Accountability Mechanisms in Teacher Training Institutions: An Evaluation of Governance and Transparency

Muhammad Nafees [1*]   **Amir Zia** [2]

Corresponding Author: Muhammad Nafees (✉: dr.nafees@aiu.edu.pk)

Abstract

This research study investigates critically the mechanisms employed to enhance accountability through the use of 'transparency' mechanisms, 'stakeholder engagement' mechanisms and 'quality assurance' mechanisms. The study is quantitative, cross-sectional survey employing a 30-item validated instrument and responses measured on a five-point Likert Scale for institutional accountability across ten different domains of focus regarding teacher education programs. A stratified random sample of 159 teachers were obtained from all four types of Teachers' Education institutions. The data demonstrates a mean score of 3.25 for the average accountability implementation, demonstrating that substantial improvement is needed in this area. Correlation analyses suggested a positive correlation between accountability and training modules leading to systematic implementation of training integrated approach rather than treating them as separate training elements. This finding carries considerable implications for changing educational policies, promoting better institutional governance within schools to enhance quality assurance. Consequently, this research supports the current lack of empirical evidence regarding how accountability mechanisms work in global south.

Key Words

Accountability Mechanisms, Educational Governance, Institutional Transparency, Quality Assurance, Stakeholder Engagement, Pakistan Education System

Background

Teacher training institutions (TTIs) are designed to train as well as enhance the professional development of teachers in educational system (Wagner & Vander Ark, 2012). TTIs act as a bridge between educational policy and practice by helping prospective teachers to translate national educational objectives into the teaching skills required for success of any educational system (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). Research has shown that the quality of TTIs is closely linked to student learning outcomes, therefore, accountability mechanism holds central for effective governance (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Boyd et al., 2009).

In Pakistan teacher training institutions (TTI's) are governed through multi-layered governance at the Federal and Provincial levels of government. The entailing standards and requirements for accreditation and societal expectations affect quality of education by creating a complicated governance structure for teacher training in Pakistan. Such structure is causing layers of complexity from federal level to provincial levels of Pakistan. The Teacher Training Institutions Act, 2018, also aims to enhance the reputation of teacher training institutions in pursuing Sustainable Development Goal #4 (SDG#4) and ensuring that there is inclusive and equitable quality

---

[1] Professor, Department of Education, Alhamd Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: dr.nafees@aiu.edu.pk

[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Governance & Public Policy, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: amir.zia@numl.edu.pk

education for all students at all levels.

Accountability creates institutional clarity, academic integrity, and a responsibility to manage resources (UNESCO, 2017). While research has shown that effective accountability systems motivate continuous improvement, build stakeholder confidence, and allow for the use of evidence-based decision making (Bovens, 2007; Koppell, 2005), there are obstacles in achieving effective accountability systems in developing countries due to various factors such as lack of capacity and other institutional priorities that take precedence (Grindle, 2004; Andrews, 2013).

Pakistan's education system is made up of numerous types of institutions for teachers training. The main types are through government colleges of elementary teachers (GCETs), government colleges of education (GCEs), private colleges for teacher training, and universities providing degrees in education (National Accreditation Council for Teacher Education, 2024). Each institution operates under a unique set of policies and therefore has different structure of accountability mechanisms. This results in a wide range of normative standards and systems of practice (Provincial Education Departments, 2024). The irregular nature of the institutional structure has been intensifying regulatory issues. Colleges that are governed by provincial education departments have different accountability mechanisms from private colleges. Therefore, disconnection in the accountability systems of these institutions has been causing issues of quality standards (Khan et al., 2025).

The uneven governance Structures provide opportunities and challenges to create accountability mechanisms within these institutions. The fact remains that such forms of governance carry out experiments when implementing accountability in response to the unique conditions of a local situation. On the other hand, multiple governance models could lead to discrepancies in the application of accountability within institutions and thus creating unequal access to the services offered (Naseem, 2025). Teachers' training programs provided by universities operate under the constraints of the Government's regulations established by the Higher Education Commission, thus illustrating intertwined peer review and academic freedom within higher education. In contrast, the colleges for Elementary Teacher Training are highly regulated by government bureaucracy and provide little opportunity for the exploration of peer review or academic freedom (Higher Education Commission Pakistan, 2023).

Accountability is identified as a core driver behind improving educational attainment in Pakistan (Ministry of Education, Pakistan, 2023). The National Accreditation Council for Teacher Education (NACTE) has developed and published a capability framework called Standards for Teacher Education (STE), which aims to develop a common quality assurance standard between Teacher Training Institutions. Areas addressed by these Sets of Standards include Curriculum, teacher qualification, infrastructure and student evaluation (Ahmad et al., 2014).

Pakistan's teacher training system is potentially compromised by systemic flaws and gaps in governance and transparency arrangements (Tahira et al, 2020). The education system of Pakistan is situated within an educational environment of constrained resources. In fact, allocation of public resources on education has long been below internationally recognized standards and regions' average (Ministry of Finance, Pakistan, 2023). Given this resource constraints create new calls for efficiency and effectiveness, accountability is critical to obtain the best outcomes from the available investment.

Factors such as lack of funding mechanisms, lack of participation from stakeholders, lack of clarity in decision-making processes, and lack of performance review have all been identified as constraints to institutional effectiveness. However, these issues illustrate technical solutions can only help addressing accountability gaps to limited scale. Therefore, larger contextual issues such as capacity, political will and societal culture collectively shape institutional behavior (Andrews, 2013).

The federal system of education in Pakistan adds to the complexity of accountability mechanisms. Even though provincial autonomy gives provinces the ability to adapt to local contexts, it can result in a lack of uniformity across provinces with respect to accountability (Government of Pakistan, 2010). Balancing the need for cohesion at the national level and autonomy for provinces requires a sophisticated level of integration and coordination among the key actors responsible for education policy development.

It is important to recognize the current state of accountability mechanisms in these institutions so that interventions and policy recommendations can be made (Grindle, 2004). The evidence shows political and bureaucratic accountability reforms could be effective if locally conceived, implemented and evaluated within local institutional and political contexts. Generic or imported accountability models mismatch local institutional culture, administrative structures or stakeholder expectations.

Moreover, the recent widespread proliferation of teachers training institutions has outpaced useful governance arrangements. The rapid increase in institutional outreach has added to the rising demand for trained teachers, thus amplifying teachers training sector issues. Therefore, reviewing protocols demanded by institutional pressures can compromise teachers training quality and regulatory bodies responsible for accountability across the system. Additionally, this proliferation has restrained the ability of governance bodies to properly supervise and support training institutions.

Therefore, present research is intended to explore requirements of workable institutional accountability mechanisms in teachers training education in Pakistan. In order to gain insights into management of institutional governance and transparency mechanisms viable measures may be proposed. Consequently this study provides an opportunity to identify the strengths, weaknesses, and current accountability practices to improve and contribute in terms of the literature on institutional reform. The study focuses on accountability practices in various institutional means aimed at practices and contextual factors determining effectiveness of accountability.

This research would open up new avenues for many developing countries to design and establish accountability systems in teachers' training institutions (UNESCO, 2017). The research findings might inform about resource constraints, limited capacity and complex governance structure impeding accountability governance. Consequently, it could be another addition in the growing literature on educational accountability through institutional governance in developing world.

Methodology
Research Design
This study employs a quantitative approach to methodological paradigm through strictly designed survey tool to measure the practices of governance and transparency within the teacher training industry in Pakistan. It is based on the modified accountability model, which is specifically adjusted to the specifics of teacher training institutions in the Global South, and is designed to test the effectiveness with which these institutions develop the framework of governance and maintain the transparency of their operational practices.

Development of Research Instrument
To create a research instrument, a thorough literature review on the following topics was conducted: Educational Accountability; Governance Frameworks; and Models of Institutional Evaluation. The instrument was designed according to the following theoretical frameworks:
- BOVENS'S Framework for Accountable Governance (2007): focuses on the relational component of accountable governance as it relates to sites of accountability and actors involved with these sites of accountability.

- Cawier & Vander Ark Educational Excellence Model (2012): focuses on the need for external oversight and the balance of capacity building and external oversight.
- UNESCO's Quality Assurance Framework (2017) seeks to highlight the different governance models for educational institutions.
- Marginson and Considine Governance Model (2000), explores the distinctions between corporate, collegial, and market models of governance.

Expert Panel Consultation

A group of six professionals, referred to as the "Advisory Panel," came together for the purpose of assisting with the purpose of instrument development for the project. The membership of this Advisory Panel consisted of:
- Two senior education administrators with experience in teacher training institutions.
- Two academic researchers conducting research into education governance and accountability.
- One representative of the National Accreditation Council for Teacher Education (NACTE).
- One provincial education department representative.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

Content Validity

Content validity was determined through expert validation. The six members of the expert panel assessed each item by item according to the degree of relevance to the intended construct which was rated on a four-point scale (1 = not relevant, 4 = highly relevant). Items with mean expert ratings below 3.0 were either revised or eliminated. The final instrument achieved a Content Validity Index (CVI) of 0.89 which is above the recommended CVI cutoff of 0.80.

Reliability Assessment

Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used as a measure of internal consistency for each of the dimensions and for the overall instrument.

Table 1

Dimension	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
Transparency in Decision-Making	0.87	3
Financial Accountability	0.89	3
Academic Quality Assurance	0.83	3
Stakeholder Participation	0.85	3
External Oversight Compliance	0.78	3
Grievance Resolution Systems	0.84	3
Performance Monitoring	0.86	3
Information Disclosure	0.88	3
Ethical Standards	0.81	3
Continuous Improvement	0.85	3
Overall Instrument	**0.92**	**30**

The alpha coefficients for the dimensions were above the suggested that the acceptable threshold of 0.70 (most were above 0.80) for good to excellent internal consistency. The overall alpha coefficient of the instrument was 0.92, which indicates good to excellent internal reliability.

Data Collection Methods

The research used a multi-modal strategy to improve response rates and cater to different institutional contexts:

- ▶ **On-site Visits (Primary Method - 68% of responses)**
- ▶ **Procedure**: Data collectors visited institutions in person to administer questionnaires
- ▶ **Time**: Each visit takes 2-3 hours; therefore many respondents can be completed
- ▶ **Benefits**: High response rates, ability to provide clarification, ability to collect completed questionnaires
- ▶ **Target**: All institutions within reasonable travel distance of data collection team bases.

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

- ▶ **Mean Scores**: Calculated for each of the accountability dimensions and total accountability
- ▶ **Standard Deviations**: Evaluated score variance, both within and across groups
- ▶ **Median Scores**: Reported as measure of central tendency less impacted by outliers
- ▶ **Range and Percentiles**: Descriptive characteristics of full distribution for each variable

Population and Sample

Population

The population for this study consisted of all teacher training institutions operating in Pakistan as of 2024. The institutions included in the population are represented by four categories related to both governance structure and program structures.

Table 2

Population

Institution Type	Number	Governance	Primary Programs	Geographic Distribution
Government Colleges of Elementary Teachers (GCETs)	142	Provincial Government	Primary Teacher Certification, B. Ed Elementary	All provinces, concentrated in Punjab and Sindh
Government Colleges of Education (GCEs)	89	Provincial Government	B. Ed, M. Ed, Secondary Teacher Training	Major cities and district Headquarters
Private Teacher Training Colleges	267	Private Sector	Various teachers certification programs	Urban centers, some rural areas
Universities with Education Departments	78	Federal/ Provincial Government & Private	B. Ed, M. Ed, M. Phil, Ph. D in Education	Major metropolitan Areas
Total Population	576	-	-	-

The total population of 576 teacher training institutions represents the entire universe of formal teacher preparation institutions in Pakistan. Government Colleges of Elementary Teachers (GCETs) are the largest single group, indicating the historical emphasis on preparation for a primary teaching role. These institutions are predominantly located in Punjab (45%) and Sindh (28%), with additional representation in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (18%) and Baluchistan (9%).

Government Colleges of Education (GCEs) are the classic secondary teacher training colleges. These are generally located at district headquarters or in significant urban settings.

Sample

A stratified random sampling method was used to assure sample representation from all four categories of teacher training institutions. The sample size was determined using Yamane's formula at the 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error.

Table 3

Sample size

Institution Type	Population (N)	Sample Size (n)	Sampling Method	Response Rate	Usable Responses
Government Colleges of Elementary Teachers	142	58	Proportionate Stratified	67%	39
Government Colleges of Education	89	36	Proportionate Stratified	72%	26
Private Teacher Training Colleges	267	109	Proportionate Stratified	63%	69
Universities with Education Departments	78	32	Proportionate Stratified	78%	25
Total	576	235	-	68%	159

The final sample of 159 institutions is equivalent to 27.6% of the total population and adequately represents all institutional categories. The stratified sampling procedure allowed sufficient representation based on the actual proportions of institution types in the population.

Geographic distribution of the sample was maintained through representation across all four provinces: Punjab (42%), Sindh (26%), Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (19%), and Baluchistan (13%). In terms of locale, the sample included 61% institutions situated in an urban area (i.e. metropolitan) and 39% rural institutions, which represents the actual geographic distribution of teacher training institutions in Pakistan.

The respondents from each selected institution were chosen across various levels of the institution - senior administration (35% of respondents), faculty (45%), and support staff (20%). This provided institutional-level perspectives across institutions on mechanisms of accountability.

The 68% response rate was above the desired goal of 60%. Therefore, we can feel confident that our results represent the entire population under study. Non-response data show no significant differences between the responding and non-responding institutions in terms of geographic location, size of institution, or governance structure.

Results and Discussion

There are ten primary areas of accountability for each of the teacher training institutions in this study.

Table 4

Overall Accountability Dimensions Assessment

Accountability Dimension	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Median	Level
Transparency in Decision-Making	3.2	1.1	3.0	Moderate
Financial Accountability	2.8	1.3	3.0	Moderate-Low
Academic Quality Assurance	3.6	0.9	4.0	High-Moderate
Stakeholder Participation	2.9	1.2	3.0	Moderate-Low
External Oversight Compliance	3.8	1.0	4.0	High-Moderate
Grievance Resolution Systems	3.1	1.2	3.0	Moderate
Performance Monitoring	3.3	1.1	3.0	Moderate
Information Disclosure	2.7	1.3	3.0	Moderate-Low
Ethical Standards	3.7	1.0	4.0	High-Moderate
Continuous Improvement	3.4	1.1	3.0	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.25	1.12	3.2	Moderate

As shown through the average scores of the 10 dimensions of accountability, the vast majority of the teacher training institutions surveyed implement moderate levels of accountability across all 10 assessment areas. However, when combined to determine the overall level of accountability across all teacher training programs in Pakistan, the average response to the accountability assessment was a score of 3.25 on a 0-5 scale. The highest rated dimension was External Oversight Compliance (3.8), indicating that most institutions are effectively complying with both accreditation standards and regulations. The evidence suggests that pressure from external regulatory bodies has been an effective motivator for the compliant behavior of the teacher training institutions.

Disclosures and Accountability are the two lowest ratings in this educational stakeholder's network (ESN). These results indicate a significant lack of transparency and accountability within institutions. While these results may reflect as an institution complying with statutory requirements of information disclosure, this should also be a reminder of continued educational institutions having the responsibility to actively disclose information regarding their accreditation process and the financial resources of the institution, to better assist the public to make informed decisions. If educational institutions better educate their constituents of these standards, institutions will have an enhanced opportunity to better support their students and employees.

Table 5

Accountability Scores by Institution Type

Accountability Dimension	GCETs	GCEs	Private Colleges	Universities	F-Value	Significance
Transparency in Decision-Making	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.8	4.23	0.006*
Financial Accountability	2.5	2.7	2.8	3.4	5.67	0.001*
Academic Quality Assurance	3.4	3.6	3.5	4.2	6.89	0.000*
Stakeholder Participation	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.4	3.12	0.027*
External Oversight Compliance	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.9	0.87	0.458
Grievance Resolution Systems	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.6	3.45	0.018*
Performance Monitoring	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.8	4.56	0.004*
Information Disclosure	2.4	2.6	2.7	3.2	4.78	0.003*
Ethical Standards	3.6	3.7	3.6	4.0	2.34	0.075
Continuous Improvement	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.8	3.23	0.024*
Overall Mean	3.07	3.18	3.22	3.61	7.89	0.000*

*Significant at $p < 0.05$; **Highly significant at $p < 0.001$

The ways that teacher training institutions hold themselves accountable are purposefully different, and comparing these systems has shown that universities (with Schools/Faculties of Education) performed better than other types of teacher training institution by overall means of (M=3.61), significantly different from other types of institutes (p<0.001), as well as having strong Financial Accountability (M=3.4). Universities also had stronger Academic Quality Review (M=4.2) based on their greater complexity of organizational structure and research culture. Further, universities performed better in regard to the Transparency in Decision Making (M=3.8) and the Stakeholder Participation scores (M=3.4), likely attributable to university governance structures, including academic senates, student representation, and the necessity of systematically considering stakeholder participation.

The lowest total score (3.07) was recorded by the Government Colleges of Elementary Teachers (GCETs), although both Financial Accountability (mean score = 2.5) and Information Disclosure (mean score = 2.4) had the lowest scores among all GCETs. These indicators likely reflect a lower level of resources, administrative ability, and management system sophistication than is found at other institutions.

Private Teacher Training Colleges scored reasonably well across all categories (3.22) and generally were on par with Government Teacher Training Colleges, with slightly higher scores for Stakeholder Engagement than Government Teacher Training Colleges. This appears to indicate that Private Teacher Training Colleges are oriented towards the market and require a level of satisfaction from stakeholders for continued operation.

Notably, there were no meaningful differences shown based on the types of institutions with regard to External Oversight Compliance; therefore, the external pressures from regulatory bodies have proven to be very effective in creating similar levels of compliance between the various types of institutions.

Table 6

Accountability Scores by Geographic Location

Accountability Dimension	Punjab	Sindh	KPK	Balochistan	Urban	Rural
Transparency in Decision-Making	3.3	3.2	3.1	2.9	3.4	2.9
Financial Accountability	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.5	3.0	2.5
Academic Quality Assurance	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.8	3.3
Stakeholder Participation	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.6	3.1	2.6
External Oversight Compliance	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.6
Grievance Resolution Systems	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.8	3.3	2.8
Performance Monitoring	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.0	3.5	3.0
Information Disclosure	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.4	2.9	2.4
Ethical Standards	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.5
Continuous Improvement	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.6	3.1
Overall Mean	3.34	3.25	3.15	3.08	3.43	2.97

The analysis of accountability factor implementation by geographical area has highlighted the differences between different geographic areas, including provincial, urban, and rural areas. For instance, the highest district scores for accountability were consistently found in Punjab, 3.34, while Sindh and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Balochistan had similar scores (3.25, 3.15, 3.08). These findings are consistent with the overall level of educational infrastructure and available resources in each province.

The difference in scores between urban (3.43) and rural (2.97) institutions also shows that urban institutions received higher ratings than rural institutions in all accountability-related categories, with the most significant differences being in the two areas of Financial Accountability (0.5) and Information Disclosure (0.5). Urban institutions have better access to the tools they need to meet their accountability obligations than rural institutions. Additionally, stakeholders connected to urban institutions have considerably greater access to information that is necessary to be held accountable than those who are connected to rural institutions and also have greater access to the resources and training necessary for establishing an inclusive accountability mechanism.

Rural institutions have a number of significant barriers that prevent them from establishing a comprehensive accountability framework, including limited internet access, reduced access to stakeholders, and a general lack of available resources with which to build a full accountability structure.

Table 7

Accountability Perceptions by Stakeholder Group

Accountability Dimension	Senior Admin	Faculty	Support Staff	F-Value	Significance
Transparency in Decision-Making	3.8	2.9	2.7	12.45	0.000*
Financial Accountability	3.4	2.5	2.3	15.67	0.000*
Academic Quality Assurance	3.9	3.5	3.2	8.23	0.000*
Stakeholder Participation	3.5	2.7	2.4	11.89	0.000*

Accountability Dimension	Senior Admin	Faculty	Support Staff	F-Value	Significance
External Oversight Compliance	4.1	3.7	3.5	7.34	0.001*
Grievance Resolution Systems	3.6	2.9	2.6	9.78	0.000*
Performance Monitoring	3.8	3.1	2.9	8.95	0.000*
Information Disclosure	3.2	2.5	2.3	10.56	0.000*
Ethical Standards	4.0	3.6	3.4	6.78	0.001*
Continuous Improvement	3.9	3.2	2.9	9.45	0.000*
Overall Mean	**3.72**	**3.06**	**2.82**	**18.23**	**0.000***

*Significant at p < 0.05; **Highly significant at p < 0.001*

Through stakeholder analysis, stakeholders expressed very different views of accountability at the different levels within the organization. The average response from senior administrators was 3.72 on an overall accountability mechanism rating and 2.82 and 3.06 for support staff and faculty, respectively. This indicates that there are substantial gaps in the perceptions of stakeholders at all levels of the institution.

Several reasons could possibly account for these differences. The increased amount of knowledge that Senior Administrators have about the formal systems of accountability may have a positive effect on their view of these systems as they use them in practice rather than just as a formality. Faculty Members have some form of participation in developing policy on academic matters and, therefore, may not have much knowledge or visibility into the administrative financial accountability system whereas Support Staff have the least amount of contact with the Institution on the Governance of the Institution and do not have much access to information regarding the Accountability System.

Perception gaps are greatest in the two areas of Financial Accountability and Transparency in Decision-Making, both of which had an average of 1.1 between senior administrators and support staff. This suggests these two areas are clear opportunities for improvement in terms of both information sharing and inclusive decision-making. In addition, all the differences were found to be statistically significant (p < 0.001), which demonstrates that they are not simply random differences, but rather systematic differences between stakeholder experiences and perceptions concerning the accountability mechanisms.

Table 8

Correlation Matrix of Accountability Dimensions

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Transparency	1.00									
2. Financial Accountability	0.67*	1.00								
3. Academic Quality	0.45*	0.52*	1.00							
4. Stakeholder Participation	0.72*	0.58*	0.41*	1.00						
5. External Compliance	0.38*	0.44*	0.63*	0.35*	1.00					
6. Grievance Systems	0.59*	0.61*	0.48*	0.66*	0.42*	1.00				
7. Performance Monitoring	0.64*	0.69*	0.71*	0.53*	0.55*	0.57*	1.00			
8. Information Disclosure	0.78*	0.74*	0.49*	0.69*	0.41*	0.62*	0.66*	1.00		
9. Ethical Standards	0.51*	0.47*	0.58*	0.43*	0.52*	0.48*	0.54*	0.46*	1.00	
10. Continuous Improvement	0.61*	0.63*	0.66*	0.58*	0.49*	0.59*	0.73*	0.64*	0.56*	1.00

Correlation significant at p < 0.01

A correlation analysis showed a significant number of positive correlations which exist for the different dimensions of accountability. Therefore, if an institution is performing well in one dimension of accountability, it is likely that they are also performing well in the other dimensions. The highest positive correlation was between the

dimensions of Information Disclosure and Transparency in Decision-Making with a correlation of 0.78, indicating that the dimensions are closely related in the way they are applied and practiced.

The results indicate that Performance Monitoring stands in a close relationship to both Continuous Improvement (r = 0.73) and Financial Accountability(r =0.69), which indicates that institutions utilizing a systematic approach to monitoring will be better at providing transparency when it comes to financial matters and making improvements within the institution. Additionally, Stakeholder Participation has a strong correlation to Transparency in Decision-Making (r = 0.72) which indicates that institutions that exhibit greater levels of transparency in decision-making will also be more effective in engaging their stakeholders in governing themselves.

Between External Oversight Compliance and Stakeholder Participation (r = 0.35), as well as External Oversight Compliance and Transparency in Decision-making (r = 0.38), there were low correlations. This indicates that regulation is not a function of institutional systems alone but is also dependent on how stakeholders perceive institutional requirements (as distinctions) between the "compliance-based" and "improvement-based" frameworks for accountability.

The correlations describe the construct validation of the accountability framework and indicate that the 10 dimensions represent both related and distinct elements of institutional accountability. The results support the theoretical foundation that an integrated system of multiple dimensions provides the best opportunity for effective accountability.

Discussion

Based on a total accountability score of 3.25, teacher training institutions are exhibiting moderate levels of accountability. However, some significant differences and obstacles are included within the total score.

The results showed significant differences in accountability mechanisms adopted by different teacher training institutions. Universities along with education departments yield high scores across various accountability dimensions compared to the other teachers' training institutions. This reflects established administrative systems, resource acquisition abilities and higher levels of governance existing within universities. In contrast, Government Colleges of Elementary Teachers (GCETs) showed the lowest accountability scores across range of dimensions, especially in terms of financial accountability and information dissemination. This suggests a relationship between the type of institution and the potential for implementing accountability measures.

A critical finding was the disparity of accountability between urban and rural institutions. Consistently across all ten indicators of accountability, urban institutions performed significantly better than rural institutions. There were particular gaps in two key aspects of accountability (Financial Accountability and Information dissemination); these two gaps had the lowest scores (2.8 in Financial Accountability; 2.7 in Information Disclosure). Therefore, this means the level of transparency in both of these areas can be classified as low (i.e., a clear lack of transparency).

The findings are troubling due to the fact that many teacher training institutions are public sector institutions and therefore there is an expectation from various stakeholders, including students and the public at large, to have access to institutional operation and financial accountability.

In addition, regarding perception of accountability among stakeholders, there were considerable differences between senior administrators and faculty/support staff; senior administrators rated accountability mechanisms considerably higher than did faculty/support staff, suggesting a lack of accessibility and involvement with all institutional stakeholders regarding formal accountability structures. Therefore, the present study suggests that the majority of formalized accountability mechanisms exist at the administrative level and lack sufficient input from other stakeholders within the institution. This finding reveals a divergence among stakeholders in what they

perceive to be the purpose of accountability mechanisms, specifically that accountability mechanisms are predominantly top-down and driven by administrative authority, with limited engagement from other institutional stakeholders. If accountability mechanisms are to have value and be effective, they must include the input and communication of all institutional stakeholders.

The relationship among the dimensions of accountability is clear in the correlations. For example, transparency in decision-making was highly correlated with the disclosure of information and public participation, suggesting that accountability should be viewed as an integrated system rather than separate components. Institutions that invested in transparency and monitoring resulted in the inclusion of more dimensions of accountability and additional benefits across those dimensions; therefore, they establish the necessity to pursue reforms in accordance with an integrated systems rationale.

Conclusion

This critical analysis of the accountability mechanisms and governance processes in the teacher training institutions in Pakistan shows a significant difference in the transparency practices among demographic, geographic and institutional stakeholders. The results reveal positive practices with some substantial gaps in the Teacher Education Institutions (TEI) to uphold transparency. Although there are institutions with strong accountability systems fostering effective governance but with few loopholes involving stakeholders in reporting systems. Such imbalance shows teacher training in Pakistan is below the required standard to ensure high-quality teacher training programs. Thus, the training institutions TEIs are expected to train prospective teachers with high governance standards with the utmost level of transparency and accountability.

The study demonstrates that although training institutions are moving towards entrenching accountability systems in Pakistan. It requires extensive, profound and efficient ways to satisfy the expectations of the educational stakeholders with high-quality assurance of modern teacher training programs. Consequently, it is the responsibility of institutional leaders, policymakers and educational stakeholders to ensure that intricate governance and transparency systems are in place to meet standards of regulatory compliance. In order to achieve effective accountability systems there is need to promote a culture of ongoing institutional transparency, innovation and responsible cultures across teachers' training institutions (TTI's).

References

Ahmad, I., Ur Rehman, K., Ali, A., Khan, I., & Khan, F. A. (2014). Critical analysis of the problems of education in Pakistan: Possible solutions. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v3i2.1805

Andrews, M. (2013). *The limits of institutional reform in development.* Cambridge University Press.

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, *13*(4), 447-468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x

Boyd, D. J., Grossman, P. L., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). Teacher preparation and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *31*(4), 416-440. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373709353129

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (2005). *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Education policy analysis archives*, *8*, 1-1. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000

Government of Pakistan. (2010). *18th Amendment to the Constitution of Pakistan.* National Assembly of Pakistan.

Grindle, M. S. (2004). *Despite the odds: The contentious politics of education reform.* Princeton University Press.

Higher Education Commission (HEC). (2023). *Quality Assurance Framework - Precepts, Standards and Guidelines (PSG-2023).* Government of Pakistan. https://hec.gov.pk

Khan, A. N., Yasmin, T., & Hussain, Z. (2025). Legal Implications of Private vs. Public Education Systems in Pakistan. *Journal of Law, Society and Policy Review*, *2*(01), 26-35. https://jlspr.uskt.edu.pk/index.php/Journal/article/view/34

Koppell, J. G. (2005). Pathologies of accountability: ICANN and the challenge of "Multiple accountabilities disorder". *Public Administration Review*, *65*(1), 94-108. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00434.x

Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia.* Cambridge University Press.

Ministry of Education, Pakistan. (2023). *Pakistan Education Statistics 2022-23.* Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Finance, Pakistan. (2023). *Economic Survey of Pakistan 2022-23.* Finance Division.

Naseem, T. (2025). Decolonizing college governance in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa: Autonomy challenges in curriculum, evaluation, and institutional structure. *International Journal of Emerging Multidisciplinaries: Social Science*, *4*(2), 20. https://doi.org/10.54938/ijemdss.2025.04.2.537

National Accreditation Council for Teacher Education. (2024). *Teacher Education Standards.* NACTE.

Provincial Education Departments. (2024). *Consolidated report on teacher training institutions.* Provincial Education Departments.

Tahira, M., Hassan, A., Malik, A., & Yousuf, M. I. (2020). Teacher education in Pakistan: Issues and problems. *Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).* https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED608314.pdf

UNESCO. (2017). *Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments.* UNESCO.

Wagner, T., & Vander Ark, T. (2012). *Creating innovators: The making of young people who will change the world.* Scribner.