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... Bare facts, objective data, never determine anything. They become significant only as interpreted in the light of accepted standards and assumptions, and these standards in the final analysis are not susceptible of scientific determination. In ordinary life, we seldom deal with bare facts but facts interpreted. This interpretation or evaluation is determined by the purpose to which we relate the facts.

—Martz

4.1. STATISTICAL DESCRIPTION

The next step in the process of research after the collection of data is organization, analysis and interpretation of data and formulation of conclusions and generalizations to get a meaningful picture out of the raw information collected.

The data collected through various tools is to be edited, classified and tabulated before it serves the purpose. Editing the data includes the checking of gathered data for accuracy, utility and completeness. Classifying refers to the dividing of the information into different categories, classes for use and tabulating refers to the recording of the classified material in accurate mathematical terms i.e. marking and counting frequency tallies for different items on which information is gathered.
Analysis of data refers to the studying of the tabulated material in order to determine inherent facts or meanings. It involves breaking down the complex factors into simple parts and putting the parts together in new arrangements for the purposes of interpretation.

The study includes four major aspects, viz Adjustment, Job satisfaction, Administrative problems and the association among the three. From the tools, the total scores of Adjustment, Job satisfaction and Administrative problems were taken as raw scores for each Head Master or Head Mistress. These three types of raw scores were used as basic sources of data for the study of the said three aspects. This raw data was put to statistical treatment. Each of the three different aspects, viz., adjustment, job satisfaction and administrative problems of the study was taken first into consideration individually. Later, these three aspects were tested for their association. The hypotheses framed under all four aspects were statistically tested and accordingly accepted or rejected.

4.2. TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

4.2.1. ADJUSTMENT

The total score of adjustment of each Headmaster was taken to find out the level of adjustment possessed by each sub sample as well as total sample of the study. The maximum score that a Headmaster can get is 150 and the minimum is 50. In the present study, the highest scores secured by the Headmaster were 136 and the lowest was 51.
For the purpose of classification of the level of adjustment possessed by the sample, the adjustment level was categorized by using the normal probability distribution (Best 1982). The adjustment level of the total sample and sub-samples was classified into three categories viz., Poor, Moderate and Good. The Headmasters who scored between 50 and 78 were kept in poor adjustment group, who scored between 79, 102 were put in moderate adjustment group, and who scored between 103 and 150 were placed in high adjustment group. The mean scores and standard deviation were used to identify the level of adjustment of the Head Masters and to compare the sub-sample variation. The values of standard deviation were used to measure the spread or dispersion of scores in a distribution (Garrett 1981).

**Hypothesis 1**

*Secondary school Head Masters differ in their levels of adjustment.*

To test the validity of Hypothesis 1, the mean, standard deviation of the total sample was calculated. For total Sample (200) Mean = 90.67 and S.D. = 12.78. The data is presented in Table 7.

**Table 7**

Levels of Adjustment of the Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-1σ Less than 78</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Low Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M In between 79 and 102</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>Moderate Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+1σ Greater than 103</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>High Adjustment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is evident from Table 7, that the Head Masters, Head Mistresses of secondary schools have varied adjustment. In the sample, as per mean and standard deviation, 12.5% of Head Masters have low adjustment, 68.5% of Head Masters have moderate adjustment and 19% of Head Masters have high adjustment. This shows that Head Masters differ in the levels of their adjustment. The data in Table 7 is represented in Bar diagram, Figure 8.

**Levels of Adjustment in Percentages**
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**Figure 8**

**HYPOTHESIS 2**

The following variables make a significant difference in the adjustment of secondary school Head Masters.

- a) Sex
- b) Age
- c) Academic Qualifications
- d) Locality
- e) Type of Management
- f) Experience
- g) Medium of instruction

For testing the major hypothesis, the following seven sub hypotheses were formulated.
Sub-Hypothesis 2A

Sex makes a significant difference in the levels of adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 2B

Age makes a significant difference in the levels of adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 2C

Academic qualifications make a significant difference in the levels of adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 2D

Locality makes a significant difference in the levels of adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 2E

Type of management makes a significant difference in the levels of adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 2F

Experience makes a significant difference in the levels of adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 2G

Medium of instruction makes a significant difference in the levels of adjustment of secondary school Head Masters
TESTING OF SUB- HYPOTHESIS

Sub -Hypothesis 2A

Null Hypothesis

Sex of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their adjustment

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D. and C.R. value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Adjustment – Sex – Mean, S.D. and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>$\sigma$ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Masters</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>90.694</td>
<td>13.239</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.191 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headmistresses</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>90.487</td>
<td>11.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 8, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 0.191 is less than the Table value 1.96. It is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. i.e. **Sex makes a significant difference in the adjustment of Head Masters** is rejected. This agrees with the findings of Rao, S.N (1981).
Sub-Hypothesis 2B

Null Hypothesis

*Age of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their adjustment*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D. and C.R. value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 9.

**Table 9**

Adjustment – Age – Mean, S.D. and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 45 years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90.97</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>2.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45 years</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>90.42</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level

From Table 9, it is observed that the calculated C.R. value 2.04 is greater than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level. It is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. That is the two groups of Head Masters when considered, those below 45 years of age and those above 45 years of age differ significantly in adjustment.

In other words the research hypothesis i.e. *there is a significant difference in the adjustment of secondary school Head Masters below 45 years and above 45 years of age* is accepted.
Sub-Hypothesis 2C

Null Hypothesis

*Academic qualifications of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their adjustment*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the mean, S.D. and C.R. value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 10.

**Table 10**

Adjustment – Academic Qualification—Mean, S.D and C.R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90.69</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.114*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>90.48</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 10, it is observed that the calculated C.R. value 0.114 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level. It is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. i.e. *graduate Head Masters do not differ significantly from postgraduate Head Masters in their adjustment.*
Sub-Hypothesis 2D

Null Hypothesis

Locality of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their adjustment

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91.48</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.46 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89.95</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 11, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 0.467 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 levels. It is not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is retained.

In other words, the two groups considered, that is secondary school Head Masters working in rural areas and secondary school Head Masters working in urban areas do not differ significantly in adjustment. This agrees with the findings of Pandey, R.U (2003) with regard to urban and rural secondary school teachers.
Sub -Hypothesis 2E

Null Hypothesis

*Type of management of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their adjustment*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>89.58</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>91.46</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 12, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 1.02 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level. It is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained.

In other words the two groups of Head Masters considered that is *Head Masters working in government schools and in private management schools do not differ significantly in adjustment.*
Sub-Hypothesis 2F

Null Hypothesis

Experience of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their adjustment.

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 13.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less experience</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>89.98</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More experience</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91.61</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.21 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 13, it is observed that the calculated C.R. value 1.21 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level. It is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

That is the two groups of Head Masters considered that is less experienced secondary school Head Masters and more experienced secondary school Head Masters differ significantly in their adjustment.
Sub- Hypothesis 2G

Null hypothesis

Medium of instruction of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their adjustment

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level

From Table 14, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 2.83 is greater than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level and is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. The two groups of Head Masters considered that is Head Masters working in English Medium Schools differ significantly from those working in Telugu medium schools in their adjustment.
4.1.2. JOB SATISFACTION

The present study is concerned with a descriptive survey appraisal of job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters. The study is very much interested in the possible association between adjustment, job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters also. The data collected was used to describe the level of job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters.

To measure the level of Job satisfaction possessed by each Head Master as well as the total sample of the study, the total score of Job satisfaction of each headmaster was taken into consideration. The maximum score that a head master can get is 120 and the minimum is 40. In the present study the highest score secured was 116 and the lowest was 54.

The mean scores and standard deviation were utilized to compare the sub sample variation. The values of standard deviation were used to measure the dispersion of scores in each case.

Hypothesis 3

Secondary school Head Masters differ in their levels of job satisfaction

The validity of the above hypothesis 3 was tested by calculating mean and standard deviation. For the total sample (200) mean = 100.4 and S.D= 9.40. The data is presented in Table 15, Page 99.
Table 15

Levels of Job satisfaction of the Total sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Verbal Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-1σ</td>
<td>Less than 92</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>In between 92 and 108</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+1σ</td>
<td>Greater than 108</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from Table 15, that the Head Masters and Head Mistresses of Secondary Schools have varied level of job satisfaction. 17.5% of Head Masters have low job satisfaction, 67.5% of Head Masters have moderate job satisfaction and 15% have high job satisfaction. In other words there is difference in the job satisfaction level of Head Masters. The data in Table 15 is represented in Bar diagram, Figure 9.

Levels of Job Satisfaction in Percentages

Figure 9
**Hypothesis 4**

The following variables make a significant difference in the job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters.

a) Sex      b) Age       c) Academic Qualifications

d) Locality   e) Type of Management   f) Experience

g) Medium of instruction

For testing the major hypotheses, the following seven sub hypotheses were formulated.

**Sub-Hypothesis 4A**

*Sex makes a significant difference in the levels of job satisfaction secondary school Head Masters*

**Sub-Hypothesis 4B**

*Age makes a significant difference in the levels of job satisfaction secondary school Head Masters*

**Sub-Hypothesis 4C**

*Academic qualifications makes a significant difference in the levels of job satisfaction secondary school Head Masters*

**Sub-Hypothesis 4D**

*Locality makes a significant difference in the levels of job satisfaction secondary school Head Masters*
Sub -Hypothesis 4E

Type of management makes a significant difference in the levels of job satisfaction secondary school Head Masters

Sub –Hypothesis 4F

Experience makes a significant difference in the levels of job satisfaction secondary school Head Masters

Sub- Hypothesis 4G

Medium of instruction makes a significant difference in the levels of job satisfaction secondary school Head Masters

TESTING OF SUB- HYPOTHESIS

Sub -Hypothesis 4A

Null Hypothesis

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head masters</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>98.88</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Mistresses</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>101.95</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>2.16*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level
From Table 16, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 2.16 is greater than the Table value (1.96) at 0.5 level. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. That is the two groups of Head Masters considered; that is Head Masters and Head Mistresses differ significantly in job satisfaction. Hence the research hypothesis is retained. This agrees with finding of Lavinga, K (1974) that women teachers were more satisfied than men teachers. This also agrees with finding of Benard and Kulandaivel (1976) that made a similar observation with regard to graduate teachers.

**Sub-Hypothesis 4B**

**Null Hypothesis**

*Age of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their levels of job satisfaction*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, SD and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 17.

**Table 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 45 years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100.68</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45 years</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99.13</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level
From Table 17, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 1.12 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained that is the two groups of Head Masters considered those below 45 years of age and those above 45 years of age do not differ significantly in their job satisfaction.

This differs with the findings of Davi Fred Lech (2009) who reported that school superintendents who are above 50 years have expressed greater job satisfaction compared to those who are below 49 years of age. Prema Latha K also stated that teachers above 40 years of age have more satisfaction than those below 40 years.

**Sub-Hypothesis 4C**

**Null Hypothesis**

*Academic qualifications of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their levels of job satisfaction*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 18.

**Table 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92.12</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>92.18</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.03 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level
From Table 18, it is observed that the calculated CR value 0.03 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level. It is not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is retained. The two groups of Head Masters considered that is graduate Secondary School Head Masters and postgraduate Secondary School Head Masters do not differ significantly in their job satisfaction.

Hence the research hypothesis stating that there is significant difference in the job satisfaction of graduate Head Masters and post graduate Secondary Head Masters is rejected. This agrees with the findings of Padma Priya C.B (1982) with respect to women teachers.

**Sub-Hypothesis 4D**

**Null Hypothesis**

*Locality of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their levels of job satisfaction*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the mean, S.D. and C.R. value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 19.

**Table 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.18</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99.62</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.01 level
From Table 19, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 0.04 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level and is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Two groups of Head Masters considered that is Head Masters of secondary schools working in rural areas differ significantly from the Head Masters of secondary schools working in urban areas in their job satisfaction. This agrees with the findings of Garg D.P (1983) in respect of urban and rural teachers.

**Sub-Hypothesis 4E**

**Null Hypothesis**

*Type of management of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their levels of job satisfaction*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 20.

**Table 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>98.74</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100.71</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.01 level
From Table 20, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 1.43 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.01 level and is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. In other words the experimental hypothesis is rejected; i.e. *Head Masters of secondary schools working in government and in private managements do not differ significantly in their job satisfaction*. This agrees with the findings of *Venkata Rami Reddy* and *Babjan O*, (1981) that teachers under private managements were more satisfied than those under government management.

**Sub-Hypothesis 4F**

**Null Hypothesis**

*Experience of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their levels of job satisfaction*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 21.

**Table 21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less experience</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More experience</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>99.74</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level
From Table 21, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 1.29 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level and is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. The two groups of Head Masters considered i.e. less experienced Secondary School Head Masters and more experienced Secondary School Head Masters do not differ significantly in their job satisfaction.

Hence the research hypothesis stating that there is a significant difference in the job satisfaction of less experienced secondary School Head Masters and more experienced Secondary School Head Masters is rejected. This agrees with the findings of Padma Priya C B (1982) that job satisfaction is not related to length of service.

**Sub-Hypothesis 4G**

**Null Hypothesis**

*Medium of instruction of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in their levels of job satisfaction*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σD</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telugu medium</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>99.73</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English medium</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>99.25</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level
From Table 22, it is observed that the calculated C.R. value 0.36 is greater than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is the two groups of Head Masters considered i.e. Secondary school Head Masters working in Telugu medium schools and secondary school Head Masters working in English medium schools do not differ significantly in their Job satisfaction.

4.1.3. ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

The present study probes into the administrative problems faced by the Head Masters of Secondary schools. The final scale of 45 statements was administered on a sample of 200 Head Masters working in secondary schools. The maximum score secured is 122 and minimum is 45.

For the purpose of the classification of categories of the administrative problems, the normal probability of distribution was applied. The headmaster who scored between 45 and 63 was kept in low level of administrative problems group.

The headmaster who scored between 64 and 97 was kept in moderate level administrative problems group and the headmaster who scored between 98 and 135 was kept in high level administrative problems group.

The mean scores and critical ratio values were considered to compare the sub-sample variations in administrative problems level. The null hypotheses formulated for this study were accordingly accepted or rejected. The values of standard deviation were applied to identify the dispersion of scores in each case.
Hypothesis 5

*Secondary school Head Masters differ significantly in their levels of administrate problems*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the mean, S.D. and C.R. value for the two groups. For the total sample (200), Mean=78.89 and S.D. = 16.54. The data is presented in Table 23.

**Table 23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Verbal Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-1σ</td>
<td>Less than 63</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>In between 63 and 93</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+1σ</td>
<td>Greater than 93</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 23, it is observed that 19.5% of Head Masters have low administrative problems, 67.5% of Head Masters have moderate administrative problems and 13% of Head Masters have High administrative problems. That is *Head Masters differ in their levels of administrative problems*. Further the scores of the units were used to identify the level of distribution of administrative problems in the whole sample. The data in Table 23 is represented in Bar diagram, Figure 10, Page 110.
Hypothesis 6

The following variables make a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

a) Sex b) Age c) Academic Qualifications
d) Locality e) Type of Management f) Experience
g) Medium of instruction

For testing the major hypotheses, the following seven sub hypotheses were formulated.

Sub -Hypothesis 6A

Sex makes a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters
Sub-Hypothesis 6B

Age makes a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 6C

Academic qualifications makes a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 6D

Locality makes a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 6E

Type of management makes a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 6F

Experience makes a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

Sub- Hypothesis 6G

Medium makes a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters.
TESTING OF SUB-HYPOTHESIS

Sub-Hypothesis 6A

Null Hypothesis

*Sex of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 24.

**Table 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Masters</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>81.15</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headmistresses</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76.94</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 24, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 1.53 is greater than the Table value 1.96 and is significant at 0.05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

The two groups of Head Masters considered that is Secondary School Head Masters and Secondary School headmistresses do not differ significantly in their administrative problems. Hence the research hypothesis is retained. This agrees with the findings of Mahant G.V (1979) who stated that the administrative behavior of high school Head Masters in central Gujarat is not influenced by sex.
Sub-Hypothesis 6B

Null Hypothesis

*Age of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 25.

### Table 25

**Administrative problems – Age – Mean, S.D and C.R**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 45 years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>79.59</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45 years</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>80.22</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 25, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 0.26 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level and is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. The two groups of Head Masters considered that is *Secondary School Head Masters aged below 45 years of age and Secondary School Head Masters aged above 45 years of age do not differ significantly in their administrative problems*. This agrees with the findings of Mahant G.V (1979) who stated that the administrative behavior of high school Head Masters in central Gujarat is not influenced by age.
Sub-Hypothesis 6C

Null Hypothesis

*Academic qualifications of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 26.

**Table 26**

Administrative problems – Academic Qualification – Mean, S.D and C.R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>79.61</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>80.21</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.26 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 26, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 0.26 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained.

The two groups of Head Masters considered that is *Secondary School graduate Head Masters and Secondary School post graduate Head Masters differ significantly in their administrative problems*. Hence the research hypothesis is rejected.
Sub -Hypothesis 6D

Null Hypothesis

Locality of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 27.

Table 27

Administrative problems – Locality– Mean, S.D and C.R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>81.22</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78.64</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 27, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 1.60 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level and is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is retained.

The two groups of Head Masters considered; Secondary School Head Masters working in rural areas Secondary School Head Masters working in urban areas do not differ significantly in their administrative problems.
Sub -Hypothesis 6E

Null Hypothesis

Type of management of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the mean, S.D and C.R value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 28.

Table 28

Administrative problems –Type of Management– Mean, S.D and C.R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level

From Table 28, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 2.02 is greater than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 levels and is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

The two groups of Head Masters considered that is Head Masters in government schools differ significantly with the Head Masters in private management schools in their administrative problems.
Sub-Hypothesis 6F

Null Hypothesis

*Experience of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems*

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the Mean, S.D. and C.R. value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 29.

**Table 29**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σD</th>
<th>C.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less experience</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>79.14</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More experience</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80.86</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 29, it is observed that the calculated C.R. value 0.71 is less than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. The two groups of Head Masters considered that is less experienced Head Masters and more experienced Head Masters do not differ significantly in their administrative problems.
Sub- Hypothesis 6G

Null Hypothesis

Medium of the secondary school Head Masters does not make a significant difference in the levels of administrative problems.

The hypothesis is tested by calculating the mean, S.D. and C.R. value for the two groups and the data is presented in Table 30.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ D</th>
<th>C.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telugu medium</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>77.18</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English medium</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82.61</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level

From Table 30, it is observed that the calculated C.R value 2.31 is greater than the Table value (1.96) at 0.05 level and is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

The two groups of Head Masters considered i.e. Secondary school Head Masters working in Telugu medium schools differ significantly from the Head Masters working in English medium schools in their administrative problems.
Relationship between Adjustment and Job Satisfaction

Hypothesis 7

There is a significant relationship between the adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters

Null Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between the adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters

Table 31

Correlation coefficient between Adjustment and Job satisfaction of Head Masters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Table Value</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.138 at 0.05 level</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In testing the validity of hypothesis 7, for the coefficient of correlation between the two pairs of scores on the two tools; i.e. adjustment scale and job satisfaction scale the obtained $r$ value is -0.01. The Table value at the given degrees of freedom is 0.138 at 0.05 level. The calculated $r$ value is less than the Table value. It is not significant at 0.05 level.

Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. That is there is no significant relationship between the adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters. There is a negative relationship between adjustment and job satisfaction of Head Masters though not significant.
Hypothesis 8

The following variables make a significant difference in the relation of adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters and Head Mistresses.

a) Sex  b) Age  c) Academic Qualifications  
d) Locality  e) Type of Management  f) Experience  
g) Medium of instruction

For testing the major hypotheses, the following seven sub hypotheses were formulated.

**Sub-Hypothesis 8A**

*Sex makes a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters*

**Sub-Hypothesis 8B**

*Age makes a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters*

**Sub-Hypothesis 8C**

*Academic qualifications makes a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters*

**Sub-Hypothesis 8D**

*Locality makes a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters*
Sub-Hypothesis 8E

Type of management makes a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 8F

Experience makes a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 8G

Medium makes a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters

TESTING OF SUB-HYPOTHESIS

Sub-Hypothesis 8A

Null Hypothesis

Sex does not make a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters

Table 32

Adjustment and Job satisfaction – Sex – r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ_DZ</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Masters</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.24 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headmistresses</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.24 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level
From Table 32, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 1.24 is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is Sex does not make a significant difference in the relation of adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters.

**Sub -Hypothesis 8B**

**Null Hypothesis**

*Age does not make a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>$\sigma_{Dz}$</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 45 years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.21 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45 years</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 33, it is observed that the calculated C.R. Value 0.21 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is age does not make a significant difference in the relation of adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters.
Sub-Hypothesis 8C

Null Hypothesis

Academic qualifications does not make a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters

Table 34
Adjustment and Job satisfaction – Academic Qualification—
r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σDz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 34, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 0.85 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is qualification does not make a significant difference in the relation of adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters.
Sub-Hypothesis 8D

Null Hypothesis

Locality does not make a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters.

Table 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>$\sigma_Dz$</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.41 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 35, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 0.41 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained, i.e. the locality of schools where the Head Masters work does not make a significant difference in the relation of adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters.
Sub-Hypothesis 8E

Null Hypothesis

_Type of the management does not make a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters_

**Table 36**
Adjustment and Job satisfaction – Type of Management – r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σDz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.07 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 36, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 0.07 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is _the type of the management in which the heads of the secondary schools work does not make a significant difference in the relation of adjustment and job satisfaction_

Sub-Hypothesis 8F

Null Hypothesis

_Experience does not make a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters_
Table 37
Adjustment and Job satisfaction – Experience – r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ_Dz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less experience</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More experience</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 37, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 0.17 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is more experienced Head Masters of secondary schools do not differ significantly from less experienced Head Masters in the relation of adjustment and job satisfaction.

Sub- Hypothesis 8G

Null Hypothesis

Medium does not make a significant difference in the relation between adjustment and job satisfaction of secondary school Head Masters

Table 38
Adjustment and Job satisfaction – Medium – r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ_Dz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telugu Medium</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Medium</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level
From Table 38, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 0.04 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is Head Masters working in schools where the medium of instruction is English do not differ significantly from the Head Masters working in schools where the medium of instruction is Telugu in relation to adjustment and job satisfaction.

Relationship between Job satisfaction and Administrative problems

Hypothesis 9

There is significant relationship between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

Null Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

Table 39

Correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and Administrative problems of Head Masters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Table Value</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.138 at 0.05 level</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test this hypothesis for the coefficient of correlation between the two pairs of scores of the two tools that is adjustment scale and job satisfaction scale, the obtained $r$ value is -0.096. The Table value at the given degrees of freedom is 0.138 at 0.05 level. The calculated $r$ value is less than the Table value and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is there is no significant relationship in the job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters.
Hypothesis 10

The following variables make a significant difference in the relation of job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters:

a) Sex 

b) Age 

c) Academic Qualifications 

d) Locality 

e) Type of Management 

f) Experience 

g) Medium of instruction 

For testing the major hypotheses, the following seven sub hypotheses were formulated.

Sub -Hypothesis 10A

Sex makes a significant difference in the relation between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters.

Sub -Hypothesis 10B

Age makes a significant difference in the relation between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters.

Sub -Hypothesis 10C

Academic qualifications make a significant difference in the relation between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters.
Sub-Hypothesis 10D

Locality makes a significant difference in the relation between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 10E

Type of management makes a significant difference in the relation between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 10F

Experience makes a significant difference in the relation between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

Sub-Hypothesis 10G

Medium makes a significant difference in the relation between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters
TESTING OF SUB- HYPOTHESIS

Sub -Hypothesis 10A

Null Hypothesis

Sex does not make a significant difference in the relation between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters

Table 40

Job satisfaction and Administrative problems – Sex – r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σDz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Masters</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headmistresses</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 4, it is observed that the calculated C.R. Value 0.29 is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is Sex does not make a significant difference in the relation of job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters.

Sub -Hypothesis 10B

Null Hypothesis

Age does not make a significant difference in the relation between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters
Table 41

Job satisfaction and Administrative problems – Age – r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ_Dz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 45 years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.049*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45 years</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.049*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 41, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 0.05 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is age does not make a significant difference in the relation of job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters.

Sub-Hypothesis 10C

Null Hypothesis

Academic qualifications does not make a significant difference in the relation between job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters.
Table 42

Job satisfaction and Administrative problems –

*Academic qualifications* – r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>$\sigma_{Dz}$</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 42, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 0.71 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is *qualifications do not make a significant difference in the relation of job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters.*

**Sub-Hypothesis 10D**

**Null Hypothesis**

*Locality of the school does not make a significant difference in the relation of job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters*
Table 43

Job satisfaction and Administrative problems – Locality – r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σDz</th>
<th>C.R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.21 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 43, it is observed that the calculated C.R. Value 0.21 is less than the Table value. It is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained.

That is the locality of schools where the Head Masters work does not make a significant difference in the relation of job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters.

Sub-Hypothesis 10E

Null Hypothesis

Type of management does not make a significant difference in the relation of job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters
Table 44
Job satisfaction and Administrative problems –
Type of Management – r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σDz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.71 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 44, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 0.71 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is the type of the management in which the heads of the secondary schools work does not make a significant difference in relation of job satisfaction and administrative problems of Secondary School Head Masters

Sub –Hypothesis 10F

Null Hypothesis

Experience does not make a significant difference in the relation of job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters
Table 45

Job satisfaction and Administrative problems - Experience - $r$, $z$, $D$, $\sigma_{Dz}$ and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$z$</th>
<th>$D$</th>
<th>$\sigma_{Dz}$</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less experience</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.71 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More experience</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 45, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 0.71 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained.

That is more experienced Head Masters of secondary schools do not differ significantly from less experienced Head Masters in the relation of job satisfaction and administrative problems.

**Sub-Hypothesis 10G**

**Null Hypothesis**

*Medium does not make a significant difference in the relation of job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters*
Table 46

Job satisfaction and Administrative problems – Medium – r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σDz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telugu Medium</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Medium</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 46, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 0.42 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained.

That is Head Masters working in schools where the medium of instruction is English do not differ significantly from the Head Masters working in schools where the medium of instruction is Telugu in relation to job satisfaction and administrative problems.

Relationship between Administrative problems and Adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Hypothesis 11

There is a significant relationship between the administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Null Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between the administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters
Table 47

Correlation coefficient between Administrative Problems and Adjustment of Head Masters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Table Value</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.138 at 0.05 level</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test this hypothesis the coefficient of correlation between the two pairs of scores on the two tools that is administrative problems scale and adjustment scale, the obtained r value is 0.569. The Table value at the given degrees of freedom is 0.138 at 0.05 level.

The calculated r value is greater than the Table value and is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. That is there is a significant relationship in the administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters.

Hypothesis 12

The following variables make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters.

a) Sex    b) Age    c) Academic Qualifications

  d) Locality e) Type of Management f) Experience

  g) Medium of instruction

For testing the major hypotheses, the following seven sub hypotheses were formulated.
Sub -Hypothesis 12A

Sex makes a significant difference in the relation between administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Sub -Hypothesis 12B

Age makes a significant difference in the relation between administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Sub -Hypothesis 12C

Academic qualifications makes a significant difference in the relation between administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Sub -Hypothesis 12D

Locality makes a significant difference in the relation between administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Sub -Hypothesis 12E

Type of management makes a significant difference in the relation between administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters
Sub-Hypothesis 12F

*Experience makes a significant difference in the relation between administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters*

Sub-Hypothesis 12G

*Medium makes a significant difference in the relation between administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters*

**TESTING OF SUB HYPOTHESIS**

Sub-Hypothesis 12A

**Null Hypothesis**

*Sex does not make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters*

### Table 48

*Administrative problems and Adjustment-Sex – r, Z and C.R.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ_Dz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Masters</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headmistresses</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.66 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level
From Table 48, it is observed that the calculated C.R. Value 0.66 is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is Sex makes no significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters.

**Sub-Hypothesis 12B**

**Null Hypothesis**

*Age does not make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative problems and Adjustment- Age – r, Z and C.R.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σDz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 45 years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45 years</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 49, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 1.28 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained. That is age does not make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters.
Sub-Hypothesis 12C

Null Hypothesis

Academic qualifications does not make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Table 50

Administrative problems and Adjustment-

Academic qualifications – r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σDz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.56*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 50, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 1.56 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained.

That is qualifications do not make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters.
**Sub-Hypothesis 12D**

**Null Hypothesis**

*Locality does not make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters*

**Table 51**

**Administrative problems and Adjustment—Locality —r, Z and C.R.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>(\sigma_{DZ})</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.63*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 51, it is observed that the calculated C.R. Value 1.63 is less than the Table value and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained.

That is the *Locality does not make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of Secondary School Head Masters.*
Sub-Hypothesis 12E

Null Hypothesis

_Type of management does not make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters_

Table 52

Administrative problems and Adjustment-

_Type of management – r, Z and C.R._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σDZ</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 52, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 1.00 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained.

That is _Types of the management does not make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of Secondary school Head Masters._
Sub -Hypothesis 12F

Null Hypothesis

*Experience does not make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters*

**Table 53**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>$\sigma D_z$</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less experience</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.64 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More experience</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 53, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 1.64 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained.

That is more experienced Head Masters of secondary schools do not differ significantly from less experienced Head Masters in relation to administrative problems and adjustment.
Sub- Hypothesis 12G

Null Hypothesis

Medium does not make a significant difference in the relation of administrative problems and adjustment of secondary school Head Masters

Table 54

Administrative problems and Adjustment-

Medium—r, Z and C.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σDz</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telugu medium</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>1.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English medium</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at 0.05 level

From Table 54, it is observed that the calculated C.R Value 1.35 is less than the Table value 1.96 and is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is retained.

That is Head Masters working in schools where the medium of instruction is English do not differ significantly from the Head Masters working in schools where the medium of instruction is Telugu in relation to administrative problems and adjustment.
4.1.3. ASSOCIATION AMONG ADJUSTMENT, JOB SATISFACTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

The present study is intended to identify whether there exists any association among adjustment, job satisfaction and administrative problems. For this, multiple coefficient of correlation R is calculated to determine the association among adjustment, job satisfaction and administrative problems.

**Hypothesis 13**

*There is no association among adjustment, job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters*

To test the validity of the hypothesis multiple coefficient correlation is calculated

**Table 55**

Comparison of adjustment, job satisfaction and administrative problems of Secondary school Head Masters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Administrative problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>92.357</td>
<td>99.295</td>
<td>79.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ</td>
<td>11.957</td>
<td>11.775</td>
<td>16.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The calculated F value at the given degrees of freedom (N =200 and K = 3) is 31.88 and it is greater than the Table value 3.80. (F –Test formula as given by R.A. Sarma, Advanced Statistics in Education and Psychology)
Formula: \[ F = \left( \frac{R^2}{1-R^2} \right) \times \left[ \frac{N-K-1}{K} \right] \] Where N=200, K=3

Hence, it is significant. i.e. the research hypothesis that there is no association among adjustment, job satisfaction and administrative problems of secondary school Head Masters is retained.

4.3. MAJOR FINDINGS

1. Secondary School Head Masters differ in their levels adjustment.

2. In adjustment of Secondary school Head Masters Age, Experience and Medium makes a significant difference, where as Sex, Academic qualifications, Locality, Type of managements do not make a significant difference.

3. Secondary School Head Masters differ in their levels of Job Satisfaction.

4. In Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Head Masters Sex, Locality makes a significant difference, where as Age, Academic, Qualifications, Type of Management, Experience and Medium do not make a significant difference.

5. Secondary School Head Masters differ in their levels of Administrative Problems.

6. In Administrative problems of Secondary school Head Masters Academic qualifications, Type of management and Medium makes a significant difference where as Sex, Age, Locality, Experience do not make a significant difference.
7. There is no significant relationship between Adjustment and Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Head Masters.

8. In the relationship between Adjustment and Job Satisfaction all the variables considered i.e. Sex, Age, Academic Qualifications, Locality, Type of Management, Experience and Medium do not make a significant relationship.

9. There is no significant relationship in the Job Satisfaction and Administrative problems of Secondary School Head Masters.

10. In the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Administrative problems all the variables considered i.e. Sex, Age, Academic Qualifications, Locality, Type of Management, Experience and Medium do not make a significant relationship.

11. There is no significant relationship in the Administrative problems and Adjustment of Secondary School Head Masters.

12. In the relationship between Administrative problems and Adjustment all the variables considered i.e. Sex, Age, Academic Qualifications, Locality, Type of Management, Experience and Medium do not make a significant relationship.

13. There is no association among Adjustment, Job Satisfaction and Administrative problems of Secondary School Head Masters.