

Teachers' Negative Labeling of Students: It's Impact on Students' Self-esteem and Personality

Dr. Parveen Khan

Assistant Professor (Education), Institute of Education & Research
University of Peshawar, Peshawar, Pakistan
afaq_ishaq@hotmail.com

Ayesha Irfan

B.Ed Scholar, Institute of Education & Research
University of Peshawar, Pakistan

Muhammad Usaid Khan

Operation Officer, Sindh Bank Limited, Peshawar

Tazeem Akhtar

Ph.D Scholar, Sarhad University of Science & Information Technology Peshawar
tw_a_786@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present study explored teachers' negative labeling of students and its impact on students' self-esteem and personality. The study was quantitative in nature. The population included Cantt area of Peshawar. The sample constituted 04 government girls high schools. Purposive sampling technique was used. The data was collected from 100 students through questionnaire based on five Likert's scale. The Collected data was tabulated and analyzed by using Chi-square, SPSS soft ware and percentages. The major conclusions were that the teachers use negative labels during class and target the students who fail in any test or exam and perceived them as lazy, useless, worthless etc. They think that these students will never get good grades because they are slow learners, lack confidence and ask too many questions. Due to negative behavior of teachers the students lose their self-esteem, get highly de-motivated, depressed, feel rejected, started showing delinquent behavior towards their teachers and friends even they want to commit suicide. The recommendations made by study included that Government may arrange in-service training courses, seminars, workshops for improving teachers' behavior especially towards weak and slow learners and also to enlighten them with the consequences of negative labeling. Schools may arrange parents/teacher meetings so teachers may discuss their students' academic problems with parents in order to solve the issues related to a child. Government may develop psychological counseling centers in public sectors where psychologists provide guidance to effected students through counseling.

Keywords: Negative labeling, Self-esteem, Personality.

Introduction

Labeling is a form of punishment both within crime and mental illness (Rains et al., 2003). Within education, formal labeling has been seen as a tool for learning opportunity and assessment. This is countered by Rist (1970) who, through his observations of educational

settings and methods, contributed to one aspect of understanding the possessions of labeling in education. He noted that negatively labeled children experience more social rejection from their peers, get less support and more criticism from their teachers, and tend to have lowered educational achievements (Rist 1970, Rist and Harrell 1982; Rist 2001). Labeled students are often ignored and disallowed by uninterested teachers (Cook, Cameron & Tankersley, 2007).

Matsueda (1992) discusses how a child committing harmless acts, seeking fun and adventure, can be labeled “bad” or “evil” by a community, parents, friends, and teachers. That label stigmatizes the child and influences the self-image. Labeling Theory stipulated that once an individual exhibits deviant behavior, such as acting outside of the norm, the public and even close relatives will react to this behavior by labeling it. Students labeled with terrible and artificial labels inclusive of "lazy," "sluggish," or "not able to examine." Unfortunately, it does not rely if they are labeled through a expert or unofficially due to the fact all labels are the providers of assumptions. When humans are recognized with the aid of a label, society is regularly judgmental via the sharing of reviews and ideals. Too often, human beings willingly be given statements without proof of validity. Such assumptions may want to lead to stigmatization. “When we count on sure behaviors of others, we're probable to behave in approaches that make the predicted behavior much more likely to occur” (Rosenthal & Babad, 1985)

Reynolds and Fletcher-Janzen (2004) defined labeling as a time period that refers to a series of terrible consequences, believed to outcome from some kind of formal category of students as handicapped. A study by Lauchlan and Boyle (2007) wondered whether or not the use of labels in training turned into valuable and made a essential declaration that the general effectiveness of labeling personalities turned into very restricted. One difficulty over disability labeling is the potential for such labels to purpose youngsters to be singled out amongst their peers. Some might also argue that labels rise the opportunity of students being mocked due to the fact the labels themselves could grow to be a way to tease the pupil. On the other hand, Boyle (2013) believes the perspective of a student with a label will differ according to personality and the type of label attributed. Therefore, some students may not be negatively affected by their label while others find being labeled disconcerting. While adopting the labels one begins a path known as a self-fulfilling prophecy, living up to the role one perceives is expected of him/her.

Self-esteem

Self-esteem is the primary component of our lives. This element can form how we expand at some stage in early life and have an effect on how we turn out to be as adults. During youth, self-idea and self-esteem begin to broaden. As such, it is important for young people to increase an effective self-idea and excessive vanity which will better their chances for a glad and enjoyable adulthood. As a child is going through formative years, he or she is subjected to many one-of-a-kind demanding situations, stressors, and opportunities. An important factor in handling these demanding situations is a fine self-image and high vanity (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Through early life, schools ought to be getting ready college students to become a part of the general population, without difficulty adjusting to their surroundings. As psychological carrier experts, it's far important to reveal the self confidence of college students and help improve their self-esteem. Self-concept is the belief that individuals have of their personal really worth. This consists of a composite in their emotions, a generalized view in their social acceptance, and their personal feelings about themselves (Belmore & Cillessen, 2006).

High self-esteem as described by Walz (1991) as appreciating oneself and acknowledging self esteem, self-discipline, and competence, with a corresponding wonderful mind-set and high self-evaluation. Opposite to this, Brendgen (2002) defined low self-esteem as having low self-

critiques self-grievance, and feelings of hopelessness. Mruk (2006) described four fundamental approaches of self-esteem; (1) as a certain mind-set, (2) based on dissimilarities, (3) as a mental reaction someone holds towards himself or herself, and (4) as a feature of personality. In the attitudinal definition, it involves advantageous or terrible cognitive, behavioral, and emotional reactions. Both self-concept and self-esteem are fluid through an infant's improvement and may be motivated with the aid of fine parental involvement.

Ochoa, Lopez, & Emler (2007) observed that strong relationship between family and children' develop high self-esteem among children, which in turn linked to a fantastic instructional self-concept and better academic achievement. If students developed high self-esteem about themselves then it is easy for educators to foster learning in them (Moller et al., 2009).

After family, school is the second place where a student spends most of his day after home. A proper environment and schooling of student plays an important role in the resulting of high self-esteem in the student's adulthood. As schools begin to higher apprehend the precise getting to know every scholar, the instructional ecosystem will flourish and students' grades may be improved. With progressed grades comes progressed self-esteem, and as an adolescent's self-esteem improves as well (Elbaum & Vaughn, 2001).

Teachers play a crucial position within the trajectory of college students at some stage in the formal education (Baker, Grant, & Morlock, 2008). Although most studies regarding teacher-scholar relationships take a look at the basic years of training, teachers have the specific opportunity to aid students' instructional and social development at all degrees of training (Baker et al., 2008). Positive teacher-scholar relationships enable students to feel secure and comfy in their mastering environments and provide scaffolding for essential social and academic skills (Baker et al., 2008; O'Connor, Dearing, & Collins, 2011). When instructors form superb connections with students, classrooms end up supportive space wherein students can have interaction academically and socially in productive ways (Hamre & Pianta, 2001).

Teacher's conduct performs an essential position in constructing pupil's self-esteem and assist in instructional achievement of students. Behavior is an outline of the observable final results of trainer and pupil overall performance in distinctive sports of institutions. Behavior can be effective or poor and effective or ineffective. Negative behavior of instructors impacts students' performance (Joyce, 1980).

Teachers additionally need to be thoughtful in the manner in which they react to college students' remarks. Generally, teachers react by using praise, attractiveness, remediation, or complaint in responding to students (Derk, 1974). It is important to keep in mind that no longer all students respond within the identical manner. Because each pupil is unique, a awesome approach desires to be taken when supplying intervention techniques. To better apprehend every student, a school may additionally perform an interpersonal competence profile (Farmer, Rodkin, Pearl, & Acker, 1999). These two profiles encompass the Interpersonal Competence Scale-Teacher (ICST) and the Interpersonal Competence Scale-Self (ICS-S). Using these interpersonal competence scales, the school will gain understanding about the distinctiveness of each student. (Farmer et al., 1999). For years, researchers have investigated the link between low self-esteem and negative labeling (Cechavicutte & Kenny, 2007).

Labeling by Teachers

Rist (1970) implemented "Labeling Theory" to schooling, arguing that teachers label students in diverse methods leading to a mass of negative effects, inclusive of limiting instructional possibilities through running students into decrease tracks, stigmatizing them as

academically inferior, and causing students to adopt that stigma. For example, a child who indicates certain signs are in reality categorized as lazy, stupid, gradual, unable to learn, idiot, fool, ill, mentally sick, retard, fats, midget, incompetent, sick-mannered, clown and many others. Through educators, circle of relatives and friends blockading their possibilities and stigmatizing them as failures, and lowering their self-esteem. Negative self-perceptions about students diminished intellectual health (Link et al., 1989, Shea & Wiener 2003) and decreased self-esteem (Rist, 2001). These abovementioned consequences could lead individuals to social withdrawal and feelings of insufficiency (Link et al. 1989). Furthermore, they give rise to insufficient coping skills and an overall decrease in self-esteem and social connections with others (Link et al. 1989, Hayward and Bright 1997, Markowitz 1998, Kroska and Harkness 2006). At the very extreme, labeled individuals suffer from complex levels of depression and anxiety and often consider suicide (Huntington and Bender 1993, Wilson et al. 2009). Link (1987) claimed that labeling mentally ill patients evokes in them a sense of rejection leading to increased discrimination from the community. Others, in the context of education, have discovered that negative labeling by teachers to students could lead to a host of social and psychological penalties, such as lowered self-esteem, self-confidence, and increased delinquent behavior (Rist & Harrell 1982, Kelly & Norwich 2004, Ladd & Linderholm 2008).

Recent studies among other fields, such as psychology and psychiatry, discovered a “Why Try” model, referring to it as “modified labeling theory” (Corrigan, Larson, & Rusch, 2009). This model examines a “why try effect” that arises after accepting and adopting attitudes that attend labels among adults. The focus on this model has been on stigma stemming from mental illness, lowered self-esteem and self-worth, and a deficiency of confidence desired to achieve one’s goals (Corrigan et al., 2009). This “Why Try Effect” concept can be applied back to sociology and criminology where it began as traditional labeling theory to explore the helpless population of youth struggling with the internalization of negative labels at a time when aspirations should be climaxing. Youth involve at times in risky life styles and activities. They are prone to stereotypes and stigmatization. Though not essentially mentally ill, being negatively labeled may leave them feeling unsuccessful. Teachers, parents, and friends play such an essential role, and a youth feeling looked down upon may also ask the question, “Why try?”

Teachers play an important role in a student’s life all along from childhood to adulthood. Behaviors of the teachers may construct positive or negative self-esteem in students which may lead to acknowledging oneself worth and appreciating oneself or face failures and get hopeless from their selves and cause harm to their selves and others in their surroundings. So, it is very important to show positive behavior and to teach how to appreciate one which predicts positive self-concept and high self-esteem in students and which are the most effective factor of a student for leading happy and satisfying life. The study deals at how the negative labeling of teachers’ effect the students’ self-esteem and personality.

Negative labeling has become a major problem in educational institutions and adversely affects the performance of students. It is not only confined to a specific region; but all over the world and has a negative effect on every student’s psychological, emotional and social life. A student under negative labialization malfunctions in various important aspect of life. In Pakistan, negative labialization in schools has been widely practiced for ages and is on the rise. Teachers use negative labels for the students having any exceptionality hence affecting their self-image negatively. And recently reports of negative labeling have increased rapidly and no one is recognizing the fact that there is urgent need to tackle such abnormalities in educational institutions. It is considered that it will not result in any type of problems but it appears to be a

major source of concern for higher authorities. And no proper attention has been given to this particular topic, therefore, attracted considerable attention of the researchers. So, Researcher decided to highlight the seriousness of this problem by bringing forth the facts and figures of the effects of negative labeling. The researcher hopes that this research and its findings will bring forth awareness where it is most needed and will ultimately help in eliminating the difficulties faced by the students affected by negative labialization.

Objectives of the Study

1. To find out how the teachers perceived students with any kind of exceptionalities.
2. To investigate the impact of negative labeling on students' self-esteem.

Hypothesis

1. Ho: The students with any kind of exceptionalities are acceptable by their teachers.
H1: The students with any kind of exceptionalities are not acceptable by their teachers.
2. H0: There is impact of negative labeling on students' self-esteem.
H1: There is no impact of negative labeling on students' self-esteem

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because by identifying the influence of negative labeling, policy makers as well as researchers can have a better understanding of the risk factors associated with negative labeling by teachers, parents and friends. Labeling the students for life is an important step that needs to be closely taken into consideration. Labeling must be the closing course in spite of everything different alternatives to help the child have been verified unsuccessful. It is the duty of educators and mother and father to be supporters for college kids. This obligation exceeds greater than just academic increase. The findings may additionally have implications for students, mother and father, teachers and the community in trendy. Together, society can conquer negative labeling by using promoting unconditional popularity, compassion, and understanding. Teachers, mother and father and buddies who recognize the power of labels and words can keep away from using them and use labels and words as a way to teach, encourage and inspire others. It would also provide guidelines for further researchers as well.

Delimitation of the Study

Due to limited time and resources, the data was only collected from four government girls' high schools, Cantt area, Peshawar. Private sector, boys' schools and rural areas were not part of the study.

Research Methodology

The study was Quantitative in nature. The population of the study comprised of all government girls' high schools in Cantt Area; Peshawar. The sample of the study included four government girls' schools and 100 students (25 students from each school) of government girls' high schools. The purposive sampling technique was used. Researcher developed the questionnaire based on five-point Liker's scale on the basis of indicators drawn from the related literature. In order to get data from the respondents through questionnaire, the researcher personally visited the sampled schools and administered the questionnaire to the sampled students. They were thoroughly brief about the procedure of filling the questionnaire. The collected data was tabulated, analyzed and then interpreted by using SPSS software, Statistical Model (Chi-square) and percentages. Conclusion and recommendations were also drawn on the basis of collected data, accordingly.

Data Analysis

S. N	Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Chi-Square	Difference	P-Value
1.	Teachers use negative labeling in class	28 28%	26 26%	09 9%	22 22%	15 15%	12.500 _a	4	0.14
2	Teachers think that I am a slow learner	19 19%	18 18%	13 13%	30 30%	19 19%	8.800a	4	.066
3	Teacher s do not like me because I asked too many questions	12 12%	20 20%	11 11%	39 39%	18 18%	25.000 _a	4	.000
4	My teachers think that I am not bold and confident like other students.	09 9%	27 27%	21 21%	31 31%	12 12%	29.000 _b	5	.000
5	My friends ignore me because I don't participate in different activities.	09 9%	27 27%	21 21%	31 31%	12 12%	17.800 _a	4	.001
6	My teachers use negative labels for students who fail in test or exam.	20 20%	32 32%	15 15%	22 22%	10 10%	34.040 _b	5	.000
7	Because of	20	32	15	22	10	8.300 ^a	4	.081

	my teachers negative labeling, my parents also think that I cannot achieve good grades.	20%	32%	15%	22%	10%			
8	My teachers use negative labels like loser, useless, fool, slow learner, etc.	28 28%	25 25%	12 12%	21 21%	14 14%	9.500 ^a	4	.050
9	Sometime, I think I am useless as my teachers call me by different negative labels.	22 22%	27 27%	17 17%	20 20%	14 14%	4.900 ^a	4	.298
10	I feel very depressed and rejected when my teachers called me by negative words/labels.	22 22%	38 38%	10 10%	19 19%	11 11%	25.500 ^a	4	.000
11	I lose interest in different activities i.e	13 13%	26 26%	22 22%	25 25%	14 14%	7.500 ^b	4	.112

	curricula and co-curricular and feel de-motivated								
12	I do not like to interact with my friends	15 15%	30 30%	13 13%	32 32%	10 10%	20.900 ^a	4	.000
13	My social life is effected	22 22%	29 29%	15 15%	19 19%	15 15%	6.800 ^b	4	.147
14	My confidence level is reduced	16 16%	30 30%	19 19%	26 26%	09 09%	13.700 ^a	4	.008
15	My self-esteem is negatively affected	22 22%	37 37%	05 05%	22 22%	14 14%	27.900 ^a	4	.000
16	My friends leave me due to negative labialization	14 14%	20 20%	11 11%	25 25%	28 28%	29.360 ^a	5	.000
17	My teachers target me in the class when I do not show good performance	27 27%	21 21%	13 13%	26 26%	13 13%	9.200 ^a	4	.056
18	I feel rejected when my teachers do not pay attention to me	21 21%	36 36%	16 16%	15 15%	12 12%	18.100 ^b	4	.001

19	My friends called me from different nicknames used by teachers	11 11%	28 28%	18 18%	22 22%	21 21%	7.700 ^a	4	.103
20	I dislike my teachers because of their negative behavior.	17 17%	30 30%	16 16%	22 22%	15 15%	7.700 ^b	4	.103
21	I lost my self-esteem when my teachers negatively labialize me in front of others.	16 16%	42 42%	18 18%	19 19%	05 05%	36.500 ^a	4	.000
22	I get aggressive and violent with my classmates because of negative labeling by my teachers.	12 12%	34 34%	13 13%	30 30%	11 11%	24.500 ^a	4	.000
23	I remain absent from school for many days in order to ignore the situation of labialization by my teachers.	06 06%	16 16%	16 16%	40 40%	18 18%	40.400 ^a	4	.000
24	Sometimes I think to commit	08 08%	17 17%	05 05%	36 36%	34 34%	41.500 ^a	4	.000

suicide because of negative labeling by my teachers.									
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Analysis

1. Item 1 indicates 54(54%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 10(20%) of the respondents were disagreed and 0(0%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 12.5 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.14 which is more than 0.05 showing that the statement is non-significant.
2. Item 2 indicates 32 (32%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 57(57%) of the respondents were disagreed and 13 (13%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 8.8 as the d.f is 4 respectively and p-value is 0.66 which is more than 0.05 showing that the statement is non-significant.
3. Item 3 indicates 32 (32%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 57(57%) of the respondents were disagreed and 11(11%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square is 25.0 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement is significant.
4. Item 4 indicates 36(36%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 43(43%) of the respondents were disagreed and 21(21%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 29.0 as the d.f was 5 respectively and p-value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement is significant.
5. Item 5 indicates 36(36%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 43(43%) of the respondents were disagreed and 21(21%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 17.8 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.01 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement is significant.
6. Item 6 indicates 52(52%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 32(32%) of the respondents were disagreed and 15(15%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 34.0 as the d.f was 5 respectively and p-value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement is significant.
7. Item 7 indicates 52(52%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 32(32%) of the respondents were disagreed and 15(15%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 8.3 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.081 which is more than 0.05 showing that the statement is non-significant.
8. Item 1 indicates 53 (53%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 35(35%) of the respondents were disagreed and 12(12%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square is 9.5 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.05 which is equal to 0.05 showing that the statement is significant.
9. Item 9 indicates 49(49%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 34(34%) of the respondents were disagreed and 17(17%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square is 4.9 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.29 which is more than 0.05 showing that the statement was non-significant.

10. Item 10 indicates 60(60%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 30(30%) of the respondents were disagreed and 10(10%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square is 25.5 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement is significant.

11. Item 11 indicates 39(39%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 39(39%) of the respondents were disagreed and 22(22%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square is 7.5 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.11 which is more than 0.05 showing that the statement was non-significant.

12. Item 12 indicates 45(45%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 42(42%) of the respondents were disagreed and 13(13%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 20.9 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement was significant.

13. Item 13 indicates 51(51%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 34(34%) of the respondents were disagreed and 15(15%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 6.8 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.14 which is more than 0.05 showing that the statement was non-significant.

14. Item 14 indicates 46(46%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 35(35%) of the respondents were disagreed and 19(19%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 13 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.08 which is more than 0.05 showing that the statement was non-significant.

15. Item 15 indicates 59(59%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 36(36%) of the respondents were disagreed and 5(5%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 27.9 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement was significant.

16. Item 16 indicates 34(34%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 53(53%) of the respondents were disagreed and 11(11%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 29 as the d.f was 5 respectively and p-value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement was significant.

17. Item 17 indicates 48(48%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 39(39%) of the respondents were disagreed and 13(13%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 9.2 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.05 which is equal to 0.05 showing that the statement was significant.

18. Item 18 indicates 57(57%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 27(27%) of the respondents were disagreed and 16 (16%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 18.1 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.01 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement was significant.

19. Item 19 indicates 39(39%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 43(43%) of the respondents were disagreed and 18(18%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 7.7 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.10 which is more than 0.05 showing that the statement was non-significant.

20. Item 20 indicates 47(47%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 37(37%) of the respondents were disagreed and 16(16%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 7.7 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.10 which is more than 0.05 showing that the statement was non-significant.

21. Item 21 indicates 58(58%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 24(24%) of the respondents were disagreed and 18(18%) of the respondents were

undecided, further more the chi-square was 36 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement was significant.

22. Item 22 indicates 46(46%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 41(41%) of the respondents were disagreed and 13(13%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 24 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement was significant.
23. Item 23 indicates 22(22%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 58(58%) of the respondents were disagreed and 16(16%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 40 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement was significant.
24. Item 24 indicates 25(25%) of the respondents agreed upon the statement where as 70(70%) of the respondents were disagreed and 5(5%) of the respondents were undecided, further more the chi-square was 41 as the d.f was 4 respectively and p-value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 showing that the statement was significant.

Conclusion

Majority of the students agreed that their teachers use negative labels during class, target them when they fail in any test or exam and perceived them as lazy, useless, worthless etc. They think that these students will never get good grades because they are slow learners, lack confidence and ask too many questions. According to the collected data, majority of the students opined that they lose their self-esteem, get highly de-motivated, depressed, feel rejected, started showing delinquent behavior towards their teachers and sometime get aggressive and violent towards their friends because of negative labeling. Moreover, sadly and unexpectedly students expressed that they want to commit suicide because of lack of attention by their teachers, and in order to avoid such situation they remain absent from schools for many days.

Recommendations

Government should arrange in-service training courses, seminars, workshops for improving teachers' behavior especially towards weak and slow learner students and to make them understand that every child has different abilities so that they may make the child realizes his/her worth and increases child's self-esteem and also to enlighten them with the consequences of negative labeling. Schools may arrange the parental/teacher meetings so teachers may discuss their students' academic problems in such a way that parents start counseling their children personally and give them time instead of taunting and shouting on them. Government may develop psychological counseling centers in public sectors where psychologists facilitate students with any type of self-esteem problems. Teachers may not use negative labels/negative words i.e stupid, useless, slow learner or show negative behavior in classroom. It is recommended that teacher's behavior may be improved by introducing the subjects (Ethics and Behaviorism) in teachers' training programme.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th edition). Washington, Dc.
- Baker, J. Grant, S., & Morlock, L. (2008). The teacher-student relationship as a developmental context for children with internalizing or externalizing behavior problems. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23(1), 3-15.
- Boyle C., (2013). Labelling in special education: Where do the benefits lie? In A. Holliman (Ed.) *Educational Psychology: An international perspective*. London: Rutledge.

- Brendgen, I. (2002). Overcoming low self-esteem: A cognitive behavioral approach. *Stress News, 14*, 7-11.
- Cechaviciute I. & Kenny D. (2007). The relationship between neutralizations and perceived delinquent labeling on criminal history in young offenders serving community orders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 1-12*.
- Cook Bryan G., Cameron, David L., & Tankersley, M. (2007). "Inclusive Teachers' Attitudinal Ratings of their Students with Disabilities." *Journal of Special Education 40(4):230–238*.
- Corrigan, P., Larson, J., & Rosch, N. (2009). Self-stigma and the “why try” effect: impact on life goals and evidence-based practices. *World Psychiatry, 8*: 75-81.
- Derk, R. (1974). Educational Technology in Curriculum Development. Harper and Row Publications, New York. U.S.A. P. 19
- Elbaum, B., & Vaughn, S. (2001). School-based interventions to enhance the self-concept of students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. *The Elementary School Journal, 101*, 303-329.
- Farmer, T.W., Rodkin, P.C., Pearl, R., & Acker, R.V. (1999). Teacher-assessed behavior configurations, peer-assessments, and self-concepts of elementary students with mild disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education, 33*, 66-80.
- Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher–child relationships and the trajectory of children’s school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development, 72(2)*, 625-638.
- Hayward, Peter and Jenifer A. Bright. 1997. —Stigma and Mental Illness: A Review and Critique. *Journal of Mental Health 6 (4): 345–354*
- Huntington, Deborah D., and William N. Bender. 1993. "Adolescents with Learning Disabilities at Risk? Emotional Well-Being, Depression, Suicide." *Journal of Learning Disabilities 26(3):159–166*.
- Kelly, N., & Norwich, B. (2004). Pupils' perceptions of self and of labels: Moderate learning difficulties in mainstream and special schools. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 74(3)*, 411-435.
- Kroska, Amy & Harkness. (2006). Stigma Sentiments and Self-Meanings: Exploring the Modified Labeling Theory of Mental Illness. *Social Psychology Quarterly 69(4):325–348*.
- Ladd, Judith. A. & Linderholm, T. (2008). "A Consequence of School Grade Labels: Preservice Teachers' Interpretations and Recall of Children's Classroom Behavior." *Social Psychological Education 11:229–241*.
- Lauchlan, F., & Boyle, C. (2007). Is the use of labels in special education helpful? *Support for Learning, 22(1)*, 36-42.
- Link & Bruce. (1987). "Understanding Labeling Effects in the Area of Mental Disorders: An Assessment of the Effects of Expectations of Rejection." *American Sociological Review 52(1):96–112*.
- Link, Bruce. G., Francis T. Cullen, Elmer Struening, Patrick E. Shrout, and Bruce P. Dohrenwend. (1989). A Modified Labeling Theory Approach to Mental Disorders: An Empirical Assessment. *American Sociological Review 54(3):400–423*.
- Markowitz & Fred E. (1998). The Effects of Stigma on the Psychological Well-Being and Life Satisfaction of Persons with Mental Illness. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour 39(4):335–347*.
- Matsueda, R. (1992). Reflected appraisals, parental labeling, and delinquency: specifying a symbolic interactional theory. *American Journal of Sociology, 97(6)*.

- Moller, I., Streblov, L., & Pohlmann, B. (2009). Achievement and self-concept of students with learning disabilities. *Social Psychology of Education, 12(1)*, 113-122.
- Mruk, C.J. (2006). *Self-esteem research, theory, and practice: Toward a positive psychology of self-esteem*. New York: Springer.
- O'Connor, E. E., Dearing, E., & Collins, B. A. (2011). Teacher-child relationship and behavior problem trajectories in elementary school. *American Educational Research Journal, 48(1)*, 120-162.
- Ochoa, G.M., Lopez, R.E., & Emler, N.P. (2007). Adjustment problems in the family and school contexts, attitude towards authority, and violent behavior in school in adolescence. *Adolescence, 32*, 779-794.
- Rains, Prudence M., Kitsuse, John L., Duster, Troy & Eliot Freidson. (2003). The Labeling Approach to Deviance. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs 3 (2): 109-114*.
- Reynolds, C., & Fletcher-Janzen, E. (2004). Labeling. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Special Education: A Reference for the Education of the Handicapped and other Exceptional Children & Adults*. Lincolnshire, UK
- Rist & Ray. (1970). Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self –Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education. *Journal of Harvard Educational Review 40 (3): 411-451*.
- Rist, et al. (2001). "On Understanding the Processes of Schooling: The Contributions of Labeling Theory in Exploring Education: An Introduction to the Foundations of Education. Edited by A. R. Sadovnik, P. W. Cookson, and S. F. Semel. New York: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rist, Ray C. & Jan E. Harral (1982). "Labeling the Learning Disabled Child: The Social Ecology of Educational Practice." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 52(1):146–160*.
- Rogers, D. (1995). "The Dynamics of Welfare Stigma." *Qualitative Sociology, 18*, 137-156.
- Rosier, K. B. & Corsaro, W. A. (1993). "Competent Parents, Complex Lives: Managing Parenthood in Poverty." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 22*, 171-204.
- Shea, Barbara and Judith Wiener. (2003). Social Exile: The Cycle of Peer Victimization for Boys with ADHD. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology 18:55–90*.