Journal of Positive School Psychology http://journalppw.com
2023, Vol. 7, No. 6, 301-309

# Impact Of School Monitoring On Quality Education In Public Sector: Empirical Evidence From Pakistan

**Assad-us-Samad[1], Wajid Ali Qureshi[2], Tahir Mahmood[3]**

*Department of Education, University of Chital, Pakistan[1]*
*Department of Business Administration, Sukkur IBA University, Pakistan[2,3]*

## Abstract

Sustainable Development Goal 4 is about inclusive and equitable quality education and providing learning opportunities for all. To this end, the government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), Pakistan initiated a unique education monitoring authority in the public sector schools to improve the quality of education. The study utilizes a mixed-method sequential design that involves both qualitative and quantitative datasets. The population of the study is all the public sector schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan. For a large-scale quantitative dataset, one hundred and twenty (120) participants were selected randomly and for a small-scale qualitative dataset, fifteen (15) respondents were selected through purposive sampling techniques. The quantitative data were analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and the small-scale qualitative data was analyzed by qualitative data software NVivo. The study reveals that an inspection of the monitoring staff has decreased the levels of absenteeism for both teaching and non-teaching staff. The findings also identified non-availability of the basic facilities at the school level.

**Keywords:** Monitoring authority; Secondary school; Quality of Education; Pakistan.

## 1. Introduction

Sustainable Development Goal 4 is about inclusive and equitable quality education and providing learning opportunities for all. The government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), Pakistan introduced a new monitoring and inspection system to check and improve the quality of education in the province in 2014.The monitoring and inspection system identifies different objectives likes: (1) levitation values of success by pupils in examination, (2) To regulate teaching and non-teaching staffs, (3) to find out the basic facilities in schools. The idea of this method is well defined by its motto: "improvement through monitoring authority''**.** Monitoring is a continuing function that uses a systematic assortment of data on a particular indicator to supply the administration and the key stakeholders of an ongoing treatment with a sign of the level of achievement of objectives and development in the utilization of giving funds (Jones, and Tymms, 2014).

As checks and balances of schools and their improvement are interdependent. Consequently, most monitoring authority objectives are to improve the quality of education in schools: specifically, the Dutch supervision act 2002 which states that the government arranged a homogeneous level of educational quality for all citizens. In order to improve the quality of education European countries evaluate the role of monitoring and inspections and identify the mechanisms that maximize a positive impact, and minimize any unintended effects (Jones, and Tymms, 2014). This comparative study started with a clear explanation of the concrete model of the inspectorate in each country (Chen, 1990;

Weiss, 1997) or selects theory-driven appraisal together with randomized experimentations designed to assess impact mechanisms (Cook, 2000). In most countries, they have their own performance indicators like report cards of school. While, in other countries, this duty is passed out by the Inspectorate (see Macnab, 2004).

The theoretical framework of this research study is partly based on the policy theory behind the Dutch Educational Schools Supervision Act: which includes assumptions about how school inspections, lead to schools' improvement. Dutch supervision background is used for evaluating school performance like academic achievement, teaching-learning process and school scholastic policy (Matthews, and Sammons, 2004; Baxter, and Clarke, 2013; Jones, and Tymms, 2014). Consequently, these issues are highlighted in European countries by the monitoring authority. Similarly, the worth of education, i.e., educational values, financial income, and students' progress by conducting monitoring and inspection in England. In Europe, a public feature of monitoring and inspection is the observation of the instructions. Numerous studies show that monitoring and inspection improve the performance of the institution (Blasé and Blasé, 1999; Musanze, 1985; Glanz et al., 2004; Baxter, and Clarke, 2013; Jones, and Tymms, 2014). The organizations hired by inspectorates to drive school improvement vary across Europe, reaching from organizations connecting authorizations with administrative control to systems with few costs based on peer reviews (Hughes, et al., 1997; Ehren, et al., 2013).

The framework for school monitoring makes it clear that school monitoring improves the quality of education in school in four ways (Baxter, and Clarke, 2013; Jones, and Tymms, 2014). First, expectations are set, schools are given an explanation of the standards they are likely to meet, and, the expectation of an inspection delivery. Second, by increasing a school's confidence by ratifying the school's personal opinion of its usefulness, or providing a 'sharp trial' if development is wanted (Jones, and Tymms, 2014). The first thing is that inspection is considered to promote development through the discussions between the monitor and the head of the school. Some other studies have shown that school monitoring may produce differences in the performance of school heads and teachers (Sammon, 1995; Matthews, and Sammons, 2004).

To improve the quality of education in Pakistan for the first-time government of Punjab introduced a monitoring and inspection system in 2005. This new system is used to monitor all the public sector schools in the province. For this purpose, education departments recruited 950 monitoring and evaluation assistants (Assad, 2020). They collect data regarding enrollments of students, the presence of teachers and the basic facilities of the school every month. Devolution of power to the province and the 18th constitution amendment all the responsibility related to education, health and other sectors hand-over to the provinces. In the same line, the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa government established an independent monitoring unit in first March 2014 to check absenteeism and regularity of teachers, the drop-out rate of the students, basic facilities of schools (Assad, 2020). Later on, the government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa changed the name of the new independent monitoring unit to educational monitoring Authority.

Globally, the mechanism to improve the quality of education is through monitoring and inspection system (Matthews, and Sammons, 2004; Allen and Burgess, 2012). Different studies conducted in many countries such as England, Netherlands and African countries related to monitoring and inspection claimed that schools' inspectors only find errors, thus there have been numerous inspection visits in schools, but find no or slight improvement in the teaching and learning process

(Earley, 1998; Ehren, et al., 2006; Luginbuhl et al. 2009; Matthews, and Sammons, 2004; Allen and Burgess 2012). The present study argues for more research in assessing the quality of education and developed specific mechanisms.

### 1.1. Objective of the Study

Identify the role of school monitoring authority to improve quality of education in the public sector schools.

### 1.2. Hypothesis of the study

$H_0$: There is no significant improvement of school monitoring authority on quality of education.

### 1.3. Research Question

How school monitoring authority support and improve quality of education in public sector schools.

## 2. Research Design

This study uses mixed methods explanatory sequential design that involves both quantitative and qualitative datasets. Mixed method research design connects integration or joining qualitative and quantitative data in a single study (Ivankova, 2006; Hafsa, 2019). In this design, two or more data collection instruments were used at the same time and collected forms of data (questionnaires and interviews) then combined these data into the interpretation of the overall results (Subedi, 2016: Creswell et al., 2003; Leeuw, 2003).

### 2.1. Population and Sample

The Population of the study consists of all the male and female public sector secondary schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. According to the census, 2017 population of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa is 30523371. There are seven (7) Divisions and twenty-eight (28) Districts, and 2108 (1382 Male &722 female) secondary schools. Through multistage cluster sampling techniques, two divisions (Malakand and Hazara) and then one district is randomly selected from each division (Chitral and Mansehra). For large and geographically scattered area cluster sampling is the best option (Creswell, 2009). Total of twenty (20) schools (10 male and 10 females in which 120 participants were selected. From each school one (1) head, two (2) teachers, two (2) students, and one (1) educated parent were selected.

## 3. Results

The descriptive statistics of the study is presented in Table 1 and Table 2. Both quantitative and qualitative findings are presented in the result section, respectively.

**Table 1 Improve Quality of Education**

| Item No | Statements | SDA (N, %) | DA (N, %) | UN (N, %) | AG (N, %) | SA (N, %) | Chi-square | P-Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Improved performance | 4.2 (4.2%) | 14.6 (14.6%) | 14.6 (4.6%) | 41.7 (41.7%) | 25.0 (25.0%) | 38.583 | .000 |
| 2 | Improved Management of school | 2 (2.1%) | 12 (12.5%) | 11 (11.5%) | 43 (44.8%) | 28 (29.2%) | 55.146 | .000 |
| 3 | Teaching method | 18 (18.8%) | 30 (31.3%) | 11 (11.5%) | 21 (21.9%) | 16 (16.7%) | 10.354 | .035 |
| 4 | PTC fund | 2 (2.1%) | 8 (8.3%) | 10 (10.4%) | 43 (44.8%) | 33 (34.4%) | 65771 | .000 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Increased | 8 (8.3%) | 25 (26.0%) | 20 (20.8%) | 26 (27.1%) | 17 (17.7%) | 10.979 | 0.27 |
| 6 | Teaching staff | 16 (16.7%) | 23 (24.0%) | 21 (21.9%) | 23 (24.0%) | 13 (13.5%) | 4.208 | .379 |

Note: Strongly disagree (SDA), disagree (DA), Undecide (UN), agree (AG), strongly agree (SA)

The above table shows that 18.8% (strongly disagree and disagree) of the respondents disagree and 66.7% agree (strongly agree and agree) whereas 16.2% undecided that education authority improve performance of schools. Chi-square value is 38.583 (degree of freedom df-4 and p is .000), the results are statistically significant. Item 2 represents that 18.8% disagreed and 66% agreed upon the statement whereas 4.6% undecided that education monitoring authority improve performance of schools. Value of chi-square is 55.146 with df-4 value of p is 0.000. The findings were statistically significant on the application of chi- square test. Item 3 shows that 50.1% disagree and 38.8% respondents agreed and 11.5% undecided the education monitoring authority inspect the teaching method of the teachers. Chi-square value is 10.354, df-4 and p 0.035. Findings were non- significant. Item 4 shows 10.4% disagreed and 79.2% agreed whereas 10.4% undecided that education monitoring authority properly check PTC details. Value of chi-square is 65.771 with df-4 and value of p is 0.000. Findings were statistically significant. Item 5identified 34.3% disagreed and 44.8% undecided. Value of chi-square is10.979 with df-4 and value of p is 0.27. The application of Chi-square test, findings were statistically non- significant. From item 6 40.7% disagreed 36.5% agreed whereas 21.9% undecided that education monitoring authority provides lake of teaching staffs. Value of chi-square is 4.208 % with df-4 p is .379. On the application of Chi-square test findings were statistically non- significant.

**Table 2 Education monitoring authority checks**

| Item No | Statements | SDA (N, %) | DA (N, %) | UN (N, %) | AG (N, %) | SA (N, %) | Chi-square | P-Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Teachers | 3 (3.1%) | 5 (5.2%) | 9 (9.4%) | 53 (55.2%) | 26 (27.1%) | 91.500 | .000 |
| 8 | Check attendance of non-teaching staff | 5 (5.2%) | 11 (11.5%) | 8 (8.3%) | 49 (51.0%) | 23 (24.0%) | 67.542 | .000 |
| 9 | Check student attendances | 9 (9.4%) | 18 (18.8%) | 10 (10.4%) | 39 (40.6%) | 20 (20.8%) | 30.354 | .000 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | After monitoring teacher attendance classes regularly | 10 (10.4%) | 20 (20.8%) | 17 (17.7%) | 31 (32.3%) | 18 (18.8%) | 12.021 | .017 |
| 11 | Check the admission register. | 18.8 (18.8%) | 32.3 (32.3%) | 9.4 (9.4%) | 29.2 (29.2%) | 10.4 (10.4%) | 21.188 | .000 |
| 12 | Check the cash- book | 17 (17.7%) | 28 (29.2%) | 8 (8.3%) | 31 (32.3%) | 12 (12.5%) | 20.771 | .000 |

Item7 table 02 depicts that 8.3% disagree, and 82.3%agreed whereas 9.4% of the respondent are undecided. Value of chi-square is91.500 df-4 and P-value is .000. On the application of the chi-square test, the findings were statistically significant. Item 8show that 16.7% disagree, 75% whereas 8.3% is undecided. Value of chi-square is67.542 df-4 and.000 is the p-value. The findings were statistically significant. Item9 28.2% agree and 61.4% disagree are undecided. The chi-square value is 30.354 with df-4 and P-value is .000. On the application of the chi-square test, the findings were statistically significant. Item 10 depicts that 31.2%disagree whereas 17.7% are undecided. The chi-square value is 12.021 with df-4 and P-value is .017. Chi-square test, application findings were statistically non-significant. Item 11 demonstrates that 51.1% disagree and 39.6% whereas 9.4% are undecided. Value of chi-square is 21.188 with df-4 and P-value is .000. The findings were statistically significant. Item 12 depicts that 46.9% disagree and 44.8% whereas 8.3% undecided. Value of chi-square is20.771 df-4 and P-value is.000. The findings were statically significant on the application of the chi-square test.

### 3.1. Quantitative Findings

On the bases of respondent's responses, that non-teaching staff were regular. Principals' responses, 75% agreed, that the data collection and monitoring assistant checks the basic facilities of schools, 66.6% agreed, that the basic facilities improved, 50% agreed, that monitors, checks cleanness of schools, 63.2% agreed, and 38.5% agreed that education monitoring authority provides a measure of success to the students, 42.8% disagreed, that the staffs of education monitoring authority identify problems of students. Majority 58% disagreed, and 42.7% disagreed, 10.4% of the respondents were undecided that the monitors check academic record of the students. 83.5% of respondents were agreed.46.2% agreed and 47.4% disagree annual examination result has improved, 47% were disagreed, 60.2% agreed and 70% agreed that education monitoring authority improve quality of education.

### 3.2. Analysis of Qualitative Data

In this section the qualitative data obtained from the semi structured interview is presented. Interviews were written and transcribe with the help of data sheets. The comprehensive analysis of themes and sub-themes were developed

regarding the quality of education in public sector schools.

**Teaching and non-teaching staff Regularity**

Other respondents said

that**……**

Head of the institution play an important role to the promotion of quality education in public sector schools. One of the participants pointed out that: Principal of school is a leader of that school. The leader of the school control and organize all the curricular co-curricular activities in schools (Interviewed).

**Teacher Absenteeism**

Participant stated

that……

Regularity of the teachers in the institution is known as student driven aspect and teacher driven aspect. Teacher performance shows a dynamic part in the lives of the students. Besides, these teachers help many more roles in teaching learning process likes: arrange the nature of the classrooms, construct a heartfelt environment and becomes a role model. For the smooth function of each and every institution head must be regular (Interviewed).

One of the respondents stated
that……

Education monitoring authority provides measure of success and failure and generates information why things went right and wrong. Participants agree that teachers were not regular before monitoring authority. One of the new appointed SST Teacher through NTS said that now teachers are coming to schools regularly and attend their classes regularly ( Interviewed).

**Quality Education**

Another participant stated……
…….

Majority of the heads were not too much satisfied from the monitoring authority. One head was asked how to improve the quality of education in public sector schools. Heads said department should be made functional by proper check and balances inside the department. From top to bottom is hierarchy, each and every staff is involved in his own work only. Political affiliations of the heads and teachers with the politician should strongly be checked (Interviewed).

To improve quality of education in public sector secondary school it is necessary that primary education should be improved. Poor primary education adversely effecting on secondary education. One senior principal said that I have experiences that lake of coordination between education officers and district monitoring officers creates issues. Another, head said that it needs strong coordination between monitoring authority and the district education officer (Interviewed).

### 3.3. Qualitative findings

Evidence of the study shows that education monitoring authority reduced teacher absenteeism. The findings revealed that quality of education improved by the education monitoring authority like teaching and non-teaching staff absenteeism and regularity, Monitoring authority pointed our many problems and issues which are negative affecting the performance of schools; Lack of coordination among the staff of monitoring authority and the district education officer.

Another problem is that Causal leave are allowed for the teacher. Teaching staffs are on causal leave but the data collection and monitoring assistant marks them absent. The findings from the survey and interviews data also revealed that

the majority of the principals, teachers, students and their parents said that the academic achievement of the students is little bit improved hereby the regularity of teachers.

## 4. Discussion and future Research

The proper practical enquiry is move toward as follow; first the nature of the education monitoring authority in all school must be tested**.** The study conducted by Ferguson et al. (2000) interested in the Ofsted regulatory framework, might take special note of these small but well-determined negative effects on students in the year of inspection**. (**Boyne, and Gould-Williams, 2003) recommendation for the improvement of any organization are; the administrators must make decisions concerning accountability, like decisions about schools' improvement, the dismissal of teachers, or staff's promotion. Several studies conducted on monitoring and inspection, such as (Ilgen et al., 1979; Jacob 2005; Brimblecombe, et al., 1995; Luginbuhl et al. 2009; Matthews, and Sammons, 2004; Allen and Burgess 2012; Srivastava et al., 2013) consider that the introduction of result-based monitoring and feedback-based inspection improve quality of education in schools. These studies also pointed out, that parents are primarily concerned about the atmosphere, pedagogical climate, working methods, safety, and clarity of regulations, waiting lists for special education, academic achievement, and reputation of the school and about decisions concerning the promotion of pupils to the next class. Another study conducted by (Lindgren, et al., 2012) distinguishes 51 characteristics to summarize the features of monitoring and Inspection in many different European countries.

Importantly, the education monitoring staff should develop professionally and apply holistic approaches to monitoring and inspection. Training is needed for the data collection and monitoring assistant to change the behavior of the monitors. Besides, well experiences staffs like retired teachers and principals should be hired as inspectors instead of the fresh monitoring staffs. They will give guidelines to the principals and the teachers by using his/her experiences for the improvement of quality of education. Government should provide transport facilities to all the public sector schools especially to the female staff in the fare flung area of the province.

## References


1. Allen, R., & Burgess, S. (2012). How should we treat under-performing schools? a regression discontinuity analysis of school inspections in England. Bristol: CMPO.
2. Baxter, J., & Clarke, J. (2013). Farewell to the tick box inspector? Ofsted and the changing regime of school inspection in England. Oxford Review of Education, 39(5), 702-718.
3. Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. Educational administration quarterly, 35(3), 349-378.
4. Boyne, G., & Gould-Williams, J. (2003). Planning and performance in public organizations an empirical analysis. Public Management Review, 5(1), 115-132.
5. Brimblecombe, N., Ormston, M., & Shaw, M. (1995). Teachers' perceptions of school inspection: A stressful experience. Cambridge Journal of Education, 25(1), 53-61.
6. Chen, H. (1990). Theory-driven evaluations. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
7. Cook, T. D. (2000). The false choice between theory-based evaluation and experimentation. In P. J. Rogers, T. A. Hacsi, A. Petrosino, & T. A. Huebner (Eds.), Program theory in evaluation: Challenges and opportunities (New directions in evaluation, 87). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
8. Creswell, J. W. (2003). A framework for design. Research design: Qualitative,

quantitative, and mixed methods approach, 9-11.
9. Creswell, J. W. (2009). Mapping the field of mixed methods research. Journal of mixed methods research, 3(2), 9
10. Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research, 209(240), 209-240.
11. Ehren, M. C. M., Altrichter, H., McNamara, G., & O'Hara, J. (2013). Impact of school inspections on improvement of schools—describing assumptions on causal mechanisms in six European countries. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 25(1), 3-43.
12. Ferguson, N., Earley, P., Fidler, P., & Ouston, J. (2000). Improving schools and inspection: the self-inspecting school. London: Paul Chapman
13. Hafsa, N. E. (2019). Mixed methods research: An overview for beginner researchers. Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics, 58(1), p45-48.
14. Hughes, G., Mears, R., & Winch, C. (1997). An inspector calls? Regulation and accountability in three public services. Policy & Politics, 25(3), 299-313.
15. Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D., & Taylor, M. S. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. Journal of applied psychology, 64(4), 349.
16. Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. Field methods, 18(1), 3-20.
17. Jacob, B. A. (2005). Accountability, incentives and behavior: The impact of high-stakes testing in the Chicago Public Schools. Journal of public Economics, 89(5-6), 761-796.
18. Jones, K., &Tymms, P. (2014). Ofsted's role in promoting school improvement: the mechanisms of the school inspection system in England. Oxford Review of Education, 40(3), 315-330.
19. Korpershoek, H., Harms, T., de Boer, H., van Kuijk, M., &Doolaard, S. (2016). A meta-analysis of the effects of classroom management strategies and classroom management programs on students' academic, behavioral, emotional, and motivational outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 86(3), 643-680
20. Leeuw, F. L. (2003). Reconstructing program theories: Methods available and problems to be solved. American journal of evaluation, 24(1), 5-20.
21. Lindgren, J., Hult, A., Segerholm, C., &Rönnberg, L. (2012). Mediating school inspection: Key dimensions and keywords in agency text production 2003–2010. Education Inquiry, 3(4), 569-590.
22. Luginbuhl, R., Webbink, D., & de Wolf, I. (2009). Do inspections improve primary school performance? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 31, 221–23
23. Macnab, D. (2004) Hearts, minds and external supervision of schools: direction and development. In: Educational Review, 56(1), 53-64
24. Matthews, P., & Sammons, P. (2004). Improvement through inspection. London: Ofsted.
25. Samad, A. U., & Ali, A. (2020). Impact of Independent Monitoring Unit (IMU) on Public Sector Secondary Schools Performances in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Dialogue (1819-6462), 15(1).
26. Sammons, P. (1995). Key characteristics of effective schools: A review of school effectiveness research. B & MBC Distribution Services, 9 Headlands Business Park, Ringwood, Hants BH24 3PB, England, United Kingdom.

27. Srivastava, A., Brewer, A. K., Mauser-Bunschoten, E. P., Key, N. S., Kitchen, S., Llinas, A., ... & Treatment Guidelines Working Group the World Federation of Hemophilia. (2013). Guidelines for the management of hemophilia. Hemophilia, 19(1), e1-e47.
28. Subedi, D. (2016). Explanatory sequential mixed method design as the third research community of knowledge claim. American Journal of Educational Research, 4(7), 570-577.
29. Weiss, C. (1997). Theory-based evaluation: Past, present and future. In D. J. Rog (Ed.), Progress and future directions in evaluation, new directions for evaluation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass