A STUDY OF QUALITY INDICATORS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF HEADS OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Noorjehan N. Ganihar

Karnatak University

nnganihar@rediffmail.com

Biodata

Dr. Noorjehan N. GANİHAR is working in Karnatak University, Dharwad since 1986. Presently she is a Professor, Post-graduate Department of Education,   Dean, Faculty of Education, Karnatak University, Dharwad, Director of UGC Sponsored Dr. Zakir Husain Studies Centre, Co-ordinator of Karnataka State Open University, Mysore, she was the former Academic Council member of Karnatak University, Dharwad and former Syndicate member of Karnatak University. She obtained her M.A. in Economics, M.Ed., and Ph.D. Degrees. She has a P.G Diploma in Education from S.N.D.T. Women's University, Bombay. She also has a P.G. Diploma in Human Resource Management, and a P.G. Diploma in Higher Education from IGNOU. She was a "Second Rank" holder in her B.A course, "First Rank" holder in B.Ed., M.Ed. and P.G Diploma in Education Management.

A STUDY OF QUALITY INDICATORS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF HEADS OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Noorjehan N. Ganihar
nnganihar@rediffmail.com

Abstract

"A good quality education is one that enables all learners to realise the capabilities they require to become economically productive, develop sustainable livelihoods, contribute to peaceful and democratic societies and enhance wellbeing. The learning outcomes that are required vary according to context but at the end of the basic education cycle must include threshold levels of literacy and numeracy and life skills including awareness and prevention of disease." (Tikly, 2010). Education quality programme encourages policy makers to take cognisance of changing national development needs, the kinds of schools that different learners attend and the forms of educational disadvantage faced by different groups of learners when considering policy options. A good quality education arises from interactions between three overlapping environments, namely the policy, the school and the home/ community environments. Creating enabling environments requires the right mix of inputs into each. the Education quality framework highlights the importance of accompanying processes within each environment that are key for ensuring that inputs get converted into desired outcomes. (Tikly, 2010). Creating a good quality education involves paying attention to the interface between each environment and ensuring that enabling inputs and processes have the effect of closing the gaps that often exist between them creating greater synergy and coherence.

Keywords: education, quality, policy

1. Understanding Quality Education

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, p. 136).

1.1. Suitably trained experienced and motivated teachers

Africa faces a severe shortage of suitably qualified and experienced teachers (UNESCO 2008). However, evidence suggests that initial teacher education and training and experience have a significant impact on achievement (Smith and Barrett 2010).

A major finding across the Education quality projects is that for training to impact positively on outcomes for disadvantaged learners it needs to be consistent with the demands of the curriculum. It must focus on improved pedagogical practices including the use of "structured pedagogy"; effective teaching of language and literacy in multilingual settings effective use of ICTs to support learning. (Rubagiza,Were et.al., 2010).

1.2. Key Processes Underlying a Good Quality Education

Implementing a good quality education requires that policy making is informed by processes of dialogue, consultation and debate both within the state and between the government and interest groups including teachers and teacher unions, non-governmental and community organisations representing parents and other interests with a stake in education. A characteristic of education policy in countries that have successfully integrated into the global economy is that there has been a good match between education priorities and outcomes and changing labour market needs facilitated by processes of inter-governmental dialogue. Access to a good quality education has been an historic demand of anti-colonial movements on the African continent (Tikly 2010).

The role of education in relation to national and local development priorities, the impact of global and regional agendas and the role of the state and of the private sector in providing access to a good quality education. Consideration of these issues is important for those involved in leading an informed public debate on education quality form a social justice perspective and for beginning to elucidate a normative basis to guide future policy (Tikly 2010).

1.3. Significance of the Study

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. The Head of the school who organizes and coordinates all the activities will possess the required leadership qualities.

1.4. The Problem

The present investigation is entitled as "**A Study of Quality Indicators from the Perspective of Heads of Secondary Schools".**

1.5. Objectives of the Study

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

2. 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

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

4. 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

1.6. Variables of the Study

The present study aims to identifying the following variables.

Heads of Schools related variables

a. Leadership qualities of Heads of schools

b. Time management of Heads of schools

2. Methodology

The present study is a descriptive survey (ex-post-facto) type research.

2.1. Hypotheses of the Study

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

Hypothesis: Schools at different levels of effectiveness differ on leadership qualities of Heads of schools.

Hypothesis: Heads of school in schools at different levels of effectiveness differ in dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., assertive administration.

Hypothesis: Schools at different levels of effectiveness differ in dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., instructional leadership

Hypothesis: Schools at different levels of effectiveness differ on dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., assumption of responsibility

Hypothesis: Schools with different levels of effectiveness differ on dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., personal vision and character.

Hypothesis: Schools at different levels of effectiveness differ on dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., decision making.

Hypothesis: Schools at different levels of effectiveness differ in dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., standard.

Hypothesis: Schools with different levels of effectiveness differ on time management.

Hypothesis: Schools at different levels of effectiveness differ on dimension of time management i.e., attitude towards time management.

Hypothesis: Schools at different levels of effectiveness differ on knowledge of time

management.

2.2. Sample

The population of the sample of Dharwad Taluka numbering upto 70 secondary schools formed the sample of the study. The data was collected from schools. From each school data was collected from teachers selected at random. In all, the data was collected from 70 schools – 490 teachers.

2.3. Research Tools

The following tools were administered to students.

1.Leadership Qualities Questionnaire by Selvaraju (1993)

2.Time, Energy, Memory Survey Scale by Petrelio (1976)

2.4. Data Collection

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

2.5. Statistical Technique Used

For the analysis of data collected, differential analysis was used.

3. Data Analyses

Table 1. *Results of t-test for the variable Leadership Qualities of Heads of Schools*

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	P-value	Significance
High	119.7778	12.5595	4.3610	<0.05	S
Average	114.9244	8.5241			
High	119.7778	12.5595	2.9255	<0.05	S
Low	115.0873	12.8903			

The results of the above table reveal that,

1. Heads in high effective schools (mean=119.7778) and average effective schools (mean=114.9244) differ significantly with respect to leadership qualities of Heads of schools. Heads in high effective schools are high on leadership qualities than in average effective schools.

2. Heads in high effective schools (mean=119.7778) and low effective schools (mean=115.0873) differ significantly with respect to leadership qualities of Heads of schools.

Heads in high effective schools are high on leadership qualities than in low effective schools.

Table 2. *Results of t-test for the Dimension of Leadership Qualities of Heads of Schools - Instructional Leadership*

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	P-value	Significance
High	20.8492	3.7525	3.0644	<0.05	S
Average	19.7017	3.1967			
High	20.8492	3.7525	3.2093	<0.05	S
Low	19.3016	3.9013			

The results of the above table reveal that,

3. Heads in high effective schools (mean=20.8492) and average effective schools (mean=19.7017) differ significantly with respect to dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., instructional leadership. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e. instructional leadership than the average effective schools.

4. Heads in high effective schools (mean=20.8492) and low effective schools (mean=19.3016) differ significantly with respect to dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., instructional leadership. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., instructional leadership than the low effective schools.

Table 3. *Results of t-test for the Dimension of Leadership Qualities of Heads of Schools - Assumption of Responsibility*

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	P-value	Significance
High	19.8571	3.4052	2.7574	<0.05	S
Average	18.9034	2.9900			
High	19.8571	3.4052	2.0685	<0.05	S
Low	18.9524	3.5369			

The results of the above table reveal that,

5. Heads in high effective schools (mean=19.8571) and average effective schools (mean=18.9034) differ significantly with respect to dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., assumption of responsibility. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., assumption of responsibility than the average effective schools.

6. Heads in high effective schools (mean=19.8571) and low effective schools (mean=18.9524) differ significantly with respect to dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., assumption of responsibility. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., assumption of responsibility than the low effective schools.

Table 4. *Results of t-test for the Dimension of Leadership Qualities of Heads of Schools - Personal Vision and Character*

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	P-value	Significance
High	20.1190	3.6389	3.8335	<0.05	S
Average	18.8445	2.6316			
High	20.1190	3.6389	2.5709	<0.05	S
Low	18.9444	3.6140			

The results of the above table reveal that,

7. Heads in high effective schools (mean=20.1190) and average effective schools (mean=18.8445) differ significantly with respect to dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., personal vision and character. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., personal vision and character than the average effective schools.

8. Heads in high effective schools (mean=20.1190) and low effective schools (mean=18.9444) differ significantly with respect to dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., personal vision and character. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., personal vision and character than the low effective schools.

Table 5. *Results of t-test for the Dimension of Leadership Qualities of Heads of Schools - Decision Making*

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	P-value	Significance
High	20.3095	3.9567	3.7807	<0.05	S
Average	18.8824	3.1103			
Average	18.8824	3.1103	2.0414	<0.05	S
Low	19.6270	3.6611			

The results of the above table reveal that,

9. Heads in high effective schools (mean=20.3095) and average effective schools (mean=18.8824) differ significantly with respect to dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., decision making. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., decision making than the average effective schools.

10.Heads in average effective schools (mean=18.8824) and low effective schools (mean=19.6270) differ significantly with respect to dimension of leadership qualities of Heads of schools i.e., decision making. Heads in low effective schools are high on dimension of leadership

qualities i.e., decision making than the average effective schools.

Table 6. *Results of t-test for the Variable Time Management of Heads of Schools*

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	P-value	Significance
Low	43.8333	3.7456	-4.9325	<0.05	S
Average	50.4118	4.9489			
Low	43.8333	3.7456	-8.7082	<0.05	S
High	56.1111	4.6639			
Average	50.4118	4.9489	-4.0282	<0.05	S
High	56.1111	4.6639			

1. Heads in low (mean= 43.8333) and average (mean=50.4118) effective schools differ significantly with respect to time management. Heads in average effective schools are high on time management than the low effective schools.

2. Heads in low (mean= 43.8333) and high (mean=56.1111) effective schools differ significantly with respect to time management. Heads in High effective schools are high on time management than the low effective schools.

3. Heads in average (mean= 50.4118) and high (mean=56.1111) effective schools differ significantly with respect to time management. Heads in high effective schools are high on time management than the average effective schools.

Table 7. *Results of t-test for the Dimension of Time Management - Knowledge of Time Management*

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	P-value	Significance
High	21.5000	1.7235	5.1278	<0.05	S
Average	24.8824	2.4956			
High	21.5000	1.7235	15.9927	<0.05	S
Low	28.3889	0.6077			
Average	24.8824	2.4956	5.8448	<0.05	S
Low	28.3889	0.6077			

The results of the above table reveal that,

1.Heads in high (mean= 21.5000) and average (mean=24.8824) effective schools differ significantly with respect to knowledge of time management. Heads in average effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e., knowledge of time management than high effective schools.

2.Heads in high (mean= 21.5000) and low (mean=28.3889) effective schools differ significantly with respect to knowledge of time management. Heads in low effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e., knowledge of time management than high effective schools.

3.Heads in average (mean= 24.8824) and low (mean=28.3889) effective schools differ significantly with respect to knowledge towards time management. Heads in low effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e., knowledge of time management than average effective schools.

Table 8.*Results of t-test for the Dimension of Time Management - Attitude towards Time Management*

Levels	Mean	SD	t-value	P-value	Significance
High	28.9444	1.0556	5.7915	<0.05	S
Average	25.2647	2.5739			
High	28.9444	1.0556	25.5429	<0.05	S
Low	21.6111	0.6077			
Average	25.2647	2.5739	5.9100	<0.05	S
Low	21.6111	0.6077			

The results of the above table reveal that,

4. Heads in high (mean= 28.9444) and average (mean=25.2647) effective schools differ significantly with respect to attitude towards time management. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e., attitude towards time management than average effective schools.

5. Heads in high (mean= 28.9444) and low (mean=21.6111) effective schools differ significantly with respect to attitude towards time management. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e., attitude towards time management than low effective schools.

6. The average (mean= 25.2647) and low (mean=21.6111) effective schools differ significantly with respect to attitude towards time management. Heads in average effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e., attitude towards time management than low effective schools.

4. Major Findings

1. Heads in high effective schools are high on leadership qualities than in average effective schools.

2. Heads in high effective schools are high on leadership qualities than in low effective schools.

3. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., instructional leadership than the average effective schools.

4. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., instructional leadership than the low effective schools.

5. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., assumption of responsibility than the average effective schools.

6. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., assumption of responsibility than the low effective schools.

7. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., personal vision and character than the average effective schools.

8. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., personal vision and character than the low effective schools.

9. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., decision making than the average effective schools.

10. Heads in low effective schools are high on dimension of leadership qualities i.e., decision making than the average effective schools.

11. Heads in average effective schools are high on time management than the low effective schools.

12. Heads in High effective schools are high on time management than the low effective schools.

13. Heads in high effective schools are high on time management than the average effective schools.

14. Heads in average effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e., knowledge of time management than high effective schools.

15. Heads in low effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e., knowledge of time management than high effective schools.

16. Heads in low effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e., knowledge of time management than average effective schools.

17. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e., attitude towards time management than average effective schools.

18. Heads in high effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e., attitude towards time management than low effective schools.

19. Heads in average effective schools are high on dimension of time management i.e.,

attitude towards time management than low effective schools.

5. 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. The major concern in schools should be educational excellence meaning that students become independent, creative thinkers and learn to work more co-operatively.

1.A great deal of successful development in schools depends on a thoroughly professional teaching force. With this foundation, the school system can achieve much progress, with effective schools, having teachers with high expectations and positive views of the capabilities of their pupils, providing good models of behaviour, exhibiting good time management, involving in school activities and remaining satisfied in the job.

2.There appears to be agreement that the quality of leadership exercised by the head us crucial to the effectiveness of the school. The Head of the school sets the love for learning by the educational beliefs and values he or she holds and with a decision making proves in which all teachers feel that their views are represented. The Head's educational philosophy, management of time concern for teachers' and staff development activities show how central these processes are for school's development.

On the basis of the findings of the present study it is revealed that the schools having better Heads of schools and institution performance were identified as more effective schools. It is essential to identify schools which are less-effective and provide necessary help to develop their facilities and other aspects so as to develop the performance of students in order to increase school effectiveness.

References

OECD (2010) *Education at a Glance 2010*. Paris: Author.

Rubagiza, J., E. Were, et al. (2010). Introducing ICT into Schools in Rwanda: Educational Challenges and Opportunities. *International Journal of Educational Development* 31(1): 37-43.

Smith, M. and A. Barrett (2010). Determinants of Primary School Learners' Attainment in Africa. *EdQual Policy Brief,* 1.

Tikly, L. (2010) *Towards a Framework for Understanding the Quality of Education*. Bristol: University of Bristol UK.

UNESCO (2010) Reaching the Marginalized: *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2010*. Paris: Author.