

## UNIVERSITY TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ABOUT INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN PAKISTAN: A QUALITATIVE STUDY

**Sahirish Farooq**

PhD Scholar

Department of Education

The University of Lahore, Lahore

**Dr. Mahwish Safdar**

Assistant Professor

Department of Education

The University of Lahore, Lahore

### Abstract

*This research paper analyzes the perceptions of university teachers about institutional accountability in Lahore, Pakistan. After recognizing the diverse global understandings regarding accountability, this study offers a contextualized interpretation in local academic experiences of teachers at public and private sector universities. It utilizes a causal-comparative research design to investigate the accountability mechanism and its impact on quality of teaching and job satisfaction among teachers in both sectors. Richard Elmore's (2004) concept of performance-based accountability is selected as theoretical framework to analyze the structures of governance and institutional policies which are directly influencing teachers' responsibilities and learning outcomes of students. Research data has been collected via interviews from teachers across 5 public and 5 private universities to assess the effectiveness of accountability factors for professional growth and pedagogical practices. A large amount of international literature is available on accountability and employees' performance, still there is a significant gap regarding university teachers' institutional accountability in Pakistan. This research has addressed a neglected topic by comparing the accountability perceptions of teachers and its effect on students' learning outcomes in both sectors. Results and data findings have highlighted the serious role of institutional accountability to enhance teaching quality, promote pedagogical innovations, and update higher education policies, and frameworks of governance in Pakistan.*

**Key terms:** Institutional accountability, equal and better education, innovative pedagogies, quality enhancement(s)

### Introduction

The concept of accountability broadly varies across international context (Sin & Amaral, 2017; Bovens, 2005), that has complicated its various interpretations in academic discourse at universities (Rasmussen & Zou, 2014) especially in Lahore, Pakistan. This paper has also considered teachers' perceptions regarding their accountability across both public and private sector universities. It also analyzes the importance of context-dependent interpretations of accountability factors and their effects on teachers' performance and their satisfaction level. This study also examines the relationship between accountability measures and teachers' performance (Alexander, 2000) by following a causal-comparative research framework. It also focuses on pedagogical quality and learning outcomes of students.

A number of research is available on accountability addressing the matter of employees' performance among different professions, but a large research gap has been identified regarding faculty of public and private universities in Pakistan. To address this gap, this paper explores the mechanism of accountability, factors, and its effect on teaching practice, teachers' motivation level, and their job satisfaction. The results and findings confirm the importance of educational accountability for maintaining standards and academic outcomes at higher education in universities. But it may have some adverse effects on teachers' performance; sometimes excessive stress and bad accountability may hurt their morale which ultimately causes problems in taking decisions regarding pedagogical innovations.

In higher education system, accountability is normally defined as a responsibility for teachers to accomplish some specific standards required for teaching and learning. Intricately, it is linked with evaluation-metrics, performance-criteria, and institutional reputation. This paper also highlights the problems of institutional-accountability frameworks which are poorly executed and are causing underperformance. Though, it can function as a catalyst for enhancing pedagogical efficiency and organizational growth if implemented constructively. Moreover, this paper emphasizes the evolving role of teachers in educational management. This study confirms an important condition to involve properly teachers for designing and implementing accountability which ultimately brings the supportive academic environment.

Accountability is a complicated concept and goes ahead of organizational supervision at higher education level. It can serve as a ‘catalyst’ to collaborate with teachers (Evans, 2008; Adams, 2012) for trust development and their professional growth (Ingersoll & Collins, 2017). These findings have highlighted the teachers’ perceptions about accountability, its effect on their performance, autonomy and independence (Romzek, 2000) in public and private sector universities in Lahore, Pakistan. However, well-designed accountability frameworks can enhance professionalism and educational quality, but the poorly structured accountability measures may badly affect the motivation and performance of teachers.

Currently, the research data has been collected after interviews with 10 teachers (i.e., 5 public and 5 private sector teachers). The previous studies addressed student-oriented outcomes (Muffo, 1992) but this study fills the identified gap regarding the perceptions of teaching faculty. Data analysis and findings suggest that well-organized accountability and trust can empower teachers. Additionally, there is a significant requirement to evolve teachers for addressing educational needs and institutional growth. Moreover, accountability can be a good tool for raising institutional status if teachers and educational institutions trust each other for aligning their performance to meet national and international expectations (Dobbins et al., 2011; Marginson, 2013).

### **Research Problem**

The existing accountability framework and teachers’ perceptions about accountability are emerging research problems and objectives of this paper which can be useful for enhancing professional satisfaction and teaching quality, which can promote a culture of continuous clarity and improvement. Moreover, accountability frameworks are emphasizing the integration of professional growth with institutional accountability, but this link is identified very weak in public and private universities in Pakistan. Therefore, the current paper addresses these research gaps by analyzing the current accountability framework and teachers’ perceptions about these measures which can ultimately support their performance and talk about organizational issues in the local context.

### **Research questions**

This study deals with the current situation of institutional accountability in public and private universities of Lahore, Pakistan. Therefore, the main aim is to address the following research questions:

1. What are the perceptions of university teachers regarding institutional accountability?
2. How is/are the current accountability framework(s) working?

## Literature Review

This section shares theoretical foundations regarding the concept of accountability across disciplines. Accountability is considerably an evolving concept and appears as an internal and external accountability. Internal accountability is related with self-assessment that is rooted with ethics, personal integrity, and individual motivation for supporting professional commitments. On the other hand, external accountability is essential and implemented by organizations and society which compels people to meet certain formal standards. Over the decades, the accountability is getting prominence equally at public and private sector institutions. Ultimately, it has significantly become relevant to the education sector (Dubnick, 2012).

### 2.1. Accountability

Accountability is an ancient discourse and applicable for all professions equally, where employees play essential roles (Banta, 2005). Accountability is equally relevant within education sector and is considered critical element for improving the quality of education, maintaining rightfulness, and governance (Levitt et al., 2008). It is theoretically defined as a “slippery concept” due to its multifaceted descriptions and practical implications across disciplines and contexts. Ethically, it is an inclusive concept which includes the individuals and their organizations to justify their actions considering their respective stakeholders. Their relationship emphasizes their conduct, attitudes, and outcomes. Bovens defines accountability as “a social relation in which an actor feels an obligation to explain and to justify his or her conduct to some significant other” (Bovens, 2005). Currently, accountability aims to enhance teachers’ performance and students’ learning outcomes in educational governance (Rhodes, 1997). Moreover, a moderate level of accountability can generate trust among teachers and management (O’Neill, 2002; Bouckaert & Halligan, 2007).

### 2.2. Types of Accountabilities in Academia

In higher education system, accountability covers multiple dimensions including (i) organizational, (ii) professional, (iii) ethical/moral, (iv) political, and (iv) legal accountability (Anderson, 2005). These types can be distinguished based on two key criteria: firstly, the nature of the accountability relationship between all stakeholders, and the evidence to evaluate their behaviour and performance (Ferlie et al., 2005). Each type is reflecting an indifferent mechanism for teachers and held them answerable regarding their institutions, professional requirements, ethical standards, political norms, and/or legal frameworks. Understanding these classifications is fundamental element to explore how teachers perceive and experience accountability across public and private universities in Lahore, Pakistan.

**Table 1: Types of accountabilities**

Type	Actors	Mechanism and method
Organisational	Superior and subordinate	Hierarchical/supervisory relationship; rules, standards and targets
Political	Elected politicians	Democratic
Legal	Individuals and organisations	Integrity, “keep them honest”, exercised through courts
Professional	Professionals	Conformity to standards and codes of conduct checked by professional peers, through their institutions
Moral/ethical	Civil society	Ethical obligation and moral responsibilities, internalised values

### 2.2.1. Organisational

Organizational accountability is normally enforced via hierarchical structures and it links with institutional and employees' (teachers') performance. In education sector, it shapes the professional relationship between institutional framework and teachers' autonomy. Teachers' perceptions and feedback(s) serve as critical inputs regarding organizational practices for continuous progress, empowerment, growth, and professional development (Bovens, 2005; Elkins & Elliott, 2004).

### 2.2.2. Political

Political accountability is exercised by the elected officials to ensure democratic oversight. It operates through election, parliamentary process, and legislative frameworks. Evaluations of political accountability are frequently contested due to the ambiguous nature of political agendas and norms. Its application is also considered complex and open to interpretation in educational governance (Bovens, 2005).

### 2.2.3. Legal

Legal accountability also serves as a significant mechanism to ensure the integrity of individual and institutional actions. The trust level is increasingly shifted from political bodies to judiciary with growing faith on legal frameworks. Therefore, autonomous individuals and institutions are held accountable for legal standards which makes it the most explicit form of accountability (Bovens, 2005; Friedman, 1985).

### 2.2.4. Professional

Professional accountability is instructed in obedience to establish code of conduct and ethical standards. It is typically monitored by peer-participants and/or regulatory institutions. In education sector, teachers are also accountable in front of professional bodies such as Secondary, Higher Secondary Boards, or HEC. These regulatory bodies are tasked to enhance quality of teaching and professional conduct. Thus, they safeguard public interests and ensure consistent standards across public and private universities<sup>1</sup>.

### 2.2.5. Ethical/Moral

Ethical accountability plays a primary role in shaping professional conduct, emphasizes mutual balance between individuals' judgment and organizational interests. It is rooted with internal moral values and community responsibilities therefore considered a complementary element for the external codes of conduct which are typically established by professional organizational bodies (Seema et al., 2017). It is opposite to professional accountability because professional accountability is formal and binding through memberships while ethical accountability more relies on informal norms and individual conscience (Ferlie et al., 2005). In the context of education sector, teachers are ethically accountable to students, institutions, and other stakeholders. Therefore, teachers take decision which act in favor of students based on personal and moral judgments for achieving professional integrity (McGrath & Whitty, 2018; GTC, 2008). This sense of duty is reinforced by their roles within professionalism that upholds shared values among peer-community.

Table 1: Types of Accountabilities

Accountability type	What is accounted for	To who
compliance with regulations	adherence to legislation and official orders	bureaucracy and political system
adherence to professional norms	professional qualifications and control within professions	professional peers and political system
evaluation of results	outputs (e.g. completion	bureaucracy, political

<sup>1</sup>General Teaching Council for England: <https://www.gtce.org.uk/>

	rates; student achievement; employment)	system and general public
--	---	---------------------------

### 2.3. Components (Elements) of Accountability

Accountability is a multi-layered system encompassing five important components in the higher education context, especially in public and private universities. These components are objectives, instructions, resources, assessments, and rewards (Anderson, 2005). These components are collectively shaping teachers' perceptions about accountability and how it is influencing institutional practices.

#### Objectives

Teachers are very clear about curricular objectives for aligning their teaching practices for achieving desired learning outcomes. These objectives orbit five guiding questions about students' achievement, teachers' preparedness, public awareness about performance, and stakeholders' engagement. Teachers' clarity about objectives enhances obviousness and promotes shared accountability among all stakeholders in academia.

#### Instruction and Resources

Successful accountability depends on the alliance of teaching strategies and teaching materials with the standards of content. Teachers should navigate curricular structure across levels and within levels, meaning both vertically and horizontally but it can only be supported with sufficient learning materials. However, the content standards practically often leave behind the developments of supportive learning materials. Therefore, a well-aligned curriculum may reflect national and economic priorities, which emphasizes literacy, logical reasoning, and employees readiness.

#### Assessment

There is a rising trend to follow results-based accountability system. It has directed to increase dependence on assessments and assessment criteria for decision-making considering student progression, teachers' evaluation, and institutional efficiency. While "high stakes" assessments lead performance improvements, they often not have diagnostic value for individualized instructions. Therefore, different assessments and adaptive teaching strategies are required to support distinct learners and substitute instructional changes. Public information of results is promoting transparency but could also create pressure on teachers. It can ultimately necessitate a supportive data collection and sharing culture.

#### Rewards

Employee recognitions, incentives, financial support, and technical assistance are key stimuli within accountability frameworks. Effective reward announcements and systems should be connected to noticeable improvements for encouraging sustainable changes. Thus, when institutional changes are externally applied and dashed, it may cause hinderances for long-term progress. Sustainable reforms require collaborative efforts among teachers and across all academic stakeholders for achieving targeted support for building institutional capacity (Anderson, 2005).

### 3. Materials and Methods

This is a causal-comparative study and based on a qualitative approach for investigating the teachers' perceptions about institutional accountability and its effect on their performance in public and private universities in Lahore, Pakistan. Therefore, Elmore's (2004) concept of performance-based accountability is selected as theoretical framework to provide a detailed survey of accountability and its effect on teachers. Qualitative data was collected by using semi-structured interviews therefore a questionnaire was designed to justify the research problems.



These interview questions were designed to cover all possible measurements related to accountability, i.e., (i) basic understanding regarding institutional accountability, (ii) student learning outcomes, (iii) teaching effectiveness, (iv) professional conduct and ethics, (v) classroom management, (vi) continuous professional development, (vii) communication and collaboration, (viii) compliance with institutional and government policies. Therefore, this interview was divided into three parts (i.e., general understanding about accountability, professional conduct and ethics, and compliance with institutional policies) and 10 comprehensive questions were designed to cover all these points.

A consent letter was also shared with the participants to follow accurate ethical protocols. Identification of all participants was kept anonymous to maintain trust and it was also assured that their recordings and research data would be used exclusively for academic research. Data was gathered from 10 teachers' (i.e., 5 public and 5 private sector university teachers). The interviews were conducted in a friendly environment, and they were allowed to answer questions in Urdu to consider teachers' convenience and true results. Later, after listening, all those recordings were translated in English. Furthermore, their opinions were collectively interpreted for data analysis.

#### **4. Data Analysis and Discussion**

##### **1. How do you define institutional accountability in the context of higher education in Pakistan?**

Teachers have different opinions about institutional accountability in the context of higher education. Their opinions encompass the adherence with academic policies, quality education, and fulfillment of institutional responsibilities. They admitted that in educational institutions, teachers' accountability involves effective content delivery, fair assessments, and students' engagement in teaching. They also accepted that their teaching style and material should be aligned with their institutional objectives, HEC policies, and social demands. However, their performance and contribution should be equally sustainable in academic and research activities for promotions. Moreover, accountability is evaluated with the help of multidimensional commitments to quality teaching, professionalism, institutional credibility, students' feedback, peer-review, administrative evaluations, and reflections in terms of timely promotions, salary increments, and awards.

##### **2. In your opinion, how does accountability differ between public and private universities?**

Teachers had mixed opinions about accountability in public and private universities. They confirmed that accountability has notable differences, particularly by considering administrative bodies and their structures, institutional preferences, and funding methods.

In public sector universities, teachers' accountability has general compliance with government rules and Higher Education Commission (HEC) policies, which are mostly illustrated by bureaucratic controls. Although public universities also have performance appraisal criteria, and their implementation may be inconsistent sometimes, students' feedback and tenure track systems also influence teachers' performance that ultimately causes job security threats among teachers.

Oppositely private university teachers shared that teachers' accountability is operated within market driven environment. Therefore, accountability is closely linked with students' satisfaction, organizational reputation, and financial capability. They also shared that faculty members are subject to thorough monitoring, consistent evaluations, and performance-based appraisals and contract renewals in private universities. Moreover, teachers' performance emphasized pedagogical innovations, active responsiveness, and performance alignment with the academic demands. However, private universities mostly provide incentives for

maintaining structured accountability among faculty by clearly defining benchmarks for teachers' performance.

Thus, their discussion confirmed that both sectors have their own priorities and policies to adhere with teachers' performance. Public universities have prioritized regulatory compliance while private universities have emphasized on performance and outcomes because stakeholders' satisfaction is a key component of accountability for the management of private universities in Pakistan.

#### **4.2. Student Learning Outcomes**

##### **3. How do you ensure that students have achieved the intended learning outcomes in your courses?**

Teachers of both sectors shared their experiences and how they employed structured and outcome-based approaches and teaching strategies. Those methodologies integrated clearly to design content to achieve learning objectives, supported reading materials, assessments, and consistent feedback to ensure students' achievements regarding the intended learning outcomes (ILOs).

Mostly teachers shared that they explicitly communicate about course objectives during first or first-week lectures by sharing and reviewing the course outlines and syllabus with their students. They deliberately designed all teaching materials, lesson plans, and classroom instructional activities to support these learning outcomes.

Teachers have conducted multiple assessments, i.e., assignment, quiz, presentation, midterm exam, final project, final term exams, etc. Teachers tried their best to carefully align all assessments with learning objectives and outcomes for evaluating conceptual and practical skills of their students. They shared that they tried to incorporate in-class activities including group discussion(s), case studies, and projects, are for promoting peer learning and critical thinking among their students.

Moreover, public and private universities solicited mid-semester feedback for refining teaching strategies and improving student engagement. They also designed thoughtful assessment rubrics for ensuring transparency and grading consistency among teachers. They said that they shared the assessment rubric with their students, along with each assignment and students can use for their self-assessment and improvements. Furthermore, teachers said they shared their weekly counselling hours during office time providing individual support to their students, ultimately enabled students to clarify their doubts by monitoring their academic achievement towards course objectives.

##### **4. What strategies do you use to support students who are struggling academically?**

All teachers shared their experiences and how they used different inclusive teaching strategies to address individual needs of their struggling students. All teachers admitted that they were following the same strategy firstly to identify their struggling students by using diagnostic test (i.e., class participations, or formative assessments, etc.). Once they identified them then called confidentially them for counselling to understand their issues and root causes of their emotional, personal, or academic difficulties. Later, they offered them some additional academic coaching and moral support through in-person consultations, alternative lectures and materials, customized content and lesson plans.

They tried to simplify all difficult concepts along with extra and/or simple materials (i.e., notes, class lecture recordings), to reinforce their learning needs. Moreover, they also encouraged peer-teaching where high-achievers or good students willingly agree to guide their class fellows to overcome their learning difficulties at basic level. Additionally, they tried to be available during their office hours and always replied to each email to their students to ensure continuous support. Furthermore, if their students were facing any language or skill-based problem, they suggested to attend some relevant trainings,

workshops, and university-support services. They tried to produce an empathetic and non-judgmental classroom where students feel free to ask any question and express their issues openly. Moreover, they aimed to build confidence and appreciate their students and encourage steady improvements which ultimately would help them to achieve their excellence in achieving academic goals.

#### **5. How do you measure and track students' progress throughout the semester?**

Teachers shared that they devised various quantitative and qualitative assessments for tracking clear performance expectations. This ultimately linked students' performance with achievement of specific learning outcomes, then they gave in-time feedback, and did required adjustments in teaching materials and styles if needed. Teachers also admitted that they observe students' class-engagement activities, quality of their participation, and curiosity level. They were actively devising and using rubrics to provide evident feedback, which helped the students to understand their strengths and weaknesses for achieving learning outcomes and improvements. Moreover, they encouraged self-assessments, peer-teaching, and feedback.

Teachers said that they prefer interactive and problem-solving teaching activities, PowerPoint presentations, case-studies, group assignments, AI tools, audio-videos, and online quiz. They use diverse learning approaches; flipped classrooms where their students can review reading materials prior to their lectures and engage in collaborative activities in their classes for better understandings. Moreover, they encourage open research activities and collaboration.

Teachers also shared their experience after receiving feedback from their students and told how they make appropriate instructive adjustments for achieving the course objectives. They also communicate the significance of students' feedback, foster a culture of mutual respect and continuous improvement. This alignment supports continuous refinement of teaching methodologies and fosters improvement in students' performance. Teachers said that they regularly communicate individual academic reports by scheduling one-on-one meetings during their counseling hours. Sometimes, they write formal emails professional documentation and official correspondence.

Regarding professional conduct and ethics, teachers shared that they uphold transparency in students' evaluation by using well-defined rubrics to ensure objectivity and consistency in grading criteria. Teachers also told they maintain fair grading policy by sharing anonymous and constructive feedback and they kept their doors open for promoting open discussion, and culture of mutual respect and trust. Teachers said they avoid favoritism and maintain confidentiality regarding personal and academic information of their students.

#### **6. What professional development opportunities have you pursued recently?**

Teachers said that they have actively engaged in several professional initiatives to enhance their competencies. These include participation in the HEC-recognized supervisor training course and multiple faculty development workshops organized by their respective departments. They attended a webinar or seminars to learn the integration of AI and digital tools and student-centered teaching and learning methodologies. Additionally, they participated in conferences to keep themselves informed of scholarly trends and emerging discourse.

Teachers actively collaborate with their colleagues for sharing and discussing teaching materials, co-developing course outline(s) and materials. Teachers appreciated peer reviews and frequent class observations if they are teaching same course in different sections. Moreover, they encourage innovative suggestions during faculty meetings to align pedagogical strategies and learning outcomes. Additionally, they collaborate in research initiatives for professional development.



**7. How do you engage with university administration regarding teaching standards?**

Teachers said that they actively participate in departmental committees, curriculum review meetings, and institutional quality assurance process to support teaching accountability. They give constructive feedback on academic policies and align their teaching practices with institutional goals. Additionally, they participate in administrative and professional training sessions for continuous improvement.

**8. How do you ensure that your teaching aligns with university and national education policies?**

Teachers said that they thoroughly review all educational policies, official documents, curriculum, provided by their respective universities and Higher Education Commission (HEC) and tried to align their teaching with institutional demands and national education standards. They integrate course learning outcomes, assessment practices, and ethical criteria into their teaching methodologies. They kept themselves academically updated by attending relevant training and consultations when necessary. Moreover, they are consistently involved in self-assessment and peer evaluation for continuous professional growth and compliance with institutional goals and HEC policies.

**9. What challenges do you face in meeting institutional accountability expectations?**

Teachers said that sometimes they face challenges; including insufficient resources, undue workload, and the continuing struggle between teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities. Often, they encountered ambiguous policies, frequent and revisions of academic guidelines, that contributed to uncertainty among teachers. In that way, these inconsistencies cause hindrance to effectively perform and fulfill institutional accountability requirements. Ultimately, these cause obstacles to achieve educational goals and quality standards.

**10. How do you think policies on teacher accountability can be improved in Pakistan?**

Teachers said there is a great need to improve teachers' accountability policies in Pakistan. It would enhance and necessitate the development of clear national and institutional guidelines. Therefore, teachers insisted on transparent institutional evaluations, and teachers' active participation in policy making and goals' setting, regular professional training and sufficient resource allocation to support faculty to achieve their academic benchmark. They said that teachers' accountability framework should emphasize relevance and fairness to evaluate teaching performance. Moreover, better results could be achieved if institutions reduced administrative workload, support monitoring practices, and promoting a culture of mutual collaboration and trust among teachers and administration. These practices can cause continuous professional growth, by this means, promoting more sustainable teachers' accountability practices in public and private universities in Lahore, Pakistan.

This study analysis and confirms that teachers' accountability is a multidimensional in Pakistan as it is embedded with ethical and professionally practices. Public and private university teachers demonstrate strong commitment to quality education by aligning with student-centered teaching styles, pedagogies, evident and unbiased assessments, ethical honesty, and continuous professional grooming. In both sectors, faculty is actively engaging in professional collaborations, governance, and innovative pedagogy regardless of institutional differences and persistent challenges (i.e., administrative tasks, teaching workload, and ambiguous policies). These findings also highlight a vigorous alignment of teachers' performance with the national and institutional academic policies. On the other hand, this study also emphasizes the need to move ahead of compliance-driven accountability. Moreover, this paper highlights the importance of adopting a supportive and developmental accountability framework which can further boost faculty and motivate professional growth and quality education.

## Conclusion

This study provides an inclusive and nuanced analysis of teachers' concepts about academic accountability, institutional practices, and HEC policies in public and private universities of Lahore, Pakistan. This research addresses some main objectives: faculty's perception about academic accountability and existing framework of institutional accountability and its impact on teachers' performance. This study is based on qualitative data collected from 10 faculty members by conducting interviews. Therefore, the current study offers a holistic view of academic accountability and how teachers are navigating their educational demands amid institutional paradigms and pedagogical shifting.

Data analysis and findings reveal that faculty members have mixed opinions regarding academic accountability. They perceive accountability is not only an administrative formality but is considered a multidimensional responsibility on the shoulders of teachers because it encompasses academic rigor, ethical conduct, and pedagogical alignment with institutional and national educational goals. Teachers consider themselves accountable at large for the performance of their students, compliance with their institutional goals, adhering to societal demands and obligations with HEC policies. This sense of responsibility is internalized and self-driven by a personal desire for professional excellence and collective progress, therefore, if academic accountability is positively positioned as a force, then it can motivate faculty rather than creating restrictions for them.

In conclusion, this study confirms a scholarly exploration of teaching accountability in higher education of Pakistan. It portrays faculty members as adaptable, ethical, and professional and people who deeply invested themselves in the growth and progress of their institutions including the success of their students. This study identifies a need to revise and update the existing accountability process. If it shifts from compliance-driven accountability to a more supportive model that stresses teachers' mentorship, mutual collaboration among teachers and institutions, and continuous grooming opportunities for achieving institutional objectives and excellence.

This research also identified key strengths including strong ethical bases, innovative pedagogical demands and approaches, robust assessments, and alignment with HEC policies. Moreover, this work also highlighted the areas which need improvements include faculty grooming and development programs, clear administrative policies, and more involvement of other stakeholders such as parents and families. This study also affirms the main role of teachers in educational reforms and underscores the requirement to empower teaching faculty by providing an institutional support system and coherent academic policies. Ultimately, this paper fills an essential gap in the discourse of higher education institutions of Pakistan. Furthermore, it offers practical recommendations for government and private universities, policy makers, and future researchers by advocating "holistic accountability" that encourages faculty intervention, promotes academic excellence, and responds to national educational requirements.

## Future Recommendations

This study recommends key areas for future research and educational reforms in higher education system of Pakistan. Future studies may investigate:

1. Gender based investigation on professional grooming, pedagogical developments, and institutional demands expectations.
2. Designation-wise differences regarding academic accountability, pedagogical practices, and beliefs.
3. Faculty satisfaction level about their institutional support for training and research publications.
4. Impact of workload on faculty motivation level and their professionalism.

## Acknowledgement

This paper is based on my PhD dissertation to fulfill the degree requirements. I am obliged to my supervisor Dr Mahwish Safdar to motivate me to write and conduct this research. I also acknowledge and grateful to all teachers who volunteered in conducting this research.

## References

- Anderson J. A., (2005). Accountability in education, International Academy of Education, *International Institute for Educational Planning*, ISBN: 92-803-1276-6, Printed by: Stedi Média UNESCO 2005 ISBN: 92-803-1276-6 <http://www.smec.curtin.edu.au/iae/>
- Abubakar I. J., Abubakar S. U., & Abubakar B., (2023). Assessment of biometric system of attendance timing and employee performance at General Hospital Busoga, Gumbo State - a conceptual review. <http://doi:10.5281/zenodo.10107364>
- Adams, K. F. (2012). The discursive construction of professionalism: An episteme of the 21st century. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization*, 12(3), 327-343.
- Alexander, F. K. (2000). The changing face of accountability: Monitoring and assessing institutional performance in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 411-431.
- Avalos, B. (2004). Teacher regulatory forces and accountability policies in Chile: From public servants to accountable professionals. *Research Papers in Education*, 19(1), 67-81.
- Baker, B. D. (2002). School finance and educational equity: The effects of school finance reforms on school spending. *American Educational Finance Association*.
- Banta, T. W. (2005). Quality and accountability in higher education: Improving policy, enhancing performance. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(1), 112-114.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2004). Education, accountability, and the ethical demand: Can the democratic potential of accountability be regained? *Educational Theory*, 54(3), 233-250.
- Bibi, S., & Naeem, M. (2019). The stress of accountability: A study of teachers in Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(5), 759-772.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: raising standards through classroom assessment. *King's College London, School of Education*.
- Bovens, M. (2005). Public accountability. Ferlie, E., Lynn, L. E. and C. Pollitt, *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Braxton, J. M. (2008). The role of research in the accountability of higher education institutions. In P. T. Hill & C. J. G. Hall (Eds.), *Accountability in Higher Education: An Introduction* (pp. 15-32). Jossey-Bass.
- Borko, H., & Drake, C. (2008). Looking at teaching through the lens of teacher learning. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 107(1), 107-130. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7984.2008.00179.x>
- Brophy, J. (2006). Classroom management as socializing students into desirable forms of behavior. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 37-53). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cobb, D. C. (2002). Performance-based accountability systems for public education. <https://www.nhpolicy.org/caseyreport.pdf>
- Conway, F. P., & Murphy, R. (2013). A rising tide meets a perfect storm: New accountabilities and teacher education in Ireland. *Irish Educational Studies*, 32(1), 11-36.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1), 1-44. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). Teaching and the change we need. *Educational Leadership*, 66(5), 8-14.
- Dobbins, M., Knill, C., & Vogtle, E. M. (2011). An analytical framework for the cross-country comparison of higher education governance. *Higher Education*, 62(5), 665-683.

- Doran, G. T. (1981). There's a S.M.A.R.T. way to write management's goals and objectives. *Management Review*, 70(11), 35-36.
- Dubnick, M. (2006). Orders of accountability. *World Ethics Forum*, University of Oxford, UK.
- Dubnick, M. (2012). Accountability as cultural keyword. *A seminar of the Research Colloquium on Good Governance, Netherlands Institute of Government*, 9 May 2012, VU University, Amsterdam NL.
- Edwards, R. (1991). Administrative practices and accountability in educational institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 29(3), 50-64.
- Edwards, W. L. (1991). Accountability and autonomy: Dual stands for the administrator. In W. Walker, R. Farquhar & M. Hughes (Eds.), *Advancing education: School leadership in action* (pp. 29–50). Falmer Press.
- Elmore, R. F. (2004). School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice, and performance. *Harvard Education Press*. <http://doi:10.5860/choice.42-4770>
- Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. M. (2016). Classroom management for middle and high school teachers, (11<sup>th</sup> ed.). Pearson.
- Epstein, D. (1993). Defining accountability in education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 19(3), 243–257.
- Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2005). Understanding student differences. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(1), 57-72. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00829.x>
- Ferlie, E., Lynn, L. E. & C. Pollitt, (2005). The Oxford Handbook of public management, *Oxford: Oxford University Press*, 2005.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59-109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2010). Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals, (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Frink, D. D., & Ferris, G. R. (1998). Accountability: Impression management and goal setting in the performance evaluation process. *Human Relations*, 51(10), 1259–1283.
- Gagne, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wager, W. W. (1992). Principles of instructional design (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Goedegebuure, L., & Hayden, M. (2007). Overview: Governance in higher education—Concepts and issues. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 26(1), 1–11.
- Goldhaber, D., & Hansen, M. (2010). Assessing the effectiveness of teacher candidate screening. *Education Finance and Policy*, 5(3), 397-417. [https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp\\_a\\_00017](https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp_a_00017)
- Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 8(3), 381-391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135406002100000512>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hill, H. C., Rowan, B., & Ball, D. L. (2005). Effect of teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(2), 371-406. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312042002371>
- Hudson, C. (2006). Regional development partnerships in Sweden: A way for higher education institutions to develop their role in the processes of regional governance? *Higher Education*, 51(3), 387–410.
- Huisman, J., & Currie, J. (2004). Accountability in higher education: Bridge over troubled water? *Higher Education*, 48, 529–551.
- Jaafar, B. S., & Earl, L. (2008). Comparing performance-based accountability models: A Canadian example. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 31(3), 697–726.
- Jansen, J. D. (2004). Autonomy and accountability in the regulation of teaching profession: A South African case study. *Research Papers in Education*, 19(1), 51–66.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2005). New approaches to conflict resolution. *Theory into Practice*, 44 (1), 13-20. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4401\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4401_3)
- Kai, J. (2009). A critical analysis of accountability in higher education: Its relevance to evaluation of higher education. *Chinese Education and Society*, 42(2), 39–51.



- Khan, M. A., Anwar, M. N., & Khan, I. (2018). Accountability and Its Impact on Teacher Performance in Pakistan: A Review. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 19(1), 123-135.
- Kleinhenz, E., & Ingvarson, L. (2004). Teacher accountability in Australia: Current policies and practices and their relation to improvement of teaching and learning. *Research Papers in Education*, 19(1), 31-49.
- Kniola, J. D. (2013). Accountability through assessments of administrative organizations in higher education. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 3(1), 89-101.
- Kogan, M. (1988). Education accountability: An analytic overview (2nd ed.). *Century Hutchinson*.
- Leithwood, K. (2005). Educational accountability: Issues and alternatives. *Journal of Research Report*, 5(1), 1-70.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705-717. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705>
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). A theory of goal setting and task performance. *Prentice Hall*.
- Lundgren, U. P. (1990). Education evaluation as policymaking: Introducing evaluation, into the national decentralized education system (pp. 23-41). *Jessica Kingsley Publishers*.
- Levitt R., Janta B., & Wegrich K., (2008). Accountability of teachers, 1-36, *RAND, General Teaching Council England*, Corporation © Copyright 2008.
- Magalhaes, A. M., Veiga, A., Amaral, A., Sousa, S., & Ribeiro, F. (2013). Governance of governance in higher education: Practices and lessons drawn from the Portuguese case. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 67(3), 295-311.
- Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, 43(3), 281-309.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher. *ASCD*.
- Middlehurst, R. (1997). Quality enhancement for accountability and transformation: A framework for the future. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 3(1), 15-24.
- Milken, L. (2000). Teaching as the opportunity: The teacher advancement program. *National Education Conference President's Presentation Santa Monica, CA*, Milken Family Foundation.
- Miller, R. J., & Vick, L. R. (1994). Goal setting and performance: An overview. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32(2), 12-30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578239410053642>
- Morris, P. (2004). Teaching in Hong Kong: Professionalization accountability and the state. *Research Papers in Education*, 19(1), 105-121.
- Muffo, J. A. (1992). The status of students' outcomes assessments at NASULGC member institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 33, 765-774.
- O'Day, A. (2002). Complexity, accountability and school improvement. *Harvard Educational Review Journal*, 72(3), 1-37.
- Opfer, D., & Pedder, D. (2011). Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(3), 376-407. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311413609>
- Pakistan Education Task Force, (2021). *Annual Report on Teacher Performance and Accountability*. Islamabad: Pakistan Education Task Force.
- Rasmussen, P., & Zou, Y. (2014). The development of educational accountability in China and Denmark. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22(121). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22.1693>. This article is part of EPAA/AAPE's Special Issue on The Comparative and International History of School Accountability and Testing, Guest Co-Edited by Dr. Sherman Dorn and Dr. Christian Ydesen.
- Rehman, A., & Malik, M. A. (2017). Teacher accountability and its effect on educational outcomes in Pakistan. *Education and Development Journal*, 24(3), 315-329.
- Romzek, B. S. (2000). Dynamics of public sector accountability in an era of reform. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 66(1), 21-44.
- Rosenblat, H., & Shimoni, O. (2001). Teacher accountability: An experimental field study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 15(4), 309-328.

- Rhodes R. A. W., (1997). Understanding Governance. Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability. *Buckingham: Open University Press*, pp. 2-21
- Schon, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. *Basic Books*.
- Shah, S. A., & Khan, S. M. (2022). Resource Constraints and Their Impact on Teacher Performance under Accountability Systems in Pakistan. *South Asian Journal of Education*, 12(4), 191-206.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543015002004>
- Simpson, R. D. (2002). How higher education differs from corporate. *Innovative Higher Education*, 27, 1–3.
- Sin, C., & Amaral, A. (2017). Academics' and employers' perception about responsibilities for employability and their initiatives towards its development. *Higher Education*, 73, 97–111.
- Suspitsyana, T. (2010). Accountability in American education as a rhetoric and a technology for governmentality. *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(5), 567–586.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms? ASCD.
- Trow, M. (1996). Trust, markets and accountability in higher education: A comparative perspective. *Higher Education Policy*, 9(4), 391–408.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. *University of Chicago Press*.
- Vidovich, L., Yang, R., & Currie, J. (2007). Changing accountabilities in higher education as China opens up to globalization. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, 5(1), 89–107.