

## PERFORMANCE OF PRIMARY SCHOOL HEADS IN RELATION TO THEIR LOCALITY AND SCHOOL STATUS

Ms Sasmita Sahu

Scholar

Dr. Dillip Kumar Khuntia

Lecturer in Education

Boudh Panchayat College, Boudh, Odisha, India

Dr. Jyoti Sankar Pradhan

Associate Professor of Education P.G. Dept. of Education,

Fakir Mohan University, Vyasa Vihar, Balasore, Odisha, India

### ABSTRACT

The present study is intended to examine the performance of primary school heads in relation to their locality and school status through descriptive survey method. To conduct the study, 80 primary School Heads from urban and rural area of Boudh District were selected by using Simple Random Sampling technique. To conduct the study the researchers developed a five point Teachers' Rating Scale. The researchers analysed the data by applying t-test and simple percentage. The findings of the study showed that, There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Rural Private and Govt. Primary schools. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban Private and Govt. Primary schools. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Private Primary schools. There is significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Govt. Primary schools. There is significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Primary schools. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Govt. and Private Primary schools.

**Keywords:** Performance, Primary School Heads, Government, Private, Rural, Urban

### BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Making the human being a perfect being, Education is an important human activity. Without education, man is like a beast and it is needless to say that Education as a potent factor modifies the behavior of child and man in a socially desirable way. Governments in all countries of the world strive to provide education to their citizens with the understanding that it is essential, not only for economic growth but also for social stability (REPOA, 2008). Education is expected to produce good human being who are able to thrive in a fast challenging world, meet challenges and solve problems; be entrepreneurial and create jobs, critical and active citizens (TEN/MET, 2008). To achieve the glittering goal of life we have to perform well. Students' performance depends upon teachers' performance; performance of teachers depends ultimately upon the performance of Head Teachers. Question comes to mind whether Government or Private; Urban or Rural school Heads perform better than their counterparts? The School Heads should have to perform better which ultimately helps the other teachers to fulfil the purpose. A sincere

attempt has been made here to find out the degree of performance of school heads according to their locality and status.

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Mpondo (2004) claims that the key function of heads of schools is to secure and operate effective allocation, monitor and control the use of resources. A school head is expected to prepare the school budget that covers different responsible areas for the fulfilment of educational objectives, specifically teaching and learning process. UNESCO (2009) found that the performance or role of headmasters should be focused on small number or particularly important points, they are related to school governance, the recruitment and careers of head teachers, their appraisal and their training. Maroa (2010) found that the head teacher is an important factor on motivation of teachers. Hence, performance of head teacher influences the other teachers' performance. Evans (2011) found that there is a lot of delinquency in leadership styles of the head teachers in students' academic performance of secondary school. Dhull (2012) found that mean achievement score of government school is lower than their private counterparts. Rono (2012) found that the social factors such as family structure, absence among students, gender, geographical location, neighborhoods, students' cults' membership in clubs and organizations and sports all are affecting educational outcomes and performance. Jannat & Omidian (2013) found that management is the most important factor in survival, growth and development or destruction of the organizations. Leadership is the most basic and key function of management. Headmaster is the one who leads the process of moving from the "status quo" to the ideal situation. Butch and Olatunya (2014) found that due to inadequacies of resources the school environment is not helpful. Hence, locality also influences the performance of headmaster of primary school Kitavi (2014) found that teachers perceived their head teachers as autocratic due to their autocratic leadership characteristics and other styles of leadership. James, David & Thinguri (2014) found that supervisory practice of primary school is one of the responsibilities delegated to the head teachers by the Teacher Service Commission. Amina, Jangu, Alhassan(2015) found that as supervision provided a very cordial relationship between teachers and head teachers in the school. Teachers are given opportunity through meetings to edge their view and subsequently solutions were provided for their problems and their suggestions well taken. Maimela (2016) found that the factors which contribute to the performance of students are parental involvement, medium of instruction, teaching materials, learner-teacher ratio, school libraries, motivation of teachers, qualification of teachers and learner's discipline. Islam and Khan (2017) found that the performance of private school is higher than the government school and the performance of rural areas is poorer than the urban areas.

### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The undertaking of the study lay on assessing how effective execution of the school heads lead to utilization of the educational objectives in their respective schools. The study findings were expected to reveal different ways that can be used by the heads of schools in the implementation of curriculum to realize healthy outcomes. In addition, the improvement in school administration was expected to create favourable environment for the pupils to learn comfortably and effectively. As a result, quality education would be provided in schools and

yield the expected outcome of education. Students would pass their examinations and leave schools well prepared with all necessary skills to enable them thrive in difficult social and economic environment. Also they would be able to contribute effectively in the social transformation and be good citizens. On top of that, the findings of the study could be used by different education stakeholders such as the government, community, teachers and parents to look for solutions that would help to overcome challenges that face our educational system. Therefore, study findings and suggested solutions would be very useful to educational administrators, policy makers, decision makers, community, NGOs and any agencies dealing with education.

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The researchers stated the current study as “Performance of Primary School Heads in Relation to their Locality and School Status”

### OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF THE KEY TERMS

**Performance:** Performance means the role related to teaching, learning, students, teacher and administration faced by the heads of primary schools.

**Primary School Heads:** Primary School Heads mean the headmasters or headmistress of both Private and Govt. primary schools.

**Locality:** Here Locality has been sub divided under two headings such as Rural and Urban. Rural means village areas and Urban means town/NAC areas.

**School Status:** - School Status refers the Primary School either Govt. or Private running.

### OBJECTIVES

1. To find out the significant difference of Performance between the Heads of Rural Private and Govt. Primary Schools.
2. To find out the significant difference of Performance between the Heads of Urban Private and Govt. Primary Schools.
3. To find out the significant difference of Performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Private Primary Schools.
4. To find out the significant difference of Performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Govt. Primary Schools.
5. To find out the significant difference of Performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Primary Schools.
6. To find out the significant difference of Performance of the Heads of Govt. and. Private Primary Schools.
7. Find out the percentage of performance among the Heads of primary Schools.

### HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Rural Private and Govt. Primary Schools.
2. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban Private and Govt. Primary Schools.
3. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Private Primary Schools.
4. There is no significant difference of performance of the Heads of Urban and Rural Govt. Primary Schools.
5. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Primary Schools.
6. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Govt. and Private Primary Schools.

### SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study is delimited to 80 primary school Heads from urban and rural area of Boudh District. It is conducted only on primary school heads. Further its scope in finding out the Performance of Primary School Heads in Relation to their Locality and School Status.

### PROCEDURE

The present research is a descriptive survey study designed to obtain precise information concerning the Performance of Primary School Heads in Relation to their Locality and School Status. The sample for the study consists of 40 urban primary school heads and 40 rural primary school heads including both males and females Out of 40, 20 primary school heads from Govt. primary school and 20 primary school heads from private primary school. The sample was selected by using simple random sampling technique. Self developed rating scale was used as tool for collection of data. The collected data were analysed by using simple percentage and t-test.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table-1:t-value between the performance of Rural Private and Rural Govt. School Heads

Category	N	M	SED	't' Value	Remark
Rural Private	20	210.15	4.37	1.81	Not significant both at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance.
Rural Govt.	20	195.55			

The table 1 shows that the obtained 't' value i.e. 1.81 is less than the table value both at 0.01 and 0.05 levels of significance which are 2.71 and 2.02 respectively at 38 degrees of freedom. The difference of performance between the school Heads of Rural Private and Rural Govt. primary school is acceptable. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis i.e. 'There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Rural Private and Govt. primary schools is accepted.

Table-2: 't' value between the performance of Urban Private and Urban Govt. School Heads

Category	N	M	SED	't' Value	Remark
Urban Private	20	212.75	2.62	1.41	Not significant both at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance.
Urban Govt.	20	209.05			

Table 2 shows that the obtained 't' value i.e. 1.41 is less than the table value both at 0.01 and 0.05 levels of significance which are 2.71 and 2.02 respectively at 38 degrees of freedom. The difference of performance between the school Heads of Urban Private and Urban Govt. primary school is acceptable. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis i.e. 'There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban Private and Govt. primary schools is accepted.

Table-3: 't' value between the performance of Urban and Rural Private School Heads

Category	N	M	SED	't' Value	Remark
Urban Private	20	212.75	2.64	1	Not significant both at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance.
Rural Private	20	210.15			

The table 3 shows that the obtained 't' value i.e. 1 is less than the table value both at 0.01 and 0.05 levels of significance which are 2.71 and 2.02 respectively at 38 degrees of freedom. The difference of performance between the school heads of Urban Private and Rural Private primary school is acceptable. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis i.e. 'There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Private primary schools is accepted.

Table-4: 't' value between the performance of Urban Govt. and Rural Govt. primary School Heads

Category	N	M	SED	't' Value	Remark
Urban Govt.	20	209.05	4.62	2.92	Significant both at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance.
Rural Govt.	20	195.55			

Table 4 shows that the obtained 't' value i.e. 2.92 is more than the table value both at 0.01 and of 0.05 levels significance which are 2.71 and 2.02 respectively at 38 degrees of freedom. The difference of performance between the school heads of Urban Govt. and Rural Govt. primary school is nil. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis i.e. 'There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban Govt. and Rural Govt. primary schools is not accepted.

Table-5: 't' value between the performance of Urban and Rural primary School Heads

Category	N	M	SED	't' value	Remark
Urban	40	210.90	2.85	2.82	Significant both at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance.
Rural	40	202.85			

The table.5 shows that the obtained 't' value i.e. 2.82 is more than the table value of both at 0.01 and 0.05 levels of significance which are 2.64 and 1.99 respectively at 78 degrees of freedom. The difference of performance between the school Heads of Urban and Rural primary school is nil. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis i.e. 'There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural primary schools is not accepted.

Table-6: 't' value between the performance of Govt. and Private primary school Heads

Category	N	M	SED	't' Value	Remark
Govt.	40	212.50	3.24	0.89	Not significant at both 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance.
Private	40	209.60			

Table 6 shows that the obtained 't' value i.e. 0.89 is less than the table value of both at 0.01 and 0.05 levels of significance which are 2.64 and 1.99 respectively at 78 degrees of freedom. The difference of performance between the school heads of Govt. and Private primary school is acceptable. Hence, the formulated null hypothesis i.e. 'There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Govt. and Private primary schools is accepted.

Table-7: level of performance of primary school Heads with regards to urban, rural, govt. and private

Category	Mean value of Performance	Percentage
Urban	210.90	25.27%
Rural	202.85	24.21%
Govt.	212.50	25.36%
Private	209.60	25.16 %

The performance of Govt. Primary School Heads is highest among the other categories, that is 212.50 (mean value) and 25.36%. The performance of Urban Primary School Heads is second among the other categories, that is 210.9(mean value) and 25.27%. The performance of Private Primary School Heads is third among the other categories, that is 209.60 (mean value) and 25.16%. The performance Rural Primary School Heads is 202.85 (mean value) and 24.21%.

## FINDINGS

1. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Rural Private and Govt. Primary schools.
2. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban Private and Govt. Primary schools.
3. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Private Primary schools.
4. There is significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Govt. Primary schools.
5. There is significant difference of performance between the Heads of Urban and Rural Primary schools.

6. There is no significant difference of performance between the Heads of Govt. and Private Primary schools.

### EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

1. The study will very helpful for the management and administration of the all primary schools of Odisha. It will helpful for Govt. to take up proper measures for developing the management skill among the Rural Private school heads. It will helpful for set up of the management system in all primary schools. It will also very helpful for all primary school heads in case of administration, teaching learning process and establishes a very good relationship with students and teachers. It will very helpful to create a suitable environment in the school surroundings.
2. For organization of various orientation programmes this study will helpful. For rural primary school heads the orientation programme is most needed. Urban primary school heads should be present in orientation programmes and give their valuable suggestions, to develop their performance.
3. By providing ICT facilities the performance of primary school heads will develop in every field of school education. Basically in the rural areas the ICT is very necessary as these areas are far from modernization. Through ICT the heads can be able to follow modern techniques for teaching- learning process. ICT will be helpful in solving the administrative problem of school heads.
4. Salary is the most important factor in any profession. Hence, in every school, teachers should be paid in time. In private school if the salary is not paid in time then the teachers will demotivate towards their teaching and duties. Increment and bonus should be given in suitable time to develop interest among the staff.
5. Different training programmes should be organized for the primary school heads continuously. Through the training the heads can professionally competent and enhance their performance.

### CONCLUSION

From the findings the researchers found that the performance of Urban Private School Heads are highest among the Heads of other primary schools. Due to higher qualified and talented Headmaster/ Headmistress, Advanced Technology used in teachings, appropriate skills are used in teaching learning etc. Hence, backward performing School Heads should follow the techniques used by Urban Private school heads. If the discussion will take in a broad sense Govt., Private, Rural, Urban then the Govt. Primary Schools Heads performance is highest.

### REFERENCES

1. Alhassan, A.J. (2015). International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies, Vol.-2, pp.129-142.
2. Dhull, J. (2012). Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Education, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak.

3. Evan, N. (2011). Leadership styles of Headmasters and their impact on students' academic performance in secondary school: A Research Project on Master of Education Degree of Kenyatta University. (Reg. No-E55/OL/4255/04).
4. Govinda R. and Varghese N. V. (1991). Independent study, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration. In M.B. Buch (Ed), Fifth Survey of Educational Research , New Delhi, N.C.E.R.T.
5. Islam, Md. R. & Khan, J. N. (2017). Asian Research Consortium, Asian journal of Research in Social Science and Humanities, Vol.7, No-11, November-2017.
6. Jannat G. & Omidian F. (2013). International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences Vol.48,pp-138-147, Switzerland.
7. Jemes N., David M. & Thinguri (2014) Journal of Education and practice, vol-5, No-21 2014, School of Education, Mount Kenya University.
8. Kitavi M. J.(2014). Ph. D. Thesis, National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation, Kenya.
9. Maimela (2016). ISRO Journal of Humanities And Social Science, Volume-21, w.w.w. iosrjournal.org.
10. Maroa S. T. (2013). Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Educational Administration and Planning, University of Nairobi, National Council for Science and Technology, June 2013, Kenya.
11. Mohanty K. C.(1991). Ph.D. Education. Utkal University. In M.B. Buch (Ed), Fifth Survey of Educational Research , New Delhi, N.C.E.R.T.
12. UNESCO.(2009). Secondary Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris .