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Abstract:  
Education is life blood for development of country. This paper explores the impact of various factors on student performance. Data was collected from ten (10) Govt. & Private schools in Rawalpindi. Out of 1100 hundred responded 600 hundred responses inducted in this study. Simple regression employed in this study to test the hypothesis. The result concluded that both factor have significant negative relationship with student performance. In future, the difference of performance level among male and female may be explored in term of pick & drop facility, university distance from home and other responsibility due on male student as they grow.
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Education plays a vital role in the development. It is extremely important not only for individual but also for society. Education does not mean only to get a high degree but it creates a difference between wild and civilized person. Well established and coordinated education system is able to produce educated and trained persons.

A student is lying at the core of the education system. Student performance is an effective gauge to measure the credibility of any education system in any country. A number of studies have conducted to know the effect of different factors on student performance. Self esteem has a meaningful role in one’s performance. Self confident student shows better result than low confident students. Leary et al (1995) discussed that self esteem as an influential contributor to academic success, productive behavior and mental and physical health in children. Support, may be moral or somewhat like financial, appreciation, praise, reward etc, is one of the factors that may enhance the student's grade in the class. Supportive environment have a substantial effect on student performance. Benninga et al (1981) argue that teacher attitude has a greater effect on the student performance. There is a positive effect on students if they have competency in English and class participation as argued by Harb and Shaaarawi (2006). A developing country, like Pakistan, facing different challenges one of them is in the education sector. This sector needs
Education policies devise without considering the student who are the key players of the education system. All institutions, Government, Public, Private, are ignoring the student. Teacher/ instructor / Professor are just delivering the lectures to relinquish his/her responsibilities only. The student in Pakistan also not fulfilling the responsibility as they have no proper guidance, check and balance, and proper environment. Parent also has no much time to give their child. More over countries democratic, economic and social condition also create panic on the student life. A wave of terrorism also shows a serious disturbance in Pakistani society. Such situation left the student helpless may shake the self confidence due to uncertain future and the student has no moral support either way. To sort out the problem and selection of variable to measure the student performance a preliminary questionnaire is distributed in different schools, colleges and universities. The questionnaire is also distributed to the parent and teachers.

Assessing the educational institution performance trend is on increasing though out the world. Performance of educational institution is measured in terms of its outcome/achievement. In developing country, like Pakistan, such activity needs much attention. A great thrust exists in Pakistani society in this regard. Such situations advocate to know factor having an impact on students' performance which in turn a gauge to measure the institution performance. This study focus on two factor self esteem and support out of so many factors. This study opens the door for researchers to conduct research on intrinsic as well as extrinsic factors.

LITRATURE REVIEW

Rosenberg (1965) described self esteem as favorable or unfavorable outcome toward the self. Whereas Rubin et al (1977) found a modest relationship exist between achievement and behavior. Whereas Lindsay (1982) discussed the effect of school size on student participation, attendance and satisfaction. This study concluded small size school has somewhat advantage over large size school. According to Hansford and Hattie (1982) average relationship existed between Self esteem and achievement which could be modified by different external variables. While Cherry et al (1983) focused on the level and stability of self esteem that affect the student performance.

Moghni and Riaz (1984) discussed student behavior toward study and academic achievement. The result showed that study habits, attitudes and motives had a notable effect on achievements. Whereas Keith and Ehly (1986) strengthened the previous studies result that there is no causal relationship between self concept and achievement. Mayer and Baker (1987) discussed the behavior and achievement of student. They used panel data to reach the conclusion. Their study showed low grade misbehaves more as compare to seniors. Furthermore, they found academic achievement has a minor effect on students' behavior. Single parent family and mothers employment also had affect on achievement and behavior.

Oritz and Volkoff (1987) showed prominent effect of gifted/accelerated program. Whereas Rosenberg (1989) examined self esteem in term of depression, delinquency and school performance. Result back the mutual effect relationship. Furthermore Riaz (1989) elaborated creativity and psychological differentiation of science students. Result of revealed that three variable was correlated but insignificant. While Skaalvik and Hagtveta (1990) examined self concept of ability and general self esteem in Norwegian school children. The result supported somewhat relation between two
variables. Furthermore Hallinan (1990) considered grouping ability of the student has a greater impact on its study performance.

Cast and Burke (2002) conceptualized self-esteem as an outcome, motive, and buffer. But it is not over all theory of self esteem. They also suggested the identity theory provide the theoretical frame work. While Baumeister et al (2003) critical reviewed assumption of high self esteem causes the positive benefits/outcomes. They said self esteem has no effect on pupils’ performance but it creates determination after failure. whereas Souza (2003) explained the effect of shyness on anxiety and academic achievement. Result showed that academic performance is independent of shy behavior. Yen et al (2005) concluded that student - teacher interaction can enhance self regulated learning strategy. Student performance in exam actually linked with student attitude toward study and mother age/education, concluded by Hijzai and Naqvi (2006), after conducting survey from private colleges. Whereas Pelish (2006) argued that a reduction in self esteem can be reversed by indulging one in the enhancement program. While Ansari and Aftab (2007) concluded that parenting style has significant importance in student achievement.

**Research Model**

Wylie (1979) found a correlation between self esteem and student grad. She further stated that there was a weak association exists. Handsford and Hatties (1982) after a series of studies declare positive relationship between self esteem and academic achievement. Ansari (1984) found a positive relationship between academic performance and achievement oriented behavior. Davis and Bremer (1999) asserted that self esteem and academic performance were in weak positive relation. Bowles (1999) work showed somewhat stronger relationship. Students with low self esteem have showed poor out come in school and on school achievement tests than those with high self esteem. Work of Bachman and Malley (1977) showed self esteem and performance correlated and found no causal effect of self esteem on performance. Maruyama et al (1981) predict correlation between two variables but no causal relationship. According to them ability test and other are fundamental causal factors that affect the self esteem and performance. Keith and Ehly (1986) found unknown / uncontrolled variables rather than any casual relation between self esteem and academic achievements. Baumeister et al (2003) result depict that there is no strong causal effect on grad. They summarized that school achievement may cause to enhance the self esteem and self esteem is overlaps with other factors. Benkninga et al (1981) relate student performance with teacher attitude and class room climate. Herb and Shaarawi (2006) discuss student performance with reference to different factor e.g Campus environment and family size. Souza (2003) contended that shyness has greater impact on student performance. Moghni and Riaz (1984) result back the teacher student relationship, freedom in subject choice, job opportunities. Yen et al (2005) discuss the role of teacher in building self regulated behavior to boost his/her performance. Ansari and Aftab (2007) argued on the parental style. The result shows that self motivated and have family involvement perform well as compared to other student. Myer et al (1987) confered that family back ground has a crucial role in shaping behavior which in turn boosts academic performance. Naqvi and Hijazi (2006) discuss student performance in term of five factor mother age, qualification, student attendance, and family income and study time at home. Mother qualification and student attitude toward attendance has a positive relation where as mother age; family income
and study time at home have a negative relationship. Natriello and Micdill (1986) determine the effect of teacher, peers, and family standards on student effort and achievements. All factors have somewhat positive relationship with student effort on home work and achievements. Piniella and Munoz (2005) linked student performance with educational opportunity. This study explores the attitude of the student toward a different kind of support and self esteem independently.

- \(H_1 = \) Support has impact on performance  
- \(H_2 = \) Self esteem has impact on performance

![Figure 1. Conceptual model](image)

**METHODOLOGY**

A seventeen item questionnaire was constructed. The first section asked about the student ID, Class, Gender and Institution. The ten item scale used to measure students' self esteem was adapted from material used by sultana et al (2005) developed by Rosenberg (1965). The seven item scale adapted from Collins et al (2001) to measure student support. This scale was incorporated by Maslach & Jackson’s (1986). Questionnaire was distributed among students by prior permission of Principal.

**Sample**

Data was collected from Rawalpindi institutions. From School level to university level student are contacted to get information. Students were of different category e.g. 10th class, intermediate, graduation, master, diploma etc. Twelve hundred (1200) data forms were distributed in Govt / Private schools. Six (600) questionnaires incorporate out of nine hundred (900) filled questionnaires received. Three Hundred (300) questionnaires were declared fake due to different reasons. Data was collected from four Govt schools and eight private schools. 270 respondents were male and 330 were female. In this study both male and female student response was inducted.

**Measurements**

Student performance was measured by developing student profile by using all independent variables. The first variable “Self Esteem” explains student stability and self confidence. The second variable “Parents/relative support” indicates how family members involved in solving student problem and understanding oneself. How easy and quickly student approach to any solution of any hurdle reflects by the “Teacher/tutors support” variable. How many facilities were provided by the institution to the student was measured from the variable “Management Support”. The last variable “Friends/Fellow student” provided the picture of how much a student enjoying the company. It also showed how much a student was a peace full mind. Student performance was taken as a
dependent variable. All other variables that construct the student profile were taken as independent. In Pakistan the exam system is mixed (annual & semester system). This study Grade of student is used to measure the performance.

**Procedure**

The questionnaire was distributed to the student during their class timing as well as out of the class. In some institutions questionnaire handed over to management and collected afterward. Some institute management also reluctant to approach their students. It was ensured to student and management that information gathers were only study purpose and did not share to anyone and kept secure. The marks were obtained from institution register, board result what was available.

**RESULT & DISCUSSION**

To intertempate the data SPSS is used. The reliability of the scale used was determined by measuring Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, which shows highly significant value i.e. 0.71. To test the Hypothesis linear regression is applied and result summarized in table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linear Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors in Parenthesis, t-Values in brackets, p – value and F – Value in italics.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>R - Square</th>
<th>F - Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.263</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>34.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.436)</td>
<td>(0.159)</td>
<td>(0.092)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows result of regression analysis for student performance showing that the value of R – square is 0.111 and value of F – Value is 34.054. The results are showing that the model is significant as p value is less than 0.05. The result supports negative relation between dependent and independent variables. Comparing variables on individual bases revealed that self esteem is significant (p<0.05) whereas support is slightly insignificant (p>0.05). The regression coefficient of self esteem is 1.183, shows that it has positive impact on performance, and significant as p<0.05. So student consider self esteem contribute only 15% in performance level. The regression coefficient level of support is 0.165 too have positive relation but not as significant as p>0.05. The overall model is significant at 95% confidence level and both variables have different degree level role in student performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Performance between Male and Female Students (Independent Sample T- Test)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


T – Test is applied, with assumption of equality of variance (p>0.05), to measure the student performance level with respect to gender. The result of T – test shows a significant difference between two responded groups. The mean value of female is greater than male as the mean value of female closer to 5 “very satisfied”.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Self esteem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance (Min 1, Max 7)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.118(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>593</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (Min 0, Max 5)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.118(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>580</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem (Min 1, Max 4)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.325(**)</td>
<td>.220(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>555</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.3 is a summary of correlation among all variables. It reveals performance is significantly related to support (p<0.05) but the relation is moderately positive (0.118). Both relations are significant at 95% confident level. This study supports existing literature. The study showed that mean of SES is higher form male. The later study examined the high self esteem may cause to damage the social norms as one consider superior to other.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This study is carried out to examine the effect of self esteem and support on student performance. An effort is made to find out the importance of both factors on performance. Difference between male & female performance is also considered and examined. From the result concluded that both factor have significant positive relationship with student performance. Support has week positive and less significant but self esteem has strong positive relation and more significant. The result also advocates the difference performance level among male and female student. As our society is male dominant that is why mostly male student are suffered more as compare to female student. More over the female student show more desire for education despite male education consider more important. There is no consensus regarding impact of self esteem on school performance among the researchers.

It is recommended to explore effect of support from all stack holders (teacher, parent, management etc) on self esteem in turn on performance in future. The difference of performance level among male and female may be explored in term of pick & drop facility, university distance from home and other responsibility due on male student as they grow.
REFERENCES


