International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications
April 2013 Volume: 4 Issue: 2 Article: 07 ISSN 1309-6249

SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS AT PRIMARY LEVEL LEVELS OF EDUCATION IN RELATION TO COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Dr. Manas Ranjan PANIGRAHI
Department of Educational Planning and Management
College of Education and Behavioural Sciences
Haramaya University- ETHIOPIA

ABSTRACT

The study aims to investigate the relationship of School Effectiveness with regard to Community Participation at primary level of education. The objectives of the study were to identify the more-effective and less-effective schools; to find out the differences between more-effective and less-effective schools in relation to physical facilities, Head Master and Teachers' performance and Students' performance; to find out the relationship between the school effectiveness and community participation. The descriptive survey method was used to carry out this study. A Total number of 27 more-effective and 35 less-effective primary schools were included in the sample of the present study. And also all principals of selected schools and 5 community members from each locality of these schools were selected incidental purposively, to investigate their participation in school activities. In order to collect data from the selected samples the School Effectiveness Schedule and Community Participation Interview Schedule were developed by the researcher. On the basis of the findings of the present study it is revealed that the schools having better Physical facilities, HM and teachers' performance and Students' performance were identified as more-effective schools. It is essential to identify schools which are less-effective and provide necessary help to develop their physical facilities and other aspects so as to develop the performance of students in order to increase school effectiveness. One of the significant findings of the present study is the higher community participation is associated with greater school effectiveness.

Key Words: Community Participation, School Effectiveness, Physical Facilities, Students Performance, Quality Education.

PROLOGUE

Improvement of quality of education raises many issues such as curriculum renewal, textbooks improvement, better teaching methods, effective teacher education and provision of material facilities in the schools. Improving the working of one teacher schools, progressive methods of evaluation, democratization and humanizing school administration and supervision, provision of rich and varied programme of co-curricular activities, healthy interaction between school and the parents and community. In fact the issue of wastage, stagnation, dropouts and improvement of quality of primary education are interlinked. While appreciable efforts have been made much need to be done and, perhaps one of the most crucial steps to improve the quality of education at primary level is to ascertain the effectiveness with which schools are imparting educations at primary level.

The studies based on community effort in enhancing school effectiveness and learning achievement revealed that empowering communities could improve relevance and efficiency in primary schools in order to attract and keep more children school as well as for effective management and development of schools (Agarwal and Harding, 1995; Jalali, 1995; Seetharamu, 1995). Ambasht and Rath (1995); Barpanda, (1997) were pointed out

that the participation of community increases the enrolment, retention and achievement of students in the primary schools. The findings of some studies on community participation and school effectiveness also revealed a positive relationship of community participation in the functions of the school management committee and its formation, getting financial support to the schools from the community (Kumar, Patel and Mehta, 1998; Rao, 1998).

Overall, we can say, improvement of quality of elementary education raised many issues such as curriculum renewal, textbooks improvement, better teaching methods, effective teacher education and provision of material facilities in the schools, progressive method of evaluations, democratization and humanizing school administration and supervision, provision of rich and varied programmes of co-curricular activities, healthy interaction between school and the community, improvement of single teacher schools etc. In fact the issue of wastage, stagnation, dropouts and improvement of education are inter-linked. The reasons for such School effectiveness, Community Participation and Classroom Teaching at primary schools provide us with many valuable insights into the diverse aspects of the problem. Therefore, the researcher realized that there is a need for this type of studies to investigate the relationship of School Effectiveness with regard to Community Participation at primary level of education.

Objectives of the Study

1. To identify the more-effective and less-effective schools.
2. To find out the differences between more-effective and less-effective schools in relation to physical facilities, Head Master and Teachers' performance and Students' performance.
3. To find out the relationship between the school effectiveness and community participation.

Hypotheses of the Study

1. More-effective schools will be having better physical facilities, Head Master and Teachers' performance and Students' performance.
2. There exists real association between school effectiveness and community participation as a whole.
3. There exists real association between school effectiveness and community participation with dimension wise.

To test the above hypotheses for the present study the researcher following null hypotheses were framed.

1. There exist no significant differences between More-effective and Less-effective schools in Physical Facilities, Head Master and Teachers' performance and Students' performance.
2. There exists essentially unrelated or independent between school effectiveness and community participation as a whole.
3. There exists essentially unrelated or independent between school effectiveness and community participation with dimension wise.

METHODOLOGY

The present study utilizing descriptive survey method endeavors to select the More-effective and Less-effective primary schools and find out the relationships with regard to Community Participation and Classroom Teaching. For this purpose a two-phased study was planned. In the *first phase* the more-effective and less-effective schools were selected from the rural area. In the *second phase* for getting the Classroom Teaching data, classrooms were observed and from that locality the community members were interviewed. Classroom Teaching was compared in both the types of schools at three levels of the teachers' involvement *i.e.* low, moderate and high. Also the levels of community participation were studied at three levels *i.e.* low, moderate and high. This grouping of teachers and community members was done by applying the formula *i.e.*, Mean $\pm$ ½ SD to the score values.

International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications
April 2013 Volume: 4 Issue: 2 Article: 07 ISSN 1309-6249

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

All the rural primary schools and their Teachers, Students and the Community Members (Where the schools are situated) in Orissa constituted the population. There are 30 districts in Orissa. But the sample of the study was taken from two districts viz., *Puri & Ganjam*. These two districts were selected randomly. After selection of these two districts one block from each district was selected by simple random sampling method. *Pipili Block* from *Puri District* and *Hinjili-cut Block* from *Ganjam District* were selected. In *Pipili Block* there are 109 Rural Primary Schools and in *Hinjili-cut Block* there are 94 Rural Primary Schools, where 5 or more teachers were working (at the time of selection of schools). In the first phase to find out more-effective and less-effective schools, the interview was taken by the researcher with the *Block Development Officers* (BDOs) for listing the primary schools in their blocks as more-effective and less-effective. In *Pipili block* out of 109 schools, the BDO listed 17 as more-effective and 30 as less-effective schools. In *Hinjili-cut block* out of 94 schools, BDO listed 25 as more-effective and 22 as less-effective schools. A total number of 94 primary schools, 47 schools from each block were listed by the BDOs. Further, the *School Effectiveness Schedule* was administered to the Headmasters/ Headmistresses of all the 47 schools of each block. The School Effectiveness score of each school was calculated. The School Effectiveness score were classified into two groups on the basis of their effectiveness i.e., more-effectiveness and less-effectiveness by adopting the criteria of *Mean ± ½ SD* i.e., Schools scoring *Mean – ½ SD* were included in Less-effective school, those scoring *Mean + ½ SD* were included in the More-effective school. Finally, the 9 more-effective & 23 less-effective schools from *Pipili Block* and 18 more-effective & 12 less-effective schools *from Hinjili-cut Block* were selected for the final sample. A Total number of 27 more-effective and 35 less-effective primary schools were thus included in the sample of the present study. And also 5 community members from each locality of these schools were selected incidental purposively, to investigate their participation in school activities.

Data Collection Instruments

In order to collect data from the selected samples, following tools were used. School Effectiveness Schedule and Community Participation Interview Schedule tools were developed by the researcher himself.

1. *School Effectiveness Schedule:* For Headmaster/ Headmistress
2. *Community participation Interview Schedule:* For Community Members.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

- *Identification of more-effective and less-effective schools through School Effectiveness Schedule*

For identification of more-effective and less-effective schools through School Effectiveness Schedule, the data collected from Headmasters/Headmistress. The School Effectiveness score were classified into two groups on the basis of their effectiveness i.e., more-effectiveness and less-effectiveness by adopting the criteria of *Mean ± ½ SD* i.e., Schools scoring *Mean – ½ SD* were included in *Less-effective school*, those scoring *Mean + ½ SD* were included in the *More-effective school.* Finally, the 9 more-effective & 23 less-effective schools from Pipili Block and 18 more-effective & 12 less-effective schools from Hinjili-cut Block were selected. A Total number of 27 more-effective and 35 less-effective primary schools were found in both the blocks**.**

Table-1: Significance of difference between the mean scores of overall More-effective and Less-effective schools.

Schools	N	Mean	SD	SEd	't'	Level of sig.
More-effective	27	100.41	12.07	2.53	15.71	.01
Less-effective	35	60.66	6.00			

Df=N1+N2-2=60, The table value at .05 level = 2.00 and .01 level = 2.66

The table-1 shows that the mean scores of overall More-effective and Less-effective schools are found to be 100.41 and 60.66 with SDs of 12.07 and 6.00 respectively. The calculated't' value 15.71 is much greater than the table value at .01 level (2.66). Therefore, it can be concluded that it is significant beyond .01 levels. Thus, the Null Hypothesis-1 of the study that there exists no significant difference between more-effective and less-effective schools is rejected for all dimensions i.e. Physical facilities; HM and teachers' performance; and Students performance.

It is further reveals that the mean scores on all dimensions i.e. Physical facilities; HM and teachers' performance; and Students performance of more-effective schools are higher than that of less-effective schools. It means that in more effective schools existing available Physical facilities; HM and teachers' performance; and Students performance are better than the less-effective schools. Therefore, the Hypothesis-1 of the present study that more-effective schools will be having better Physical facilities; HM and teachers' performance; and Students performance is retained.

Table-2: Significance of Difference between the mean Scores on Physical Facilities of More-effective and Less-effective Schools.

Schools	N	Mean	SD	SEd	't'	Level of sig.
More-effective	27	63.70	7.71	1.72	10.52	.01
Less-effective	35	45.51	5.27			

Df=N1+N2-2=60, The table value at .05 level = 2.00 and .01 level = 2.66

Table-2 highlights that the mean scores on Physical facilities of more-effective and less-effective schools are found to be 63.70 and 45.51 with SDs of 7.71 and 5.27 respectively. The calculated't' value 10.52 is greater than the table value at .01 level. Therefore, it can be said that it is significant beyond .01 levels. Thus, the Null Hypothesis-1 of the present study that there exists no significant difference between more-effective and less-effective schools is rejected for Physical facilities.

The above table further indicates that the mean scores on Physical facilities of more-effective schools are higher than that of the less-effective schools. It means that in more-effective schools existing/available Physical facilities are better than the less-effective schools. Therefore, the Hypothesis-1 of the study that more-effective schools will be having better Physical facilities; HM and teachers' performance; and Students' performance is retained for physical facilities.

Table-3: Significance of Difference between the mean Scores on HM and Teachers' Performance of More-effective and Less-effective Schools.

Schools	N	Mean	SD	SEd	't'	Level of sig.
More-effective	27	29.29	9.12	1.91	10.47	.01
Less-effective	35	9.29	4.46			

Df=N1+N2-2=60, The table value at .05 level = 2.00 and .01 level = 2.66

The above Table shows that the mean scores on HM and teachers' performance of more-effective and less-effective schools are found to be 29.29 and 9.29 with SDs 9.12 and 4.46 respectively. The obtained't' value, 10.47 is higher than the table value at .01 level. Hence, the Null Hypothesis-1 of the present study that there

exists no significant difference between more-effective and less-effective schools is rejected for HM and teachers' performance.

The Table-3 further indicates that the mean scores on HM and teachers' performance of more-effective schools are higher than that of less-effective schools. It means that in more-effective schools HM and teachers' performance are better than that of the less-effective schools. Therefore, the Hypothesis-1 of the present study that more-effective schools will be having better Physical facilities; HM and teachers' performance; and Students' performance is retained for HM and teachers' performance.

Table 4: Significance of Difference between the mean Scores on Students' Performance of More-effective and Less-effective Schools.

Schools	N	Mean	SD	SEd	't'	Level of sig.
More-effective	27	7.41	1.90	0.54	2.87	.01
Less-effective	35	5.86	2.38			

Df=N1+N2-2=60, The table value at .05 level = 2.00 and .01 level = 2.66

It can be found from Table-4 that the mean score on Students' performance of more-effective and less-effective schools are found to be 7.41 and 5.86 with SDs of 1.90 and 2.38 respectively. The obtained't' value, 2.87 is greater than the table value at .01 level. Therefore, it can be said that it is significant beyond .01 levels. Hence, the Null Hypothesis-1 of the present study that there exists a significant difference between more-effective and less-effective schools is rejected for Students' performance.

Table-4 further reveals that the mean scores on students' performance of more-effective schools are higher than that of the less-effective schools. It means that in more-effective schools Students' performance is better than the less-effective schools. Hence, the Hypothesis-1 of the present study that more-effective schools will be having better Physical facilities; HM and teachers' performance; and Students' performance is retained for Students' performance.

Thus, on the basis of above analysis and interpretation, it can be said that the more-effective schools are found to be having better Physical facilities; HM and teachers' performance; and Students' performance.

Findings of the present study of this Section revealed that there is significant difference between more-effective and less-effective schools in Physical facilities; HM and teachers' performance and Students' performance. The more-effective schools have been found to be having better Physical facilities; HM and teachers' performance; and Students' performance, which is some way linked to a conducive school environment and pupils' performance. It is supported by the many researchers' *(Scwietzer, 1984; Mortimore et al., 1988; Creemers, 1994)* findings that physical and infrastructural environment has an effect of pupils achievement.

The findings of studies conducted in India *(Buch & Buch, 1983; Govinda & Verghese, 1991, 1993; Sharma et al., 1992)* lend adequate support as they are also in conformity with the findings of the present study that the level of infrastructure facilities played an important role in improving teaching learning process, learners achievement level as well as overall school quality. Similarly, the findings of the study conducted by *Saxena et al. (1994)* on "School effectiveness and learners achievement", found that the factors of educational and physical facilities in schools have shown positive associations with achievement. It is also shows in support of the physical facilities dimension of the present study.

In this study, the HM and teachers' performance has been considered a dimension of the school effectiveness. It means HM and teachers' performance plays an important role for develop0ment and improvement of school effectiveness. It is conformity with the studies conducted by the eminent researchers i.e. *Burkey (1997), Morly (1997), Davies (1998), Tiguryera (1999), Reynolds & Teddile (2000), and Thrupp (2001)*. Their studies emphasized that performance of the teachers in the learning process, their academic involvement and their qualification plays an important role for the progress of school. In conformity with the findings of the present study, it can be concluded with the findings of many researchers *(Saxena et al., 1994; Rajakutty, 1995; Das, 1997; Pathak et al., 1994; Rath and Rajesh, 1997; and Das, 2002)* that the teachers, physical environment in the school and teaching learning materials also have positive association with the school effectiveness.

- *School Effectiveness in relation to Community Participation*

In this section analysis has been done to fulfill the objective of the present study i.e. to find out the relatedness or independence of school effectiveness in relation to community participation. The analysis has been done in two phases i.e. (i) School effectiveness in relation to overall community participation, and (ii) School effectiveness in relation to different dimensions (Improving school complex, Resource mobilization, Organizing socio-cultural activities, Management of the school and Improving academic environment of the school) of community participation. For this purpose, community members were classified into three groups on the basis of their participation in school activities i.e., Low, Moderate and High groups by adopting the criteria of *M ± ½ SD* i.e., community members scoring *Mean – ½ SD* were included in *Low level* of participation group, those scoring *Mean + ½ SD* were included in the *High level* community participation group, and those scoring between these two limits were included in *Moderate level* community participation group. The classification of community members into three groups on the basis of their community participation scores.

Table 5: Calculation of Chi-Square (χ^2) Value Showing Association of School Effectiveness and Overall Community Participation

SCHOOLS	LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Chi-square χ^2	Level of Sig.
	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe		
More-effective	04	45.72	46	38.75	85	50.51	111.53	.01
Less-effective	101	59.27	43	50.24	31	65.48		

df= (c-1)(r-1)i.e. (3-1)(2-1)=2, The df table value at .05 level is 5.999 and .01 level is 9.210

The above Table shows that the obtained χ^2 value 111.53 of these three groups (Low, Moderate and High group) of the community members participation in more-effective and less-effective schools is greater than the table value at .01 level. It can be said that it is significant beyond .01 levels. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis-2(i) i.e. school effectiveness and community participation are effectively unrelated or independent is rejected.

It indicates that observed results are not close to those expected on the hypothesis of independence and there is greater evidence of real association between school effectiveness and overall community participation. Therefore, Hypothesis-2(i) of the present study i.e., there exists a real association between effectiveness and community participation is retained. It can be interpreted to mean that a significant majority of the community members belonging to the more-effective schools participates more in the school activities as compared to less-effective schools. It can also be observed that high community participation is associated with increasing the school effectiveness. It advocates that community participation is likely to increase the school effectiveness.

- *School Effectiveness in relation to different Dimensions of Community Participation*

Table 6: Calculation of Chi-Square (χ^2) Value Showing Association of School Effectiveness and Community Participation in Improving the School Complex

SCHOOLS	LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Chi-square χ^2	Level of Sig.
	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe		
More-effective	03	31.66	85	69.47	47	33.85	61.62	.01
Less-effective	69	40.33	73	88.52	30	43.14		

df= (c-1)(r-1)i.e. (3-1)(2-1)=2, The df table value at .05 level is 5.999 and .01 level is 9.210

It is observed from the above table that in Dimension-I (community participation in *Improving School Complex*), the community members were divided into three groups such as Low, Moderate and High groups according to their participation in more-effective and less-effective schools. The calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value found to be 61.62. This value is greater than the table value at .01 levels of significance, it can be said that it is significant beyond .01 level. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis-2(ii) present study i.e. school effectiveness and community participation are essentially related or independent is rejected for community participation in *Improving School Complex.*

It is also observed that the observed results are not close to those expected on the null hypothesis of independence and there is evidence of real association between school effectiveness and community participation in improving the school complex. So, the Hypothesis-2(ii) of the study i.e. there exist a real association between school effectiveness and community participation in improving the school complex of community participation is retained. It was also observed that where schools were functioning more-effectively, there was higher community participation in improving school complex Dimension in comparison to those schools functioning less-effectively. This can be interpreted to mean that high community participation is associated with increasing the school effectiveness.

Table 7: Calculation of Chi-Square (χ^2) Value Showing Association of School Effectiveness and Community Participation in Resource Mobilization in the School

SCHOOLS	LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Chi-square χ^2	Level of Sig.
	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe		
More-effective	11	19.44	60	70.96	51	31.59	33.61	.01
Less-effective	29	20.55	86	75.03	14	33.41		

df= (c-1)(r-1)i.e. (3-1)(2-1)=2, The df table value at .05 level is 5.999 and .01 level is 9.210

The above table indicates that in Dimension-II (community participation in *Resource Mobilization*), the community members were divided into three groups such as Low, Moderate and High groups according to their participation in more-effective and less-effective schools. The calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value comes to be 33.61. This value is greater than the table value at .01 levels of significance, it can be said that it is significant beyond .01 level. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis-2(ii) present study i.e. school effectiveness and community

participation are essentially related or independent is rejected for community participation in *Resource Mobilization.*

It is also revealed that the observed results are not close to those expected on the null hypothesis of independence and there is evidence of real association between school effectiveness and community participation in improving the school complex. Therefore, the Hypothesis-2(ii) of the study i.e. there exist a real association between school effectiveness and community participation in *Resource Mobilization* of community participation is retained. It was also observed that where schools were functioning more-effectively, there was higher community participation in *Resource Mobilization* Dimension in comparison to those schools functioning less-effectively. This can be interpreted to mean that high community participation is associated with increasing the school effectiveness.

Table 8: Calculation of Chi-Square (χ^2) Value Showing Association of School Effectiveness and Community Participation in Organizing Socio-Cultural Activities in the School

SCHOOLS	LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Chi-square χ^2	Level of Sig.
	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe		
More-effective	11	39.57	77	57.61	47	37.82	52.86	.01
Less-effective	79	50.42	54	73.39	39	48.18		

df= (c-1)(r-1)i.e. (3-1)(2-1)=2, The df table value at .05 level is 5.999 and .01 level is 9.210

On Dimension-III i.e. Community participation in *Organizing Socio-cultural Activities*, the community members were divided into three groups such as Low, Moderate and High groups according to their participation in more-effective and less-effective schools. The calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value comes to be 52.86. This value is greater than the table value at .01 levels of significance, it can be said that it is significant beyond .01 levels. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis-2(ii) of the present study i.e. school effectiveness and community participation are essentially related or independent is rejected for community participation in *Organizing Socio-cultural Activities.*

It is also revealed that the observed results are not close to those expected on the null hypothesis of independence and there is evidence of real association between school effectiveness and community participation in *Organizing Socio-cultural Activities*. Therefore, the Hypothesis-2(ii) of the study i.e. there exist a real association between school effectiveness and community participation in *Organizing Socio-cultural Activities* of community participation is retained. It was also observed that where schools were functioning more-effectively, there was higher community participation in *Organizing Socio-cultural Activities* Dimension in comparison to those schools functioning less-effectively. This can be interpreted to mean that high community participation is associated with increasing the school effectiveness.

Table:9: Calculation of Chi-Square (χ^2) Value Showing Association of School Effectiveness and Community Participation in the Management of the School

SCHOOLS	LOW fo	LOW fe	MODERATE fo	MODERATE fe	HIGH fo	HIGH fe	Chi-square χ^2	Level of Sig.
More-effective	11	40.06	42	47.90	82	47.03	84.68	.01
Less-effective	81	51.93	68	62.09	26	60.96		

df= (c-1)(r-1)i.e. (3-1)(2-1)=2, The df table value at .05 level is 5.999 and .01 level is 9.210

The above table-9 indicates that in Dimension-IV (community participation in *Management of the School*), the community members were divided into three groups such as Low, Moderate and High groups according to their participation in more-effective and less-effective schools. The calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value comes out to be 84.68. This value is greater than the table value at .01 levels of significance, it can be said that it is significant beyond .01 level. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis-2(ii) present study i.e. school effectiveness and community participation are essentially related or independent is rejected for community participation in *Management of the School.*

It is also observed that the observed results are not close to those expected on the null hypothesis of independence and there is evidence of real association between school effectiveness and community participation in *Management of the School*. Therefore, the Hypothesis-2(ii) of the study i.e. there exist a real association between school effectiveness and community participation in *Management of the School* of community participation is retained. It was also observed that where schools were functioning more-effectively, there was higher community participation in *Management of the School* Dimension in comparison to those schools functioning less-effectively. This can be interpreted to mean that high community participation is associated with increasing the school effectiveness.

Table 10: Calculation of Chi-Square (χ^2) Value Showing Association of School Effectiveness and Community Participation in Improving Academic Environment of the School

SCHOOLS	LOW fo	LOW fe	MODERATE fo	MODERATE fe	HIGH fo	HIGH fe	Chi-square χ^2	Level of Sig.
More-effective	08	35.27	61	56.17	66	43.54	58.59	.01
Less-effective	73	45.72	68	72.82	34	56.45		

df= (c-1)(r-1)i.e. (3-1)(2-1)=2, The df table value at .05 level is 5.999 and .01 level is 9.210

The above table indicates that in Dimension-V (community participation in *Improving Academic Environment of the School*), the community members were divided into three groups such as Low, Moderate and High groups according to their participation in more-effective and less-effective schools. The calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value comes out to be 58.59. This value is greater than the table value at .01 levels of significance, it can be said that it is significant beyond .01 levels. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis-2(ii) present study i.e. school effectiveness and community participation are essentially related or independent is rejected for community participation in *Improving Academic Environment of the School.*

It is also observed that the observed results are not close to those expected on the null hypothesis of independence and there is evidence of real association between school effectiveness and community

participation in *Improving Academic Environment of the School*. Therefore, the Hypothesis-2(ii) of the study i.e. there exist a real association between school effectiveness and community participation in *Improving Academic Environment of the School* of community participation is retained. It was also observed that where schools were functioning more-effectively, there was higher community participation in *Improving Academic Environment of the School* Dimension in comparison to those schools functioning less-effectively. This can be interpreted to mean that high community participation is associated with increasing the school effectiveness.

The above interpretations is revealed that there is a real association between school effectiveness and community participation as overall and in all the five dimensions such as: *Community participation in improving school complex, organizing socio-cultural activities, the management of the school and improving academic environment of the school*. The finding of the analysis also shows that in more-effective schools, there is a higher community participation in all the activities covered under all the dimensions. It is similar to the findings of Crispeels (1996) study that the support and participation of families, community members and agencies, and school staff in the community or at school, in activities and efforts that directly and positively affect students' achievement. The homework could be considered to be school practice, which links the role of parents and teachers.

Similarly, the findings of the study conducted by Creemers & Werf (1989) on "Effects and cost of community participation" revealed that there is a positive effective of community participation in management, evaluation, and monitoring and teacher professional development.

The Indian researcher, studies conducted in relation to the community participation variable, revealed that involvement of community in school activities develop the achievement of their student (Agarwal & Harding, 1995; Ambasht & Rath, 1995). In the present study also shows that in more-effective schools community participation is higher in comparison to less-effective schools. This is supported by some studies conducted in the Indian socio-cultural context. Ambasht & Rath (1995) and Barapanda (1997) found that in his studies, the community participation helps in increasing enrolment and retention of children in the schools.

The research findings of Kumar, Patel & Mehata (1998) related to the community participation variable of the present study found that there is a positive relationship of community participation in the functions of the school management committee and its formation, getting financial support to the school from community. This is also falls in line with the present study. Similarly, the findings of the study get almost a direct support from the findings of Rao's (1998) study i.e. there is a significant positive relationship between community participation and school effectiveness.

Thus, the above discussion reflects that there is a real association between school effectiveness and community participation as overall and in all the five dimensions such as: *Community participation in improving school complex, organizing socio-cultural activities, the management of the school and improving academic environment of the school*. It is also very clear that in more-effective schools, there is a higher community participation in all the activities covered under all the dimensions.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

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

One of the significant findings of the present study is the higher community participation is associated with greater school effectiveness. Community members must constitute the integral part of school education. School activities must be organized in constitution with the Village Education Committee (VECs). VEC must actively engage in the programmes meant for development of the school. So in order to make their actively participate and to get their whole hearted co-operations. School must organize community awareness programme on different occasions. It is also revealed that in decision making process such as taking decision on financial matters, improvement of physical facilities etc. there is lower community participation. Thus particular measure should be taken so as to make them on participation participate in the decision-making processes of the schools.

All school must be provided with appropriate teaching-learning material and at the same time the teacher must be encouraged to develop the improvised teaching Aids so as to suit the need of child in the classroom. During pre-service and in-service training programme, the teacher-educators and experts should give emphasis on development of the teachers profile, development of teacher-students interaction and the teaching activities. The orientation programmes for teachers should be organized at a regular interval. At the time of orientation and training programmes the HM/teachers from more-effective schools should be given a chance to exchange of their ideas and experiences on the classroom teaching techniques which were found effective in enhancing the school effectiveness at primary level.

Therefore, the findings of the present study has implications for Govt personals, educational planners, administrators, researchers, designers and others who involved with the task improvement of school effectiveness by improving learning environment and encouraging the community members to participate in school activities. VEC must be empowered in the development of school effectiveness programme.

Although some tall claims on the basis of a humble research effort based on a mere adequate sample cannot be made, however, it can be said in that the present study has implications for improving the school effectiveness at primary level of education. The findings of this study provide direction to improve the state primary education in the country, provided efforts are to be made in the right direction and at right moment

BIODATA AND CONTACT ADDRESSES OF AUTHOR

Manas RANJAN PANIGRAHI is a faculty in Educational Leadership and Management in the Department of Educational Planning and Management at the Haramaya University, Ethiopia. He earned his Ph.D. from Jamia Millia Islamia Central University, New Delhi, India. He is having a diverse career in Education Management, Pedagogy and ICT in education in teaching and research for the last 13 years in different Indian and other international universities. He has published three books and 25 research articles in Indian and international journals. He is also member of editorial and review committee in several national and international peer reviewed journals.

Dr. Manas RANJAN PANIGRAHI
Department of Educational Planning and Management
College of Education and Behavioural Sciences
Haramaya University
P.O. Box No. 138, Dire Dawa- ETHIOPIA
Ph. No.: 0251921788711
E. mail: manaseducation@gmail.com

REFERENCES

Agarwal, S. & Harding, D. (1995). A community based effort in enhancing school effectiveness and learning achievement: A case study from Ghana. In K. Kumar (Ed.), *School effectiveness and learning achievement at primary stage.* New Delhi, Pp. 291-309.

Ambasht, N. K. & Rath, K. B. (1995). A study of the effect of household, community and school factors on the enrollment, retention and achievement of scheduled tribe children at primary level. In K. Kumar, (Ed.), *School effectiveness and learning achievement at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT Pp. 223-251.

Barpanda, N. (1997). Teacher empowerment strategies to ensure community involvement in UEE: A case study of tribal areas of Sambalpur District. In V. Prakash (Ed.), *Teacher empowerment and school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 478-484.

Best, J. W. & Khan, J. V. (1996). Research in education (7th ed.). New Delhi: Printice Hall.

Buch, M. B. (1974). A Survey of research in education. CASE, Baroda: MSU.

Buch, M. B. (1979). Second survey of research in education (1972-79). CASE, Baroda: MSU.

Buch, M. B. (1984). Third survey of research in education (1978-1983). New Delhi: NCERT.

Buch, M. B. (1991). Fourth survey of research in education (1983-88). Vol. I & II, New Delhi: NCERT.

Buch, M. B. (1999 & 2000). Fifth survey of research in education (1988-92). Vol. I & II, New Delhi: NCERT.

Burkey, A. (1997). Teacher professionalization and teacher empowerment. In V. Prakash (Ed.1998), *Teacher empowerment and school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 335-349.

Burkey, A. (1998). Back to basics: Research based lessons for effective school learning in India. In V. Prakash (Ed.), *Studies on learning organization, community participation and school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 114-129.

Creemers, B. P. M. (1994). The history, value and purpose of school effectiveness studies. In Reynolds et al. (Eds), *Advances in School Effectiveness Research and Practice,* Oxford: Pergamon.

Creemers, B. P. M. & Werf, G. V. (1998). Effects and costs of community participation: results of the primary education quality improvement project. In V. Prakash (Ed.), *Studies on learning organization, community participation and school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 2-19.

Creemers, B. P. M. & Jong, R. D. (1999). Effective school improvement projects: two case studies from the Netherlands. In NCERT (Ed.), *Studies on researches in school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 342-355.

Crimm, J. A. (1993). Parental involvement and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* Vol. 53(7).

Crispeels, J. (1996). Effective schools and home-school community partnership roles: A framework for parent involvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement.* Vol. 7, No. 4, Pp. 297-323.

Dave, P. N. et. al. (1988). Pupil achievement at the primary stage. *Department of Pre-School and Elementary Education,* New Delhi :NCERT.

Dave, P.N. & Murthy, C. G. V. (1994). Educational research and innovation: Bibliography. New Delhi: NCERT.

Dave, P.N. (1995). Project primary educational curriculum renewal: an evaluation study. In K. Kumar (Ed.), *School effectiveness and learning achievement at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 425-441.

Davies, L. (1998). School climate and effectiveness in contexts of stringency. In V. Prakash (Ed.), *Studies on learning organisation, community participation and school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 256-268.

DPEP Calling (1997). Empowering the community. *A DPEP News letter,* Vol 1, No. 14, New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resources Development.

DPEP Calling (1997). Teacher empowerment and school effectiveness. *A DPEP News letter,* Vol. 1, No. 17, New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resources Development.

DPEP Calling (1998). Building a communication strategy and understanding. *A DPEP News letter,* Vol. II, No. 2, New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resources Development.

DPEP Calling (1998). Community mobilization and participation. *A DPEP News letter*, Vol. II, No. 4, New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resources Development.

Government of Haryana. (2001). Annual report. *Chandigarh: Haryana Prathmic Shiksha Pariyojona Parishad,* Haryana.

Govinda, R. & Varghesh, N. V. (1991). Quality of education: An empirical study. *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration,* Vol. 10, No. 1, Pp.17-35.

Govinda, R. & Varghesh, N. V. (1993). Quality of primary schooling in India: A case study of Madhaya Pradesh. Paris: IIEP.

Jalali, J. R. (1995). Innovative practices to ensure school effectiveness among deprived groups: role of autonomous district council of Mizoram. In K. Kumar (Ed.), *Studies on school effectiveness and learning achievement at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 557-565.
Kaul, L. (1988). Methodology of educational research. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Ltd.

Kumar, S., Patel, C. S. & Mehta, A. K. (1998). Community participation in primary education and school effectiveness. In V. Prakash (Ed.) *Studies on on learning organisation, community participation and school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 339-354.

Ministry of HRD. (1993). Education for All: The Indian scene-widening horizens. Department of Education, New Delhi: Government of India.

Ministry of HRD. (2000). Annual report 1999-2000. New Delhi: *Department of Secondary and Higher Education,* Government of India.

Ministry of HRD. (2001). Annual report 2000-2001. New Delhi: *Department of Secondary and Higher Education,* Government of India.

Mortimore, P. et al. (1988). The effects of school membership on pupils' educational outcomes. *Research Papers in Education.* Vol. 3, No. 1, Pp. 3-26.

MHRD. (2000). Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan-Framework for Implementation. Govt. of India, *Department of Elementary Education and Literacy.* New Delhi.

MHRD. (2002). Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan: Manual for Appraisal of Plans. Govt. of India, *Department of Elementary Education and Literacy.* New Delhi.

Nagalaxmi, J. (1996). Essentials for pre-school stage. In NCERT (Ed.), *Studies on classroom processes and school effectiveness at primary stage,* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 545-554.

Nagaraju, C. S. (1995). Intervention for MLL attainment in multi-grade contexts. In K. Kumar (Ed.) *School effectiveness and learning achievement at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 425-441.

Rao, K. G. (1998). A study of the relationship between community participation and school effectiveness. In V. Prakash (Ed.), *Studies on learning organisation, community participation and school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 248-254.

Rao, N. M. (1998). Combating school dysfunctional through community mobilization: Case study of a rural school. In V. Prakash (Ed.), *Studies on learning organisation, community participation and school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 331-338.

Rath, K. B. & Rajesh, K. (1997). Schooling process and effectiveness: implication of teacher empowerment. In V. Prakash (Ed.), *Teacher empowerment and school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 310-320.

Reynolds, D. & Cuttance, P. (Eds). (1992). School effectiveness research, policy and practice. London: Cassell.

Saxena, A. B. (1995). Developing classroom strategy for more effective teaching. *Journal of Indian Education,* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 45-56.

Scheerens, J. (1992). Effective schooling: Research, theory and practice. London: Cassell.

Schweitzer, J. (1984). Characteristics of effective schools. Paper for American Educational research association.

Seethramu, A. S. (1995). Structure and management of education in karnataka state: imperative of the 73rd constitutional amendment and Karnataka panchayat raj act, 1993. In K. Kumar (Ed.), *School effectiveness and learning achievement at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp.567-576.

Sharma, P. (1998). Enhancing learning school language of disadvantaged learners through the use of home language in multi-grade schools. In V. Prakash (Ed.), *Studies on learning organization, community participation and school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp. 433-442.

Thrupp, M. (2001). Sociological & political concern about school effectiveness: Time for a new research agenda. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement an International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice,* Vol. 12, Pp. 7-40.

Thrupp, M. (2001). Recent school effective counter-critiques: Problems and possibilities. *British Educational Research Journal,* Vol. 27, 453-457.

Tiguryera, S. (1999). School effectiveness at the primary stage: a view of the Kampal school improvement project. In NCERT (Ed.), *Studies on researches in school effectiveness at primary stage.* New Delhi: NCERT, Pp.125-139

Wiersama, W. (1986). Research methods in education: An introduction (4th ed.). Toronto: Allyn and Bacan, Inc.

Yashpal Committee Report (1993). Panel calls for end to toddler's torture. Deccan Herald, Friday, July.