

## *Performance of Profit and Non-profit Rural on School Performance in Qom Province in 2020*

Hamidreza Sheikholeslam<sup>1</sup>, Hossein Khanifar<sup>2\*</sup>, Abolfazl Bakhtiari<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D Student of Educational Management, Qom Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qom, Iran

<sup>2\*</sup>Professor, Faculty of Management and Accounting, Farabi College, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, Educational Management, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran

**\*Corresponding Author Address:** Faculty of Management and Accounting, Farabi College, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran

**Tel:** 0098-9121513335

**Email:** Khanifar@ut.ac.ir

**Received:** 26 Feb 2021

**Accepted:** 17 May 2021

### **Abstract**

**Background:** The education level of individuals in a community is one of the indicators explaining the health of that community, and the performance of schools plays a significant role in promoting health and observing the educational justice of students and individuals in the community.

**Objectives:** The present study aimed to compare the performance of support and public (rural) schools in Qom province concerning the preventive role of selected components in students' health.

**Methods:** The present research is a descriptive comparative survey study. The statistical population included 17 Profit and Non-profit Rural schools in Qom province with 110 teachers and principals. First, the regions and schools were selected by cluster sampling method; then, through stratified sampling among profit and non-profit schools the proportion of gender and school type was observed, and through simple random sampling, 44 teachers and principals were chosen from among the selected schools. The research tool was a researcher-made questionnaire. To analyze the data, an independent t-test in SPSS version 16 software was used.

**Results:** According to the findings of this study, the age range of participants was 22 to 51 years. Twenty-four participants (54.5%) had 1-10 years of teaching experience. Based on the data, the performance of profit schools was better than public (rural) schools in terms of the dimensions of planning, empowerment, health promotion, and physical education, and the performance of public (rural) schools was better than profit schools regarding the dimensions of education, learning, and executive and administrative affairs, which this difference was statistically significant ( $p \leq 0.001$ ). There was no significant difference between the performance of profit schools versus public (rural) schools in the dimensions of developing participation in the school as well as the educational and complementary activities ( $p \geq 0.05$ ).

**Conclusion:** Given the differences in the dimensions of planning, education, learning, empowerment, health promotion, and physical education by this study, the officials' planning seems to play a preventive role in addressing the weaknesses in schools. However, performing more research in this regard is recommended.

**Keywords:** *profit schools, non-profit schools, health, health promotion, empowerment, education*

### **Introduction**

Factors affecting student health are one of the most important issues all over the world [1]. Investing in the children health in learning situations and identifying strategies to improve student health, monitor process and outcomes, is

one of the most important health interventions [2,3]. Various studies have been performed on factors affecting students' health in schools [4-6]. These factors can include planning [7], physical activity [8], and psychological activities [9,10], which in turn can affect learning rate [11,12],

participation in school activities [13], and empowerment [14]. Health quality can also be related to school type. Little research has been performed to evaluate the role of school type and, particularly, the strengths and weaknesses of different in helping community health [1].

Non-profit schools are schools that are established and managed through the participation of the people, in accordance with the goals, rules and general instructions of the Ministry of Education, under the supervision of that ministry [15].

Education, as the most important social institution in fulfilling its mission, requires the use of significant intellectual, financial, supportive and spiritual resources, the provision of which depends on the cultural conditions and attitudes of society, especially senior managers and decision makers. One of the important changes and events that our country's educational system has experienced during the years after the Islamic Revolution is the activity of non-profit schools alongside public schools [16]. These schools are run under the supervision of the Ministry of Education, in accordance with its goals and policies, but with the financial participation of the people. Non-profit schools, despite the assumptions and underlying principles of their laws, were formed to relieve part of the cost of education by transferring it to affluent families, with the aim of providing more care for the children of disadvantaged families and thus improving education. Education was based on the people's ability to receive secondary education and be recognized in public schools [17].

Various modes of privatization include allowing private educational institutions alongside government-run institutions, increasing government support and funding from private institutions, transferring ownership of public institutions to the private sector, increasing private credit, or private control and oversight of Governmental institutions [18].

Also, one of the other goals of non-governmental schools, called "without bag", has been established in the country with the aim of improving the educational level of students [19].

Numerous factors have been mentioned in previous studies that have caused problems in the field of educational justice. Among these factors are school expectations and regulations, poor school performance, lack of free education,

economic characteristics of the school, and lack of professional training for teachers [20-22]. One part is related to the diseconomy, such as the poverty in the conditions of marginalization as well as remote and impassable villages, obviously creating the dilemma of poverty and inequality to access appropriate educational conditions, and another part is related to the existence of social harms, causing this educational inequality. Achieving educational justice and equality in educational services seems to be one of the important and critical principles. Due to the necessity and influence of underlying components and providing learning opportunities concerning the effective factors for all individuals- this study was done to compare profit schools and public (rural) schools in Qom province to improve performance and health considering the preventive role of the selected components.

### **Methods**

The research method is descriptive-comparative. The statistical population included 17 rural and non-profit schools of Qom province with 110 teachers and principals. The sample size was considered 44 people (mean age= 22-45 years) using G-Power software. First, the regions and schools were selected by cluster sampling method; then, through stratified sampling among support and non-profit schools (three profit schools and two non-profit schools), the proportion of gender and school type was observed, and through simple random sampling, several teachers and principals were chosen from among the selected schools. The sample size was assigned using G-Power software with the assumptions of 95% confidence level (first type error= 0.05) and 90% power test ( $\beta-1$ ). Samples also included three profit schools in the villages of Jandab and Salafchegan, which were selected along with their two adjacent schools under independent management. To collect the required data, a questionnaire was used as follows: This questionnaire involved 47 items, and its response scale was based on the Likert scale (very low= 1, low = 2, medium = 3, high = 4, and very high = 5), consisted of 7 components including planning, education and learning, empowerment, developing participation in the school, educational and complementary activities, health promotion and physical education, and executive and

administrative affairs. It should be mentioned that each activity had 2 points and the minimum and maximum total scores of the form were 47 and 235. The validity of this tool has been confirmed by experts and specialists in the field of education using face and content validity. The reliability of this tool was also calculated through Cronbach's alpha (equal to 0.96), indicating the high reliability of this questionnaire.

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive indicators and inferential statistical tests. Descriptive indicators include mean and standard deviation as well as presenting tables and graphs related to frequencies and percentages. Moreover, the independent two-sample t-test was used to compare the research variables, and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to evaluate the normality of the distribution of variables. SPSS software version 25 was used to analyze the data at the level of 0.05.

## Results

According to the findings of this study, the number of participants in the group of public (rural) schools was 23 people (52.3%), and the number of participants in the group of profit schools was 21 people (47.7%). Six people (13.6%) were in the 22-26 years age group, 18 (40.9%) were in the 27-31 years age group, 15 (34.1%) were in the 32-36 years age group, and 5 (11.4%) were in the 37-51 years age group. Eighteen people (40.9%) were male, and 26 people (59.1%) were female. Twenty-four people (54.5%) had 1-10 years of teaching experience, 15 (34.1%) had 11-20 years of teaching experience, and 5 (11.4%) had 21-30 years of teaching experience. Based on the results of the Kolmogorov test, the data were distributed normally, and therefore, the parametric test was used to examine the data.

*Table 1: Indicators for evaluating the performance of profit and non-profit schools' educational services using t independent*

Components	Indicators	percentage of profit schools	percentage of Non-profit schools	The Difference Rate of point Percent
Planning	Formulating an annual program	98	88	10
	Approval of the annual program by the district primary education unit	100	100	0
	Formulating and implementing an operational program	96	87	9
	Evaluating during the implementation of the operational program	72	65	7
Education and learning	The principal's supervision over the classes' educational process	100	100	0
	The presence of teachers in the festival of superior teaching models	75	48	27
	Holding field trips	92	75	17
	Identifying students with learning disabilities and educational pursue	72	78	-6
	Identifying, absorbing, and maintaining school-dropout students	65	64	1
	Checking the classroom process notebook and observing the curriculum hours	98	91	7
	Implementing the quality evaluation program properly	85	68	17
	Laboratory status (equipping the classroom with the necessary teaching aids)	74	59	15
	Developing the educational science research and Jaber Bin Hayan Festival	82	42	40
	Improving the quality of education with a new educational approach	84	85	-1

<b>Empowerment</b>	Familiarizing principals, educators, and teachers with learning disabilities and the unapt	95	94	1
	Participating colleagues in the mid-career training workshops	95	94	1
	Holding specialized workshops on descriptive evaluation, lesson study, and teaching methods	100	68	32
	Using new technologies and software	92	91	1
<b>Developing participation in school</b>	Holding teachers' council	100	100	0
	Holding school council	100	100	0
	Holding student council	100	100	0
	Holding family education	90	85	5
<b>Educational and complementary activities</b>	Implementing Islamic life etiquette and skills program	100	100	1
	holding an exhibition of superior ideas and appreciating distinguished students	100	85	15
	creating a class library	74	62	12
	Developing students' Quranic activities	80	85	-5
	Holding congregational prayer	82	85	-3
	Holding the opening ceremony	69	80	-11
	Holding ceremonies regarding national and religious occasions	85	80	5
<b>Health promotion and physical education</b>	Promoting calligraphy	64	70	-6
	School physical status	90	61	29
	Health status	95	74	21
	School safety status	82	83	-1
	Beautifying and refreshing the school	100	64	36
	Performing students' medical examinations	100	95	5
	Sports field lineation and dynamic yard	100	68	32
<b>Executive and administrative affairs</b>	Providing sports equipment and facilities	75	69	6
	Availability of regulations and instructions	72	95	-23
	Installing elementary school goals in the right place	100	100	0
	Quality of attendance sheet of colleagues	92	100	-8
	Apportion duties of staff and delegation of authorities	82	80	2
	Timely and qualitative response to circulars and administrative letters	95	89	6
	Forming the financial council and adhering to its approvals	75	85	-10
	Archiving documents and offices (financial, statistics, and exams)	80	92	-12
	Filing for staff and students	80	91	-11
	Using technology in registering documents and providing reports	90	92	-2
Using the financial system and entering the information timely and correctly	90	86	4	
Mean total	87.59	81.97	5.62	

*Table 2: Descriptive indicators of research variables*

Variables	Group	Mean (SD)
<b>Planning</b>	Profit schools	91.5 (15.71)
	Non-profit schools	85 (16.82)
<b>Education and learning</b>	Profit schools	82.7 (16.49)
	Non-profit schools	71 (15.32)
<b>Empowerment</b>	Profit schools	95.5 (17.88)
	Non-profit schools	86.75 (14.12)
<b>Developing participation in the school</b>	Profit schools	97.5 (19.56)
	Non-profit schools	96.25 (15.39)
<b>Educational and complementary activities</b>	Profit schools	81.75 (16.02)
	Non-profit schools	80.87 (16.91)
<b>Health promotion and physical education</b>	Profit schools	91.71 (15.21)
	Non-profit schools	73.42 (15.66)
<b>Executive and administrative affairs</b>	Profit schools	85.6 (15.95)
	Non-profit schools	91 (17.39)

*Table 3: The performance of profit schools versus public (rural) schools*

Variables	Groups	Means (SD)	T-test*		
			Mean Differences	T Value	Significance Level
Planning	Profit schools	91.5 (7.3)	6.5	2.919	0.001
	Non-profit schools	85 (4.3)			
Education and learning	Profit schools	28.7±2.4	11.7	3.615	0.001
	Non-profit schools	71 (3.4)			
Empowerment	Profit schools	95.5 (5.8)	8.75	3.213	0.001
	Non-profit schools	86.75 (5.4)			
Developing participation in the school	Profit schools	97.5±8.6	1.25	0.851	0.194
	Non-profit schools	96.25 (9.2)			
Educational and complementary activities	Profit schools	81.75 (4.4)	0.88	0.487	0.217
	Non-profit schools	80.87 (5.8)			
Health promotion and physical education	Profit schools	91.71 (8.4)	18.29	6.721	0.001
	Non-profit schools	73.42 (7.5)			
Executive and administrative affairs	Profit schools	85.6 (5.2)	-5.4	2.437	0.001
	Non-profit schools	91 (6.9)			

**independent T test**

Based on the data of this study, profit schools performed more favorably in “planning”, “empowerment”, and “physical health promotion” than non-profit schools, which was statistically

significant (p-value= 0.001). Non-profit schools also performed more favorably in “education and learning” and “executive and administrative affairs” than profit schools, which was

statistically significant ( $P$ -value= 0.001). In this study, no statistically significant difference was observed between the performance of profit schools versus that of public (rural) schools in the dimensions of “developing participation” and “educational activities” ( $P$ -value> 0.05).

### **Discussion**

The main purpose of this study was to compare the performance of profit and non-profit rural schools in Qom province concerning the preventive role of the selected components in students' health. According to the findings of the present study, the mean scores of planning, empowerment, health promotion, and physical education of profit schools were higher than that of public (rural) schools. No significant difference was observed between the performance of profit schools versus that of public (rural) schools in the dimensions of developing participation in the school as well as educational and complementary activities. The mean scores of education and learning and also executive and administrative affairs in profit schools were lower than in public (rural) schools. Given that the researcher has not found a study that compares support and public (rural) schools, concerning comparing the results to previous research, he refers to some studies that have dealt with the differences between non-profit schools and non-non-profit schools, including Wu et al. [23], Keramati et al. [24], Parasteh Ghambovani [25], Zarei et al. [26], Habibi and Lotfi [27], Razavi et al. [28], and Khan et al. [29]. Based on the research findings, there was no significant difference between support and public (rural) schools regarding developing participation in the school as well as educational activities. Habibi and Lotfi [27] showed in their study a significant difference between the ideas of male and female teachers in public and non-non-profit schools regarding the principals' participatory style; it means that male and female principals of non-non-profit schools are more participatory than those of non-profit schools, which is inconsistent with the results of the present study. In explaining the findings of the present study, it can be said that given the goals of each institution as well as the attitudes, values, and worldview of each group, management methods in all organizations are not the same, and the relationships present at work and human, material,

and spiritual factors affect the educational environment [30]. The lack of difference between public and profit schools can be attributed to the management type of principals that may have acted independently of the policies of school types and may have caused no difference in the performance of the principals of these school types concerning participation.

Based on the research findings, the performance of profit schools regarding empowerment was higher than that of public (rural) schools. The results of this study were in line with the results of Mina's [31] study. It seems that empowerment has a significant association with students' creativity, and according to Mina's research, due to the facilities of private schools, this creativity was more in private schools than in non-profit schools. Based on the research findings, health promotion and physical education were higher in profit schools than in public (rural) schools. The results of this study were inconsistent with the results of Bezerra et al.' [32] study and were consistent with the results of Kuponiyi's [33] study. The differences appear to depend on the type of general policies of countries and, to a large extent, the type of supervision over tasks and duties can determine the type of the differences [34].

The research findings showed that the performance of planning in profit schools was more favorable than in public (rural) schools. In Ali et al.'s [35] research, the habits of study and planning are better in private schools, which is consistent with the findings of the present study. It seems that being interested in study in private schools has led to better planning in this regard [35].

According to the research findings, there was no significant difference between profit schools and non-profit schools regarding educational and complementary activities. If we consider educational activities as equivalent to social skills, the results of this part of the research will be consistent with the findings of Sabzevar et al.'s [36] study. Of course, in the mentioned study, the components of social skills were different among these schools, but in general, it can be said that the type of school policy concerning the human factors responsible is effective in the difference between these schools and the type of management [30].

In addition, the executive and administrative affairs of profit schools were found to be lower than that of non-profit schools. The results of this part of the study were inconsistent with the findings of Onongha et al.'s [37] study. It seems that there is a relationship between the type of difference and the type of management because it is not mentioned in the Onongha et al.'s [37] study. In some components, non-profit schools performed better, and in some others, the performance of private schools was more favorable.

### Conclusion

It seems that more supervision over the issues of interest has been able to further improve the learning status in this group. Concerning the dimension of empowerment, with the indicators of familiarizing principals, educators, and teachers with learning disabilities and the unapt as well as participating colleagues in the mid-career training workshops, profit schools performed better. Concerning the dimension of developing participation in the school, with the indicators of holding teachers' council and holding school council, and also in the dimension of educational and complementary activities, with the indicators of holding an exhibition of superior ideas and appreciating distinguished students and creating a class library, there was no difference between support and non-profit schools, and it seems that both groups performed the same. Also, regarding the dimension of health promotion and physical education, with the indicators of the school physical status of and performing students' medical examinations, profit schools had a better performance. Regarding the dimension of executive and administrative affairs, with the indicators of availability of regulations and instructions as well as archiving documents and offices (financial, statistics, and exams), non-profit schools performed better. In general, it can be said that the two types of management methods, by separating profit schools from public (rural) schools, have shown different results in the desired dimensions, and this is important that the strategies of the officials to improve performance and health can be effective concerning the preventive role of the selected components, and has been able to create differences in these cases. One of the limitations of this research is that the

data were limited to Qom province; therefore, to generalize the results, it is recommended to perform similar research in other provinces.

### Acknowledgments

This article has been extracted from a doctoral dissertation at Islamic Azad University, Qom Branch, approved on 2019/07/05 (approval code 10120709983112) by the University Research Council.

We would like to appreciate the supervisors, advisors, and participants in the study, as well as all the organizations and individuals that provided the necessary cooperation.

### Conflict of interest

There is no conflict of interest in this study.

### Funding:

This research has been done with the personal fund of researchers.

### References

1. Evans D. The role of schools of public health: learning from history, looking to the future. *J Public Health*. 2009; 31(3): 446-50.
  2. St Leger L, Nutbeam D. Research into health promoting schools. *J Sch Health*. 2000; 70(6): 257-59.
  3. Zareipour M, Sadaghianifar A, Valizadeh R, Alinejad M, Noorani S, Ghelichi Ghogh M. The effect of health promoting schools programs in improving the health status of schools in Urmia, North West of Iran. *Int J Pediatr*. 2017; 5(2): 4319-27.
  4. Shea B, Knowlton K, Shaman J. Assessment of climate-health curricula at international health professions schools. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020; 3(5): e206609.
  5. Steeb DR, Urlick BY, Sleath BL, Joyner PU. Institutional factors associated with global health education across US pharmacy schools. *Curr Pharm Teach Learn*. 2019; 11(8): 767-73.
  6. Norris E, van Steen T, Direito A, Stamatakis E. Physically active lessons in schools and their impact on physical activity, educational, health and cognition outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2020; 54(14): 826-38.
- Phelps Ch, Madhavan G, Rappuoli R, Levin S, Shortliffe E, Colwell R. Strategic planning in

- population health and public health practice: a call to action for higher Education. *Milbank Q.* 2016; 94(1): 109-25.
8. Hills AP, Dengel DR, Lubans DR. Supporting public health priorities: recommendations for physical education and physical activity promotion in schools. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis.* 2015; 57(4): 368-74.
9. Martineau M, Beauchamp G, Marcotte D. Efficacy of mental health prevention and promotion strategies in higher education. *Sante Ment Que.* 2017; 42(1): 165-82.
10. O'Connor CA, Dyson J, Cowdell F, Watson R. Do universal school-based mental health promotion programmes improve the mental health and emotional wellbeing of young people? A literature review. *J Clin Nurs.* 2018; 27(3-4): e412-26.
- National Research Council. *Green Schools: Attributes for health and learning.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2007.
12. Simovska V, Paakkari L, Paakkari O. Health literacy as a learning outcome in schools. *Health Educ.* 2012.
13. Pereira S, Santos JN, Nunes MA, Oliveira MG, Santos TS, Martins-Reis VdO. Health and education: a partnership required for school success. *CoDAS.* 2015; 27(1): 58-64.
14. Laverack G. *Public health: power, empowerment and professional practice.* 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Macmillan International Higher Education; 2019.
15. Khaneghi F. *A Survey of Students' Attitudes Towards Their School, Their Academic Performance and the Relationship between the Two in Public Schools, Popular and Non-Profit Sample of Girls' High Schools in Urmia [dissertation].* Tehran: Tarbiat Modares University Tarbiat Modares University; 1997.
16. Abbaszadeh M. Comparison of the effectiveness of public schools with non-profit schools. *J Mashhad Fac Literature & Humanities.* 2000; 1(2): 23-37.
17. Hashemian F, Zandian H, Aqamohammadi D. Analysis of Private Sector Participation in the Education System. *J Macro & Strategic Policies.* 2016; 3(12): 1-26. [In Persian]
18. Mugisha Baine EM. Privatisation of higher education in Uganda and the global gender justice ideal: uneasy bedfellows? *Educ Re.* 2010; 1; 62(3): 315-28.
19. Sabzevar M, Liaghatdar MJ, Abedi A. The comparison of social Skills components of primary students at without bag schools and public schools of Isfahan. *New Educ Approach.* 2015; 10(1): 105-20. [In Persian]
20. Levin HM. The economic payoff to investing in educational justice. *Schools in Transition: Brill Sense;* 2017; 161-88.
21. Bang M, Vossoughi S. Participatory design research and educational justice: Studying learning and relations within social change making. *Cogn Instr.* 2016; 34(3): 173-93.
22. Lalas JW, Morgan RD. Training School Leaders Who Will Promote Educational Justice: What, Why, and How? *Educ leadersh Admin.* 2006; 18: 21-34.
23. Wu H, Wu S, Wu H, Xia Q, Li N. Living arrangements and health-related quality of life in Chinese adolescents who migrate from rural to urban schools: Mediating effect of social support. *International journal of environmental research and public health.* 2017; 14(10): 1249.
24. Keramati M, Pourkarimi J, Zali F. Comparison of The Educational Space of Public and Non-Public Karaj's High Schools. *J School Admin.* 2017; 5(1): 51-72. [In Persian]
25. Parasteh Ghambovani F. The role of education policies in the efficiency and effectiveness of principals and its comparison in public and non-public schools *Behavioral Sciences (Abhar).* 2016; 27: 46-29. [In Persian]
26. Zarei Matin H, Jandaghi GhR, Moeini B. Study and comparison between the level of organizational learning of public and non-profit secondary schools in Qom in 2003-2002. *Orgnizational culture management.* 2003; 1(3): 47-67. [In Persian]
27. Habibi Sh, Lotfi Damsaz M. Comparison of public school management styles with non-governmental schools in Shahriar city. *Educational Management Research.* 2009; 1(2): 149-74. [In Persian]
28. Razavi Seyed MH, Asivand Chamali H, Manouchehri Nejad M. Relationship between social influence of school principals and job empowerment of physical education teachers *Sports Management. Movement.* 2015; 7(5): 764-51. [In Persian]
29. Khan HMA, Chandio JH, Farooqi MTK. Comparison of performance appraisal system in



public and private schools. *Pak J Commer Soc Sci.* 2014; 8(1): 278-88.

30. Stone NJ. Human factors and education: Evolution and contributions. *Hum factors.* 2008; 50(3): 534-9.

31. Mina KD. Analyzing relationships among principal instructional leadership, teacher empowerment, teacher creative practices and student creative problem solving skills in public and private schools [dissertation]. Arkansas: University of Arkansas at Little Rock; 2016.

32. Bezerra MD, Carvalho EF, Oliveira JS, Leal VS. Health and nutrition in public and private schools in the city of Recife. *Revista Brasileira de Saúde Materno Infantil.* 2017; 17(1): 191-200.

33. Kuponiyi OT, Amoran OE, Kuponiyi OT. School health services and its practice among public and private primary schools in Western Nigeria. *BMC Res Notes.* 2016; 9(1): 203.

34. Pate RR, Trilk JL, Byun W, Wang J. Policies to increase physical activity in children and youth. *J Exerc Sci Fit.* 2011; 9(1): 1-14.

35. Ali A, Ali Z, Naz R. Study habits and education planning: A case study of comparison of private and public sector schools. *The Dialogue.* 2012; 7(3): 309-18.

36. Sabzevar M, Liaghatdar MJ, Abedi A. The comparison of social Skills components of primary students at without bag schools and public schools of Isfahan. *New Educ Approach.* 2015; 10(1): 105-20. [In Persian]

37. Onongha GI. Comparative analysis of administrative leadership styles of principals in public and private schools in Oriade Local Government Area, Osun State, Nigeria. *Educational Journal of the University of Patras UNESCO Chair.* 2018; 5(1): 37-46.