CONCLUSIONS
5.1 ADMINISTRATIVE SUCCESS OF PRINCIPALS

The present study has highlighted numerous and diverse aspects about the participatory behaviour of Principals to maintain all the best for their institutions to function smoothly, normally, and perfectly. It all depends upon the administrative success of the Principals which is directly or indirectly affected by other variables like personality factors, adjustment, job satisfaction, experience (administrative), risk taking behaviour etc. Hence, the administrative success of Principals was assessed alongwith the affect of the aforesaid variables and the study was conducted Locationwise (Urban-Rural) and Sexwise (Male-Female) in the different types of the Secondary Schools.

Any attempt which has been made for a systematic study yields certain findings which are
some lines quite useful and throw light in further involvement in the previous investigations. The investigator after analysing the data in the present study could reach to certain findings and conclusions which are being reported in this chapter. The study was planned and carried out to test the tentative hypotheses and objectives formulated. Each of the hypotheses and objectives were evaluated in the light of the study. The educational implications of this investigation, suggestions for further research work are given at the end of this chapter.

5.2 TESTING OF THE HYPOTHESES

The first working hypothesis was that "There are some of the personality factors of the successful Principals which are significantly related to the administrative success in the different types of the Secondary Schools", and the objective was "To find out the personality factors of the successful Principals in the different types of the Secondary Schools as a measure of their administrative success". On analysing the results this hypothesis could not be accepted.
The values of correlations \( r \) among different Groups and Sub-Groups, viz., Total Sample, Male Principals, Female Principals, Urban Principals, Rural Principals, Urban Male Principals, Urban Female Principals, Rural Male Principals, and Rural Female Principals, are not significant even at .05 level except in the case of Urban Female Principals where Factor (B) is significant at .01 level \( (r = .7192) \). This may be due to indirect effect of other variables. The values of correlations \( r \) may be seen in Table 4.128 to 4.136 for personality factors. So, in almost all the cases the investigator could not see the significant relationship in administrative success and personality factors as these factors are independent to each other. Hence, on the basis of the above findings the first hypothesis has not been accepted and the objective as stated above could not be achieved.

The second hypothesis was that "There is a significant relationship between the administrative success and the adjustment of the Principals in different types of the Secondary Schools" and the objective was "To find out the relationship between administrative success and the adjustment of the Principals in
the different types of the Secondary Schools". This hypothesis has been accepted after analysing the results.

The values of correlations \( r \) among different Groups and Sub-Groups, viz., Total Sample, Male Principals, Female Principals, Urban Principals, Rural Principals, Urban Male Principals, Urban Female Principals, Rural Male Principals, and Rural Female Principals, are significant at .01 level. Almost all the values of correlations are highly significant (See Tables 4.128 to 4.136 for adjustment variable). These significant values of correlations show that well adjusted Principals are highly successful in their administration.

Hence, on the basis of the above findings of the present study, the second hypothesis has been accepted and the corresponding objective has, thus, been achieved.

The third working hypothesis was that "There is a significant relationship between the administrative success and the job satisfaction of the
Principals in the different types of the Secondary Schools" and the objective was "To find out the relationship between administrative success and the job satisfaction of the Principals in the different types of the Secondary Schools". This hypothesis has been accepted after analysing the results.

The values of correlations (r) among different Groups and Sub-Groups, viz., Total Sample, Male Principals, Female Principals, Urban Principals, Rural Principals, Urban Male Principals, Urban Female Principals, Rural Male Principals, and Rural Female Principals, are significant. All these values of correlations are significant at .01 level except in the case of Urban Female Principals where this value is significant at .05 level. All the other values are highly significant (See Tables 4.128 to 4.136 for job satisfaction variable). These significant values of correlations show that Principals who are satisfied with their job are highly successful in their administration.

Hence, on the basis of the above findings of the present study, the third hypothesis has been
accepted and the objective stated as above has also been achieved.

The fourth working hypothesis was that "There is a significant relationship between the administrative success and the administrative experience of the Principals in the different types of the Secondary Schools" and the objective was "To find out the relationship between administrative success and the administrative experience of the Principals of the different types of the Secondary Schools". This hypothesis has been accepted after analysing the results.

The values of correlations (r) among different Groups and Sub-Groups, viz., Total Sample, Male Principals, Female Principals, Urban Principals, Rural Principals, Urban Male Principals, Urban Female Principals, Rural Male Principals, and Rural Female Principals, are significant. All these values of correlations are significant at .01 level except in the case of Urban Female Principals where this is significant at .05 level. All the other values are highly significant (See Tables 4.128 to 4.136 for administrative experience variable). These significant values of
correlations show that Principals having long administrative experience are highly successful in their administration.

Hence, on the basis of the above findings of the present study the fourth hypothesis has been accepted and the corresponding objective has been achieved.

The fifth working hypothesis was that "There is a significant relationship between the administrative success and the risk taking behaviour of the Principals in the different types of the Secondary Schools", and the objective was "To find out the relationship between the administrative success and the risk taking behaviour of the Principals of the different types of the Secondary Schools". This hypothesis has also been accepted after analysing the results.

The values of correlations (r) among different Groups and Sub-Groups, viz., Total Sample, Male Principals, Female Principals, Urban Principals, Rural Principals, Urban Male Principals, Urban Female Principals, Rural Male Principals, and Rural Female Prin-
cipals, are significant in most of the cases. The values which are significant at .01 level stand in Groups/Sub-
Groups are Total Sample, Male Principals, Rural Princip-
als, Urban Male Principals, Rural Male Principals,
and Rural Female Principals. The value of correlation
for Female Principals is significant at .05 level. In case of Urban Principals and Urban Female Principals
the values of correlations are not significant. Hence,
in most of the cases the values of correlations are
significant. All the values of correlations bear nega-
tive sign. This means, if risk taking behaviour increases
the Administrative Success of the Principals decreases
or vice-versa (See Tables 4.128 to 4.136 for Risk Tak-
ing behaviour variable).

Hence, on the basis of the above findings
of the present study the fifth hypothesis has been
accepted and the corresponding objective has also
been achieved.

The sixth working hypothesis was that
"There are significant differences in the adminis-
trative success, personality factors, adjustment, job
satisfaction, administrative experience and the risk
taking behaviour of the Principals on the basis of sex (Male and Female) in the different types of the Secondary Schools" and the objective was "To find out whether there are significant differences in the administrative success, personality factors, adjustment, job satisfaction, administrative experience, and the risk taking behaviour of the Principals on the basis of Sex (i.e., Male or Female) of the Principals in the different types of the Secondary Schools". This hypothesis was partially accepted and partially rejected.

To achieve the above objectives means, standard deviations, 't' and 'F'-values were calculated for Groups and Sub-Groups. In Male-Female Group the value of 't' and F were not significant in cases of variables - Administrative Success; Personality Factors B,E,G,H,I,L,M,N,O,Q₁,Q₃,Q₄; Job Satisfaction; and Experience (Administrative). However, the significant values of 't' and F were obtained in the cases of variables Personality Factors A,C,F,Q₂; Adjustment and Risk Taking Behaviour. In Urban Male-Urban Female Sub-Group the values of 't' and F were not significant in cases of variables Administrative Success; Personality Factors B,E,G,H,I,L,M,N,O,Q₁,Q₃,Q₄; Job Satisfac-
tion; and Experience (Administrative). However, the significant values of 't' and F were obtained in the cases of variables - Personality Factors A, C, F, Q₄; Adjustment, and Risk Taking Behaviour. In Rural Male-Rural Female Sub-Group the values of 't' and F were not significant in cases of variables - Administrative Success; Personality Factors A, B, E, G, H, I, L, M, N, O, Q₁, Q₃, Q₄; Job Satisfaction; Experience (Administrative); and Risk Taking Behaviour. However, the significant values of 't' and F were obtained in the cases of variables - Personality Factors C, F; and Adjustment.

Reviewing the above results the sixth hypothesis may partially be accepted and may partially be rejected and the corresponding objective could be achieved within limits.

In the last, the seventh working hypothesis of the present study was that "There are significant differences in the administrative success, personality factors, adjustment, job satisfaction, administrative experience and risk taking behaviour of the Principals on the basis of location (Urban and Rural Areas) in the different types of the Secondary Schools" and
the objective was "To find out whether there are significant differences in the administrative success, personality factors, adjustment, job satisfaction, administrative experience and the risk taking behaviour of the Principals on the basis of the location (i.e., Urban and Rural Areas) of the different types of the Secondary Schools". This hypothesis has been accepted with partial rejection after analysing the results.

To achieve the above objectives means, standard deviations, 't' and F - values were calculated for Groups and Sub - Groups. In Urban-Rural Group the values of 't' and F were significant in cases of variables - Administrative Success; Adjustment; Job Satisfaction; Experience (Administrative); and Risk Taking Behaviour. No significant values of 't' and F were obtained in case of all the Sixteen Personality Factors of this Group. In Urban Male-Rural Male Sub-Group the values of 't' and F were significant in cases of variables - Administrative Success; Adjustment; Job Satisfaction; Experience (Administrative); and Risk Taking Behaviour. No significant values of 't' and F were obtained in case of all the Sixteen Personality Factors
of this Sub-Group. In Urban Female-Rural Female Sub-Group the values of 't' and F were significant in cases of variables—Administrative Success; Adjustment; Job Satisfaction; and Experience (Administrative). In case of Experience (Administrative) the value of F was not significant. No significant values of 't' and F were obtained in cases of all the Sixteen Personality Factors and Risk Taking Behaviour variables. In brief, the personality factors have not shown any significant difference in Group and Sub-Groups. Similarly, in Sub-Group Urban Female-Rural Female no significant difference exists in case of Risk Taking Behaviour. In rest of the cases significant differences exist.

Reviewing the above results it may be presumed that in majority of the cases (except personality factors) the values of 't' and F are highly significant. As such, this hypothesis may be accepted and deserves for partial rejection keeping in view of the personality factors. In this way, the objectives laid down for this hypothesis could also be achieved.

5.3 FINDINGS:

The following are the findings of the
present study:

1. The Principals working in the urban areas were found better in comparison to the Principals working in the rural areas with regard to their administrative success.

2. There was no significant difference in the administrative success of the male and female Principals.

3. The urban Male Principals were found better in comparison to rural Male Principals with regard to their administrative success.

4. The urban Female Principals were found better in comparison to rural Female Principals with regard to their administrative success.

5. There was no significant difference in the administrative success of urban Male and urban Female Principals.

6. There was no significant difference in the administrative success of rural Male and rural Female Principals.

7. There were no significant differences in the Personality Factors of the urban and rural Areas Principals.

8. There were no significant differences in the
Personality Factors (except Factors A, C, F, and Q2) of the Male and Female Principals.

9. There were no significant differences in the Personality Factors of the Urban Male and Rural Male Principals.

10. There were no significant differences in the Personality Factors of the Urban Female and Rural Female Principals.

11. There were no significant differences in the Personality Factors (except Factors A, C, F, and Q2) of the Urban Male and Urban Female Principals.

12. There were no significant differences in the Personality Factors (except Factors C and F) of the Rural Male and Rural Female Principals.

13. The Principals working in the Urban areas were found better adjusted in comparison to the Principals working in the Rural areas.

14. The Female Principals were found better adjusted in comparison to the Male Principals.

15. The Urban Male Principals were found better adjusted in comparison to the Rural Male Principals.

16. The Urban Female Principals were found better adjusted in comparison to Rural Female Principals.

17. The Urban Female Principals were better adjusted
in comparison to the urban male principals.

19. The rural female principals were better adjusted in comparison to the rural male principals.

19. The principals working in the urban areas were found more satisfied with their job in comparison to the principals working in the rural areas.

20. There was no significant difference in the job satisfaction of the male and female principals.

21. The urban male principals were found more satisfied with their job in comparison to the rural male principals.

22. The urban female principals were found more satisfied with their job in comparison to the rural female principals.

23. There was no significant difference in the job satisfaction of the urban male and urban female principals.

24. There was no significant difference in the job satisfaction of the rural male and rural female principals.

25. The principals working in the urban areas were found better as they were having long administrative experience in comparison to the principals working in the rural areas.
26. There was no significant difference in administrative experience of the Male and Female Principals.

27. The Urban Male Principals were found better as they were having long administrative experience in comparison to the Rural Male Principals.

28. The Urban Female Principals were found better as they were having long administrative experience in comparison to the Rural Female Principals.

29. There was no significant difference in the administrative experience of the Urban Male and Urban Female Principals.

30. There was no significant difference in the administrative experience of the Rural Male and Rural Female Principals.

31. The Principals working in the Urban areas were found to take more risk in comparison to the Principals working in the Rural areas.

32. The Male Principals were found to take more risk in comparison to the Female Principals.

33. The Urban Male Principals were found to take more risk in comparison to the Rural Male Principals.

34. There was no significant difference in the Risk Taking Behaviour of Urban Female and Rural Female Principals.
35. The Urban Male Principals were found to take more risk in comparison to the Urban Female Principals.

36. There was no significant difference in the Risk Taking Behaviour of Rural Male and Rural Female Principals.

37. There was no significant relationship between administrative Success and Personality Factors of the Principals (except Factor P in Urban Female Principals) in all the groups and sub-groups.

38. There was significant positive relationship between Administrative Success and Adjustment of the Principals in all the groups and sub-groups.

39. There was a significant positive relationship between Administrative Success and Job Satisfaction of the Principals in all the groups and sub-groups.

40. There was a significant positive relationship between Administrative Success and Administrative experience of the Principals in all the groups and sub-groups.

41. There was a significant negative relationship (except in the case of Urban Principals and Urban Female Principals) between Administrative Success and Risk Taking Behaviour of the Principals in all
the groups and sub-groups. The negative relationship indicated if risk taking behaviour increases the Administrative Success of Principals decreases or vice-versa.

42. There was no significant relationship between Adjustment and Personality Factors (except Factor C in Urban Principals, and Factors H, L, and Q4 in Urban Female Principals) of Principals in all the groups and sub-groups.

43. There was significant positive relationship between Adjustment and Job Satisfaction of the Principals in all the groups and sub-groups.

44. There was significant positive relationship between Adjustment and Administrative Experience of the Principals in all the groups and sub-groups.

45. There was significant negative relationship (except in the case of Female Principals, Urban Principals, Urban Male Principals, Urban Female Principals, and Rural Female Principals) between Adjustment and Risk Taking Behaviour of Principals in all the groups and sub-groups. The negative relationship indicated that high risk taking Principals have very poor adjustment.

46. There was no significant relationship between Job
Satisfaction and Personality Factors of Principals (except Factor B in Urban Female Principals) in all the groups and sub-groups.

47. There was significant positive relationship between Job Satisfaction and Administrative Experience of the Principals in all the groups and sub-groups.

48. There was significant negative relationship (except in the case of Urban Principals, Urban Male Principals, and Urban Female Principals) between Job Satisfaction and Risk Taking Behaviour of Principals in all the groups and sub-groups. The negative relationship indicated that high risk taking Principals were less satisfied with their job in comparison to those Principals who took minimum possible risk and were well satisfied with their job.

49. There was no significant relationship between Administrative Experience and Personality Factors of Principals in all the groups and sub-groups.

50. There was significant negative relationship (except in the case of Urban Principals, Urban Male Principals, and Urban Female Principals) between Administrative Experience and Risk Taking Behaviour of Principals in all the groups and sub-groups. The negative relationship indicated that the Principals
having long administrative experience preferred to take minimum possible risk while high risk taking Principals have not the longer administrative experience.

51. There was no significant relationship between risk Taking Behaviour and Personality Factors of Principals in all the groups and sub-groups except Factor A in Total Sample, Urban Principals and Rural Female Principals; Factor A and N in Female Principals; Factor C in Rural Principals; and Factor B and \( Q_2 \) in Female Principals.

5.4 SUGGESTIONS :

The investigator could realize after completing the present study that there was an area which pointed out several aspects to study. There was a great score for new studies to be undertaken in this area. These researches could cover several aspects with certain new dimensions. Some of the important suggestions which the investigator feels to be mentioned here are as follows :

First of all, the investigator wishes to
explain that studies related to the administrative success of the Principals have a lot of scope with regard to its definition and concept. There are studies where this concept has been defined and measured. The present study also has defined it and measured it in a particular way. However, the investigator was not satisfied with the way it has been defined and measured. In the present study, the administrative success was defined in terms of the perceptions of the teachers about the Principals. Another criteria would have been the validation of this concept. Few more studies may be conducted which aim at only identifying characteristics of Principal's administrative success. Hence, a need is supposed to exist to work in this direction.

In the present study, the administrative success of the Principals was studied as related to some other variables, viz., Personality Factors, Adjustment, Job Satisfaction, Experience (Administrative), and Risk Taking Behaviour. In most of the cases the relationship was significant (negative relationship in case of risk taking behaviour) except in the cases of personality factors and in certain cases with risk taking behaviour where the relationship was not signi-
significant. Despite of all these things one may not conclude it positively about the significance of the results as an indication of the administrative success of the Principals. In cases where the results were not significant for some variables, the Principals were found to be equally successful in their administration, e.g., personality factors and risk taking behaviour of Principals though not providing significant values of correlations but the Principals were having better administrative control. Hence, it appeared that conclusions were not final and findings of the study were only suggestive. So, more specific and perfect method be invented.

The prediction of Principal's administrative success in the present study was made through simple correlational technique. This, no doubt, reveals the kind of relationship that may be existing between these variables. But this linear relationship assumes that each variable has uniformly the same relationship at all levels of other variables. For example, Principal's job satisfaction was found significantly related to the administrative success. This being the linear relationship means that Principal's job satisfaction affects
the administrative success at all its levels in the same way, while the fact may be that it might be operating differentially at different levels. Hence, a better design of statistical analysis would be factorial design of experiment to study the interaction effect. It is, therefore, suggested that in future, studies using factorial design of experiment be conducted.

In the present study, the Principals of Secondary Schools were selected but the concept of administrative success is also more important in case of Principals of degree colleges affiliated to various universities. The Principals of degree colleges have to manage larger number of teachers, students and community members. The administrative situation is much complex and intricate in this case as compared to that of the Principals of Secondary Schools. It may be of great interest to repeat the present study on a sample of the Principals of degree colleges to analyze whether the results are similar or different to those of the Secondary School's Principals.

5.5 **EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS** :

The administrative success of the Principals
is not absolute. It is a relative term and is influenced by certain variables. Such type of the studies like the present one are helpful in finding to some extent a successful and dynamic Principal. It is the Principal who is responsible for the overall image of the institution. The Principal's behaviour in relation to certain variables like adjustment, job satisfaction etc. is indicative for the circumstances where one may get success or failure. So, to study such variables is important and such studies related to the administrative control emphasizes about the abilities which ought to be considered while appointing a Principal. Hence, the present study holds its own significance and contains a great deal of educational implications.

5.6 **LIMITATIONS** :

(a) Due to paucity of time, the study was restricted to the Principals of Secondary Schools and that too of Moradabad Division only. It could have been more useful and interesting if the sample could be taken on inter state basis and also the Principals of degree colleges would have also been included.
(b) The number of Principals was too small for fairly stable correlations to be obtained in between the different variables. A study with much bigger sample of dependable magnitude comprising of sufficient number of Principals according to sex and location would have added to the credibility of the findings and implications of this study.

(c) Obviously, the study suffered from all limitations which its tools might have been suffering from.

5.7 SUGGESTIONS FOR NEEDED RESEARCH:

The administrative success of the Principals is an important aspect which is related to a number of variables. Hence, some of the topics related with the present study are being suggested as under:

(a) A study of the administrative success of the Principals in relation to the different organizational climates.

(b) A study of the administrative success of the Principals as related to their leadership behaviour.
(c) A study of the administrative success of the Principals as related to the creative thinking and family background.

Besides, there are several aspects which need to be studied in detail. It would be better to deal with such variables which are more contributing for a successful Principal.

* * *
