



DOI: <https://doi.org>

The Kashmir Journal of Academic Research and Development

Journal homepage: <https://rjsaonline.org/index.php/KJARD>



From Classrooms to Politics: Teachers' Perceptions of Political Activities in Peshawar Schools

Dr Atif khan¹, Sohail Ahmad², Kashif Lodhi³

¹Assistant Professor, Faculty, Education, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain,

Email: atifkhan@ub.edu

²M.Phil. English Linguistics. SSE English School Education Department (SED), Govt. of Punjab, Pakistan,

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8710-3237>, Email: ahmad.sohail664@gmail.com

³Department of Management, Economics and Quantitative Methods. Università degli Studi di Bergamo via dei Caniana 2, 24127 Bergamo (BG), Italy, Email: k.lodhi@studenti.unibg.it

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
<p>Received: February 04, 2025</p> <p>Revised: March 12, 2025</p> <p>Accepted: March 18, 2025</p> <p>Available Online: March 24, 2025</p> <p>Keywords: Politics, educational institutions, teacher and students' performances, personal benefits, Peshawar.</p> <p>Corresponding Author: ahmad.sohail664@gmail.com</p>	<p>Politics have devastated the educational institutions, teacher and students' performances became zero, respect for teacher got finished and even teachers themselves became enemies of one another and pull one another legs for personal benefits. The school is not more an educational body but it is like a parliament. The overall purpose of the proposed study was to analyze the perception of teachers on the politics in the educational institutes of district Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The objectives of the proposed study were to explore the political activities and their impacts on teachers, students, and overall body of educational institutions. The target population was teachers both male and female, from the public and private Secondary Schools of District Peshawar. A sample of 200 teachers was selected conveniently from district Peshawar. Questionnaires containing 20 items were prepared and data was collected, tabulated, analyzed and interpreted. It has been concluded that majority of the teachers are involved in politics in educational institutions which have affected the performances of the teacher, students and overall performance of educational body badly. It is recommended that teachers may be recruited only on the criteria of merit so that we may have politics free environment in our educational institutes.</p>

Introduction

Political activities issues take real unmistakable structure and assume significant parts in educational frameworks around the world. No educational framework can escape from the political group in which it works and tries to serve. The educational framework must reflect what the political group needs it to do. The system can set formally to change the community only if the community includes change of this kind among its aims of education provision. Pakistan educational frameworks contain some germ of genuine political exercises and are subsequently liable to impact educational qualities. (Scribner et al, 2004).

As an academic discipline the investigation of governmental issues in educational institutes have two fundamental roots. The primary root is focused around speculations from political science while the second establish is footed in organizational theories. (Scribner et al, 2004). Political science endeavors to clarify societies and social organizations use power to establish regulations and allocate resources. Organizational theories utilize investigative speculations of administration to create deeper understandings with respect to the capacity of associations. Scientists have drawn a refinement between two types of politics in schools. The term micro politic issue alludes to the utilization of formal and informal power by people and gatherings to attain their objectives in associations. Agreeable and conflict methodologies are fundamental parts of micro politics. Macro politics refers to how power is used and decision making is conducted at district, state, and federal levels. Macro politics is generally considered to exist outside of the school, but researchers have noted that micro and macro politics may exist at any level of school systems depending on circumstance (Blase, 2004).

Although there is controversy among social scientists about the influence of political activities on teacher performance, students performance as well as on the whole body of educational institutions and due to such influences they agree that the school fulfills the role of a providing surface to political activities, and the main player of such political activities are teacher and students (Almond & Verba, 1963; Dawson, Prewitt, & Dawson, 1977; Dreeben, 1970; Ehman, 1980; Heater & Gillespie, 1981; Hess & Torney, 1967; Patrick, 1977; Westholm, Lindquist & Niemi, 1990). Although the main function of school body, is to be act as formal organization whose objectives include educating people, to preserve culture, to share culture of different people with one another and to transmit culture to next generation, to make ability in students that they should learn norms and values of societies and student should learn to adjust themselves in any kind of situation etc (Heater & Gillespie, 1981). But sadly, schools resemble as a political organization due to support of two players that are teachers and students and such school also provides experiences that prepare the teachers and students to function in their political system. Some of them are involved in such activities for their sake of benefits while in some case this is actually that hands which have the authority and power, which can forced teachers and students on way of politics unwillingly.

Within the school, teachers play a determinative role in the political impact exerted on the students. They are in direct and continuous interaction with the students during the long school days, transmitting and mediating knowledge to the students and preparing them to act as members of society. The present study, therefore, examines those teachers who can be known to have a political impact on their students, in an attempt to outline the characteristics that typify them. The school carries out political activities through different channels. First of all, both curricula and school textbooks touch political themes, directly, as well as indirectly. Of special importance are curricula that contain topics of direct political relevance, among them civic studies, social sciences, or history. Other subjects, such as literature, Bible, or languages, are also likely to refer to political themes. Indeed research reporting analysis of school textbooks has shown that they contain direct reference to political themes (Bar-Gal, 1993; Bar-Tal, 1998; Firer, 1985; Torney, Oppenheim & Farnen, 1975). It is assumed, thus, that through exposure to the contents of curricula and school textbooks students acquire knowledge about political matters and form attitudes towards various political issues. So it's advisable that such contents which make the way easy for students to involve themselves in political activities such contents must be ignored and if its included in curricula then it's the duty of teacher to explain such contents in that way, that students consider it only a part of contents, not the way to involve in political activities.

Another channel of political activities background, in the school is through what has often been called the "hidden curriculum" or "school climate" (Merel- man, 1971; Torney et al., 1975). This notion refers to the school's educational and social practices, such as the quality of students- teachers interaction, the level of teachers openness and tolerance towards students, the level of autonomy granted to students, the level of relation between teachers and administrations, the level of relations between teachers themselves, or the extent of students participation in school-related decision making. School climate is often evaluated on the open-closed dimension. The open climate, propagated by the progressive educational ideology, as will be later noted, is characterized by relations of warmth, autonomy, openness, tolerance, support, and trust between teachers and students. In this climate teachers encourage criticism, politics, skepticism and creativity, accept alternative answers, direct students to various channels of information and allow students to participate in decisions related to school life. In contrast, in a closed climate, typical of a more traditional educational ideology, teachers serve as ultimate authorities on knowledge, maintain formal and hierarchical relations with their students and emphasize discipline as a means to maintain order (Biber & Menuchin, 1970; Dewey, 1938; Moos, 1979).

The school climate represents students' main experience of life in a social system on the basis of which they acquire skills and attitudes which are relevant to life in the social and political world. In this vein, for example, studies have shown that students who studied in open climate schools develop attitudes and skills which are more compatible to life in democratic societies than students who studied in schools with a closed climate (Armento, 1986; Ehman, 1969; Gold- enberg, 1998; Greenberg, 1985; Hedges & Giacco- nia, 1981; Johnson, 1981). In contrast, in the closed climate the students may acquire divergent beliefs and skills, since their experiences imply divergent lessons.

Teachers, too, serve as agents for political activities They directly provide information about political issues to students for their own benefits, either through the content of the subject matters they teach (e.g., civic studies or history), or by reference to current political events. Moreover, teachers also to a large extent determine the nature of the climate in their class rooms. Finally, teachers may serve as role models to their students by exhibiting their own social and political awareness and involvement in their school, community and society at large. With regard to the function number one, studies show that teachers are perceived by their students as sources of information (Kutnick, 1980; Longstreet, 1989; Nucci, 1984). They provide students with knowledge, not only about the subject matter they teach, but also about various topics relevant to students lives, and as well as about political activities which can be used in educational institutions for benefits of teachers with support of students, so its mean teacher play an important role in motivation of students for political activities and in such activities students are effected not the teachers but most of the students are unaware of this situations.

According to a study conducted by the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System in the United States, students who are taught by teachers who only are in search of their benefits through illegal way (Use of Politics) on for three consecutive school years

exhibit an average achievement gain of 29 percent. By contrast, students who have competent teachers for three years in a row exhibit an average achievement gain of 83 percent.

Objectives

- I. To identify political activities in educational institutions.
- II. To analyze the perceptions of teachers on political activities in educational institutions.
- III. To explore the impact of political activities on teachers' and students' performance.
- IV. To highlight the impacts of political activities on students and teacher relations.
- V. To unfold the impact of political activities on the relation among teachers and
- VI. administration.

Significance of study

The Selected topic is significant as; it will help the educational institutions to avoid political activities. The study will motivate the teachers to focus only on their duties. It will be helpful in keeping good human relations in the schools. The study will help the educational institutions to check the performance of the teachers regularly.

Methodology

Population

The target population of the study was all male and female teachers of public and private schools in district Peshawar, at Secondary Level.

Sampling

Out of all secondary schools, 10 private and 10 public (Male & Female) schools were randomly selected and from each school 10 teachers of different subject were selected by random sampling techniques. So 20 schools and 200 teachers were selected randomly.

Research Instrument

A questionnaire is a major instrument of the research for collection of data from varied and scattered sources in survey study. (Foddy, 1994) Five points likert scale questionnaire was constructed for Secondary School teacher who teaches to class 9th and 10th Beside this few questions were also asked from each respondent about the selected topic.

Data Analysis

After collection the data was arranged, tabulated, analyzed and interpreted by percentage method

Results

Table 1: Showing results for "Politics is the cause of academics down fall of the students.

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	32	57	04	06	01	100
Public School	40	32	08	13	07	100
Total teachers	72	89	12	19	08	200
%	36	44.5	06	9.5	4	

Table.1. indicates that 44.5% teachers were strongly agreed, 36% teachers were agreed, 6% teachers didn't decide, 9.5% teachers were disagreed, and 04% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. From the above percentages it's concluded that, political activities in educational institutions are the cause of academics fall of the students.

Table 2: Teachers are involved in political activities in educational institutions

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	62	14	08	13	03	100
Public School	48	06	22	13	11	100
Total teachers	110	20	30	26	14	200
%	55%	10%	15%	13%	07%	

The table above shows that 10% teachers were strongly agreed, 55% teachers were agreed, 15% teachers didn't decide, 13% teachers were disagree and 07% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. So it is concluded that teachers are involved in political activities.

Table 3: Teachers are using students for their own politics in educational institutions

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	15	04	24	54	03	100
Public School	35	15	15	15	20	100
Total teachers	50	19	39	69	23	200
%	25	9.5	19.5	34.5	3.5	

Table.3. shows that 9.5% teachers, 25% teachers were agreed, 19.5% teachers didn't decide, 34.5% teachers were disagree and 3.5% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement.

It is concluded that teachers are not using students for their own politics.

Table 4: The overall discipline of educational institutions is destroyed due to politics

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	42	23	16	09	10	100
Public School	24	30	28	07	11	100
Total teachers	66	53	44	16	21	200
%	33	26.5	22	08	10.5	

Table 4. represents that 26.5% teachers were strongly agreed, 33% teachers were agreed, 22% teachers didn't decide, 08% teachers were disagreed and 10.5% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. So it is clearly concluded that overall discipline of educational institutions is destroyed due to political activities in educational institutions.

Table 5: Teachers are involved in politics as they are not in good terms with the administrators

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	15	04	37	39	05	100
Public School	15	18	29	36	02	100
Total teachers	30	22	66	75	07	200
%	15	11	33	37.5	3.5	

Table 5 represents that 11% teachers were strongly agreed, 15% teachers were agreed, 33% teachers didn't decide 37.5% teachers were disagreed, and 3.5% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. So it is concluded that, political activities in educational institution are not due to having bad interactions between teachers and administrators.

Table 6: Most of the teachers are involved in politics for their sake of promotion

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	40	20	15	10	15	100
Public School	40	25	25	10	00	100
Total teachers	80	45	40	20	15	200
%	40	22.5	20	10	7.5	

Table.6. indicates that 20% teachers were strongly agreed, 40% teachers were agreed, 22.5% teachers didn't decide, 10% teachers were disagreed, and 7.5% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. From the above obtained percentages it is clearly known that most of the teachers are involved in politics in educational institutions for the sake of their promotion.

Table 7: The head of educational institutions are greatly disturbed by the teachers' politics

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	57	15	13	08	07	100
Public School	27	38	22	10	03	100
Total teachers	84	53	35	18	10	200
%	42	26.5	17.5	9	5	

Table 7 indicates that 26.5% teachers were strongly agreed, 42% teachers were agreed, 17.5% teachers didn't decide, 09% teachers were disagreed and 05% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. From the above percentages it is clearly known that the head of educational institutions are greatly disturbed by the teacher's political activities in educational institutions.

Table 8: The head of educational institutions do not like political activities

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	23	44	20	09	04	100
Public School	38	26	24	07	05	100
Total teachers	61	70	44	16	09	200
%	30.5	35	22	08	4.5	

Table 8 represents that 35% teachers were strongly agreed, 30.5% teachers were agreed, 22% teachers didn't decide, 08% teachers were disagreed and 4.5% teachers were strongly disagreed with the statement. From the above results it is clearly concluded that the head of educational institutions do not like political activities in their educational institutions.

Table 9: Teachers do not like politics in their educational institutions

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	33	16	25	23	03	100
Public School	34	28	30	07	01	100
Total teachers	67	44	55	30	04	200
%	33.5	22	27.5	15	02	

Table 9 indicates that 22% teachers were strongly agreed, 33.5% teachers were agreed, 27.5% teachers didn't decide, 15% teachers were disagreed and 02% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. From the above % it is known that, teachers do not like politics.

Table 10: Teachers are unwillingly involved in politics for solving their problems

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	66	08	15	04	07	100
Public School	33	16	30	18	03	100
Total teachers	99	24	45	22	10	200
%	49.5	12	22.5	11	5	

Table 10 shows that 12% teachers were strongly agreed, 49.5% teachers were agreed, 22.5% teachers didn't decide, 11% teachers were disagreed 05% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. It is clearly mention in above table that the teachers are unwillingly involved in political activities for solving their problems in educational institutions.

Table 11: Teachers are pulling their legs through politics in educational institutions

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	53	06	23	16	02	100
Public School	36	05	37	20	02	100
Total teachers	89	11	60	36	04	200
%	44.5	5.5	30	18	02	

Table 11 indicates that 5.5% teachers were strongly agreed, 44.5% teachers were agreed, 30% teachers didn't decide, 18% teachers were disagreed and 02% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. It is clearly shown in the above table that, teachers are pulling their legs through politics.

Table 12: Students do not like those teachers who are involved in political activities

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	44	18	16	20	02	100
Public School	30	40	10	20	00	100
Total teachers	74	58	26	40	02	200
%	37	29	13	20	01	

Table 12 indicates that 29% teachers were strongly agreed, 37% teachers were agreed, 13% teachers didn't decide about, 20% teachers were disagreed and 01% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. It is clearly known from above table that, students do not like those teachers who are involved in political activities in educational institutions.

Table 13: Teachers involved in politics are showing their superiority over others teachers”.

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	45	20	13	15	07	100
Public School	32	40	08	12	08	100
Total teachers	77	60	21	27	15	200
%	38.5	30	10.5	13.5	7.5	

Table 13 indicates that 30% teachers were strongly agreed, 38.5% teachers were agreed, 10.5% teachers didn't decide, 13.5% teachers were disagreed and 4.5% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. From above obtained percentages it is clearly mention that the teachers who are involved in politics are showing their superiority over others teachers.

Table 14: Teachers who are involved in politics show no interest in academic activities.

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	42	20	10	16	12	100
Public School	40	22	13	15	10	100
Total teachers	82	42	23	31	22	200
%	41	21	11.5	15.5	11	

Table 14 in above table its mention that 21% teachers were strongly agreed, 41% teachers were agreed, 11.5% teachers didn't decide, 15.5% teachers were disagreed and 11% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. It is clearly known from above table results that, those teachers who are involved in political activities show no interest in academic activities.

Table 15: Students became disrespectful towards their teachers who are involved in politics

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	30	25	15	20	10	100
Public School	42	20	12	16	10	100
Total teachers	72	45	27	36	20	200
%	36	22.5	13.5	18	10	

Table 15 mention that 22.5% teachers were strongly agreed, 36% teachers were agreed, 13.5% teachers didn't decide, 18% teachers were disagreed and 10% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. From the above table it is concluded that students became disrespectful towards their teachers who are involved in political activities.

Table 16: Teachers who are not involved in politics are always suffering in their promotion

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	32	28	12	15	13	100
Public School	45	23	12	16	04	100
Total teachers	77	51	24	31	17	200
%	38.5	25.5	12	15.5	8.5	

Table 16 indicates that 22.5% teachers were strongly agreed, 38.5% teachers were agreed, 12% teachers didn't decide, 15.5% teachers were disagreed and 8.5% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. It is known from above table that the teachers who are not involved in politics in educational institutions are always suffering in promotion.

Table 17: Idle teachers are involved in politics in education institutions

Respondents	A	SA	UD	DA	SD	Total
Private School	32	18	23	10	17	100
Public School	40	28	13	17	02	100
Total teachers	72	46	36	27	19	200
%	36	23	18	13.5	9.5	

Table 17 indicates that 23% teachers were strongly agreed, 36% teachers were agreed with this statement, 18% teachers didn't decide, 13.5% teachers were disagreed and 9.5% teachers were strongly disagreed with this statement. In above table it is concluded that those teachers are involved in political activities in education institutions who shirk hard work.

Findings

- 1) It is concluded from the analysis of the data in table # 1 that 86.5% respondents are of the view that students 'academic downfall is due to politics activities in educational institute.
- 2) The analysis of table # 2 shows that 65% of the respondents said that teachers are involved in political activities in educational institutions.
- 3) From table 4, 59.5% of the respondents opine that politics is the cause in destroying overall discipline of educational institutions.
- 4) The analysis of table # 5 shows 41% of the respondents do not consider that politics in are not the outcome of ill relation between the teachers and the administration
- 5) From table 6, (66.5%) of the respondents declared that promotion is the cause of politics.
- 6) The analysis of the data shows that 68% of the respondents agree on the point that head of educational institutions are greatly disturbed by teacher politics.
- 7) The analysis of the data declares that 65.5% of the respondents that the head of educational institutions do not like political activities in their educational institutions
- 8) It is concluded from the analysis of the data that 55% of the respondents are of the opinion that teachers do not like politics in their educational institutes.
- 9) The result of the data shows that 61.5% of the respondents view that teachers are unwillingly involved in political activities for solving their problems.
- 10) It is concluded from the analysis that 50% of the teachers are of the opinion that teachers are pulling their legs through politics in educational institutions
- 11) The data shows that 66% of the teachers view that students do not like those teachers who are involved in political activities in educational institutions.
- 12) The analysis of the data unfolds that 68.5% of the respondents view that teachers want to show their superiority over others teachers that is why they are involved in politics.
- 13) It is concluded from the data in the table that 63.5% of the respondents are of the view that those teachers who are involved in politics in show no interest in academic activities.
- 14) The result from the table shows that 58% respondents view that students become disrespectful towards their teachers who are involved in politics.
- 15) It is concluded that 63.5% of the responded view that the teachers who do not involved in political activities in educational institutions are always suffer in their promotion
- 16) From the analysis of the data it is clear that 59% of the respondents were of the opinion that those teachers are involved in political activities in who shirk hard work

Conclusions

Political activities in educational institution are responsible for academic down fall of students, in destroying overall discipline of educational institutions, for the promotions of teachers, for showing superiority by some teachers over others, in creating worst relation between teachers, between teachers and students, for effecting students and teachers' performances badly. Those teachers are involved in political activities who solved their problems through political influences, who do not show interest in academic activities and who shirk hard work. Most of the teachers are not using students for their own politics. The involvement of teachers in political activities is not due to having worst interactions between teachers and administrators. The head of educational institutions are greatly disturbed and do not like teacher politics. Teachers do not like politics. Teachers are pulling their legs through politics. Students do not like those teachers and become disrespectful towards those teachers who are involved in politics. The teachers who do not involve in politics are always suffering in case of their promotion

Recommendations

The following workable plan is recommendations which can minimize the negative politics in the educational institutes:

- It is recommended that teachers and administrations of educational institute may focus on delivering quality education to produce good citizens then there will be no academic down fall.
- Teachers are selected for teaching purpose so they must concentrate only on teaching.
- Parents are sending their children to educational institute as they have trust on teachers so teachers must not use students for their politics and must not break trust of the parents.
- Educational institute are made for the purpose of providing quality education and producing good citizens, so it may not involved themselves in politics because such politics are the source of destroying overall discipline of educational institutions.
- Teachers and heads must have good term because worse interaction would let to political legs pulling due to which students will get affected.
- The junior teachers may respect senior as it is their moral obligation.

- In educational institutions some of the teachers are involved in political activities for their benefits and such teachers always got superiority over others teachers, so this is the point which motivates others to get involved in politics unwillingly.
- Teaching profession is respectable and honorable profession. Teachers are role model for students. They may restrain themselves from getting involved in politics, because those teachers who are involved in politics are not respected.
- The recruitment criteria must be free of politics and selection of teachers may be on merit because those teachers who are recruited through political influences are involved in political activities as they have been recruited through politics.

References

1. Almond G., and Verba S. (1963). *The civic culture*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
2. Armento B. (1986). Research on teaching social studies. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 942–951). New York: Macmillan.
3. Biber B., and Menuchin P. (1970). The impact of school philosophy and practice in child development. In N. V. Overly (Ed.), *the unstudied curriculum*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
4. Bar-Gal Y. (1993). Homeland and geography in a hundred years of Zionist education. Tel Aviv: Am Oved (in Hebrew).
5. Bar-Tal D. (1998). The rocky road toward peace: Societal beliefs functional to intractable conflict in Israeli school textbooks. *Journal of Peace Research*, 35, 723–742.
6. Dreeben R. (1970). *On what is learned in school*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison Wesley.
7. Dawson R. E., Prewitt K., and Dawson K. S. (1977). *Political socialization*. Toronto: Little, Brown.
8. Ehman L. H. (1980). The American school in the political socialization process. *Review of Education Research*, 50, 90–119.
9. Ehman L. H. (1969). An analysis of the relationship of selected educational variables with the political socialization of high school students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 4, 559–580.
10. Firer R. (1985). *The agents of Zionist education*. Tel-Aviv: Sifriyat Hapoalim (in Hebrew).
11. Foddy, W. H. (1994). *Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires: Theory and practice in social research* (New ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
12. Greenberg D. (1985). *The Sudbury school experience*. Sudbury, MA: Sudbury Valley School Press.
13. Goldenberg D. (1998). *The influence of a democratic school on students' knowledge and attitudes*. Unpublished master's thesis submitted to the department of psychology. Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv (in Hebrew).
14. Hess R. P., and Torney J. V. (1967). *The development of political attitudes in children*. Chicago: Aldine.
15. Hedges L. V., and Giacconia R. M. (1981). Identifying feature of effective open education. *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 579–602. Princeton University Press. p. 24. ISBN 978-0-691-03497-3. Retrieved 22 August 2011.
16. Heater D., and Gillespie J.A. (1981). *Political education in flux*. London: Sage.
17. Johnson D. W. (1981). Student–student interaction: The neglected variable in education. *Education Research*, 10, 5–10.
18. Kutnick P. (1980). The inception school of school authority. *The socialization of the primary school child*. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 101, 35–70
19. Longstreet W. S. (1989). Education for citizenship: New dimensions. *Social Education*, 54, 41–45.
20. Moos R. H. (1979). *Evaluating education environments*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
21. Nucci, L. P. (1984). Evaluating teachers as social agents. *American Education Research Journal*, 21, 367–378.
22. Patrick J. Y. (1977). Political socialization and political education in schools. In S. A. Renshon,
23. Scribner J. D., Aleman E., Maxcy B. (2003). "Emergence of the Politics of Education Field: Making Sense of the Messy Center". *Educational Administration Quarterly* 39(1): 10–40. Doi:10.1177/0013161X02239759.
24. Torney J. V., Oppenheim A. N., and Farnen R. F. (1975). *Civiceducation in ten countries*. New York: Wiley.
25. Westholm. A., Lindquist A., and Niemi R. G. (1990). Education and the making of the informed citizen: Political literacy and the outside world. In O. Ichilov (Ed.), *Politica socialization, citizenship education and democracy* (pp. 177–204). New York: Teachers' College Press.



2025 by the authors; Journal of The Kashmir Journal of Academic Research and Development. This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).