

Causes of Teacher's Favoritism and Its Effects on the University Students: A Case Study

Amjad Ali* Dost Muhammad Khan† Mujeeb Hussain‡



Abstract *This study aims at exploring and examining the causes of teacher's favoritism and its effects on the university students. Quantitative tools are applied to collect data for the study and to check its reliability. The results of the data reveal that the teachers favor the students on the basis of gender, race, area, similar political ideology and family/blood relation. The study also indicates that a teacher's favoritism in the class affects boldness, mutual trust and respects between students and teacher which results in the student's struggle for favoritism instead of studies and academic achievements. Moreover, the students may opt for leaving the institute in which favoritism exists. The study also shows that both male & female students have the same opinions regarding different factors and effects of favoritism. The study concludes that the students' flair, potential, abilities and academic achievements should be emphasized as essential criteria for testing and evaluating the students' academic performance. It will, further, compel the students to focus on their studies, rather than on gaining teacher's favor.*

Key Words:

Teacher's Favoritism, Causes, Effects, Semester System, University Students

Introduction

A teacher can perform a very constructive role for his students. His teaching methods, attitude and behavior guide the students to gain a sound personality that will help them to build a better career and forming a new clear world-view. Study conducted by Ulug, M. et al. (2011) reveals that a teacher's negative attitude includes discrediting, revenge, strict discipline, lack of interest, favoritism, annoyance, unkindness, narrow-mindedness, misunderstanding and unpredictability. In this study, favoritism is considered as negative attitude. The study concludes that the teacher's positive behavior has positive effects on the students' career building and personality development, whereas negative behavior has a negative impact on both the students' performance and character-

*Assistant Professor, Department of Statistics, Islamia College, Peshawar, KP, Pakistan.

Email: amjad@icp.edu.pk

†Assistant Professor, Department of Statistics, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, Mardan, KP, Pakistan.

‡MPhil. Scholar (Statistics), Department of Statistics Islamia College, Peshawar, KP, Pakistan.

building. Moreover, the teacher's positive behavior has positive effect on the students' personality and practical performance.

Favoritism means to give undue honor to a person or to show favor to him/her in a matter for which he/she does not have the required abilities and potentials. Favoritism leads to the promotion of some incompetent people who are, then, employed in various walks of life (Employee Favoritism, 2006). In favoritism, personal likes and dislikes of the teachers are involved in decision-making. The authorities favor likeable persons (Kwon, 2005).

Hussain, N. et al. (2013) argue that non-involvement in any sort of favoritism is a peculiarity of a positive teacher-student relationship. The teacher should be impartial in assessing the students' academic excellence. He/she should avoid discrimination by treating the students equally. Positivity in teacher-student relationship develops mutual understanding, respect, self-confidence and obedience between the teacher and the students. This also improves mutual trust and understanding between teacher and student. According to him, if no favoritism exists on the basis of gender, cast, race etc., and then it will create confidence in the student, enable him/her to learn easily, and no grievance will prevail in their learning environment.

Semester system is also a factor due to which favoritism happens. Rana, A. M. K et.al. (2013), explored that semester system can also lead to nepotism and favoritism. Their study displays that 90% students advocated the importance of semester system which raised the standard of education by developing inventive power in the students and making them more dynamic. Demerits of the semester system are also highlighted in their study. They conclude that 56% students confirmed the demerit of the semester system as it creates flatterers of their teachers. This system lets students to move towards teachers for favors (Rana, A. M. K et al., 2013).

According to O'Reilly, R. (1975), one of the reasons of the pupils' low self-concept in academic achievement is favoritism. Academic achievement is a level of aptitude achieved in education or a properly gained knowledge which is frequently represented by percentage of marks taken by students in an assessment in school subjects (Kohli, 1975).

Karip (2002) argue that for eliminating biasness, the teachers should adopt the same rules and regulations for everyone. It will enable the teachers to use their authority easily and without any difficulty. It will also be clarified to the students that the teacher is not involved in any sort of favoritism. Ismail Aydogan (2009) explored and evaluated favoritism in the Turkish educational system. He recommends that favoritism should be discouraged at every level in the education. However, abilities, qualities and achievements of the candidate should be stressed as essential and necessary criterion.

Regarding education system, few studies have been conducted on favoritism which relate to schools and the Ministry of Education's central organization. No

qualitative or quantitative study has been conducted regarding universities (Aydogan, 2012). Favoritism is such a sensitive issue that can badly affect the performance of the students as well as teachers in future. It can discourage the hard working students and their goals, and may upraise the apprehension of failure even before attempting. In Pakistan, favoritism also exists in the universities and especially in semester system. The current study deals with investigating the negative impact of favoritism in the public sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Pakistan), and discovering the major determinants of this evil/issue in the institutions.

Methodology

To investigate the causes of teacher's favoritism and its effects on the university students, a case study was conducted. And through survey technique, with the help of well-designed questionnaires, the data were gathered. The data analyzed through statistical software SPSS. For analyzing the data, descriptive statistics, Reliability analysis, Odds Ratios, Ordinal Logistics Regression, Kendall's tau-b and Chi-Square Test are used.

Subject of the study are the students of all public sector universities in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Pakistan). As the whole list of the respondents getting higher education from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa universities was hard to collect, therefore, a sample size of 778 respondents were selected from the 19 public sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa by using Proportional Allocation Procedure and Stratified Random Sampling. In the first step, sample size "n" is selected from the "sample size table" by Krejci R.V et al. (1970) on the basis of population size "N". In the second step, sample size n_i is selected from each university on the basis of proportional allocation procedure.

Research Instrument

The study was conducted on the basis of primary data. Interview schedule/questionnaire was used as research tool for the collection of data that is desired for the study. The Questionnaire was designed for the students so that it could cover all the objectives of the study. The questionnaire was developed by using five-point likert scale on the basis of literature, related studies and under the guidance of supervisor. Where 1 stands to "strongly disagree" and 5 stands to "strongly agree". Cronbach's alpha is used for reliability of the questionnaire. The value of Cronbach's alpha is 0.843 which is indicative of the reliability of the questionnaire.

Results and Interpretations

The prime aim of this study is to investigate the causes of teacher’s favoritism and its effects on the university students. The data, collected through research instruments, are tabulated, analyzed and interpreted in the light of the objectives of the study. Results with their interpretations are presented in the following subtopics.

Ordinal Logistic Regression

To study different causes of teacher’s favoritism, ordinal logistic regression is used. First, the model fitting information was studied by comparing a model with the baseline against the model with all the explanatory variables. The final model is compared against the baseline in order to see whether it has significantly improved the fit to the data. The results are given in the following table:

Table 1. Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
Intercept Only	2261.877			
Final	192064	341.812	36	00

Link function: Logit.

The Model fitting Information of the above table gives the -2 log-likelihood (-2LL) values for the baseline and the final model. The significant chi-square statistic ($p < .05$) indicates that the final model gives a significant improvement over the baseline model. This reveals in the table that the model provides better predictions than the one based on the marginal probabilities for the outcome categories.

Estimation of Ordinal Regression Model

The parameter estimates and their p-values, using ordinal regression model for different causes of teacher’s favoritism, are given in the following table:

Estimate		Std. Error	Wald	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval		exp(β)	
					LB	UB		
Threshold	[TF = 1]	-5.467	.511	114.539	.000	-6.468	-4.466	0.0042
	[TF = 2]	-4.231	.500	71.715	.000	-5.210	-3.252	0.013
	[TF = 3]	-3.676	.496	54.969	.000	-4.648	-2.704	0.025
	[TF = 4]	-1.326	.480	7.648	.006	-2.266	-.386	0.26
Location	[OG=1]	1.742	.335	27.013	.000	1.085	2.400	5.70
	[OG=2]	.824	.253	10.568	.001	.327	1.320	2.27
	[OG=3]	.140	.252	.310	.045	-.353	.633	1.15
	[OG=4]	.468	.210	4.987	.026	.057	.879	1.60
	[OG=5]	0 ^a	
	[OR=1]	-1.384	.286	23.427	.000	-1.945	-.824	0.25
	[OR=2]	-.446	.261	2.925	.087	-.956	.065	0.64
	[OR=3]	-.086	.267	.103	.749	-.610	.438	0.91
	[OR=4]	-.081	.226	.127	.721	-.524	.363	0.92
	[OR=5]	0 ^a	
	[OA=1]	-.989	.289	11.711	.001	-1.555	-.422	0.37
	[OA=2]	-.972	.255	14.513	.000	-1.473	-.472	0.38
	[OA=3]	-.988	.264	13.958	.000	-1.506	-.469	0.37
	[OA=4]	-.604	.236	6.551	.010	-1.066	-.141	0.54
	[OA=5]	0 ^a	
	[Gf=1]	-.077	.261	.087	.768	-.588	.434	0.92
	[Gf =2]	-.322	.266	1.471	.225	-.843	.198	0.72
	[Gf =3]	.087	.296	.085	.770	-.495	.668	1.09
	[Gf=4]	-.251	.273	.846	.358	-.787	.284	0.78
	[Gf=5]	0 ^a	
	[ES=1]	-.230	.346	.443	.506	-.907	.447	0.80
	[ES=2]	.130	.341	.145	.703	-.539	.799	1.13
	[ES=3]	-.010	.354	.001	.978	-.704	.684	1.99
	[ES=4]	.088	.348	.064	.800	-.594	.771	0.91
[ES=5]	0 ^a		

[SPI=1]	-.848	.400	4.507	.054	-1.632	-.065	0.42
[SPI=2]	-.552	.382	2.087	.109	-1.300	.197	0.59
[SPI=3]	-.334	.382	.762	.383	-1.082	.415	0.71
[SPI=4]	.116	.379	.094	.760	-.627	.860	1.12
[SPI=5]	0 ^a	
[SRI=1]	-1.275	.353	13.033	.000	-1.968	-.583	0.28
[SRI=2]	-.705	.334	4.460	.035	-1.360	-.051	0.50
[SRI=3]	-.536	.344	2.419	.120	-1.210	.139	0.58
[SRI=4]	-.385	.331	1.353	.245	-1.033	.264	0.68
[SRI=5]	0 ^a	
[BL=1]	-.450	.274	2.707	.010	-.987	.086	0.64
[BL=2]	-.304	.246	1.527	.021	-.787	.178	0.74
[BL=3]	-1.142	.283	16.323	.000	-1.696	-.588	0.31
[BL=4]	-.456	.216	4.446	.035	-.880	-.032	0.63
[BL=5]	0 ^a	
[PA=1]	-.581	.264	4.826	.028	-1.098	-.063	0.56
[PA=2]	-1.139	.252	20.413	.000	-1.633	-.645	0.32
[PA=3]	-1.232	.299	16.952	.000	-1.818	-.645	0.29
[PA=4]	-.314	.278	1.276	.259	-.859	.231	0.73
[PA=5]	0 ^a	
Link function: Logit.							
This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.							

The above table shows the output of ordinal logistic regression model where logit is used as a link function. In the table, the output of parameter estimates indicates the relationship between the response variable, Teacher’s Favoritism (TF) and different explanatory variables. The threshold coefficients just represent the intercepts, especially the point (in terms of logit) where favoritism might be predicted into the higher categories. The parameter estimates table summarizes the effect of each predictor.

From the table, the p-value for all categories of the predictor variable “Opposite Gender” (OG) is less than 0.05 (i.e. $P < 0.05$). Thus, we conclude that the variable OG is significant. It means that there is relationship between the response variable TF and the explanatory variable OG. In other words, it can be argued that female teachers are more inclined to favor male students, and male

teachers are more tended to favor female students.

The ordered logit for the category SDA being in the response variable "Teacher's Favoritism" category is 1.742, with an odds ratio of 5.70, which means that for OG, the respondents are 5.70 times more in favor of high level of agreement with "Teacher's Favoritism". Similarly, order logit for the DA category of OG being in the response variable "Teacher's favoritism" is 0.824, with an odds ratio of 2.27, which means that, the respondents are 2.27 times more in favor of moderate level of agreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism". The order logit for the category UD category is 0.140 and odds ratio is 1.15, which means that for OG the respondents are 1.15 times more in favor of neutral level of agreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism". For Agree category, the ordered logit is 0.468 and odds ratio is 1.6, which means that for OG, the respondents are 1.6 times more in favor of moderate level of disagreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism".

The table verifies that there is some relationship between the variable TF and the explanatory variables Own Race (OR) & Similar Religious Ideology (SRI). As for some categories, $P < 0.05$ for both variables, so it is concluded that the variable OR and SRI has some contribution in the model on the empirical grounds.

The ordered logit for the category SDA being in the response variable "Teacher's Favoritism" category is -1.384, with an odds ratio of 0.25, which means that for OR, the respondents are 0.25 times more in favor of high level of agreement with "Teacher's Favoritism". Similarly, order logit for the DA category of OR being in the response variable "Teacher's favoritism" is -0.446, with an odds ratio of 0.64, which means that, the respondents are 0.64 times more in favor of moderate level of agreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism". The order logit for the category UD category is -0.086 and odds ratio is 0.91, which means that for OR the respondents are 0.91 times more in favor of neutral level of agreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism". For Agree category, the ordered logit is -0.081 and odds ratio is 0.92, which means that for OR, the respondents are 0.92 times more in favor of moderate level of disagreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism". Similarly, for the variable SRI, the ordered logit for the category SDA being in the response variable "Teacher's Favoritism" category is -1.275, with an odds ratio of 0.28, which means that for SRI, the respondents are 0.28 times more in favor of high level of agreement with "Teacher's Favoritism". Similarly, order logit for the DA category of SRI being in the response variable "Teacher's favoritism" is -0.705, with an odds ratio of 0.50, which means that, the respondents are 0.50times more in favor of moderate level of agreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism". The order logit for the category UD category is -0.536 and odds ratio is 0.58, which means that for SRI the respondents are 0.58 times more in favor of neutral level of agreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism". For Agree category, the ordered logit is -0.385 and odds ratio is

0.68, which means that for SRI, the respondents are 0.68 times more in favor of moderate level of disagreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”.

The explanatory variable “own area” (OA) in the table shows that the teacher favors those students who belong to the same area of the teacher. The table reveals that all the categories of the variable OA are significant (i.e. $P < 0.05$). It means that the explanatory variable OA has significant relation with the response variable TF.

The ordered logit for the category SDA being in the response variable “Teacher’s Favoritism” category is -0.989, with an odds ratio of 0.37, which means that for OA, the respondents are 0.37 times more in favor of high level of agreement with “Teacher’s Favoritism”. Similarly, order logit for the DA category of OA being in the response variable “Teacher’s favoritism” is -0.972, with an odds ratio of 0.38, which means that, the respondents are 0.38 times more in favor of moderate level of agreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”. The order logit for the category UD category is -0.988 and odds ratio is 0.37, which means that for OA the respondents are 0.37 times more in favor of neutral level of agreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”. For Agree category, the ordered logit is -0.604 and odds ratio is 0.54, which means that for OA, the respondents are 0.54 times more in favor of moderate level of disagreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”.

Gift (Gf) and economic status (ES) are the explanatory variables that are included in the model to identify if the teacher’s favoritism occurs due to these variables. The study reveals that there is insignificant relationship between the variable TF and Gf & ES as all the categories of both the response variables are insignificant. So, it is concluded that there is no contribution due to these variables in the model.

The ordered logit for the category SDA being in the response variable “Teacher’s Favoritism” category is -0.077, with an odds ratio of 0.92, which means that for Gf, the respondents are 0.92 times more in favor of high level of agreement with “Teacher’s Favoritism”. Similarly, order logit for the DA category of Gf being in the response variable “Teacher’s favoritism” is -0.332, with an odds ratio of 0.72, which means that the respondents are 0.72 times more in favor of moderate level of agreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”. The order logit for the category UD category is 0.087 and odds ratio is 1.09, which means that for Gf the respondents are 1.09 times more in favor of neutral level of agreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”. For Agree category, the ordered logit is -0.251 and odds ratio is 0.78, which means that for Gf, the respondents are 0.78 times more in favor of moderate level of disagreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”. Similarly, for the variable ES, the ordered logit for the category SDA being in the response variable “Teacher’s Favoritism” category is -0.230, with an odds ratio of 0.80, which means that for ES, the respondents are 0.80 times more in favor of high level of agreement with “Teacher’s Favoritism”.

Similarly, order logit for the DA category of ES being in the response variable "Teacher's favoritism" is 0.130, with an odds ratio of 1.13, which means that, the respondents are 1.13 times more in favor of moderate level of agreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism". The order logit for the category UD category is -0.010 and odds ratio is 1.99, which means that for ES the respondents are 1.99 times more in favor of neutral level of agreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism". For Agree category, the ordered logit is 0.088 and odds ratio is 0.91, which means that for ES, the respondents are 0.91 times more in favor of moderate level of disagreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism".

Similar Political Ideology (SPI) of the teacher and student is also another cause/factor due to which favoritism exists. The above output table of ordinal logistic regression displays that there is no single category of the variable SPI that is significant on its own. Only two categories are marginally significant. Usually, such a variable is worth keeping in the model as the small effects of each category accumulate and provide useful information to the model. So, it is concluded that the variable Similar Political ideology (SPI) of the teacher and student has some contribution in the model.

The ordered logit for the category SDA being in the response variable "Teacher's Favoritism" category is -0.848, with an odds ratio of 0.42, which means that for SPI, the respondents are 0.42 times more in favor of high level of agreement with "Teacher's Favoritism". Similarly, order logit for the DA category of SPI being in the response variable "Teacher's favoritism" is -0.552, with an odds ratio of 0.59, which means that the respondents are 0.59 times more in favor of moderate level of agreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism". The order logit for the category UD category is -0.334 and odds ratio is 0.71, which means that for SPI the respondents are 0.71 times more in favor of neutral level of agreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism". For Agree category, the ordered logit is 0.116 and odds ratio is 1.12, which means that for SPI, the respondents are 1.12 times more in favor of moderate level of disagreement with the "Teacher's Favoritism".

Blood Relation (BL) between parents and teachers make a difference in teacher's behaviors and it can lead to the problem of teacher's favoritism with the students. The above table clarifies that the p-value for all categories of the predictor variable BL is significant, i.e. ($P < 0.05$). So it is conclusive to argue we conclude that there is relationship between the response variable, Teacher's Favoritism and BL.

The ordered logit for the category SDA being in the response variable "Teacher's Favoritism" category is -0.450, with an odds ratio of 0.64, which means that for BL, the respondents are 0.64times more in favor of high level of agreement with "Teacher's Favoritism". Similarly, order logit for the DA category of BL being in the response variable "Teacher's favoritism" is -0.304, with an odds ratio of 0.74, which means that the respondents are 0.74 times more

in favor of moderate level of agreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”. The order logit for the category UD category is -1.142 and odds ratio is 0.31, which means that for BL the respondents are 0.31times more in favor of neutral level of agreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”. For Agree category, the ordered logit is -0.456 and odds ratio is 0.63, which means that for BL, the respondents are 0.63 times more in favor of moderate level of disagreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”.

Physical appearance of the students may also be a factor due to which favoritism occurs in the class room. In the current study, it is confirmed through ordinal logistic regression that most of the categories are significant. Thus, it can be argued that the relationship between teacher’s favoritism and good-looking students exists.

The ordered logit for the category SDA being in the response variable “Teacher’s Favoritism” category is -0.581, with an odds ratio of 0.56, which means that for PA, the respondents are 0.56times more in favor of high level of agreement with “Teacher’s Favoritism”. Similarly, order logit for the DA category of PA being in the response variable “Teacher’s favoritism” is -1.139, with an odds ratio of 0.32, which means that, the respondents are 0.32 times more in favor of moderate level of agreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”. The order logit for the category UD category is -1.232 and odds ratio is 0.29, which means that for PA the respondents are 0.29 times more in favor of neutral level of agreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”. For Agree category, the ordered logit is -0.314 and odds ratio is 0.73, which means that for PA, the respondents are 0.73 times more in favor of moderate level of disagreement with the “Teacher’s Favoritism”.

Chi-Square Test

There are various effects which occur due to favoritism. In this study, chi-square test is used to study different effects of teacher’s favoritism. The results are given in the following table:

Table. Effects of Favoritism

Variables	Chi-Square Value	P-Value
Boldness (Bd)	222.32	000
Mutual Trust (MT)	178.95	000
Mutual Respect (MR)	94.77	000
Work for Favoritism instead of Study (WF)	168.26	000
Learning Environment (LE)	66.45	000
Whole Education System (WES)	78.70	000
Career (Cr)	2278	000

Discuss Favoritism other Students/Parents(DF)	3.2	0.57
Discourage Youngers to Take Admission (DY)	2.1	0.300
Marks Affected effect in Previous Sem(ME)	243.75	000
Marks effect in the Coming Semesters(ME)	182.58	000
Students Leave/Migrate/Cancel Admission (CA)	68.47	000

The above table shows the analysis of the effects of different variables which occur due to the teacher's favoritism. Chi-square test is used to analyze the effects of favoritism on students. The table shows Chi-square values and significant values for each variable.

The table shows that the χ^2 value for variable "Boldness" is 222.32 which is high, and also the P-value is less than the 5% level of significant value. It means that the variable Bd is significant. This means that boldness of the students is affected if favoritism exists in the class. The table also indicates that the chi-square value for the variable MT and MR is high, and the P-value is significant. So, it is concluded that mutual trust and mutual respect between the student and the teacher will be affected due to favoritism in the class.

The chi-square value for the variable "work for favoritism instead of study" is also high. So the said variable is significant. It means that when favoritism exists in the class, the student will not focus on hard work. They will attempt to find the means through which the teacher could favor them in order to obtain good academic grade. The table also shows that the p-value for the variables LE, WES and Cr is also significant. It means that when favoritism exists in the class, the learning environment as well as the whole education system will be affected. The significance of the variable Career (Cr) shows that when teacher's favoritism exists in the class, then marks of the hardworking students will be affected, and it will further, affect the career of the student in future.

Moreover, table shows that the chi-square values for the variables "Discuss Favoritism with other students/parents" (DF) and "Discourage Youngers" (DY) are small, and the p-values for both the variables are insignificant, i.e. $P > 0.05$. It means that if favoritism exists in the class, then there is no effect on both the variables DF and DY.

The table also shows the chi-square and P-values for the variables "Marks Effected in Previous Semester" (ME), "Marks Effected in Coming Semesters" (ME) and "Students Leave/Migrate/Cancel Admission" (CA). All the variables i.e. marks affected in previous & coming semesters and CA, have P-values less than 5% level of significance. Thus, it is concluded that all three variables are significant. It means that a "Teacher's Favoritism" not only affects the previous marks, but also builds the students worry low percentage of marks in the coming semester. Likewise, when favoritism exists, the students will migrate to other institutes where favoritism does not exist.

Comparing Responses of Male and Female Regarding Causes & Effects of Favoritism

Variables	Test statistics	Male	Female
Opposite Gender	χ^2	51.78	45.58
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.80	
Own Race	χ^2	97.98	58.84
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.64	
Own Area	χ^2	61.78	43.58
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	.96	
Gifts	χ^2	3.06	3.50
	P-Value	.37 < .05	.24 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.74	
Economic Status	χ^2	64.30	74.94
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	.86	
Similar Political Ideology	χ^2	2.54	3.62
	P-Value	.34 < .05	.23 < .05
	Correlation(r)	.95	
Similar Religious Ideology	χ^2	3.45	2.73
	P-Value	.44 < .05	.23 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.78	
Family/Blood Relation	χ^2	67.64	87.4
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.97	
Physical Attraction	χ^2	3.50	2.27
	P-Value	.23 < .05	.43 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.85	

Boldness	χ^2	63.48	84.35
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.78	
Mutual Trust	χ^2	86.28	192.78
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.99	
Mutual Respect	χ^2	191.34	169.34
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.65	
Work for Favoritism instead of Study	χ^2	20.52	36.0
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	-0.035	
Learning Environment	χ^2	188.18	247.25
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.24	
Whole Education System	χ^2	288.93	278.49
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.97	
Career	χ^2	93.51	74.22
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.88	
Discussion of Favoritism with other Students/Parents	χ^2	93.43	141.91
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.71	
Discourage Youngsters	χ^2	104.99	87.38
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.94	
Marks effect	χ^2	30.47	37.26
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.66	
Mark effect in the Coming Semester	χ^2	83.07	48.26
	P-Value	.000 < .05	.000 < .05
	Correlation(r)	0.95	

The Chi square values for all the variables in the above table for both male and female respondents are large, and P-value is less than the significance value of

0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and it is concluded that both male and female students have same opinions regarding these variables. Similarly, there is a strong positive correlation between the responses of male and female respondents for the variables, teachers' opposite gender, teachers' own area, economic status, similar political ideology, family/blood relation, physical attraction, mutual trust, whole education system, career and marks. It reveals that both male and female students are agreed to the given statement of the teacher's favoritism due to these variables.

Findings and Conclusion

The current study was carried out to investigate the causes of teacher's favoritism and its effects on the university students. In this study the variables were partitioned into two groups. One group relates to the factors or causes of favoritism, and another group deals with the effects of favoritism. Data were collected from both male and female students of all the public sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

Main Findings

Data were obtained from 778 students and was analyzed and interpreted. The following findings are drawn:

In order to analyze the causes of favoritism, ordinal logistic regression was used. According to model fitting information, the significant chi-square statistic ($p < .05$) indicates that the final model gives a significant improvement over the baseline model. This proves that the model gives better predictions than the one guessed based on the marginal probabilities for the outcome categories.

From the parameter estimates table, it is detected that all the categories of the variables OG, OA, BL and PA are significant while some categories of the variables OR and SRI are also significant. It means that these variables have contribution in the model. The results also reveal that the variables Gf and ES are insignificant. It is also observed from the analysis that no single category of the variable SPI is significant on its own. Only two categories are marginally significant.

The analysis reveals that the variable Bd, MT, MR, WF, LE, WES, Cr, CA and ME have significant association with the response variable TF. It means that these variables are affected due to favoritism. It was also discovered that the variables DF and DY are insignificant which means that there is no effect of teacher's favoritism on these variables.

The analysis shows that no difference in the opinions was found between male and female students regarding the significance of different variables of causes and effects of teacher's favoritism. In other words, both were agreed with

the characteristics of teacher's behavior during instruction and assessment. The results of the analysis by Kendall's tau-b show that high correlation value of above 0.84 was found between the opinions of male and females for the variables Ar, ES, SPI, BL, MT, WES, DY Cr, PA and marks.

Conclusion

The aim of this study is to determine the causes of teacher's favoritism and its effect on the universities' students of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Pakistan). The variables in the study were divided into two parts. One is related to the factors/causes due to which favoritism occurs, and another is concerned with the effects of favoritism on the students. For the determination of causes of favoritism, ordinal logistic regression was used, and for the effects, chi-square test was used for the association of effects with favoritism. Students in the universities accept the existence of teacher's favoritism in the classroom. The study reveals different causes/factors of favoritism which include own race, same area of teacher and student, similar political ideology, blood relation and physical attraction. These variables have significant relationship with the response variable "teacher's favoritism", and these variables make a big difference in the teacher's behavior. Another significant relation was found between the response variable and the explanatory variable, opposite gender. Teachers are influenced and impressed by the gender of the student. Both male and female teachers are more inclined to favor the students belonging to opposite gender. Students confirm that the effects of teacher's favoritism on students include mutual trust, mutual respect between student and teacher, boldness, work for favoritism instead of hardwork and effect on whole education system. It is also concluded that favoritism affects the academic achievement of the student as the study reveals that favoritism affects marks of the hardworking students. The opinion of male and female students regarding different causes and effects of favoritism was similar. In other words, they were agreed with the characteristics and behavior during instruction and assessment. A high correlation value of above 0.84 was found between the opinions of males and females for the variables: area, economic status, and similar political ideology blood relation, mutual trust, whole education system and discourage youngsters to take admission at an institute where favoritism exists.

References

- Aydogan, I. (2012). The existence of favoritism in organizations. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(12), 4577.
- Aydogan, I. (2009). Favoritism in the Turkish Educational System: Nepotism, Cronyism and Patronage. *Online Submission*, 4(1).
- Bhushan, V. (1985). Relationship of Teacher Attitude to the Environment of His/Her Class.
- Employee Favoritism (2006). Retrieved August 10, 2006, from <http://www.anonymousemployee.com/csssite/sidelinks/employeefavoritism.php>.
- Hussain, N., Nawaz, B., Nasir, S., Kiani, N., & Hussain, M. (2013). Positive Teacher-Student Relationship and Teachers Experience-A Teacher's Perspective. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 13(3).
- Karip, E. (2002). *Sinifyonetimi (class management)*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Kohli, T. K. (1975). Characteristic Behavioural and Environmental correlates of Academic Achievement of over and Under Achievers at different levels of intelligence. Punjab University, unpublished Ph. D. *Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Chandigarh, Panjab University, Deptt. Of Edu.*
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *EducPsychol Meas.*
- Kwon, I. (2005). Endogenous favoritism in organizations, topics in theoretical economics, 10 Ekim 2006.
- O'Reilly, R. (1975). Classroom climate and achievement in secondary school mathematics classes.
- Rana, A. M. K., & Perveen, U. (2013). A study to investigate the views of punjab university students regarding semester system in pakistan. *Asian journal of social sciences & humanities*, 2(2), 79-83.
- Ulug, M., Ozden, M. S., & Eryilmaz, A. (2011). The Effects of Teachers' Attitudes on Students' Personality and Performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 738-742.