Analysis & Interpretation
In the preceding chapters, the theoretical basis of the problem, objectives, hypotheses, the development of the tools and method of study were discussed. The present chapter has been devoted to the analysis of data and interpretation of the results.

The study demands that the two dependent variables viz. job satisfaction and academic achievement should be studied for democratic process in relation to institutional climate.

Democratic process has been studied in
(a) Government and privately managed schools and also in
(b) Boys and girls schools.

This process was studied for decision making mechanism and participation in school functioning and based upon this the schools of the sample were divided into democratic and undemocratic schools.

4.1 Identification of Schools as Democratic and Un-democratic

For identification of the two types of schools, the criterion used was democratic process which comprises of
a) Decentralization of decision making in respect of all the activities of school life such as
i) Admission
ii) Time Table
iii) Examination
iv) Preparation of results
v) Purchase, and
b) Functional participation in respect of all activities of life in school such as
   i) Admission
   ii) Time Table
   iii) Examination
   iv) Preparation of results
   v) Purchase

During the process of inquiry, it was observed that in some schools, decision making process was decentralized on the above mentioned aspects. The different committees such as admission committee purchase committee etc., for different activities were formulated on the basis of an objective criteria either seniority or work competence and also the willing co-operation or the combination of all. All these committees represent a fairly wide cross-section of teachers of the school. The committees work moderately independently either under the formal instructions regarding the policy or under the school conventions and traditions. The principals in these schools are natural leaders and have got an element of general acceptance among the staff. He directs, controls, at times amends but makes least use of power invested in his chair.

On the other hand, there are schools where such committees either are totally absent or are composed of few favourites whose names are repeated again and again with little considerations of fair representation. These committees function under the direct dictation and sweet will of the authority with little or no consideration of even reasonable dissent if it does not have the patronage of the authority.
The first brand of schools are termed as democratic and second as undemocratic. In some schools, the decisions are taken to some extent by the respective principals and some decisions are taken collectively. These schools have neither been placed under democratic nor under undemocratic and a separate category of mixed climate has been made for them. For the purpose of analysis, all the schools under study were divided into democratic, undemocratic and mixed as identified on the above mentioned criteria. The distribution of schools understudy in these three categories have been placed below table 4.1

### TABLE 4.1
CATEGORY WISE DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Undemocratic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The schools understudy represented Government and private schools equally and also a care was taken to get a proportional representation of boys and girls schools. The same has been placed below in table 4.2 and 4.3.
TABLE 4.2
DEMOCRATIC PROCESS AND MANAGEMENT STYLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Type</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Undemocratic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Govt.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4.3
DEMOCRATIC PROCESS AND GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Type</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Undemocratic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overview of the above tables suggests that out of 36 schools, only 30 schools have been incorporated in the sample. For the purpose of analysis, selection of the schools were made such that there were 15 governments and 15 private schools and also there were 15 boys and 15 girls schools. But as it appears on the face all the government schools were not boys schools or the vice versa.
The obtained value of $X^2$ was 0.132. The calculated value of $X^2$ at .01 level of confidence was 6.635. The calculated value does not exceed the obtained value. Hence the hypothesis-1 could not be rejected at specified level indicating that democratisation and style of management do not correspond with each other.

In the case of democratic process and gender, the obtained value of $X^2$ was 0.132. The calculated value of $X^2$ at .01 level of confidence was 6.635. The calculated value does not exceed the obtained value. Hence the hypothesis-2 could not be rejected at specified level indicating that democratisation and gender do not correspond with each other.

In the present investigation, institutional climate has been studied on a three fold criterion, consisting of

i) Academic climate

ii) Emotional Climate

iii) Organizational Climate

For the purpose of analysis, the effect of democratic process has been studied separately for different aspects of institutional climate. Firstly the effect of democratic process was seen in relation to academic climate where schools were divided into

a) the institutions with intellectually sensitive climate, and

b) the institutions with intellectually insensitive climate.

4.2 Criterion for selection of institutions with intellectually sensitive climate and intellectually insensitive climate

On the basis of responses of the items contained in the academic climate schedule, the schools were classified as friendly, neutral and
unfriendly. The schools with scores three and four under friendly heading were identified as academically sensitive and schools with scores three and four under unfriendly heading were placed as academically insensitive. The schools with three and four scores under neutral category were branded as neutral.

Secondly, the effect of democratic process was seen in relation to emotional climate, where the schools were divided into

a) mutually cohesive and
b) unconcerned climate

4.3 Criterion for selection of mutually cohesive and unconcerned schools

Total of all the items were taken school wise. 25th and 75th percentiles were calculated. The schools having total below 25th percentile were branded as mutually unconcerned schools and schools having total above 75th percentile were classified as mutually cohesive.

Thirdly, the effect of democratic process was seen in relation to organizational climate, where the schools were divided into

a) Person centred organization and
b) Group centred organization

4.4. Criterion for selection of group centred and person centred schools

Sharma, M.L. (1978) working on adaptation of tool OCDQ of Halpin and Croft has divided the entire list of 8 subtests into two groups of subtests namely person centred and group centred. For identifying person centred schools, the school scores in respect of four dimensions viz. Psycho-physical hindrance, control, production emphasis and humanized thrust were taken and to find out group centred schools the scores of subtests viz. disengagement, hindrance, intimacy and esprit were taken. 25th and 75th percentile were computed. The schools having totals above
75th percentile in group centred schools were identified as group centred schools and below 25th percentile in person centred schools were labelled as person centred schools.

4.5. Impact of democratic process in relation to academic climate on
   a) Job satisfaction
   b) Student Performance

The study employed a 2x2 factorial design which was first conducted on criterion scores of job satisfaction and then on the scores of student performance.

The two independent variables were divided into 2 levels each. The variable of the democratic process was studied at democratic and undemocratic levels and variable of academic climate on
   a) academically sensitive climate
   b) academically insensitive climate

4.5.1. Impact of democratic process in relation to academic climate on job satisfaction

The data of job satisfaction was analysed for the two levels of democratization and the two levels of academic climate and the obtained values of sum of squares and F-ratios have been incorporated in the following table 4.4.
### TABLE 4.4
**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ACADEMIC CLIMATE AND JOB SATISFACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>M.S.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1895.17</td>
<td>1895.17</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>368.05</td>
<td>368.05</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>163.60</td>
<td>163.60</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21004.35</td>
<td>552.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23431.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Democratic Mean (M = 69.5)
- Academically Sensitive mean: 71.6
- Academically insensitive mean: 67.75

Undemocratic Mean (M = 56.05)
- Academically Sensitive mean: 60.8
- Academically insensitive mean: 51.3

It may be observed from the table that the F-ratio for the difference of the means of job satisfaction scores of democratic and undemocratic groups of schools was not found significant even at the .05 level of confidence. The observed difference may be ascribed to chance factor alone. It may be inferred that democratic and undemocratic schools do not differ on job satisfaction.

The F-ratio for the difference in the means of the two academic climates (sensitive and insensitive) was not found significant even at the
.05 level of confidence. The observed difference may be ascribed to chance factor alone. It suggests that the teachers of academically sensitive and insensitive groups do not differ on job satisfaction.

The interaction between democratic process and academic climate was not found significant even at the 0.05 level of confidence. It indicates that two factors are independent in respect of job satisfaction. This has also been shown through the interaction graph figure 4.1.

4.5.2 Impact of Democratic process in relation to academic climate on student achievement

The scores of student achievement were studied for their mean difference on democratic process and academic climate. The mean sum of squares and F-ratios for the main and interaction effects have been recorded in the table 4.5.
FIG. 4.1: Interaction between academic climate and job satisfaction
TABLE 4.5
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ACADEMIC CLIMATE AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>M.S.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>233746.62</td>
<td>233746.62</td>
<td>50.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1321159.52</td>
<td>1321159.52</td>
<td>287.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81949.75</td>
<td>81949.75</td>
<td>17.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3605</td>
<td>16544465.63</td>
<td>4589.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3608</td>
<td>18181321.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level of confidence.

Democratic Mean (106.2) Academically Sensitive mean 122.63 Academically Insensitive mean 77.43

Undemocratic Mean (89.4) Academically Sensitive mean 102.67 Academically Insensitive mean 81.28

It may be observed from the table that the F-ratio for the difference in means of achievement scores of democratic and un-democratic groups of schools was found to be significant at the .01 levels of confidence leading to an inference that the achievement scores of the democratic and the un-democratic schools differ. The observation of their mean achievement scores suggests that the mean of democratic group of schools was more than that of the un-democratic group of schools.
The F-ratio for the difference in means of the academically sensitive and academically insensitive groups of schools was found significant at the .01 level of confidence. It indicates that the two means are different. The examination of their means suggests that mean achievement scores of academically sensitive schools was more than the academically insensitive schools.

The interaction between democratisation and academic climate was found highly significant at the .01 level of confidence. It suggests that two variables were not independent. The democratic process was found qualified by the academic climate. The observation of their respective means shows that difference in democratic and un-democratic schools at academically sensitive level is more than that at the academically insensitive level. Though academic sensitivity is an important factor, which affects students achievements in democratically and undemocratically managed schools to a great extent, but the academically sensitive climate yielded better achievements than its counterparts. The same has been depicted through the interaction graph in figure 4.2.

4.6 Impact of democratic process in relation to socio-emotional climate on

a) Job satisfaction

b) Student performance

4.6.1. Impact of democratic process in relation to socio-emotional climate on job satisfaction

For the purpose of the analysis, a 2x2 factorial design has first been conducted on job satisfaction scores and then on students performance scores.
FIG. 4.2: Interaction between academic climate and student achievement
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FIG.4.2 : Interaction between academic climate and student achievement
The two independent variables viz. democratic process and emotional climate have been studied for democratic and un-democratic levels and mutually cohesive and unconcerned levels respectively.

The scores of job-satisfaction were studied for their relationship with democratic process and socio-emotional climate. The mean sum of squares and F-ratios for the main effect and interaction effects have been recorded in table 4.6.

TABLE 4.6
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SOCIO-EMOTIONAL CLIMATE AND JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>M.S.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1261.51</td>
<td>1261.51</td>
<td>2.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-emotional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2952.11</td>
<td>2952.11</td>
<td>4.701*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>371.42</td>
<td>371.42</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20095</td>
<td>627.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24680.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F-ratio significant at .05

Democratic Mutually cohesive Mean (76) 84.25
Democratic Mutually unconcerned Mean (63.85) 66.1

Undemocratic Mutually cohesive Mean (63.85) 72.6
Undemocratic Mutually unconcerned Mean (63.85) 57.37
It may be observed from the table that the F-ratio for the difference in means of job satisfaction scores of democratic and un-democratic groups of schools was not found significant even at the .05 levels of confidence. The observed difference in means may be ascribed to chance factor. It suggests that the two groups on democratisation do not differ on job satisfaction. The F-ratio for the difference in means of the two socio-emotional groups (i.e. mutually cohesive and mutually unconcerned) has been found marginally significant, at the .05 level of confidence. It indicates that the two groups were different. The examination of their means suggests that the mean of mutually cohesive group was found more than the mean of mutually unconcerned group.

The interaction between democratic process and socio-emotional status was not found significant even at the .05 level of confidence. It suggests that the two variables were independent of each other. Thus the democratic process was not qualified by socio-emotional climate. The observation of their respective means suggests that the difference at mutually cohesive level is more than that at the mutually unconcerned level. This has also been shown through the interaction graph fig. 4.3.

4.6.2. Impact of democratic process in relation to socio-emotional climate on student achievement

The scores of student achievement were studied for their relationship with democratic process and socio-emotional climate. The mean sum of squares and F-ratio for the main effect and interaction effect have been recorded in table 4.7.
FIG. 4.3: Interaction between socio-emotional climate and job satisfaction
### TABLE 4.7
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SOCIO-EMOTIONAL CLIMATE AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>M.S.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15991.5</td>
<td>15991.5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-emotional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116534.0</td>
<td>116534.0</td>
<td>22.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>194007.1</td>
<td>194007.1</td>
<td>37.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3335</td>
<td>17090585.6</td>
<td>5124.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3338</td>
<td>17417118.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F-ratio significant at .01 levels**

Democratic Mean (98.05)  
Mutually cohesive mean 97.08  
Mutually unconcerned mean 99.28  

Undemocratic mean (93.55)  
Mutually cohesive mean 72.38  
Mutually unconcerned mean 104.86  

It may be observed from the table that the F-ratio for the difference between the mean achievement scores of democratic and un-democratic group of schools was not found significant even at the .05 levels of confidence. The observed difference in means may be ascribed to chance factor alone. It led to an inference that the two groups were not found different on student achievement. The F-ratio for the difference in means of the two socio-emotional groups i.e. (mutually cohesive and mutually unconcerned) was found significant at the .01 level of confidence indicating...
that the two group means were different. The examination of their means suggests that means of student achievement of mutually unconcerned groups was found more than that of the mutually cohesive groups.

The interaction between democratic process and the socio-emotional status was found significant at the .01 level of confidence. It suggests that two variables were not found independent and democratic process was found qualified by socio-emotional climate in respect of student achievement. The observation of their respective means suggests that the difference in democratic and un-democratic schools at mutually cohesive levels was more than that at mutually unconcerned level. In a mutually cohesive group, democracy contributes positively to the student’s performance. But in mutually unconcerned groups, undemocratic management contributes more to the student’s performance. However, the best student’s performance has been the result of undemocratic management and unconcerned climate. The same has also been depicted through the interaction graph figure 4.4.

4.7 Impact of democratic process in relation to organizational climate on

a) Job satisfaction
b) Student performance

The study employed a 2x2 factorial design which was first conducted on the criterion scores of job satisfaction and then on the scores of student performance.

The two independent variables were divided into 2 levels each. The variable of democratic process was studied at democratic and undemocratic levels and variable of organizational climate also at the two levels viz.
FIG. 4.4: Interaction between socio-emotional climate & student achievement
a) Person centred
b) Group centred

4.7.1 Impact of democratic process in relation to organizational climate on job satisfaction

The scores of job-satisfaction were studied for their relationship with democratic process and organizational climate. The mean sum of squares and F-ratios for the main effect and interaction effects have been recorded in table 4.8.

**TABLE 4.8**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE AND JOB SATISFACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>M.S.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1107.57</td>
<td>1107.57</td>
<td>1.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92.35</td>
<td>92.35</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19438.65</td>
<td>607.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20642.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Democratic Mean (84.35) Group Centred 86.62 Person Centred 82.83

Undemocratic Mean (73.18) Group centred 74.2 Person centred 71.5
It may be observed from the table that the F-ratio for the difference in the means of job satisfaction scores of democratic and un-democratic groups of schools was not found significant even at the .05 level of confidence. The observed difference may be ascribed to chance factor alone. The two levels of democratisation were not found different in respect of job-satisfaction.

The F-ratio for the difference in means of the two organizational climate groups i.e. (group centred and person centred) was not found significant even at the .05 level of confidence. The observed difference may be ascribed to chance factor alone. The two organizational climate groups were not found different on job-satisfaction.

The interaction between democratic process and organizational climate was also not found significant even at the .05 level of confidence. It indicates that the two factors were independent in respect of job-satisfaction. This has also been shown through interaction graph figure 4.5.

4.7.2 Impact of democratic process in relation to organizational climate on student achievement

The scores of student achievement were studied for their relationship with democratic process and organizational climate. The mean sum of squares and F-ratios for the main effect and interaction effect have been recorded in table 4.9.
FIG. 4.5: Interaction between organizational climate & job satisfaction
TABLE 4.9
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>M.S.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28884.7</td>
<td>28884.7</td>
<td>54.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>539440.2</td>
<td>539440.2</td>
<td>101.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156304.8</td>
<td>156304.8</td>
<td>29.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3241</td>
<td>17243088.45</td>
<td>320.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3244</td>
<td>18227678.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** F-ratio significant at .01 level of confidence,

Democratic Mean (101.20)  
Group Centred Mean 90.68  
Person centred Mean 106.28

Undemocratic Mean (82.07)  
Group centred Mean 71.98  
Person centred mean 102.72

It may be observed from the table that the F-ratio for the difference in means of the achievement scores of democratic and un-democratic groups was found significant at the .01 level of confidence. It indicates that the two mean achievement scores were different from each other. The examination of their means suggests that the mean student achievement of the democratic schools was more than the counterparts.

The F-ratio for the difference between the means of two groups i.e. person centred and group centred was found significant at the .01 level of
confidence. The examination of their means suggest that mean achievement scores of person centred schools was more than that of the group centred schools.

The interaction between democratic climate and the organizational climate was found significant at the .01 levels of confidence. It suggests that the effect of democratization was not independent of organizational climate on the achievement of students. The observation of their respective means suggests that the difference in democratic and un-democratic schools at group centred level was more than that of the person centred level. The person centred organizational climate yielded better student's scores than the group centred climate with democratic as well as undemocratic management styles. The same has been depicted through the interaction graph fig. 4.6

4.8 Discussion of Results

This part of the Chapter is devoted to the critical appraisal of the results in the light of the findings available in the related literature.

1. There is no correspondence between the level of introduction of democratic process with the management style of the schools. It suggests that in government and privately managed schools, the proportion where the democratic processes are introduced superficially and where it is introduced thoroughly and seriously did not show much difference.

2. The correspondence between the introduction of democratic process and the gender of school population could not be established. It led to an inference that introduction of democratic process in the school climate is almost equally proportional in boys and girls schools.
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FIG.4.6: Interaction between organizational climate & student achievement
The above finding was inconsistent with the finding by Clark (1983), viz., "Male teachers were found to be more involved in decision making process than female teachers". The inconsistency in the result appears to be a natural consequence of the present situation as democratic processes are passing through a stage of rapid change.

On these premises, the following findings in respect of job satisfaction among the teachers working in the school and the achievement of the students studying in school have been enlisted as follows.

3. The hypothesis -3 viz., "There is no significant difference in democratic and undemocratic schools on job satisfaction" could not be rejected. It suggests that schools with nominal introduction of democratic processes and schools where democratic processes were seriously introduced were not found significantly different in respect of job satisfaction. It indicates that the mere introduction of democratic process was not affecting the job satisfaction among teachers.

The results of present study was not supported by the findings of the studies by Warner (1980), Burke (1981), Cloud (1984), Bennett (1990), Stove (1992), Dondero (1993) and Iden (1994). The above contradiction may be explained on the basis of the fact that different studies have worked with different parameters of democratic process, hence the studies can not be compared with the single dimension of democratic process.

The sample of schools whether privately managed or government are taken from a very homogenous group of schools in
respect of democratic processes. It becomes all the more effective in the present day climate where democratisation in all walks of life has become a dominating concept.

Particularly after the acceptance of a parliamentary form of government for the nation which for the last 50 years has been accepted as a way of life. Even if the school does not provide the formal democratisation of within the school climate, its benefits keep on affecting the dependent variables and thus, a climate which was formally considered least democratic may be conceived a little bit more democratic than it was rated. On the other hand, a climate which is considered slightly less than what is rated for. Hence the limiting groups in its spirit perhaps did not have that significant differences which it exhibited numerically.

4. The hypothesis -4 viz., "There is no significant difference in democratic and undemocratic schools with different academic climates in respect of job satisfaction", could not be rejected.

The results of present study were inconsistent with the findings put forward by Carter (1982), Samad (1986), Ronnenkamp (1984) and Sardana (1985). The above result may be explained in view of analysis of the present stage of transformation in India. After independence democratization of schools have been done but many authoritarian tendencies still persist in schools in the form of pseudo-democratic tendencies. Findings of the present study pertain mainly to dynamic style where difference in the two types of climate is fast declining.

5. The hypothesis-5 viz. "There is no significant difference in democratic and undemocratic schools in respect of their pupil achievement" was
rejected leading to an inference that in-democratically managed schools, the performance of students was found better than their counterparts. This finding was supported by a few researchers. They concluded that democratically managed schools showed better performance in respect of pupil achievement. (Field, 1991).

6. The hypothesis-6 viz. “There is no significant difference in democratically and undemocratically managed schools with academically sensitive and insensitive climate in respect of pupil achievement” was rejected in favour of a finding that difference in student performance in democratic and undemocratic schools in academically sensitive climate was more than the same in academically insensitive climate. It suggests that the benefits of democratisation in respect of their pupil achievement are better received by their students when the climate of the school is academically sensitive.

The finding was provided sufficient support by researchers Linderman (1983), Badiali (1985), Williford (1989) and Barberio (1990).

7. The hypothesis-7 viz., “There is no significant difference in democratic and undemocratic schools with varying socio-emotional climates in respect of job satisfaction” was rejected in favour of finding that the difference of mutually cohesive level is more than the mutually unconcerned level. That the difference of the two levels of democratisation in mutually cohesive climate is more than mutually unconcerned climate.

8. The hypothesis 8, viz., “There is no significant difference in democratic and undemocratic schools with different socio-emotional
climates in respect of their pupil achievement", was rejected in favour of finding that in respect of student achievement the difference in democratic and undemocratic schools in mutually cohesive climate was more than the mutually unconcerned climate. Mutually cohesive climate along with democratisation supported the student performance. The finding was supported by Voliter (1994) and Hoffman (1995).

9. The hypothesis 9, viz., "There is no significant difference in democratic and undemocratic schools with varying organizational climates in respect of job satisfaction" could not be rejected.

10. The hypothesis 10, viz., "There is no significant difference in democratic and undemocratic schools with varying organizational climates in respect of their pupil achievement" was rejected in favour of the finding that difference in democratic and undemocratic schools in a person centred work climate was more than the same in group centred climate. It led to an inference that benefits of democratisation were received better by students in democratic and undemocratic schools in respect of person centred climate than group centred climate. The finding was amply supported by Baraiya (1984), Panday (1986), Bedford (1987).

But the above findings were inconsistent with findings of Frankline (1982), Das (1983). The majority of findings confirmed the positive outcome of democratisation in person centred climate in respect of pupil achievement. The inconsistency in result appear to be a natural consequence of the present situation as democratic process is passing through a stage of rapid change.