

CHAPTER V
REVIEW, DISCUSSION OF RESULTS, RECOMMENDATIONS
AND CONCLUSION

- 5.1 Review of the Present Study
- 5.2 Discussion of Results
- 5.3 Recommendations for Further Study
- 5.4 Conclusion

5.1 Review of the present study

The problem in the present study was stated as -
A STUDY OF MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS IN RELATION TO
INTELLIGENCE, ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AND ROLE STRESS.

The present study had the following four null hypotheses which were stated as follows :

- a) There is no significant relationship between managerial effectiveness and intelligence of educational managers.
- b) There is no significant relationship between managerial effectiveness and achievement motivation of the educational manager.
- c) No significant relationship exists between managerial effectiveness and role stress of the educational managers.
- d) There is no significant contribution of intelligence, achievement motivation and role stress together in predicting managerial effectiveness of the educational managers.

The sample was selected from heads of the secondary schools of Baroda city in two phases. It was

first ascertained that the school principals under the sample have been with the school for atleast two years. Then 50% schools under the Gujarat State board of Secondary Education were chosen randomly. Out of 5 schools under the Central Board of Secondary Education, four were chosen, as one school was having a newly appointed principal. Thus, a total sample of 57 was chosen for the next phase. 30% of the teachers from each of these schools who had been with the principal for last two years were also chosen.

The Managerial Effectiveness Scale (MES) developed by the investigator was administred on all the principals as well as the teachers selected in order to get their perception regarding the principals' effectiveness.

Thus, the tool was collected from 54 schools as two schools out of 57 did not return the scale and one principal got transferred.

Out of these 54 schools, 15 top and 15 bottom schools were taken when all the scores were arranged from the highest to the lowest order of the teachers' mean perception score about their principals' effectiveness.

Thirty principals of these selected schools were given the rest three tests, namely, Raven's Progressive Matrices for measuring intelligence, Murray's Thematic Apperception Test for achievement motivation and Pareek's Organisational Role Stress (ORS) scale for measuring role stress.

The first null hypothesis was retained at .05 level which means that there was no significant relationship between managerial effectiveness and intelligence of the educational managers.

The second null hypothesis was also retained at .05 level confirming that there was no significant relationship between managerial effectiveness and achievement motivation.

The third null hypothesis was retained at .05 level of significance which means that there was no significant relationship between managerial effectiveness and role stress.

The fourth null hypothesis was also accepted at .05 level which means that there was no significant contribution of intelligence, achievement motivation and

role stress together in predicting the managerial effectiveness of the educational managers.

5.2 Discussion of Results

The first major finding of the study seems to indicate that managerial effectiveness does not depend on intelligence of the educational managers. So even an effective manager can have an average of intelligence.

Though this is the major finding of the study, the further analysis of data reveal something different. When the t-test was employed to see if there is any significant difference between the mean intelligence scores of the two groups - the top and the bottom - it was found that there is a significant difference between the two means. The t-test result was strengthened by the data collected through interview. The top group of principals, in general, have shown much promptness of thought and are rational thinkers in contrast to the bottom group. Most of the bottom group of principals presented an inactive and lethargic kind of attitude towards school management. They have shown less concern for the institute than the top group. Some of the principals of this group have scored fairly high and

much above the median point. One of the reasons for them to belong to this category of managerial effectiveness is probably due to the fact that they do not apply their intelligence in conducting the managerial activities of the school.

From their response to some of the knowledge areas related to education, it seems that they are less aware of the different education commissions held in India and the crisis in the management of education the knowledge of which can motivate them to exercise their managerial ability in a better way. On being questioned about the kind of training they need for becoming more effective, most of them could not give a definite answer for it which seems to indicate that they did not think much about it earlier and are satisfied of their own performance.

Out of the bottom fifteen schools it was observed that ten schools have a very poor maintenance and lack of discipline among the students, sometimes even in the teachers. May be due to this lack of consciousness about their institution are making them less effective managers inspite of having a reasonable level of intelligence.

The reason for not finding a significant correlation for the top group may be due to the fact that their intelligence scores were not sufficiently higher to show any significant relationship with their managerial effectiveness score.

A particularly surprising aspect of the present study is that for the bottom group of principals the mean scores of the teachers' rating about their principals' effectiveness for all the cases were lower than the principals' own rating about themselves. In contrast to this, for the top group of principals, in many cases, the mean scores of, teachers' rating about their principals were higher than the principals' own rating of themselves. All these data are provided in Table-12 and Table-13.

TABLE 12

THE RESPONSE SCORE OF THE PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS
ON MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS SCALE FOR THE TOP GROUP.

| Sl. No. | Score of Principals' Response (P) | Mean Score of Teachers' Response (T) | (P-T) |
|---------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. | 244 | 250.43 | - 6.43 |
| 2. | 232 | 248 | - 16 |
| 3. | 235 | 241.5 | - 6.5 |
| 4. | 209 | 240.5 | - 31.5 |
| 5. | 206 | 237 | - 31 |
| 6. | 247 | 227.67 | 19.33 |
| 7. | 224 | 227.5 | - 3.5 |
| 8. | 248 | 219 | 29 |
| 9. | 253 | 218.67 | 34.33 |
| 10. | 195 | 218 | - 23 |
| 11. | 240 | 216 | 24 |
| 12. | 217 | 216.33 | 0.67 |
| 13. | 225 | 213.67 | 11.33 |
| 14. | 195 | 213 | - 18 |
| 15. | 243 | 211 | 32 |

TABLE 13

THE RESPONSE SCORE OF THE PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS
ON MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS SCALE FOR THE BOTTOM GROUP.

| ----- | | | |
|--|-----|--------|-------|
| Sl. Score of Principals' Mean Score of Teachers' (P-T) | | | |
| No. Response (P) Response (T) | | | |
| ----- | | | |
| 1. | 217 | 75 | 142 |
| 2. | 237 | 131.6 | 105.4 |
| 3. | 221 | 145 | 76 |
| 4. | 193 | 151.2 | 41.8 |
| 5. | 174 | 152.14 | 21.86 |
| 6. | 232 | 156.5 | 75.5 |
| 7. | 242 | 161.3 | 80.7 |
| 8. | 213 | 164.6 | 48.4 |
| 9. | 234 | 166.33 | 67.67 |
| 10. | 222 | 175.2 | 46.8 |
| 11. | 191 | 176 | 15 |
| 12. | 224 | 177 | 47 |
| 13. | 209 | 180 | 29 |
| 14. | 215 | 182.5 | 32.5 |
| 15. | 204 | 185 | 19 |
| ----- | | | |

The t-test confirmed that the mean difference in perception between the principals and the teachers

regarding managerial effectiveness for the bottom group is significantly higher than that of the top group. The calculated t-value was 5.14 which is significant at .05 and .01 level. This statistic could be used as a check over the response to the scale on Managerial Effectiveness because unanimity between the perception of the principal and the teachers about the managerial effectiveness of their respective school to a certain extent ascertain effectiveness, whereas the absence of it after a certain level brings effectiveness under suspicion. It could also be taken as a rough measure of the extent of group acceptance of the principals.

This result also gives an indication of the extent to which the manager is accepted by his group of colleagues. As management is getting the work done by the group, and the manager is a leader of his group of followers, effectiveness of his management is to a large extent dependent on group acceptance. Fielder and Meuwese (1965) while reviewing studies of military organizations and one group creativity project, found generally high positive correlations between leader intelligence and task performance in groups which expressed esteem or acceptance of the leader, whereas, the group which did not accept their leaders the

correlations were found to be low or slightly negative. The first major finding of the present study supports this view as for the less effective managers who belong to the bottom group, the group acceptance is less compared to that of the top group, and for them the correlation between managerial effectiveness and intelligence is also found to be negative. It is obvious, that a manager who is not accepted by the group may find it difficult to obtain compliance (Fiedler & Leister, 1977). Schachter et al. (1951) concluded that a non-cohesive group is more difficult to control than a cohesive one. Therefore, it can be assumed that, there will be high correlation between intelligence of the manager and his effectiveness where the group is willing to carry out his directions rather than the unwilling group.

The second major finding in that there is no relationship between managerial effectiveness and achievement motivation of the principals. The response to Murray's Thematic Apperception Test supported by the interview with the principals indicated that the principals of the secondary schools have a very low achievement motivation. Interview with them indicated that most of the principals do not have the urge for

excellent performance in school management, neither they have the long term involvement to perform better than what they are doing now. There is a general tendency for them to somehow maintain the status quo.

Three principals from the top group who have scored fairly high in n-Ach compared to the others' score, showed a clear distinction from the rest of the lot so far the institutional goals are concerned. They are much more flexible than the others in the group and have an inclination to implement new ideas to the school management and also to see the result of such implementation.

One of the bottom group of principals has also scored fairly high on n-Ach. One of reasons for him to belong to this bottom category may be he has a very low intelligence score where he could touch only the lower limit of the average range of intelligence according to the test used.

The other twenty six principals have scored very low in n-Ach probably because of the non-specificity of the institutional goals to them.

The finding regarding the relationship between managerial effectiveness and role stress suggested that there is no significant relationship between these two variables. The interviews of the principals seemed to indicate that the bottom principals are stressed because of the too many roles that they have to attend. They said that they are never able to finish the day's work and overburdened with it as a result of which the quality of work is deteriorating. For the top group of principals resource inadequacy seems to be one of the major sources of stress that is hampering their effectiveness to a large extent. Though they want to improve the performance of their institute in every respect, the less amount of money, lack of space, unbalanced ratio of teacher and student are making them unable to reach their destined goal.

The common stress for both the groups that they feel dominant over the other stresses, is role erosion. The general feeling about this stress is that, their role has been reduced in importance and that they are not free to take decisions on their own according to the need of the situation, as the higher bodies, like, the school managing committee, state government, interfere a lot in their activities. They are sometimes bound to

submit themselves in the hands of political powers especially during the teacher recruitment and the admission of students which in turn reduces the quality of teaching and the overall performance of the school.

The interview seems to indicate that there are three main stresses, namely, role overload, role erosion and resource inadequacy, that are hindering the principals from being effective.

5.3 Recommendations For Further Study

The findings cited in the study bring to light significant issues for further systematic inquiry, which are as follows :

1. The same study could be replicated to a larger sample of educational managers. The primary school principals could also be taken as a sample.
2. The present study by taking the same sample, hypothesis and statistical treatment could be replicated in order to confirm the consistency of the result.
3. Another study could be conducted by taking some other type of methodology, like, more indepth

observation or opinion from the parents and community to collect data regarding the principals' effectiveness, rather than relying on only the principals and teachers' perception regarding the effectiveness.

4. Other factors that are contributing to a principal's effectiveness could be taken into consideration.
5. An experimental study could be conducted after exposing the principals to a programme on Managerial Effectiveness and their pre and post-facto performance could be measured.

5.4 Conclusion

The present study was taken up to investigate if there is any relationship between the managerial effectiveness of the principals and his intelligence, achievement motivation and role stress. Most of the researches on principals so far have focused either their leadership or administrative behaviour and the organizational climate of the institute they are working in, which shed little light on their managerial effectiveness as a whole - a much broader concept than either leadership or administration. Being in a

situation of crisis and with immense problems surrounding the field of education, the principals are not mere leaders or administrators but managers who are bound to manage the situation in order to keep pace with the rapid progress made in the world today. The present study has been an attempt to find out few prerequisites of such managers which would help in performing his activities in an effective way. The study is a begining only and not an end in the area of educational management as there is much more to be discovered in future.