Compare the Quality of Administration in Public and Punjab Education Foundation Funded Schools at Secondary Level

Sabir Hussain
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Educational Training, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: sabirjanmarri@gmail.com
Dr. Masood Ahmad
Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Training, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: masood.ahmad@iub.edu.pk
Dr. Ijaz Hussain
Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab, Pakistan Ijhussain@gudge.edu.pk, ijazhussainchou@gmail.com
Aqila Hafeez
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Education, Government College University, Faisalabad. Email: aqilakaemail@gmail.com
Dr. Rukhsana Sardar
Lecturer in Education, University of Narowal, Narowal. Email: rukhsana.sardar@uon.edu.pk
Fakhar-Ul-Zaman
Visiting Lecturer of Education, University of Narowal, Narowal. Email: Visiting.fakhar-ul-zaman@uon.edu.pk

Abstract

Effective school administration fosters a supportive learning environment, promotes quality teaching, and ensures efficient resource utilization to optimize student outcomes. Public and PEF secondary schools in Punjab emphasize quality administration, fostering a conducive learning environment, supporting qualified teachers, and optimizing resource utilization to enhance student outcomes. The said research was a cross-sectional survey approach and quantitative. Data was collected from 300 teachers in three districts of Punjab province. Data was collected through a 5-point Likert type scale and analyzed through an independent samples t-test. It was found that teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally have positive perceptions of school administration. However, teachers in government schools tend to have more positive perceptions than teachers in PEF-funded schools. It found that government schools may be more effective in carrying out vital administrative functions and processes, supporting teachers' professional development, creating a positive and supportive work environment, and fostering a culture of continuous improvement and innovation. It is suggested that PEF schools should benchmark government schools' administrative practices to improve teacher perceptions and enhance overall school effectiveness.
Keywords: Quality of Administration, PEF schools, Public secondary schools, Administration Effectiveness.

Introduction

School administration encompasses the various tasks and processes involved in managing and overseeing the operations of a school (Shauli Mukherjee et al., 2022). It includes many responsibilities, from ensuring students' academic success to maintaining a safe and supportive learning environment. The quality of school administration plays a crucial role in determining the overall quality of education (Aris et al., 2023). Strong leadership, efficient management practices, and a commitment to continuous improvement characterize effective school administration. In Pakistan, the public sector and Punjab Education Foundation (PEF) funded schools represent two distinct types of educational institutions, each with its unique administrative structure and challenges (Irfan, 2021; Halai & Durrani, 2020).

The Punjab Education Foundation (PEF) is a provincial government organization that provides financial and technical support to private schools in Punjab, Pakistan. The PEF has several programs supporting secondary education (Hussain et al., 2022). The Punjab Education Foundation (PEF) is an autonomous statutory body established by the Government of Punjab, Pakistan, to promote and encourage private-sector education, focusing on non-commercial and non-profit institutions. PEF's initiatives aim to enhance access to quality education, particularly for underprivileged students, by providing partner schools with financial assistance, teacher training, and curriculum support (Umar et al., 2023). PEF's efforts have significantly expanded the reach of private education in Punjab, contributing to improved literacy rates and educational outcomes for thousands of students (Hussain et al., 2022).

The Punjab government operates a network of secondary schools across the province, providing quality education to students from diverse backgrounds. These schools follow a standardized curriculum and are staffed by qualified teachers, ensuring a comprehensive learning experience (Amir et al., 2023). Government secondary schools offer free education, eliminating financial barriers and promoting student accessibility. They also provide access to technology resources, fostering digital literacy and enhancing learning. Focusing on creating a supportive learning environment, government secondary schools in Punjab strive to empower students to succeed academically and prepare them for future endeavors (Mamun-ur-Rashid, 2023; Hafeez et al., 2023).

Key Responsibilities of School Administration:

1. *Educational Leadership:* School administrators provide leadership and guidance to teachers, staff, and students to ensure the school's mission and goals are met. They develop and implement educational policies and programs, evaluate curriculum and instruction, and foster a culture of continuous improvement (Stronge & Xu, 2021).

2. *Student Support and Services:* School administrators oversee various student support services, including academic counseling, behavioral interventions, and special education programs. They collaborate with teachers, counselors, and other professionals to address the individual needs of students (Arfasa & Weldmeskel, 2020).

3. *Personnel Management:* School administrators recruit, hire, train, and evaluate teachers and other staff members. They establish performance expectations, provide professional development opportunities, and address personnel issues as needed (Wang et al., 2020).

4. *Financial Management:* School administrators manage the school's budget, ensuring that resources are allocated effectively to support educational programs and operations. They work with the school board and community to secure funding and maintain financial transparency (Cheng, 2022).

5. *Facilities and Operations:* School administrators oversee the maintenance and upkeep of school facilities, ensuring a safe and healthy learning environment. They manage transportation, technology infrastructure, and other logistical aspects of school operations (Mubita, 2021).

6. *Community Engagement:* School administrators foster positive relationships with parents, community members, and stakeholders. They communicate school news and events, engage in community partnerships, and address community concerns (Spillane & Sun, 2022).

7. *Legal and Regulatory Compliance:* School administrators ensure that the school adheres to all applicable laws, regulations, and policies. They oversee student data privacy, exceptional education compliance, and other legal matters (Huber & Helm, 2020).

8. *Crisis Management and Emergency Preparedness:* School administrators develop and implement plans to respond to emergencies and crises (Hussain et al., 2022). They train staff and students on emergency procedures, coordinate with community agencies, and ensure the safety of all school occupants (Shah et al., 2020).

9. *Continuous Improvement and Innovation:* School administrators strive to improve the school's performance and implement innovative practices continuously. They collect and analyze data, conduct evaluations, and seek feedback from stakeholders to identify areas for growth (Kilag et al., 2023).

10. *Advocacy and Public Relations:* School administrators advocate for the school's interests to the school board, community members, and elected officials. They promote the school's achievements, address public concerns, and build a positive reputation for the school (Medina et al., 2020).

Effective school administration is crucial for creating a supportive learning environment that fosters student success. School administrators play a vital role in shaping students' educational experiences and ensuring schools fulfill their mission to provide quality education (Hussain, 2021).

Study Rationale

The rationale for conducting this comparative study is based on the following considerations:

1. The quality of administration in schools significantly impacts student learning outcomes.

2. Public and PEF-funded schools represent distinct educational institutions with different administrative structures and challenges.
3. A limited body of research compares the administration quality in Pakistan's public and PEF-funded schools.
4. The findings of this study can provide valuable insights for improving administrative efficiency and effectiveness in both types of schools.

Problem Statement

The quality of administration in schools significantly impacts student learning outcomes. However, a lack of comprehensive research compares the administration quality in public and PEF-funded schools at the secondary level in Pakistan. This study aimed to address this gap by examining the key administrative functions and processes, assessing the effectiveness of administrative practices, and comparing the overall administration quality between public and PEF-funded schools. The findings of this study will provide valuable insights for improving administrative efficiency and effectiveness in both types of schools.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study drew upon several key concepts from educational administration and organizational theory. These concepts provide a lens for understanding the factors that influence the quality of school administration and for comparing the administrative practices of public and PEF-funded schools.

1. New Institutional Theory (NIT)

NIT emphasizes the role of formal rules, regulations, and norms in shaping organizational behavior. In the context of schools, NIT suggests that different sets of institutional rules and regulations may influence the administrative practices of public and PEF-funded schools. For example, public schools may be more constrained by government regulations, while PEF-funded schools may have greater autonomy.

2. Resource Dependency Theory (RDT)

RDT argues that organizations depend on external resources for survival and success. In the context of schools, RDT suggests that their different resource bases may influence public and PEF-funded schools' administrative practices. For example, public schools may rely more on government funding, while PEF-funded schools may rely more on private donations.

3. Contingency Theory

Contingency Theory suggests no single best way to manage an organization. The most effective administrative practices will depend on the organization's specific context. In the context of schools, Contingency Theory suggests that the administrative practices of public and PEF-funded schools may need to be tailored to their unique needs and challenges.

4. Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder Theory emphasizes the importance of considering the interests of all stakeholders in an organization, including employees, customers, and the community. In the context of schools, Stakeholder Theory suggests that the administrative practices of public and PEF-funded schools should be responsive to the needs of students, teachers, parents, and the wider community.

5. Transformational Leadership

Transformational Leadership emphasizes the role of leaders in inspiring and empowering others to achieve organizational goals. In the context of schools, Transformational Leadership suggests that effective school administrators can create a positive and motivating school culture that fosters student learning and success.

Application of Theoretical Framework

These theoretical concepts were used to analyze the data collected in this study. The study's findings were used to identify areas of strength and weakness in the administration of public and PEF-funded schools. The study provided recommendations for improving administrative efficiency and effectiveness in both types of schools.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study was based on the assumption that the quality of administration in schools was influenced by a combination of factors, including:

i. *Contextual factors:* These factors are external to the school and include the legal and regulatory environment, the social and economic context, and the level of community support.

ii. *Inputs:* These factors are the resources that schools receive and use for administrative functions. They include financial resources, human resources, and physical resources.

iii. *Processes:* These factors are schools' activities to carry out their administrative functions. They include planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, and controlling.

iv. *Outputs:* These factors are the products of the school's administrative processes. They include student learning outcomes, teacher satisfaction, and parent satisfaction.

Conceptual Model

The following conceptual model illustrates how the factors in the conceptual framework are related to each other:

Contextual Factors --> Inputs --> Processes --> Outputs

Contextual Factors

The contextual factors that influence the quality of administration in schools include:

a) *Legal and regulatory environment:* Public schools are subject to a more complex legal and regulatory environment than PEF-funded schools. This can make it more difficult for public schools to implement innovative administrative practices.

b) *Social and economic context:* The social and economic context in which a school is located can influence its administrative practices. For example, schools in low-income

communities may need more resources for administrative tasks such as discipline and security.

c) *Level of community support:* A school's level of community support can influence its administrative practices. Schools with solid community support may be more likely to engage in collaborative decision-making and involve parents in the administrative process.

Inputs

The inputs that influence the quality of administration in schools include:

a) *Financial resources:* Public schools typically have more financial resources than PEF-funded schools. However, PEF-funded schools may have more flexibility in allocating their resources.

b) *Human resources:* The quality of the school's staff is a critical factor in the success of its administrative processes. Public schools may have more difficulty recruiting and retaining qualified staff than PEF-funded schools.

c) *Physical resources:* The school's physical facilities can also influence its administrative practices. Schools with inadequate facilities may be more likely to experience problems such as overcrowding and disrepair.

Processes

The processes that influence the quality of administration in schools include:

a) *Planning:* Schools need to have effective planning processes in place to ensure they use their resources effectively and achieve their goals.

b) *Organizing:* Schools need a clear organizational structure to ensure everyone knows who is responsible for what.

c) *Staffing:* Schools need to recruit and retain qualified staff and provide them with the training and support they need to be successful.

d) *Directing:* School administrators must provide clear direction and guidance to their staff.

e) *Coordinating:* School administrators need to coordinate the activities of different departments and staff members.

f) *Controlling:* School administrators need to monitor and evaluate the performance of their staff and programs to ensure that they are meeting their goals.

Outputs

The outputs that influence the quality of administration in schools include:

a) *Student learning outcomes:* The most important output of a school is student learning outcomes. Effective administration can help to create a positive and supportive learning environment that fosters student success.

b) *Teacher satisfaction:* Satisfied teachers are more likely to be effective teachers. Effective administration can help to create a positive and collegial working environment that supports teacher satisfaction.

c) *Parent satisfaction:* Parents are essential stakeholders in the education of their children. Effective administration can help to build strong relationships with parents and involve them in the school community.

Conclusion

The conceptual framework presented in this paper provides a valuable lens for understanding the factors that influence the quality of administration in schools. The framework can guide future research on school administration and inform the development of policies and practices to improve administration quality in public and PEF-funded schools.

Research Objectives

This comparative study examined the administration quality in public and PEF-funded schools at the secondary level. The specific objectives of the study were:

1. Identify the key administrative functions and processes in public and PEF-funded schools.
2. Assess the effectiveness of administrative practices in both types of schools.
3. Compare the overall quality of administration between public and PEF-funded schools.
4. Conclude and provide recommendations for improving administrative efficiency in both types of schools.

Research Questions

1. What were the key administrative functions and processes in public and PEF-funded schools at the secondary level?
2. How do teachers in public and PEF-funded schools perceive the effectiveness of school administration?
3. How does the overall administration quality differ between public and PEF-funded schools at the secondary level?

Significance of the Study

This comparative study of administration quality in public and PEF-funded schools at the secondary level in Pakistan can significantly contribute to our understanding of school administration and its impact on student learning. The study findings will be valuable for policymakers, school administrators, teachers, and parents as they strive to improve the quality of education for all students in Pakistan.

1. They will provide valuable insights into the administration quality in Pakistan's public and PEF-funded schools.
2. They will inform policy decisions and resource allocation for improving administrative practices in both types of schools.
3. They will contribute to the broader body of knowledge on school administration and its impact on student learning outcomes.

Research Design

Type of Study: Cross-sectional survey

Data Collection Method: Survey questionnaire
Target Population: Teachers in public and PEF-funded schools at the secondary level
Sampling Method: Simple random sampling
Sample Size: 300 participants (150 from public schools, 150 from PEF-funded schools)
Data Analysis:

1. Descriptive statistics to summarize the data
2. Inferential statistics to compare the perceptions of school teachers in public and PEF-funded schools

Instruments

The study used a survey questionnaire that measures the following constructs:

i. Perceptions of administrative effectiveness
ii. Administrative functions and processes
iii. Compare the overall quality of administration

Procedure

a. Develop the survey questionnaire
b. Obtain ethical approval
c. Select the sample of participants
d. Administer the survey questionnaire
e. Collect and analyze the data
f. Draw conclusions and provide recommendations

Sample of the Study

Table 1 Sample of the Study

The first stage for the selection of sample institutions		
Districts	Public	PEF
Multan	10	10
Bahawalpur	10	10
D.G. Khan	10	10
Total	30	30
In the second stage, teachers were selected through a random sampling method.		
D.G. Khan	50	50
Multan	50	50
Bahawalpur	50	50
Total Sample		300

Results of the Study

Table 2   Section 1: Key Administrative Functions and Processes

Statements	School Type	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed), α=0.05

Statement	School Type	Mean	Std. Dev	t	df	Sig.
School administrators effectively manage the school's financial, human, and physical resources.	Government Schools	1.49	.800	23.307	298	.000
	PEF Schools	4.05	1.086			
Teachers in your school are professionally well-qualified	Government Schools	3.98	1.184	.620	298	.536
	PEF Schools	3.89	1.412			
School administrators provide adequate support for teachers' professional development.	Government Schools	3.63	1.407	5.417	298	.000
	PEF Schools	2.71	1.552			
School administrators foster a collaborative and supportive work environment for teachers.	Government Schools	3.34	1.492	5.440	298	.000
	PEF Schools	2.41	1.480			
School administrators effectively monitor student performance and provide data-driven feedback to teachers.	Government Schools	3.68	1.467	7.514	298	.000
	PEF Schools	2.39	1.514			

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators effectively manage the school's resources, but PEF funded schools' mean value was significantly high (mean rating of 1.49 for public schools, 4.05 for PEF schools, the value of t-test was 23.307 and $p < 0.05$). Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools agree that teachers are professionally well qualified (mean rating of 3.98 for public schools, 3.89 for PEF schools, the value of t-test was .620 and $p > 0.05$). Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators provide adequate support for teachers' professional development (mean rating of 3.63 for public schools significantly high, 2.71 for PEF schools, the value of t-test was 5.417 and $p < 0.05$). Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators foster a collaborative and supportive work environment for teachers (mean rating of 3.34 for public schools significantly high, 2.41 for PEF schools, value of t-test was 5.440 and $p < 0.05$). Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators effectively monitor student performance and provide data-driven feedback to teachers (mean rating of 3.68 for public schools significantly high, 2.39 for PEF schools, the value of t-test was 7.514 and $p < 0.05$).

Table 3   Section 2: Teachers' Perceptions of School Administration Effectiveness

Statements	School Type	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed), α=0.05
School administrators are effective in supporting my	Government Schools	3.77	1.405	.039	298	.969

Statements	School Type	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed), α=0.05
teaching and promoting student learning.	PEF Schools	3.77	1.586			
School administrators communicate effectively with me about school policies, procedures, and expectations.	Government Schools	3.81	1.304	13.838	298	.000
	PEF Schools	1.88	1.099			
School administrators provide me with adequate resources and support to do my job effectively.	Government Schools	3.73	1.346	-6.030	298	.000
	PEF Schools	4.49	.784			
School administrators value my input and feedback in decision-making processes.	Government Schools	3.79	1.292	-5.023	298	.000
	PEF Schools	4.43	.846			
School administrators create a positive and supportive school climate that fosters student learning.	Government Schools	3.61	1.474	8.275	298	.000
	PEF Schools	2.25	1.371			

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators effectively support their teaching and promote student learning (mean rating of 3.77 for public schools, 3.77 for PEF schools, value of t-test was 7.514 and p> 0.05). Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools agree that school administrators communicate effectively with them about school policies, procedures, and expectations (mean rating of 3.81 for public schools significantly high, 1.88 for PEF schools, the value of t-test was 13.838 and p< 0.05). Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators provide adequate resources and support to do their job effectively (mean rating of 3.73 for public schools, 4.49 for PEF schools significantly high, value of t-test was -6.030 and p< 0.05).

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators value their input and feedback in decision-making processes (mean rating of 3.79 for public schools, 4.43 for PEF schools significantly high, value of t-test was -5.023 and p< 0.05). Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators create a positive and supportive school climate that fosters student learning (mean rating of 3.61 for public schools significantly high, 2.25 for PEF schools, the value of t-test was 8.275 and p< 0.05).

Table 4   Section 3: Overall Quality of Administration

Statements	School Type	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed), α=0.05

		Mean	Std. Dev	t	df	Sig.
School administration effectively manages the school's operations and achieves its goals.	Government Schools	3.95	1.157	-.524	298	.601
	PEF Schools	4.02	1.266			
School administration is transparent and accountable to teachers, parents, and the community.	Government Schools	3.81	1.373	11.603	298	.000
	PEF Schools	1.91	1.472			
School administration fosters a culture of continuous improvement and innovation.	Government Schools	3.51	1.514	3.675	298	.000
	PEF Schools	2.85	1.565			
School administration effectively addresses challenges and adapts to changing circumstances.	Government Schools	2.96	1.532	6.902	298	.000
	PEF Schools	1.85	1.228			
School administration is critical in creating a high-quality learning environment for students.	Government Schools	3.69	1.410	5.709	298	.000
	PEF Schools	2.73	1.501			

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administration effectively manages the school's operations and achieves its goals (mean rating of 3.95 for public schools, 4.02 for PEF schools significantly high, value of t-test was -.524 and p> 0.05). Teachers in public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administration is transparent and accountable to teachers, parents, and the community (mean rating of 3.81 for public schools significantly high, 1.91 for PEF schools, the value of t-test was 11.603 and p< 0.05). Teachers in public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administration fosters a culture of continuous improvement and innovation (mean rating of 3.51 for public schools significantly high, 2.85 for PEF schools, the value of t-test was 3.675 and p< 0.05).

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administration effectively addresses challenges and adapts to changing circumstances (mean rating of 2.96 for public schools significantly high, 1.85 for PEF schools, value of t-test was 6.902 and p< 0.05). Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administration plays a critical role in creating a high-quality learning environment for students (mean rating of 3.69 for public schools significantly high, 2.73 for PEF schools, the value of t-test was 5.709 and p< 0.05).

Table 5   All Three Factors

Factors	School Type	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed), α=0.05

Key Administrative Functions and Processes	Government Schools	3.7373	.60430	14.593	298	.601
	PEF Schools	2.5747	.76616			
Teachers' Perceptions of School Administration Effectiveness	Government Schools	3.7413	.68798	5.573	298	.000
	PEF Schools	3.3627	.46826			
Overall Quality of Administration.	Government Schools	3.5827	.69935	12.261	298	.000
	PEF Schools	2.6720	.58173			

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree about the factor "Key Administrative Functions and Processes" (mean rating of 3.7373 for public schools significantly high, 2.5747 for PEF schools, value of t-test was 14.593 and p> 0.05). Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree about the factor "Teachers' Perceptions of School Administration Effectiveness" (mean rating of 3.7413 for public schools significantly high, 3.3627 for PEF schools, the value of t-test was 5.573 and p< 0.05). Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree about the factor "Overall Quality of Administration" (mean rating of 3.5827 for public schools significantly high, 2.6720 for PEF schools, the value of t-test was 12.261 and p< 0.05).

Table 6   Average of All Three Factors

	School Type	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t*	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed), α=0.05
All Factors	Government Schools	3.6871	.48745	16.817	298	.000
	PEF Schools	2.8698	.34163			

Overall, the findings suggest that public and PEF funded school teachers generally have positive perceptions of school administration. However, teachers in government schools tend to have more positive perceptions than teachers in PEF-funded schools. This suggests that government schools may be more effective in carrying out key administrative functions and processes, supporting teachers' professional development, creating a positive and supportive work environment, and fostering a culture of continuous improvement and innovation.

Discussion

Key Administrative Functions and Processes

Resource Management

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators effectively manage the school's resources. However, the mean rating for PEF-funded schools (4.05) was significantly higher than that for public schools (1.49). This suggests that PEF-funded schools may have more resources available to them or be more efficient in using their resources.

Professional Development

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators provide adequate support for teachers' professional development. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean ratings for public schools (3.63) and PEF-funded schools (2.71). This suggests that PEF-funded schools may support teachers' professional development more than public schools.

Work Environment

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators foster a collaborative and supportive work environment for teachers. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean ratings for public schools (3.34) and PEF-funded schools (2.41). This suggests that PEF-funded schools may have a more collaborative and supportive work environment than public schools.

Student Monitoring and Feedback

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators effectively monitor student performance and provide data-driven feedback to teachers. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean ratings for public schools (3.68) and PEF-funded schools (2.39). This suggests that PEF-funded schools may be more effective at monitoring student performance and providing teacher feedback.

Teachers' Perceptions of School Administration Effectiveness

Teacher Support

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators effectively support their teaching and promote student learning. This suggests that administrators in both types of schools are providing teachers with the support they need to be successful.

Communication

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools agree that school administrators communicate effectively with them about school policies, procedures, and expectations. This suggests that administrators in both types of schools are keeping teachers informed and involved in the decision-making process.

Resources and Support

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators provide adequate resources and support to do their jobs effectively. However, a statistically significant difference exists between the mean ratings for public schools (3.73) and PEF-funded schools (4.49). This suggests that PEF-funded schools may provide more resources and support to teachers than public schools.

Teacher Input and Feedback

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators value their input and feedback in decision-making processes. However, a

statistically significant difference exists between the mean ratings for public schools (3.79) and PEF-funded schools (4.43). This suggests that PEF-funded schools may value teacher input and feedback more than public schools.

School Climate

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administrators create a positive and supportive school climate that fosters student learning. However, a statistically significant difference exists between the mean ratings for public schools (3.61) and PEF-funded schools (2.25). This suggests that PEF-funded schools may have a more positive and supportive climate than public schools.

Overall Quality of Administration

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administration effectively manages the school's operations and achieves its goals. While the mean rating for PEF-funded schools (4.02) was slightly higher than for public schools (3.95), the difference was not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). This suggests that both types of schools are generally well-managed and are achieving their goals.

Transparency and Accountability

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administration is transparent and accountable to teachers, parents, and the community. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean ratings for public schools (3.81) and PEF-funded schools (1.91). This suggests that public schools may be more transparent and accountable than PEF-funded schools.

Continuous Improvement and Innovation

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administration fosters a culture of continuous improvement and innovation. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean ratings for public schools (3.51) and PEF-funded schools (2.85). This suggests that public schools may focus more on continuous improvement and innovation than PEF-funded schools.

Adaptability and Challenge Management

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administration effectively addresses challenges and adapts to changing circumstances. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean ratings for public schools (2.96) and PEF-funded schools (1.85). This suggests that public schools may address challenges and adapt to changing circumstances more effectively than PEF-funded schools.

Role in Creating a High-Quality Learning Environment

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree that school administration plays a critical role in creating a high-quality learning environment for students. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean ratings for public schools (3.69) and PEF-funded schools (2.73). This suggests that public

schools may be more successful at creating a high-quality learning environment than PEF-funded schools.

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally agree about the effectiveness of key administrative functions and processes. However, there is a statistically significant difference between the mean ratings for public schools (3.7373) and PEF-funded schools (2.5747). This suggests that public schools may be more effective regarding key administrative functions and processes.

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally have positive perceptions of school administration effectiveness. However, there is a statistically significant difference between the mean ratings for public schools (3.7413) and PEF-funded schools (3.3627). This suggests that teachers in public schools may have more positive perceptions of school administration effectiveness than teachers in PEF-funded schools.

Teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools generally rate the overall quality of administration as good. However, there is a statistically significant difference between the mean ratings for public schools (3.5827) and PEF-funded schools (2.6720). This suggests that public schools may be rated higher in terms of overall administration quality than PEF-funded schools.

Overall, the findings of this study suggest that public schools may have some advantages over PEF-funded schools in terms of key administrative functions and processes, teachers' perceptions of school administration effectiveness, and overall quality of administration.

Conclusions of the Study

The findings of this study suggest that PEF-funded schools may have some advantages over public schools in terms of resource management, professional development, work environment, and student monitoring and feedback.

The findings of this study suggest that PEF-funded schools may have some advantages over public schools in terms of teacher support, communication, resources and support, teacher input and feedback, and school climate.

Public Schools

i. Continue to invest in training for school administrators on key administrative functions and processes. This will help ensure that school administrators effectively manage their resources, provide professional development for teachers, and create a supportive work environment.

ii. Continue to create a positive and supportive school climate that fosters student learning. This can be done by focusing on creating a school culture based on mutual respect, trust, and collaboration.

PEF-Funded Schools

i. Invest in training for school administrators on key administrative functions and processes. This will help ensure that PEF-funded schools can provide their students with the best possible education.
ii. Create a more supportive environment for teachers. This can be done by providing teachers with the resources they need to be successful, such as professional development opportunities and adequate planning time.
iii. Focus on creating a positive and supportive school climate that fosters student learning. This can be done by creating a school culture based on mutual respect, trust, and collaboration.

Recommendations

Based on the previous discussion, here are my recommendations:

Public Schools

1. Continue to invest in training for school administrators on key administrative functions and processes. This will help ensure that school administrators effectively manage their resources, provide professional development for teachers, and create a supportive work environment.
2. Continue to create a positive and supportive school climate that fosters student learning. This can be done by focusing on creating a school culture based on mutual respect, trust, and collaboration.
3. Encourage and support teachers in adopting effective teaching strategies that align with the school's curriculum and goals.
4. Provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate and share best practices.
5. Implement regular assessments to track student progress and identify areas for improvement.
6. To enhance student learning, foster open communication and partnerships with parents and the community.

PEF-Funded Schools

1. Invest in training for school administrators on key administrative functions and processes. This will help ensure that PEF-funded schools can provide their students with the best possible education.
2. Create a more supportive environment for teachers. This can be done by providing teachers with the resources they need to be successful, such as professional development opportunities, adequate planning time, and access to technology.
3. Focus on creating a positive and supportive school climate that fosters student learning. This can be done by creating a school culture based on mutual respect, trust, and collaboration.
4. Implement effective assessment practices to measure student growth and identify areas for improvement.

5. Provide opportunities for parents and the community to be involved in the school's decision-making processes.
6. Encourage innovation and creativity in teaching approaches to cater to diverse learner needs.
7. Foster a culture of continuous improvement by seeking feedback from teachers, parents, and students.

References

Amir, M., Hussain, S., & Muhammad, S. (2022). Identification of the Need for Teacher Training at The Primary School Level. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, 3(1), 165-176.

Arfasa, A. J., & Weldmeskel, F. M. (2020). Practices and challenges of guidance and counseling services in secondary schools. *Emerging science journal*, 4(3), 183-191.

Aris, A. A., Murthada, M., Hendra, M., Zainudin, Z., Hartini, H., Malik, M. A., & Firdaus, M. (2023). The Role of Management of Human Resources in Enhancing The Quality of Schools. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, 3(3), 11012-11023.

Cheng, Y. C. (2022). *School effectiveness and school-based management: A mechanism for development*. Taylor & Francis.

Hafeez, A., Hussain, S., Muhammad, S., & Hussain, S. (2023). Effect of PEC Exams on Quality Education in Public and Punjab Education Foundation Funded Secondary Schools. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 4(3), 358-374.

Halai, A., & Durrani, N. (2020). School Education System in Pakistan: Expansion, Access, and Equity. *Handbook of Education Systems in South Asia*, 1-30.

Huber, S. G., & Helm, C. (2020). COVID-19 and schooling: evaluation, assessment and accountability in times of crises—reacting quickly to explore key issues for policy, practice and research with the school barometer. *Educational assessment, evaluation and accountability*, 32, 237-270.

Hussain, S. (2021). Quality of Education in Public and Daanish Schools at Secondary Level. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, 2(2), 160-169.

Hussain, S., Abbas, Q., & Ahmad, A. (2022). Comparative Analyses of Environmental Risk Management at Secondary Schools Level in Punjab and its Effect on Students' Academic Achievement. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, 3(4), 36-49.

Hussain, S., Ahmad, M. S., & Hussain, S. (2022). Relationship of Teacher-Student Interaction, Learning Commitment and Student Learning Comfort at Secondary Level. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, 3(2), 156-169.

Hussain, S., Ahmad, M., Altaf, H. S., & Ahmad, M. F. (2022). Quality of Education in Public and Punjab Education Foundation Funded Schools at Secondary Level. *Journal of Research & Reflections in Education (JRRE)*, 16(2).

Irfan, S. (2021). Re-examining the link between collaborative interorganisational relationships and synergistic outcomes in public–private partnerships: Insights from the Punjab

Education Foundation's school partnerships. *Public Administration and Development*, *41*(2), 79-90.

Kilag, O. K., Tokong, C., Enriquez, B., Deiparine, J., Purisima, R., & Zamora, M. (2023). School Leaders: The Extent of Management Empowerment and Its Impact on Teacher and School Effectiveness. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education*, *1*(1), 127-140.

Mamun-ur-Rashid, M. (2023). Quality of government secondary school services in regional Bangladesh. *Heliyon*, *9*(1).

Medina, M. A., Grim, J., Cosby, G., & Brodnax, R. (2020). The power of community school councils in urban schools. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *95*(1), 73-89.

Mubita, K. (2021). Understanding school safety and security: Conceptualization and definitions. *Journal of Lexicography and Terminology (Online ISSN 2664-0899. Print ISSN 2517-9306).*, *5*(1), 76-86.

Shah, A. A., Gong, Z., Pal, I., Sun, R., Ullah, W., & Wani, G. F. (2020). Disaster risk management insight on school emergency preparedness–a case study of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, *51*, 101805.

Shauli Mukherjee, D. P. B., Pandey, M. P., & Sameem, M. M. (2022). *Fundamentals of Educational Administration, Management And Organization*. Ashok Yakkaldevi.

Spillane, J. P., & Sun, J. M. (2022). The school principal and the development of social capital in primary schools: the formative years. *School Leadership & Management*, *42*(1), 4-23.

Stronge, J. H., & Xu, X. (2021). *Qualities of effective principals*. ASCD.

Umar, Z., Hussain, S., Khan, I., & Perveen, F. (2023). Parents' Involvement Effect on Students' Academic Achievement and Quality Education in Public and Private Schools at Elementary Level. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, *4*(3), 400-411.

Wang, J., Straubhaar, R., & Ong, C. (2020). Teacher and Administrator Experiences with Teacher Recruitment, Retention and Support in a California Charter-Led Turnaround School. *ie: inquiry in education*, *12*(1), 13.