

Marital Status A Way to Elevate Adaptation of Quality Learning: An Evidence from Research



Komal Sharma

Assistant Professor,
Deptt.of Education,
Shivalik Hills College of Education,
Patti, Nangal, Punjab



Prabha Vig

Associate Professor,
Deptt.of Lifelong Learning &
Extension,
Panjab University,
Chandigarh

Abstract

Marital status play a dominant role in the lives of teachers' as professionals by affecting ones' status with marriage viz; single, married, divorced or widowed. Studies conducted by[Arnold (1982); Diamond (1987); Valdez and Gutek (1987); Eyer (1993);Fontaine (1996); Antikainen (2001); Biagetti and Scicchitano (2009); Solomon (2011); Mundy (2012);Thomas, Raynor and Al-Marzooqi (2012); Stringer, Saqr and Tennant (2015)]; revealed that marital status influence by affecting ones' outlook and commitment by sacrificing their personal lives and careers. Keeping in view, the research work of researchers' the undertaken research laid emphasis on (i) Marital status as married or single; (ii) attitude as a coping strategy with adaptation; (iii) association with continuous professional improvement and personalization as a self regulated skill. 300 in-service teachers working in 16 colleges of education of Punjab participated for the study. The results of the study highlighted that married teachers have more power to adapt to their teaching profession than single in-service teachers. This may be due to the demands of raising and having family.

Keywords: Adaptation, Continuous Professional Improvement; In-Service, Marital Status and Quality.

Introduction

Marital status is a predictor of participating by mastering ones' skills according to change of practices due to marriage such as; presence of children; economic factors; availability of the partner and so on. This factor is associated to the effect of quality because it governs adaptation. These views were put forth by Gottman and Notarius (2002); who emphasized that marital status is governed by changing role of women cultural variation in marriage, immune system, marital distress, long life and health psychology. They further advocated that it affect the profession by changing their approach to adjust to their profession and along with it one's personality. Based on the research work, Sanders and Rivers (1999) advocated that inputs of learning are affected by one's learning inputs. The logical reason behind this is that with increased pressure of time and energy one is not able to invest more in quality of education. This means marital status is affected by cumulative nature of learning inputs. These views were also put forth by Hanushek (1999); who disclosed that if huge investments are not made then lack of confidence approach takes the casual relationship between individuals and outcomes.

Now the point arises how marital status affects the adaptation process of the teacher as learner and as teacher. The reason behind this was conceptualized by Lopes (2002); who emphasized that the process of adaptation is dynamic and continuous because of negotiation between wishes, opportunities and constraints. The very same views were also recognized by Lee, Zhang, Song and Huang (2013); who perceived adaptation as an acquisition which has direct or indirect influence on capacities of teachers' teaching and learning. This led us to believe that teacher's conceptions and practices are shaped and driven by his/her status of marriage that is; married, single, divorced or widower.

The undertaken study makes an attempt to measure how marital status effect the adaptation of quality learning as single or married

Rationale of the Paper

For the present study, adaptation was conceived as quality to teachers by adapting desirable features of personalization such as; personality, attitude and decision making process. This means that adaptation act as a mean to renovate person by improving oneself and

adjusting to the possibilities of learning by continuous professional improvement, empowerment and reading interest. That is why; University Grants Commission (2006) conceived professionalism of teachers as professional commitment, professional attitude and continuous professional improvement. Associated to Quality, Billett (2010); emphasized quality learning as a socio-personal process and a personal factor which can be best supported and promoted by its' unquestionable 'value' or 'worth'. Here he embarked that individual learning and diversity depends on stakeholders' interest and perceptions and development of life courses where marital status appears. This means quality learning requires interest in one's life span whereas life span gets affected by significant aspects such as; gender and marital status.

Operational Definitions of the Terms Used in the Paper

In-Service Teachers

They are the teachers' working in the colleges of education. Actually, they are service providers of education.

Quality

Australian Universities Quality Agency (2005) identified quality as fitness for purpose.

Cohen (2010) argued that there is no universal definition for quality and learning. He designed quality of learning by taking into consideration indicators like; creative aspect, personalization, adaptation, continuous improvement and flexibility.

Harris and Sass (2010) identified that quality of teachers' learning can be judged by one's productivity, in-service professional development and informal training on job experience.

McNair (2012) recognized that outcomes of quality of learning largely depend on academic and developmental needs of teachers' cohorts in accordance to their institutional contexts and culture.

Marital Status

It is considered whether the person is married or unmarried/single.

Adaptation

Braimoh (2008) regarded adaptation as learning of new ideas and gaining of valuable knowledge. He further stressed that it requires unlearning old and unprofitable habits which are injurious to learner and detrimental to the developmental growth of society in which he lives. Bentley and Miller (2004) regarded adaptation as a potential approach, to meet future educational needs, by providing alternatives that foster learning capacity among individual learners.

Beauchamp and Thomas (2009) regarded adaptation as development, which is required as most important aspect of professional development for teachers.

Gosper et al (2010) advocated adaptation as competence to adjust with learning which enables the learner to adjust to the learning pace.

Brown (2012) introduced adaptation as instructional practice which involves increased control on courses and instruction, better tracking, grading and monitoring of students' progress.

Review of Literature

Arnold (1982); Diamond (1987); Valdez and Gutek (1987) conducted research on women and inferred that women get interrupted in their careers and process of learning because of their spouse careers and parenting responsibilities while men do not get disrupted by these reasons.

Antikainen (2001) conducted research in Finland and found that participation in learning varies with marital status and type of family. He further stressed that differences in marital status may be due to uneven participation of married and unmarried people in learning activities.

Uhlenbeck, Verloop and Beijaard (2002) conducted research on teachers and found that teachers are the best adapters because of their considerable judgment towards variety of strategies such as; pedagogical and instrumental.

Glastra, Hake and Schedler (2004) conducted research on feminist educators to determine their emphasis on individualism, competition, influence of market and place in shaping the learning contexts. Their study revealed that as individuals, learners are expected to assume personal responsibility for making decisions towards their life and learning trajectories.

Williams and Baumann (2008) conducted research on teachers and found that adaptive teachers balance and consider a variety of class-room variables by making adaptive decisions.

Biagetti and Scicchitano (2009) advocated that marital status has stronger relevance for women because of their less focus on work career. They further suggested that young and unmarried workers are more likely to receive learning because of their individual characteristics like temporary job, part-time contract, recent job changes and size of the institution.

Gimeno, Seiz, de Siqueira and Martinez (2010) conducted research and advocated that future professional world of today's' students and teachers is to adapt to changing market and an environment which is full of new opportunities and challenges.

Aypay (2011) conducted research and suggested adaptation as a process important for learning because of relationship between teachers' beliefs in process, expert knowledge and effort in learning.

Based on his study Solomon (2011) revealed that male professors whose wives do not work full time feel more comfortable whereas female professors regardless of their spouse professors feel that being married and having children would interfere in their careers.

Mundy (2012) opined that being married and having children creates hurdle in women chance for success in academic field and women have to sacrifice their personal lives when they get married and have children.

Thomas, Raynor and Al-Marzooqi (2012) conducted research in United Arab Emirates to determine effect of marital status and gender on undergraduate learning performance. The findings revealed that marital status did not attribute towards

the quality of learning performance but it help spouses to assume additional responsibilities by being focused and propelling towards time management skill.

Stringer, Saqr and Tennant (2015) conducted research on married in-service teachers residing at United Arab Emirates. The findings of the study revealed that marital status influence in-service teachers' to cope with challenges and continuation of their learning by affecting their outlook and commitment.

Objective of the Study

To examine the influence of marital status on adaptation of quality learning of in-service teachers

Hypothesis of the Paper

There exists no significant difference among in-service teachers on the variable marital status on adaptation of quality learning

Research Design

The study adapted a systematic procedure to collect the data in accordance to perceived objectives and hypothesis of the study. The method of investigation used was descriptive exploratory survey method. The undertaken study got completed under phases;

1. Personal information data sheet which include information on gender, faculty to which one belongs, marital status, name of the college and experience of the teacher.
2. Construction and standardization of the adaptation scale
3. Preliminary try out of the scale and final try out of the scale
4. Reliability and validity of the scale

Variables of the Study

Independent Variable

Marital status (Married or single)

Dependent Variable

Adaptation

Tools and Techniques Used For the Study

For the scale construction, reviews of research undertaken by (Spradley 1980; Koroscik 1990; Guellec 2002; Uhlenbeck, Verloop and Beijaard 2002; Murphy, Delli and Edwards 2004; Jarvis 2006; Williams and Baumann 2008; Aypay 2011; Meerah et al 2011) were taken into consideration to evolve the concept of adaptation for the research work. Going through these, adaptation was conceived as a multi-dimensional concept having three dimensions viz; continuous professional improvement and

personalization as a self regulated skill. The final questionnaire consisted of 24 statements and 8 on each dimension. The data was collected on a 5- level Likert type scale ranging from 1- (St. Disagree); 2- (Disagree); 3- (Undecided); 4-(Agree)to 5- (St. Agree). Reliability coefficient of the scale was determined before collecting the data. It was 0.891 by Cronbach Alpha Method. The tool was validated by 08 experts of Panjab University of Chandigarh.

Population of the Study

The population of the present study comprises of 300 in-service teachers who were working in the colleges of education of Punjab through stratified sampling technique. The detailed distribution is given under Table- 1.

Table-1 Marital Status- Wise Description for in-Service Teachers

Teacher Type	Marital Status	Frequency
In-Service	Married	149
	Single	151
	Total	300

The above table described the marital status of in-service teachers who formed the actual sample of teachers.

Statistical Techniques Used

1. Calculation of means and standard error of mean
2. Analysis of Variance
3. Calculations of t-ratios where F-ratios were significant

Table-2 Analysis of Variance for the Main Effects of Marital Status with Respect To Adaptation

The statistical analysis pertaining to the main effects of M.S for adaptation is given below

Symbol	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Level of Sig.
M.S.	19.253	1	19.253	2.783	0.05

The above table indicates that the main effect of M.S is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The findings of the present study are supported by those of Antikainen (2001); who found that participation in learning varies with marital status and type of family. He further observed that differences caused by marital status give birth to uneven participation of married and unmarried people in their profession.

Table-3 t- ratio for Variable of Marital Status (M.S)

Symbol	N	M	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
M	149	18.05	4.075	0.519	M-S	4.731**	0.01
S	151	16.05	4.291	0.308			

**Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The significant t-ratio for the differences between the means of treatment levels M-S reveals

that married teachers have scored significantly higher on adaptation than single in-service teachers.

Table-4 t- ratio for Variable of Gender(S) for Adaptation

Symbol	N	Mean	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
S1	149	16.19	5.309	0.433	S1-S2	3.247**	0.05
S2	151	18.09	4.777	0.390			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The observation of means for the different levels of gender indicates that the mean of male teachers (M=18.09) is higher than the female teachers (M=16.19); which shows differences between male and female in-service teachers. The findings of the present study are in agreement with the findings of Johnsrud (1995); who found that women accept their responsibilities and do not change their dutiful, subservient roles. Thus they have to balance their work and family responsibilities in order to maintain social harmony. The findings of the present study are supported by those of Matheson and Rosen (2012); who found that women professors lag behind because of imbalance between personal and work life. They further stressed that learning experiences of female professors are honed and their interest does not match with their work life.

Table-5 Summary Table of ANOVA for Main Effects of M Son Personalization as Self Regulated Skill

Symbol	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Level of Sig.
M.S.	32.013	1	32.013	1.605	-

The above table reveals that the main effect of marital status is insignificant at 0.05 level of confidence. The findings of this study are not in line with the research findings of Fontaine (1996); who observed that marital status act as a predictor to determine individual's frequency to participate in self-directed learning activities viz. mastering of new skills, up-gradation of knowledge and changing of practices in accordance to it. He further inferred that women enhance their professional knowledge by continuously upgrading their knowledge and skills; so as to enhance their visibility in male dominating occupations.

Table-6 t- ratio for Variable of Gender (S) for Personalization as Self Regulated Skill

Symbol	N	Mean	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
S1	149	15.86	4.926	0.402	S1-S2	7.767**	0.01
S2	151	20.03	4.363	0.356			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The observation of means for the gender given in table-6 shows that the mean of S2 (20.03) is higher than mean of S1(M=15.86). This is further confirmed by finding t-ratio for the difference between the means of S1-S2, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence.

Table-7 Summary Table of ANOVA for Main Effects of M S on Continuous Professional Improvement

Symbol	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Level of Sig.
M.S.	18.253	1	18.253	4.704	0.05

The perusal of table-7 reveals that main effect of marital status is significant at 0.05. This confirms that there are differences among male and female; married and single in-service teachers regarding their perceptions on continuous professional improvement.

Table-8 t- ratio for Variable of Marital Status (M.S)

Symbol	N	M	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
M	149	17.05	5.375	0.641	M-S	4.813**	0.01
S	151	16.55	5.129	0.318			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The observation of means at two levels of marital status shows that mean of married teachers is higher than the mean of unmarried teachers. The significant t-ratio for the differences between the

means of treatment levels M-S reveals that married teachers have scored significantly higher on continuous professional improvement than single in-service teachers.

Table 9 t- ratio for Variable of Gender(S)

Symbol	N	M	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
S1	149	15.55	5.094	0.416	S1-S2	4.227**	0.01
S2	151	18.08	5.122	0.418			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The observation of means for the two levels of gender shows that mean of S2 (18.08) is higher than mean of S1 (15.55). This is further confirmed by the significant t-ratio (4.227) at 0.01 level of confidence. These results of the present study get support from the research findings of Moen, Kelly and Magennis (2009); Wu (2010); who studied women in comparison to men and found that women have long duration of learning engagement, but there is variation in opportunities to access learning for both the genders. They further highlighted that as women are entering job market, they have to shoulder their

responsibilities with men to raise children and maintain their households which gradually has changed their social environment by making them more aware in terms of their; capacities, capabilities and life skills.

Discussion of Results and Conclusion

The statistical results show that male in-service married teachers' are more adaptable in learning process when compared with female married teachers. On the other hand, male single teachers are more adaptable in their learning process when compared to female in-service single teachers. Also

married in-service teachers are significantly scored higher on continuous professional improvement as compared to single teachers. Gender interacts with marital status to yield significant results for adaptation and continuous professional improvement. The significant t-values and examination of means led to conclude that male married in-service teachers are better on personalization when compared with female married, female single and male single in-service teachers. On the other hand, male single teachers are more personalized when compared to female married and female in-service single teachers; [Johnsrud (1995); Fontaine (1996); Antikainen (2001); Moen, Kelly and Magennis (2009); Wu (2010); Matheson and Rosen (2012).

Suggestions

The findings of the present study can provide necessary feedback and insight to in-service teachers' to understand and enact quality learning in a way, so that they can make initiatives for their adaptation, continuous professional development and personalization as a self regulated skill.

References

1. Arnold, K. (1982). *Career development for the experienced student affairs professional*. *NASPA Journal*, 20(2), 3-8.
2. Antikainen, A. (2001). *Is lifelong learning becoming a reality? The case of Finland from a comparative perspective*. *European Journal of Education*, 36(3), 379-394. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1503840>.
3. Australian Universities Quality Agency (2005). *Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum 2005: Engaging communities*. Retrieved on December 15, 2009, from <http://www.auqa.edu.au>.
4. Aypay, A. (2011). *The adaptation of the teaching-learning conceptions questionnaire and its relationships with epistemological beliefs*. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 11(1), 21-29. Retrieved from ERIC database (EJ919887).
5. Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2009). *Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education*. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 39(2), 175-189.
6. Beare, H. (2001). *Creating the Future School*. London: Routledge Falmer.
7. Bentley, T., & Miller, R. (2004). *Personalisation: Creating the Ingredients for Systematic and Society-wide Change*. A paper presented in personalised learning conference, London.
8. Biagetti, M., & Scicchitano, S. (2009). *Inequality in Workers' Lifelong Learning Across European Countries: Evidence from EU-SILC Data-Set*. Available online at: <http://mpa.ub.uni.muenchen.de/17356>.
9. Braimoh, D. (2008). *Teaching and Cheating in ODL Institutions: The Interventionist Role of Research in Professional Development*. A keynote address delivered at the official launch of professional and administrative research group (PARG), Unisa, Senate.
10. Bransford, J., Brown, A.L., Cocking, R.R., Donovan, M.S., & Pellegrino, J.W. (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience and School (Expanded version)*. Washington, D.C. National Academy Press.
11. Brophy, J. (1999). *Toward a model of the value aspects of motivation in education: Developing appreciation for particular learning domains and activities*. *Educational Psychologist*, 34, 75-85.
12. Brown, J. L. M. (2012). *Online learning: a comparison of web-based and land-based courses*. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 13(1), 39-42.
13. Cheng, Y.C. (1993). *Profiles of organizational culture and effective schools*. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 4(2), 85 - 110.
14. Cohen, D.K. (2010). *Teacher quality: An American educational dilemma*. In M.M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teacher Assessment and the Quest for Teacher Quality*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
15. Creswell, J. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
16. Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research (2nd ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
17. Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and be able to do?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
18. Day, C. (1999). *Developing Teachers: The Challenges of Lifelong Learning*. New York: Routledge Falmer, Taylor & Francis Group.
19. Desharnais, R. A., & Limson, M. (2007). *Designing and implementing virtual courseware to promote inquiry-based learning*. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 3(1), 30-39. Retrieved on October, 11, 2000 from <http://jolt.merlot.org/vol3no1/desharnais.pdf>
20. Diamond, E. E. (1987). *Theories of career development and the reality of women at work*. In B. Gutek & I. Larwood (Eds.). *Women's Career Development*, (pp.15-27). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
21. Duxbury, L., Dyke, L., & Lam, N. (1999). *Career Development in the Federal Career Service: Building a World-Class Work Force*. Ottawa, Canada: Treasury board of Canada Secretariat.
22. Eyer, J. (1993). *Self-directed continuing learning characteristics and perceptions of professional autonomy in senior baccalaureate nursing students (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1993)*. Abstract from: DIALOG File: Dissertation Abstracts Online, Dialog. File Number 35 Accession Number 1675625.
23. Fontaine, R.H. (1996). *Participation in Self-directed Learning by Older Adults*. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi. Abstract from: DIALOG File: Dissertation Abstracts Online, DIALOG File Number 35 Accession Numbers 1564958.

24. Glastra, F.J., Hake, B., & Schedler, P.E. (2004). Lifelong learning as transitional learning. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 54(4), 291-307.
25. Gottman M.J., & Notarus, I. C. (2002). Marital research in the 20th century and a research agenda for the 21st century. *Family Process*, vol. 41 (2), 159-197. 10.1111/J.1545-5300.2002.41203.X.
26. Gosper, M., McNeill, M., Phillips, R., Preston, G., Woo, K., & Green, D. (2010). Web-based lecture technologies and learning and teaching: a study of change in four Australian universities. *ALT-J, Research in Learning Technology*, 18(3), 251–263.
27. Harris, D.N., & Sass, T.R. (2010). Teacher training, teacher quality and student achievement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 95, 798–812. Retrieved on August 29, 2013 from www.elsevier.com/locate/jpube. Doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.11.009.
28. Johnsrud, L.K. (1995). Korean academic women: Multiple roles, multiple challenges. *Higher Education*, 62, 119-149. Doi: 10.1007/BF01 384 051.
29. Koroscik, J.S. (1990). Novice-Expert Differences in Understanding and Misunderstanding Art and Their Implications for Student Assessment in Art Education. Paper presented at the American educational research association, Boston.
30. Lee, J., Zhang, Z., Song, H., & Huang, X. (2013). Effects of epistemological and pedagogical beliefs on the instructional practices of teachers: A Chinese perspective. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(12). Retrieved on March 22, 2014 from <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol38/iss12/8>
31. Lopes, A. (2002). Constructing professional identities in Portuguese primary school teachers. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 2(3), 241-254. Doi: 10.1207/S1532706 XID0203_04.
32. Matheson, J.L., & Rosen, K. H. (2012). Marriage and family therapy faculty members' balance of work and personal life. *Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy*, 38(2), 394-416.
33. Maxwell, J. A., & Miller, B. A. (2008). Categorizing and connecting strategies in qualitative data analysis. In P. Leavy, & S. Hesse-Biber (Eds.), *Handbook of Emergent Methods* (pp. 461-477). New York, USA: Guilford Press.
34. McNair, T.B. (2012). Seeking High- Quality, High-Impact Learning: The Imperative of Faculty Development and Curricular Intentionality. *Association of American colleges and Universities*, 14(3).
35. Meerah, T.S.M., Lian, D.K.C., Osman, K., Zakaria, E., Iksan, Z.H., & Soh, T.M.T. (2011). Measuring life-long learning in the Malaysian institute of higher learning context. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 18, 560-564. Retrieved from J-Gate database.
36. Moen, P., Kelly, E., & Magennis, R (2009). Gender strategies: Socialization allocation, and strategic selection processes shaping the gendered adult life course, in Smith, MC & DeFrates-Densch, N (eds.), *Handbook of Research on Adult Learning and Development*, New York, NY: Routledge: 378–411.
37. Mukhopadhyay, M. (2008). *Total Quality Management in Education*. Retrieved on June 7, 2010 from <http://www.nuepa.org/book>.
38. Mundy, L. (2012). *Women, Money and Power*. Time, 28-34. Print.
39. Murphy, P. K., Delli, L. A. M., & Edwards, M. N. (2004). The good teacher and good teaching: Comparing beliefs of second-grade students, pre-service teachers and in-service teachers. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 72(2), 69-92.
40. NPE (1986). *National Policy on Education*, Ministry of Human Resource Development. GOI, New Delhi.
41. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development OECD (2001). *Knowledge And Skills For Life: First Results From Pisa, 2000*. Paris, OECD.
42. Picard, R. W. (1997). *Affective Computing*. MIT Press. Cambridge
43. Solomon, C. R. (2011). Sacrificing at the altar of tenure: Assistant professors' work/life management. *The Social Science Journal*, 48, 335-344. Doi: 10.1016/j.soscij.2010.11.006.
44. Spradley, J.P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
45. Thomas, S. (2003). Long-term economic effects of college selectivity and control. *Research In Higher Education*, 44, 263-299.
46. Thomas, J., Raynor, M., & Al-Marzooqi, A. (2012). Marital status and gender as predictors of undergraduate academic performance: a United Arab Emirates context. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives* 9(2). <http://lthe.zu.ac.ae> page 1.
47. Sanders, W., & Rivers, J. (1996). Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement: Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System. University of Tennessee value-added research and assessment center. Retrieved on September 30, 2007, from http://www.cgp.upenn.edu/pdf/Sanders_Rivers-TVASS_teacher%20effects.pdf.
48. Solomon, C. R. (2011). Sacrificing at the altar of tenure: Assistant professors' work/life some relevant conclusions of a study based on the interpretative paradigm. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research* 2(3), 241–254.
49. Stark, J. (1998). A Few words about –TQM. Retrieved on August 12, 2010 from <http://www.johnstark.com/fwtqm.htm>.
50. Stringer, P., Saqr, S., & Tennant, L. (2015). Challenges and support factors of married Emirati students in teacher education. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 5(1), 15-26.
51. Taylor, E.W. (2009). Fostering transformative learning. In J. Mezirow, E.W. Taylor, &

- Associates (Eds.), *Transformative Learning in Practice* (pp. 3–17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
52. Uhlenbeck, A. M., Verloop N., & Beijaard D. (2002). *Requirements for an assessment procedure for beginning teachers: Implications from recent theories on teaching and assessment. Teachers College Record, 104(2), 242-272.*
 53. Verna, I. (2014). *Continuous improvement in the university teaching: The TEM model. European Scientific Journal, 1, 480-505.*
 54. Williams, T. L., & Baumann, J. F. (2008). *Contemporary research on effective elementary literacy teachers. In Y. Kim, V. J. Risko, D. L. Compton, D. K. Dickinson, M. K. Hundley, R. T. Jimenez, K. M. Leander, & D. W. Rowe (Eds.), 57th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference (pp. 357–372). Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.*
 55. Wu, M-L. (2010). *Comparative research on key competences for lifelong learning of UNESCO, OECD and European Union. Educational Policy Forum, 33, 45–75.*
 56. www.ncte-india.org