such as giving them golden stars, happy faces and comments like ‘excellent’ on their copies. One of the respondents mentioned that “I give a different kind of a happy face. The kids say, “please miss, give us that happy face” so I tell them that I will only give them if
they behave properly in the class and if they stay good the whole time” (Nimra, 2019). In another case, a respondent that taught class four said that she always promises to give the children sweets and stars if they perform and behave well. The children look forward to receiving rewards and that teachers readily use treats, stickers and positive feedback among other things to get students to make a commitment to “behaving well.” Giving concrete rewards such as these, may however, indicate that the teacher or her students may perceive verbal appreciation as less attractive for younger kids in grade three and four (Sahin et al, 2016). In comparison, students from the secondary section are rewarded by being verbally praised, receiving extra marks or by being made a class representative or a prefect. Formal recognition of efforts become the norms as they grow up.

Punishments also vary from grade to grade. Students from the primary section are warned to maintain discipline or they will lose marks or not receive their rewards as other students will. One of the teachers resorting to a classic strategy of classroom discipline, said, “if any child misbehaves a lot, then one way to punish him is that, we can make him write a quote one hundred times” (Shabina, 2019). Meaning, that the misbehaving child is given extra work in the form of a repetitive task such as transcribing the same sentence many times. Moreover, one of the ways to punish a child is to completely ignore their presence. The teacher explained how the students fear disappointing their teachers and upsetting them. Thus, if you start ignoring them they will get curious and will immediately start to behave in a more desired manner. This is not necessarily the case however, as some students may disengage and drift off into their own little world, as opposed to longing “attention,” and still others may be inclined to misbehave as “negative attention” is for some, better than no attention at all. In such matters, differences between children may matter a great deal.

The teachers from the secondary section had a more drastic approach to punishing children. One of the teachers mentioned how they had to punish a child after giving them many warnings, which the child failed to heed. She said “we have to punish the kids to make them alert so they think “oh, the teacher is punishing us, we now have to work.” We have to do this when they get lazy” (Nadia, 2019). Thus, through teacher’s perspective, it has become essential to punish misbehaving students in order to instill fear among them.

Seating Arrangements: All the respondents agreed that their seating arrangement is a conscious effort linked to managing student behavior. The teachers do not allow friends to sit together as they would be less likely to pay attention in class. Trivedi (2014) argues that if the students are allowed to sit with their friends, their social interaction would inhibit teaching, thereby creating undesired behavior in the class. One of the teachers pointed out that “the kids
do not like this seating since they like to sit with their friends. They make faces. I think that it’s okay for them to make faces but in the end, it will benefit them” (Anila, 2019). Another teacher explained: “We try to shuffle the kids. There is one child who stays very silent and says nothing and does his work, so I make him sit with a child who talks to create comparison. They start learning themselves” (Nadia, 2019). But often, these comparisons can become problematic, for example, for the smart children who may become frustrated by having to work with a struggling student. Of course talented students are not to be held responsible for the slow progress of some peers, but this can also hold them back, and create animosity between high performing students and low performing students. Some may become aggressive or confrontational when their partners are not performing well, or they may develop a superiority complex over their weaker partner. As one of the teachers mentioned that things can get tricky, especially “When we hear a child say to their partner, “you don’t do your work, the teacher is scolding me!” and then [the frustrated student] slaps them [the struggling student]. We then, have to change their seating.” (Nimra, 2019). Evidently, teachers do their best to regulate potentially volatile situations, while experimenting, rather intuitively, with student classroom placement, to promote or curb certain kinds of behavior in specific students. In essence, placing a high achieving student with a student that “does not work”, is an attempt, not always successful, at motivating the latter while validating the former.

Motivation and Appreciation: One of the most crucial quality that teachers and educators must have to improve learning, is the skill to motivate and show appreciation for students. According to Palmer, “student motivation is an essential element that is necessary for quality education.” (Vero, Puka, 2017). During classroom observations, there were many instances, where all the respondents were seen motivating the students. Five out of six respondents expressed heightened appreciation, trying to lend support and encouragement quite consistently and explicitly, to struggling children, compared to those students that generally performed well. The students that were slow in completing their classwork and took a little time to grasp concepts were repeatedly questioned (not antagonistically) and teachers paid special attention to them. Their forms of expressions were not consistent with those students as sometimes they would express annoyance while correcting the child, whereas other times, they would express concern and support. For example, one of the teachers waited patiently and motivated the child to go on when he was struggling to answer in class. This seemed as a very supportive gesture as the child was later appreciated.

Rida, who teaches at the primary level, talked about how important it is to politely motivate a child rather than to scold him harshly for he/she would feel targeted. But, she also
said that “Sometimes we have to use both methods. Sometimes we motivate and sometimes we also reprimand the child. Why should I lie? Sometimes, when we get frustrated, we do yell at the child” (Rida, 2019). In instances where the students are shamed and punished harshly by the teachers, the principal asks the students to sit in her office and cool down. She then, politely motivates the child to behave and perform well.

Shabina and Nimra both mentioned that if the students show improvements in their performance and behavior, they are acknowledged and publicly appreciated in the assembly. As Nimra (2019) said, “When we see that these children who misbehaved in the class have improved, we appreciate them in the assembly and also give them a certificate. This makes them behave more positively.” This recognition serves as reward, a positive reinforcement, a symbolic gesture that replaces the child to “a good standing.” When the students are motivated, they start paying more attention, they ask questions and begin to complete their work on time. They appear to be happy and eager (Vero, Puka, 2017).

Teachers consciously chose to disregard certain behaviors: According to a study led by the University of Exeter Medical School, it was found that teachers who overlooked children with low-level disruptive behavior were more likely to see a positive change in them (Busby, 2018). Similarly, Rida and Nayab shared instances where they chose to consciously ignore disruptive behavior in their classrooms. For Rida, ignoring the disruptive acts, such as expressing anger towards the teacher, or pulling tricks to grab her attention, is really effective. “I leave them for a while”, she said, “I don’t respond to them at all. Then after a little while they cool down.” (Rida, 2019). Nayab (2019), shared a similar opinion that “we have to ignore many things... or else the entire class gets distracted.” Professor Tamsin Ford, from the University of Exeter Medical School argued that disregarding behavior helps in shutting down the ‘naughty kid route’. She explained, that “If the teacher lets go of the tug of war rope and just ignores it then there’s no fun carrying on and it will just stop. You just have to be patient.” (Busby, 2018)

It was also observed that some teachers ignored students that performed well, when they raised their hands to participate in class. Nadia mentioned that she was aware of the students who knew their lesson, so she focused more on taking answers from students who were lagging behind or those, that didn’t pay attention in the class. In another case, the teacher ignored the behavior of those kids that performed well but misbehaved in class. She said “I like those children whose behavior is not good but performs well. I appreciate them and I tend to ignore their misbehavior.” (Anila, 2019). Of course, there are some behaviors, which cannot be disregarded, but if the focus remains on appreciating and celebrating the good behavior and
performance of students who meet expectations, there are chances that it will have a ripple-effect as more children would try to emulate behaviors, which elicit appreciation (Busby, 2018).

Compassion: Three out of six teachers emphasized greatly the role of compassion as a classroom management tool. Rida shared an instance where a student was classified as a very hyper child. The council, the teacher and the management considered him as a very disruptive child but Rida always motivated and guided him. “From here, I got to know that there should be an emotion of love involved in teaching” (Rida, 2019). She further stated that due to her love, guidance and motivation that child became respectful and calm, making huge improvements overtime. In addition, Nimra identified a few actions that helped her manage behavior in the primary section. She talked about how touching a child’s face with compassion, helps them to calm down. Moreover, the student’s express great happiness from the small gestures of love for example, “One day, a child was shaved bald and I kissed him on his head. He got so happy that the teacher kissed him. These things effect the kids a lot.” Such gestures not only communicate the positive reinforcements within the child, but also increase children’s confidence in themselves, formulating attachment between child and the teacher. This is an example of practices that may be effective for younger children who are in need of affection and affirmation, although they become ethically less acceptable with children of older ages, such as teens. Furthermore, Nimra also discussed how she observed that using compassion on her students inclined them to respect and pay more attention to her, while also learning to be kind to one another. By itself, compassion is a very important part of classroom management. It has the power to enhance the effectiveness of other behavioral management strategies, and gives students the opportunity to build trust and a special rapport, with their teachers. (Marshbank, 2017).

Corporal Punishments: Corporal punishments are considered to be effective for exercising control and are used to elicit immediate response/compliance from students. Although corporeal punishment in the classroom is strictly banned in most modern Western classrooms, this is not the case in Pakistan. The teachers from the secondary section admitted to sometimes use corporal punishments to discipline their students, whereas, the teachers from the primary section expressed a strict belief of never raising their hands on their students. Secondary level teachers provided their students with “reasons” as to why they were slapped. In one case Nadia (2019), mentioned that “when I slap a child, I call him in to meet [later] and tell him the reason behind why I slapped him. I tell him that you were not listening when I told you so many times, you were wasting my time...I did this for you.” In desi culture, parents,
elders and teachers commonly believe that hitting a child/youth is the “right thing” to do. In fact, in some cases, as described by Rida, it is the parents themselves who encourage teachers to use corporal punishments on their children. In Pakistan, there is no institutionalized monitoring to gauge the extent, frequency and intensity of the corporal punishment inflicted on children in schools, which may become a legal liability for a school, that might one day defend itself in a court of law, against parents who believe this is equivalent to assault on a minor. Violence in the classroom, whether officially permitted or not, may serve to also normalize violence amongst the students, and in society generally.

Even though two respondents confessed to hitting the students, one other respondent seemed to give a dubious response, which showed that she was not in favor of using forms of corporal punishments, but still used them when need be, thereby testifying to the normality of this practice. Shabina (2019), said that “We handle them using different strategies. Not beating. We try not to. Mostly we try not to beat the child. When they shout or when they are extremely disrespectful then sometimes we raise our hands.” The vague and sometimes contentiousness of what constitutes a beating, makes it difficult to draw a fine line between justified and measured violence, versus excessive and unjustified usages. Certainly, the person inflicting the violence usually feels justified, but whether it truly was, or ever is, is a philosophical and pedagogical question that goes beyond the scope of this study. Teachers are aware of the problem of physical abuse, yet for some of them, especially with older student cohorts, corporal punishments seem like an effective way to discipline students, when all else fails. But, it is important to be reminded that an unsafe environment (physically and emotionally) makes it hard for the student to learn (Vero, Puka, 2017).

**Awareness of student needs and classroom behavioral patterns:**

In the process of understanding student behavior, one of the most crucial step is to be aware of student needs. Teachers seemed quite aware of where the most of their students are coming from, in terms of their environment, background, language and neighborhood. Shabina (2019), disused how they formulated strategies based on their knowledge about the students: “We look at everything”, she said, “the way they live, the way they talk and we help them wherever they need help.” Similarly, Nadia (2019), discussed that “There are a variety of students, a variety of mentality, a variety of expertise so there are a lot of things to look at when we plan.”

Since, it is a community-based school, not only are the teachers aware of where the student come from, through their interpersonal exchanges with them, but teachers also interact and communicate with other teachers. Nimra shared that when the students are being promoted
from one class to the other, we ask the teachers “what type of children will be coming to the class? If they are either hyper, naughtly or calm? The biggest benefit is that they live in the colony [local district] so generally, we know many things about them” (Nimra, 2019).

Secondly, not only are the teachers aware of the student needs, but they are also, to some extent, aware of the way they behave in and out of the classroom. Anila and Nimra, both acknowledged that the students considered them as strict teachers, because they want children to perceive them in a certain way. “From the very beginning of the classes when we are setting rules, I don’t smile” said Nimra, “Sometimes, I feel that the children will think I am strict, but I stay strict so they behave properly throughout the year.” Moreover, Nadia discussed that she is aware when she encourages or discourages a student in the class. “It clicks in my mind that no, I am not supposed to say harsh things to the child, so I try to talk to him separately.” Thus, at times, teachers are aware that their interactions with children plays a significant role in child socialization.

**Student Behavioral Profiling:**

*Behaviors which are considered problematic and disruptive:*

Every teacher, highlighted actions that created disturbance in the class. Most of the behaviors found to be intolerable and stress provoking in the Secondary section were the same for both teachers at that level (Anila and Nadia). These misbehaviors included showing “disrespect” and rudeness to the teacher, “mimicking” and hindering classmates, “not listening or following instructions”, defiance and using verbal insults. Some of the most frequent but less overtly disruptive classroom behaviors that bothered the teachers included “borrowing stationary from other students”, “not finishing their work on time”, “not bringing their copies and submitting incomplete work.” The list of troublesome behaviors identified by Nimra and Rida, who taught in the primary section were quite different. Since the children were just promoted from the Early Childhood Education (ECD) section, they did not sit properly, and sometimes even kept standing and moving around, without the teacher’s permission. They kept questioning the teacher about the same thing over and over again, which, according to Nimra, got very frustrating. In their need to learn new forms of physical and mental disciplines (sitting still and focusing), the younger students had to be given time and expectations had to be clarified systematically. A few “categories” were repeatedly used by respondents to describe specific students, they are cast as either “hyper”, “naughty”, “stubborn”, “calm”, “slow” and/or “silent.” The use of these descriptors may also become problematic if they are consistently used, and linked to negative connotations that can affect how children self-define, as a result of the looking-glass-self effect, or their perception/awareness of what others think of them.
The teachers were able to identify various reasons behind student misbehavior, and specific conditions, which negatively affected a child’s behavior in the classroom. These included: a teacher’s way of interacting with the students, a child’s background and their intellectual engagement with the subject. Moreover, according to respondents, students’ economic conditions play a major role in shaping their behavior, insofar as from the teachers’ experience, general “misbehavior” was more common from poorer students. Poverty alone is not and cannot be the cause of classroom misbehavior, but rather, it is the conditions that poverty entails, such as a lack of parental involvement and investment in their kids schooling in general, which can occur if the parents themselves are illiterate or uneducated, or if they work in slave-like conditions, incapable to make time to stay involved in their kid’s schooling.

Rida mentioned that there is a reason behind every action. If a child is very “hyper” or “silent” and reclusive, then that can be because he may be facing a particular situation at home. “I don’t know if they are getting any attention at home or not. Maybe there is no one to teach them at home. Maybe they are not getting a proper environment at home.” Rida related to a case where the child was known to be physically abused at home, and she later found out that the child studied all by himself, with no support from his parents. Clearly, teachers cannot directly intervene in their student’s household dynamics, though they are aware to some degree, of the challenges they may sometimes face, from neglect to physical and sexual abuse. Teachers are rarely backed by counselors and even more rarely by social workers, that can address issues professionally with parents and student.

In addition, Rida pointed out that some children are very poor. “I have noticed that people who live under these conditions...their children are often too hyper or too shy. Feeling shy, can mean that they are trying to hide their poverty. If they are hyper, this can mean that he is jealous or tired of listening to his parent’s scolding.” Rida, without fully investigating the nuanced causes of specific behaviors, imparts meaning to these behaviors and links them to specific conditions, instinctively. Teachers understand that they are one of many other adults, that may put pressure on the child. If parents and teachers keep shouting at a child “he will get mentally tired which will make him angry, irritated and frustrated” said Rida. In these conditions children become rebellious and stop paying attention to the teacher. Thus, constantly scolding a child can either prompt isolation and withdrawal, or rather, retaliation and resentment, which in both cases may spur patterns of behavior that are not optimal for learning in a classroom.
Forms of behavioral profiling:

The teachers in this study, used a more intuitive approach to profile their students. Anila, Nadia and Rida suggested that they are unaware of tangible or systematic way, to profile behaviors, and that they did it instinctively, as a result of experience and mindful assessment. “Everyone deals with students in their own way...All teachers individually know a child’s profile” (Nadia, 2019). Every teacher in this study confirmed that they did not consciously categorize or label students, but at the same time, they did use socially recognized labels (constructionist precept) and their own subjective assessment (constructivist precept) to tackle students’ behaviors and misbehaviors. They all agreed that this was akin to an intuitive function that allows them to make classroom management decisions, although on some level, some of the respondents could not recognize in themselves, the tendency to fall back into the trap of using demeaning and condescending attributes (embedded in symbolic devaluation) as salient descriptors. For example, Anila (2019), mentioned that “we do not categorize children because we don’t want them to feel inferior. I have never done this [explicitly] but we try to make the intelligent and the duffer children sit together.” In another case, whereby a teacher shows greater reflexivity regarding the fine line between awareness vs self-control, Rida confessed that “sometimes we do form categories, it happens. At specific times, you might even impose it on the children but you will know in your mind that this is not right. You might not be able to control it at that time.” This shows that teachers are aware of the profiles they have formed and that despite the need to be careful when it comes to imposing them on students in the classroom, this may still happen, as this may be out of their immediate control. This limitation may be due to habitual practice, or shortcoming in knowledge and know how, which limits a teacher’s ability to try new ways of making sense of student behavior, and new ways of managing classroom interactions.

Other than profiling a child’s behavior intuitively, one teacher had generalized an entire batch due to repeated disappointments with the student cohort. This teacher had no qualms in generalizing her impressions of an entire grade batch as “duffers” and predicting that the upcoming batches will be worse than the previous batches. The other respondents disagreed as a majority of them stated that the new batches are way better in terms of behavior and performance than the previous ones. The other teachers however did not generalize any judgment related to an entire grade, or class. They were more careful in their ways of describing their interactions with students, using quantifiable and nuanced terms such as “one or two kids” or “some children” to identify problematic behaviors.
Some of the respondents admitted to not treating everyone equally as they tended to provide extra attention to a selected number of students in the class. The teachers would question them more frequently, pace around them to keep a closer eye on their work and check their work after every class. “I wanted them to stay aware”, said Nadia. This shows an explicit effort to care for students who are lagging behind, or those who for a reason or another struggle to pay attention in class. While three teachers emphasized the importance of adapting their level of attention to the specific needs of students, Nimra, for her part, felt strongly about being unbiased, and treating everyone equally in the classroom. Nimra mentioned that treating a child who fails and the child that gets the highest marks equally is very important. “I love the kids that fail and also those that get A+s.” said Nimra, “The child that is failing knows that the teacher will love her as much as she loves an A+ student. So then they may try harder in your subject.” Rida expressed the same belief as Nimra, that judging and labeling students based on their grades and treating them with such biases is wrong. She said that “Every person is the same and if we walk together no one would know who failed or who came first” (Rida, 2019).

The respondents were aware that labelling and classifying students greatly affected a child’s mental state. Nimra confirmed that children compare themselves with other students and they realize clearly, when they are appreciated and when they are not. With the ascription of less than flattering categories, as descriptors of who they are, they may feel discouraged, as a label becomes the box they are trapped in. Furthermore, Nadia (2019), added that “teaching is a very delicate job. If we scold a child in front of everyone and if we treat him harshly, he may then be absent for three days in order to protect himself.” Teachers are thus aware of the damage they can cause by being excessively harsh. Finding the right balance between punitive and rewarding strategies, in order to productively and effectively engage in behavior and classroom management may well be an art, more than a science for some. Certainly, there is an acute need to develop tools and instruments that can help teachers avoid the negative impacts of profiling, while maintaining a more systematic assessment practice to help identify those in need of support, or those at risk of dropping out.
CONCLUSION

This study revealed how 5 teachers in a community-based school in Karachi engage in behavior and classroom management. Their experience and insights allow them to intuitively profile students, despite their awareness of the possible negative effects of attributing a pejorative label to a student. Various behavior and classroom management strategies were described, and respondents, taking varied positions on what constitutes the “dos and don’ts” of teaching, did demonstrate a reflexive capacity as to the productive and deleterious effects associated with the ways in which students are treated. Profiling students based on their class performance and observable behavior can have dire consequences on the emotional growth and self-concept of a child. Respondents from this lower-middle class community-based school, together with the researcher, addressed the many ways in which classroom misbehavior can be managed, and how students might contend with ascribed descriptors. Since there is gross lack of research regarding behavioral profiling and classroom management practices in Pakistan and since this constitutes relevant empirical data and findings in the field of psycho-education in Pakistan, this project, hopefully, can be conceived as a valuable contribution to knowledge, and a springboard to further research. A growing body of knowledge on educators’ practices in Pakistan, should help inform effective policies and the adoption or development of tools to improve the quality of education for all, and ensure the ethical treatment of youth, particularly those who may be disadvantaged, at risk of dropping out, those with learning disabilities, or those who may suffer from mental health and behavioral problems at any point in their educational journey.

Education should be oriented towards the effective social integration of all children, regardless of class, gender, ethno-cultural background, religion or physical (dis)ability. The onus is on educational administrations to ensure teachers have the time, expertise and resources, such as access to school counsellors’ insights, to properly care and respond to the individual needs of their students. The educational sector in Pakistan is in dire need of reform, however, in order to develop evidence-based policies and programs, a lot more research is needed, notably on teachers’ best practices in Pakistan, and on the educational requirements, which lie beyond the utilitarian model of market integration, and which foreground the fundamental link between learning and long-term well-being.
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APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. How long have you been teaching?
2. How well do you think, you know your students in and outside the classroom?
3. What are the different types of students you have come across in your teaching career?
4. How do you differentiate between different kinds of behavior?
5. Tell me about the behaviors that you qualify as disruptive?
6. Do you think there is a connection between class behavior and class performance?
7. Are there any students that are disruptive but perform well in class? What do you think is the cause for their behavior?
8. Have you seen an evolution in a child’s behavior, either improving or deteriorating?
9. Do you always agree with the behavioral assessment of other teachers concerning the students you have in common?
10. Do you have categories for different kinds of behaviors? How would you describe them?
11. Have you ever categorized a student and realized you were wrong about them?
12. How do you expect a student to behave in school?
13. Do you know about behavioral or student profiling? Are you familiar with the techniques and methods involved in profiling student behaviors?
14. Do you have tools that help you to profile your students’ behaviors in a systematic way?
15. What do you have to say about students that pay attention and students that pay no attention in class?
16. How do you assess student behavior?
17. Do you have a method to assess behaviors?
18. Do you keep a record of past student behaviors?
19. What do you think are the risks and benefits of student profiling?
20. What types of students have you come across in your entire career as a teacher?
21. How do you think a student moves from one category to the other?
22. Were there any students that made you change your approach?
23. At what point does a behavior turn into a category, a box?
24. Are their students that are consistently good or consistently bad?
25. Are you always aware when you encourage or discourage a student?
26. Do you see a difference between different cohorts? If yes, what are the differences and how did you cope with them?

27. Were the children behaving differently because of my presence?
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SEATING PLAN

Fig 1: Ms. Nadia’s class.

Fig 2: Ms. Nimra’s class
Fig 3: Ms. Shabina’s class

Fig 4: Ms. Rida’s class
Fig 5: Ms. Anila’s class
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1. My participation in this project is voluntary. I understand that I will not be paid for my participation. I may withdraw and discontinue participation at any time without penalty. If I decline to participate, or if I withdraw from the study, no data relating to me will ultimately be used in research reports/publications or related dissemination of findings.

2. I understand that some sensitive subject matters may be discussed, and that I have the right to decline to answer any specific question or refuse to delve deeper in a subject which I may be uncomfortable and unwilling to address.

3. Participation will require a minimum of 30 minutes for an interview and 45 minutes for in-class observations.

4. I understand that the researcher(s) involved will take notes and that data gathering activities may involve audio recording to facilitate transcription and analysis. I have the right to request not to be recorded, although this may impair my participation in some aspects of the study, if this compromises the quality of the data accessible to the researcher(s).

5. Please tick one of the following:

☐ I understand that I will remain anonymous, and that no one will be able to trace any published information back to me. The researcher will not identify me by my real name in any reports.

6. I understand that confidential information, such as personal information, or any markers which could lead people to identify me, or contact me, will remain private under the strictest of conditions. During data gathering activities, I also have the right to request that certain information shared be kept private as "off the record."
7. I understand that this research project has been **reviewed and approved through a rigorous process of Ethics Review** for studies involving humans, by competent faculty members of Habib University.

8. I understand that the **data and meta data will be used to inform reports, publications, conference presentations** and other means of public dissemination of findings.

9. The coded and anonymous data/metadata will be stored in a secure location, offline, and in an encrypted format. Access to this data/metadata will be controlled by the primary investigator. The data/metadata sets will be kept indefinitely and may be used in future research. Destruction of data archives may occur at a later date, following a strict security protocol, such as thorough deletion, disk reformatting, hardcopy shredding or incineration, etc.

10. If the nature of the subject matter turns out to be sensitive, the researcher will provide separate information on follow up activities, and resources available to me, in order to provide adequate support, during and after data gathering activities.

11. I have read and understood the explanation provided to me. I had the chance to ask questions and these have been answered to my satisfaction.

By signing this form, I confirm my informed consent, and agree to voluntarily participate in this study:

____________________________         ________________________
Signature of Participant                                           Date

____________________________          ________________________
Printed Name                                         Signature of Main Investigator

For further communication with the principal investigator, please use the following contact information:

Name: Shajia Mithani
Email: sm01194@st.habib.edu.pk
Phone: +92-3322949