

## Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation

Sabir Hussain

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Educational Training, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.

Email: [sabirjanmarri@gmail.com](mailto:sabirjanmarri@gmail.com)

Qaisar Abbas

M.Phil. Education, University of Education Lahore, DG Khan Campus, Punjab, Pakistan.

Working in the Punjab School Education Department as a Teacher

Email: [ctsc53dgkhan@gmail.com](mailto:ctsc53dgkhan@gmail.com)

Sabir Hussain

M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Education, Institute of Southern Punjab, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.

Email: [sabirhussain148@gmail.com](mailto:sabirhussain148@gmail.com)

Received on: 09-10-2023

Accepted on: 19-11-2023

### **Abstract**

To maximize student results, effective school administration creates a safe space for learning, encourages high-quality instruction, and makes sure that school resources are used efficiently. Public and PEF secondary schools in Punjab prioritize effective management, creating a supportive learning atmosphere, assisting certified educators, and making the most of available resources to improve student achievement. The aforementioned study used a quantitative and cross-sectional survey design. Three districts of Punjab province were surveyed to get data from 300 teachers. An independent samples t-test was used to assess the data acquired from a 5-point Likert scale. School administrators are well-respected among educators in both publicly funded and privately-funded institutions. On the other hand, PEF-funded school teachers are less likely to have a positive outlook than their public school counterparts. It concluded that public schools may do a better job of carrying out critical administrative tasks, helping teachers advance their careers, building a welcoming workplace, and encouraging a spirit of constant innovation and improvement. To improve teacher opinions and overall school effectiveness, PEF schools should benchmark the administrative procedures of government schools.

**Keywords:** Administration, PEF schools, Secondary schools, Administration Effectiveness.

*Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

---

### **Introduction**

The term "school administration" refers to the wide range of responsibilities that fall under the umbrella of "school management" (Shauli Mukherjee et al., 2022). It encompasses a wide range of duties, such as making sure pupils do well in school and keeping the classroom safe and helpful. When considering the standard of education as a whole, the caliber of school management is crucial (Aris et al., 2023). Successful school administration is characterized by strong leadership, competent management methods, and a dedication to constant improvement. There are two main categories of schools in Pakistan: those supported by the government and those that receive funding from the Punjab Education Foundation (PEF). (Decimal & Durrani, 2020; Irfan, 2021).

Punjab, Pakistan's private schools receive financial and technical assistance from the Punjab Education Foundation (PEF), an agency of the provincial government. There are several secondary education initiatives funded by the PEF (Hussain et al., 2022). The Government of Punjab, Pakistan, created the Punjab Education Foundation (PEF) as an independent statutory agency to support and advance private education, particularly at non-profit and non-commercial institutions. By supplying partner schools with funding, teacher training, and curriculum support, PEF's initiatives seek to increase access to high-quality education, especially for disadvantaged pupils (Umar et al., 2023). Thousands of kids in Punjab have benefited from increased access to private education and higher literacy rates because of PEF's work (Hussain et al., 2022).

Students from all walks of life can get a high-quality secondary education through the provincial network of schools run by the Punjab government. With their qualified professors and standardized curricula, these schools provide a well-rounded education (Amir et al., 2023). Free public secondary education helps more students get the education they need by removing financial obstacles. In addition, they facilitate access to technological resources, which in turn improves education by increasing digital literacy. Government secondary schools in Punjab emphasize fostering a positive learning environment to enable pupils to achieve academic success and be prepared for their future pursuits (Mamun-ur-Rashid, 2023; Hafeez et al., 2023).

**Leadership in Education:** Administrators of educational institutions guide and support faculty, staff, and students in carrying out the institution's purpose and achieving its objectives. Curriculum and instruction are assessed, new policies and programs are created, and a growth mindset is encouraged (Stronge & Xu, 2021).

**Services and Support for Students:** Academic counseling, behavioral interventions, and special education programs are all under the purview of school administrators. They work together with educators, guidance counselors, and other experts to meet each student where they are academically and personally (Arfasa & Weldmeskel, 2020).

**Management of Personnel:** Educators and other school employees are recruited, hired, trained, and assessed by administrators. They handle personnel matters as they arise, set standards for performance, and offer chances for professional growth (Wang et al., 2020).

**Budget Management:** Educators and school leaders are responsible for overseeing the school's financial plan and allocating funds wisely to fund various programs and activities. To keep school finances open and transparent, they collaborate with the community and school board to seek for support (Cheng, 2022).

## *Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

---

Ensuring a secure and healthy learning environment is the responsibility of school administrators, who also oversee the maintenance and repair of school buildings. They oversee the school's transportation system, technological infrastructure, and other administrative functions (Mubita, 2021).

**Participation in the Community:** School leaders work to build strong bonds with parents, neighbors, and other community members. They disseminate information about school happenings, form partnerships within the community, and respond to community issues (Spillane & Sun, 2022).

**Compliance with Laws and Regulations:** It is the responsibility of school administrators to make sure that the school follows all rules and regulations. Concerning exceptional education compliance, student data privacy, and other legal concerns, they are in charge (Huber & Helm, 2020).

School administrators are responsible for creating and executing strategies to deal with potential crises and emergencies (Hussain et al., 2022). They make sure everyone at the school is safe by teaching everyone how to respond in an emergency, working with local organizations, and training teachers and students (Shah et al., 2020).

**Effortless Improvement and New Approaches:** School administrators are always looking for new ways to make their schools better. To pinpoint development opportunities, they gather and analyze data, do evaluations, and get stakeholder feedback (Kilag et al., 2023).

**Public Relations and Advocacy:** School administrators speak out for the school's best interests while communicating with community members, government authorities, and the school board. They help spread the word about the school's successes, respond to community feedback, and boost the school's image (Hussain, 2021; Medina et al., 2020).

### **Problem Statement**

Student learning results are greatly affected by the caliber of school administration. Public and PEF-funded secondary schools in Pakistan are not comparable in terms of administrative quality, nevertheless. This research set out to fill that void by comparing the general quality of administration in public and PEF-funded schools, as well as by investigating the most important administrative tasks and processes. The results of this study will help administrators at both kinds of schools become more efficient and productive.

### **Theoretical Framework**

Educational administration and organizational theory provided the theoretical underpinnings for this investigation. These ideas offer a framework for comparing the administrative practices of publicly funded schools with those of PEF-financed schools and for comprehending the elements that impact the quality of school administration.

First, the Emergence of Modern Institutional Theory (NIT)

The importance of established policies, procedures, and standards in molding organizational conduct is highlighted by NIT. According to NIT, public and PEF-funded schools may be subject to various sets of institutional restrictions that impact their administrative practices. For instance, schools supported by the PEF may have more freedom than public schools due to fewer restrictions imposed by the government.

2. Relying on resource theory (RDT)

*Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

---

Organizational success and survival, according to RDT, are dependent on resources from outside the organization. According to RDT, public and PEF-funded schools may use different administrative techniques due to their differing resource bases. For instance, private donations may play a larger role in PEF-funded schools than they do in public schools.

### 3. Precautionary Principle

There is no one optimal method of managing a company, according to Contingency Theory. The optimal administrative methods for a given organization are context-dependent. Public and PEF-funded schools may require administrative techniques that are customized to their specific demands and challenges, according to Contingency Theory in the context of schools.

### 4. The Theory of Stakeholders

All parties involved in an organization, from workers to consumers to the local community, should have their interests taken into account, according to Stakeholder Theory. According to Stakeholder Theory, public and PEF-funded schools' administrative operations ought to cater to the requirements of the community at large as well as those of instructors, parents, and students.

### 5. A Leadership Style That Transforms

Leaders, according to transformational leadership theory, should focus on motivating and enabling their followers to accomplish the organization's objectives. When applied to educational settings, Transformational Leadership posits that inspiring and motivating school cultures are possible outcomes of competent administration.

### Theoretical Framework in Practice

This study's data analysis was informed by these theoretical principles. Public and PEF-funded schools' administrative strengths and weaknesses were highlighted by the study's results. The research concluded that both kinds of schools may benefit from more effective and efficient administration.

## **Conceptual Framework**

Several important ideas from organizational theory and educational administration formed the basis of this study's theoretical framework. By applying these ideas, we can compare and contrast the administrative strategies used by public schools and those supported by the PEF, and we can gain a better grasp of the elements that affect the quality of school administration.

### 1. A Brand-New Theory of Institutions (NIT)

According to NIT, established policies and procedures have a significant impact on how businesses operate. When it comes to school administration, NIT implies that public and PEF-funded schools may be subject to different sets of institutional laws. As an example, schools that get funding from the PEF may have more freedom than public schools that are subject to stricter government rules.

### 2. The Theory of Resource Dependency (RDT)

According to RDT, organizations can't make it without relying on outside sources. When considering schools, RDT posits that the administrative procedures of public and PEF-funded schools may be impacted by their respective resource bases. Public schools, on the one hand, and PEF-funded schools, on the other, may depend more heavily on public funds and private donations, respectively.

*Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

---

### 3. A Theory of Contingencies

According to the Contingency Theory, there is no silver bullet for managing a company. The best methods of administration for a given company will vary according to its unique circumstances. According to Contingency Theory, public and PEF-funded schools may require individualized approaches to school administration to meet the specific demands of their respective environments.

### 4. Interest Group Theory

According to Stakeholder Theory, a company should prioritize the needs of its workers, consumers, and the community at large. Public and PEF-funded schools, according to Stakeholder Theory, should adapt their administrative methods to meet the demands of all stakeholders, including students, instructors, parents, and the community at large.

### 5. Leading with a Transformative Approach

To accomplish corporate objectives, transformational leaders must inspire and empower their followers. According to the theory of transformational leadership, good school administrators may influence their students to study and succeed by cultivating an inspiring and supportive school climate.

### Implementation of the Conceptual Model

The data gathered for this investigation was analyzed using these theoretical principles. Public and PEF-funded school administrators were able to use the study's results to pinpoint both their successes and failures. Both kinds of schools could benefit from the study's suggestions for enhancing administrative effectiveness and efficiency.

## 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.

## 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

1. The quality of school administration and its effect on student learning can be better understood with the help of this comparative study of public and PEF-funded secondary schools in Pakistan. All students in Pakistan deserve a high-quality education, and this study will help lawmakers, school administrators, educators, and parents get there.

*Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

2. They will shed light on the state of school administration in public and PEF-funded schools in Pakistan.
3. Decisions about policy and the distribution of resources to enhance administrative procedures in both kinds of schools will be based on these.
4. Their work will enrich our understanding of how school leadership affects students' academic performance.

### **Research Design**

Survey Design: Cross-sectional

Questionnaires are used to gather data.

Secondary school teachers in public and PEF-funded schools are the intended recipients of this message.

Approach to Sampling: A Random Sample

The sample size was 300 individuals (150 from public schools, 150 from PEF-funded schools)

Analyzing Data:

Summary statistics based on descriptive statistics

A comparison of public school teachers' versus PEF-funded school teachers' perspectives using inferential statistics

Instruments

A survey questionnaire measuring the following constructs was utilized in the study:

Views on the efficacy of administration

Operations and procedures in administration

Evaluate each department's performance relative to

Procedure

Creating the survey format

Scour the literature for ethical clearance

Pick a group of people to take part

Hand out the survey forms.

Gather the information and examine it.

Evaluate the situation and make suggestions

### **Research Sample**

Listing 1 Research Data Set

| 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 |



*Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

**Results of the Study**

**Table 2 Section 1: Key Administrative Functions and Processes**

| Statements  | School Type        | Mean | Std. Deviation | t      | df  | Sig. (2-tailed), $\alpha=0.05$ |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |
|---|--------------------|------|----------------|--------|-----|--------------------------------|---|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-----|------|-------------|------|-------|---|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-----|------|-------------|------|-------|---|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-----|------|-------------|------|-------|---|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-----|
| Financial, human, and material assets are all well-managed by school administrators.  | Government Schools | 1.49 | .800           | 23.307 | 298 | .000                           |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |
|   | PEF Schools        | 4.05 | 1.086          |        |     |                                | Everyone who teaches at your institution is highly competent in their field.  | Government Schools | 3.98 | 1.184 | .620  | 298 | .536 | PEF Schools | 3.89 | 1.412 | When it comes to teachers' professional development, school administrators back them up adequately.                                   | Government Schools | 3.63 | 1.407 | 5.417 | 298 | .000 | PEF Schools | 2.71 | 1.552 | It is the goal of school administrators to create a climate where teachers feel supported and encouraged to work together.            | Government Schools | 3.34 | 1.492 | 5.440 | 298 | .000 | PEF Schools | 2.41 | 1.480 | School administrators are great at keeping tabs on how well students are doing and giving instructors feedback based on hard numbers. | Government Schools | 3.68 | 1.467 | 7.514 | 298 |
| Everyone who teaches at your institution is highly competent in their field.  | Government Schools | 3.98 | 1.184          | .620   | 298 | .536                           |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |
|   | PEF Schools        | 3.89 | 1.412          |        |     |                                | When it comes to teachers' professional development, school administrators back them up adequately.                                   | Government Schools | 3.63 | 1.407 | 5.417 | 298 | .000 | PEF Schools | 2.71 | 1.552 | It is the goal of school administrators to create a climate where teachers feel supported and encouraged to work together.            | Government Schools | 3.34 | 1.492 | 5.440 | 298 | .000 | PEF Schools | 2.41 | 1.480 | School administrators are great at keeping tabs on how well students are doing and giving instructors feedback based on hard numbers. | Government Schools | 3.68 | 1.467 | 7.514 | 298 | .000 | PEF Schools | 2.39 | 1.514 |   |                    |      |       |       |     |
| When it comes to teachers' professional development, school administrators back them up adequately.                                   | Government Schools | 3.63 | 1.407          | 5.417  | 298 | .000                           |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |
|   | PEF Schools        | 2.71 | 1.552          |        |     |                                | It is the goal of school administrators to create a climate where teachers feel supported and encouraged to work together.            | Government Schools | 3.34 | 1.492 | 5.440 | 298 | .000 | PEF Schools | 2.41 | 1.480 | School administrators are great at keeping tabs on how well students are doing and giving instructors feedback based on hard numbers. | Government Schools | 3.68 | 1.467 | 7.514 | 298 | .000 | PEF Schools | 2.39 | 1.514 |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |
| It is the goal of school administrators to create a climate where teachers feel supported and encouraged to work together.            | Government Schools | 3.34 | 1.492          | 5.440  | 298 | .000                           |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |
|   | PEF Schools        | 2.41 | 1.480          |        |     |                                | School administrators are great at keeping tabs on how well students are doing and giving instructors feedback based on hard numbers. | Government Schools | 3.68 | 1.467 | 7.514 | 298 | .000 | PEF Schools | 2.39 | 1.514 |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |
| School administrators are great at keeping tabs on how well students are doing and giving instructors feedback based on hard numbers. | Government Schools | 3.68 | 1.467          | 7.514  | 298 | .000                           |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |
|   | PEF Schools        | 2.39 | 1.514          |        |     |                                |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |      |             |      |       |   |                    |      |       |       |     |

There was a noticeable difference in the mean value between public and PEF-funded schools, with a mean rating of 1.49 for public schools and 4.05 for PEF schools. The t-test value was 23.307 and  $p < 0.05$ , indicating that teachers in both types of schools generally agree that school administrators do a good job managing the school's resources. With a mean rating of 3.98 for public schools and 3.89 for PEF schools, a t-test value of .620, and a p-value greater than 0.05, teachers in both types of schools believe that their students' instructors are highly competent in their fields. Teachers in public and PEF-funded schools generally feel that school administrators offer sufficient assistance for teachers' professional development. The mean rating for public schools was 3.63, which is considered significantly high, while the mean rating for PEF schools was 2.71. The t-test value was 5.417, and the p-value was less than 0.05.

School administrators create a collaborative and supportive work environment for teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools, according to teachers in both groups. This is supported by a mean rating of 3.34 for public schools and 2.41 for PEF schools, with a t-test value of 5.440 and a p-value less than 0.05. Overall, teachers in public and PEF-funded schools believe that school administrators do a good job of keeping tabs on student performance and giving them data-driven feedback. The mean rating for public schools was 3.68, which is considered significantly high, while the mean rating for PEF schools was 2.39. The t-test value was 7.514, and the p-value was less than 0.05.

*Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

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

| Statements   | School Type        | Mean | Std. Deviation | t      | df  | Sig. (2-tailed), $\alpha=0.05$ |
|--|--------------------|------|----------------|--------|-----|--------------------------------|
| The administration of my school does a good job of bolstering my lessons and encouraging students to learn.      | Government Schools | 3.77 | 1.405          | .039   | 298 | .969                           |
|  | PEF Schools        | 3.77 | 1.586          |        |     |                                |
| When discussing school rules, procedures, and expectations, I have productive conversations with administrators. | Government Schools | 3.81 | 1.304          | 13.838 | 298 | .000                           |
|  | PEF Schools        | 1.88 | 1.099          |        |     |                                |
| The administration of the school gives me all the tools and encouragement I need to execute my work well.        | Government Schools | 3.73 | 1.346          | -6.030 | 298 | .000                           |
|  | PEF Schools        | 4.49 | .784           |        |     |                                |
| When making decisions, school leaders listen to my thoughts and suggestions.                                     | Government Schools | 3.79 | 1.292          | -5.023 | 298 | .000                           |
|  | PEF Schools        | 4.43 | .846           |        |     |                                |
| To help students study, school administrators work to make the school a welcoming and safe place.                | Government Schools | 3.61 | 1.474          | 8.275  | 298 | .000                           |
|  | PEF Schools        | 2.25 | 1.371          |        |     |                                |

With a mean rating of 3.77 for public schools and 3.77 for PEF schools, a t-test value of 7.514, and a p-value greater than 0.05, most teachers believe that school administrators successfully assist their teaching and enhance student learning. School administrators effectively communicate school policies, procedures, and expectations to teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools (with a significantly high mean rating of 3.81 for public schools and a significantly low mean rating of 1.88 for PEF schools; t-test value was 13.838 and  $p < 0.05$ ). Overall, teachers in public and PEF-funded schools believe that school administrators give them what they need to do their jobs well (with a mean rating of 3.73 for public schools and 4.49 for PEF schools, which is significantly higher; the t-test value was -6.030 and the p-value was less than 0.05).

The majority of teachers in public and PEF-funded schools believe that school administrators greatly appreciate their opinions and suggestions when making decisions (with a mean rating of 3.79 for public schools and 4.43 for PEF schools, which is statistically significant with a t-test value of -5.023 and a p-value less than 0.05). School administrators create an environment that is positive and supportive of student learning, according to teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools. This is supported by a mean rating of 3.61 for public schools and 2.25 for PEF schools, with a t-test value of 8.275 and a p-value less than 0.05.

**Table 4 Section 3: Overall Quality of Administration**

| Statements | School Type | Mean | Std. Deviation | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed), $\alpha=0.05$ |
|------------|-------------|------|----------------|---|----|--------------------------------|
|------------|-------------|------|----------------|---|----|--------------------------------|



**Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation**

|   |                    |      |       |        |     |      |
|---|--------------------|------|-------|--------|-----|------|
| The administration of a school is responsible for directing its daily operations and ensuring that it meets its objectives. | Government Schools | 3.95 | 1.157 | -524   | 298 | .601 |
|   | PEF Schools        | 4.02 | 1.266 |        |     |      |
| The school board is open and honest with the faculty, parents, and the general public.                                      | Government Schools | 3.81 | 1.373 | 11.603 | 298 | .000 |
|   | PEF Schools        | 1.91 | 1.472 |        |     |      |
| A culture of creativity and constant improvement is encouraged by school management.  | Government Schools | 3.51 | 1.514 | 3.675  | 298 | .000 |
|   | PEF Schools        | 2.85 | 1.565 |        |     |      |
| The leadership of the school can handle problems and adjust to new situations with ease.                                    | Government Schools | 2.96 | 1.532 | 6.902  | 298 | .000 |
|   | PEF Schools        | 1.85 | 1.228 |        |     |      |
| The role of school management in establishing a conducive learning environment for pupils is vital.                         | Government Schools | 3.69 | 1.410 | 5.709  | 298 | .000 |
|   | PEF Schools        | 2.73 | 1.501 |        |     |      |

A high level of agreement exists among public school teachers and PEF school teachers regarding the effectiveness of school administration in managing the school's operations and achieving its goals (mean rating of 3.95 for public schools and 4.02 for PEF schools; t-test value was -.524 and  $p > 0.05$ ). With a mean rating of 3.81 for public schools and 1.91 for PEF schools, a t-test value of 11.603, and a p-value less than 0.05, teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools largely believe that school administration is open and responsible to teachers, parents, and the community. Educators in both publicly and privately financed schools tend to concur that the leadership of these institutions promotes an environment of constant growth and new ideas (with a mean rating of 3.51 for publicly funded schools and 2.85 for privately funded schools; t-test value: 3.675,  $p < 0.05$ ).

The majority of teachers in public and PEF-funded schools believe that the administration of their school successfully handles problems and changes in circumstances. The mean rating for public schools was 2.96, which is considered significantly high, while the mean rating for PEF schools was 1.85. The t-test value was 6.902, and the p-value was less than 0.05. The majority of teachers in public and PEF-funded schools believe that effective school administration is crucial for establishing a top-notch learning environment for students. This is supported by statistical evidence (t-test value of 5.709 and  $p < 0.05$ ), with a mean rating of 3.69 for public schools and 2.73 for PEF schools.

**Table 5 All Three Factors**

| Factors  | School Type        | Mean   | Std. Deviation | t      | df  | Sig. (2-tailed), $\alpha=0.05$ |
|--|--------------------|--------|----------------|--------|-----|--------------------------------|
| Key Administrative Functions and Processes     | Government Schools | 3.7373 | .60430         | 14.593 | 298 | .601                           |
|  | PEF Schools        | 2.5747 | .76616         |        |     |                                |
| Teachers' Perceptions of School Administration | Government Schools | 3.7413 | .68798         | 5.573  | 298 | .000                           |

*Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

|                                    |                    |        |        |        |     |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------|--------|--------|-----|
| Effectiveness                      | PEF Schools        | 3.3627 | .46826 |        |     |
| Overall Quality of Administration. | Government Schools | 3.5827 | .69935 | 12.261 | 298 |
|                                    | PEF Schools        | 2.6720 | .58173 |        |     |

The factor "Key Administrative Functions and Processes" is generally agreed upon by teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools. The mean rating for public schools was 3.7373, which is significantly high, while the mean rating for PEF schools was 2.5747. The t-test value was 14.593, and the p-value was greater than 0.05. The factor "Teachers' Perceptions of School Administration Effectiveness" is generally agreed upon by teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools. The mean rating for public schools was 3.7413, which is considered significantly high, while the mean rating for PEF schools was 3.3627. The t-test value was 5.573, and the p-value was less than 0.05. The criterion "Overall Quality of Administration" is generally agreed upon by teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools (with a substantially high mean rating of 3.5827 for public schools and 2.6720 for PEF schools; the t-test value was 12.261 and  $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 6** *Average of All Three Factors*

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

In general, the results indicate that instructors who are funded by the public and PEF tend to have a positive impression of school administration. On the other hand, PEF-funded school teachers are less likely to have a positive outlook than their public school counterparts. Based on these findings, it seems that public schools are better able to handle important administrative tasks, provide resources for educators' professional growth, cultivate a welcoming workplace, and encourage a spirit of constant innovation and improvement.

### Discussion

In general, teachers in public and PEF-funded schools feel that their school administrators do a good job of managing the school's funds. On the other hand, public schools had a much lower mean rating (2.0) than PEF-funded institutions (4.05). (1.49). This shows that schools receiving funding from the PEF might be better able to use the resources they have or have access to more resources overall.

School administrators offer sufficient assistance for teachers' professional development, according to instructors in both public and PEF-funded schools. On the other hand, PEF-funded schools had significantly higher mean ratings (3.63 vs. 4.67). (2.71). This shows that public schools do not provide as much support for teachers' professional development as schools sponsored by the PEF.

It is widely acknowledged by instructors in both public and PEF-funded schools that administrators create an atmosphere that encourages collaboration and support among educators. Public schools had a mean rating of 3.34, whereas PEF-funded schools had a significantly lower grade (2.41). This provides evidence that schools receiving funding from the PEF may be more conducive to teamwork and mutual support than their public school counterparts.

*Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

---

School administrators in both publicly and privately funded schools do a good job of keeping tabs on student progress and providing data-driven comments to educators. The mean evaluations for public schools (3.68 out of 5) and PEF-funded institutions were significantly different (2.39). This provides evidence that schools receiving funding from the PEF may have a better system in place for tracking student progress and offering comments to educators.

School administrators successfully assist teachers and advance student learning, according to teachers in both publicly and privately funded schools. Administrators in both sorts of institutions are going out of their way to help teachers succeed.

Public school teachers and those from schools that receive funding from the PEF both feel that administrators do a good job of keeping them informed of school rules, procedures, and expectations. If administrators in both kinds of schools are doing a good job of keeping teachers informed and involved, then the students will benefit.

School administrators supply teachers with sufficient resources and assistance, according to teachers at both publicly and privately funded schools. Public schools have an average rating of 3.73, whereas PEF-funded schools have a somewhat lower average rating of 3.73. (4.49). This data reveals that public schools do not offer the same level of assistance and resources to educators as PEF-funded institutions.

School administrators greatly appreciate teachers' criticism and input when making decisions, regardless of whether their school is public or PEF-funded. Public schools have an average rating of 3.79, whereas PEF-funded schools have a significantly lower average rating of 3.79. (4.43). Teachers' opinions and suggestions may be more highly esteemed in PEF-funded schools compared to public schools, according to this.

Administrators, according to teachers at public and PEF-funded schools alike, are responsible for cultivating an encouraging and safe learning environment for their students. Nevertheless, there is a notable disparity in the mean ratings between public schools (3.61) and schools sponsored by PEF (2.25). There seems to be a more cheerful and supportive atmosphere at PEF-funded schools compared to public schools.

The majority of public school and PEF-funded teachers feel that the administration does a good job of running the school and getting things done. The difference between the mean ratings of public schools (3.95 out of 5) and PEF-funded schools (4.02) was not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ), although it was slightly higher. Both kinds of schools seem to be running smoothly and accomplishing what they set out to do.

School administration is open and accountable to community members, parents, and teachers at both publicly financed and PEF-supported schools, according to most teachers. Public schools had a mean rating of 3.81 whereas PEF-funded schools had a significantly lower rating (1.91). Compared to schools supported by the PEF, public schools seem to be more open and responsible.

The majority of public school and PEF-funded educators believe that the administration encourages a mindset of constant growth and new ideas. Public schools had a mean rating of 3.51 whereas PEF-funded schools had a significantly lower rating (2.85). It appears that public schools prioritize innovation and ongoing improvement more than schools sponsored by PEF.

The majority of public school and PEF-funded teachers feel that the administration does a

*Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

---

good job of responding to problems and evolving with the times. Public schools had a mean rating of 2.96 whereas PEF-funded schools had a significantly lower grade (1.85). This shows that public schools, as opposed to schools supported by PEF, may be better equipped to deal with problems and adjust to new situations.

School administration is crucial in establishing a high-quality learning environment for pupils, according to teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools. On the other hand, PEF-funded schools had much higher mean ratings (3.69 vs. 4.19). (2.73). Public schools, rather than those supported by the PEF, may be better able to establish a conducive atmosphere for learning, according to these results.

Key administrative roles and processes are generally well-received by teachers in both public and PEF-funded schools. On the other hand, PEF-funded schools had significantly higher mean ratings (4.7373) than public schools (2.5747). It appears that public schools could perhaps outperform private ones when it comes to important administrative tasks and procedures.

School administrators are well-respected among educators in both publicly funded and privately-funded institutions. Public schools have a mean rating of 3.7413, while PEF-funded schools have a significantly lower rating (3.3627). This data reveals that public school instructors may have a more favorable impression of the performance of school management compared to PEF-funded school teachers.

The majority of public school and PEF-funded teachers have positive things to say about the administration. Public schools have a mean rating of 3.5827, while PEF-funded schools have a significantly lower rating (2.6720). There is evidence to show that public schools, as a whole, may have better administration than schools supported by the PEF.

When comparing public schools with schools that receive funding from the Public Education Foundation (PEF), this study found that public schools had better quality administration, more effective school administration according to teachers, and more important administrative roles and processes.

### **Conclusions of the Study**

In comparison to publicly supported schools, PEF-financed schools may offer better management of resources, opportunities for professional growth, a more pleasant workplace, and better monitoring and input from students.

This study's results show that PEF-funded schools may have a better school atmosphere, communication, resources, support, and input from teachers than public schools.

#### **Public Schools**

- i. School administrators should be adequately trained in essential administrative tasks and procedures. This will play a role in making sure that school administrators can manage their resources well, offer teachers professional development opportunities, and foster a positive work atmosphere.
- ii. Maintain an encouraging and safe learning environment for all students. Building a school climate that values and promotes cooperation, trust, and respect is one way to achieve this goal.

#### **PEF-Funded Schools**

- i. Funding for school administrators' training on essential administrative tasks and procedures

*Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

---

should be prioritized. Schools that get funding from the PEF will be able to offer their children a top-notch education because of this.

- ii. Foster an atmosphere that is more conducive to teachers' well-being. Making sure educators have access to professional development programs and sufficient time for lesson planning is one way to achieve this goal.
- iii. Put your energy into making the school a welcoming and safe place for students so that they can study. To achieve this goal, it is necessary to establish a school climate that values cooperation, trust, and respect for one another.

### **Recommendations**

In light of what has already been said, I propose the following:

#### **Public Schools**

1. School administrators should be adequately trained in essential administrative tasks and procedures. This will play a role in making sure that school administrators can manage their resources well, offer teachers professional development opportunities, and foster a positive work atmosphere.
2. Maintain an encouraging and safe learning environment for all students. Building a school climate that values and promotes cooperation, trust, and respect is one way to achieve this goal.
3. Assist and encourage educators to implement successful pedagogical practices that are in line with the school's curricular objectives and aims.
4. Facilitate circumstances where educators can work together and exchange successful strategies.
5. Establish a system of frequent assessments to monitor student growth and pinpoint problem areas.
6. Improve students' educational experiences by encouraging two-way dialogue and collaborative efforts with community members and parents.

#### **PEF-Funded Schools**

1. Funding for school administrators' training on essential administrative tasks and procedures should be prioritized. Schools that get funding from the PEF will be able to offer their children a top-notch education because of this.
2. Foster an atmosphere that is more conducive to teachers' well-being. Providing teachers with chances for professional development, sufficient time for planning, and access to technology are all ways to help them succeed in the classroom.
3. Put your energy into making the school a welcoming and safe place for students so that they can study. To achieve this goal, it is necessary to establish a school climate that values cooperation, trust, and respect for one another.
4. To gauge student progress and pinpoint problem areas, establish reliable assessment procedures.
5. Make sure that people from the community and parents have a chance to weigh in on school decisions.
6. Promote originality and imagination in the classroom to meet the requirements of a wide range of students.
7. Encourage a growth mindset by listening to the thoughts and opinions of everyone



*Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation*

---

involved (students, parents, and educators).

### References

1. Ahmad, M., Altaf, S., & Ahmad, M. F. (2023). Quality Education Sustainable Development (SDG-4) 2025: A Comparative Study of Government and Punjab Education Foundation Secondary Schools. *PJE*, 40(2).
2. Ahmad, M., Hussain, S., & Qahar, A. (2024). Comparison Between Virtual Reality and Integrating Blended Learning Flipped Classroom Model: An Experiment on Secondary School Students. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 5(1), 1-11.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. Asad, A., Mehmood, S., Hussain, S., & Amir, M. (2023). Analysis of Risk Management in Higher Education Institution. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 4(3), 282-288.
7. Cheng, Y. C. (2022). *School effectiveness and school-based management: A mechanism for development*. Taylor & Francis.
8. 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.
9. Halai, A., & Durrani, N. (2020). School Education System in Pakistan: Expansion, Access, and Equity. *Handbook of Education Systems in South Asia*, 1-30.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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).
15. Hussain, S., Ahmad, M., Hussain, I., Hafeez, A., & Sardar, R. (2024). Compare the Quality of Administration in Public and Punjab Education Foundation Funded Schools at Secondary Level. *Al-Qanṭara*, 100-117.
16. Hussain, S., Ahmad, M., Ul Zaman, F., & Ahmad, A. (2023). Comparative Study of Administrators' Supervisory Skills and Teachers' Pedagogical Skills Towards Quality Education in Public and Punjab Education Foundation Funded Schools at Secondary Level. *Journal of Education &*



**Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation**

---

*Educational Development, 10(2).*

17. Hussain, S., Fakhar-Ul-Zaman, D. B. K., Kanwal, M., Hussain, T., Nawaz, I., & Thaheem, M. I. (2024). TPACK and ICT, the new hope for Pakistan's education system: analysis of the perception of prospective teachers. *Remittances Review, 9(2)*, 743-754.
18. Hussain, S., Hafeez, A., Zaman, F. U., & Seerat, S. S. (2023). Why Quality of Education is Low at the Secondary Level in Pakistan: A Group Discussion. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 4(4)*, 190-205.
19. Hussain, S., Zaman, F. U., Muhammad, S., & Hafeez, A. (2023). Analysis of the Initiatives taken by HEC to Implement Associate Degree Program: Opportunities and Challenges. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 4(3)*, 193-210.
20. 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.
21. 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.
22. Mamun-ur-Rashid, M. (2023). Quality of government secondary school services in regional Bangladesh. *Heliyon, 9(1)*.
23. 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.
24. 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.
25. Muhammad, S., Nadeem, M., Hussain, S., & Qahar, A. (2023). Comparison of the Impact of Oral and Written Feedback on the Students' Academic Achievement. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 4(3)*, 375-385.
26. 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.
27. Shauli Mukherjee, D. P. B., Pandey, M. P., & Sameem, M. M. (2022). *Fundamentals of Educational Administration, Management And Organization*. Ashok Yakkaldevi.
28. 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.
29. Stronge, J. H., & Xu, X. (2021). *Qualities of effective principals*. ASCD.
30. 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.
31. Umar, Z., Sadiqi, T., Hussain, S., & Qahar, A. (2023). Compare the Quality of Infrastructure on Student Outcomes in Public and Punjab Education Foundation Funded Schools at Secondary Level. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 4(4)*, 26-39.
32. 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.
33. Zaman, F. U., Muhammad, S., Hussain, S., & Qahar, A. (2023). Challenges and Risks for Higher Education Now and Beyond the 2030. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 4(3)*, 180-192.