

REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON EFFECT OF ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION SCHEME ON QUALITY OF SECONDARY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMME

*Sandeep Sharma and **Dr. Roopam Jain

*Research Scholar, Department of Education, SunRise University, Alwar, Rajasthan (India)

**Associate Professor, Department of Education, SunRise University, Alwar, Rajasthan (India)

*Email: sandeepsharma23282@gmail.com

Abstract: To understand why it is essential to invest in education and at what level of education, various research scholars across the globe have conducted research studies and have tried to analyse the relationship between educational performance indicators and socio-economic outcomes in developing the methods of measuring quality of education and identification of its determinants. This chapter reviews the literature of such noteworthy studies. However, it has been noted that in the absence of qualitative indicators of education, most researchers have used quantitative indicators as a base for doing these analyses. Although most of the research work in this area has been conducted at global level, we have tried to present a few Indian cases as well to identify what has already been done and what needs to be done.

[Sandeep Sharma and Dr. Roopam Jain. **REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON EFFECT OF ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION SCHEME ON QUALITY OF SECONDARY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMME.** *Researcher* 2026;18(8):12-14]. ISSN 1553-9865 (print); ISSN 2163-8950 (online).

<http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>. 03. doi:[10.7537/marsrj180826.03](https://doi.org/10.7537/marsrj180826.03)

Keywords: REVIEW OF LITERATURE; ASSESSMENT; ACCREDITATION SCHEME; QUALITY; SECONDARY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMME

Introduction:

Education is a basic requirement for human development and poverty reduction (Sivakumar & Sarvalingam, 2010), and it acts as the bedrock for the sustainable development of any country. Education converts people into human resources and equips them to contribute to society and the economy. In a globalized world, economic development is highly associated with a nation's human capital endowment (Khan et al., 2014), which is acquired through quality education. Thus, quality education greatly influences economic and social development, and it is essential to raise citizen awareness and enhance students' scientific knowledge of quality education (Paz et al., 2022). Therefore, quality education must be provided to the students, though it is sometimes disrupted by disasters such as earthquakes, tsunamis, pandemics, and war (Peters et al., 2020). As quality is one of the most preferential issues from national and global perspectives, ensuring quality education is the central task for any educational institution (Akhter, 2008) and a country needs to deliver quality education to the students to prepare globally competent citizens (Malik, 2018). In the global competitive arena, secondary education is considered an important stage of basic education that changes the learners' attitudes and is essential for society (Rahman et al., 2010). Along with quantitative development, qualitative development in secondary education is urgently needed (Campaign for Popular Education, 2019).

Review of literature:

Literature reviews documenting the criteria for assessing quality in higher education are quite abundant. However, secondary education lacks such a type of scientific stock. In a review, Brennan and Shah (2000) gave a conceptual model showing the relationship between quality management and institutional change in higher education that found the different effects of quality assessment, such as rewards, policies, and cultures among the 29 institutions of 14 countries. The review also found that power and values are the key issues to the assessment system and management. However, the review was conducted with a limited sample size. In another review, Coates (2005) explored students' engagement as a factor of quality in higher education. He explained that as the students directly contribute to the educational process, institutions need to develop an approach for increasing students' engagement that facilitates, analyses and focuses on performance indicators. This review emphasized only students' engagement as a factor of quality education but didn't identify other factors and their influences. Harvey and Williams (2010) focused on external factors of quality in higher education in the national and global context in their first part of the review paper from 1995 to 2010. They found that quality is related to purpose, context, political intention and system development. The second part also emphasized internal quality assurance factors for improving teaching-learning and assessment. The review also found quality enhancement elements, including student feedback surveys, that were key in quality processes. Pereira et al. (2016) reviewed the assessment and evaluation of European higher education from 2006 to

2013 after introducing ‘Bologna Process’. They found the implementation and impact of different assessment methods, especially the student-centred assessment method, which was compatible with the assumptions of the Bologna Process, along with traditional methods such as self, peer, continuous, formative, and summative assessment. They revealed that students and teachers play an active role in the student-centred assessment. Ferrante (2017) found that students’ incoming quality is measured based on average CISIA (Consorzio Interuniversitario Sistemi Integrati per ‘l’Accesso) test scores and revealed variation of quality among the incoming students due to better personal capabilities, higher quality secondary school studied, and developed socio-economic background. He also found the measures of students’ outgoing performance, such as the quality of the students’ careers and the position of the graduates in the job market. The review further mentioned that students’ incoming quality influences their outgoing performance. However, CISIA test score provides only average values for faculty or university, not showing the causal relationship among the different quality indicators.

In line with international policy trends among members of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) aimed at improving ‘core’ educational outcomes in literacy, numeracy, and science (Savage & O’Connor, Citation2019, p. 2), there has been increasing attention in the last decade on the role of ‘quality teachers’ in enhancing international competitiveness in the global education market (AGDET, Citation2016; Australian Government Department of Education and Training [AGDET], Citation2015; Cochran-Smith et al., Citation2017; Dinham, Citation2013; Rowe & Skourdoumbis, Citation2017; Sayed & Ahmed, Citation2015; Scholes et al., Citation2017). This has resulted in a flurry of teacher education reforms, within a number of countries, which focus on effectively selecting and preparing high-quality teacher candidates (Hutt et al., Citation2018; Ledwell & Oyler, Citation2016).

We are cognizant that much of the research to date on the standardised testing of teachers—and of teacher candidates, in particular—has been the tendency for minorities to be over-represented in groups most adversely affected by such gatekeeping mechanisms (Goldhaber & Hansen, Citation2010; Graham, Citation2013; Petchauer & Baker-Doyle, Citation2016). However, our argument is not that LANTITE produces a similar effect, but that it seems to have no effect or impact at all regarding its claims to improve teacher quality. Rather, it simply creates an additional impost for *all* candidates to undertake the test, creating not only a financial burden for an otherwise futile exercise that is pushed onto teacher candidates—those least responsible for having created the problem in the first quality instance—but leaving potentially legitimate problems about teacher quality unaddressed.

he widely held assumption that student outcomes are inextricably linked with teaching quality (AITSL, Citation2011; Darling-Hammond, Citation2015; Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development, Citation2005) has been a driving force for teacher education reforms (Wang et al., Citation2010). Recently, the selection and preparation of high-quality teacher candidates have been central to public policy discourses in countries such as the United States and Australia (AITSL, Citation2011; Hutt et al., Citation2018; Ledwell & Oyler, Citation2016). Consequently, we draw upon both these concepts in the current study—teacher quality and selection (in the form of gatekeeping)—to interrogate and further understand their relationship to education reform.

Theorising ‘quality’ within education is highly contentious (Rowe & Skourdoumbis, Citation2017; Sayed & Ahmed, Citation2015). Further, in relation to the teaching profession more specifically, the concepts ‘*teacher* quality’ and ‘*teaching* quality’ are often used interchangeably (Mockler, Citation2018a). Yet, the subtle difference between teacher and teaching quality is important. While the former refers to typically inherent traits and competencies associated with an individual, the latter emphasises the nature and characteristics of the strategies used to produce certain outcomes (Mockler, Citation2018b; Scholes et al., Citation2017). Conceived in this way, ensuring quality *teachers* is to ensure the ‘right’ people enter the profession in the first instance, while quality *teaching* focuses on what teachers do once they enter the profession and begin practising in schools.

Similarly, gatekeeping, particularly in the form of tests for both entry to and exit from teacher education programmes has been employed as a mechanism to address national and international pursuits to achieve teacher quality (Ledwell & Oyler, Citation2016; Malinen et al., Citation2012). Gatekeeping can be conceived as a policy solution (Shohamy, Citation2001), focused on selection criteria and procedures, that has been mobilised in a number of countries around the world (e.g., Caena, Citation2014; Heinz, Citation2013; Klassen & Kim, Citation2019). Shohamy (Citation2001) argues that using gatekeeping tests to solve policy issues is appealing to policy makers because ‘they allow users to determine cutting scores in an arbitrary way and thus create quotas in a flexible manner’ (p. 86). She contends that tests are often used as a way for test users to seek permission to enter or exit and to demonstrate they have the knowledge required to make them legitimate members of the group being tested. With concerns regarding the seeming decline in education quality, and more specifically the quality of teachers, there has been a recent push for the need for more national and state policy initiatives that focus on selecting and preparing high-quality teachers

through gatekeeping tests in both the US (Dover, Citation2018; National Council on Teacher Quality, Citation2019) and Australia (Australian Government Department of Education and Training [AGDET], Citation2015; AGDET, Citation2016; AITSL, Citation2019a, AITSL, Citation2011).

Ledwell and Oyler (Citation2016) argue that, in the US, gatekeeping tests have historically been used in teacher education for two purposes: 1) to assess basic skills knowledge and/or pedagogical knowledge as an *entry* requirement, and 2) assess skills and competencies as a *summative* assessment for licensure purposes. Both gatekeeping purposes have traditionally been assessments that were ‘paper-and-pencil’ tests and under the purview of state-level legislation (Ledwell & Oyler, Citation2016, p. 121). However, this paper will focus primarily on gatekeeping tests, used internationally, that focus on basic skills testing and have been used primarily for selection into teacher education programmes, rather than teacher performance assessments that aim to assess classroom-readiness at the end of a teacher education programme (AITSL, Citation2019b; Ledwell & Oyler, Citation2016).

References

- Altinok, N. (2007). *Do school resources increase school quality? Institute for research in the sociology and economics of education*. Research papers.
- Ansari, M. I., & Singh, S. K. (1997). Public spending on education and economic growth in India: Evidence from VAR modeling. *Indian Journal of Applied Economics*, 6(2), 43–64.
- Aslam, M., & Kingdon, G. (2011). What Can Teachers do to Raise Pupil Achievement? *Economics of Education Review*, Elsevier, 30(3), 559–574.
- Barnwal, S. K. (2008). *Educational development index in India*. <http://digitallearningeletsonline.com/2008>.
- Barro, R. J. (1991). Economic growth in a cross-section of countries. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106, 407–443.
- Barro, R. J., & Lee, J. W. (1993). International comparisons of Educational attainment. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 32, 363–394.
- Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education* (3rd ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago (1993).
- Behrman, J., & Wolfe, B. (1987). How does mother’s schooling affect the family’s health, nutrition, medical care usage and household sanitation? *Journal of Econometrics*, 36, 185–204.
- Birdsall, N., Ross, D., & Sabot, R. (1995). Inequality and growth reconsidered: Lessons from East-Asia. *World Bank, Economics Review*, 93, 477–508.
- Bloom, D., Canning, D., & Chan, K. (2006). *Higher education and economic development in Africa*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.