

A Study of Student Correlates of School Effectiveness at Secondary School Level

Dr. Noorjehan N. Ganihar
Professor , Department of Education
Karnatak University, Dharwad-580 001

Abstract: No doubt that every one is interested in knowing how schools are effectively functioning for one or the other reason. A school is said to be effective which it achieves its objective using the available reasons efficiently and economically.

The students' development and a well academic environment are the primary targets of the effective school. The principal has focused on well structured teaching activities, academic goals and students' high achievement. Students are monitored to progress and allowed to provide feedback of the school to enhance effectiveness. Agreed with Zembat (2010), the school provides a secure and safe environment for students and teachers to learn and teach, the teachers are expected to build respect, acceptance, and warm environment for students. Some teachers pointed out that a rigorous, supportive and optimistic environment is the students expected learn environment. The principal in this school is recognized to be a good example to appropriate use of instruction technology.

For a better school effectiveness, the principal keeps working hard, team work, be a continual leader, determination and being optimistic. It is important to be able to react to the changing demand and face the specific environment. Like it is said by Leithwood et al (2004), the principal emphasizes the importance of students' achievement. It can be observed from the interview that the principal is creative in her collaboration with teacher, committed to students and good at instruction in dealing with changes. There are also specific works for principals such as give praise to excellent teachers, make suggestions, develop effective instruction and so on. All this actions are conducted to enhance or maintain the school effectiveness.

Keywords: School Effectiveness, Correlates, Students' Behaviour, Adjustment

I. Introduction

In ancient times when human social life was very simple, the family used to provide the child with all the activities and experiences that he or she needed for preservation and improvement of his or her life and culture. The child was learning the vocations and life patterns from the adults, from the family, church, religious ceremonies, social functions and so on. In course of time, however, as the society became more complex and life more complicated there was gradual development of human civilization and the quantum of knowledge and experience increased. The home or the family and other primitive agencies were later found inadequate for transmitting the knowledge, skills and values, that is, the cultural heritage from one generation to another. Thus emerged a formal agency of education called the school.

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.

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 United States and Britain, studies by Coleman, (1966). Jenks, (1971) 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 Tomlinson (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 (including regular setting and monitoring of home work) and high GCSE 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 which were seen to have acted as barriers to effectiveness.

THE PROBLEM

The present investigation is entitled as “**A Study of Student Correlates of School Effectiveness at Secondary School Level**”.

No doubt that every one is interested in knowing how schools are effectively functioning for one or the other reason. A school is said to be effective which it achieves its objective. Using the available reasons efficiently and economically.

Studies on school effectiveness, initially considered variables such as achievement, literacy and numeracy and later on some studies used factors like absenteeism, behaviour in school, delinquency and pupils examinations results. The researches so far undertaken reveal that individual school variance is an important dimension that can be influenced by selected actions and resources. The present study aims at identifying certain variables responsible for school variance that account for differences in effectiveness.

II. Review of Related Literature

Isaac (2010) studied “Learning Environment and Secondary School Effectiveness in Nigeria.” This study examined the relationship between learning environment and effectiveness of secondary schools in Nigeria. The descriptive research design of the survey type was used for the study. The study revealed that the learning environment in secondary schools was very conducive and the secondary schools were effective in the affective and the psychomotor domains of learning but not all that effective in the cognitive domain. Based on the findings, it was recommended that the school administrators and other stakeholders in the secondary education sector should strive hard to sustain the tempo of the conducive environment for learning. It was also recommended that schools should sustain the tempo of achievements of the students in the affective and the psychomotor domains of learning. Efforts should also be made at improving upon the level of cognitive achievement of the learners, as this will enhance the improvement on the general level of school effectiveness.

Zembat (2010) studied “The Relationship between the Effectiveness of Preschools and Leadership Styles of School Managers” This study aimed to analyze the relationship between the

effectiveness of preschools and their managers' leadership styles, according to the opinions of teachers and managers from the preschool year of elementary schools and from independent kindergartens. The results indicated a positive meaningful relationship ($p < .01$ and $p < .05$) between the sub-dimensions of the effective school survey and the multifactor leadership styles questionnaire. This finding is indicative of a parallel relationship between the effectiveness of schools and high leadership skills possessed by managers.

Orr (2011) studied "How Graduate-Level Preparation Influences the Effectiveness of School Leaders: A Comparison of the Outcomes of Exemplary and Conventional Leadership Preparation Programs for Principals". This study attempted to determine the influence of exemplary leadership preparation on what principals learn about leadership, their use of effective leadership practices, and how their practices influence school improvement and the school's learning climate. The authors also investigated how the frequency of effective leadership practices related to the strength of district support and the extent of school problems and student poverty. Finally, the authors examined the contribution of exemplary leadership preparation to variations in school improvement progress and school effectiveness climate. The study, using survey research conducted in 2005, compared 65 principals who had graduated from one of four selected exemplary leadership preparation programs to a national sample of 111 principals. These results yield significant implications for policy makers, universities, and other providers of leadership preparation.

III. Objectives of The Study

The objectives of the present study are:

- To identify the correlates of effective schools
- To identify the discriminating variables with reference to high average and low effective schools.
- To ascertain the relative strength of the variables that contribute to the effectiveness of schools.
- 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.
 - i. Studiousness
 - ii. Compliance
 - iii. Teacher contact

To study the students' motivation towards school in high, average and low effective schools.

- i. To study the dimensions of students' motivation towards schools in high, average and low effective schools
- ii. Cognitive domain
- iii. Affective domain and
- iv. Moral domain

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

To find out whether boys, girls and co-education schools differ in the selected variables.

IV. Hypotheses of The Study

The objectives of the study are stated above. The following hypotheses are generated based on the objectives of the study.

1. Major Hypothesis: Students in schools with different levels of effectiveness differ in their behaviour adjustment in schools.

Sub Hypothesis: Students in schools with different levels of effectiveness differ in their –

- a) Studiousness
- b) Students' compliance
- c) Teacher contact

2. Major Hypothesis: Students in schools with different levels of effectiveness differ in their motivation towards schools.

Sub Hypothesis: Students in schools with different levels of effectiveness differ in their –

- a) Cognitive domain
- b) Affective domain
- c) Moral domain

V. Methodology

The present study adopted normative survey type research and the data were collected from students.

SAMPLE

The population of the sample of Dharwad taluka numbering upto 94 formed the sample of the study. The data was collected from 70 schools giving due consideration to the type of management and type of schools. Eight Government schools, twenty six aided schools and fourteen private schools were selected. Out of these seven were boys schools, sixteen girls schools and forty seven co-education schools. Totally the data was collected from 70 schools.

From each school data was collected from ten students selected at random. In all, the data was collected from 70 schools – 700 students schools.

RESEARCH TOOLS

The following tools were administered to students of schools.

All the students were administered the following tools:

- Behaviour in School Inventory by Youngman (1979)
- Kozeki's Motivational Inventory by Kozeki (1983)

DATA COLLECTION

Data was collected from students. The investigator personally visited the 70 schools of Dharwad taluka and with the prior permission of the Heads of schools, administered the tools to ten students of standard X in each school. Clear cut instructions were given to fill up the questionnaires.

VI. Data Analyses

Table-1: Results of t-test for the Variable Students' Behaviour Adjustment to Schools

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Signi.
High	27.8143	0.8398	1.1689	>0.05	NS
Average	27.0968	2.7188			
High	27.8143	0.8398	8.1549	<0.05	S
Low	23.7056	2.1273			
Average	27.0968	2.7188	4.5396	<0.05	S
Low	23.7056	2.1273			

The results of the above table reveal that,

1. High effective schools and average effective schools do not differ significantly with respect to the variable students' behaviour adjustment to schools.
2. High effective schools (Mean=27.8143) and low (Mean=23.7056) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the variable students' behaviour adjustment to schools. High effective schools are high on the students' behavior adjustment to schools than the low effective schools.
3. Average effective schools (Mean=27.0968) and low (Mean=23.7056) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the variable students' behaviour adjustment to schools. Average effective schools are high on the students' behaviour adjustment to schools than the low effective schools.

Table-2: Results of t-test for the Dimension of Students' Behaviour Adjustment to Schools – Studiousness

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Signi.
High	9.5429	0.6087	-1.1109	>0.05	NS
Average	9.8194	1.0226			
High	9.5429	0.6087	3.3820	<0.05	S
Low	8.7056	0.9258			
Average	9.8194	1.0226	3.8018	<0.05	S
Low	8.7056	0.9258			

The results of the above table reveal that,

1. High effective schools and average effective schools do not differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools - Studiousness.
2. High effective schools (Mean=9.5429) and low (Mean=8.7056) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools - Studiousness. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment in schools- Studiousness than the low effective schools.
3. Average effective schools (Mean=9.8194) and low (Mean=8.7056) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to

schools - Studiousness. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools- Studiousness than the low effective schools.

Table-3: Results of t-test for the Dimension of Students' Behaviour Adjustment to Schools - Compliance

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Signi.
High	9.5333	0.3979	0.6947	>0.05	NS
Average	9.3581	1.1057			
High	9.5333	0.3979	6.8405	<0.05	S
Low	8.3556	0.6626			
Average	9.3581	1.1057	3.4909	<0.05	S
Low	8.3556	0.6626			

The results of the above table reveal that,

1. High effective schools and average effective schools do not differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools- Compliance.
2. High effective schools (Mean=9.5333) and low (Mean=8.3556) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to school- Compliance. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools- Compliance than the low effective schools.
3. Average effective schools (Mean=9.3581) and low (Mean=8.3556) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to school- Compliance. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools- Compliance than the low effective schools.

Table-4: Results of the t-test for the Dimension of Students' Behaviour Adjustment to Schools- Teacher Contact

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Signi.
High	8.7381	0.3667	3.9409	<0.05	S
Average	7.9194	0.9005			
High	8.7381	0.3667	8.7537	<0.05	S
Low	6.6444	1.0240			
Average	7.9194	0.9005	4.5429	<0.05	S
Low	6.6444	1.0240			

The results of the above table reveal that,

1. High effective schools (Mean=8.7381) and average (Mean=7.9194) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to school - Teacher contact. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools- Teacher contact than the average effective schools.
2. High effective schools (Mean=8.7381) and low (Mean=6.6444) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to school - Teacher contact. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools- Teacher contact than the low effective schools.
3. Average effective schools (Mean=7.9194) and low (Mean=6.6444) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to

school - Teacher contact. Average effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools - Teacher contact than the low effective schools.

Table-5: Results of t-test for the Variable Students' Motivation Towards Schools

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Signi.
High	13.5714	0.8923	-1.2215	>0.05	NS
Average	14.0097	1.4680			
High	13.5714	0.8923	1.6359	>0.05	NS
Low	13.0889	0.9480			
Average	14.0097	1.4680	2.3828	<0.05	S
Low	13.0889	0.9480			

The results of the above table reveal that,

1. High effective schools and average effective schools do not differ significantly with respect to the variable students' motivation towards schools.
2. High effective schools and low effective schools do not differ significantly with respect to the variable students' motivation towards schools.
3. Average effective schools (Mean=14.0097) and low (Mean=13.0889) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the variable students' motivation towards schools. Average effective schools are high on students' motivation towards schools than the low effective schools.

Table-6: Results of t-test for the Dimension of Students' Motivation Towards Schools – Cognitive Domain

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Signi.
High	4.6000	0.4037	-2.3855	<0.05	S
Average	4.9000	0.4705			
High	4.6000	0.4037	0.6806	>0.05	NS
Low	4.5111	0.4100			
Average	4.9000	0.4705	2.9193	<0.05	S
Low	4.5111	0.4100			

The results of the above table reveal that,

- High effective schools (Mean=4.6000) and average (Mean=4.9000) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' motivation towards schools - Cognitive domain. Average effective schools are high on the dimension of students' motivation towards schools- Cognitive domain than the high effective schools.
- High effective schools and low effective schools do not differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' motivation towards schools- Cognitive domain.
- Average effective schools (Mean=4.9000) and low (Mean=4.5111) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' motivation towards schools - Cognitive domain. Average effective schools are high on the dimension of students' motivation towards schools- Cognitive domain than the low effective schools.

Table-7: Results of t-test for the Dimension of Students' Motivation Towards Schools – Affective Domain

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Signi.
High	4.7619	0.2500	-0.0459	>0.05	NS
Average	4.7677	0.5443			
High	4.7619	0.2500	2.8733	<0.05	S
Low	4.4389	0.4394			
Average	4.7677	0.5443	2.1808	<0.05	S
Low	4.4389	0.4394			

The results of the above table reveal that,

1. High effective schools and average effective schools do not differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' motivation towards schools - Affective domain.
2. High effective schools (Mean=4.7619) and low (Mean=4.4389) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' motivation towards schools - Affective domain. High effective schools are high the dimension of students' motivation towards schools - Affective domain than the low effective schools.
3. Average effective schools (Mean=4.7677) and low (Mean=4.4389) effective schools differ significantly with respect to the dimension of students' motivation towards schools - Affective domain. Average effective schools are high the dimension of students' motivation towards schools - Affective domain than the low effective schools.

Table-8: Details of t-test Results Computed for the Types of Management

Variable	Management	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Signi.
Students' Behaviour adjustment in schools	Government	25.4778	3.1196	-0.6328	>0.05	NS
	Aided	26.1513	2.8245			
	Government	25.4778	3.1196	-1.9633	<0.05	S
	Unaided	27.3455	2.0676			
	Aided	26.1513	2.8245	-1.7355	>0.05	NS
	Unaided	27.3455	2.0676			
Students' motivation towards schools	Government	14.1889	1.6473	1.7501	>0.05	NS
	Aided	13.3487	1.2120			
	Government	14.1889	1.6473	0.5311	>0.05	NS
	Unaided	13.9364	0.9801			
	Aided	13.3487	1.2120	-1.9420	>0.05	NS
	Unaided	13.9364	0.9801			

1. The above table results reveal that the t-values for the two variables comparing different types of management of schools are computed. There is no significant difference except between government and aided management schools on students adjustment behaviour to schools. The details are presented in the above table. Students of unaided schools are high on students' behaviour adjustment to schools when compared to students of government schools.

VII. Major Findings

The major findings of the study are enumerated as follows:

Findings of Differential Analysis

1. High effective schools are high on the students' behavior adjustment to schools than the low effective schools.
2. Average effective schools are high on the students' behaviour adjustment to schools than the low effective schools.
3. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment in schools- Studiousness than the low effective schools.
4. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools- Studiousness than the low effective schools.
5. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools- Compliance than the low effective schools.
6. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools- Compliance than the low effective schools.
7. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools- Teacher contact than the average effective schools.
8. High effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools- Teacher contact than the low effective schools.
9. Average effective schools are high on the dimension of students' behaviour adjustment to schools - Teacher contact than the low effective schools.
10. Average effective schools are high on students' motivation towards schools than the low effective schools.
11. Average effective schools are high on the dimension of students' motivation towards schools- Cognitive domain than the high effective schools.
12. Average effective schools are high on the dimension of students' motivation towards schools- Cognitive domain than the low effective schools.
13. High effective schools are high the dimension of students' motivation towards schools - Affective domain than the low effective schools.
14. Average effective schools are high the dimension of students' motivation towards schools - Affective domain than the low effective schools.
15. Students of unaided schools are high on students' behaviour adjustment to schools when compared to students of government schools.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

A general opinion is that a school is said to be effective when it achieves better results in public examinations. This can be achieved only by means of establishing proper co-ordination among various activities undertaken by different persons in the school. The results of the present study highlight this observation.

With regard to the learner correlates students in high effective school are higher in their adjustment to schools. They are studious, compliant and interact more with teachers. They are found to be motivated in cognitive, affective and moral domains. They are high on students' involvement in school activities, they are disciplined, participate in extra-curricular activities, are willing to work, and good in organizing abilities.

Students of average and low effective schools are found to be low on these factors. If students in these schools are studious motivated to work, disciplined, engaged to participate in extra-curricular activities, are willing to work and are trained to develop organizing abilities, they can also be raised to the levels of expectations.

VIII. Conclusions of The Study

During the past two decades much research has been conducted in the field of school effectiveness and improvement of the quality of schooling. But the school effectiveness research should not be treated as a blueprint of success. The major concern in schools should be educational excellence meaning that students become independent, creative thinkers and learn to work more co-operatively.

1. Schools do have substantial effects upon pupils and there are processes that work across schools to maximize their outcomes, with effective schools using rewards, praise, motivation, appreciation, high levels of involvement, providing good working conditions for pupils, being responsive to pupil needs, giving ample opportunities for pupils to take positions of responsibility and to participate in the running of the school and in the education activities within the classrooms, making positive use of homework and setting clear and explicit academic goals.
2. If children are to learn individually and collectively they need to do so in an organizational context which enables rather than disables both kinds of growth. The school as an organization needs to be innovative and flexible. A good organization is flexible, uses integrated structures, monitors itself, its climate, health and culture, develops strategic planning techniques and empowers the people. In this sense, the school needs to be responsive to the needs of its members, pupils, teachers, other staff, parents and the community in which it is located.
3. Parents do not choose schools 'rationally'. They have prejudices or are misled by simplistic slogans. Parents often think that a good school is one where pupils wear uniform, or sometimes they may be more impressed by non-educational reasons for example they may choose a private school not for the quality of education but with the hope that their child will acquire middle-class speech and manners. They may not have chosen schools on the basis of published examinations or test reports. Education must be a shared process, involving pupils, teachers, Head-teachers and parents. Empowering parents is equally important on the road to quality.

It is clear that although we have made some progress in understanding of what makes an effective school, an effective school is one which has concern to improve the quality of life in that community and not just raise a few scores on a list of performance indicators.

IX. References

- Central Advisory Council for Education (1967) Children and their Primary Schools ('The Plowden Report'), London: HMSO.
- Coleman, J. (1966) *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington: U.S Government Private Office.
- Creemers, B. (1994) *The Effective Classroom*, London: Cassell.
- Creemers, B. and Scheerens, J. (1989) Developments in School Effectiveness Research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13, (17), Pp. 685-825.

- Cuttance, P. (1992) Evaluating the Effectiveness of Schools. In D. Hopkins & D. Reynolds (Eds.), *School Effectiveness*, pp.71-95. New York: Cassell.
- Followay, D. (1985) *Schools and Persistent Absentees*, Oxford: Pergaman press.
- Gath (1987) *Child Guidance and Delinquency in London Borough*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Gray, J. M. (1990) Estimating Differences in Examination Performance of Secondary Schools in Six LEAS- Anance of Secondary Schools Effectiveness *Oxford: Review of Education*, 16, (2), Pp. 137-58.
- Isaac (2010) Learning Environment and Secondary School Effectiveness in Nigeria. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67 (9), P. 4239-A.
- Mortimore, P. (1991). The Nature and Findings of Research on School Effectiveness in the Primary Sector. In S. Riddell, & S. Brown (Eds.), *School Effectiveness Research: Its Messages for School Improvement*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Orr, D. L. (2011) How Graduate-Level Preparation Influences the Effectiveness of School Leaders: A Comparison of the Outcomes of Exemplary and Conventional Leadership Preparation Programs for Principals. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67 (3) January, P. 1234-A.
- Power, M. J. et.al. (1967) Delinquent Schools. *New Society*, 10, 542-43.
- Reynolds, D. (1976) The Delinquent School. In P.Woods (ed), *The Process of Schooling*, London: Routledge and Kegan, Paul.
- Reynolds, D. (1987) A Method for Linking Sociology of Education and Teachers. In P.Woods and A Polland (Eds.), *Sociology and Teaching*. London: Croom Helm.
- Reynolds, D. (1992) School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An Updated Review of the British Literature. In D. Reynolds and P. Cuttance (Eds.) *School Effectiveness*, London: Cassell.
- Rutter, M et al (1979) 15000 Hours: *Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children*. London: Open Books.
- Sammons, P. (1995) *Key Characteristics of Effective Schools. A Review of School Effectiveness Research*. London: Office for Standards in Education.
- Scheerens, J. (1992). *Effective schooling: Research, theory and practice*, Cassell, London.
- Smith, D. and Tamlinson, S. (1989) *The School Effect: A Study of Multi Racial Comprehension*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Zembat (2010) The Relationship between the Effectiveness of Preschools and Leadership Styles of School Managers” *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2, (2), Pp. 2269-2276.