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SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the proceeding chapters, introduction of the problem, development of the tools, method of the study and interpretation of the results, were discussed. The present chapter presents a brief summary of investigation and the conclusions of the study.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Education has been viewed as an input in the development process. In the National Policy on Education (NPE, 1986) the priority has been given to the qualitative aspects of education and at the same time, education has been conceptualized as a subsystem of the social system which has dynamic and beneficial links with other sub-systems.

Education in India has been a budget based system where efficiency is related by ability to "Consume" budget and to demand more. Performance at delivery point has not been an important criterion. The ongoing economic reforms and structural adjustments would, therefore, demand a shift from input to performance and outcomes.

Schools are symbols of progress and centres of the past and present values where the human beings are equipped with academic competence, technical skills and where that develop a number of qualities to lead their lives. Schools are an important agent of socialization which develop pupil's natural, intellectual, emotional and moral potentialities.
During the last few years, increasing attention has been given to the instructional management role of school principal. The old maxim, "Effective School, Effective Principal" has reappeared and has sparked demands for the researches. Research in educational administration and management has focussed on the school as a formal organization, thus ignoring these important schooling processes how they are organised and managed (Erickson, 1979).

The need for effective management is obvious, especially when one considers, the important role that education serves in society and the tremendous amount of Public and Private resources devoted to it.

Management is becoming increasingly important in education as a means of narrowing the gap between resources and expectations, that is to say, Management has become the means to effectiveness.

School management is a process of utilizing human resources for the effective operation of schools. It is people oriented in every sense of word, because it deals primarily with the development of human beings and does not deal with the direction of things.

Effectiveness, however refers to the relationship between the goals of schooling process and the actual results or the effects of the process, an effective school is one which realizes the objectives set for it.

Crowson (1981), Huff et al. (1982), Lithe (1982), Halinger (1983), Jones (1987), Harold Mann (1986), Villanova et al. (1982), Peterson (1987), Mortimore et al. (1988), Oakey (1989), Gillett Austin and David Reynold (1990), Witziers (1992), Johnson (1991), Dougal Hutchison (1993), have identified many factors of characters of effective schools. But, for the present study the following components of the Management were taken into consideration:

1. Goals.
2. Planning.
4. Promoting Academic Learning Climate.
5. Finances.
7. Relationships.
8. Communication.

The above mentioned components were also studied in relation to job satisfaction.

**School Effectiveness**

For many economists, the terms effectiveness and efficiency are practically identical. An effective school would be an efficient school, and vice versa. Hanushek (1986) argues, however, that it is necessary to distinguish between two types of efficiency (a) economic efficiency (b) technical efficiency. Considering economic efficiency, on the one hand, schools would be considered to be efficient if they select the least cost mix of inputs, given input prices and production relations, and
maximize educational output given the available resources under technical efficiency, on the other hand, an efficient school would be one which operates on the production frontier, that is using the best available techniques in the production of education.

Windham (1988) indicated, efficiency can be measured in terms of inputs, processes, outputs.

Out of the Criteria developed by Lockhead and Hanushek (1989), Internal effectiveness of schools which is defined as ratio of Non-monetary inputs and Non-monetary outputs, was studied.

Job Satisfaction

Schultz (1973) defined Job Satisfaction,""As a Set of attitudes that employees have about their job'", and described it as psychological disposition of people toward their job-how they feel about their work. This involves a collection of numerous attitudes or feelings. Job Satisfaction of teachers was studied as it has been invariably found that job satisfaction is outcome of mode of management.

So, the present Study entitled ; ""A STUDY OF SCHOOL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS ON THE CRITERIA OF EFFECTIVENESS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH JOB SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS,"" was conducted to find out the relevant components of management for effective schools in different management systems. Also, the effect of components of management was studied on job satisfaction of teachers.
Further, the correlations were found among different components of management in various management systems.

5.2 OBJECTIVES

The present Study was designed to attain the following objectives:

1. to determine the criteria for school effectiveness.
2. to identify the components of management system in schools.
3. to study the effectiveness of different school management systems.
4. to find out the differences in the school management systems on the following dimensions of management:
   a. Goals
   b. Planning
   c. Managing Teaching - Learning Process
   d. Promoting Academic Learning Climate
   e. Finances
   f. Decision Making
   g. Relationships
   h. Communication
   i. Leadership Processes
5. to work out the differences in school effectiveness on the following components of management:
   a. Goals
   b. Planning
   c. Managing Teaching - Learning Process
   d. Promoting Academic Learning Climate
   e. Finances
   f. Decision Making
6. to study the interaction effects of the variables of school management systems and school effectiveness on the criterion variable of the following management components:
   a. Goals
   b. Planning
   c. Managing Teaching - Learning Process
   d. Promoting Academic Learning Climate
   e. Finances
   f. Decision Making
   g. Relationships
   h. Communication
   i. Leadership Processes

7. to find out the differences in the school management systems on the job satisfaction of teachers.

8. to find out the differences in the school effectiveness on the job satisfaction of teachers.

9. to find out the interaction effects of the variables of the school management systems and school effectiveness on the criterion variable job satisfaction of teachers.

10. to study the interrelationships among the components of management for various management systems.

11. to study the correlation between components of management and job satisfaction of teachers in four management systems and two levels of school effectiveness i.e. high school effectiveness and low school effectiveness.
5.3 HYPOTHESES

The Study was designed to test the following hypothesis:

1. There will be no significant differences in the effectiveness of different school management systems.

2. There will be no differences in the mean goal scores of different management systems.

3. There will be no differences in the mean Planning scores of different management systems.

4. There will be no differences in the mean Managing Teaching-Learning process scores of different management systems.

5. There will be no differences in the mean Promoting Academic Learning Climate scores of different management systems.

6. There will be no differences in the mean Finances scores of different management systems.

7. There will be no differences in the mean Decision Making scores of different management systems.

8. There will be no differences in the mean Relationships scores of different management systems.

9. There will be no differences in the mean Communication scores of different management systems.

10. There will be no differences in the mean Leadership Processes scores of different management systems.
11. There will be no differences in the mean Job Satisfaction scores of different management systems.

12. High effective schools yield higher mean Goals score than that of Low effective schools.

13. High effective schools show higher mean Planning score than that of Low effective schools.

14. High effective schools give higher mean Managing Teaching-Learning process score than that of Low effective schools.

15. High effective schools yield higher mean Academic Learning Climate score than that of Low effective schools.

16. High effective schools yield higher mean Finances score than that of Low effective schools.

17. High effective schools exhibit higher mean Decision Making score than that of Low effective schools.

18. High effective schools show higher mean Relationships score than that of Low effective schools.

19. High effective schools reveal higher mean Communication score than that of Low effective schools.

20. High effective schools yield higher mean Leadership Processes score than that of Low effective schools.

21. High effective schools exhibit higher mean Job Satisfaction score than that of low effective schools.
22. The interaction between the management system and effectiveness levels will not yield significant results on mean Goals scores.

23. The interaction between the management system and effectiveness levels will not yield significant results on mean Planning scores.

24. The interaction between the management system and effectiveness levels will not show significant results on mean Managing Teaching-Learning process scores.

25. The interaction between the management system and effectiveness levels will not yield significant results on mean Promoting Academic climate scores.

26. The interaction between the management system and effectiveness levels will not reveal significant results on mean Finances scores.

27. The interaction between the management system and effectiveness levels will not yield significant results on mean Decision Making scores.

28. The interaction between the management system and effectiveness levels will not give significant results on mean Relationships scores.

29. The interaction between the management system and effectiveness levels will not yield significant results on mean Communication scores.
30. The interaction between the management system and effectiveness levels will not exhibit significant results on mean Leadership processes scores.

31. The interaction between the management system and effectiveness levels will not yield significant results on mean Job Satisfaction scores.

32. There is no significant correlation among components of management in Private school management system.

33. There is no significant correlation among components of management in Government school management system.

34. There is no significant correlation among components of management in Central school management system.

35. There is no significant correlation among components of management in Government aided school management system.

36. There is no significant correlation among components of management in High effective schools.

37. There is no significant correlation among components of management in Low effective schools.

38. There is no significant correlation between components of management and Job satisfaction of teachers in various management systems and two levels of effectiveness.
5.4 DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The design of the study had been envisaged in four parts. In the first part, the differences among four management systems were found out on the criterion variable of effectiveness involving one way analysis of variance.

The second part of the design dealt with the study of management system and effectiveness as independent variables with the nine components of management taken as dependent variables. The study was carried out on the basis of 4X2 factorial design wherein the management system was studied at four levels namely - Government School Management System, Private School Management System, Central School Management System, Government aided School Management System designated as MSI, MSII, MSIII and MSIV respectively.

The variable of school effectiveness was studied at two levels viz., high and low school effectiveness.

The dependent variable consisted of the following components of management viz., Goals, Planning, Managing Teaching - Learning Process, Promoting Academic Climate, Finances, Decision Making, Relationships, Communication and Leadership Processes.

The 4X2 analysis of variance was replicated nine times as reflected by the nine components of management.

The third part of the design was again 4X2 factorial study consisting of four levels of management levels and two levels of school effectiveness. But here, the dependent variable was job satisfaction of teachers instead of the components of management.
The fourth part of the design dealt with computation of intercorrelations among the various components of management in four management systems and high & low effective schools, also their correlation with job satisfaction of teachers.

5.5 TOOLS

The following tools were used for data collection:
1. School Effectiveness scale (Prepared by investigator),
2. Management Scale (Prepared by investigator),
3. Teacher Job Satisfaction Scale (Gupta and Srivastva, 1980).

5.6 PROCEDURE

The school effectiveness scale was administered to 64 Schools, 16 Schools from each type of four management systems. On the basis of scores, 4 top and 4 bottom schools were selected from each type of four management systems, to represent schools of high and low level of school effectiveness.

After the selection of schools, the management scale and job satisfaction scale was administered to eight teachers (of 8th and 10th Class) from each school.

5.7 FINDINGS

The findings of the present investigation were as follows:
- MSII yielded higher mean Goals score than that of MSI.
- MSII gave higher mean higher Goals score than that of MSIII.
- MSII and MSIII showed higher mean Planning scores than that of MSIV.
MSI yielded higher mean Managing Teaching-Learning score than those of MSII, MSIII, MSIV.

MSII and MSIII yielded higher mean Managing Teaching-Learning Process score than that of MSIII.

MSI, MSII and MSIII gave higher mean Academic Learning Climate Scores than that of MSIV, and MSI yielded higher mean Academic Learning Climate score than that of MSIII.

MSII and MSIII yielded higher mean Finances scores than that of MSIV.

MSII showed higher mean Decision Making score than that of MSI. And MSI, MSII, MSIII yielded higher mean Decision Making scores than that of MSIV.

Four Management Systems viz., MSI, MSII, MSIII, MSIV produced equal level of mean Relationships scores.

MSI and MSII yielded higher mean Communication scores than that of MSIII. And MSIV gave higher mean Communication score than that of MSIII.

MSI yielded higher mean Leadership Processes score that those of MSII, MSIV. And MSIII showed higher mean Leadership Processes score higher than those of MSII and MSIV.

Four Management Systems MSI, MSII, MSIII, MSIV produced equal level of mean Job Satisfaction scores.

MSII and MSIII yield higher mean school effectiveness scores than that of MSI and MSIV.

High effective school yielded higher mean Goals score than that of low effective schools.

High effective schools showed higher mean Planning score than that of low effective schools.
High effective schools gave higher mean Managing Teaching-Learning Process score than that of low effective schools.

High effective schools revealed higher mean Academic Learning Climate score than that of low effective schools.

High effective schools yielded higher mean Finances score than that of low effective schools.

High effective schools exhibited higher mean Decision Making score than that of low effective schools.

High effective schools showed higher mean Relationships score than that of low effective schools.

High effective school revealed higher mean Communication score than that of low effective schools.

High effective schools yielded higher mean Leadership Processes score than that of low effective schools.

High effective schools exhibited higher mean Job Satisfaction score than that of low effective schools.

MSI, MSII, MSIII, MSVI, yielded higher mean Goal scores in case of the HSE than those in LSE groups.

The differences of the Planning scores in MSI, MSII, MSIII, MSIV, were not qualified by School Effectiveness levels.

Differences of Managing Teaching-Learning scores in MSI, MSII, MSIII and MSIV were qualified by school effectiveness levels, HSE groups showed higher scores those in LSE groups.

Differences of the Academic Learning Climate scores in MSI, MSII, MSIII, MSIV were not qualified by school effectiveness levels.

Differences of the Finances scores in MSI, MSII, MSIII, MSIV, were not qualified by school effectiveness levels.
- Differences of the Decision Making scores in MSI, MSII, MSIII, MSIV were not qualified by school effectiveness levels.

- Differences of the Relationships scores in MSI, MSII, MSIII, and MSIV were not qualified by school effectiveness levels.

- Differences of Communication scores in MSI, MSII, MSIII, MSIV were not qualified by school effectiveness levels.

- Differences of the Leadership Processes scores in MSI, MSII, MSIII, MSIV were not qualified by school effectiveness levels.

- Differences of the Job Satisfication scores in MSI, MSII, MSIII, MSIV were not qualified by school effectiveness levels.

- Relationships among components of management with one another in private school management system, viz., Goals with Relationships, and Relationships with Communication and Leadership Processes were not significant. Whereas, remaining variables significantly correlated.

- The Relationships among components of management with one another in Governance school management system viz., Goals with Finances; Planning with Relationship and Leadership Processes; Managing Teaching-Learning process with Relationships; Academic Learning Climate with Finances, Relationships and Leadership Processes; Finances with Relationships, Leadership Processes, were not significant. Whereas, other variables relationships were significantly related.

- Relationship among components of management with one another in Central school management system viz., Goals with Managing Teaching-Learning Process, Academic Learning Climate,
Communication and Leadership Processes; Planning with Relationships and Leadership Processes; Managing Teaching-Learning Process with Communication; Academic Learning Climate with Communication and Leadership Process; Relationships with communications were not significant. Whereas, in case of remaining variables relationships, components were significantly correlated.

- Correlation coefficients among all the nine components of management were significant in Government aided school management system.


- Relationships among components of management viz., Goals with Communication and Leadership Processes; Planning with Relationships; Relationships with Communication, were not significant in Low effective schools. Other variable were significantly related with one another.
- Job Satisfaction in MSI is significantly related with all components of management viz., Goals, Planning, Managing Teaching-Learning Process, Academic Learning Climate, Finances, Decision Making, Relationships, Communication and Leadership Processes; In case of MSII, Job Satisfaction is significantly related with Goals, Planning, Managing Teaching-Learning Process, Academic Learning Climate, and lastly with Communication; In case of MSIII, Job Satisfaction is significantly related with Managing Teaching-Learning Process, Communication and Leadership Processes; In case of MSIV, Job Satisfaction is found significantly related with Managing Teaching-Learning Process, Communication and Leadership Processes.

- In case of High effective Schools, Job Satisfaction is found significantly related with Finances and Communication whereas, in case of Low effective Schools, Job Satisfaction is significantly related with Communication only.

5.9 EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The findings of the study suggest that the various components of management may be taken into consideration to enhance the school effectiveness.

The results suggest that the schools working under different types of management system may take into consideration those components which affect the school effectiveness for that particular management system.

The results of the study shows that the job satisfaction of the teachers effect school effectiveness. Hence, the management
systems should take into consideration the job satisfaction of teachers.

Results also shows that job satisfaction is correlated with few components of management. Therefore, it is also suggested that administrators should consider these management components to bring about effectiveness and job satisfaction of teachers.

5.10 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The studies can further be designed to substantiate the present investigation.

In the present study, only secondary general schools were taken into consideration; while more studies may be conducted on various types of schools viz., Vocational and sports schools, and at different levels viz., Primary schools, Middle schools, senior secondary schools etc.

Replication of the present study on different samples for wider generalisations may be done.

Variables like leadership qualities, self concept, organizational commitment etc. may be studied in different management systems with differing levels of effectiveness.