

# CAUSES OF HIGH, AVERAGE AND LOW ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE INSTITUTIONS IN THE B.I.S.E. RESULT 2009

**\*DR. SAFDAR REHMAN GHAZI, \*DR. MUHAMMAD AZAM, \*\*DR. MUKARRAM KHAN**

\*Assistant Professor, University of Science & Technology, Bannu, NWFP, Pakistan

\*\*Director, Higher Education Govt. of NWFP

## ABSTRACT

*This study was conducted with the main objectives: to find out the causes of the High, Average, and Low academic achievements of the institutions in the BISE results of 2009 at secondary level, to identify the factors which affect the academic achievements of the students at secondary level, and to give recommendations for the improvements of the situation. Mean, Standard Deviation, Analysis of Variance and Scheffe post hoc tests were used as statistical tools. Although no significant differences were found in the managerial skills of the heads with High, Average and Low academic achievements but the managerial skills of the heads were found relative to their institutions results. The main cause of High, Average and Low academic achievements of the institutions was their teachers' effectiveness, physical facilities and internal evaluation system. It is recommended: refresher courses should be arranged to improve the managerial skills of the heads of the institutions teaching competencies of the teachers, competent teachers should be appointed, promotion of the teachers should be attached with their performance, good physical facilities i.e. proper infrastructure and building, computer and science laboratory for practical work, library, clean drinking water etc. should be provided, and internal evaluation system should be improved by making it more effective, regular, and compulsory through proper class test, homework, and pre-board examination.*

## INTRODUCTION

Education is central to socio-economic development of a country. It plays a critical role in building human capabilities and accelerates economic growth through knowledge, skills and creative strength of a society. Education also creates awareness, tolerance, self esteem and confidence which empower people to defend their rights. The positive outcomes of education include reduction in poverty and inequality, improvement in health status and good governance in implementation of socio-economic policies. The benefits of education are not only confined to the national economy but individual also benefit from it (Govt. of Pakistan, 2008).

In determining the effectiveness of a national system of education, secondary education is universally recognized as a fundamental stage. Developed countries and many of the European countries are concentrating all their attention on and research in exploring better solutions to the ever-increasing problems faced by young people at secondary school-level. Most of the people, who com-

pose the skilled manpower of a nation, are trained before the end of their high schools years. The quality of higher education is dependent upon the quality achieved at this stage. The formation of character and foundations of future leadership are laid at this stage (Ali, 1970).

Pakistan is a developing country. The country needs an effective education system to be at par with developed countries. For the purpose effective educational organization are needed to educate the masses. Effectiveness of an organization is determined by the quality and quantity of its output/services. It is an established fact that managerial skills available for the functioning of an organization are critical factor for its success. As such only those educational institutions can provide the society with quality education in required quantity which has effective use of management skills.

Quality is the single most important issue in education, business and government today. We all recognize that there are problems with today's education system. Students are leaving or graduating from high schools and colleges unprepared to meet

the demands of society. This problem has a ripple effect throughout society. Students who are not prepared to become responsible, productive citizens become a burden to society. These students, a product of an education system that does not focus on quality and increase social welfare costs. They impact criminal justice system, they are not prepared to meet the needs of the next generation, and, most important, they are citizens to feel alienated from society. If the quality of education is to be improved, today's education professionals must lead the improvement (Arcare, 1997).

The quality of education and schooling is linked with the qualifications of teachers, curriculum, and educational material, teaching methodologies, equipment and physical facilities. It is well understood that the real impact of these factors on quality of education can be determined through valid and reliable examination system. The performance measure of the students and teachers is based on their examinations results only (Govt. of Pakistan, 1998).

The teacher's role is confused with that of assessor, and the student is inhibited from seeking guidance for fear or being urged. It is impartial as to justify this sacrifice? Even if it compromises objectivity, some more relaxed and continuous evaluation, evaluation of the student's work, in which his initiative had for more scope, ought to maintain standards of expectation high enough (Ritter, 1966).

Evaluation is the systematic process of collecting, analyzing, and preparing information regarding educational programmed for the purpose of description, determination worth and fostering better decisions. Within a high school evaluation serves three needs:

1. It provides information for cause and programmed improved.
2. It provides information for describing and justifying you're programmed to others.
3. It provides information for student advising, (Chapman and Willour, 1978).

There are two systems of evaluation being used in our country. The internal evaluation system-the student is evaluated by his own teachers and external evaluation system-the student is evaluated by an institution other than the school (Bhatti, 1987).

Public as well as professional opinion is now generally aware of the beneficial effect of regular

internal evaluation of the educational progress of the students and some people are of the view that all examinations should be conducted internally by the teachers concerned. Although doubts have been expressed by other about the reliability of such an evaluation, we are convinced that there can be no improvement in the educational system or in examination without policing due confidence in the ability of teachers to assess the academic progress of their own students. There will, no doubt be some difficulties and discrepancies in the beginning but there are many difficulties, discrepancies and malpractice in the present system of external examination also. With proper checks and safeguards and adequate arrangements, the internal evaluation can be placed in the teachers will be reciprocated by them with an equal sense of responsibility (Govt. of Pakistan, 1971).

According to the Human Development in South Asia's 1998 Report, 70 percent of the schools in Pakistan have no toilets, 68 percent no drinking water, 92 percent no playgrounds, 60 percent no boundary walls and 16 percent are without a building. A delegation from the UK to Pakistan has also noted a lack of desks, books, blackboards, electricity, doors, and windows, not to mention the problem of overcrowded classrooms.

### OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To find out the causes of the High, Average, and Low academic achievements of the institutions in the BISE results of 2009 at secondary level.
2. To identify the factors which affect the academic achievements of the students at secondary level, and
3. To give recommendations for the improvements of the situation.

### DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was subjected to the following delimitations:

1. Results of the Boards of Intermediate and Secondary Education; Dera Ismail Khan, Bannu, and Kohat at secondary level,
2. Total 45 male schools, 15 schools from the jurisdiction of each BISE, and 5 from each category (i.e. High results 100%, Average results 50% and Low results 0%), and
3. Four major factors which may affect the result

of the institution i.e. Managerial Skills, Teachers, Physical Facilities, and Internal Evaluation System of the schools.

Skills, Teachers, Physical Facilities and Internal Evaluation System in the institutions were focused using a Five Point Likert Scale.

**HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY**

This study was guided by the following four null hypotheses.

- H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant difference among the managerial skills in the institutions having High, Average and Low Academic Achievements.
- H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant difference among the teachers of the institutions with High, Average and Low academic achievements.
- H<sub>03</sub>: There is no significant difference between the physical facilities of the institutions with High, Average and Low academic achievements.
- H<sub>04</sub>: There are no significant differences among the internal evaluation system of the institutions with High, Average and Low academic achievements.

The questionnaires were distributed through a helper among the heads and teachers of the institutions to collect data. The helper visited the sampled schools personally to collect the filled questionnaires from heads and teachers of the institutions.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The questionnaire was consisted of 20 statements including five statements about each factor. The scores about each factor were entered in SPSS 16 and thus results pertaining to the objectives of this study were generated using Mean (M), Standard Deviation (SD), Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Scheffe post hoc tests as statistical tools.

**POPULATION AND SAMPLE**

The population of the study is all the teachers of secondary schools whose students were appeared in BISE examination of 2009.

Data in Table 1 shows that respondents are “Strongly Agree” with Managerial Skills, Teachers’ Effectiveness, Availability of the Physical Facilities, and Evaluation System of the institutions having 100% results. Respondents of the institutions having 50% result are “Strongly Agree” with the Managerial Skills of the Heads, and are “Agree” with the Teachers’ Effectiveness and are “Undecided” with the Availability of the Physical Facilities, and Evaluation System of the institutions. Respondents of the institutions having 0% result are “Undecided” with Managerial Skills of the Heads, and are “Disagree” with Teachers’ Effectiveness and Availability of the Physical Facilities, and are “Strongly Disagree” with the Evaluation System of the institutions.

Fifteen schools from each category i.e with 100%, 50% and 0% results, their headmasters and nine teachers from each school were selected as a sample using multistage random sampling technique.

**INSTRUMENTATION**

Table 2 shows that there is no significant difference among the Managerial Skills of the heads of the institutions having High, Average, and Low results while there is a significant difference among the Teachers’ Effectiveness, Physical Facilities, and

An open ended questionnaire consisted of 20 statements was developed to seek the views of heads and teachers of all the three categories of the institutions. The main parameters Managerial

**Table 1: Mean Differences among Institutions having 100%, 50%, and 0% Result**

S.No.	School Result Factors	100%		50%		0%	
		M	S.D	M	S.D	M	S.D
1	Managerial Skills of the Heads	4.37	6.71	4.30	8.02	3.41	2.81
2	Teachers’ Effectiveness	4.28	6.52	3.63	5.96	2.16	2.39
3	Availability of Physical Facilities	4.32	5.93	3.28	5.69	2.12	2.95
4	Evaluation System	4.09	5.84	3.31	6.36	1.46	2.09

**Table 2: ANOVA Test: Differences among institutions for Managerial Skills, Teachers' Effectiveness, Physical Facilities, and Evaluation System**

Variables	Group Differences	Sum of squares	Mean square	F	P
Managerial Skills	Between groups	95.19	47.59	2.35	0.10
	Within groups	1315.08	20.23		
Teachers' Effectiveness	Between groups	360.27	180.13	4.75	*0.01
	Within groups	2460.71	37.85		
Physical Facilities	Between groups	640.67	320.33	10.40	0.00*
	Within groups	2000.80	30.78		
Evaluation System	Between groups	753.16	376.58	9.85	0.00*
	Within groups	2483.35	38.20		

**Table 3: Differences among Teachers' Effectiveness, Physical Facilities, and Internal Evaluation System of the institutions having High, Average, and Low results**

Dependent Variable	Institution Academic Achievement (I)	Institution Academic Achievement (J)	Mean differences (I-J)	P
Teachers' Effectiveness	High	Average	5.18	0.02*
		Low	3.40	0.01*
	Average	High	-5.18	0.02*
		Low	-1.78	0.66
	Low	High	-3.40	0.01*
		Average	1.78	0.66
Physical Facilities	High	Average	6.96	0.01*
		Low	3.90	0.00*
	Average	High	-6.96	0.01*
		Low	-3.05	0.02*
	Low	High	-3.90	0.00*
		Average	3.05	0.02*
Internal Evaluation System	High	Average	5.69	0.00*
		Low	8.28	0.00*
	Average	High	-5.69	0.00*
		Low	2.58	0.04*
	Low	High	-8.28	0.00*
		Average	-2.58	0.04*

Evaluation System of the institutions having High, Average, and Low results.

In Table 3 Scheffe post hoc tests show that there is a significant difference between the institutions having High and Average, Low academic achievements for their Teachers' Effectiveness, Availability of Physical Facilities, and Evaluation System in the institutions.

## FINDINGS

1. Majority of respondents of institutions having High, Average, and Low academic achievements, with M=4.37, 4.30, 3.41, and S.D=6.71, 8.02, 2.81 respectively have management skills including planning, human relationship, problem solving, decision making and communication skills.

2. Most of the respondents of institutions having High, Average, and Low academic achievements, with  $M=4.28, 3.63, 2.16$  and  $S.D=6.52, 5.96, 2.39$  of the institutions have effective teachers due to selection on merit, have good command on subjects, preparations of the lesson regularly, uses of the A.V Aids and communication skills.
3. Most of the respondents of institutions having High, Average, and Low academic achievements, with  $M=4.32, 3.28, 2.12$  and  $S.D=5.93, 5.69, 2.95$  of the institutions have physical facilities including proper infrastructure & buildings, laboratories for practical works, library, clean drinking water and furniture.
4. Majority of respondents of institutions having High, Average, and Low academic achievements, with  $M=4.09, 3.31, 1.46$  and  $S.D=5.84, 6.36, 2.09$  of the institutions have evaluation system including arrange class test regularly, assign and check home work properly, conduction of pre-board examination, arrangement of extra coaching classes and teachers sharing with parent of students' progress.
5. Most of the respondents of institutions having High, Average, and Low academic achievements, have mean difference in their responses on the management skills but this mean difference is not statistically significant. It is observed that heads of institution with good and average results have good management skills where as respondents of low results have poor management skills of heads.
6. Most of the respondents of institutions having High, Average, and Low academic achievements, have significant mean differences on the effectiveness of the teachers. The Scheffe post hoc test indicates that there is a significant difference among the High, Average and Low achievers institutions.
7. Majority of the respondents of institutions having High, Average, and Low academic achievements, have significant mean differences on the availability of physical facilities. The Scheffe post hoc test indicates that there is a significant difference among the High, Average and Low achiever institutions.
8. Most of the respondents of institutions having High, Average, and Low academic achievements, have significant mean differ-

ences on the evaluation system. The Scheffe post hoc test indicates that there is a significant difference among the High, Average and Low achievers institutions.

## CONCLUSIONS

In the light of statistical analysis and findings of the study the following conclusions were drawn.

1. Although no significant differences were found in the managerial skills of the heads with High, Average and Low academic achievements but the managerial skills of the heads were found relative to their institutions results.
2. The main cause of High, Average and Low academic achievements of the institutions was their teachers' effectiveness respectively. Schools having a good teaching staff generally have good results.
3. There was a significant difference among the institutions having High, Average and Low academic achievements. The institutions with good physical facilities showed good results, institutions with average facilities showed average results, and the institutions with poor facilities showed bad results.
4. It is also found that evaluation system including arrangement of class test, proper checking of home work, arrangement of the extra coaching classes, pre-board examination system and sharing of the progress reports with the parents is also different in all the three categories of the institutions. The institutions with good evaluations system showed good results, with average evaluation system showed average results while the institutions with bad system of evaluation showed worst results.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Following are some of the suggestions to minimize the causes of low academic achievements of the institutions in the Board results:

1. Refresher courses should be arranged to improve the managerial skills of the heads of the institutions.
2. Teachers play a pivotal role in enhancing good education. Competent teachers should be appointed to get good results.
3. Highly qualified and on merit bases teachers should be appointed in the schools, and there should be no political interference in the appointments and transfers of the teachers.

4. In service training is must for the teachers to get good results. Therefore, the refresher courses should be arranged for the teachers.
5. Teachers with poor results should be departmentally punished while transferring them in the far flung areas.
6. Promotion of the teachers should be attached with their performance in the form of their students' matriculation result.
7. Good physical facilities i.e. proper infrastructure and building, computer and science laboratory for practical work, library, clean drinking water etc. should be provided to all the schools.
8. Internal evaluation system should be improved by making it more effective, regular, and compulsory through proper class test, homework, and pre-board examination.
9. Criteria for students' promotion in next classes should be improved through their suitable assessment and evaluation.
10. Parents and teachers meeting should be arranged regarding students' performance.

**REFERENCES**

- Ali, A.S. (1970). *Report of Educational Conference*. West Pakistan Education Center. Lahore, Pakistan, P. 1.
- Arcare, J. S. (1997). *Quality in Education: An Implementation Handbook*. Vanity Books International, New Delhi. P. 72.
- Bhatti. M. A. (1987). *Secondary School Education in Pakistan, Perspective Planning*, National Education Council G-8/4 Islamabad, P. 124.
- Chapman, E. and Wilbur (1978). *College Course in the High School, Nation Association of Secondary School Principals*, Reston P. 44, P. 95.
- Govt. of Pakistan. (1971). Report of National Committee on Examinations 1970-71: Examination System in Pakistan Current Practices, Problems and Possible Solutions. Ministry of Education and Scientific Research, Islamabad. P. 13, P. 34.
- Govt. of Pakistan, (1998). *Human Development in South Asia's 1998 Report*.
- Govt. of Pakistan, (1998). *National Education Policy 1998-2010*. Ministry of Education, Islamabad. P. 32, P. 44.
- Government of Pakistan, Economic Survey of Pakistan (2008-09) Economic Advisors Wing Ministry of Finance Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Ritter, (1966). *Education for Creation, Growth and Change*, Pergamon Press Oxford, P. 380.