

## **Psychological Effects of Excessive Administrative Visits on Teachers' Performance**

Akhtar Ali<sup>\*</sup>, Nasreen Akhter<sup>\*\*</sup>, Muhammad Ramzan<sup>\*\*\*</sup> and Anfa Tabassum<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>

---

### **Abstract**

The process of inspection is not new in education; it is used to monitor teachers' performance which is dated back to the colonial period. Due to increase in number of schools, teachers, and students it was observed that multiple vigilance techniques are being used to cope with the problems such as absenteeism from duties, lack of professionalism, and degradation in teaching but certain psychological effects due to excessive visits have also been reported by teachers. Educators' complaints signify that excessive monitoring is yielding depression on their performance. The study aimed to analyze "the psychological effects of excessive administrative visits on teachers' efficiency". The simple random sampling technique for selecting 371 teachers from the secondary schools from Bahawalpur area was used. The researcher collected the feedback of teachers regarding excessive administrative visits and its psychological repercussion by using a self-designed questionnaire, on 5 points Likert scale. Cronbach alpha reliability of the tool was 0.915. Data were analyzed by two ways. First of all its mean scores and measures of dispersion (standard deviation) was calculated. The independent sample t-test was applied on the respondents' data. For multiple comparisons of different variables, one way ANOVA was applied on the data. The findings showed that psychological effects like fire out, lack of interest, conversion to other profession, anxiety, depression, overburden, etc exist among teacher due to excessive administrative visits, which may affect teachers' efficiency.

**Keywords:** Teachers, administrative visit, personality, performance, psychological effects

---

\* Professor, Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur

\*\* Assistant Professor, Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur

\*\*\* Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Training, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur

\*\*\*\* Research Scholar, Department of Educational Training, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur

## Introduction

It is common and prevailing perception in the society that teaching profession is free from any accountability but this is not true, because a teacher is accountable in various forms for instance teacher is answerable before his/her conscious, students, peer, society etc (Ali, 1998). The absence of accountability may be true to some extent in past when teachers were recruited on political basis but a transparent recruitment policy can be observed in Punjab province. Now for entrance in school teaching, one has to qualify a test conducted by the National Testing Service (NTS) which is followed by academic merit. The frequent administrative visits are done by various officials like, EDO, DEO, Deputy DEO, AEO, DMO, MEA, TE, DTE, cluster heads and public leaders. Their unnecessary arrival affects teachers' performance because they indulge in maintaining official records for the fear of being checked. All these efforts are being made to bring teachers accountable but there is possibility that school staff give preference to evaluative activities instead of focusing on the academic work (Grauwe & Naidoo, 2004). They prefer to please the inspectorate staff and all the time they think about future inspection. Naturally this is a chaotic situation for the teaching and school administrative staff. Unwanted formalities, like, extra paper work and fear can push teachers towards psychological dilemma like jealousy, backbiting and use of unfair means (Tylor, 1996).

These monitoring activities are helpful for authorities to force teachers to go to class but they are unable to compel them to teach (Beach, 1989). It is a worthy saying that mediocre teacher tells, good teacher explains, superior teacher demonstrates and great teacher inspires. The inspiring personality provides education, dispenses knowledge, transform culture and shares his/her experience. The administrative visits can be classified as planned and surprise or sudden visit (Saeed, 2007). The planned visits take a longer duration of time for which the head of school is usually informed in advance. The visiting team checks the attendance record both for teachers and students, observe class work, teachers' lesson planning, cleanliness of school, library facilities, schools infrastructure, school financial record, construction work, and finally inspection ends in meetings with the teachers and head of the institution. For surprised visits, the head of the institutions are not informed in advance. The philosophy behind surprise visit is; mostly inspectors make physical verification of teachers and students to control their absenteeism (Kazmi, 2005).

Administrative visits have many faces such as auditing, supervision, inspection, mentoring, evaluation, and monitoring (Watson, 1994). Supervision is for what school personnel do for students and what kind of activities they perform to bring changes which may directly influence the teaching learning process (Singhal, 1987). Matthews and Crow (2003) describe “mentoring an act of advocacy which is about teachers’ evaluation. The philosophy behind this appraisal is to improve teaching skill and it is a sort of formative evaluation which is used to improve person’s efficiency. The mentor can contribute to develop the mentee’s interpersonal communications, self-confidence, negotiation skills, problem solving, accessing resources, networking and realization of personal goals” (Perera, 1997). It means that mentor observes teachers’ demonstration in a class, lecture delivery or teaching method, communication and suggests teachers about some innovative strategies to improve his/her teaching skills.

The major purpose of administrative visits is to improve teaching and learning, and to ensure quality induction. Although improvement in education system is due to monitoring, and this has been reported during intellectual discussion among teachers (Macbeath & McGlynn, 2002). Often such measure was appreciated but an element of fear among teachers was also noticed during teachers’ conversation and this indicates an origin of psychological issues. As viewed by an anonymous teacher (2013), “My colleagues and I work in a climate of fear. We see teachers crying in their cars; not able to come in for fear of the day ahead. Teachers are crying in corridors after years of successful teaching, demoralized and mystified by bad observation feedback. They are also crying over their loss of confidence and joy of teaching (Gray, 1996). Misery at the injustice of the inspection system we’re currently victims of”. It is noticed that the visitors often ignore their primary aspect of visit to find out causes of any deficiency rather they mostly create element of fear and tension among teachers by indicating some weak points. Administrative visits have three types of effects; before, during and after visit. Head teachers feel less anxious and stress than class teachers because they have fear of being observed. Before the forthcoming visit teachers of public school have deep concern for the timing because if the visit is surprised it would be difficult to make any preparation for them. If the visit is planned and school staff has been informed in advance then it will be less perplexed (Glanz, 1999). Newly appointed teachers are more confused about the visiting team than old staff because they have less experience about how to deal with them and less confident about implementing the curriculum (Gray & Wilcox, 1996).

During monitoring, the psychological reactions of teachers are different from one another. Some teachers claimed to be unaffected by the presence of officers while others admitted to experiencing varying degree of panic. Teachers' anxiety is associated with the phenomenon of being observed during teaching. They are conscious to know when they would be observed. During lecture when a teacher is being observed, in few cases, especially new comer feel hesitation in delivering lesson in the presence of an observation team. Another area which often provoked anxiety was the lack of feedback at the end of lesson on how it had been perceived by visitor (Gray, 1996).

Singhal (1987) described that the school inspection system in Indo-Pakistan sub-continent was originated during British rule in 1854, following the landmark report known as Wood's Despatch. Sir, Charles Wood, then Secretary of State, sent a report to the directors of the East India Company, articulated the aim of education and ways of supporting the education system in colonial period of subcontinent (Ali, 2000). The system continued even after independence from British rule. Under the system inspection is being used as a process of assessing the quality and performance of schools by external agents. School visit serves functions like, evaluation, administrative improvement, school developmental, and academic betterment (Singhal, 1986). After visit, an evaluation report is prepared on the basis of certain indicators such as, teachers' performance, students' results and school progress for submission to the higher authorities. The existing study is an attempt to the policy makers that instead of having multiple visits by different agencies, an effective and collaborative visit may reduce the psychological and unwanted fear among teaching faculty.

### **Objectives and Hypothesis**

This study revolves around a single measurable objective i.e. to explore the psychological effects of administrative visits on teachers' performance as describe by the teachers. The purpose of this research is to measure the Psychological gravity of working teachers using a Likert type rating scale. The central hypothesis of study describe that Psychological effects exist among teachers due to excessive administrative visit and this influence the teachers' Performance in the education sector.

## Research Methodology

The study is descriptive in nature. So, a structured questionnaire on five point Likert scale was developed. Through Cronbach's Alpha the reliability internal consistency of research tool was assessed. After the pilot testing the research tool was administered to collect the data. The population for this study comprised of approximately 1440 teachers of 48 public sector government high schools of Bahawalpur. Random sampling technique was used to select a sample of 371 teachers. The collected data was tabulated and analyzed by using SPSS-20 version. Mean and standard deviation was calculated to describe the data set whereas t-test and ONE WAY ANOVA was employed as inferential statistics.

## Results & Interpretation

**Table 1**

*The psychological effects of administrative visits on teachers' personality (Urban & Rural) using one tail t-test*

Sr. No	Statements	Locality	Mean	S.D	t-test	Sig
1	Increased anxiety due to the admin visit	Urban	3.31	1.294	0.733	0.169
		Rural	3.20	1.382		
2	Feelings of mentally stressed.	Urban	3.13	1.299	-0.560	0.864
		Rural	3.21	1.284		
3	Become embarrassed when questions about class management and professional skills.	Urban	2.83	1.307	0.359	0.535
		Rural	2.77	1.353		
4	Feel hesitation in delivering lesson in the presence of inspecting team.	Urban	2.73	1.389	-0.699	0.667
		Rural	2.84	1.419		
5	Afraid of being fired from job.	Urban	2.86	1.364	-0.498	0.960
		Rural	2.94	1.390		

Table 1 shows the difference in views and the overall reactions of urban and rural teachers about the psychological effects of administrative visits on teachers' personality. The results indicate that anxiety among teachers is increased due to the administrative visits, they feel mentally stressed while observing, and respondents have afraid of being fired from job. It also exhibits that psychological problem from both the locality is same and there is no significant difference on the basis of t-value. Teachers feel fear/embarrassed when an administrator asked questions about their class management and professional skills. The level of hesitation in delivering lesson increases during the presence of inspecting team.

**Table 2***Comparison of both the genders the psychological effects of administrative visits*

<i>Sr. No</i>	<i>Statements</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D</i>	<i>t-test</i>	<i>Sig</i>
1	Increased anxiety due to the admin visit	Male	3.15	1.333	-	.436
		Female	3.43	1.307	1.958	
2	Feelings of mentally stressed.	Male	3.05	1.300	-	.859
		Female	3.30	1.272	1.760	
3	Become embarrassed when questions about class management and professional skills.	Male	2.90	1.287	1.480	.185
		Female	2.68	1.363		
4	Feel hesitation in delivering lesson in the presence of inspecting team.	Male	2.68	1.409	-	.922
		Female	2.88	1.382	1.334	
5	Afraid of being fired from job.	Male	2.89	1.412	-.006	.218
		Female	2.89	1.324		

Table 2 shows the difference in views of male and female teachers about psychological effects of administrative visits on teachers' personality. Table indicates that teachers' anxiety increases due to the administrative visits. When they are observed they feel stress and fear of being fired from the job. But senior teachers were disagreed that they become embarrassed when an administrator asked questions about their class management and professional skills but they feel hesitation in delivering lesson in the presence of inspecting team. According to the mean scores male were more disagreed than female teachers with the statement that they become embarrassed when questions about class management and professional skills. There is no significant difference between mean scores of male and female respondents as indicated by *t-value*. Thus, null hypothesis is accepted that there is no significance difference based on gender and they feel the same psychological effects of administrative visits.

**Table 3**

*Multiple analyses of Academic level variables ANOVA-test, on the psychological effects of administrative visits on teachers' personality*

Sr. No	Statements	Academic qualification	A	DA	UD
1	Anxiety is increased due to the administrative visits.	Matric.	1.8%	.9%	0.0%
		FA/F.Sc.	5.0%	4.8%	.6%
		BA/B. Sc	18.5%	8.1%	3.3%
		MA/M. Sc	28.2%	19.3%	3.0%
		M. Phil	3.3%	.9%	.3%
		Ph.D	.3%	.9%	0.0%
		<i>F value: 1.149</i> <i>p value: 0.335</i>			
2	Feeling of mental stress.	Matric.	1.8%	.9%	0.0%
		FA/F.Sc.	5.7%	4.5%	1.2%
		BA/B. Sc	15.8%	10.1%	3.9%
		MA/M. Sc	26.7%	19.1%	4.8%
		M. Phil	1.2%	2.7%	.6%
		Ph.D	.3%	.9%	0.0%
		<i>F value: 0.635</i> <i>p value: 0.673</i>			
3	Embarrassed when asked questions about class management and professional skills.	Matric.	1.2%	.9%	.6%
		FA/F.Sc.	3.6%	7.2%	.6%
		BA/B. Sc	12.5%	14.0%	3.3%
		MA/M. Sc	20.0%	25.6%	5.1%
		M. Phil	1.2%	2.7%	.6%
		Ph.D	.3%	.9%	0.0%
		<i>F value: 0 .956</i> <i>p-value: 0.445</i>			
4	Feeling of hesitation during the presence of inspecting team, in delivering lesson.	Matric.	.6%	1.2%	.9%
		FA/F.Sc.	4.2%	6.0%	1.2%
		BA/B. Sc	12.8%	15.5%	1.5%
		MA/M. Sc	20.3%	25.9%	4.5%
		M. Phil	1.5%	2.7%	.3%
		Ph.D	.3%	.9%	0.0%
		<i>F value: 0 .309</i> <i>p-value: 0.908</i>			
5	Afraid of being fired from job.	Matric.	1.2%	1.2%	.3%
		FA/F.Sc.	4.5%	5.7%	1.2%
		BA/B. Sc	13.1%	14.0%	2.7%
		MA/M. Sc	21.1%	23.8%	5.7%
		M. Phil	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%
		Ph.D	.6%	.6%	0.0%
		<i>F value: 0.213</i> <i>p-value: 0.957</i>			

The table 3 reveals the results of the psychological effects of administrative visits on teachers' personality and calculated through *F-value* i.e., ONE WAY ANOVA at *p-value* 0.05. Regarding the table-3 respondents of various qualifications indicate that their anxiety increases due to the administrative visits and it is noted that majority hold good qualification i.e. Master Degree. The classroom observation increases their mental stress. A simple majority or certain loud voices can be heard about hesitation in delivering lesson in front of any inspector. For this fear there may be multiple interpretations, one is over burden, second is irrelevancy of subject, criticism in front of students, and un-planning of the lesson. However teachers can respond to any question outside the class, but certain have fear that continuous degradation through reporting may fired them and they may become unemployed.

**Table4**

*Multiple analysis of teaching experience level variables ANOVA-test, on the psychological effects*

Sr. No	Statements	Teaching Experience	A	DA	UD
1	Anxiety is increased due to the administrative visits.	1-5	8.1%	2.7%	0.0%
		6-10	5.7%	2.7%	.6%
		11-15	6.0%	4.5%	1.8%
		16-20	6.9%	5.1%	2.4%
		21-25	17.6%	9.8%	.3%
		More than 25	14.0%	10.2%	2.1%
		<i>F value: 1.222      p value: .298</i>			
2	Feeling of mental stress.	1-5	5.1%	5.1%	.6%
		6-10	5.1%	3.3%	.6%
		11-15	4.8%	5.4%	2.1%
		16-20	9.2%	3.6%	1.5%
		21-25	14.6%	10.7%	2.4%
		More than 25	12.8%	10.1%	3.3%
		<i>F value: .546      p value: 0.741</i>			
3	Embarrass when asked questions about class management and professional skills.	1-5	4.2%	6.0%	.6%
		6-10	2.4%	5.7%	.9%
		11-15	4.2%	7.5%	.6%
		16-20	6.0%	5.7%	2.7%
		21-25	9.2%	15.2%	3.3%
		More than 25	12.8%	11.3%	2.1%
		<i>F value: 1.563      p value: 0.170</i>			



4	Feel hesitation during the presence of inspecting team in delivering lesson.	1-5	3.3%	7.2%	.3%
		6-10	4.5%	4.5%	0.0%
		11-15	4.2%	7.2%	.9%
		16-20	5.4%	6.3%	2.7%
		21-25	11.6%	14.5%	1.5%
		More than 25	10.7%	12.5%	3.0%
		<i>F value: 0 .660</i>		<i>p value: 0.654</i>	
5	Afraid of being fired from job.	1-5	3.6%	5.7%	1.5%
		6-10	3.3%	4.5%	1.2%
		11-15	5.4%	5.7%	1.2%
		16-20	7.2%	6.0%	1.2%
		21-25	11.6%	13.1%	3.0%
		More than 25	11.3%	12.0%	3.0%
		<i>F value: .712</i>		<i>P value: 0.615</i>	

Table-4 reports the results of the psychological effects of administrative visits on teachers' personality and calculated *F-value* by using ANOVA test by using 0.05 level of significance. The psychological effects can be noticed upon the experienced person too. The excessive visit increases the mental stress and level of anxiety among experienced person. It may be assumed that they have rarely seen such kind of monitoring or supervision. However they excessive evaluation may create an element of fear. There is another dimension which should be considered, sometimes monitoring officers and the district teacher educator (DTE) are younger than that of teaching staff and their unnecessary comments or criticism may hurt teaching community and the level of stress may affect their progress. Grace of public servant, the fear of removal from service is not an easy task, however due to The Punjab Employees Efficiency, Discipline and Accountability Bill 2006, (PEDA) employee feel insecure. The psychological stress, anxiety and the similar kinds of fear are relatively less in the fresh employed faculty. There is another picture, those teacher who prepare themselves for the changing world remains relax and confident and the other who remains stagnant face the hot wind from society and changes disturb them.

## Discussion

The study reveals that the spirit of accountability makes person responsible and energetic. When the teachers of public school learn that their actions, performance, work and behavior will be supervised; they work consciously according to rules and regulation. The official visits have both good as well as adverse effects on teachers' performance. Good in the sense that teachers work

properly, they become regular, decreases absentee, teacher started to plan their lesson and try to complete their syllabus at fixed time and those who work receives certificate/verbal/facial appreciation. The motivation a techniques encourage teachers to work. On contrary to this, administrative visits had certain psychological effects on teachers' performance for which teachers discuss it openly, for instance increasing work, unwanted pressure, burn out and stress. Basically, supervision should be the process of engaging, teachers in instructional dialogue, for the purpose of improving teaching and increasing students' achievement (Sullivan & Glanz, 2005). The excessive checks and unnecessary restrictions may harm teachers' creativity, because such system demands to fulfill formality and procedure. In case, a teacher receives complaint, blame, criticism, misbehavior from any of the administrative officers, s/he feels uncomfortable, and becomes embarrassed, which may decline his/her devotion. The fear of external visits can be neutralized by introducing self assessment (Bailey, 1981). Moreover, when a teacher is not able to avail a casual leave or any other short leave from headmaster, it forces them to tell a lie and take it off without any written permission. The additional work on teachers may exert pressure for achieving targets and completion of extra duties for instance polio eradication, census, recruitment, examination, and in result extra paper work becomes the base of mental stress. In addition to this, critical questioning asked to teachers by official land unnecessary remarks confuses and disheartens them. Negative report of visit also reduces professional efficiency of teachers. If supervision is a moral action, it must respect the moral integrity of the supervisor and the supervised (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007).The wrong implementation of PEEDA act and fear from removal of service by the administrators laid strong psychological effects on teaching profession. These drawbacks have adverse effect on students' personality, their behavior, way of life, achievements, curricular and co-curricular activities which are directly associated with teachers reflex behavior.

Administrators' visits are necessary to increase teachers' efficiency, students' attendance and for educational improvement. Teachers' issues are neither listed and nor resolved by the visiting officers. Teachers have no authority to appeal or challenge the findings of the report. Visits duration consumes enough academic time and some evaluators have relatively less professional approach, towards institutional evaluation. The study verifies the findings of Haris, 1985 and Wilcox and Gray, 1996.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

It is noted that excessive administrative visits are annoying teachers as they consider it unwanted stress. These visits are creating a psychological sphere of tension and fear of being checked and depriving the dedicated teachers from the pleasure of working in educational environment. Unnecessary restrictions incline teachers to adopt unfair strategies for survival which is a major reason of decline in quality education among public schools. Therefore, it is assumed that such excessive administrative visits have negative psychological impact on teachers' academic performance. The problems with the current inspection practices are; lack of sufficient time, the unprofessional behavior of inspectors, evaluation based on perceptions instead of reality, non scientific process of inspection, hidden and unpublished inspection reports create stress and anxiety among faculty. The findings showed that psychological effects like burn out, lack of interest, conversion to other profession, anxiety, depression, overburden, etc was observed among teacher due to excessive administrative visits and this effect teachers' efficiency to certain extent. During monitoring, the psychological reactions of teachers are different from one another. Some teachers claimed to be unaffected by the presence of officers while others admitted to experience anxiety of varying degree of panic. Teachers' nervousness is associated with the phenomenon of being observed during teaching in front of his/her students. So we can conclude that, although administrative visits have advantages but certain Psychological issues exist with these administrative visits, and the subject needs to be addressed for congenial environment, which is necessary for teaching learning. So, it is suggested that to maintain quality of education continuous evaluation is essential and it is also important that instead of multiple visits by different agencies one effective, professional and collaborative visit may serve the purpose.

## References

- Ali, M. A. (2000). Supervision for teacher development: an alternative model for Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 20 (1), 177-188.
- Bailey, G.D. (1981). *Teachers' self-assessment: A mean for improving classroom Instruction*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Barlin, D. Moir, E. Gless, J. and Miles, J. (2009). *Better Mentoring, Better Teachers*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.
- Beach, J. R. (1989). *Supervision: Focus on Instruction*. New York: Harper &Row.

- Glanz, J. (1999). Exploring supervision history: an invitation an agenda. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 10 (2), 95-113.
- Good, T.L, & Brophy, J.E. (1984). *Looking in Classrooms* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed). New York: Harper and Row.
- Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education. (2008). *Education For All: MidDecade Assessment (Country Report)*. Islamabad: Ministry of Education. PP. 11-15
- Grauwe, A. D. & Naidoo, J. P.(2004). *School Evaluation For Quality Improvement*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Gray & Wilcox, B. (1996). *Inspecting Schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gray, J & Wilcox, B. (1995). *Good school, Bad School: Evaluating Performance and Encouraging Improvement*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Kazmi, S.W. (2005). Role of Education in Globalization: A Case for Pakistan. *SAARC. Journal of Human Resource Development*, 90-107.
- London, N.A. (2004). School Inspection, The inspectorate and educational practice in Trinidad and Tobago. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(4), 479-502.
- Macbeath, J., & McGlynn, A. (2002). *Self-evaluation: What's in it for schools?* London: Routledge.
- Matthews, L. J., & Crow, G. M. (2003). *Being And Becoming Principals*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Perera, W. J. (1997). Changing schools from within: A management intervention for improving school functioning in Sri Lanka. *Trends In School Supervision Series*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Pritchard, M. W. (1975). *Primary School Inspection*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Singhal, R. (1987). *School Inspection System*. New Delhi: NIEPA-VIKAS.
- Reavis, C.A. (1977). A test of the clinical supervision model. *Journey of Educational Research*, (70), 311-315.
- Saeed, M. (2007). Education System of Pakistan and the UK: Comparisons in Context to Inter- provincial and Inter-countries Reflections. *Bulletin of Education & Research*, 29 (2), 43-57.

- Swaleha, A. (2015). *Can Inspection Improve Efficiency of the System of Education?* <http://www.Countercurrents.org/sindhi> retrieved 4/17/2015
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007) *Supervision a redefinition*. New York: MacGraw Hill.
- Siddiqui, H. (1987). *Education in Sindh: Past and Present*. Hyderabad: Institute of Sindhology, University of Sindh.
- Singhal, R. (1986). *School Inspection System*. New Dehli: NIEPA-VIKAS.
- Sullivan, S. & Glanz, J. (2005). *Supervision That Improves Teaching: Strategies And Techniques*. Thousand Oaks: Crown Press.
- Tylor, F. G. (1996). *Monitoring Education Indicators, Quality And Effectiveness*. London: 11 York Road.
- Warwick, D. P. & Reimers, F. (1994). *Hope Or Despair? Learning In Pakistan's Primary Schools*. New York: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- Watson, J. K. (1994). School inspection and supervision. *The International Encyclopedia of Education: Research & Studies*. London: Paragon