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ABSTRACT

This research highlights correlational variables derived from teachers' attitudes regarding the impact of socioeconomic status on the quality of education and teaching in Kosovo. The research design is descriptive with a theoretical-empirical character. The population is determined numerically and includes around 23,200 teachers from seven regions of Kosovo working in pre-university education from grades 1 to 12. The research was conducted with a sample of 738 teachers from over 50 schools. The study's results indicate that the socioeconomic status of teachers is correlated with the quality of teaching and education in general. Through teachers' attitudes, the study enabled the understanding of a consistent correlation regardless of variables such as marital status, rural-urban residence, number of employed family members, qualifications, work experience, and professional development. The findings recommend that the socioeconomic status of teachers should be taken into account when formulating strategies and policies for enhancing the quality of education and teaching in pre-university education in Kosovo.
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1. Introduction

The education system in Kosovo has faced challenges to its quality over the past two decades. During the 1990s, due to the conflict situation (violent measures from Serb authorities in Kosovo), Kosovar teachers and students conducted the teaching process outside regular school institutions, in private homes, religious facilities, or temporarily adapted spaces. In those difficult conditions, the teaching process was also organized with very low teacher salaries. Those salaries resembled more social assistance than monthly payments. In the early 1990s, the monthly salary for a teacher was 15 German marks, with a gradual increase, which reached 150 German marks (Deutsche Mark) in 2000. This payment was the same for all pre-university teachers.

After the end of the war in 1999, the consolidation of the education system in Kosovo began; old schools were reconstructed, and many new schools were built. Students and teachers returned to regular school institutions. Teachers' monthly payments shifted from the voluntary system of collecting funds from the citizens to the regular state budget. Starting from the year 2000, teachers' salaries began to gradually increase year by year up to the present day. The base salary of an entry-level teacher upon joining pre-university school institutions was 405 euros net, while for more experienced teachers, the monthly salary reached 500–550 euros (regardless of qualification level, such as Bachelor, Master, or doctorate).

As of November 2022, the guaranteed minimum wage, according to the laws in force in the public sector, is categorized at 130 euros net for employees up to 35 years old and 170 euros for employees over 35 years old. The overall average wage for both sectors in Kosovo is 416 euros, 552 euros in the public sector and 342 euros in the private sector (Kosovo Statistics Agency, 2021). To provide readers with a clearer understanding of teachers' payments for their work on a monthly basis, we referred to data from the Kosovo Agency of Statistics concerning wages in the public and private sectors. By comparing the net monthly wage of teachers, which ranges from 450 to 500 euros per month, with school directors' wages of 550 to 600 euros, educational inspectors' wages of 500 to 550 euros, nurses' wages of 300 to 350 euros, and medical doctors' monthly wages of 600 to 700 euros, it can be said that teachers' salaries in Kosovo are favorable. Even when comparing teachers' salaries in Kosovo with those of teachers in the
neighboring countries (such as North Macedonia, Albania, Montenegro, and Serbia), the situation is similar, with the exception of Serbia, where teachers’ salaries are higher. However, considering the needs and the deteriorated economic condition of teachers for two consecutive decades, it can be concluded that teachers’ salaries should be higher and motivating.

Throughout the years, state educational institutions in Kosovo (MESTI), the Pedagogical Institute of Kosovo, and other governmental and non-governmental organizations (i.e., KEC-Kosovo Education Center), both local and international, have taken indicators such as the PISA Test, Grade 9 Matura Test, State Matura Test Grade 12/13, students’ success in school, students’ success in studies, and attainment of competencies during schooling needed for the job market, as indicators for assessing quality in Kosovo education. Currently, the formal assessment instrument deployed by the MESTI in measuring the quality of pre-university education in Kosovo consists of five (5) quality areas, 25 criteria, and 133 indicators. The level of school performance (quality) is determined based on the school’s achievements in relation to each indicator. Indicators are the main references for assessing school performance. This assessment instrument or standard is composed of the following quality areas:

1. Management and governance (5 evaluation criteria with 31 indicators),
2. School culture and environment (5 evaluation criteria with 28 indicators),
3. Teaching and learning (5 evaluation criteria with 29 indicators),
4. Professional development of teachers (5 criteria with 18 indicators),
5. Student performance (5 evaluation criteria with 27 indicators; Pedagogical Institute of Kosovo, 2016).

2. Literature Review

To gain a deeper understanding of the studies conducted in the field of education quality in Kosovo, we have reviewed local pedagogical and educational literature and consulted the Dissertation Work Registry at the Central Library in Pristina. We have encountered materials and documents published by various individuals, institutions, and organizations, both local and international, which have conducted research in the field of education and quality, but we have not found studies or data specifically carried out in Kosovo regarding the impact of SES of teachers or students on the quality of education and teaching.

Several studies conducted in the field of education, including those by individual researchers or commissioned by the EU Office in Kosovo, do not specifically address the impact of teachers’ socioeconomic status on education quality. Some of the education-related studies that touch on quality and economic aspects include Qehaja and Aliu (2018), Riinvest Institute (2016) report, and the study by Peci (2018).

From our review of physical and electronic literature on the internet, we understand that various international authors, institutes, and organizations, both regional and international, have extensively researched this field. They have conducted studies and drawn important conclusions and recommendations regarding the impact of SES on education. The information we have obtained from the reviewed literature has enabled us to understand that most studies have considered one or two factors related to socioeconomic status, and primarily, the studies have focused on students’ success in school, academic performance of students, teaching quality, teacher motivation for work, teacher performance, their professional development, parents’ education and its impact on children’s success, parents’ profession and income, and the impact of SES on children’s IQ.

Below, we present some of the findings and observations that have emerged from SES-related studies in the field of education. The following data is not arranged in any particular order or chronological sequence; it is presented in a summarized form for comparative findings:

1. Conditions and work at the school have more influence on learning quality than family SES characteristics (Aikens & Barbarin, 2008).
2. Teaching experience and the quality of professional development of teachers have an impact on students’ academic achievements (Gimbert et al., 2007).
3. Students in schools with low incomes are less likely to have qualified teachers (Clotfelter et al., 2006).
4. To improve the quality of schools in low SES neighborhoods, factors such as improving teaching and learning, creating an information-rich environment, building a learning community, continuous professional development, involving parents, and increasing material resources and funding should be considered (Muijs et al., 2004).
5. There is a significant impact on the SES of teachers and their work in higher secondary schools in the Merauke region, Papua, Indonesia (Werang, 2014).
6. Socioeconomic status is the best predictor of academic achievement for all (Caldwell & Ginther, 1996; Sirin, 2005).
7. A correlation between family income and children’s achievements is noticeable (Bracey, 1999; Caldwell & Ginther, 1996; Milne & Plourde, 2006; Quagliata, 2008).
8. Students’ success is related to the performance of teachers, who are key actors in implementing codified educational programs. Teachers play a crucial role in the education process, according to Piaget (Navidi & Barzegar, 2003). Improving the living conditions and well-being of teachers is another fundamental factor in promoting their social status (Hoyle, 2001).

Research conducted by various authors internationally on the impact of teachers’ SES on the quality of teaching and learning provides us with an understanding that there is a pronounced correlation (depending on the variables) between teachers’ SES and the quality of education, teaching, and students’ achievements in school.
3. Study Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine and verify (a) pre-university teachers’ attitudes in Kosovo regarding the impact of SES on the quality of education and teaching, (b) the relationship between selected variables (demographic, social, and professional) with the quality of education and teaching, and (c) the most significant influencing factors on the quality of education and teaching. This study’s topic is relevant not only for Kosovo but also for the broader region. The findings of this study offer important data and information concerning the impact of teachers’ SES on the quality of education, findings that could serve the Ministry of Education of Kosovo in developing new policies aimed at improving education quality.

The main questions guiding the study’s purpose are:

- Is the quality of education correlated with teachers’ SES?
- Has the economic-financial condition of teachers influenced the quality of education?
- What are the most influential factors contributing to the quality of education in Kosovo?

4. Methodology

4.1. Research Design

A quantitative research design was employed to understand the significance of teachers’ SES on the quality of education and to answer the three questions stated above. This design is used to identify factors influencing specific research outcomes and simultaneously provides a quantitative description of trends, attitudes, or opinions within a population by studying a sample of that population (Creswell, 1994).

4.2. Participants/Population Sample

A representative sample of 738 pre-university teachers out of the population of 23,200 active teachers in pre-university education in Kosovo were included. The sample consisted of teachers from 50 schools in Kosovo, covering grades 1 to 12.

4.3. Data Collection Technique/Instrument

A questionnaire consisting of three parts was used for data collection. The first part contains 8 questions that refer to the socioeconomic status of each individual teacher. The second part includes five questions related to the qualification level and the profession (teaching) of the teachers. The third part of the questionnaire consists of 26 questions through which teachers’ attitudes about the impact of SES on the quality of education and teaching, including the influence of professional development on teaching quality, are measured. The Likert scale of 5 points (with response options: 1. Very much; 2. Somewhat; 3. A little; 4. Not at all; 5. Not sure) was predominantly used in the third part, with several cross-referencing multiple-choice questions (options: 1. Always; 2. Often; 3. Sometimes; 4. Never) and a few open-ended questions.

4.4. Data Collection Procedure

For the purpose of regional and urban-rural representativeness of teachers in the preliminary research, we discussed and reached an agreement with the Regional Education Directorates in Kosovo (7 directorates). The questionnaire for teachers in electronic format was sent to the Regional/Municipal Education Directorates and then distributed to the teachers through the school directors. The questionnaires have also been distributed online to several dedicated groups that have a large number of readers and mainly focus on educational issues, schools, and education. The questionnaire has been published on a web form with the possibility of completion only by teachers who are active in the educational process in pre-university education in Kosovo. The questionnaire was prepared and formulated in the Google Form, informing the participating teachers in advance about research ethics and data confidentiality.

4.5. Analytical and Statistical Processing

Statistical analysis was conducted using the SPSS Statistics program v20. Non-parametric tests (chi-square) were performed for hypothesis testing, and several coefficients (contingency coefficient, Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient, Pearson correlation coefficient) were calculated to help in result interpretation. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations) were used to analyze and describe the data (gender, age, settlement type, educational qualification, family employment, economic conditions, teaching experience, and professional development activities).

5. Results

5.1. Socioeconomic Status of Teachers

According to statistical data from the Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI) for the 2020/21 school year, the total number of pre-university teachers in Kosovo is around 23,173, with 13,175 being women and 9,998 being men. The representative sample in this study matches the overall number of employed teachers in terms of gender: 13,175 female teachers (F) and 9,998 male teachers (M). By comparing the data of employed teachers in pre-university education in relation to gender, it’s evident that there’s a noticeable dominance of female employees compared to male employees. MESTI data for the 2020/21 school year highlights the increasing number of employed women teachers across all three levels of pre-university education. This trend of development and women’s interest in the education sector is also evident in student enrollment in teacher education faculties.

The current age distribution of teachers in pre-university institutions is as follows: 50.2% are aged 30–44, 29.3% are aged 45–65, and 20.5% are under 29. Based on the representative sample, the educational qualification level of pre-university teachers is as follows: 0.3% have a high school diploma, 54.3% have a bachelor’s degree (240 ECTS), 44.1% have a master’s degree (60/120 ECTS), and 1.4% have a doctoral degree. This trend of increasing the capacities of teachers with higher qualifications (master’s...
and doctoral degrees) gives a positive prospect for overall improvement in the quality of education.

The participating teachers in the study were from seven regions in Kosovo, with the following representation: 7.2% from Pristina, 10.2% from Peja, 10.6% from Ferizaj, 14.8% from Gjakova, 15.6% from Gjilani, 17.7% from Prizren, and 23.8% from Mitrovica. Regarding settlement type, the representation of teachers in the study for the seven Kosovo regions is 48% rural and 52% urban. Self-declared marital status representation in this study is as follows: 80.7% are married, 16.6% are unmarried, and 2.7% fall under other categories (undefined).

Monthly income for employed individuals varies (in economic terms) in a family with 2–4 members compared to a family with 5–9 members or more. Participating teachers in the study through the random sample represented the following: 54.8% from families with 5–9 members, 39.3% from families with 2–4 members, 4.6% from families with more than nine members, and 1.2% are teachers living alone. Most teachers’ families (97.1%) reside in their own houses, while 2.9% live in rented houses or apartments, generally reflecting the overall situation in Kosovo regarding ownership of houses.

Among the family members, excluding the teachers themselves, the distribution of employment is as follows: 40.4% have two employed family members, 24.9% have three employed family members, 14.8% have four employed family members, and 19.9% of teachers are the only ones employed in the family.

5.2. Attitudes of Teachers

In order to understand teachers’ attitudes regarding the impact of their socioeconomic status on the quality of education and teaching, the questionnaire included the questions provided in Table I.

The attitudes of the teachers (Table I) allow us to understand the correlation between some SES variables (monthly salary, free time, professional development, marital status) and the quality of education. The findings, based on the attitudes of teachers, show a high correlation between SES variables and quality in education. To the question, “Would you be more committed to teaching quality if your salary were better?” (See Table II), the majority of teachers (51.1%) reported that they would work more with students and raise the quality of education.

In Table III, we have the attitudes of the teachers regarding the question, “In general, what factors do you think have contributed to the decline in the quality of education?” Low engagement of students in learning (80.5%), low involvement of the family/parents in educational work with children (76.7%), and political interventions in education (74.6%) have received more clicks as the most important factors for the decline in quality in education.

In Table IV, we present the attitudes of the teachers regarding the question, “What factors do you think contribute to the improvement of the quality of education?” Employing teachers according to meritocracy in education (89.6%), professional development of teachers (82.9%), and planning and preparing teachers for teaching (82.3%) received the most clicks as the most important factor for improving quality in education. In Tables V and VI, we have presented the level of correlation between teachers’ SES and their professional development with the quality of education. In Table VII, we have the attitudes of teachers (with village-city residence) regarding the cross tabulated question: In general, what factors do you think influence the improvement of the quality of education? [Teachers’ socio-economic conditions]. Through the Chi-Square test and symmetrical measures, we have presented the correlation between the three variables (SES + residence of teachers – with the quality in education). The findings show a consistent correlation between teachers’ SES and the improvement of the quality of education. As for the correlation between the place of residence of the teachers (village-city) and the increase in the quality of education, the results indicate a very small or insignificant impact.

6. Discussion

Statistical calculations confirmed a strong correlation between the socioeconomic status (SES) of teachers and the quality of teaching in pre-university education in Kosovo (see Table VI). The study highlighted a significant correlation between the teachers’ socioeconomic status and the quality of education and instructional engagement. This correlation is particularly robust when considering the continuous professional development of teachers and its impact on education and teaching quality. The study also revealed correlations between teachers’ professional development, age, gender, and settlement type (rural vs. urban), although these correlations were not as significant as others. The calculated chi-square values were larger than the tabular values for the respective degrees of freedom (based on the number of columns and rows in tables) and for a significance level of 99% in most cases.

The correlation coefficient between variables was confirmed through calculated coefficients (contingency, Spearman, and Pearson), often indicating high values, almost within the range of a functional correlation. Based on teachers’ perspectives and statistical data, the correlations between variables are as follows:

1. The correlation between marital status and education quality and teaching is not very strong, but it favors motivation for teaching work.
2. The correlation between caring for family and children and engagement in teaching work at school is not very strong, but it favors hindrance to work engagement.
3. Participation in professional development activities showed a slight correlation with the settlement type (rural-urban).
4. The professional development of teachers in relation to teaching quality shows a strong correlation.
5. The quality of organizing professional development activities correlates strongly with teaching quality.
6. The relationship between the economic status (monthly payment) and engagement in teaching work also shows a very strong correlation.
TABLE I: Teachers’ Attitudes Regarding the Impact of Their Socioeconomic Status on the Quality of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your monthly salary adequately fulfill your family's needs for a normal life?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have enough time at home to prepare for lessons?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your marital social status influence your engagement in school and the quality of teaching?</td>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>Helps me</td>
<td>Hinders me</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does caring for children and the family hinder your preparation for teaching?</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you participated in any form of professional development activities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied have you been with the quality of those professional development activities?</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you assess the current quality of education in Kosovo?</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Somewhat good</td>
<td>Not very good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Attitudes of Teachers Regarding Salary Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extend</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III: Factors Influencing the Decline of Education Quality in Percentages (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>To some extend</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequent education reforms</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited knowledge of the new curriculum</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low involvement of family/parents with children</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low engagement of students in teaching</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of supervision and oversight</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor school management (inexperienced principals)</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low engagement of teachers in work</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low teacher salaries</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of teaching resources (technology)</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political interventions in education</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accountability and evaluation of schools and teachers</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited training for CPD (Continuous Professional Development)</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low quality of CPD activities</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV: Factors Influencing the Improvement of Education Quality in Percentages (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>To some extend</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of studies (at the faculty)</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular content during studies (subjects)</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit-based employment of teachers in education</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification/education level of teachers-Bachelor's, Master's, PhD</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development of teachers</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good understanding of the new Curriculum</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair payment for the work performed (in teaching)</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work supervision and accountability</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic conditions</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson planning and preparation</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE V: The Impact of Professional Development on Raising the Quality of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extend</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VI: The Impact of Socioeconomic Status on Raising the Quality of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extend</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VII: Attitudes of Teachers by Place of Residence (Village-City) Regarding the Impact of SES on Quality

#### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, which factors do you consider to influence the improvement of education quality? [Socioeconomic conditions of teachers]</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To some extend</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chi-square tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Symmetric measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymptotic standard error$^a$</th>
<th>Approximate T$^b$</th>
<th>Approximate significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interval by interval</td>
<td>Pearson’s R</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal by ordinal</td>
<td>Spearman Correlation</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $^a$Not assuming the null hypothesis. $^b$Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis. $^c$Based on normal approximation.

7. The quality of professional development activities correlates strongly with teaching quality and the ability to apply acquired knowledge to teaching. Notably, the organization of professional development activities is crucial, and the majority of teachers’ opinions emphasize the necessity for high-quality organization of such activities.

From comparing teachers’ responses to cross-sectional questions regarding the impact of SES on education quality, for potential factors that influenced the decline in education quality (Table I), and for factors that could contribute to improving education quality (Table II), the study’s results lead to the division of influencing factors into primary and secondary categories:

- **Primary:** Student engagement in teaching, family and parental engagement with children, successful teacher employment in studies, professional development of teachers, lesson planning and preparation, familiarity with the curriculum, and education level/qualification.
- **Secondary:** Use of technology in teaching, school management, supervision and accountability, monthly payment, socioeconomic conditions, and education reforms.

7. **Conclusion**

The study has focused on the influencing factors in the quality of education and teaching and has analyzed the attitudes of teachers regarding the impact of SES on their teaching work in pre-university education in Kosovo. Through their positive attitudes, teachers have conveyed that the SES of teachers has a significant influence on the quality of education and teaching. These findings correspond with the results of other studies in this field concerning the impact of SES on the quality of
education (Muijs et al., 2004). The study also provides additional findings related to the correlations between demographic variables. Small correlations were found between the age of teachers and educational qualification, educational qualification and professional development activities, educational qualification, and teaching experience. A strong correlation was observed between age and teaching experience, gender, and the possibility of professional development.

The favorable economic status of teachers is an important factor for their personal and family well-being; it is a prerequisite for greater engagement in daily teaching work and participation in professional development activities. Pay increases and material incentives are always welcomed, but they are not factors that necessarily lead to teaching quality, improvement of education quality, and the attainment of professional competencies of teachers.

The findings of the research will assist the leadership of higher state educational institutions in creating affirmative policies related to the influencing factors in education quality. Motivation for work, professional development of teachers, monitoring of professional development activities, employment of candidates with high academic success, appointment of successful managers in schools, supervision, and accountability in work are factors of significant importance for education quality that should not be overlooked in the case of planning and formulating medium and long-term development policies in education.
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