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CHAPTER-I
THE PROBLEM

1.1 Introduction

In ancient times when human social life was very simple, the family used to provide the child with all the activities and experiences that he or she needed for preservation and improvement of his or her life and culture. The child was learning the vocations and life patterns from the adults, from the family, church, religious ceremonies, social functions and so on. In course of time, however, as the society became more complex and life more complicated there was gradual development of human civilization and the quantum of knowledge and experience increased. The home or the family and other primitive agencies were later found inadequate for transmitting the knowledge, skills and values, that is, the cultural heritage from one generation to another. Thus emerged a formal agency of education called the school.

The school is the "child's home" during the school hours and the "community centre" afterwards. It may be called a "living laboratory" where pupils learn through living and doing. It is also known as a "youth centre" or a "civic enterprise" which provide recreational, library
and other cultural facilities for the development and growth of the youth. School is a place where not only education is being imparted but also the required atmosphere to young pupils to develop their total personality is provided.

Classrooms are diverse places, varying in their size and the age and composition of pupils as well as aims, characteristics and experiences of teachers. Diversity in practice exists at both primary and secondary levels between different classes in the same school as well as in different schools. Do these variations in conditions and practices, and therefore in pupils experiences of education matter?

Research on school effects and school effectiveness is now old enough to have a “history”, replete with internal time demarcations. If we take the “Coleman Report” (Coleman et al., 1966) as the first major school effects research and as the progenitor of the school effectiveness studies to follow, the history spans a full two decades. The researchers focus on the post-Coleman part of that history and the line of currently popular inquiry most often called “effective schools” research. It is in two eras: the first characterized by explicit concerns for equity, the second by implicit concerns for efficiency. The division between the two eras, results from the introduction of context variables into the critique
and revision of effective schools research designs. "Context" can include such socio-political facets as the socio-economic background of the students, governance structures that determine fiscal and operational decision making, grade levels (age of students and curricular programme) of the school, and more.

Research in the area of school effectiveness followed a predominant 'paradigm' by which researchers explained variation in children's educational growth over time by variations in home background, community characteristics and individual intellectual and personal attributes. Now the findings of school effectiveness research are increasingly used in educational debate and are increasingly being accessed by practitioners wanting a knowledge base to inform their improvement programmes in schools (Reynolds and Cuttance, 1992). The development of this field over time has been extensively described by experts (Creemers and Scheerens 1989 and Reynolds 1991). In both United States and Britain, studies by Coleman (1996), Jenks (1971), and the British Plowden Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (1967) concluded that schools brought little independent influence to bear upon the development of their pupils. This period was gradually followed in both the societies by the emergence of a wide range of effective schools. School effectiveness or school effects studies, which
argue for the importance of school influence, began in the United States with various qualitative case studies and moved on at a wide range of quantitative studies. In Britain, it started with the work by Power (1967), Gath (1987), Reynolds (1976, 1982, Reynolds 1987), Rutter (1979), Falloway (1985) and Gray (1990). Subsequent studies have been made by Smith and Tomlinson (1989) and by Scheerens (1992), Mortimore (1993) and Creemers (1994) in multicultural schools. A number of studies have shown correlations between teaching and learning and school teacher effectiveness. Sammons (1995) reported that academic emphasis (including regular setting and monitoring of home work) and high GCSE entry rates appear to be features of more highly academically effective schools. They further report (1995) that the ineffective schools had experienced high staff turnover and secure staff shortage in specialist subjects which were seen to have acted as barriers to effectiveness.

It is common to forward for discussions of school effectiveness research to report that their organizing questions, sampling procedures, and implications have been consciously constructed as a response to the findings in Coleman et. al., (1966) and Jencks et.al., (1972). These researchers concluded that differences in children’s achievement are
more strongly associated with family background characteristics than with school based variables.

The last two decades have seen increasing academic interest in the study of school and teacher effectiveness in promoting pupils' educational outcomes. This interest arose originally in response to the pessimistic interpretation of findings by researchers in the US (Coleman et.al. 1966; Jenks et.al. 1972) concerning the potential influence of the school (and by implication, therefore, of teachers and their classroom practice) on pupils' attainment. On the basis of such analysis it was argued that whether a pupil attended a particular school (A rather than B) was unimportant. Attainment was seen as primarily determined by such factors as IQ, socio-economic status and race, with schools and teachers making little difference in comparison. It is important to note, however, that Coleman et.al. (1966) and Jencks et.al. (1971) researches were not intended to imply that schooling and teaching have no influence on learning. One only has to look at literacy rates in countries where access to schooling is limited on the basis of income and gender to demonstrate the positive effects of access to education. Rather, their work concerned the extent to which individual schools, with all their variations in organization, leadership and curriculum, differ in their diversity in classroom practices and have a differential impact on pupils'
learning and development and thus in terms of pupils educational outcomes. The studies by Coleman et al. (1966) and Jencks et al. (1971) stimulated some researchers to study the nature of any specific school and teacher influences on pupils educational outcomes in more depth. In other words, they addressed the question of whether variation in the processes of schooling, including what goes on in the classroom, makes some schools or teachers more effective than others.

Receiving the Coleman (1966) Jencks (1971) conclusion as a challenge, some educators set out to disprove or modify it by locating and describing schools that serve children from poor families where achievement gains were unusually high (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Klitgaard and Hall, 1974; Weber, 1971; Wisenbaker, 1979; Edmonds, 1979b; Phi Delta Kappa, 1980;).

1.2 Effective Schools

Organizational effectiveness remains a complex and difficult problem for both theorists and researchers as well as for practitioners. There is no general agreement on the definition of the concept let alone its measurements. The effectiveness is one of the most pervasive yet least delineated constructs in the study of organizations.
Research in the area of school effectiveness followed a predominant 'paradigm' by which researchers explained variation in children's educational growth over time by variations in home background, community characteristics and individual intellectual and personal attributes. Now, the findings of school effectiveness research are increasingly used in educational debate and are increasingly being accessed by practitioners wanting a knowledge base to inform their improvement programmes in schools (Reynolds and Cuthance, 1992). The development of this field over time has been extensively described by experts (Creemers and Scheerens, 1989; Reynolds, 1991). In both the United States and Britain, studies such as that by Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (1967) Jenks et.al. (1971) Coleman et.al. (1996) and the British Plowden all concluded that schools bring little independent influence to bear upon the development of their pupils. This period has been gradually followed in both societies by the emergence of a wide range of effective schools. School effectiveness or school effects studies, which argue for the importance of school influence, began in the United States with various qualitative case studies and moved on to a wide range of quantitative studies. In Britain it started with the work by Power et.al. (1967), Reynolds (1976, Gath (1977), Ruter et.al., (1979), 1982; Galloway (1985); Reynolds et.
al., 1987), and Gray et.al., (1990). Subsequent studies have been made by Mortimore and his colleagues (1988) in primary schools and by Smith and Tomlinson (1989) in multicultural secondary schools and by Scheerens (1992), Mortimore (1993) and Creemers (1994). A number of studies have shown correlations between teaching and learning and school and teacher effectiveness. Sammons et.al., (1995) reported that academic emphasis (including regular setting and monitoring of homework) and high GCSE entry rates appear to be features of more highly academically effective secondary schools. They also further report (1995) that the ineffective schools had experienced high staff turnover and serve staff shortages in specialist subjects which were seen to have acted as barriers to effectiveness.

School effectiveness has emerged as a recent a popular topic among educational researches. The works of Coleman (1979), Rutter (1979), Brookover (1979), Edmonds (1979), Moss (1979) and Madaus (1980) are typical of educational studies on effective schools. However, much of the research has been criticized on measurement, statistical, methodological and theoretical grounds. It appears that the research on effective schools is limited by the same weaknesses as the research on effective organizations the absence of both a sound theoretical framework and careful definition and measurement of the concept.
There has long been a tradition of writing about a particular school as a way of trumpeting certain values that the school embodied, but the climate of the times tended to define the "good school". In the progressive era, certain schools were singled out because of their anti-traditional features, such as their combination of work and play or their engagement in the school life of the surrounding community.

By the late 1970s and early 1980s, an "effective school" came to be identified with the characteristics such as outstanding principal, high expectations for all children, an orderly atmosphere, a regular testing programme and an emphasis on academic learning.

Effective schools will have clear idea about the purpose for which they exist and also they are determined to move towards the purpose with the cooperation of different personalities working within the school system.

1.3 Measuring Effectiveness

Effectiveness has always been an elusive term. Bernard (1938) defines, "An action is effective, if it accomplishes its specific objective, aim". To effect means to bring about, to accomplish; thus to be effective means an action or an institution or an individual must bring something
about, must accomplish something. Indeed the term implies that the action is deliberate.

So a school can be effective but also inefficient if it achieves its objectives but at too great a cost. A school can be efficient (that is, good at achieving results). A school which is efficient and effective may not necessarily be excellent in the sense of being the best among its peers. But most important of all, a school can not be either efficient or effective unless it has objectives, targets to achievement, so there needs to be at least some outcome measures which can be used to separate effective schools from the middling or ineffective ones.

There is a distinct difference between effectiveness and efficiency. Both derive from the same Latin root, and both involve accomplishment, but the word efficient also implies productivity, accomplishing an end without waste of effort or resources it implies getting value for money.

One way to raise the average scores is to exclude from the sample those students whose scores will fall below the average and will therefore pull the average down. This can be done by the simple device of advising the low achieving student to go elsewhere for his or her education and it is sad to note that some schools have used this device
over the years and have been judged excellent accordingly. Suppose one judges the effectiveness of a hospital on the proportion of its patients which it can discharge in good health; the way for a hospital to stay on top of the list would be for it to admit only those patients who were already reasonably healthy or who had a high probability or recovery. To retain its reputation for effectiveness, it would refuse to admit any patient who was terminally ill or whose illness presented the doctors with difficulties and it would certainly not involve itself in the risky business of experimentation and medical research.

How is one of demonstrate effectiveness, achievement of a sought outcome? The American studies used as performance indicators the performance in national standardized achievement tests. Thus in the USA "effectiveness" meant raising the average scores in the school mathematics and reading. But bluntly, school effectiveness usually meant literacy and numeracy. Judging the effectiveness of a school by this orientation should cause disquiet to educators.

Being effective as a school does not mean seeking more resources’ it assumes achieving better outcomes with the resources that are already there. Being effective assumes a re-concentration on what is basic schooling’ it means getting rid off frills and homing in on what is
the school's essential task teaching children and improving scholastic performances. Being effective often means literally improving student performance in reading and mathematics.

It was so easy to use this effectiveness measure in the late 1970s, when there was so much discussion on school achievement testing, on levels of literacy and numeracy and so vigorous a campaign about getting back to the basics. "Mastery learning" also grew up in this period. In the U.S.A. State legislatures were mandating the basic competencies which every student must acquire before graduating from general education. It was in this context that a new enthusiasm for a core curriculum arose.

But if educators want recognition of effective an excellent schools, they must define more precisely what their objectives are, win concurrence--at least among their parent population for those objectives, teach to the objectives and then regularly apply indicators or measures which quite clearly demonstrate whether progress is being made towards those objectives. One simple can not have an "effective" school unless it has specific aims and unless progress is monitored in someway.
Ascertaining school effectiveness is neither simple nor obvious. It is agreed that effectiveness is multidimensional rather than a unidimensional construct. Researchers listed out a number of criterion measures of school effectiveness.

A school is said to be effective when it achieves its objectives using the available resources efficiently, economically and sufficiently too. It is quite natural that a school attracts more pupils when it enjoys high academic achievement. The academic achievement can be achieved in a vacuum. The academic achievement and the ultimate reputation are the outcome of various factors that work within the school. A school should satisfy the needs of various persons such as teachers, students, parents and the public. In an effective school, teachers, students and parents actively participate in various school activities. A conducive atmosphere will prevail within the school. The Head of the school who organizes and co-ordinates all the activities will possess the required leadership qualities. Thus, the factors namely teachers' involvement, students' involvement, parents' involvement, school atmosphere and leadership qualities of the Heads of the schools are directly responsible for the academic achievement and indirectly influences the reputations.
1.4 Correlates of Effective Schools

The correlates are the means to achieving high and equitable levels of student learning. It is expected that all children (whether they be male or female, rich or poor, black or white) will learn at least the essential knowledge, concepts and skills needed so that they can be successful at the next level next year. Further, it has been found that when school improvement processes based upon the effective schools research are implemented, the proportions of students that achieve academic excellence either improves, or at the very least, remains the same.

While the seven correlates continue to appear in the replication research, it should be noted that our knowledge and understanding of each correlate is deeper and broader than it was in the early 1980's.
### Summary of Effective School Characteristics as Identified in Nine Major Effective School Studies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strong administrative leadership</td>
<td>Characteristics influencing reading achievements:</td>
<td>Schools with increasing reading scores exhibited:</td>
<td>• Emphasis on accomplishing reading and math objectives:</td>
<td>• Coordination of curriculum, instruction, and testing on specified objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High expectations for children's achievement</td>
<td>• Strong leadership</td>
<td>• A general sense of education purposes</td>
<td>• Teachers believe students can master basic skill objectives</td>
<td>• A focus on educational needs of low achieving students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An orderly atmosphere conducive to learning</td>
<td>• Atmosphere of order, purposefulness, and pleasure in learning</td>
<td>• Positive leadership from the building principal</td>
<td>• High expectations for students' educational accomplishment</td>
<td>• Emphasis on higher order cognitive skills:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emphasis on basic skill acquisition</td>
<td>• Strong emphasis on reading</td>
<td>• High expectations for student learning:</td>
<td>• More time spent in direct reading instruction</td>
<td>• Assured availability of materials and resources for teaching:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Frequent monitoring of pupil progress</td>
<td>• High expectations</td>
<td>• Teacher accountability for student performance</td>
<td>• Less satisfied staff</td>
<td>• Minimum of record keeping tasks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Additional reading personnel</td>
<td>• Ongoing in-service training:</td>
<td>• Less overall parent involvement, but more parent initiated involvement</td>
<td>• Coordinated required homework:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of phonics in the reading program</td>
<td>• Reading curriculum</td>
<td>• Compensatory education programs with less emphasis on paraprofessional staff and involvement of teachers in identifying compensatory education students</td>
<td>• Instructional planning emphasizing grade-level decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Individualization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff supervision based on student achievement in basic skills:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Careful evaluation of student progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Comparative monitoring of student progress on a class-by-class basis:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Outstanding administrative leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Summary of Effective School Characteristics as Identified in Nine Major Effective School Studies*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes in effective schools include:</td>
<td>Gains in reading performance are associated with:</td>
<td>Characteristics of effective schools:</td>
<td>Elements contributing to school effectiveness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students actively engaged in learning activities</td>
<td>• Teachers' strong sense of efficacy and high expectations for students</td>
<td>• High expectations for student performance;</td>
<td>• Clearly stated rules consistently, fairly, and firmly enforced;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Praise freely given; discipline applied infrequently but firmly;</td>
<td>• Orderly classrooms;</td>
<td>• Good school atmosphere;</td>
<td>• Teachers with high job satisfaction in agreement with principal’s procedures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A general attitude and expectation for academic success;</td>
<td>• High level of parent-teacher contacts and parent-principal contact;</td>
<td>• Clear focus on basic skills;</td>
<td>• Cohesiveness among teachers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students responsible for personal and school duties and resources;</td>
<td>• Ongoing inservice training;</td>
<td>• Small group instruction;</td>
<td>• Material and moral support from central administration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Immediate feedback on acceptable performance;</td>
<td>• Balance between principal's strong leadership role and teachers' autonomy;</td>
<td>• Interchange of ideas among staff.</td>
<td>• Emphasis on academic success; rewards for individual improvement and achievement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff consensus on school values and aims;</td>
<td>• Teacher flexibility in modifying and adapting instructional approaches.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Class size designed to increase sense of personal relationship between student and teacher:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear guidelines and principles for student behavior;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• High staff morale;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clean, comfortable environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong schools spirit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff concern for individual and group student welfare;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students' belief that school subject matter is relevant and valuable;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treatment of students in ways that emphasize their success and potential for success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students' sense that &quot;the school ... is not a meaningless environment.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the important British Secondary School Study of Rutter et.al. (1979) the factors that were linked with effectiveness were grouped under the following broad headings:

The pupils control system, with effective schools using rewards

- The school environment provided for pupils
- The involvement of pupils
- The academic development of pupils
- The behaviour of teachers
- Management in the classroom
- The management structure.

Coleman et.al. (1982) showed that it was much more a question of the ethos or culture of the school as a whole. But within an effective school culture there are certain pre-requisites.

- A commitment to clearly and commonly identified norms and goals
- Collaborative planning, shared decision-making and collegial work in a framework of experimentation and evaluation
- Positive leadership in initiating and maintaining improvement
- Staff stability
A strategy for continuing staff development related to each school's pedagogical and organizational needs

Working to a carefully planned and co-ordinated curriculum that ensures sufficient place for each student to acquire essential knowledge and skills

A high level of parental involvement and support

The pursuit and recognition of school-wide values rather than individual ones

Maximum use of learning time

The active and substantial support of the responsible education authority.

Twelve key factors of effectiveness were identified by Mortimore et.al. (1988).

Purposeful leadership by the head teacher

The involvement of the deputy head teacher

The involvement of teachers

Consistency among teachers

Structured sessions

Intellectually challenging teaching

Work-centered environment
• Limited focus within session
• Maximum communication between teachers and students
• Record keeping
• Parental involvement
• Positive climate

Many of the British findings about the characteristics of effective secondary and primary schools are also paralleled by the large volume of international studies on school effectiveness. In the United States, Lezatte (1989) and others have popularized the five factor theory of school effectiveness, which sees schools that are academically highly performing as possessing the following:

• Strong principal leadership and attention to the quality of instruction
• A pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus
• An orderly safe climate conducive to teaching and learning
• Teacher behaviours that convey the expectation that all students are expected to obtain at least a basic mastery of simple skills
• The use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for programme evaluation.
Wilson's (1989) study of exceptionally successful secondary schools generated a list of common elements in their effective schools that has distinct similarities with findings from the British Secondary School Studies. Their common elements were:

- A positive attitude towards the students by teacher and the principal
- Strong and competent leadership
- Highly committed teaching staff
- High expectations and standards
- An emphasis upon high achievement in academic subjects
- Intensive and personal support services for artist students
- Stable leadership and public support in the area of the school for a period of years sufficient to implementation of new policies.

Sammons, Hillman and Mortimore (1995) provide a description of eleven key factors or correlates of effectiveness identified from their literature review.

- Professional leadership  Firm and purposeful
  A participative approach
  The leading profession

- Shared vision and goals  Unity of purpose
  Consistency of practice
  Collegiality and collaboration
• A learning environment
  An orderly atmosphere
  An attractive working environment

• Concentration on teaching and learning
  Maximization of learning time
  Academic emphasis
  Focus on achievement

• Purposeful teaching
  Efficient organization
  Clarity of purpose
  Structured lessons
  Adaptive practice

• High expectations
  High expectations all round
  Communicating expectations
  Providing intellectual challenge

• Positive reinforcement
  Clear and fair discipline of feedback

• Monitoring progress
  Monitoring pupil performance
  Evaluating school performance

• Pupil rights and responsibilities
  Raising pupil self-esteem
  Position of responsibility
  Control of work

• Home school partnership
  Parental involvement in their children's learning

• A learning organization
  School-based staff development

1.5 Significance of the Study

The frequent topic of conversation in the midst of perspective of learners is school effectiveness. The people who generally discuss school effectiveness employ terms such as "accountability", "quality", "drop out rates, faculty morale", "school atmosphere", "organizational
health", "organizational culture", school atmosphere", and so on. This acute interest in correlates of school effectiveness is neither a new phenomenon nor unique to education. Correlates of school effectiveness represents such a central theme in the theory and practice of perspective of learner and the institution are no longer to be avoided. Organizational effectiveness remains a complex and difficult problem for both theories and researchers as well as for practitioners. There is no general agreement on the definition of the concept let alone its measurements. Effectiveness is one of the most pervasive yet least delineated constructs in the study of organizations. Edwards (1979) defined an effective school as one that "brings the children of the poor to those minimal masters of basis school skills that now described minimally successful pupil performance for the children of the middle class". This is too narrow a definition. An effective school exhibits pupil performance relatively on par with or above the achievement of other schools with comparable student populations, that is socio-economic background and resources. To this, another dimension of reputation and client satisfaction is added. An effective school should be recognized as such by those who use its facilities and resources and by external observes who claim expertise in educational practice and / or
assessment. In sum, the effective school competes favourably in terms of output, support and reputation within its comparable cohort of schools.

A common assumption has developed among scholars that organizational effectiveness is a multi-dimensional concept. Virtually every phase, process or outcome can be and has been used as an indicator of effectives. Various concepts have been used as indicators of effective schools by various researchers.

Autonomy for teachers, good leadership, staff stability, parental involvement, a form of organization that maximized teaching and learning time and support for teachers from the local authority were considered to be indicators of effective schools according to Purkey (1983). To Miskal and others (1983), school’s productivity, adaptability and flexibility, job satisfaction of teachers and students, attitudes towards school were the indicators of effective school. Likewise, different authors have identified different variables as indicators of effective schools.

The entry on to the educational stage of research and practice in the area of school effectiveness has been one of the major changes in educational thinking of the past decade. A decade ago, the predominant ‘paradigm’ by which researchers explained variation in children’s
educational growth over time involved relating achievement to features of children's home background, community characteristics and individual intellectual and personal attributes.

Reynolds (1991) predicted that the 1990s will see an increase in the influence that schools have over the development of young people. He suggested that a variety of factors would be responsible for this phenomena. Reynolds argued that the result of such changes, in the short term at least, is likely to be the development of their pupils. This period has been gradually followed in both USA and UK by the emergence of a wide range of 'effective schools', school effectiveness or school effects' studies which argue for the importance of school influence, beginning in the United States with various qualitative case studies and a wide range of quantitative studies in these two societies has been recently rejoined by those from the Netherlands, Australia and Canada and by a recent resurgence of studies done in the about Third World Societies.

The late 20th century saw the rapid rise of quality assurance and effectiveness measures in most industries and organisations. These trends were very much reflected in education at all levels. An associated emergent trend in primary and secondary education in Australia was
growth in the use of standardized measures of student achievement that increasingly served (and continue to serve) as a major source of data in judging school effectiveness. While cognitive measures are important outcomes of schooling, it is reasonable to argue that interpretations of quality and effectiveness that do not include affective measures. In particular, these criteria sacrifice what may be regarded as more complex and aesthetic measures of quality and effectiveness, such as student perceptions of aspects of their life at school.

The late 20th century saw the rapid rise of quality assurance in most industries and organisations, and in education quality assurance was epitomized as a concern with school effectiveness. Effectiveness measures most often took the form of standardized measures of student achievement in basic skills, and these measures remain the most salient today. While student cognitive development is an essential outcome of schooling, it is argued that interpretations of quality and effectiveness that do not include affective outcomes are inadequate as measures of desirable schooling outcomes.

This is concerned with the use of affective measures as important components of school effectiveness and quality assurance as well as the associated implementation of school reform and school improvement to
enhance these measures. Support for this thesis can be found in a broad spectrum of the school effectiveness literature. Sammons and Reynolds (1997) and later Sammons (1999), for example, suggested the most appropriate type of assessment of school effectiveness examines the effect of teaching behaviour and school and classroom practice on social and affective outcomes along with the traditional focus of student attainment. The need for this focus was particularly emphasized for under-achieving, poor, and minority students.

The expanding role of schools in terms of developing the whole student is certainly evident in the literature. In the context of the major economic and societal restructuring that had taken place in the late 20th century, schools needed to change their teaching and learning practices to ensure that students were more highly educated and skilled citizens. Levine and Havighurst (1984), for example, highlighted that in the century preceding their study, the family had lost much of the control of the socialization process of children and schools increasingly had taken on this role.

Purposefully or otherwise, there was a shift away from a broad range of educational outcomes. Whilst school and educational departments espouse that the education of students is undertaken
across a diversity of outcomes, it would appear that school evaluation, student assessment, and school based research emphasize achievement of a limited range of academic outcomes at the expense of the broader educational curriculum. Schooling forms a major part of the life of children (Ainley & Bourke, 1992) and school and classroom environments have many attributes of adult workplaces (Schofield & Bourke, 1997; Leonard, 2002). Children spend a similar number of hours each day at school as are spent at work by many members of the work force; they undertake mental and physical tasks of similar duration and intensity to many workers; their output is monitored by superiors; and, as with many workplaces, they have a regimented daily routine. Hence in the same way that quality of life is important in adult life, it would appear obvious that student quality of school life is also most important for young persons and is related to many more factors than simply achievement. Quality and effectiveness need to be considered across a broader range of outcomes.

Safe and happy schools and effective learning are promoted when classrooms are rewarding, stimulating environments where students and teachers want to be. The benefits for students and educators of an increased awareness of the nature of positive and negative impacts on student quality of school life, such as satisfaction
and stress (respectively), are obvious. It is contended that students who feel good about themselves and are excited and stimulated by their school environment, are more likely to be students who are ready to learn. Students who want to learn will want to be at school and are likely to make an increased effort to attend. An associated improvement in teacher morale and reduction in absenteeism may also be evident (Leonard, Bourke and Schofield, 2003).

However, the picture is not nearly as clear cut as this impressive body of evidence would indicate at first glance. Very recent research suggests that the notion that schools can be placed on a continuum from effective to ineffective may be inappropriate (Hargreaves, 1995), and indeed that effectiveness itself may not be a unitary concept. There are questions as to whether schools are differentially effective for all of their students, whether they are equally effective across all curriculum areas, and whether they remain effective over time. To those closely involved with schools this would seem to be merely common sense, but empirical demonstration is another matter.

It would seem necessary for future research to pay closer attention to the issue of teacher effectiveness for there to be significant advances in our understanding of what makes schools effective.
Hargreaves (1995) discusses the need to consider the cultural dimension to school improvement. The question to be answered is this: is an effective school more than a collection of effective classrooms, or is there some cultural influence operating over and above the contribution of individuals.

Schools directly or indirectly touch on the life of almost everyone in modern society, whether as student, parent, teacher, employer or consumer of the goods and services produced by school leavers. Education is a major undertaking of governments around the world. Schools account for a substantial proportion of public and private expenditure, averaging around 4 percent of GDP in OECD countries. The NSW Department of School Education is one of the largest employers in Australia, and has a budget of well over $3 billion annually. In return for this investment, high hopes are held for education as an instrument of social and economic policy for the betterment of individual, community and national well-being. It therefore should come as no surprise that there is intense interest in knowing whether schools are delivering value for money – how effective schooling is and how it can be improved (Hill, Rowe and Holmes-Smith, 1995).
Such interest is not new, but may have become more intense, as moves to "reconstruct" poor performing schools takes hold (see for example, North Carolina State Board of Education, 1997). The education indicators movement of the late 1980s (Smith, 1988; Wyatt and Ruby, 1988) refocussed attention on the need for both educational accountability and improvement to be based on accurate, reliable and defensible collection, dissemination and utilization of information. The measurement of student outcomes as a reflection of school effectiveness is an essential and integral part of such information systems. Hill (1995) notes that the need for reliable information and measurement has been understood for some time by those in industry and business, and the message is becoming increasingly clear within education.

From all these works it is clear that schools do have substantial effects upon pupils and that there are processes that work across schools to maximize their outcomes.

Primary education provides a fundamental base for all further schooling training or self-developing the capacity to cope with rapidly evolving and changing societies in an information age. Its universal availability and quality are central to the human resource capacity of any society.

An efficient educational system should enable students to develop both cognitive and non-cognitive skills and knowledge as required by the
curriculum, ensure that secondary education is readily accessible to all children, permit targets to be reached within the regular time frame set for secondary education and establish good school community relations. Effectiveness in secondary education varies within different regions, schools etc. This disparity is related to certain characteristics of the schools, students and school communities, some of which facilitate effectiveness while others tend to impede it.

Factors that affect the quality of education are the educational administration system, heads of schools, teachers, the teaching learning process, parents, students, school and community.

A school is said to be effective when it achieves its objectives using the available resources efficiently, economically and sufficiently too. It is quite natural that a school attracts more pupils when it enjoys high academic achievement. Here the academic achievement refers to the percentage of passes in the VII standard examinations conducted by the Karnataka Secondary Education Board.

There is no lingering doubt when a school produces good results in the public examinations; it establishes "reputation" in the midst of the public residing in that particular locality. The academic achievement and the reputation may be considered as the explicit or practical indicators to identify the effective schools. The present study too will consider these two variables.
to identify the schools as high effective schools, average effective schools and low effective schools.

The academic achievement cannot be achieved in a vacuum. The academic achievement and the ultimate reputation are the outcome of various factors that work within the school. A school should satisfy the needs of various persons such as teachers, students, parents and the public. In an effective school, teachers, students and parents actively participate in various school activities. Students will behave well and a proper atmosphere will prevail within the school. The head of the school who organizes and coordinates all the activities will possess the required leadership qualities.

1.6 Conceptual Model of the Study

Ascertaining school effectiveness is neither simple nor obvious. It is agreed that effectiveness is multidimensional rather than a unidimensional construct. Researchers listed out a number of criterion measures of school effectiveness.

After the examinations of the above studies, theoretical models and also the various research studies on school effectiveness, the conceptual model for the present study is developed and presented in Figure-1.
Figure 1: Conceptual Model of the Present Study Correlates of Effective Schools
1.7 The Problem

In developing countries, research on school effectiveness has been more limited, and studies examining the effects of alternative inputs on student achievement have not taken into account the explicitly hierarchical nature of the explanatory models and data. Instead, most research on effective schools in developing countries has utilized a "production function" approach that compares the relative effectiveness of alternative material and non material inputs and, to a lesser degree, teaching processes on student achievement. The school characteristics most frequently examined have been indicators of material inputs: per pupil expenditures, number of books, presence of a library, presence of desks, teacher salaries and so forth. The past decade has provided several important reviews of this research. Most of the reviews conclude that, when student background is controlled for school characteristics do have significant effects on achievement and in many cases the effects of school characteristics are greater than the effects of family background.

The National Policy on Education (1986) took serious note of conditions related to basic facilities and other support systems in schools, emphasizing the need to improve the quality of publicly funded
schools so that irrespective of socio-economic background, every child has access to basic education of comparable quality. It is in this context that learning conditions related to primary schooling have been examined. Specifically, the review focuses on four basic dimensions that relate to the learning environment in the school and consequent learning levels among children, namely school building and other physical facilities, teachers in primary schools, teaching learning material, and learner achievement levels. It should be recognized that availability of facilities by itself does not represent supportive learning conditions. Actual utilization of facilities is the real indicator of the qualitative aspect of schooling.

Today 95 percent of population is served by a primary school within a 1 km radius. However, the large scale expansion of schooling resulted in the creation of educational facilities with widely varying quality in terms of institutional infrastructure, teaching learning processes, as well as the quality of students passing out of these institutions. It is against this backdrop that the National Policy on Education (1986) called for paying immediate attention to:
- Improving the unattractive school environment, the unsatisfactory condition of buildings, and the inadequacy of instructional materials; and
- Laying down minimum levels of learning (MLLs) that all children completing different stages of education should achieve.

It is this emphasis on qualitative improvement in conditions of primary schooling that characterizes several programmes of educational development launched during the 1990s. The entire spectrum of factors related to primary schooling such as curricular structure, textbooks, teaching learning materials, teacher competence and performance, and all other supportive inputs were to be viewed in terms of their contribution towards improvement of quality of schooling. Thus, reviewing learning conditions in primary schools in terms of 'quality schooling' that would yield anticipated 'learning achievement' presented the paradigm for educational development during the present decade.

The present investigation is entitled as "Correlates of School Effectiveness from the Perspective of Learner and the Institution at the Primary Level". No doubt that, every one is interested in knowing how schools are effectively functioning for one reason or other reasons.
The government is interested in knowing how its investment is utilized effectively. As a citizen, one is interested in knowing what has happened to the sum he or she has paid by means of tax. Educational administrators look from the viewpoint of resources. They want to ensure that the available resources are effectively utilized. A parent expects that the school gives good education to his child. Students want to school to be places where they can enjoy learning. To a person living in a particular locality, the school should be a pride to his locality. Hence, a school can be considered effective in the functioning to the extent that it satisfies the expectations of the various persons concerned.

Studies on "School effectiveness" in foreign countries, initially considered variables such as achievement. Literacy and numeracy, later on, some studies used factors like absenteeism, behaviour in school, school atmosphere, school organizational health, classroom climate, and organizational culture, delinquency, and public examination results to measure school effectiveness. From mid 1970s, the study about school effectiveness has taken a new look from the viewpoint of accountability and productivity. In the year 1982, Ronald Edwards observed the characteristics of schools are important determinants of academic achievement. Research studies have also revealed that individual school
variance is an important dimension that can be influenced by selected actions and resources.

The present study aims to identify certain variables accounting for school effectiveness variance in the Indian context. Hence the correlates of school effectiveness selected for study in the present investigation are as follows.

1. Correlates Related to Learner
   a. Students' behavioural adjustment to schools
   b. Students' motivation towards schools
   c. Students' involvement in school activities
   d. Students' personal effectiveness

2. Correlates Related to Institution
   a. Classroom climate
   b. School atmosphere
   c. Organizational culture
   d. Organizational health
1.8 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the present study are:

1. To identify the correlates of effective schools
2. To identify the discriminating variables with reference to high, average, and low effective schools.
3. To ascertain the relative strength of the variables that contributes to the effectiveness of schools.
4. To study the students' behaviour adjustment in school in high, average, and low effective schools.
5. To study the students' motivation towards school in high, average, and low effective schools.
6. To study the students' involvement in school activities in high, average, and low effective schools.
7. To study the students' personal effectiveness in high, average, and low effective schools.
8. To study the school atmosphere in high, average, and low effective schools.
9. To study the classroom climate in high, average, and low effective schools.
10. To study the organizational health in high, average, and low effective schools.
11. To study the organizational culture in high, average, and low effective schools.

1.9 Limitations of the Study

1. The study is limited to only government, aided and unaided primary schools situated in Hubli-Dharwad urban and rural areas.

2. The study is limited to a sample of 450 students, 270 teachers and 45 head masters selected at random from 45 primary schools.