

Performance of The Provincial Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (2013-18) in Terms of Reforms Introduced in Education Department

Dr. Muhammad Ibrahim Lecturer Pakistan Studies, NUML University Peshawar.
(Corresponding Author) muhammad.ibrahim@numl.edu.pk

Dr. Sarfaraz Khan Assistant Professor Pakistan Studies, University of Swat

Muhammad Tariq Khan Lecturer Pakistan Studies, University of Swat

Abstract: *The current study demonstrated the performance of the provincial government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (2013-18) in terms of the introduced reforms at primary level education department in connection with the level of public satisfaction. The study exhibited the level of public satisfaction up to an average level (36.10%) with the introduced reforms in the education department. This study is based on primary data collected from the public and experts randomly in district Peshawar and Charsadda. The questionnaire is analysed via SPSS and chi-square test, p-value and percentage method is used.*

Keywords: Performance, Education Department, Reforms, Provincial Government.

Introduction

Educational Governance encompasses institutions by connecting government officials, service providers and citizens. It would have the qualities of transparency, accountability, responsiveness, citizen engagements and state actors for designing and implementation of the policies (Marija Risteska, 2010). It links the schools and the political system, in such a way that the needs, wishes and desires are transformed into policies for the direction of the schools of the community. (Smith, 2008). Likewise, it is responsible for the effectivity, quality and accountability of the educational institutes (school). It comprises the composition of policies, production and expansion of funds, developing curriculum, producing experts for teaching and administering school population (Muhammad Shahzad, 2015).

After the passage of the 18th Constitutional Amendment to the 1973 Constitution of Pakistan, Education is devolved and has been placed under the jurisdiction of the Provinces in terms of management, including policy formulation, planning and curriculum development (Nabi, 2014).

The schools are operated in various setups including, public, private, religious, secular, hybrid charter, non-profit or private foundations and voucher financed schools (Brian Levy, 2018). This study focusses the public schools that are operated under the patronage of governments and especially the performance of the government in the primary education will be analysed.

Quality is creating an environment where

educators, parents, government officials, community representatives, and business leaders work together to provide students with the resources they need to meet current and future academic, business and changes. Strengthening the quality of education has become a global agenda at all educational levels and more so at the primary level. The quality of basic education is important not only for preparing individuals for the subsequent educational levels but to equip them with the requisite basic life skills and social norms too. Quality education also ensures increased access and equality and it is mainly due to these reasons that various international Forums and Declarations have pledged improvements in quality of education. It is important to mention that quality of education can be measured from three different viewpoints i.e. quality of inputs, quality of the process, and quality of output. Input reflects the resources committed by the government and society in general for the cause of providing education; these resources include infrastructure (including various physical facilities), teaching resources, curriculum and other support materials. Quality of the process reflects how good the delivery process is, and generally measures what goes on in the classroom as well as in the school in general. The quality of output reflects the conformance of the knowledge and skill levels of students to well established standards, e.g. exam systems and their results are a useful measure of output quality. (Millennium Development Goals (Mdgs) and Quality Education Situation in Pakistan at Primary Level).

The report of World Bank revealed the condition

of the public schools in Pakistan that one percent of the students leave schools due to lack of basic facilities. It also reported the closure of the public schools due to low enrolment of the students and consequently decreased the number of institutions. The provincial government of KP tried for the improvement education by the introduction of reforms (Shakeel Khan, 2020). The provincial government of KP (2013-18) made elementary and secondary education its top priority and sorted out that access, quality, equity and governance are the key challenges to education. The incumbent government took substantive measures in terms of policies and reforms for overcoming the mentioned areas (Arif, 2016). It also tried for the integration of education with social development, introduction of schools in remote villages of the province, including schooling for girls and teacher trainings (Zaman, 2013). Study revealed that the provincial government of Pakistan Tehrik-e-Pakistan in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (2013-18)

satisfied the public to an average extent (35.66%)¹ with its performance at primary school level.

METHODOLOGY:

This research study comprised on quantitative and analytical method. The primary data is collected from the public and experts of the education department were inquired through questionnaire from the two districts of Peshawar and Charsadda. The experts constituted the primary school teachers and primary school head teachers. In 464 questionnaires 64 were the experts from the primary school department were inquired from the two districts. The remaining 400 were equally divided into the two districts of Peshawar and Charsadda that were further stratified into rural and urban areas of the two districts. These questionnaires were analysed by SPSS and chi-square test, p-value and percentage method is used. The term education department in the study refers to the primary school education.

Q 1. TO WHICH EXTENT ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE REFORMS INTRODUCED BY THE KP GOVERNMENT (2013-18) AT PRIMARY LEVEL?

Table 47

| Variables | Sub-Category | Greater Extent | Average Extent | Lower Extent | Total | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|---------|
| Gender | Male | 117 34.7% | 137 40.7% | 83 24.6% | 337 100.0% | 8.367 | 0.015 |
| | Female | 26 28.0% | 53 57.0% | 14 15.1% | 93 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 33.3% | 190 44.2% | 97 22.6% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Age | 18-30 | 40 36.4% | 45 40.9% | 25 22.7% | 110 100.0% | 11.359 | 0.023 |
| | 31-40 | 51 31.3% | 86 52.8% | 26 16.0% | 163 100.0% | | |
| | 41 and Above | 52 33.1% | 59 37.6% | 46 29.3% | 157 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 33.3% | 190 44.2% | 97 22.6% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Education | Illiterate | 28 28.0% | 37 37.0% | 35 35.0% | 100 100.0% | 24.512 | 0.002 |
| | Matriculate | 17 29.3% | 22 37.9% | 19 32.8% | 58 100.0% | | |
| | Intermediate | 41 39.0% | 42 40.0% | 22 21.0% | 105 100.0% | | |
| | Graduate | 38 34.5% | 58 52.7% | 14 12.7% | 110 100.0% | | |
| | Postgraduate | 19 33.3% | 31 54.4% | 7 12.3% | 57 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 33.3% | 190 44.2% | 97 22.6% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Profession | Government Servant | 19 35.2% | 26 48.1% | 9 16.7% | 54 100.0% | 10.099 | 0.039 |
| | Private Service Sector | 18 22.8% | 43 54.4% | 18 22.8% | 79 100.0% | | |
| | Businessmen & Shopkeepers | 30 33.0% | 31 34.1% | 30 33.0% | 91 100.0% | | |
| | Health Experts | 10 47.6% | 9 42.9% | 2 9.5% | 21 100.0% | | |
| | Education Experts | 6 | 16 | 5 | 27 | | |

¹ This is the average percentage that has been calculated by taking the average percentage of the percentages of all those questions which have been

asked from the respondents in determining the public perception regarding the performance of the provincial government of KP (2013-18) at primary level education.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | 22.2% | 59.3% | 18.5% | 100.0% | | |
| | Others | 60 | 65 | 33 | 158 | | |
| | | 38.0% | 41.1% | 20.9% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 | 190 | 97 | 430 | | |
| Monthly Income | PKR 21000 and Below | 60 | 53 | 34 | 147 | 13.040 | 0.009 |
| | | 40.8% | 36.1% | 23.1% | 100.0% | | |
| | PKR 22000 and Above | 51 | 88 | 29 | 168 | | |
| | | 30.4% | 52.4% | 17.3% | 100.0% | | |
| | Sorry | 32 | 49 | 34 | 115 | | |
| | | 27.8% | 42.6% | 29.6% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 | 190 | 97 | 430 | | |
| | | 33.3% | 44.2% | 22.6% | 100.0% | | |
| Area | Rural | 114 | 111 | 62 | 287 | 17.127 | 0.000 |
| | | 39.7% | 38.7% | 21.6% | 100.0% | | |
| | Urban | 29 | 79 | 35 | 143 | | |
| | | 20.3% | 55.2% | 24.5% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 | 190 | 97 | 430 | | |
| | | 33.3% | 44.2% | 22.6% | 100.0% | | |

EXPLANATION:

A sizable number of the education experts (59.3%) pursued by the female respondents (57.0%), the middle age respondents of 31-40 (52.8%), the postgraduate respondents (54.4%), the respondents of the higher income group of PKR 22000 and above (52.4%) and the urban respondents (55.2%) confessed satisfaction with the reforms introduced in education department in general and at primary level in particular. The chi-square test dispensed significant resulted p-value

for all the variables of gender, age, education, profession, monthly income and area. The p-value < 0.05 closely associated significant variables and satisfaction in terms of the introduced reforms.

The tabulation revealed that the respondents from within the education experts were content with the performance of the provincial government of KP (2013-18) for the introduced reforms in elementary education department.

Q 2. TO WHICH EXTENT ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE INTRODUCTION OF IMU AT PRIMARY LEVEL BY THE KP GOVERNMENT (2013-18)?

Table 48

| Variables | Sub-Category | Greater Extent | Average Extent | Lower Extent | Total | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------|------------------|---------|
| Gender | Male | 78 | 146 | 113 | 337 | 7.337 | 0.026 |
| | | 23.1% | 43.3% | 33.5% | 100.0% | | |
| | Female | 34 | 30 | 29 | 93 | | |
| | | 36.6% | 32.3% | 31.2% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 112 | 176 | 142 | 430 | | |
| | | 26.0% | 40.9% | 33.0% | 100.0% | | |
| | 18-30 | 42 | 32 | 36 | 110 | 14.068 | 0.007 |
| | | 38.2% | 29.1% | 32.7% | 100.0% | | |
| Age | 31-40 | 38 | 70 | 55 | 163 | | |
| | | 23.3% | 42.9% | 33.7% | 100.0% | | |
| | 41 and Above | 32 | 74 | 51 | 157 | | |
| | | 20.4% | 47.1% | 32.5% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 112 | 176 | 142 | 430 | | |
| | | 26.0% | 40.9% | 33.0% | 100.0% | | |
| Education | Illiterate | 16 | 52 | 32 | 100 | 16.118 | 0.041 |
| | | 16.0% | 52.0% | 32.0% | 100.0% | | |
| | Matriculate | 20 | 19 | 19 | 58 | | |
| | | 34.5% | 32.8% | 32.8% | 100.0% | | |
| | Intermediate | 24 | 38 | 43 | 105 | | |
| | | 22.9% | 36.2% | 41.0% | 100.0% | | |
| | Graduate | 32 | 47 | 31 | 110 | | |
| | | 29.1% | 42.7% | 28.2% | 100.0% | | |
| | Postgraduate | 20 | 20 | 17 | 57 | | |
| | | 35.1% | 35.1% | 29.8% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 112 | 176 | 142 | 430 | | |
| | | 26.0% | 40.9% | 33.0% | 100.0% | | |
| Profession | Government Servant | 22 | 12 | 20 | 54 | | |
| | | 40.7% | 22.2% | 37.0% | 100.0% | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------|-------|
| | Private Service Sector | 18 22.8% | 40 50.6% | 21 26.6% | 79 100.0% | 24.941 | 0.005 |
| | Businessmen & Shopkeepers | 17 18.7% | 41 45.1% | 33 36.3% | 91 100.0% | | |
| | Health Experts | 9 42.9% | 7 33.3% | 5 23.8% | 21 100.0% | | |
| | Education Experts | 12 44.4% | 7 25.9% | 8 29.6% | 27 100.0% | | |
| | Others | 34 21.5% | 69 43.7% | 55 34.8% | 158 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 112 26.0% | 176 40.9% | 142 33.0% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Monthly Income | PKR 21000 and Below | 36 24.5% | 59 40.1% | 52 35.4% | 147 100.0% | 2.755 | 0.600 |
| | PKR 22000 and Above | 42 25.0% | 67 39.9% | 59 35.1% | 168 100.0% | | |
| | Sorry | 34 29.6% | 50 43.5% | 31 27.0% | 115 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 112 26.0% | 176 40.9% | 142 33.0% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Area | Rural | 77 26.8% | 113 39.4% | 97 33.8% | 287 100.0% | 0.871 | 0.647 |
| | Urban | 35 24.5% | 63 44.1% | 45 31.5% | 143 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 112 26.0% | 176 40.9% | 142 33.0% | 430 100.0% | | |

EXPLANATION:

A considerable number of the illiterate respondents (52.0%) followed by the professionals of the private services sector (50.6%), the male respondents (43.3%), the elderly respondents of 41 and above age group (47.1%), the respondents of the undisclosed income group (43.5%) and the urban respondents (44.1%) positively favoured the introduction of IMU at the elementary level education. The chi-square test set out significant p-values for the gender, age, education and profession while the monthly income and area consideration got

insignificant p-values. The p-value < 0.05 brightened up relationship between the significant variables and the introduction of the IMU at primary level education while separated the insignificant variables and the IMU introduced at primary school level.

It examined that the professionals of the private services sector confessed satisfaction with the performance of the provincial government of KP (2013-18) for the introduction of IMU in elementary level education.

Q 3. TO WHICH EXTENT ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF IMU IN ENHANCING PRIMARY LEVEL EDUCATION IN KP (2013-18)?

Table 49

| Variables | Sub-Category | Greater Extent | Average Extent | Lower Extent | Total | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|-----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|---------|
| Gender | Male | 100 29.7% | 142 42.1% | 95 28.2% | 337 100.0% | 5.908 | 0.052 |
| | Female | 40 43.0% | 32 34.4% | 21 22.6% | 93 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 140 32.6% | 174 40.5% | 116 27.0% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Age | 18-30 | 38 34.5% | 46 41.8% | 26 23.6% | 110 100.0% | 8.544 | 0.074 |
| | 31-40 | 55 33.7% | 73 44.8% | 35 21.5% | 163 100.0% | | |
| | 41 and Above | 47 29.9% | 55 35.0% | 55 35.0% | 157 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 140 32.6% | 174 40.5% | 116 27.0% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Education | Illiterate | 32 32.0% | 35 35.0% | 33 33.0% | 100 100.0% | 9.943 | 0.296 |
| | Matriculate | 18 31.0% | 22 37.9% | 18 31.0% | 58 100.0% | | |
| | Intermediate | 39 37.1% | 37 35.2% | 29 27.6% | 105 100.0% | | |
| | Graduate | 31 28.2% | 52 47.3% | 27 24.5% | 110 100.0% | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------|-------|
| | Postgraduate | 20 35.1% | 28 49.1% | 9 15.8% | 57 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 140 32.6% | 174 40.5% | 116 27.0% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Profession | Government Servant | 20 37.0% | 20 37.0% | 14 25.9% | 54 100.0% | 20.970 | 0.021 |
| | Private Service Sector | 24 30.4% | 32 40.5% | 23 29.1% | 79 100.0% | | |
| | Businessmen & Shopkeepers | 29 31.9% | 27 29.7% | 35 38.5% | 91 100.0% | | |
| | Health Experts | 12 57.1% | 8 38.1% | 1 4.8% | 21 100.0% | | |
| | Education Experts | 6 22.2% | 16 59.3% | 5 18.5% | 27 100.0% | | |
| | Others | 49 31.0% | 71 44.9% | 38 24.1% | 158 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 140 32.6% | 174 40.5% | 116 27.0% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Monthly Income | PKR 21000 and Below | 54 36.7% | 57 38.8% | 36 24.5% | 147 100.0% | 11.180 | 0.025 |
| | PKR 22000 and Above | 52 31.0% | 79 47.0% | 37 22.0% | 168 100.0% | | |
| | Sorry | 34 29.6% | 38 33.0% | 43 37.4% | 115 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 140 32.6% | 174 40.5% | 116 27.0% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Area | Rural | 104 36.2% | 113 39.4% | 70 24.4% | 287 100.0% | 5.982 | 0.050 |
| | Urban | 36 25.2% | 61 42.7% | 46 32.2% | 143 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 140 32.6% | 174 40.5% | 116 27.0% | 430 100.0% | | |

EXPLANATION:

A solid number of the education experts by profession (59.3%) pursued by the postgraduate respondents (49.1%), the middle age group of respondents (44.8%), the higher income group of respondents (47.0%) and the urban respondents (42.7%) were moderately pleased while the female respondents (43.0%) admitted greater extent pleasure with the performance of IMU in enhancing primary level education. The chi-square test revealed significant resulted p-values for the gender, profession, monthly income and area while age and education were declared as

insignificant variables. The p-value < 0.05 brought closeness between the significant variables and the performance of IMU in enhancing the primary level education.

It further exhibited that the respondents from the education experts were more positive in crediting the government performance in the provincial elementary education sector with the introduction of satisfactory reforms in terms of IMU in enhancing the primary level education.

Q 4. TO WHICH EXTENT ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE ROLE OF IMU IN ENHANCING THE PERFORMANCE OF TEACHERS IN TEACHING LEARNING PROCESS AT PRIMARY LEVEL IN KP (2013-18)?

Table 50

| Variables | Sub-Category | Greater Extent | Average Extent | Lower Extent | Total | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|-----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|---------|
| Gender | Male | 77 22.8% | 110 32.6% | 150 44.5% | 337 100.0% | 4.774 | 0.092 |
| | Female | 31 33.3% | 23 24.7% | 39 41.9% | 93 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 108 25.1% | 133 30.9% | 189 44.0% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Age | 18-30 | 40 36.4% | 22 20.0% | 48 43.6% | 110 100.0% | 19.309 | 0.001 |
| | 31-40 | 41 25.2% | 61 37.4% | 61 37.4% | 163 100.0% | | |
| | 41 and Above | 27 17.2% | 50 31.8% | 80 51.0% | 157 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 108 25.1% | 133 30.9% | 189 44.0% | 430 100.0% | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------|-------|
| Education | Illiterate | 18 18.0% | 28 28.0% | 54 54.0% | 100 100.0% | 15.876 | 0.044 |
| | Matriculate | 17 29.3% | 15 25.9% | 26 44.8% | 58 100.0% | | |
| | Intermediate | 38 36.2% | 28 26.7% | 39 37.1% | 105 100.0% | | |
| | Graduate | 24 21.8% | 40 36.4% | 46 41.8% | 110 100.0% | | |
| | Postgraduate | 11 19.3% | 22 38.6% | 24 42.1% | 57 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 108 25.1% | 133 30.9% | 189 44.0% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Profession | Government Servant | 10 18.5% | 13 24.1% | 31 57.4% | 54 100.0% | 13.683 | 0.188 |
| | Private Service Sector | 17 21.5% | 31 39.2% | 31 39.2% | 79 100.0% | | |
| | Businessmen & Shopkeepers | 19 20.9% | 32 35.2% | 40 44.0% | 91 100.0% | | |
| | Health Experts | 6 28.6% | 7 33.3% | 8 38.1% | 21 100.0% | | |
| | Education Experts | 8 29.6% | 4 14.8% | 15 55.6% | 27 100.0% | | |
| | Others | 48 30.4% | 46 29.1% | 64 40.5% | 158 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 108 25.1% | 133 30.9% | 189 44.0% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Monthly Income | PKR 21000 and Below | 36 24.5% | 42 28.6% | 69 46.9% | 147 100.0% | 31.937 | 0.000 |
| | PKR 22000 and Above | 24 14.3% | 55 32.7% | 89 53.0% | 168 100.0% | | |
| | Sorry | 48 41.7% | 36 31.3% | 31 27.0% | 115 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 108 25.1% | 133 30.9% | 189 44.0% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Area | Rural | 66 23.0% | 81 28.2% | 140 48.8% | 287 100.0% | 8.164 | 0.017 |
| | Urban | 42 29.4% | 52 36.4% | 49 34.3% | 143 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 108 25.1% | 133 30.9% | 189 44.0% | 430 100.0% | | |

EXPLANATION:

An eminent number of the government servants by profession (57.4%) seconded by the illiterate respondents (54.0%), the elderly respondents of 41 and above age group (51.0%), the male respondents (44.5%), the respondents with a high income of PKR 22000 and above (53.0%) and the rural respondents (48.8%) favoured the role of IMU in enhancing the performance of the teachers in teaching learning process at primary level. Significant p-values were issued by the chi-square test for majority of the variables while gender and profession were declared as insignificant p-valued variables. The p-value < 0.05 shows unity between the significant variables and the role of IMU in

enhancing the performance of teachers in teaching learning process. Disunity is noted between the insignificant variables and the enhanced teaching learning process of the teachers with IMU at primary level education.

It further clarified that the respondents from the government servants agreed more with the performance of the provincial government of KP (2013-18) for the introduced reforms in terms of the enhancement of the teachers performance in teaching learning process with the introduction of the IMU in elementary level education.

Q 5. TO WHICH EXTENT WAS IMU EFFECTIVE IN ENHANCING THE PUNCTUALITY OF TEACHING STAFF AT PRIMARY LEVEL IN KP (2013-18)?

Table 51

| Variables | Sub-Category | Greater Extent | Average Extent | Lower Extent | Total | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|-----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|---------|
| Gender | Male | 148 43.9% | 107 31.8% | 82 24.3% | 337 100.0% | 0.328 | 0.849 |
| | Female | 42 45.2% | 31 33.3% | 20 21.5% | 93 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 190 44.2% | 138 32.1% | 102 23.7% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | 18-30 | 61 | 30 | 19 | 110 | 18.073 | 0.001 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| Age | | 55.5% | 27.3% | 17.3% | 100.0% | | |
| | 31-40 | 79 | 51 | 33 | 163 | | |
| | | 48.5% | 31.3% | 20.2% | 100.0% | | |
| | 41 and Above | 50 | 57 | 50 | 157 | | |
| | | 31.8% | 36.3% | 31.8% | 100.0% | | |
| Education | Total | 190 | 138 | 102 | 430 | 19.069 | 0.014 |
| | | 44.2% | 32.1% | 23.7% | 100.0% | | |
| | Illiterate | 36 | 38 | 26 | 100 | | |
| | | 36.0% | 38.0% | 26.0% | 100.0% | | |
| | Matriculate | 19 | 18 | 21 | 58 | | |
| | | 32.8% | 31.0% | 36.2% | 100.0% | | |
| | Intermediate | 43 | 34 | 28 | 105 | | |
| Profession | | 41.0% | 32.4% | 26.7% | 100.0% | 29.843 | 0.001 |
| | Graduate | 58 | 32 | 20 | 110 | | |
| | | 52.7% | 29.1% | 18.2% | 100.0% | | |
| | Postgraduate | 34 | 16 | 7 | 57 | | |
| | | 59.6% | 28.1% | 12.3% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 190 | 138 | 102 | 430 | | |
| | | 44.2% | 32.1% | 23.7% | 100.0% | | |
| Monthly Income | Government Servant | 18 | 25 | 11 | 54 | 56.436 | 0.000 |
| | | 33.3% | 46.3% | 20.4% | 100.0% | | |
| | Private Service Sector | 37 | 26 | 16 | 79 | | |
| | | 46.8% | 32.9% | 20.3% | 100.0% | | |
| | Businessmen & Shopkeepers | 32 | 27 | 32 | 91 | | |
| | | 35.2% | 29.7% | 35.2% | 100.0% | | |
| | Health Experts | 11 | 10 | 0 | 21 | | |
| Area | | 52.4% | 47.6% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 4.715 | 0.095 |
| | Education Experts | 20 | 3 | 4 | 27 | | |
| | | 74.1% | 11.1% | 14.8% | 100.0% | | |
| | Others | 72 | 47 | 39 | 158 | | |
| | | 45.6% | 29.7% | 24.7% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 190 | 138 | 102 | 430 | | |
| | | 44.2% | 32.1% | 23.7% | 100.0% | | |
| Area | PKR 21000 and Below | 90 | 26 | 31 | 147 | | |
| | | 61.2% | 17.7% | 21.1% | 100.0% | | |
| | PKR 22000 and Above | 70 | 74 | 24 | 168 | | |
| | | 41.7% | 44.0% | 14.3% | 100.0% | | |
| Area | Sorry | 30 | 38 | 47 | 115 | | |
| | | 26.1% | 33.0% | 40.9% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 190 | 138 | 102 | 430 | | |
| | | 44.2% | 32.1% | 23.7% | 100.0% | | |
| Area | Rural | 120 | 102 | 65 | 287 | | |
| | | 41.8% | 35.5% | 22.6% | 100.0% | | |
| | Urban | 70 | 36 | 37 | 143 | | |
| | | 49.0% | 25.2% | 25.9% | 100.0% | | |
| Area | Total | 190 | 138 | 102 | 430 | | |
| | | 44.2% | 32.1% | 23.7% | 100.0% | | |

EXPLANATION:

A distinguished number of the education experts by profession (74.1%) seconded by the lower income respondents of PKR 21000 and below group (61.2%), the female respondents (45.2%), the younger respondents of 18-30 age group (55.5%), the postgraduate respondents (59.6%) and the urban respondents (49.0%) confirmed the improved punctuality of the teaching staff with the introduction of IMU at primary level. The chi-square test laid down significant p-values for the age, education, profession and the monthly income. The p-value < 0.05 brings unity between these significant variables and the effectivity of

IMU in enhancing punctuality of the teaching staff. The gender and area were asserted as insignificant by the chi-square test and disunity is noted between the insignificant variables and the effective IMU in enhancing the teachers punctuality.

It also elaborated that the respondents from the education experts were more satisfied with the performance of the provincial government of KP (2013-18) with the reforms introduced at primary level education that enhanced the teachers promptness.

Q 6. TO WHICH EXTENT DID YOU SUPPORT THE BAN OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT INTRODUCED AT PRIMARY LEVEL IN KP (2013-18)?

Table 52

| Variables | Sub-Category | Greater Extent | Average Extent | Lower Extent | Total | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|---------|
| Gender | Male | 105 31.2% | 112 33.2% | 120 35.6% | 337 100.0% | 18.827 | 0.000 |
| | Female | 15 16.1% | 22 23.7% | 56 60.2% | 93 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 120 27.9% | 134 31.2% | 176 40.9% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Age | 18-30 | 41 37.3% | 22 20.0% | 47 42.7% | 110 100.0% | 10.871 | 0.028 |
| | 31-40 | 42 25.8% | 56 34.4% | 65 39.9% | 163 100.0% | | |
| | 41 and Above | 37 23.6% | 56 35.7% | 64 40.8% | 157 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 120 27.9% | 134 31.2% | 176 40.9% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Education | Illiterate | 15 15.0% | 27 27.0% | 58 58.0% | 100 100.0% | 28.799 | 0.000 |
| | Matriculate | 15 25.9% | 22 37.9% | 21 36.2% | 58 100.0% | | |
| | Intermediate | 33 31.4% | 29 27.6% | 43 41.0% | 105 100.0% | | |
| | Graduate | 45 40.9% | 34 30.9% | 31 28.2% | 110 100.0% | | |
| | Postgraduate | 12 21.1% | 22 38.6% | 23 40.4% | 57 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 120 27.9% | 134 31.2% | 176 40.9% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Profession | Government Servant | 18 33.3% | 23 42.6% | 13 24.1% | 54 100.0% | 36.147 | 0.000 |
| | Private Service Sector | 18 22.8% | 35 44.3% | 26 32.9% | 79 100.0% | | |
| | Businessmen & Shopkeepers | 29 31.9% | 17 18.7% | 45 49.5% | 91 100.0% | | |
| | Health Experts | 4 19.0% | 11 52.4% | 6 28.6% | 21 100.0% | | |
| | Education Experts | 1 3.7% | 9 33.3% | 17 63.0% | 27 100.0% | | |
| | Others | 50 31.6% | 39 24.7% | 69 43.7% | 158 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 120 27.9% | 134 31.2% | 176 40.9% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Monthly Income | PKR 21000 and Below | 37 25.2% | 23 15.6% | 87 59.2% | 147 100.0% | 40.615 | 0.000 |
| | PKR 22000 and Above | 42 25.0% | 72 42.9% | 54 32.1% | 168 100.0% | | |
| | Sorry | 41 35.7% | 39 33.9% | 35 30.4% | 115 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 120 27.9% | 134 31.2% | 176 40.9% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Area | Rural | 92 32.1% | 85 29.6% | 110 38.3% | 287 100.0% | 7.413 | 0.025 |
| | Urban | 28 19.6% | 49 34.3% | 66 46.2% | 143 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 120 27.9% | 134 31.2% | 176 40.9% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |

EXPLANATION:

An adequate number of the education experts (60.2%), the younger respondents of the age group (63.0%) followed by the female respondents of 18-30 (42.7%), the illiterate respondents

(58.0%), the respondents having lower income of PKR 21000 and below (59.2%) and the urban respondents (46.2%) have depreciated the ban on corporal punishment. The chi-square test come up with significant p-values about the gender, age, education, profession, monthly income and the inhabited area of the respondents. The p-value < 0.05 shows linkage between the significant variables and the ban on the corporal punishment

while the insignificant p-valued variables were detached from the ban on the corporal punishment.

It also showed that the respondents from within education experts were sufficiently satisfied with the performance of the provincial government of KP (2013-18) for reforming the elementary education particularly with the imposition of ban on the corporal punishment.

Q 7. TO WHICH EXTENT DID THE BAN ON CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IMPROVE THE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS AT PRIMARY LEVEL IN KP (2013-18)?

Table 53

| Variables | Sub-Category | Greater Extent | Average Extent | Lower Extent | Total | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|---------|
| Gender | Male | 97 28.8% | 98 29.1% | 142 42.1% | 337 100.0% | 1.378 | 0.502 |
| | Female | 22 23.7% | 32 34.4% | 39 41.9% | 93 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 119 27.7% | 130 30.2% | 181 42.1% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Age | 18-30 | 37 33.6% | 26 23.6% | 47 42.7% | 110 100.0% | 10.183 | 0.037 |
| | 31-40 | 34 20.9% | 62 38.0% | 67 41.1% | 163 100.0% | | |
| | 41 and Above | 48 30.6% | 42 26.8% | 67 42.7% | 157 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 119 27.7% | 130 30.2% | 181 42.1% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Education | Illiterate | 21 21.0% | 23 23.0% | 56 56.0% | 100 100.0% | 23.585 | 0.003 |
| | Matriculate | 14 24.1% | 21 36.2% | 23 39.7% | 58 100.0% | | |
| | Intermediate | 32 30.5% | 29 27.6% | 44 41.9% | 105 100.0% | | |
| | Graduate | 43 39.1% | 35 31.8% | 32 29.1% | 110 100.0% | | |
| | Postgraduate | 9 15.8% | 22 38.6% | 26 45.6% | 57 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 119 27.7% | 130 30.2% | 181 42.1% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Profession | Government Servant | C 24.1% | 23 42.6% | 18 33.3% | 54 100.0% | 13.453 | 0.139 |
| | Private Service Sector | 18 22.8% | 26 32.9% | 35 44.3% | 79 100.0% | | |
| | Businessmen & Shopkeepers | 30 33.0% | 23 25.3% | 38 41.8% | 91 100.0% | | |
| | Health Experts | 5 23.8% | 5 23.8% | 11 52.4% | 21 100.0% | | |
| | Education Experts | 4 14.8% | 6 22.2% | 17 63.0% | 27 100.0% | | |
| | Others | 49 31.0% | 47 29.7% | 62 39.2% | 158 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 119 27.7% | 130 30.2% | 181 42.1% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Monthly Income | PKR 21000 and Below | 50 34.0% | 7 4.8% | 90 61.2% | 147 100.0% | 96.906 | 0.000 |
| | PKR 22000 and Above | 22 13.1% | 81 48.2% | 65 38.7% | 168 100.0% | | |
| | Sorry | 47 40.9% | 42 36.5% | 26 22.6% | 115 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 119 27.7% | 130 30.2% | 181 42.1% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Area | Rural | 94 32.8% | 79 27.5% | 114 39.7% | 287 100.0% | 11.286 | 0.004 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--|--|
| | Urban | 25 17.5% | 51 35.7% | 67 46.9% | 143 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 119 27.7% | 130 30.2% | 181 42.1% | 430 100.0% | | |

EXPLANATION:

A large number of the education experts (63.0%) pursued by the respondents of the lower income group of PKR 21000 and below (61.2%), the male respondents (42.1%), the elderly and the younger respondents alike (42.7%), the illiterate respondents (56.0%) and the urban respondents (46.9%) scarcely approved of the improved performance of students with the imposition of ban on corporal punishment of the students. The chi-square test furnished insignificant p-values for the gender and profession and were separated from improvement of the performance of students with the imposed ban on corporal punishment. The age, education monthly income and the area

consideration of the respondents got significant p-values and the p-value < 0.05 united the significant variables and the improved performance of the students with the imposition of the corporal punishment.

It also concluded that the education experts were satisfied to a lower extent with the reforms introduced in the education department by the provincial government of KP during (2013-18) in terms of the ban on corporal punishment and its role in improving the performance of the students at primary level education.

Q 8. TO WHICH EXTENT DID THE CORPORAL PUNISHMENT PROVE EFFECTIVE FOR THE TEACHERS AT PRIMARY LEVEL IN KP (2013-18)?

Table 54

| Variables | Sub-Category | Greater Extent | Average Extent | Lower Extent | Total | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|---------|
| Gender | Male | 66 19.6% | 118 35.0% | 153 45.4% | 337 100.0% | 8.565 | 0.014 |
| | Female | 14 15.1% | 21 22.6% | 58 62.4% | 93 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 80 18.6% | 139 32.3% | 211 49.1% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Age | 18-30 | 19 17.3% | 33 30.0% | 58 52.7% | 110 100.0% | 1.136 | 0.888 |
| | 31-40 | 33 20.2% | 54 33.1% | 76 46.6% | 163 100.0% | | |
| | 41 and Above | 28 17.8% | 52 33.1% | 77 49.0% | 157 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 80 18.6% | 139 32.3% | 211 49.1% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Education | Illiterate | 14 14.0% | 26 26.0% | 60 60.0% | 100 100.0% | 17.398 | 0.026 |
| | Matriculate | 13 22.4% | 18 31.0% | 27 46.6% | 58 100.0% | | |
| | Intermediate | 28 26.7% | 33 31.4% | 44 41.9% | 105 100.0% | | |
| | Graduate | 21 19.1% | 42 38.2% | 47 42.7% | 110 100.0% | | |
| | Postgraduate | 4 7.0% | 20 35.1% | 33 57.9% | 57 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 80 18.6% | 139 32.3% | 211 49.1% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Profession | Government Servant | 17 31.5% | 19 35.2% | 18 33.3% | 54 100.0% | 23.004 | 0.011 |
| | Private Service Sector | 9 11.4% | 26 32.9% | 44 55.7% | 79 100.0% | | |
| | Businessmen & Shopkeepers | 14 15.4% | 27 29.7% | 50 54.9% | 91 100.0% | | |
| | Health Experts | 6 28.6% | 9 42.9% | 6 28.6% | 21 100.0% | | |
| | Education Experts | 2 7.4% | 5 18.5% | 20 74.1% | 27 100.0% | | |
| | Others | 32 20.3% | 53 33.5% | 73 46.2% | 158 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 80 18.6% | 139 32.3% | 211 49.1% | 430 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Monthly Income | PKR 21000 and Below | 25 17.0% | 22 15.0% | 100 68.0% | 147 100.0% | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|------|---------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------|-------|
| | PKR 22000 and Above | 32 19.0% | 68 40.5% | 68 40.5% | 168 100.0% | 37.749 | 0.000 |
| | Sorry | 23 20.0% | 49 42.6% | 43 37.4% | 115 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 80 18.6% | 139 32.3% | 211 49.1% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Area | Rural | 60 20.9% | 113 39.4% | 114 39.7% | 287 100.0% | 31.086 | 0.000 |
| | Urban | 20 14.0% | 26 18.2% | 97 67.8% | 143 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 80 18.6% | 139 32.3% | 211 49.1% | 430 100.0% | | |

EXPLANATION:

A prominent number of the respondents serving in education sector (74.1%) supported by the respondents of the lower income group of PKR 21000 and below (68.0%), the urban respondents (67.8%), the female respondents (62.4%), the illiterate respondents (60.0%) and the younger respondents of 18-30 age group (52.7%) supported to a smaller extent the effectivity of the corporal punishment for the teachers at primary level. The p-values of the gender, education, profession, monthly income and the area were supplied as significant by the chi-square tests that highlighted the connectivity between the significant variables

and the impact of the corporal punishment for the teachers at primary level. The variable of age got insignificant p-value and is isolated from the teachers convenience with the ban on corporal punishment of the students.

It further illustrated that the professionals from the education experts barely agreed with the reforms introduced by the provincial government of KP during its rule (2013-18) in the educational institutions in terms of the ban on corporal punishment and its impact on teachers convenience.

Q 9. TO WHICH EXTENT DID THE BAN ON CORPORAL PUNISHMENT ENHANCE THE ENROLMENT RATIO AT PRIMARY LEVEL IN KP (2013-18)?

Table 55

| Variables | Sub-Category | Greater Extent | Average Extent | Lower Extent | Total | Chi-Square Value | P-Value |
|------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|---------|
| Gender | Male | 120 35.6% | 130 38.6% | 87 25.8% | 337 100.0% | 10.111 | 0.006 |
| | Female | 23 24.7% | 53 57.0% | 17 18.3% | 93 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 33.3% | 183 42.6% | 104 24.2% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Age | 18-30 | 47 42.7% | 47 42.7% | 16 14.5% | 110 100.0% | 10.678 | 0.030 |
| | 31-40 | 51 31.3% | 71 43.6% | 41 25.2% | 163 100.0% | | |
| | 41 and Above | 45 28.7% | 65 41.4% | 47 29.9% | 157 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 33.3% | 183 42.6% | 104 24.2% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Education | Illiterate | 22 22.0% | 43 43.0% | 35 35.0% | 100 100.0% | 23.326 | 0.003 |
| | Matriculate | 24 41.4% | 21 36.2% | 13 22.4% | 58 100.0% | | |
| | Intermediate | 44 41.9% | 34 32.4% | 27 25.7% | 105 100.0% | | |
| | Graduate | 38 34.5% | 56 50.9% | 16 14.5% | 110 100.0% | | |
| | Postgraduate | 15 26.3% | 29 50.9% | 13 22.8% | 57 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 33.3% | 183 42.6% | 104 24.2% | 430 100.0% | | |
| Profession | Government Servant | 14 25.9% | 22 40.7% | 18 33.3% | 54 100.0% | | |
| | Private Service Sector | 28 | 30 | 21 | 79 | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | 35.4% | 38.0% | 26.6% | 100.0% | 15.259 | 0.123 |
| | Businessmen & Shopkeepers | 28 | 33 | 30 | 91 | | |
| | | 30.8% | 36.3% | 33.0% | 100.0% | | |
| | Health Experts | 8 | 11 | 2 | 21 | | |
| | | 38.1% | 52.4% | 9.5% | 100.0% | | |
| | Education Experts | 7 | 14 | 6 | 27 | | |
| | | 25.9% | 51.9% | 22.2% | 100.0% | | |
| Monthly Income | Others | 58 | 73 | 27 | 158 | 27.623 | 0.000 |
| | | 36.7% | 46.2% | 17.1% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 | 183 | 104 | 430 | | |
| | | 33.3% | 42.6% | 24.2% | 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Area | PKR 21000 and Below | 53 | 67 | 27 | 147 | 1.617 | 0.446 |
| | | 36.1% | 45.6% | 18.4% | 100.0% | | |
| | PKR 22000 and Above | 36 | 86 | 46 | 168 | | |
| | | 21.4% | 51.2% | 27.4% | 100.0% | | |
| | Sorry | 54 | 30 | 31 | 115 | | |
| | | 47.0% | 26.1% | 27.0% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 | 183 | 104 | 430 | | |
| | | 33.3% | 42.6% | 24.2% | 100.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Rural | 99 | 116 | 72 | 287 | | |
| | | 34.5% | 40.4% | 25.1% | 100.0% | | |
| | Urban | 44 | 67 | 32 | 143 | | |
| | | 30.8% | 46.9% | 22.4% | 100.0% | | |
| | Total | 143 | 183 | 104 | 430 | | |
| | | 33.3% | 42.6% | 24.2% | 100.0% | | |

EXPLANATION:

A reasonable number of the female respondents (57.0%) seconded by the middle aged respondents of the 31-40 age group (43.6%), the graduate and the postgraduate respondents (50.9%), the professionals of the health experts (52.4%), the higher income respondents (51.2%) and the urban respondents (46.9%) agreed to an average extent with the enhanced enrolment ratio of the students with the imposition of the corporal punishment. The chi-square test fitted out significant p-values for the gender, age, education and monthly income that finished by associating the significant variables and the improved enrolment ratio with the inflicting ban on corporal punishment. The p-value > 0.05 illustrated insignificance of the profession and area consideration and disassociation occurred between the insignificant variables and the infliction of ban on the corporal punishment that increased the enrolment ratio at primary level.

It also posited that the female respondents were satisfied with the performance of the provincial government of KP (2013-18) for the introduced reforms in elementary education by playing positive role with the enforcement of ban on the corporal punishment for the increased enrolment.

CONCLUSION:

The Pakistan Tehrik-e-Insaf (2013-18) after coming in power in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa get a chance for the transformation of the electoral manifesto into policies. In this regard, the government tried to introduce reforms in education department at primary level. It introduced IMU for monitoring and smooth

functioning of the academic activities in the schools. It also pointed out ghost schools and reported the shortage of administrative and teaching staff. The government focused on the enrolment and introduced reforms regarding the corporal punishment of the student at primary level. The study reported exhibited that the reforms introduced by the provincial government in primary level education department satisfied the public to an average extent (36.10%).

The education reforms examined at the primary school level are important to be known in terms of the variables including gender, age group, education, profession, monthly income and rural or urban stratification. Study demonstrated that in terms introduced reforms at primary school level the male respondents are more satisfied as compared to the female respondents from the performance of the provincial government of KP (2013-18). The age, education, professional, monthly income and area consideration portrayed satisfaction of the respondents of the middle age group, the graduates, the ‘Others group of professionals, income group of PKR 22000 and above and the inhabitants of the rural area respectively.

REFERENCES

Arif, S. (2016, April 11). *K-P improves on key educational*. Retrieved from The Express Tribune:
<https://tribune.com.pk/story/1082910/k-p-improves-on-key-educational-indicators>

Brian Levy, R. C. (2018). *The Politics and*

Governance of Basic Education: A Tale of Two South African Provinces. UK: Oxford.

Marija Risteska, A. M. (2010). *Good governance in education.* Skopje: SEEU.

Muhammad Shahzad, M. N. (2015). A content analysis of education and good governance in public schools of pakistan. *The Explorer Islamabad: Journal of Social Sciences*, 307-310.

Nabi, I. (2014). *Reclaiming Prosperity in Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa: A Medium Term Strategy for Inclusive Growth.* London: IGC.

Shakeel Khan, M. H.-e.-N. (2020). Comparative Analysis of Education Policy Reforms of Khyber Pakhtunkhuwa (KP) Pakistan since 2008-18 . *Review of Education, Administration and Law (REAL)*, 165-174.

Smith, D. J. (2008). A Framework for Understanding Educational Governance: The Case of California. *Education Finance and Policy*, 20-40.

Zaman, M. H. (2013, June 01). *K-P's education test.* Retrieved from The Express Tribune: <https://tribune.com.pk/story/557513/k-ps-education-test>