1.1 Introduction

When considering various characteristics that comprise elements of an effective school, there are plenty of pieces within a school and school system to pull such inspiration from. One could consider the administrative level of a school, faculty/staff (involvement, professionalism, relationships with students), assessment, student involvement, parents, community members, extra-curricular programming, the physical layout of a school, resources available, volunteers, finances, or location - the list goes on, depending on your perspective. None of these characteristics is any more or less important than the others; however, many may vary in prevalence across the spectrum, depending on the school being considered.

One characteristic that apparent in an effective school is when staff (teachers, admin, and support staff) are team-oriented; by this it means that the staff enthusiastically participate in PLCs, volunteer their time to the school and students, involve parents and community members, and support each other and the school environment via
various interest committees. By teachers, administrative and support staff participating in committees with each other, they are building their collegial relationships and act as resources for each other through the exchange of ideas and planning processes that happen as they work towards a common goal. This is also important for communication between staff; the more information made aware to staff, the more knowledgably they can inform parents and students and in turn, receive respect as professionals from the community surrounding the school. By having staff who are able to share ideas and plan together effectively (always with the students' best interests in mind!), it is my impression that students would be able to enjoy school more as an academically and socially fulfilling place. School becomes a place where they can learn in a positive, supportive academic environment, and build relationships as they grow socially.

Another characteristic of an effective school is a school that is student-centred. It is extremely important that teachers, administrative and support staff are aware as their role(s) in the school systems as more than a job; they are mentors, caregivers, and are present to support children to give them the tools they need for success throughout their academic years, and tools that they carry throughout their entire lives. This is evident in classrooms where
teachers practice more than the "stand and deliver" teaching methods; instead they switch up activities and materials each day to address various learning styles and abilities present in their classroom. This is also evident as administration addresses the importance of these, providing staff with resources in approaching these practices when teaching and interacting with students. Teachers who take personal inventory of students (interest in them outside of their grades and in-class time) by getting to know their students through informal conversations at school are also important in establishing relationships with students that enable trust and approachability.

Whether a school has an abundance of money or very limited funds, the effectiveness of a school can be greater than any monetary value that a school can hold on its resources; this is by having staff who is innovative and creative with what resources they do have, knowing how to use these within the dynamics of their classroom. Schools can have reputable and highly priced learning programs, but if staff cannot adapt their materials to each of their individual students in a way that works for the entire class, such programs are not very effective. An ability to reach each of your students - no matter the fancy resources or limited amount of them - shows that a
staff has taken the time to innovatively plan to work the curriculum around each students’ needs to meet objectives and to develop student confidence in learning.

Assessment can be another characteristic of effective schools; staff can use assessment not only to see how students are scoring in comparison with other schools (or provinces, etc.), but also to self-reflect on themselves. Assessments on students show teachers what objectives they could be spending more time on while teaching; this could show more about various learning needs in their schools and how to assist teachers in attaining the resources needed to address these. Using assessments as cues for improved teaching methods are effective for students (academically - grades and learning confidence), teachers (learning to teach more effectively), and for parents (having confidence in their child’s teacher as self-reflecting and striving to improve to meet the learning needs in the classroom).

Having a support staff that can assist teachers in the classrooms is definitely a part of having an effective school. Whether the classroom has children with special needs or not, an EA being present definitely makes a difference in the availability of attention that students can receive during their learning. There are often extremely wide learning ranges in classrooms; with Differentiated
Instruction and the Adaptive Dimension becoming more present in classrooms, having another teacher present can only benefit a classroom. Students on the higher end can have their learning needs met, students who are "middle of the road" can work with confidence, and students with learning disabilities or alternative learning styles can have the support of another teacher in the classroom, working at a pace that allows them to learn, and in turn can feel good about their abilities.

1.2 Effective Schools

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

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

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

Research in the area of school effectiveness followed a predominant ‘paradigm’ by which researchers explained variation in
children’s educational growth over time by variations in home background, community characteristics and individual intellectual and personal attributes. Now the findings of school effectiveness research are increasingly used in educational debate and are increasingly being accessed by practitioners wanting a knowledge base to inform their improvement programmes in schools (Cuttance, 1992). The development of this field over time has been extensively described by experts (Creemers and Scheerens 1989 and Reynolds 1992). In both the United States and Britain, studies by Coleman, (1966). Jenks, (1972) and the British Plowden Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (1967) concluded that schools brought little independent influence to bear upon the development of their pupils. This period was gradually followed in both the societies by the emergence of a wide range of effective schools. School effectiveness or school effects studies, which argue for the importance of school influence, began in the United States with various qualitative case studies and moved on at a wide range of quantitative studies. In Britain, it started with the work by Power (1967), Gath (1987), Reynolds (1976, 1982, Reynolds 1987), Rutter (1979), Falloway (1985) and Gray (1990). Subsequent studies have been made by Smith and Tomilinson (1989) and by Scheerens (1992), Mortimore (1993) and Creemers (1994) in multicultural schools. A
number of studies have shown correlations between teaching and learning and school teacher effectiveness. Sammons (1995) reported that academic emphasis like including regular setting and monitoring of home work and high entry rates appear to be features of more highly academically effective schools. They further report (1995) that the ineffective schools had experienced high staff turnover and secure staff shortage in specialist subjects that were seen to have acted as barriers to effectiveness.

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

The last two decades have seen increasing academic interest in the study of school and teacher effectiveness in promoting pupils' educational outcomes. This interest arose originally in response to the pessimistic interpretation of findings by researchers in the US (Coleman et al 1966; Jencks et al 1972) concerning the potential influence of the school (and by implication, therefore, of teachers and
their classroom practice) on pupils' attainment. On the basis of such analysis it was argued that whether a pupil attended a particular school A rather than B was unimportant. Attainment was seen as primarily determined by such factors as IQ, socio-economic status and race, with schools and teachers making little difference in comparison. It is important to note, however, that Coleman et al (1966) and Jencks et al (1972) researches were not intended to imply that schooling and teaching have no influence on learning. One only has to look at literacy rates in countries where access to schooling is limited on the basis of income and gender to demonstrate the positive effects of access to education. Rather, their work concerned the extent to which individual schools, with all their variations in organization, leadership and curriculum, differ in their diversity in classroom practices and have a differential impact on pupils' learning and development and thus in terms of pupils educational outcomes. The studies by Coleman et al (1966) and Jencks et al (1972) stimulated some researchers to study the nature of any specific school and teacher influences on pupils educational outcomes in more depth. In other words, they addressed the question of whether variation in the processes of schooling, including what goes on in the classroom, makes some schools or teachers more effective than others.
Receiving the Coleman (1966) Jencks (1972) conclusion as a challenge, some educators set out to disprove or modify it by locating and describing schools that serve children from poor families where achievement gains were unusually high (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Klitgaard and Hall, 1972; Weber, 1971; Wisenbaker, 1979; Edmonds, 1979b; Phi Delta Kappa, 1980;). (Coleman 1966).

Organizational effectiveness remains a complex and difficult problem for both theorists and researchers as well as for practitioners. There is no general agreement on the definition of the concept let alone its measurements. In fact, Goodman and Pennings (1977) argue that effectiveness is one of the most pervasive yet least delineated constructs in the study of organizations.

School effectiveness has emerged as a recent popular topic among educational researchers. The works of Coleman (1976), Rutter (1979), Brookover (1979), Edmonds (1979) and Madaus (1980) are typical of educational studies on effective schools. However, much of the research has been criticized on measurement, statistical, methodological and theoretical grounds. It appears that the research on effective schools is limited by the same weaknesses as the research on effective organizations the absence of both a sound
theoretical framework and careful definition and measurement of the concept.

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

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

There has long been a tradition of writing about a particular school as a way of trumpeting certain values that the school embodied, but the climate of the times tended to define the "good school". In the progressive era, certain schools were singled out.
because of their anti-traditional features, such as their combination of work and play or their engagement in the school life of the surrounding community.

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

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

Researches focus on school effectiveness refers to emphasize the importance of the principal's leadership (Harris et al., 2003). Education administrators not only need to set educational goals and standard, but also need to achieve the goal by establishing the procedures and policies. The school effectiveness is affected by the relationship between principals and other administrators, teachers, parents, students and others in the community. For the school's development, principals are in charge of the school's budgets and responsible to prepare reports on finances, student performance.
students' further development, school should establish a purposeful and orderly environment which is helpful to learning and forming the good character (US Department of Labor, 2010). Competent principals are needed to operate the education institution successfully.

According to McGuire's (2001) analysis, leaders must develop, nurture and support staff. A standard for behavior criterion should be set by effective leaders. They are seeking for different perspectives, and refuse points-of-view. Leaders should encourage initiatives, innovations and collaborations, besides staff's personal growth should be supported. Organizations should provide all kinds of opportunities for staff's professional growth. To be a successful leader, cooperation and collaboration are needed to deal with daily basis. The success of the principal is not an overnight action, it depends on the principal's hard work and the all the teacher's collaboration. It is also the power to pull all the participants together. With effectiveness leadership, understanding and trust will be fostered between principals and staffs. They can build partnerships, share credit and secure resources for accomplishment. The option is hold by Spencer and Kochan (2000) that principal's leadership style is the key element to the school effectiveness, while even the best of parental and teacher's efforts will be ruined by ineffective leaders.
After using the quantitative analysis, it is shown that the idealized effect leadership styles and the school effectiveness are related, when the idealized behavior leadership styles increased, the school effectiveness also increased (Zembat, 2010). The principal effectiveness and their leadership styles are parallel relationship; school managers should be offered the training to make their leadership skills more efficiency. At the same time, all stakeholders including students, parents and teachers have the right to know clearly about the school’s situation. The similar conclusion is drawn by Reynolds (2010), it has pointed that school administrator’s leadership qualities is vital to organization health. With transformational leadership styles, principals can manage the school more successfully. If there is more cooperation between teachers, it will be better to develop professional school, make full use of resources, and more productive and efficient. In that way, teacher will form the sense of belonging and have fewer pressures.

1.3 Measuring Effectiveness

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Summary of Effective School Characteristics as Identified in Nine Major Effective School Studies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strong administrative leadership</td>
<td>• Characteristics influencing reading achievements</td>
<td>Schools with increasing reading scores exhibited:</td>
<td>• Emphasis on accomplishing reading and math objectives</td>
<td>• Coordination of curriculum, instruction, and testing on specified objectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High expectations for children's achievements</td>
<td>• Strong leadership</td>
<td>• A general sense of education purposes</td>
<td>• Teachers believe students can master basic skill objectives</td>
<td>• A focus on educational needs of low achieving students;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An orderly atmosphere conducive to learning</td>
<td>• Atmosphere of order purposefulness, and pleasure in learning</td>
<td>• Positive leadership from the building principal</td>
<td>• High expectations for students' educational</td>
<td>• Emphasis on higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong emphasis on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis on basic skill acquisition</th>
<th>Frequent monitoring of pupil progress</th>
<th>Accomplishment order</th>
<th>Cognitive skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• High expectations</td>
<td>• Additional reading personnel</td>
<td>• More time spent in direct reading instruction</td>
<td>• Assured availability of materials and resources for teaching;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of phonics in the reading program</td>
<td>• Individualization</td>
<td>• Less satisfied staff</td>
<td>• Minimum of record keeping tasks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Careful evaluation of student progress</td>
<td>• Ongoing inservice training;</td>
<td>• Less overall parent involvement, but more parent initiated involvement</td>
<td>• Coordinated required homework;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High expectations for student performance</td>
<td>• Reading curriculum</td>
<td>• Compensatory education programs with less emphasis on paraprofessional staff and involvement of teachers in identifying compensatory education students</td>
<td>• Instructional planning emphasizing grade-level decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High expectations for student learning;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff supervision based on student achievement in basic skills;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of phonics in the reading program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Comparative monitoring of student progress on a class-by-class basis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individualization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Outstanding administrative leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Careful evaluation of student progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes in effective schools include:</td>
<td>Gains in reading performance are associated with:</td>
<td>Characteristics of effective schools:</td>
<td>Elements contributing to school effectiveness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students actively engaged in learning activities</td>
<td>• Teachers' strong sense of efficacy and high expectations for students</td>
<td>• High expectations for student performance;</td>
<td>• Clearly stated rules consistently, fairly, and firmly enforced;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Praise freely given; discipline applied infrequently but firmly;</td>
<td>• Orderly classrooms;</td>
<td>• Good school atmosphere;</td>
<td>• Teachers with high job satisfaction in agreement with principal's procedures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A general attitude and expectation for academic success;</td>
<td>• High level of parent-teacher contacts and parent-principal contact;</td>
<td>• Clear focus on basic skills;</td>
<td>• Cohesiveness among teachers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students responsible for personal and school duties and resources;</td>
<td>• Ongoing inservice training;</td>
<td>• Small group instruction;</td>
<td>• Material and moral support from central administration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Immediate feedback on acceptable performance;</td>
<td>• Balance between principal's strong leadership role and teachers' autonomy;</td>
<td>• Interchange of ideas among staff.</td>
<td>• Emphasis on academic success; rewards for individual improvement and achievement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff consensus on school values and aims;</td>
<td>• Teacher flexibility in modifying and adapting instructional approaches.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Class size designed to increase sense of personal relationship between student and teacher:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear guidelines and principles for student behavior;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• High staff morale;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clean, comfortable environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong schools spirit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff concern for individual and group student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students' belief that school subject matter is relevant and valuable;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students' sense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the important British Secondary School Study of Rutter et al (1979) the factors that were linked with effectiveness were grouped under the following broad Head:

The pupils control system, with effective schools using rewards

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

Coleman et al (1979) showed that it was much more a question of the ethos or culture of the school as a whole. But within an effective school culture there are certain pre-requisites.

- A commitment to clearly and commonly identified norms and goals

Reprinted with permission from “Effective Schools: A Review” by Purkey (1983)
Collaborative planning, shared decision-making and collegial work in a framework of experimentation and evaluation

Positive leadership in initiating and maintaining improvement

Staff stability

A strategy for continuing staff development related to each school’s pedagogical and organizational needs

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

A high level of parental involvement and support

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

Maximum use of learning time

The active and substantial support of the responsible education authority.

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

Purposeful leadership by the Head teacher

The involvement of the deputy Head teacher

The involvement of teachers

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

- Strong principal leadership and attention to the quality of instruction
- A pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus
- An orderly safe climate conducive to teaching and learning
- Teacher behaviours that convey the expectation that all students are expected to obtain at least a basic mastery of simple skills
The use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for programme evaluation.

Wilson’s (1989) study of exceptionally successful secondary schools generated a list of common elements in their effective schools that has distinct similarities with findings from the British Secondary School Studies. Their common elements were:

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

Sammons, Hillman and Mortimore (1995) provide a description of eleven key factors or correlates of effectiveness identified from their literature review.
■ Professional leadership
  Firm and purposeful
  A participative approach
  The leading profession

■ Shared vision and goals
  Unity of purpose
  Consistency of practice
  Collegiality and collaboration

■ A learning environment
  An orderly atmosphere
  An attractive working environment

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

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

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

■ Positive reinforcement
  Clear and fair discipline of feedback

■ Monitoring progress
  Monitoring pupil performance
  Evaluating school performance

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

■ Home school partnership
  Parental involvement in their children’s learning

■ A learning organization
  School-based staff development

While the seven correlates continue to appear in the replication research, it should be noted that our knowledge and understanding of each correlate is deeper and broader than it was in the early 1980’s.
The correlates were defined as follows:

**Clear School Mission** - In the effective school, there is a clearly articulated school mission through which the staff shares an understanding of and commitment to instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures and accountability. Staff accepts responsibility for students' learning of the school's essential curricular goals.

**High Expectations for Success** - In the effective school, there is a climate of expectation in which the staff believes and demonstrates that all students can attain mastery of the essential content and school skills, and the staff also believes that they have the capability to help all students achieve that mastery.

**Instructional Leadership** - In the effective school, the principal acts as an instructional leader and effectively and persistently communicates that mission to the staff, parents, and students. The principal understands and applies the characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program.

**Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress** - In the effective school, student academic progress is measured frequently. A variety of assessment procedures are used. The results of the assessments are
used to improve individual student performance and also to improve the instructional program.

**Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task** - In the effective school, teachers allocate a significant amount of classroom time to instruction in the essential content and skills. For a high percentage of this time students are engaged in whole class or large group, teacher-directed, planned learning activities.

**Safe and Orderly Environment** - In the effective school, there is an orderly, purposeful, businesslike atmosphere which is free from the threat of physical harm. The school climate is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning.

**Home - School Relations** - In the effective school, parents understand and support the school's basic mission and are given the opportunity to play an important role in helping the school to achieve that mission.

What is unique about the correlates is that they are the only, set of research based characteristics of a school's climate associated with improved, better student learning. They are the only set of research identified constructs with which to analyze that complex
social organization called a school in order to cause the school as a whole to improve.

1.5 Concept of School Effectiveness

Researchers generally lack consensus on what constitutes school effectiveness: It has been argued in the input-output perspective (Cheng, 1996; Lockheed and Hanushek, 1988); in the perspective of schools in which students progress further than might be expected from consideration of its intake (Sammons and Mortimore, 1995); growth in student achievement (Willms, 1992); and on a more broader stand that should not focus on mere academic achievement (Rutter, 1983; Sammons et al., 1996; Mc Gaw et al. (1992). Reynolds et al (1996) are of the view that effectiveness is dependent on people and the resources available. Hence the difficulty in defining school effectiveness is dependent on people who are forced to choose from competing values. (Stoll and Fink, 1996).

There is an argument that a school is effective if school processes result in observable (not always quantifiable) positive outcomes among its students consistently over a period of time (Reynolds, 1985; Ninan, 2006) This implies that the effectiveness of a school is dependent more on its 'processes' and gauged by its
'outcomes' than on its 'intake'. 'Intake', plays only a marginal role in school effectiveness. This is in contrast with the argument that differential effects of schools plays a role in school effectiveness (Teddle and Reynolds, 2000).

Mortimore's view was that an effective school adds an extra value to its students' outcomes in comparison with other schools serving similar intakes (Sammons and Mortimore, 1995). This concept of the 'value added' by the school resulted in a need to explicitly focus on student outcomes in all methodologies involving school effectiveness research (McPherson, 1992). This then led to methodological issues such as consistency and stability in effectiveness.

Hoy and Miskel (2001) argued that a school is deemed as effective if the outcome of its activities meets or exceeds its goals. Relevant here is the view that an effective school is one that promotes high levels of student achievement for all students in the school (Murphy, 1990) It is no surprise, therefore that academic emphasis and frequent monitoring of student academic progress has been viewed as important correlates of an effective school (Al Waner, 2005). An effective school hence is a school that can achieve or exceed its academic goals. A rather different view is that schools are
effective if their pupils perform at a higher than average level than an average school (Cuttance, 1985) school effectiveness is the ability of a school to achieve or exceed its goals. The goals set should be reflective of students' academic ability. There is a need to take value added scores into consideration of prior achievement of pupils on entry to school (Sammons et al, 1996a in Teddlie and Reynolds, 2000). An effective school hence is argued as a school that can achieve or exceed its prior set goals.

An Australian view that effective schools are those that successfully progress the learning and personal development of all of their students (ACT, 2005) is a stark contrast from the UK and USA perspective of an effective school being judged merely by academic performance. Though studies give various perspectives of what constitutes school effectiveness or what an effective school is, the diversified views lead to the conclusion that

'...... while all reviews assume that effective schools can be differentiated from ineffective ones, there is no consensus yet on just what constitutes an effective school.'

(Reid, Hopkins and Holly, 1987)
Schreersens (2000) adds that ‘School effectiveness is a difficult concept to define and once defined is of a nature difficult to reason’.

Hence the concept of school effectiveness has various approaches and as Firestone (1991) noted that ‘Defining the effectiveness of a particular school always requires choices among competing values’. Hence he further adds that ‘the criteria of effectiveness will be a subject of political debate’.

**Eight Key Factors of School Effectiveness (Coleman 2010)**

The start of the school year is a busy time for school heads, as they work with their teams to implement their school improvement plans. An effective school is most certainly the aim of these plans. But what does effectiveness really look like? And how does a school achieve it? Eight key factors that can provide a foundation to guide heads in their school-improvement efforts. The eight factors of school effectiveness are as follows;

1. **Strong and Effective Principal Leadership**

First and foremost, the literature suggests that strong and effective principal leadership has a profound influence on student achievement and is second in this regard only to classroom teaching. Such leadership involves firm and purposeful behaviour that “puts
children first” and is based on a strong belief in the capabilities of students and teachers. It also involves sharing leadership responsibilities and exhibiting instructional leadership by maintaining high visibility, actively supervising instruction, protecting instructional time and providing a supportive work environment. In addition, effective principals monitor staff performance, recruit talented staff and promote professional development in their schools.

2. Sustained Focus on Instruction and Learning

A pervasive focus on instruction and learning is also central to school effectiveness, according to the research. Effective schools focus on academics by ensuring high curriculum coverage that offers rich learning opportunities for students, and they maximize learning time at both the school and classroom levels. Such schools also focus on the mastery of key learning skills and create blocks of time for literacy and mathematics.

3. Safe and Positive School Climate and Culture

The literature suggests that establishing a school climate characterized by shared goals, safety and a positive student culture supports effectiveness. Creating a shared vision and a collaborative
learning community and maintaining an orderly environment in which learning can take place lead to effectiveness. Research has identified positive reinforcement as an important contributor to the development of positive student attitudes toward school and school staff. Reinforcement that is specific, varied, timely and consistently applied has been found to be most effective.

4. High Expectations for all Students and Staff

The literature consistently points to the importance of setting high and appropriate expectations for both students and school staff. In the case of students, these include expectations for both achievement and behaviour, which should be clearly communicated to students and parents. Where staff is concerned, these include expectations for participation in professional development, time management, prioritizing academic achievement and monitoring student work and achievement.

5. Effective Use of Student Achievement Data

The literature identifies the effective use of data at both the school and classroom levels as contributing to school effectiveness. This use includes rigorous, regular monitoring of student progress in order to provide both differentiated learning experiences and
appropriate support to meet the needs of students. In effective schools, staff members have access to both outcome and process data, and these are used to evaluate whether or not school goals are being achieved. When data are being used effectively, both student- and school-level decisions are grounded in analysis.

6. Teaching Practice

The literature suggests that a variety of teaching practices correlate with effective schools. These practices include maximizing the use of class time, preparing lessons in advance that provide for different student needs, communicating clearly with students about the purpose of lessons and what the students are to do and working with manageable curriculum units. Effective schools also provide a balanced, relevant and stimulating curriculum that is shaped and presented to match students' needs, and set high standards for teaching.

7. Productive Parent Involvement

The literature points to the importance of involving parents productively. Effective schools engage parents in activities that offer the greatest impact on student achievement, such as becoming involved in their children's school work. Other useful approaches to
involving parents include an “open door” school policy, parent assistance in the classroom and on field trips, and the mutual sharing of student progress information with parents.

8. Building Staff Skills

School effectiveness is strongly correlated with the provision of high quality on-site staff development. Practical professional development opportunities closely synchronized with school-development priorities, and collaborative learning communities that take shared responsibility for student outcomes are key.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The frequent topic of conversation in the midst of perspective of learners is school effectiveness. The people who generally discuss school effectiveness employ terms such as “accountability”, “quality”, “drop out rates, faculty morale”, “school atmosphere”, “organizational health”, “organizational culture”, school atmosphere”, and so on. This acute interest in correlates of school effectiveness is neither a new phenomenon nor unique to education. Correlates of school effectiveness represents such a central theme in the theory and practice of perspective of learner and the institution are no longer to be avoided. Organizational effectiveness remains a complex and
difficult problem for both theories and researchers as well as for practitioners. There is no general agreement on the definition of the concept let alone its measurements. In fact, Goodman and Pennings (1977) argue that effectiveness is one of the most pervasive yet least delineated constructs in the study of organizations. They defined an effective school as one that “brings the children of the poor to those minimal masters of basis school skills that now described minimally successful pupil performance for the children of the middle class”. This is too narrow a definition. An effective school exhibits pupil performance relatively on par with or above the achievement of other schools with comparable student populations, that is socio-economic background and resources. To this, another dimension of reputation and client satisfaction is added. An effective school should be recognized as such by those who use its facilities and resources and by external observes who claim expertise in educational practice and / or assessment. In sum, the effective school competes favourably in terms of output, support and reputation within its comparable cohort of schools.

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

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

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

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

Reynolds (1992) predicted that the 1990s will see an increase in the influence that schools have over the development of young people. He suggested that a variety of factors would be responsible for this phenomena. Reynolds argued that the result of such changes, in the short term at least, is likely to be the development of their pupils. This period has been gradually followed in both the USA and UK by the emergence of a wide range of 'effective schools', school effectiveness or school effects' studies which argue for the importance of school influence, beginning in the United States with various qualitative case studies and a wide range of quantitative studies in these two societies has been recently rejoined by those from the Netherlands, Australia and Canada and by a recent resurgence of studies done in the about Third World Societies.

The 21st century saw the rapid rise of quality assurance and effectiveness measures in most industries and organisations. These trends were very much reflected in education at all levels. An associated emergent trend in secondary and secondary education in Australia was growth in the use of standardized measures of student achievement that increasingly served (and continue to serve) as a
major source of data in judging school effectiveness. While cognitive measures are important outcomes of schooling, it is reasonable to argue that interpretations of quality and effectiveness that do not include affective measures. In particular, these criteria sacrifice what may be regarded as more complex and aesthetic measures of quality and effectiveness, such as student perceptions of aspects of their life at school.

The 21st Century saw the rapid rise of quality assurance in most industries and organisations, and in education quality assurance was epitomized as a concern with school effectiveness. Effectiveness measures most often took the form of standardized measures of student achievement in basic skills, and these measures remain the most salient today. While student cognitive development is an essential outcome of schooling, it is argued that interpretations of quality and effectiveness that do not include affective outcomes are inadequate as measures of desirable schooling outcomes.

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

The expanding role of schools in terms of developing the whole student is certainly evident in the literature. The National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (Sawatzki, 1993), for example, recommended that, in the context of the major economic and societal restructuring that had taken place in the late 20th century, schools needed to change their teaching and learning practices to ensure that students were more highly educated and skilled citizens. Similarly, recent investigations of the teaching service in New South Wales have highlighted that modern society demanded that students be provided with the broadest range of skills and knowledge whilst at school (Ramsey, 2000). Ramsey reported that this was especially important as the delineation between work, social, and learning participation was becoming less clear. This reflected a much earlier emphasis on school as the bridge between the child and adult world as an agent of socialization.
Purposefully or otherwise, there was a shift away from a broad range of educational outcomes. Whilst school and educational departments espouse that the education of students is undertaken across a diversity of outcomes, it would appear that school evaluation, student assessment, and school based research emphasize achievement of a limited range of academic outcomes at the expense of the broader educational curriculum. Schooling forms a major part of the life of children (Ainley and Bourke, 1992) and school and classroom environments have many attributes of adult workplaces (Schofield and Bourke, 1997; Leonard, 2002). Children spend a similar number of hours each day at school as are spent at work by many members of the work force; they undertake mental and physical tasks of similar duration and intensity to many workers; their output is monitored by superiors; and, as with many workplaces, they have a regimented daily routine. Hence in the same way that quality of life is important in adult life, it would appear obvious that student quality of school life is also most important for young persons and is related to many more factors than simply achievement. Quality and effectiveness need to be considered across a broader range of outcomes.
Safe and happy schools and effective learning are promoted when classrooms are rewarding, stimulating environments where students and teachers want to be. The benefits for students and educators of an increased awareness of the nature of positive and negative impacts on student quality of school life, such as satisfaction and stress (respectively), are obvious. It is contended that students who feel good about themselves and are excited and stimulated by their school environment, are more likely to be students who are ready to learn. Students who want to learn will want to be at school and are likely to make an increased effort to attend. An associated improvement in teacher morale and reduction in absenteeism may also be evident (Leonard, et al, 2003).

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

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

Schools directly or indirectly touch on the life of almost everyone in modern society, whether as student, parent, teacher, employer or consumer of the goods and services produced by school leavers. Education is a major undertaking of governments around the world. Schools account for a substantial proportion of public and private expenditure, averaging around 4 percent of GDP in OECD countries. The NSW Department of School Education is one of the largest employers in Australia, and has a budget of well over $3 billion annually. In return for this investment, high hopes are held for education as an instrument of social and economic policy for the betterment of individual, community and national well-being. It
therefore should come as no surprise that there is intense interest in knowing whether schools are delivering value for money — how effective schooling is and how it can be improved (Hill, Rowe and Holmes-Smith, 1995).

Such interest is not new, but may have become more intense, as moves to "reconstruct" poor performing schools takes hold. The education indicators movement of the late 1980s re-focussed attention on the need for both educational accountability and improvement to be based on accurate, reliable and defensible collection, dissemination and utilization of information. The measurement of student outcomes as a reflection of school effectiveness is an essential and integral part of such information systems. Hill (1995) notes that the need for reliable information and measurement has been understood for some time by those in industry and business, and the message is becoming increasingly clear within education.

From all these works it is clear that schools do have substantial effects upon pupils and that there are processes that work across schools to maximize their outcomes.
Secondary education provides a fundamental base for all further schooling training or self-developing the capacity to cope with rapidly evolving and changing societies in an information age. Its universal availability and quality are central to the human resource capacity of any society.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Today 95 percent of population is served by a secondary school within a 1 km radius. However, the large scale expansion of schooling resulted in the creation of educational facilities with widely varying quality in terms of institutional infrastructure, teaching learning processes, as well as the quality of students passing out of these institutions. It is against this backdrop that the National Policy on Education (1986) called for paying immediate attention to:

- Improving the unattractive school environment, the unsatisfactory condition of buildings, and the inadequacy of instructional materials; and
• Laying down minimum levels of learning (MLLs) that all children completing different stages of education should achieve.

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

Quality education plays an essential part of economic and social development of the nations. “Economic benefits of education flow not only to the individual but also to society through lower social transfers and through the additional taxes individuals pay once they enter the labour market” (OECD 2010). School education lays the foundation for lifelong knowledge and skill development of the
humanity. School effectiveness refers to the extent to which the goals set by the school management or school boards or school departments of the State governments have been achieved. It is a multi dimensional concept. One of the important measures of school effectiveness is the performance of the students in a public examination. Comparison of performance of students of various schools is no longer limited to national level. International comparative studies of student performance have come out with varied performance indicators.

Efforts to have effective schools result in educational innovations in terms of ideas or practices new to a specific educational context that meets unsatisfied needs. The notion that private fee charging schools are more effective than government schools has resulted in efforts among poor parents for education of their children in fee charging private schools. Preference for private schools arise out of the consideration that pupil teacher ratio in these schools is much lower than that of government schools. As per EFA Global Monitoring Report 2010, the world student teacher ratio for pre-primary education was 20. In case of various types of countries, the ratio was: Countries in transition - 8, Developed countries - 15 and Developing countries - 28. In case of regions, it varied from 9
(Central and Eastern Europe) to 40 (South and West Asia). The figure in case of other regions were: Central Asia -11, North America and Western Europe -14, Pacific - 17, Arab States -18, Latin America and the Caribbean - 21, East Asia- 21, East Asia and the Pacific -21; Caribbean - 32, Sub-Saharan Africa - 28. (UNESCO 2010). In India, the situation is not very bright. For instance, in Orissa State, the general class for higher secondary students (Aged 17 and 18 years) attached to junior college has a class size of 128 students, whereas a private fee charging school will have a class size of 50 students. In such situations, standards of school effectiveness may not be generalised, as the expectations from rural schools may be different than from those in case of urban schools. As the operating systems vary, there may not be standards for school effectiveness. In operational terms, it may not be appropriate to have even nationalised text books.

School effectiveness also depends on the quality of its intake. Many children in poor regions suffer from under nutrition. Hence, there is limited scope for high quality functioning of the brain of a large number of children, which affects school effectiveness in terms of pupil attainment, compared to schools in developed regions. Similarly, there are large numbers of orphan children created by
natural catastrophes. They are at higher risk than non-orphans of discrimination, social exclusion, dropping out of school and poor access to basic health care. There are roaming schools, which move along with roaming population. There are also schools in difficult areas such as hilly pockets, islands, and deserts. In spite of efforts of SSA, the school conditions in large number of difficult areas are poor. The school effectiveness expectations are rightly influenced by rural development including roads and transport facilities. Hence, the expectations of school effectiveness will vary from one geographical region to another.

Study of school effectiveness is an important factor. Such studies have become part of the school systems of advanced nations. "Paralleling the movement toward developing curriculum standards for students, standards for schools have also been developed for the purpose of school evaluation" (Faubert 2009). Studies on school effectiveness are carried out at two levels: internal and external. Internal study helps teachers and school authorities in improving learning of the students by improving quality of teaching and management. External study compares effectiveness of schools within a State system and in relation to schools in other countries. Findings from studies on school effectiveness are used by various
stakeholders: parents, school heads, school management, school grant providers and policy makers. Findings of school effectiveness studies help to publicise and disseminate experiences and best practices and also suggest follow up measures necessary for improving school effectiveness. Sample study on school effectiveness gives quick feedback to educational planners.

The present investigation is titled as "A Study of Correlates of Effectiveness of Secondary Schools". No doubt that, every one is interested in knowing how schools are effectively functioning for one or the other reasons. The government is interested to knowing how its investment is utilized effectively. As a citizen one is interested in knowing what has happened to the sum paid by means of tax. Educational administrators look from the view point of resources. They want to ensure that the available resources are effectively utilized. A parent expects that the school gives good education to his child. Students want schools to be places where they can enjoy learning. To a person living in a particular locality, the school should be a pride to his locality. Hence, a school can be considered effective in the functioning to the extent that it satisfies the expectations of various persons concerned.
Studies on “School effectiveness” in foreign countries, initially considered variables such as achievement literacy and numeracy, lateron, some studies used factor like absenteeism, behaviour in school, school atmosphere, school organizational health, classroom climate and organizational culture, delinquency and public examination results to measure school effectiveness. From mid 1970s, the study about school effectiveness has taken a new look from the view point of accountability and productivity. In the year 1982, Ronald Edwards observed the characteristics of schools are important determinants of academic achievement research studies have also revealed that individual school variance is an important dimension that can be influenced by selected actions and resources.

The present study aims to identifying certain variables responsible for school variance that account differences effectiveness in the Indian context. The present investigation related to the following factors influencing effective schools, for detailed investigation.

1.8 Variables of the Study

1. Students Related Variables
   a. Students’ behavioural adjustment to school
   b. Students' personal effectiveness
2. Teachers Related Variables
   a. Teachers' involvement in school activities
   b. Teachers' job satisfaction in schools

3. Heads of Schools Related Variables
   a. Leadership qualities of Heads of schools
   b. Time management of Heads of schools

4. Institution Related Variables
   a. Organizational culture
   b. Organizational health

1.9 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the present study are:

1. To identify the correlates of effective schools
2. To identify the discriminating variables with reference to high average and low effective schools.
3. To ascertain the relative strength of the variables that contributes to the effectiveness of schools.
4. To study the students' behaviour adjustment to school in high average and low effective schools.
   a. To study the dimensions of students' behaviour adjustment to schools in high, average and low effective school.
1. Studiousness
   
2. Compliance
   
3. Teacher contact

5. To study the students' personal effectiveness in high, average and low effective schools.
   
   a. To study the dimensions of students' personal effectiveness in high, average and low effective schools
      
      (i) Self Disclosure
      
      (ii) Openness to Feedback
      
      (iii) Perceptiveness

6. To study the teachers' involvement in school activities in high, average and low effective schools.
   
   a. To study the dimensions of teachers' involvement in school activities in high, average and low effective schools
      
      i. Planning the school work
      
      ii. Decision making
      
      iii. Administration
      
      iv. Extra curricular activities

7. To study the teachers' job satisfaction in high, average and low effective schools
   
   a. To study the dimensions teachers' job satisfaction in high, average and low effective schools.
i. Intrinsic aspect of the job

ii. Salary, Promotional Avenues and Service Conditions

iii. Institutional plan and policies

iv. Satisfaction with authorities

v. Satisfaction with social status and family welfare

vi. Rapport with students

vii. Relationship with co-workers

8. To study the leadership qualities of Heads of schools in high, average and low effective schools.

   a. to study the dimensions of leadership qualities of Heads of schools in high, average and low effective schools.

      i. Assertative administration

      ii. Instructional leadership

      iii. Assumption of responsibility

      iv. Personal vision and character

      v. Decision making

      vi. Standard

9. To study the time management of Heads of schools in high, average and low effective schools.

   a. To study the dimensions of time management of Heads of schools in high, average and low effective schools.
i. Knowledge of time management
ii. Attitude towards time management

10. To study the organizational culture in high, average and low effective schools.
   a. To study the dimensions of school atmosphere in high, average and low effective schools.

11. To study the organizational health in high, average and low effective schools.
   a. To study the dimensions of organizational health in high, average and low effective schools.
   i. Institutional integrity
   ii. Principal influence
   iii. Consideration
   iv. Initiating structure
   v. Resource support
   vi. Morale
   vii. Academic emphasis

12. To find out whether government, aided and private schools differ in the selected variables.

13. To find out whether boys, girls and co-education schools differ in the selected variables.
1.10 Limitations of the Study

1. The study is limited to only Government, aided and unaided secondary schools situated in Hubli-Dharwad corporation area.

2. The study is limited to a sample of 450 students, 225 teachers and 45 Heads of schools selected at random from 45 secondary schools.