

Explanation of Schools Management Effectiveness

Iman Abiri¹

¹Ph.D in Educational Management, Islamic Azad University, Rodehen Branch, Rodehen Iran

Abstract

The purpose of the current research was explaining the schools management effectiveness in Iran based on output components. The type of the research is descriptive-survey. The statistic society included all of the Iranian principals. The number of the sample volume was considered 500 principals by using the method of the purposeful sampling based on equalization. In order to collect the information, the questionnaire was used. For data analysis, the factor analysis in type of principal components analysis was used. Based on the factorial analysis results, 2 Output factors related to schools management effectiveness were recognized and named as Effectiveness of educational systems based on immediate outcomes and Effectiveness of the educational system based on creating added value for the individual and society. Also, the results have shown that there is a meaningful relationship between all the Output factors, and these factors have the significant ratio in explaining schools management effectiveness.

Keywords: Effectiveness of School Management, Output Components

Introduction

The assessment of effectiveness and its definition have always been a significant and complex issue in organization and management literature. Therefore, it seems essential to examine the effectiveness based on different approaches in order to achieve a comprehensive understanding of the concept of effectiveness and identifying the methodology of its measurement. Because the effectiveness is defined by each approach in a special way, and according to that definition, a unique way is offered to measure it. For instance, Goal-Attainment Approach (Price 1979, Glunk and Wilderom 1996, Plante 1999), System-Resource Approach (Yuchtman and Seashore 1967, Price 1979), Internal Process Approach (Glunk and Wilderom 1996, Plante 1999), Multiple-Constituencies Approach (Connolly, Conlon, and Deutsch 1980, Parsayan 2008), and Competing-Values Approach of Quinn and Rohrbaugh (Visitchaichan) are some samples of variety of views about definition and measurement of organizational and managerial effectiveness.

But when the effectiveness in educational systems especially in schools is discussed, an important question is proposed: can either a large volume of acquired resources or optimizing the process of implementation without thinking about the results ensure the effectiveness of system? Certainly, the answer is not "yes". Therefore, it seems that ensuring the quality of output components is a more confident criterion for effectiveness than other input and process components.

According to this assumption that output components have crucial and key role in assessing the effectiveness of each organizational system especially in educational system, this research also has emphasized on output components of school's management effectiveness in Iran and seeks to answer these question related to research that "What are the output components which represent school's management effectiveness and by which factors they saturated?", "How is the relationship between

the extracted factors?", and "How much of the school's management effectiveness they can explain?"

Research Method

The research type is descriptive-survey. The statistic society included all of the Iranian principals in primary, junior high school, and senior high school levels. The number of the sample volume was considered 500 principals by using the method of the purposeful sampling .In order to collect the data, first, the output components of school's management effectiveness were extracted by using the literature related to research. Then, the final questionnaire was designed by using these components. This questionnaire had been adjusted by four-choice Likert scale in number of 17 questions. After that the questionnaires were administrated and collected, all of them were coded. Then, the codes were imported in spss software version 18.The centralism indexes have been used for descriptive analysis of data, and the factor analysis in type of principal components analysis, correlation statistic, and variance analysis for deductive analysis.

Findings

After administration, collecting, and coding questionnaire, extracted data have been analyzed according to questions of research which are reported separately later.

First question: What are the output components which represent school's management effectiveness and by which factors they saturated?

In order to recognize the output components of school's management effectiveness, 17 components are extracted as output components of school's management effectiveness by surveying and studying theoretical foundations of research. Of course, there was an effort that the context validity of these components increases by comparing them with valid theoretical frameworks. Then, these components have been arranged within the questionnaire of measurement of output components 'effectiveness. In this questionnaire, the principals of sample group were asked to determine that weather each of these components is effective in school's management or not. Extracted data are analyzed descriptively based on the centralism indexes, mean, variance, correlation. Since, all of the components had acceptable correlation (over 0.3), and also the achieved reliability of collected components had been 0.893, there were no need to delete the components and further.

Also, the method of principal component analysis was used in order to discover and explain a simpler structure of output components related to school's management effectiveness. In fact, this method recognizes and separates main factors among a set of factor. Therefore, after that the least acceptable correlation among components was ensured, and the amount of KMO (0.851) was assessed, and the results of Bartlett's test were meaningful, performing the principal component analysis was allowed. Thus, after three times Varimax rotation, two factors were separated.

Table 1 shows the communalities between the output components which represent school's management effectiveness and extracted factor achieved by factor analysis.

Table 1: The results of factor analysis of components of school's management effectiveness

Components	Factor 1	Factor 2
Acceptance rate of students		0.369
Promotion rate of students		0.640
Recapitulation rate of students		0.796
Drop-out rate of students		0.780
Graduation rate of students		0.695
Survival rate of students		0.308

Pass rate of students	0.562
Waste rate of students	0.712
Repetition rate of students	0.636
The rate of graduates' achievements to religious goals	0.661
The rate of graduates' achievements to ethical goals	0.733
The rate of graduates' achievements to scientific-educational goals	0.744
The rate of graduates' achievements to artful-cultural goals	0.745
The rate of graduates' achievements to social goals	0.817
The rate of graduates' achievements to biological goals	0.749
The rate of graduates' achievements to political goals	0.652
The rate of graduates' achievements to economical goals	0.728

The two extracted factors were named as:

First factor: effectiveness based on immediate outcome of educational system.

Second factor: effectiveness of educational system based on creating added value for individual and society.

Second question: How is the relationship between extracted factors ?And what percentage of school's management effectiveness do they explain?

The correlation statistic has been used for examine the relationship between factors.

Table 2 shows the correlation of output factors to each other.

Table 2: Correlation of output factors with each other (p=0.0001, n=500)

Factors	1	2
1	1	0.510**
2	0.510**	1

According to the data of table 2, the initial relationship between two extracted factors was reported meaningful. Also in table 3, the percentage of explained variance has been shown by each factor before and after rotation.

Table 3: Explained variance by extracted factors before and after rotation

Factors	Variance percentage of communalities before rotation	Cumulative variance percentage before rotation	Variance percentage of communalities after rotation	Cumulative variance percentage after rotation
1	38.134	38.134	27.018	27.018
2	13.745	51.878	20.226	47.244

These two factors explain 47.244 percentage of total variance of output components related to school's management effectiveness.

Discussion and Conclusion

Nowadays, in many countries, making schools effective is one of the most important issues to improve the educational system (Petty et al, 2007). The present research arranged with the same purpose. But, according to the fundamental differences between educational systems and other organizational systems, it focused on output components of school's management. This research, in order to explain output components of school's management effectiveness in Iran, extracted two factors and named them as effectiveness based on immediate outcome of educational system, and

effectiveness of educational system based on creating added value for individual and society.

It has been reported about it either on official document or findings of research. For instance, Iran's Supreme Council of Education in its seven hundred and sixtieth bill, has introduced the output indexes used for evaluating management performance in educational system in two groups that are intermediate and ultimate output (Supreme Council of Education, 1387) that is the same as findings of the present research. Also, Hoy (2008) has introduced some outputs of school's system such as scientific goal achievement, job satisfaction, the ratio of absence, dropout, and graduation, top score in the exams, and efficiency. Some other researches have defined output component of school's management effectiveness as excellent results on exams, academic success of students, good students' feedback, and appropriate outcome for society (Jamaa, 2011). Finally, this research according to the results of correlation statistic and variance analysis either has shown meaningful relationship among all of output factors or determined that these output factors have significant ratio in explaining the school's management effectiveness.

Resources:

Shafritz, Jay M., & Ott, A. Steven (2008). Classics of Organization Theory. Translated by A. Parsayan (Ph.D). Published by Termeh. Vol. 2.

Supreme Council of Education (2008). Output indexes used for evaluating educational system. The bill of seven hundred and sixtieth meeting of Supreme Council of Education in Bahman 23rd, 1386. <http://www.sce.ir>

Connolly, T., Conlon, E., & Deutsch, S. (1980). Organizational Effectiveness. A Multiple-Constituency Approach. Academy of Management Review Vol. 5, No. 2. <http://www.jstor.org>

Glunk, U. & Wilderom, C.P.M. (1996). Organizational Effectiveness Corporate Performance? Why and How Two Research Traditions Need to Be Merged. Tilburg University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration. <http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi>

Hoy. (2008). School Effectiveness, Accountability, and Improvement. www.waynekhoy.com

Jamaa, S.A. (2011). The effectiveness of applying total quality management in Public Senior High School Kasihan 1 Bantul, Yogyakarta Indonesia. Kenyata University, Republic of Kenya. www.journal.uny.ac.id

Petty, N.W. & Green, T. (2007). Measuring educational opportunity as perceived by students: a process indicator. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 18:67-91.

Plante, C.J. (1999). Organizational Effectiveness Theory: Application to the Royal Military College of Canada in the Development of Future Officers for the Canadian Forces. Canadian Forces College. <http://cfc.forces.gc.ca>

Price, J.L. (1972). The Study of Organizational Effectiveness. Quarterly, 13. <http://www.jstor.org>

Quinn, R.E. & Rohrbaugh, J. (1981). A Competing Values Approach to Organizational Effectiveness. Public Productivity Review. Vol. 5.

Visitchaichan, S. (2010). In Search of Organizational Effectiveness. <http://gspace.nida.ac.th/load.php>

Yuchtman, E. & Seashore, S. E. (1967). System Resource Approach to Organizational Effectiveness. American Sociological Review, 32.