IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

CHAPTER - IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.1 Introduction

The objective of the study was to measure the innovative proneness of the secondary schools teachers in relation to their personal variables and on the basis of leadership behaviour pattern of the Principals, Organizational climate types of the schools and the job satisfaction of teachers. The sample of study was stratified in such a way that varied types of schools could be included in the study. Six mediums of instructions, boys and girls types and Kendriya Vidyalaye - both in and outside Gujrat - were considered as separate managements and hence independent variables. The ten personal variables of teachers considered were : age, sex, teaching experience, academic qualification, professional qualification, mobility, prior professional experience, in-service education, professional reading habits, and professional satisfaction.

In this study four tools were used for collection of data one of which has been constructed by the investigator for this study, the details of which has been discussed in the previous chapter. The present chapter covers the analysis of data yielded by these

these tools viz. I.P.S., L.B.D.Q , O.C.D.Q. and J.S.I.,
first separately for each tool and later in relatiòn to the
other tools. The data have also been presented as per the
variables.

4.2 Analysis of the I.P.S. Data

The tool "Innovative Proness Scale" was designed
by Panchal (1977) for use on teacher-educators of Gujrat.
Patel (1979) redesigned it for use of Secondary and Higher
Secondary school Teachers of Gujrat. In the present study
the version of tool used by Patel has been used. The
analysis of data yielded by the I.P.S. are presented in
this section.

Table 4.1 - The Innovative Proneness of Different
types of school Teachers

Type of School	Response	Mean	S.D.	t value
Part A - Management				
K.V.	90	536.22	69.955	2.17*
Others	242	531.21	72.03	
Part B - Types of K.V.				
K.V.in Gujrat	30	536.40	86.78	0.02
Outside K.V.	60	536.04	53.13	
Part C - Unisex Schools				
Boys	50	521.52	62.31	2.00*
Girls	32	503.74	79.74	1.00
Mixed	250	537.74	72.85	1.49
Part D - Medium of Insturction				
English	35	572.59	55.69	2.62*
Gujrati	40	556.52	80.51	2.41*
Sindhi	29	503.74	79.73	1.50
Hindi	31	606.92	74.76	1.17
Marathi	15	473.59	58.46	1.64
Urdu	10	513.07	85.05	1.73

* Significant at.05 level

Table 4.1 shows the innovative proneness of the teachers of the schools under different managements viz. K.V. in Gujrat and outside, Unisex schools and medium of instruction group of schools. Significant difference in favour of K.V. is found (in part 'A' which shows the innovative proneness of K.V.) in relation to the other schools. The mean score of the K.V. was higher but the standard deviation was higher for other schools. In part 'B' the difference was marginal and not significant difference was found between the K.V. in Gujrat and outside K.V. though mean score and standard deviation were higher in respect of K.V. in Gujrat. In part 'C' the difference was significant at .05 level between the mixed and boys schools and it was in favour of the mixed schools. The highest mean was of the mixed schools and the highest standard deviation was of the girls schools. In part 'D' two differences were significant at .05 level, firstly between English and Urdu in favour of English and between English and Gujrati also in favour of English. The highest mean score was of Hindi medium and the lowest of the Marathi schools. The highest SD was of Urdu and the lowest of the English schools.

Table 4.2 shows the combined scores of teachers for the three sections of the I.P.S. The Part 'A' of the table shows no significant difference between the K.V. and other schools. Section I shows higher mean and S.D. scores for

Table 4.2 : Combined Scores of teachers on the three Sections of I.P.S.

Type of School	Sec I – Attitude to Innovation			Sec II – Situational & Innovation Characteristics			Sec III – Change Related Values		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Part 'A' – Management									
K.V.	124.37	17.38	1.12	201.94	39.96	1.01	222.52	32.51	1.31
Others	126.96	20.48		200.78	35.95		212.73	33.82	
Part 'B' – Types of K.V.									
K.V. in Gujrat	120.44	20.79	1.62	207.37	48.19	0.70	222.70	34.23	0.04
Outside K.V.	128.30	13.96		196.50	31.74		222.35	30.79	
Part 'C' – Unisex Schools									
Boys	110.90	17.67	1.18	202.87	34.12	0.90	218.87	28.33	0.91
Girls	109.93	21.91	0.24	195.60	32.92	1.20	209.53	42.82	2.34*
Mixed	115.82	19.88	1.16	201.45	37.56	1.11	214.81	33.06	1.06
Part 'D' – Medium of Instruction									
English	128.15	12.64	0.67	217.95	33.79	0.30	237.15	26.16	1.04
Gujrati	111.80	22.44	3.15**	205.62	42.78	1.21	220.22	33.83	2.11*
Sindhi	109.73	21.91	0.50	195.60	32.92	1.33	209.53	42.83	1.56*
Hindi	111.23	30.41	0.24	204.40	37.79	0.99	207.93	31.98	0.17
Marathi	99.50	13.44	1.17	184.40	32.21	1.33	188.80	22.07	1.75*
Urdu	114.20	23.45	1.91*	200.18	41.10	1.00	209.80	42.58	1.51

*Significant at 0.05 level

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

other schools. Section II shows higher mean as well as SD scores for the K.V. Section III shows higher mean score for the K.V. and higher S.D. for other schools. Part 'B' of the table shows no significant difference, between the two types of K.V. In section I the mean score was higher for outside K.V. but the S.D. was higher for the K.V. in Gujrat. In case of Sections II and III mean scores as well as S.D. were higher for the K.V. in Gujrat. Part 'C' of the table reveals significant difference at .05 level between the boys and girls schools in favour of Boys in Section III. In Section I the mean was highest for mixed schools and the S.D. was highest for girls schools. In Section II the mean was highest for boys schools and the S.D. was highest for mixed schools. In Section III the mean was highest for boys schools and S.D. for girls schools. Part 'D' of table shows highly significant difference at 0.01 level in Section I between English and Gujrati in favour of English and significant difference at .05 level between Marathi and Urdu in favour of Urdu. In Section III significant difference was found between English and Gujrati in favour of English, between Gujrati and Sindhi in favour of Gujrati, and between Hindi and Marathi in favour of Hindi. In all these sections the mean was highest for Hindi but the S.D. was highest for Hindi in Section I, Gujrati in Section II and Sindhi in Section III.

254

Table 4.3 : Combined scores of teachers on the components of Attitude to Innovation

Types of School	Individualisation			Curriculum Organisation			Teaching Learning Process			Teaching Resource		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
PART 'A' — MANAGEMENT												
K.V.	22.16	2.69	1.31	12.96	2.30	1.47	21.37	3.36	0.71	16.49	3.08	1.01
Others	19.50	1.31		11.36	3.00		19.33	4.24		11.36	3.00	
PART 'B' — TYPES OF K.V.												
K.V.in Gujrat	20.87	4.02	2.83**	12.82	2.18	0.52	21.14	3.57	0.54	15.83	3.53	1.58
Outside KV	23.45	1.36		13.10	2.43		21.60	3.15		17.15	2.63	
PART 'C' — UNISEX SCHOOLS												
Boys	20.20	3.03	0.58	11.60	2.51	0.41	19.93	3.55	0.18	12.77	4.06	1.03
Girls	19.68	4.62	1.57	10.55	3.42	1.42	19.48	4.77	0.44	14.13	4.13	1.37
Mixed	20.05	3.79	1.39	11.83	2.84	1.20	19.75	4.04	0.78	14.96	3.70	1.11
PART 'D' — MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION												
English	22.05	2.73	2.23*	13.80	1.40	3.64**	20.90	2.82	2.08*	16.40	3.62	2.00*
Gujrati	19.80	4.45	2.18*	11.26	3.25	3.42**	19.20	4.15	1.80	14.46	4.07	1.98*
Sindhi	18.68	4.42	1.34	10.55	3.42	1.15	19.48	4.77	0.34	14.48	3.39	0.02
Hindi	18.53	5.10	0.12	11.70	4.32	1.24	18.00	5.84	1.16	13.50	4.52	1.03
Marathi	17.60	3.74	0.54	10.40	1.80	0.92	17.60	2.99	0.21	13.10	3.60	0.25
Urdu	19.44	4.83	1.21	11.02	3.91	0.49	20.02	5.05	1.46	14.78	4.20	1.18

* Significant at 0.05 level

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

(Table 4.3 Contd.....)

Types of School	Inter. School Organisation			Staff Development			School Community Relationship		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
PART 'A' - MANAGEMENT									
K.V.	19.11	4.53	1.01	19.84	4.83	1.40	12.58	2.60	1.37
Others	17.83	3.91		17.82	3.99		11.25	2.74	
PART 'B' - TYPES OF K.V.									
K.V. in Gujrat	18.53	5.14	0.96	19.58	4.87	0.44	11.97	2.85	1.81
Outside K.V.	19.70	3.92		20.10	4.79		13.20	2.35	
PART 'C' - UNISEX SCHOOLS									
Boys	18.00	3.52	0.10	17.67	4.46	0.41	10.40	2.70	1.22
Girls	17.90	4.10	0.11	16.88	3.79	0.80	11.78	3.30	1.86
Mixed	18.13	4.09	1.14	18.46	4.17	1.40	11.62	2.64	1.33
PART 'D' - MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION									
English	19.15	4.67	1.68	22.15	2.06	3.00**	13.15	2.08	1.49
Gujrati	17.34	4.47	1.64	18.43	4.74	3.44**	11.21	3.31	2.52*
Sindhi	17.90	4.10	0.69	17.20	4.10	1.44	11.70	2.77	0.83
Hindi	17.63	4.62	0.26	16.90	4.78	0.28	10.00	3.98	2.46*
Marathi	15.60	4.54	1.36	15.10	4.01	1.07	10.10	1.00	0.10
Urdu	19.16	4.30	2.57*	18.20	4.01	0.23	11.66	3.79	1.29

* Significant at 0.05 level

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.3 describes the collective score for teachers
on Attitude to Innovation. No significant difference was
found on any component betwee the K.V. and other schools
of Gujrat state. Mean of the K.V. was higher in case of
all components whereas SD of K.V. was higher in five of
the seven components only. The S.D. of other schools was high
in case of curriculum organisation and teaching-learning
process. This shows that the attitude to innovation was
relatively better for K.V. teachers though no significant
difference was found. In case of Part 'B' highly significant
difference at .01 level was revealed for the component of
"Individualisation" in favour of outside K.V. The mean of
outside K.V. was also higher for all the components. The
S.D. of K.V. in Gujrat was higher for five of the seven
components. The components of curriculum organisation and
staff development showed higher SD score for the outside K.V.
In part 'C' no significant difference was found on any
components. The mean score of Boys schools was higher on the
components of Individualisation and Teaching Learning Process,
of Girls schools on School Community Relation, and of Mixed
schools on the remaining four components. The S.D. score was
highest for the Girls schools on six components. In case of
staff development Boys schools had the highest S.D.Score.
On School Community Relationship of Girls school teachers
scored highest mean as well as S.D. scores. In Part 'D'
highly significant differences at .01 level were found

between English and Gujrati in favour of English and
between English and Urdu in favour of English on the
components of curriculum organization and staff development.
Similar results were found in case of significant diff-
erences at .05 level on the components of Individualisations,
Teaching Learning Process and teaching resource. Significant
difference was also found between Marathi and Urdu in.
favour of Urdu, between English and Gujrati in. favour of
English and Sindhi and Hindi in favour of Sindhi. Gujrati
and Urdu medium schools showed better Attitude to
Innovation.

Table 4.4 shows the combined scores of teachers on
the components of the second section of the I.P.S. viz.
Situation and Innovative characteristics. No significant
difference was found in any part of the table for the
components of Administrative Support, Staff norms and
System norms. There was also no significant difference in
parts 'A' and 'B' on the components of complexity,
compatibility and localiteness. Part 'A' showed no signi-
ficant difference on any component. Outside K.V. had
higher mean on staff norms, System Norms, and Cosmopolite-
ness and the K.V.in Gujrat had higher mean on Complexity,
Riskness and Localiteness. The mean of both types of K.V.
was almost equal on Administrative Support. In this part
the SD score of other schools was higher on Staff Norms
and System Norms and on all other components K.V. scored
higher mean.

In Part 'B' highly significant difference at .01
level was found in favour of K.V. in Gujrat on the
component of Cosmopoliteness and significant difference
was found in favour of outside K.V. on the components of
Riskness. Higher mean was found for outside K.V. on the

Table 4.4 : Combined scores of Teachers on the components of situational and Innovative characteristics

Types of Schools	Administrative Support			Staff Norms			System Norms			Complexity		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
PART 'A' – MANAGEMENT												
K.V.	26.26	7.16	0.59	29.72	12.50	0.65	15.50	7.56	0.62	23.12	5.41	1.30
Others	26.25	6.56		35.78	12.54		17.15	6.47		20.93	5.46	
PART 'B' – TYPES OF K.V.												
K.V.in Gujrat	25.68	8.77	0.57	31.75	13.18	0.94	16.80	8.99	1.24	23.89	4.32	1.36
Outside KV	26.85	5.56		27.70	13.82		14.20	6.13		22.35	6.10	
PART 'C' – UNISEX SCHOOLS												
Boys	26.13	7.45	0.57	32.57	11.66	0.91	16.60	6.25	0.68	21.90	8.18	2.21*
Girls	25.45	5.59	0.64	36.73	13.12	1.10	16.75	6.34	0.10	20.28	5.20	2.30*
Mixed	26.37	6.72	0.61	34.55	12.57	0.83	16.85	6.79	0.76	21.56	5.19	0.31
PART 'D' – MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION												
English	28.10	6.14	1.31	36.10	14.85	1.60	14.95	8.28	0.66	23.95	5.73	1.30
Gujrati	26.87	7.57	0.88	36.02	12.50	0.10	17.48	6.81	0.58	21.63	4.86	1.46
Sindhi	25.70	5.92	0.58	36.23	11.45	0.10	16.75	6.34	0.58	21.47	4.04	1.04
Hindi	26.53	7.91	0.51	38.18	11.33	0.70	19.70	6.18	0.95	18.20	6.09	1.94*
Marathi	24.90	5.20	0.61	36.70	11.05	0.59	18.20	3.88	0.72	20.72	5.16	1.37
Urdu	26.32	6.73	0.63	33.78	14.36	0.49	15.76	7.74	0.57	21.90	8.18	0.99

* Significant at 0.05 level

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

(Table 4.4 Contd...)

Types of School	Compatibility			Riskness			Localiteness			Cosmopoliteness		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
PART 'A' – MANAGEMENT												
K.V.	23.94	3.52	1.31	33.64	6.23	1.81	33.18	6.32	1.68	15.22	6.83	1.95
Others	21.45	5.44		30.64	6.18		30.52	5.93		17.85	6.48	
PART 'B' – TYPES OF K.V.												
K.V. in Gujrat	23.54	4.29	0.81	32.03	6.52	2.04*	33.32	6.35	0.17	17.70	7.60	2.74**
Others K.V.	24.35	2.76		36.25	5.95		33.05	6.30		12.75	6.07	
PART 'C' – UNISEX SCHOOLS												
Boys	22.63	6.91	1.85	32.23	7.09	1.28	33.70	5.86	0.23	18.27	7.66	1.53
Girls	20.23	6.08	0.85	29.35	7.42	0.64	30.20	7.04	2.21*	17.13	6.49	1.67
Mixed	22.09	4.69	1.18	31.35	5.92	1.86	30.83	5.90	1.42	17.23	6.42	0.09
PART 'D' – MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION												
English	24.35	3.13	1.83*	36.95	3.30	4.68**	33.50	4.15	2.13*	17.65	7.07	0.03
Gujrati	22.18	4.78	1.95*	30.59	6.58	4.21**	31.20	6.99	2.65*	19.10	5.89	0.86
Sindhi	20.22	6.08	2.02*	29.35	7.42	0.97	30.20	7.04	0.76	17.13	6.79	1.54
Hindi	21.43	4.45	0.92	30.43	5.59	0.67	28.80	6.28	0.86	18.17	7.10	0.62
Marathi	19.20	5.94	1.26	25.10	4.80	2.70*	24.40	2.96	2.13*	17.70	2.91	2.20*
Urdu	21.46	6.13	1.10	31.12	7.21	2.52*	32.20	7.12	2.39**	17.66	6.92	0.02

* Significant at 0.05 level
** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

components of Administrative Support, Compatibility and
Riskness and for other components the mean was higher for
the K.V. in Gujrat. The S.D. score of outside K.V. was
higher for Staff Norms and Complexity and for all other
components the SD Score was higher of K.V. in Gujrat.
In Part 'C' significant difference at .05 level was found
between Boys and Girls and Mixed and Boys both in favour
of Boys school on the components of Localiteness. The
mean score of the Boys schools was highest on the components
of complexity. It was highest for Girls school on Adminis-
trative Support and Staff Norms and it was highest for the
Mixed schools on system Norms. The SD score of Boys schools
was highest on Administrative support, complexity,
compatibility, and cosmopoliteness. It was highest for Girls
schools on Riskness and Localiteness. It was highest for
Mixed schools on Staff norms and System Norms. In Part 'D'
highly significant difference at .01 level was found between
English and Gujrati and between Urdu and English both in
favour of English schools on the components of Riskness.
Significant difference at .05 level was found between
Sindhi and Hindi in favour of Sindhi medium on the component
of Complexity, between English and Gujrati in favour of
English, between Gujrati and Sindhi in favour of Gujrati
and between Urdu and English in favour of English on the
component of Compatibility. Significant difference at .05
level was also found between Hindi and Marathi in favour
of Hindi, and between Marathi and Urdu in favour of Urdu
on the component of Riskness and between English and Gujrati
in favour of English, between Hindi and Marathi in favour
of Hindi, between Marathi and Urdu in favour of Urdu, and
between Urdu and English in favour of English on the
component of Localiteness. Significant difference at .05
level was also found between Hindi and Marathi in favour of
Hindi on the component of Cosmopoliteness. In Part 'D' the
highest mean scores was of English medium on Administrative
Support and complexity, for Hindi medium on staff Norms and

System Norms and Gujrati medium on Cosmopoliteness. The S.D. Score was highest for Urdu medium on Complexity, Compatibility and Localiteness, for English medium on Staff norms and System norms, for Hindi medium on Administrative Support and Cosmopoliteness and for Sindhi medium on Riskness.

Table 4.5 shows the combined score of teachers on the components of Sect. III of the I.P.S. viz. the Change Related Values. No significant difference was found on any component in Part 'A'. The mean of other schools was higher for Conservatism and of the K.V. for all other components. The S.D. score of other schools was higher for Traditionalism and Change proneness and of the K.V. for all other components. In Part 'B' highly signifi-cant difference at .01 level was found in favour of outside K.V. on the component of Change Proneness. Significant difference at .05 level was found in favour of outside K.V. on Progressivism. K.V. in Gujrat had higher mean score on Dogmatism and Conservatism and on all other components the mean was higher for outside K.V. The S.D. score of outside K.V. was higher on Progressivism and Dognatism and of K.V. in Gujrat on the other four components. In Part 'C' significant difference at .05 level was found between Boys and Girls in favour of Boys school, on progressivism and Change Proneness and between Girls and Mixed in favour of Mixed Schools on Change Proneness. The mean of conservatism was highest for Girls, of Dogmatism for Mixed and for the remaining four components of the Boys schools. The S.D. score of all components was highest for the Girls schools. In Part 'D' highly significant difference at 0.01 level was found between English and Gujrati in favour of English medium on Traditionalism, between Marathi and Urdu in favour of Urdu medium on Dogmatism and between Urdu and English in favour of English medium on Change Proneness.

Table : 4.5 : Combined scores of Teachers on the Components of Change Related Values

Types of Schools	Traditionalism			Progressivism			Dogmatism		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
PART 'A' MANAGEMENT									
K.V.	40.68	5.98	0.42	41.33	8.27	1.46	33.44	8.95	0.80
Others	37.69	6.23		37.52	6.42		32.53	7.97	
PART 'B' — TYPES OF K.V.									
K.V.in Gujrat	39.36	6.64	1.67	39.75	6.06	2.85*	35.28	8.08	1.80
Outside K.V.	42.00	5.31		42.90	10.48		31.60	9.85	
PART 'C' — UNISEX SCHOOLS									
Boys	41.50	6.20	0.01	39.90	5.28	1.27	31.70	8.69	0.24
Girls	36.95	6.80	0.88	35.95	7.74	2.41*	31.73	9.57	0.11
Mixed	38.05	6.09	0.91	38.37	6.86	1.04	32.96	7.93	1.21
PART 'D' — MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION									
English	43.50	4.80	1.62	40.65	6.11	1.71	38.40	6.04	3.01
Gujrati	33.88	6.67	2.94**	40.45	6.00	0.13	33.81	8.07	2.41*
Sindhi	36.95	6.80	0.54	36.20	7.64	2.47*	31.65	9.48	1.36
Hindi	37.20	5.90	0.16	27.03	5.89	1.50	32.40	7.49	2.36*
Marathi	36.00	4.14	0.59	33.40	4.76	1.76	29.00	5.08	1.33
Urdu	35.55	8.51	2.16*	36.60	7.95	2.22*	31.54	9.35	2.85**

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level

(Table 4.5 Contd....)

Types of School	Conservatism			Change Proneness			Venturesomeness		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
PART 'A' - MANAGEMENT									
K.V.	28.45	8.17	0.31	46.65	4.75	1.42	35.03	7.33	0.77
Others	31.93	7.93		38.90	7.51		33.37	6.72	
PART 'B' - TYPES OF K.V.									
K.V.in Gujrat	32.61	8.28	1.11	46.61	6.04	3.64**	34.96	7.35	0.07
Outside K.V.	24.30	8.06		46.70	3.47	3.64**	35.10	7.32	
PART 'C' - SEX OF STUDENT									
Boys	30.37	8.67	1.54	41.93	6.67	0.23	33.50	5.31	1.63
Girls	33.55	8.88	1.50	37.73	9.96	2.03*	31.20	7.18	1.48
Mixed	31.06	7.78	1.42	40.61	6.65	2.06*	33.29	6.99	0.61
PART 'D' MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION									
English	31.35	8.94	0.01	45.80	3.65	3.64**	37.45	6.32	0.98
Gujrati	31.54	5.53	1.30	41.28	7.52	2.62*	34.16	7.80	1.77
Sindhi	33.35	8.88	1.25	37.48	9.53	2.50*	31.20	7.18	1.07
Hindi	30.70	7.90	1.39	38.80	7.60	1.63	32.60	6.56	0.84
Marathi	31.90	5.67	1.44	29.90	5.55	2.40*	28.60	5.64	1.72
Urdu	32.72	8.97	1.28	38.28	9.84	2.60*	32.24	7.77	1.41

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level.

Significant difference at .05 level was found between
Marathi and Urdu in favour of Marathi medium on Traditiona-
lism, between Gujrati and Sindhi in favour of Gujrati
medium and between Marathi and Urdu in favour of Urdu medium
on Pro-gressivism, between English and Gujrati in favour of
English and between Sindhi and Hindi in favour of Sindhi on
Dogmatism, and between English and Gujrati in favour of
English, between Gujrati and Sindhi in favour of Gujrati
between Hindi and Marathi in favour of Hindi and between
Marathi and Urdu in favour of Urdu on Change Proneness. The
mean of Part 'D' was highest of Urdu for conservatism and
of English for the remaining components. The highest S D
score was of Gujrati on Venturesomeness, of Sindhi on
Dogmatism and of Urdu medium for the remaining components.

4.3 Innovative Categories

Theoretically a respondent could score maximum of
750 points (150x5). This figure has been divided by 3 to form
the three groups of Highly, moderate and low innovative
categories of teachers. Even though the possibilities existed
to devide the teachers into four or more groups also but the
grouping was retained at three to keep the study comparable.
It was presumed that anybody who scored more than zero was
an innovative person falling into one of these categories.
In other words, there was a fourth group of non-innovative
teachers also but as no one scored zero this group needs no
mention. The scoring range of these categories was under :-

Category	Range of score
Highly Innovative (HI)	Above 500
Moderately Innovative (MI)	251 - 500
Low Innovative (LI)	1 - 250

Table 4.6 gives the break-down of the scores of these three groups. The MI category had 47% teachers followed by LI category 33% and HI category 20%. Similar ratio of teachers was found in the 3 groups of schools. The HI category consisted of teachers of K.V. 27% of Unisex schools 25% and of other schools 48%. Individually the HI category teachers were 26% in English, 25% in Girls and Gujrati, 20% both types of K.V. and Urdu, 18% Boys, 17% Sindhi and 13% Hindi and Marathi medium schools.

Table 4.6 : Distribution of Teachers in the Three Innovative categories.

Type of School	Res- ponse	HI		MI		LI	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
K.V. in Gujrat		Part A - Kendriya Vidyalaye					
K.V. in Gujrat	30	6	20(9)	16	53(10)	8	27(7)
Outside	60	12	20(18)	26	43(17)	22	37(20)
Total	90	18	20(27)	42	47(27)	30	33(27)
		Part B - Unisex Schools					
Boys	50	9	18(13)	24	48(16)	17	34(15)
Girls	32	8	25(12)	14	44(9)	10	31(9)
Total	82	17	21(25)	38	46(25)	27	33(24)
		Part C - Medium of Instruction					
English	35	9	26(14)	14	40(9)	12	34(11)
Gujrati	40	10	25(15)	19	40(12)	11	27(10)
Sindhi	29	5	17(7)	14	49(9)	10	34(10)
Hindi	31	4	13(6)	16	52(10)	11	35(10)
Marathi	15	2	13(3)	7	47(5)	6	40(5)
Urdu	10	2	20(3)	4	40(3)	4	40(3)
Total	160	32	20(48)	74	46(48)	54	34(49)
Grand Total	332	67	20(100)	154	47(100)	111	33(100)

Note : Figures in parantheses refer to the percentage of grand total.

HI = Highly Innovative.   MI = Moderately.   LI = Low

The distribution of MI category teachers was similar to H.I. Category teachers. In this category the KV together had 47%, in Gujrat, 53% and outside K.V. 43%. The Unisex schools together had 46% Boys Schools 48% and Girls schools 44%. The medium of instruction group together had 46%, Hindi, 52%, Sindhi 49%, Marathi 47% and remaining 3 types of schools 40% each. The LI category consisted to 27 % K.V., 24% Unisex and 49% other schools teachers. In this group K.V. together had 33% outside K.V. 37% and K.V. in Gujrat 27%. The Unisex schools together had 33% Boys schools 34% and the Girls Schools 31%. The medium of instruction group together had 34%, Urdu and Marathi 40% each, Hindi 35%, English and Sindhi 34% each and Gujrati medium 27%.

Table 4.7 : Relationship of Innovative Categories of Teachers.

Category	Section I (Attitude to Innovation			Section II (Situational and Innovative Character		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Highly Innovative	131.69	12.19	48.09**	240.22.	28.49	47.10**
Moderately Innovative	109.65	20.13	19.06**	185.21	28.99	19.05**
Low Innovative	76.09	28.88	5.44**	104.18	57.43	8.98**
	Section III (Change Related Values)			Innovative Proneness as a whole		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Highly Innovative	248.08	23.47	59.52**	620.04	40.77	10.23**
Moderately Innovative	199.45	29.33	27.10**	394.10	49.38	4.32**
Low Innovative	141.27	52.97	6.41**	221.55	85.84	11.31**

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.7 shows the relationship of the innovative categories of teachers as per the sections of the I.P.S. All the 12 relationships were highly significant at .01 level and were in favour of the relatively higher category. Means of all the sections were highest for the M.I. category and SD for the LI category.

Table 4.8 shows the relationship of the three innovative categories of teachers on the components. Attitude to Innovation. All the 21 relationship were highly significant at .01 level and were in favour of the relatively higher category. The highest mean of all components was of the H.I. category and the SD of the LI category.

Table 4.8 : Innovative Categories of Teachers and components of Attitude to Innovation

	Individualisation			Curriculum Organisation			Teaching Learning Process			Teaching Resource		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
High Innovative	22.37	2.18	3.68**	13.51	1.97	3.06**	22.23	2.84	35.19**	17.27	5.17	27.74**
Moderate	19.70	4.34	11.02**	11.29	3.29	11.76**	19.07	4.27	12.65**	14.00	3.70	11.57**
Low Innovative	13.46	5.45	4.71 **	7.85	3.85	3.55 **	13.01	4.53	4.59++	9.55	5.56	3.92**

	Internal School Organisation			Staff Development			School Community Relationship		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
High Innovative	21.64	3.83	34.77**	21.81	3.02	3.45**	13.24	2.52	3.49**
Moderate	17.20	4.04	18.25**	17.43	4.20	17.53**	10.85	2.98	12.93**
Low Innovative	13.18	6.31	3.23**	13.18	5.46	3.31**	6.82	2.99	4.46**

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.9 : Innovative Categories of Teachers and the components of situational and Innovation Characteristics

	Administrative Support			Staff Norms			System Norms			Complexity		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
High Innovative	31.34	5.47	39.36**	43.10	12.54	26.06**	21.15	6.95	35.43**	25.28	3.50	46.52**
Moderate #	24.65	6.92	15.86**	28.38	12.67	17.73**	14.44	6.23	15.69**	20.32	5.49	15.57**
Low Innovative	14.73	9.93	4.67**	21.46	11.45	2.80**	9.91	6.32	2.89**	10.46	6.49	5.89**

	Compatibility			Riskness			Localiteness			Cosmopoliteness		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
High Innovative	25.66	3.45	26.86**	35.37	13.93	47.68**	35.68	4.17	58.83**	22.20	5.88	34.87**
Moderate #	20.77	5.49	15.40**	30.54	7.24	11.83**	31.13	6.96	11.41**	15.02	6.30	17.76**
Low Innovative	12.36	7.45	5.00**	15.91	11.55	6.56**	12.18	7.82	8.93**	8.10	5.59	3.62**

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.9 shows the relationship of the three
innovative categories of teachers on the components of
Situational and Innovation Characteristics. All the 24
relationships were found to be highly significant at .01
level and were in favour of the relatively higher category.
In all the components the highest and lowest means were of
H.I. and M.I. categories, respectively. In case of Staff
Norms and Cosmopoliteness the highest and SD scores were
of the M.I. and L.I. categories,, respectively; in case of
System Norms these score were of the H.I. and M.I.
categories and in case of the remaining components these
scores were of L.I. and M.I. categories, respectively.

Table 4.10 : Categories of Teachers and the components
of Change Related Value

	Traditionalism			Progressivism			Dogmatism		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
High Innovative	43.36	5.36	43.83**	43.65	5.17	41.68**	38.76	6.91	26.81*
Moderate Innovative	36.42	6.31	17.77**	36.82	6.84	16.56**	28.89	7.95	19.80*
Low Innovative	25.46	13.32	5.56**	26.46	9.42	4.95**	25.36	12.06	7.08*

	Venturesomeness			Conservatism			Change Proneness		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
High Innvative	38.52	6.56	7.08**	35.35	8.99	27.23**	46.24	4.52	51.9**
Moderate Innovative	30.25	6.45	19.38**	28.48	7.91	12.56**	38.84	7.45	16.5**
Low Innovative	20.56	7.93	4.92**	20.46	9.56	3.32**	23.00	11.05	6.5**

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.10 shows the relationship of the three innovative categories of teachers on the components of Change Related Values. All the 18 relationships were highly significant at .01 level and were in favour of the relatively higher category. The highest and lowest means of all components were of the H.I. and L.I. categories, respectively. In case of Traditionalism, Progressivism, Dogmatism and Change Proneness the highest and lowest SD scores were of the L.I. and H.I. categories, respectively, and in case of Venturesomeness and Conservatism the highest and lowest SD scores were of the L.I. and M.I. Categories, respectively.

4.4 Personal Variables and Innovative Proneness

In this section the relationship of the 10 personal variables and the components of I.P.S. has been presented.

Table 4.11 shows the age-wise distribution of teachers in different types of schools. 32% teachers were found to be upto 34 years and 68% above it. In the lower age group 30% were in the K.V., 24% in the Unisex Schools and 46% in the medium of instruction group of schools. The distribution of upper age group was 26% in the K.V., 25% in the unisex school and 49% in the medium of instruction group of schools. The highest percentage of upper age group teachers was in the Urdu Schools (80%) followed by Sindhi 79%, Boys schools 76%, Marathi 73% English 72%, Hindim 71%, K.V. in Gujrat 67%, outside K.V. 63%, Girls schools 59% and Gujrati medium schools 55%.

Table 4.11 : Agewise Distribution of Teachers in Different
Types of Schools

Type of School	Response	Upto 34 years		Above 34 years	
		No	%	No	%
Part A - Kendriya Vidyalaye					
K.V. in Gujrat	30	10	33	20	67
Outside K.V.	60	22	37	38	63
Total	90	32	36(30)	58	64(26)
Part B - Unisex Schools					
Boys	50	12	24	38	76
Girls	32	13	41	19	59
Total	82	25	30(24)	57	70(25)
Part C - Medium of Instruction					
English	35	10	28	25	72
Gujrati	40	18	45	22	55
Sindhi	29	6	21	23	79
Hindi	31	9	29	22	71
Marathi	15	4	27	11	73
Urdu	10	2	20	8	80
Total	160	49	31(46)	111	69(49)
Grand Total	332	106	(32(100)	226	68(100)

Note : Figures in parantheses indicate the percentages
of the grand total.

Table 4.12 : Age of Teachers and Innovative Proneness
as a whole.

Age Group	Mean	SD	t-value
Upto 34 years	422.78	72.01	1.95*
About 34 years	432.65	66.83	

* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.12 shows the relationship of the two
age-groups with I.P.S. as a whole. Significant difference
at .05 level was found in favour of the upper age-group.
The upper group had the higher mean and the lower group
higher S.D.score.

Table 4.13 : Age of Teachers and Attitude to Innovation
as a whole.

Age Group	Mean	SD	t-value
Upto 34 years	103.40	21.28	1.19
Above 34 years	105.10	20.71	

Table 4.13 shows the relationship of teachers' age with
Attitude to Innovation as a whole. The difference was not
significant. The upper group had higher mean and the lower
group higher SD score.

Table 4.14 : Age of Teachers and Components of Attitudes
to Innovation.

| Components | Upto 34 Years | | Above 34 years | | t-value |
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Individualization	19.37	4.38	19.64	3.57	1.05
Curriculum Organization	11.01	2.76	11.02	3.21	0.63
Teaching-Learning Process	18.62	5.20	19.48	3.87	3.26**
Teaching Resources	14.08	5.31	14.11	3.61	2.41*
Internal School Organization	17.49	4.17	17.88	4.28	1.44
Staff Development	17.82	4.24	18.06	3.34	0.50
School Community Relationship	10.45	3.03	10.70	3.01	1.27

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
 * Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.14 shows the relationship of the two age groups on the components of Attitude to Innovation. Highly significant difference at .01 level was found in favour of the upper group on Teaching Learning Process and significant difference at .05 level in favour of the upper group on Teaching Resource. The highest as well as the lowest mean scores were for the upper age group on Individualisation and School Community Relationship, respectively. The highest and lowest SD scores of the upper group was on Teaching Resources and Curriculum Organisation, respectively. The lower group had the highest and lowest S.D. scores on Internal Organisation and School Community Relationship, respectively.

Table 4.15 : Age of Teachers and Situation and Situation Innovation Characterisation as a whole :

Age Group	Mean	SD	t-value
Upto 34 years	204.80	38.70	0.98
Above 34 years	203.25	40.67	

Table 4.15 shows the relationship of the two age-groups on the Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a whole. No significant relationship was found between the two groups. The higher mean and S.D. scores were of the lower and upper groups, respectively.

Table 4.16 : Age of Teachers and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Upto 34 Years		Above 34 Years		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Administrative Support	26.10	7.12	25.70	7.32	0.85
Staff Norms	33.67	13.07	31.61	13.75	2.24*
System Norms	16.23	5.87	15.30	7.46	2.02*
Complexity	20.60	4.80	21.25	4.04	1.85
Compatability	21.73	4.13	21.03	4.63	2.03*
Riskness	30.66	5.70	31.44	6.00	1.78
Localiteness	31.01	5.54	32.05	5.83	2.85**
Cosmopoliteness	17.08	5.60	16.00	6.35	2.17*

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level

 * Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.16 shows the relationship of the two age groups on the components of the situational and Innovation Characteristics. Highly significant relationship at 0.01 level in favour of the upper group was found on Localiteness and significant relationship at .05 level was found in favour of the lower age-group on Staff Norms. System Norms, Compatibility and Cosmopoliteness. The highest and lowest means of the lower group were on Staff Norms and System Norms, respectively, and for the upper group on Localiteness and System Norms, respectively. The highest and lowest SD scores of both groups were on Staff Norms and Compatibility, respectively.

Table 4.17 : Age of Teachers and Change Related Values
as a Whole

Age Groups	Mean	SD	t-value
Upto 34 Years	210.32	35.82	4.52**
Above 34 Years	220.82	35.42	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.17 shows the relationship of the two age-groups on the Change Related Values as a wholes. Highly significant relationship at .01 level was found in favours of the Upper group. The higher mean was of the upper group and the SD of the lower group.

Table 4.18 : Age of Teachers and Components of Change Related Values.

Components	Upto 34 Years		Above 34 Years		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Traditionalism	37.42	5.58	38.16	6.28	1.43
Progressivism	37.06	6.15	39.14	6.06	4.60**
Dogmatism	30.26	8.10	32.59	7.60	3.92**
Venturesomeness	31.54	7.10	32.61	6.13	2.19*
Conservatism	29.43	8.06	30.18	7.88	1.32
Change Proneness	39.22	7.00	41.33	6.60	4.23**

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.18 shows the relationship of the two age-groups on the components of the Change Related Values. Highly significant relationship at 0.1 level in favour of the upper group was found on Progressivism, Dogmatism and Change Proneness and significant relationship at 0.05 level also in favour of the upper group was found on Venturesomeness. The means of both groups were highest of Change Proneness and lowest of Conservatism. The highest and lowest SD scores of the lower group were on Dogmatism and Traditionalism, respectively and of the higher group on Conservatism and Progressivism, respectively.

Table 4.19 — Distribution of Teachers as per their Sex in Different Types of Schools

Type of School	Response	Male		Female	
		No	%	No.	%
Part A - Kendriya Vidyalaye					
K.V.in Gujrat	30	10	33	20	67
Outside K.V.	60	29	48	31	52
Total	90	39	43(26)	51	57(28)
Part B - Unisex Schools					
Boys	50	35	70	15	30
Girls	32	2	6	30	94
Total	82	37	45(25)	45	55(25)
Part C - Medium of Instruction					
English	35	20	57	15	43
Gujrati	40	11	28	29	72
Sindhi	29	18	62	11	38
Hindi	31	11	35	20	65
Marathi	15	8	53	7	47
Urdu	10	6	60	4	40
Total	160	74	46(49)	86	54(47)
Grand Total	332	150	45	182	55

Note : Figures in parantheses indicate the percentages of the grand total.

Table 4.19 shows the distribution of teachers as per their sex in different types of schools. Male teachers constituted 45 % and female teachers 55% of the teachers population. The males were 26% in the K.V., 25% in the Unisex schools and 49% in the medium of instruction schools. The female teachers were 28% in the K.V. 25% in the Unisex Schools and 47% in the medium of instruction schools. Less than 50% ratio of female teachers was found in Marathi(47%), English (43%), Urdu (40%), Sindhi (38%), and Boys (30%). Below 50% ratio of male teachers was found in outside KV. (48%), Hindi (35%) K.V. in Gujrat (33%), Gujrati medium(28%) and Girls Schools (6%).

274

Table 4.20 : Sex of Teachers and Innovative Proneness
as a Whole

Teachers	Mean	SD	t-value
Male	532.91	80.11	4.56**
Female	561.31	75.41	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table 4.20 shows the relationship of sex of teachers with the Innovative Proneness Scale as a whole. The relationship was highly significant at .01 level in favour of female teachers. The higher mean and SD scores were of females and males, respectively.

Table 4.21 : Sex of Teachers and Attitude to Innovation
as a Whole

Sex	Mean	SD	t-value
Male	115.67	21.14	5.24**
Female	124.25	19.62	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.21 shows the relationship of sex of teachers with the Attitude to Innovation as a whole. The relationship was highly significant at .01 level in favour of the female teachers. The higher mean and SD scores were of the females and males, respectively.

Table 4.22 : Sex of Teachers and the components of Attitude
to Innovation

Components	Male		Female		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Individualization	20.45	4.09	21.26	3.54	2.59**
Curriculum Organization	11.96	3.30	12.53	2.13	2.37*
Teaching Learning Process	19.77	4.11	21.73	4.04	6.11**
Teaching Resources	15.03	4.81	15.65	3.84	1.70
Internal School Organization	18.39	4.31	20.39	4.08	5.98**
Staff Development	18.91	4.46	19.36	4.16	1.29
School Community Relationship	11.45	3.11	12.60	2.80	2.79**

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

.* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.22 shows the relationship of sex of teachers
with the components of Attitude to Innovation. The relation-
ship was not significant on Teaching Resources and Staff
Development. Significant relationship at .05 level was found
on Curriculum Organisation and on the remaining components
the relationships were highly significant. All the relation-
ships were in favour of female teachers. The highest and
lowest means of males were for Individual&sation and School
Community Relationship, respectively, and of females for
Teaching Learning Process and Curriculum Organisation,
respectively. The highest and lowest S D scores of males
were for Internal School Organisation and School Community
Relationship, respectively, and of females for Staff
Development and Curriculum Organisation, respectively.

Table 4.23 : Sex of Teachers and the Situational and
Innovation Characteristies as a whole

Sex	Mean	SD	t-value
Male	204.10	40.85	0.78
Female	206.62	40.70	

Table 4.23 shows the relationship of sex teachers with the Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a whole. The relationship was not significant. The higher mean and SD scores were of the female and male teachers, respectively.

Table 4.24 : Sex of Teachers and the Components of
Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Male		Female		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Administrative Support	26.69	7.50	28.26	6.34	2.73**
Staff Norms	33.92	14.60	33.01	14.19	0.80
System Norms	17.08	7.24	16.01	7.44	1.88
Complexity	21.89	5.64	22.63	5.14	1.69
Compatibility	22.48	5.46	22.49	5.71	0.03
Riskness	32.00	7.07	33.80	6.30	1.48
Localiteness	32.27	6.97	33.92	6.02	3.10**
Cosmopoliteness	17.62	7.02	17.49	7.49	0.23

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.24 shows the relationship of sex of teachers with the components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics. Highly significant relationship at .01 level in favour of female teachers was found on Administrative Support and Localiteness. The highest means of males and females were on Staff Norms and Localiteness, respectively and the lowest means of both groups was on System Norms. The

highest SD scores of both groups were on Staff Norms. The
lowest SD score of males and females were on Compatibility
and Complexity, respectively.

Table 4.25 : Sex of Teachers and the Change Related
Values as a Whole

Sex	Mean	SD	t-value
Male	213.14	36.36	6.22**
Female	230.93	36.55	

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.25 shows the relationship of sex of teachers
with Change Related Values as a whole. The relationship
was highly significant at .01 level and was in favour of
females. The mean as well as the SD scores were higher for
the females.

Table 4.26 : Sex of Teachers and the Components of
Change Related Values

Components	Male		Female		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Traditionalism	38.58	7.24	39.96	6.21	2.50*
Progressivism	38.50	7.26	42.07	6.40	6.39**
Dogmatism	31.92	9.25	34.75	7.69	4.03**
Venturesomeness	32.90	7.75	34.39	7.62	2.48*
Conservatism	30.51	8.92	32.55	9.31	2.88**
Change Proneness	40.91	8.01	43.32	7.48	3.88**

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.
* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.26 shows the relationship of sex of teachers
with the components of Change Related Values. The
significant relationship at .05 level in favour of females
were on Traditionalism and Venturesomeness and on the
remaining components highly significant relationship at
.01 existed in favour of females. For both group the
highest and lowest means were on Change Proneness and
Conservatism, respectively. The highest SD scores for the
males and females were on Dogmatism and Conservatism,
respectively. The lowest SD scores of both groups were on
Traditionalism.

Table 4.27 : Distribution of Teachers According to
Teaching Experience

Type of School	Response	Upto 5 Years		Above 5 Years	
		No	%	No	%
KxVxxinxSujxxx		Part A - Kendriya Vidyalaye			
K.V. in Gujrat	30	13	43	17	57
Outside K.V.	60	27	45	33	55
Total	90	40	44(30)	50	56(25)
		Part B - Unisex Schools			
Boys	50	14	28	36	72
Girls	32	18	56	14	44
Total	82	32	39(24)	50	61(25)
		Part C - Medium of Instruction			
English	35	10	29	25	71
Gujrati	40	17	42	23	58
Sindhi	29	9	31	20	69
Hindi	31	14	45	17	55
Marathi	15	5	33	10	67
Urdu	10	6	60	4	40
Total	160	61	38(46)	99	62(50)
Grand Total	332	133	40(100)	199	60(100

Note : Figures in parantheses indicate the percentages of
the grand total.

Table 4.27 shows the distribution of teachers according to their teaching experience. 60% teachers had above 5 years experience and 40% lesser experience. 25% teachers of the upper and 30% of the lower groups were in the K.V. 25% and 24% in the Unisex schools and 62% and 46% in the medium of instruction group. Except for Urdu medium and Girls schools which had 40% and 44%, respectively, all other schools had more than 54% teachers in the Upper group, highest being in Boys and English medium schools.

Table 4.28 : Teaching Experience and Innovative Proneness Scale as a Whole

Teaching Experience	Mean	SD	t-value
Upto 5 Years	521.61	81.63	3.84**
Above 5 Years	544.10	78.73	..

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table 4.28 shows the relationship of the two groups with the I.P.S. as a whole. Highly significant difference at .01 level was found in favour of the Upper group. The higher mean and SD scores were of the upper and lower groups, respectively.

Table 4.29 : Teaching Experience and Attitude to Innovation as a whole

Teaching Experience	Mean	SD	t-value
Upto 5 Years	114.07	19.87	2.86**
Above 5 Years	118.50	21.41	..

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table 4.29 shows the relationship of the two groups with the Attitude to Innovation as a whole. Highly significant relationship at .01 level was in favour of the upper group. The mean as well as the SD scores were also higher of the upper group.

Table 4.30 : Teaching Experience and Components of
Attitude to Innovation.

Components	Upto 5 Years		Above 5 Years		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Individualisation	20.05	4.37	30.00	3.90	2.55*
Curriculum Organization	11.63	2.96	12.22	3.14	2.89**
Teaching Learning Process	18.93	4.30	20.57	4.05	5.41**
Teaching Resources	14.95	6.57	15.23	3.81	0.82
Internal School Organization	18.49	3.82	18.89	4.49	1.24
Staff Development	19.12	3.77	18.99	4.59	0.47
School Community Relationship	11.40	2.90	11.78	3.13	1.69

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
·* Significant at .05 level.

Table 4.30 shows the relationship of two groups with the components of Highly significant relationship at .01 level in favour of the upper group existed on Attitude to Innovation. On Curriculum Organisation and Teaching Learning Process and significant relationship at .05 level also in favour of the upper group was found on Individualisation. The highest and lowest means of both groups were for 'Individualisation and 'School Community Relationship, respectively. The highest SD scores of the upper and lower groups were on Teaching Resources and Staff Development, respectively, and the lowest SD scores of both groups were on School Community Relationship.

Table 4.31 : Teaching Experience and the Situational and
Innovation Characteristics as a Whole

Teaching Experience	Mean	SD	t-value
Upto 5 Years	104.40	39.11	0.07
Above 5 Years	204.62	41.36	

Table 4.31 shows the relationship of the two groups
of teachers on the Situational and Innovation Characteristics
as a whole. The relationship was not significant. The higher
mean and SD scores were of the upper group.

Table 4.32 : Teaching Experience and Components of Situational
and Innovation Characteristics.

Components	Upto 5 Years		Above 5 Years		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Administrative Support	27.21	7.14	26.94	7.40	0.51
Staff Norms	35.47	13.96	33.15	14.64	2.17*
System Norms	16.35	6.92	17.02	7.40	1.24
Complexity	21.96	5.80	22.07	5.47	0.26
Compatibility	22.40	4.69	22.51	5.70	0.28
Riskness	31.87	6.63	32.24	7.01	0.72
Localiteness	31.11	7.01	33.08	6.69	3.95**
Cosmopoliteness	17.86	6.67	17.50	7.25	0.68

**Highly significant at 0.01 level

* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.32 shows the relationship of the two groups
of teachers on the components of Situational and Innovation
Characteristics. Highly significant relationship at .01 level
in favour of the upper group was found on 'Localiteness' and
significant relationship at .05 level in favour of the lower

group was on Staff Norms. The highest and lowest means of both the groups were on Staff Norms and System Norms, respectively. The highest SD scores of both groups were on 'Staff Norms'. The lowest SD score of the lower group was on 'Compatibility' and of the upper group on Complexity.

Table 4.33 : Teaching Experience and the Change Related Values as a Whole

Teaching Experience	Mean	SD	t-value
Upto 5 Years	203.06	36.93	6.76**
Above 5 years	221.14	36.09	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table 4.33 shows the relationship of the two groups on the Change Related Values as a whole. Highly significant relationship at .01 level was found in favour of the upper group. The higher mean and SD scores were of the upper and lower groups, respectively.

Table 4.34 : Teaching Experience and the Components of Change Related Values

Components	Upto 5 Years		Above 5 Years		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Traditionalism	37.10	6.99	39.42	7.00	4.50**
Progressivism	37.17	7.26	39.88	7.11	5.14**
Dogmatism	29.45	8.99	33.48	8.83	6.15**
Venturesomeness	31.20	8.53	33.84	7.37	4.66**
Conservatism	28.34	8.68	31.75	9.00	5.18**
Change Proneness	39.64	8.78	41.96	7.61	3.49**

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.34 shows the relationship of the
two groups with the components of Change Related
Values. All relationships were highly significant
at .01 level in favour of the upper group. The
highest and lowest means of both the groups were
on Change + Proneness and Conservatism,
respectively. The lowest S D scores of both the
groups were on Traditionalism. The highest S D
score of the lower group was on Dogmatism and of
the upper group on Conservatism.

Table 4.35 : Distribution of Teachers According to Academic Qualifications

Type of School	Res-ponse	Graduates							
		B.A.		B.Com.		B.Sc.		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
PART 'A' – K.V.									
K.V.in Gujrat	30	7	37	3	16	9	47	19	64
Outside	60	15	38	5	12	20	50	40	67
Total	90	22	37(27)	8	14(16)	29	49(25)	59	66(24)
PART 'B' – UNISEX SCHOOL									
Boys	50	12	30	10	25	18	45	40	80
Girls	32	8	29	6	21	14	50	28	87
Total	82	20	29(25)	16	24(32)	32	47(28)	68	83(28)
PART 'C' – MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION									
English	35	7	35	3	15	10	50	20	57
Gujrati	40	7	20	8	23	20	57	35	88
Sindhi	29	10	40	5	20	10	40	25	86
Hindi	31	7	35	6	30	7	35	20	65
Marathi	15	4	33	3	25	5	42	12	80
Urdu	10	3	43	1	14	3	43	7	70
Total	160	38	32(48)	26	22(52)	55	46(47)	119	74(48)
Grand Total	332	80	33(24)	50	20(15)	116	47(35)	246	74

Type of School	Res-ponse	Post Graduates							
		M.A.		M.Com.		M.Sc		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
PART 'A' – K.V.									
K.V.in Gujrat	30	8	73	1	9	2	18	11	36
Outside	60	13	65	3	15	4	20	20	33
Total	90	21	68(48)	4	13(31)	6	19(21)	31	34(36)
PART 'B' – UNISEX SCHOOL									
Boys	50	3	30	2	20	5	50	10	20
Girls	32	1	25	1	25	2	50	4	13
Total	82	4	29(9)	3	21(23)	7	50(24)	14	17(16)
PART 'C' – MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION									
English	35	7	47	1	6	7	47	15	43
Gujrati	40	2	40	1	20	2	40	5	12
Sindhi	29	2	50	1	25	1	25	4	14
Hindi	31	4	36	3	28	4	36	11	35
Marathi	15	2	67	–	–	1	33	3	20
Urdu	10	2	67	–	–	1	33	3	20
Total	160	19	46(43)	6	15(46)	16	39(55)	41	26(48)
Grand Total	332	44	51(13)	13	15(4)	29	34(9)	86	26

Note : Figures in paranthesis indicate percentages of the grand total.

285

Table 4.35 shows the distribution of teachers according to their academic qualifications. 74% teachers were graduates and 26% post-graduates. The graduates were distributed as 24% in K.V., 28% in Unisex Schools and 48% in medium of instruction group. The distribution of Post-Graduates was : 36% in the K.V., 16% in the Unisex schools and 48% in medium of instructions group. The highest percentage of graduates was in the Gujrati medium (88%) followed by the Girls (87%) Sindhi (86%), Marathi and Boys (80%), Urdu(70%), outside K.V. (67%), Hindi (65%) K.V. in Gujrat (64%) and English medium (57%). The highest percentage of Post-graduates was in English medium (43%) followed by K.V. in Gujrat 36%, Hindi (35%), outside K.V.(33%), Boys school (20%) Marathi (20%) Urdu (20%), Sindhi (14%), Girls School (13%), and Gujrati (12%).

K.V. had graduates as : 49% B.Sc., 37% B.A., 14% B.Com. and post-graduates as : 68% M.A., 19% M.Sc and 13% M.Com. The ratio in the two types of K.V. was similar. Distribution of graduates in the Unisex schools was : B.Sc. 47%, B.A.29%, B.Com 24% and Post-graduates : M.Sc. 50%, M.A. 29% and M.Com 21%. Similar ratio existed in the Boys and Girls Schools. The distribution of graduates in the medium of instruction group was : 47% B.Sc., 33% B.A. and 20% B.Com. and of post-graduates. 46% M.A., 39% M.Sc. and 15% M.Com. Except for Sindhi and Hindi medium all Schools had above 40% B.Sc. Urdu and Sindhi medium had 40% or more B.A. Commerce graduates remained upto 30% in all the medium schools. In the post-graduate group all medium schools except Gujrati and Hindi had above 40% M.A. Only English medium had above 40% M.Sc. also and Gujrati had 40% of M.A. and M.Sc. In all medium schools M.Com. degree holders remained below 29%, of the total post-graduates. 48% M.A. were in K.V. followed by 43% in the medium of instruction

schools and 9% in the Unisex schools. The distribution
of M.Sc. however was 55% in the medium of instruction
of group followed by 24% Unisex schools and 21% K.V.
Among the total graduates the highest ratio (above 46%)
of teachers of all types was employed in the medium of
instruction schools and K.V. group had the lowest of
B.Com, and B.Sc. teachers. K.V. was second in order so far
as B.A. teachers were concerned.

Table 4.36 : Academic Qualification of Teachers and
Their Innovative Proneness Scale as a Whole.

Qualification	Mean	SD	t-value
B.A.	542.94	82.29	2.01*
B.Com.	512.70	73.76	2.28*
B.Sc.	533.49	67.76	1.79
M.A.	538.59	76.76	0.74
M.Com.	561.07	101.50	2.23*
M.Sc.	534.15	71.58	1.97*

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.36 shows the relationship of academic
qualifications with I.P.S. as a whole. Significant
relationships at .05 level existed between M.A. and M.Com.
and M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.Com. and between M.Sc.
and B.A. and B.A. and B.Com. both in favour of B.A. The
highest and lowest means were of M.Com. and B.Com.,
respectively and the highest and lowest SD scores were of
M.Com. and B.Sc., respectively.

Table 4.37 : Academic Qualification of Teachers and
Attitude to Innovation as a Whole

Qualification	Mean	SD	t-value
B.A.	118.96	21.81	2.84**
B.Com.	108.42	19.34	3.00**
B.Sc.	116.16	22.49	2.09*
M.A.	116.69	20.30	0.26
M.Com.	118.64	20.29	0.80
M.Sc.	122.56	14.04	1.44

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

·* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.37 shows the relationship of academic qualification with the Attitude to Innovation. Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed between B.A. and B.Com. in favour of B.A. and between M.Sc. and MA. in favour of M.Sc. Significant relationship at .05 level also existed between B.Com. and B.Sc. in favour of B.Sc. The highest and lowest means were of M.Sc. and B.Com., respectively, and the highest and lowest SD scores were of B.Sc. and M.Sc., respectively.

Table 4.38 : Academic Qualification and Components of Attitude to Innovation

Academic Qualifi-cation	Individualization			Curriculum Organisation			Teaching Learning Process			Teaching Resources		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
B.A.	20.40	3.57	2.71**	12.21	2.54	2.18*	20.63	4.14	3.24**	15.64	6.15	0.37
B.Com.	19.00	4.45	1.80	11.30	3.73	2.05*	18.84	3.26	2.76**	13.77	4.21	1.93
B.Sc.	21.21	3.56	3.50**	12.05	3.14	1.35	19.59	4.31	1.08	15.96	4.11	1.71
M.A.	20.83	4.07	1.05	12.02	3.35	0.09	20.03	4.11	1.10	11.48	3.69	0.22
M.Com.	20.15	4.77	1.30	11.84	2.15	0.50	20.66	3.96	1.28	14.55	3.02	0.73
M.Sc.	21.44	3.16	2.05*	12.85	3.86	2.15*	21.08	3.57	0.72	16.05	2.53	2.92**

Academic Qualifi-cation	Internal School Organisation			Staff Development			School Community Relationship		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
B.A.	19.06	4.40	0.12	18.61	6.00	2.15*	12.08	3.29	2.17*
B.Com.	16.49	4.38	3.59**	18.35	4.13	0.32	11.09	2.92	1.85
B.Sc.	18.61	4.55	2.79**	18.97	4.48	0.83	13.34	2.98	0.49
M.A.	18.63	4.36	0.04	19.03	4.17	0.14	11.31	2.83	0.11
M.Com.	19.01	4.21	0.73	19.89	3.31	1.80	12.51	3.19	3.39**
M.Sc.	19.63	3.53	1.03	20.06	3.50	0.33	12.06	2.71	0.97

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.38 shows the relationship of academic qualification with the Components of Attitude to Innovation. Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed between B.Com. and B.Sc. in favour of B.Sc. and M.Sc. and B.A. in favour of M.Sc. on Individualisation; M.Sc. and B.A. in favour of M.Sc. and B.A. and B.Com. in favour of B.A. on Teaching Learning Process; M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.Sc. on Teaching Resources, B.A. and B.Com in favour of B.Com. and B.Com. and B.Sc. in favour of B.Sc. on Internal School Organisation, and M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.Com. on School Community Relationship. Significant relationship at .05 level also existed between M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.Sc. on Individualisation; B.A. and B.Com. in favour of B.A., M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.S. and M.Sc. and B.A. in favour of M.Sc. on Curriculum Organisation; M.Sc. and B.A. in favour of M.Sc. on Staff Development and M.Sc. and B.A. in favour of B.A. on School Community Relationship.

The highest and lowest means of Individualisation, Curriculum Organisation, Teaching Learning Process, Internal School Organisation and Staff Development were for M.Sc. and B.Com., respectively. On Teaching Resources the highest and lowest means were for M.Sc. and M.A., respectively, and on School Community Relationship for B.Sc. and B.Com, respectively. The highest and lowest SD scores were of M.Com. and M.Sc., respectively, on Individualisation; M.Sc. and M.Com., respectively, on Curriculum Organisation; B.Sc. and B.Com., respectively, on Teaching Learning Process; B.A. and M.Sc., respectively, on Teaching Resources; B.Sc. and M.Sc., respectively, on Internal School Organisation; B.A. and M.Com. respectively on Staff Development and B.A. and M.Sc., respectively, on School Community Relationship.

Table 4.39 : Academic Qualification and Situational
Innovation Characteristics as a Whole.

Qualification	Mean	SD	t-value
B.A.	200.31	42.41	0.51
B.Com.	199.63	41.70	0.10
B.Sc.	206.75	35.28	1.15
M.A.	205.34	40.76	0.39
M.Com.	218.31	42.66	2.85**
M.Sc.	201.01	42.58	2.49*

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level.
* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.39 shows the relationship of academic
qualification of teachers with the situational & Innovation
Characteristics. Highly significant relationship at .01
level existed between M.A. and M.Com. in favour of M.Com.
and significant relationship at .05 level between M.Com.
and M.Sc. also in favour of M.Com. The highest and lowest
means were of M.Com. and B.Com., respectively, and SD
scores were of M.Com. and B.Sc., respectively.

Table 4.40 : Academic Qualifications and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Academic Qualifications	Administrative Support			Staff Norms			System Norms			Complexity		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
B.A.	26.94	6.98	1.34	32.46	14.96	0.78	16.49	7.81	0.34	21.22	5.62	1.09
B.Com.	25.33	8.60	1.38	33.19	13.59	0.30	15.91	7.48	0.46	22.47	5.15	1.37
B.Sc.	27.38	7.03	1.65	33.80	14.21	0.26	17.78	5.80	1.81	23.56	4.60	1.38
M.A.	26.88	7.85	0.70	33.47	14.23	0.25	17.07	7.37	1.12	21.60	5.65	3.98**
M.Com.	27.78	6.26	0.99	40.55	12.91	4.21**	17.91	7.91	0.93	22.65	5.32	1.57
M.Sc.	26.34	7.96	1.32	32.76	15.33	3.00**	15.01	7.20	2.49*	22.48	6.53	0.18

Academic Qualifications	Compatibility			Riskness			Localiteness			Cosmopoliteness		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
B.A.	21.78	5.55	0.35	31.85	7.12	2.63**	32.48	6.93	2.74**	17.05	7.01	2.06*
B.Com.	23.02	4.71	1.40	32.05	6.39	0.17	30.40	6.40	1.80	16.58	7.15	0.41
B.Sc.	23.31	4.67	0.37	31.33	6.65	0.64	32.03	6.53	1.49	17.81	6.22	1.14
M.A.	22.65	5.83	1.48	32.58	7.34	1.84	33.49	6.81	2.31*	17.30	7.49	0.77
M.Com.	23.90	5.04	1.97*	32.88	5.98	0.36	32.87	7.55	0.74	20.06	7.96	3.00**
M.Sc.	21.19	6.40	3.09**	33.75	6.37	0.92	33.10	5.92	0.22	17.15	6.76	2.54*

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.40 shows the relationship of academic qualification with the component of Situational and Innovation Characteristics. Highly significant relationship at .01 level was found between M.A. and M.Com. in favour of M.Com. and M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.Com. for Staff norms; M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.Com. for Compatibility; M.Sc. and B.A. in favour of M.Sc. for Riskness as well as Localiteness and M.A. and M.Com. in favour of M.Com. for Cosmopoliteness. Significant relationship at .05 level was also found between M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.Com. for System Norms; M.A. and M.Com. in favour of M.Com. for Compatibility; B.Sc. and M.A. in favour of M.A. for Localiteness, M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.Sc. and M.Sc. and B.A. in favour of M.Sc. for Cosmopoliteness.

The highest and lowest means were of M.Com. and B.Com., respectively, for Administrative Support; M.Com. and B.A., respectively, for Staff Norms; of M.Com. and M.Sc., respectively, for System Norms; of B.Sc. and B.A., respectively, for Complexity; of M.Com. and M.Sc., respectively, for Compatibility; of M.Sc. and B.Sc., respectively, for Riskness, of M.A. and B.Com., respectively, for Localiteness; of M.Com. and B.Com., and respectively, for Cosmopoliteness. The highest and lowest SD scores were of B.Com. and M.Com., respectively, for Administrative Support; of M.Sc. and M.Com., respectively, for Staff Norms; of M.Com. and M.Sc., respectively, for System Norms, of M.Sc. and B.Sc. respectively, for Complexity and Compatibility; of B.A. and M.Com.; respectively, for Riskness; of M.Com. and M.Sc., respectively, for Localiteness and of M.Com. and B.Sc., respectively, for Cosmopoliteness.

Table 4.41 : Academic Qualification and Change Related
values as a Whole

Qualification	Mean	SD	t-value
B.A.	324.12	38.21	2.27*
B.Com.	204.67	34.91	3.15 **
B.Sc.	210.54	29.81	1.13
M.A.	216.54	34.20	1.95
M.Com.	224.12	46.91	1.67
M.Sc.	209.58	35.21	2.26 *

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.
 * Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.41 shows the relationship of academic
qualification with Change Related Values as a whole. Highly
significant relationship at .01 levels existed between B.A.
and B.Com. in favour of B.A. and significant relationships
at .05 level were found between M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of
M.Com and between M.Sc. and B.A. in favour of B.A. The
highest and lowest means were of B.A. and B.Com., respec-
tively, and the SD scores of M.Com. and B.Sc., respectively.

Table 4.42 : Academic Qualification and Components of Change Related Value

Academic Qualification	Traditionalism			Progressivism			Dogmatism		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
B.A.	39.31	6.82	1.70	37.26	6.94	1.09	33.85	7.85	0.41
B.Com.	36.37	6.63	2.65**	40.39	7.62	3.04**	31.16	7.25	2.12*
B.Sc.	37.66	6.94	1.10	36.70	6.06	2.17*	31.40	9.19	0.16
M.A.	40.03	6.68	3.69**	38.96	6.17	0.38	31.98	9.00	0.67
M.Com.	39.87	7.44	0.19	39.20	7.36	1.67	34.32	11.26	2.02
M.Sc.	37.28	7.42	2.27**	37.68	7.94	1.31	30.99	10.22	2.01*

Academic Qualification	Venturesomeness			Conservatism			Change Proneness		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
B.A.	34.29	7.41	2.15	32.14	8.02	0.43	41.71	8.61	3.78**
B.Com.	31.42	8.20	2.35*	28.49	7.98	2.79**	41.26	7.32	0.33
B.Sc.	32.00	6.34	0.52	29.27	9.03	0.52	41.13	6.53	0.11
M.A.	33.14	7.68	1.68	30.78	9.06	1.73	41.50	7.73	0.54
M.Com.	35.28	8.73	2.23*	34.99	10.22	3.72**	41.99	7.88	0.53
M.Sc.	32.10	8.10	2.44*	27.85	9.65	4.66**	41.85	7.08	0.12

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.42 shows the relationship of academic qualifi-
cation with the components of Change Related Values. Highly
significant relationship at .01 level existed between B.A.
and B.Com. in favour of B.A., B.Sc. and M.A. in favour of
M. A. and M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.Com. on
Traditionalism; B.A. and B.Com. in favour of B.Com. on
Progressivism; B.A. and B.Com. in favour of B.A., M.A. and
M.Com. in favour of M.Com. and M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour
of M.Com. on Conservatism and M.Sc. and B.A. in favour of
M.Sc. on Change Proneness. Significant relationship at
.05 level was found between B.Com. and B.Sc. in favour of
B.Com. on Progressvism; B.A. and B.Com. in favour of B.A.
and M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.Com. on Dogmatism and
B.A. and B.Com. in favour of B.A., M.A. and M.Com. in
favour of M.Com. and M.Com. and M.Sc. in favour of M.Com.
on Venturesomeness.

The highest and lowest means were of M.A. and B.Com.,
respectively, for Traditionalism; of B.Com. and B.Sc.,
respectively for Progressivism; of M.Com. and M.Sc.,
respectively for Dogmatism; of M.Com. and B.Com.,
respectively for Venturesomeness; of M.Com. and M.Sc.,
respectively for Conservatism and of M.Com. and B.Sc.,
respectively for Change Proneness. The Highest and lowest
SD scores were of M.Com. and B.Com., respectively, on
Traditionalism; of M.Sc. and B.Sc., respectively, on
Progressivism; of M.Com. and B.Com., respectively on
Dogmatism; of M.Com. and B.Sc., respectively, on Venture-
someness; of M.Com. and B.Com., respectively, on
Conservatism and of M.Com. and B.Sc., respectively, on
Change Proneness.

Table 4.43 : Distribution of Teachers According to their Professional Qualifications

Type of School	Response	Untrained		Diploma		B.Ed./B.T.		M.Ed.		Ph.D.	
		NO	%	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
Part 'A' : K.V.											
K.V.in Gujrat	30	1	3	1	3	26	88	1	3	1	3
Outside K.V.	60	2	3	2	3	52	88	2	3	2	3
Total	90	3	3(43)	3	3(7)	78	88(28)	3	3(44)	3	3(100)
Part 'B' : Unisex Schools											
Boys	50	-	-	1	2	48	96	1	2	-	-
Girls	32	-	-	1	3	30	44	1	3	-	-
Total	82	-	-(-)	2	2(5)	78	96(28)	2	2(28)	-	-(-)
Part 'C' : Medium of Instruction											
English	35	2	6	-	-	33	94	-	-	-	-
Gujrati	40	-	-	10	25	30	75	-	-	-	-
Sindhi	29	-	-	8	28	21	72	-	-	-	-
Hindi	31	-	-	12	39	17	55	2	6	-	-
Marathi	15	1	7	3	20	11	73	-	-	-	-
Urdu	10	1	10	2	20	7	70	-	-	-	-
Total	160	4	3(57)	35	22(88)	119	74(44)	2	1(28)	-	-(-)
Grand Total	332	7	2	40	12	275	83	7	2	3	1

Note : Figures in parantheses indicate the percentages of grand total.

Table 4.43 shows the distribution of teachers according to their Professional Qualification. 83% were B.Ed/B.T. 12% were Diploma holders, 2% M.Ed. and 1% Ph.D. in Education and 2% teachers were untrained. All the Ph.D. teachers were working in the K.V. and the distribution was similar among the two types of K.V. (3%). Even the highest percentage (44%) of M.Ed. were employed in the K.V. and the inter se. distribution was similar (3%). M.Ed. teachers were in equal proportion (28%) in the other two groups. 6% M.Ed. teachers were in Hindi medium, 3% in the K.V. and Girls schools and 2% in Boys schools. 44% of B.Ed/BT were in the medium of instruction schools and 28% each in the K.V. and Unisex schools. The school ratio of B.Ed./B.T. was : 96% Boys, 94% of English, 88% K.V.(each) 75% Gujrati, 73% Marathi, 72% Sindhi, 70% Urdu, 55% Hindi and 44% Girls Schools. The Diploma Holders were 88% in the medium of instruction schools, 7% in the K.V. and 5% in the Unisex schools. The school ratio of Diploma holders was : 39% Hindi, 28% Sindhi, 25% Gujrati, 20% Marathi and Urdu, 3% K.V.(each) and 2% Boys. The ratio of untrained teachers was : 10% Urdu, 7% Marathi, 6% English and 3% of K.V. (each) only.

Table 4.44 : Distribution of Teachers According to Academic as well as Professional Qualifications

Qualifi-cation	Graduates								Post Graduates								Grand Total	
	B.A.		B.Com.		B.Sc.		Total		M.A.		M.Com.		M.Sc.		Total			
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Diploma	34	42	-	-	6	5	40	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40	12
B.Ed./B.T	46	58	50	100	110	95	206	84 75*	34	77	13	100	22	76	69	80 25*	275	83
M.Ed.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	11	-	-	2	7	7	8	7	2
Ph.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	7	-	-	-	-	3	4	3	1
Untrained	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	5	-	-	5	17	7	8	7	2
Total No	80	-	50	-	116	-	246	-	44	-	13	-	29	-	86	-	332	-
%	-	24	-	15	-	35	-	74	-	13	-	4	-	9	-	26	-	100

* Shows percentages of grand total

Table 4.45 : Distribution of B.Ed./B.T. Teachers with Graduate Level Professional Qualification

Type of School	B.Ed./B.T.		B.A.		B.Com.		B.Sc.		M.A.		M.Com.		M.Sc.	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
K.V.in Gujrat	26	9	7	9	3	6	9	8	8	20	1	8	2	7
Outside K.V.	52	19	15	18	5	10	20	17	13	30	3	23	4	14
Boys	48	18	12	15	10	20	18	15	3	7	2	14	5	17
Girls	30	11	8	10	6	12	14	12	1	2	1	8	2	7
English Medium	33	12	7	9	3	6	10	9	7	16	1	8	7	25
Gujrati	30	11	7	9	8	16	20	17	2	4	1	8	2	7
Sindhi	21	8	10	12	5	10	10	9	2	4	1	8	1	3
Hindi	17	6	7	9	6	12	7	6	4	9	3	23	4	14
Marathi	11	4	4	5	3	6	5	4	2	4	-	-	1	3
Urdu	7	2	3	4	1	2	3	3	2	4	-	-	1	3
Total	275	100	80	100	50	100	116	100	44	100	13	100	29	100

Table 4.44 shows the distribution of teachers as per their academic as well as professional qualifications. Subsequent tables no. 4.45 to 4.48 show the schoolwise breakdown of such teachers separately. Tables 4.44 and 4.45 together reveal that 75% B.Ed./B.T. (84% of the groups) were graduates and 25% (80% of the group) were post-graduates. 100% M.Com. and B.Com., 95% B.Sc., 77% M.A., 76% M.Sc. and 58% B.A. were B.Ed. qualified. Also, 43% were in the medium of instruction schools, 29% in Unisex schools and 28% in K.V. Their school-wise distribution was : Outside K.V. 19%, Boys 18%, English 12% Girls and Gujrati 11%, K.V. in Gujrat 9%, Sindhi 8%, Hindi 6%, Marathi 4% and Urdu medium 2%.

Tables 4.44 and 4.46 together reveal that all untrained teachers were post-graduates and none was M.Com. Further, the 3 such teachers in K.V. were M.Sc., 2 in English medium were M.Sc. and M.A., one in Marathi medium was M.Sc. and one in Urdu medium M.A.

Tables 4.44 and 4.47 together reveal that no Diploma holder was Post-graduate or B.Com. Maximum of them were B.A. (34) followed by B.Sc.(6) and 89% of them were employed in the medium of instruction schools, 7% in K.V. and 1% in the Unisex schools. Hindi medium employed 30%, Gujrati 26%, Sindhi and Marathi 8% each and Urdu medium 5%.

Tables 4.44 and 4.48 together reveal that only post-graduates (all M.A.) were M.Ed./Ph.D. Also 71% of M.Ed. were M.A. and 29% M.Sc. Also, the distribution of M.Ed. was : Outside K.V. and Hindi medium 29% each and K.V. in Gujrati, Boys and Girls schools 14% each.

Table 4.46 : Distribution of Untrained Teachers

Type of Schools	Untrained		Academic Qualification
	No	%	
K.V. in Gujrat	1	14	M.Sc.
Outside K.V.	2	29	M.Sc.
English Medium	2	29	M.Sc. & M.A.
Marathi Medium	1	14	M.Sc.
Urdu Medium	1	14	M.A.
Total	7	100	M.Sc.(5) & M.A. (2)

Table 4.47 : Distribution of Diploma Holdef Teacher

Type of School	Diploma		Academic Qualification
	No	%	
K.V.in Gujrat	1	2	B.A.
Outside K.V.	2	5	B.Sc. and B.A.
Boys	1	2	B.A.
Girls	1	2	B.A.
Gujrati Medium	10	26	B.Sc.(2) B.A.(8)
Sindhi Medium	8	20	B.A.
Hindi Medium	12	30	B.Sc.(3) B.A.(9)
Marathi Medium	3	8	B.A.
Urdu Medium	2	5	B.A.
Total	40	100	B.Sc.(6) & B.A.(34)

Note : English medium schools had no diploma holder.

Table 4.48 : Distribution of M.Ed. and Ph.D. qualified
teachers

Type of School	M.Ed.		Academic qualifi- cation	Ph.D.		Academic qualifica- tion
	No	%		No	%	
K.V.in Gujrat	1	14	M.Sc.	1	33	M.A.
Outside K.V.	2	29	M.Sc. & M.A.	2	67	M.A.(both)
Boys	1	14	M.A.			
Girls Schools	1	14	M.A.	-		
Hindi Medium	2	29	M.A.(both)	-		
Total	7	100	M.A. (5) * M.Sc.(2) @	3	100	M.A.(3)

* 71%

@ 29%

Table 4.51 : Professional Qualifications and Components of Attitude to Innovation

Professional Qualification	Individualization			Curriculum Organisation			Teaching Learning Process			Teaching Resource		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Untrained	20.22	4.49	5.88**	12.22	2.75	4.53**	20.17	4.00	3.31**	14.76	3.77	1.80
Diploma	19.56	4.35	1.19	12.19	3.63	0.06	20.97	4.84	1.37	15.30	3.96	1.05
B.Ed./B.T.	20.43	4.43	0.70	12.64	2.24	0.45	20.29	3.54	0.51	16.50	3.35	1.08
M.Ed.	20.80	1.92	0.18	11.60	2.79	0.85	18.60	1.14	1.03	11.40	2.97	3.00**
Ph.D.	21.07	3.74	0.16	12.18	2.98	0.43	20.23	4.14	0.88	14.32	4.92	1.78

Professional Qualification	Internal School Organization			Staff Development			School Community Relationship		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Untrained	19.42	4.16	1.84	19.90	3.54	3.74**	11.73	3.42	4.77**
Diploma	20.31	3.78	1.65	19.12	4.01	1.56	12.71	3.64	2.09*
B.Ed./B.T.	20.64	3.30	0.31	20.64	3.80	1.33	12.64	2.71	0.07
M.Ed.	18.00	5.05	1.34	15.80	2.17	2.67**	10.60	1.52	1.58
Ph.D.	18.55	4.36	0.28	19.00	4.57	1.56	11.70	2.91	0.85

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.51 shows the relationship of professional
qualification with the components of Attitude to
Innovation. Highly significant relationship at .01 level
existed between Ph.D. and untrained in favour of Ph.D.
on Individualisation, and Teaching Learning Process and
in favour of untrained on Curriculum Organisation, Staff
Development and School Community Relationship. Such
relationship also existed between B.Ed./B.T. and M.Ed.
in favour of B.Ed./B.T. on Teaching Resource and Staff
Development. Significant relationship at .05 level
existed between untrained and Diploma holders in favour
of Diploma holders.

The highest and lowest means were of B.Ed./B.T.
and M.Ed., respectively, on Curriculum Organisation,
Teaching Resource, Internal School Organisation and
Staff Development; Ph.D. and Diploma holders,
respectively on Individualisation, and Diploma holders
and M.Ed., respectively,on Teaching Learning Process
and School Community Relationship. The highest and
lowest SD scores were of Ph.D. and M.Ed., respectively,
on Teaching Resource and Staff Development; of Diploma
holder and M.Ed., respectively, on Teaching Learning
Process and School Community Relationship; of untrained
and M.Ed., respectively, on Individualisation, of
Diploma holders and B.Ed./B.T., respectively, on
Curriculum Organisations, of B.Ed./B.T. and M.Ed.,
respectively, on Internal School Organisation.

305

Table 4.52 : Professional Qualification and Situational
and Innovation Characteristics as a Whole.

Professional Qualification	Mean	SD	t-value
Untrained	209.01	47.90	0.76
Diploma	195.77	35.68	2.26*
B.Ed./B.T.	200.14	44.33	0.41
M.Ed.	160.80	39.82	1.74
Ph.D.	204.87	40.29	2.44*

* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.52 shows the relationship of professional
qualification and the Situational and Innovation
Characteristics as a Whole. Significant relationship at
.05 level existed between Untrained and Diploma holders
in favour of untrained and M.Ed. and Ph.D. in favour of
Ph.D. teachers. Highest and lowest means were of
untrained and M.Ed., respectively, and the SD scores were
of untrained and Diploma holders, respectively.

Table 4.53 : Professional Qualifications and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Professional Qualification	Administrative Support			Staff Norms			System Norms			Complexity		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Untrained	26.69	7.64	1.33	26.27	15.47	2.85*	18.35	3.28	2.31*	21.89	5.65	0.35
Diploma	26.67	6.54	0.21	27.58	14.93	4.24**	12.69	6.92	5.42**	22.16	3.77	0.54
B.Ed./B.T.	24.14	7.82	1.31	27.64	20.50	0.01	16.07	8.68	1.64	24.07	5.73	1.64
M.Ed.	26.00	6.78	0.47	28.80	9.15	0.12	15.20	5.50	0.21	17.00	3.24	2.58*
Ph.D.	27.28	7.51	0.38	33.69	14.25	0.76	16.23	7.06	0.55	22.09	5.88	1.94*

Professional Qualification	Compatibility			Riskness			Localiteness			Cosmopoliteness		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Untrained	22.56	5.29	1.76	32.74	6.17	1.69	32.05	7.37	2.21*	18.55	8.18	1.33
Diploma	21.40	6.01	1.42	34.63	4.53	2.52*	34.21	5.62	2.38*	16.21	9.41	2.00*
B.Ed./B.T.	23.14	2.83	2.23	24.29	6.26	0.25	33.79	6.23	0.26	15.00	6.00	0.47
M.Ed.	16.00	5.20	4.97**	21.60	6.88	3.80**	19.20	8.32	4.13**	17.00	4.42	0.68
Ph.D.	22.69	5.34	2.80**	31.92	7.10	3.24**	32.41	6.76	4.35**	17.69	6.61	0.74

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

* Significant at 0.05 level.

307

Table 4.53 shows the relationship of professional
qualification and Situational and Innovation Character-
istics. Highly Significant relationship at .01 existed
between untrained and Diploma holders in favour of
untrained on Staff Norms and System Norms; B.Ed./B.T.
and M.Ed. in favour of B.Ed./B.T. and M.Ed. and Ph.D.
in favour of Ph.D. on Compatibility, Riskness and
Localiteness. Significant relationship at .05 level also
existed between Ph.D. and untrained in favour of Ph.D.
on Staff Norms and Localiteness and in favour of
untrained on System Norms, untrained and Diploma holders
in favour of Diploma holders on Riskness and Localiteness
and in favour of untrained on Cosmopoliteness and between
B.Ed./B.T. and M.Ed. in favour of B.Ed./B.T. and M.Ed.
and Ph.D. in favour of Ph.D. on Complexity.

The highest and lowest means were of Ph.D. and
B.Ed./B.T., respectively, on Administrative Support; B.Ed./
B.T. and M.Ed., respectively, on Complexity and
Compatibility; of Diploma holders and M.Ed., respectively,
on Riskness and Localiteness; of Ph.D. and untrained,
respectively, on Staff Norms; of untrained and Diploma
holders, respectively on System Norms and of Diploma
holders and M.Ed., respectively on Riskness. The highest
and lowest SD scores were of B.Ed./B.T. and Diploma holders
respectively, on Administrative Support; of B.Ed./B.T. and
M.Ed. respectively, on Staff Norms, of B.Ed./B.T. and
untrained, respectively, on System Norms, of Ph.D. and
M.Ed., respectively, on Complexity of Diploma holders and
B.Ed./B.T., respectively, on Compatibility; of Ph.D. and
Diploma holders, respectively on Riskness; of M.Ed. and
Diploma holders, respectively on Localiteness and of
Diploma holders and M.Ed., respectively, on Cosmopoliteness.

Table 4.54 : Professional Qualification and Change Related
Values as a Whole

Professional Qualification	Mean	SD	t-value
Untrained	214.61	42.42	0.31
Diploma	237.93	44.45	4.02**
B.Ed./B.T.	223.00	19.75	1.23
M.Ed.	211.00	30.59	1.01
Ph.D.	214.41	35.01	0.22

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table 4.54 shows the relationship of professional
qualification and Change Related values as a whole.
Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed
between untrained and Diploma holders in favour of
Diploma holders. The highest and lowest means were for
Diploma holders and M.Ed., respectively, and the SD
scores were for Diploma holders and B.Ed./B.T.,
respectively.

Table 4.55 : Professional Qualifications of Teachers and Components of Change Related Values

Professional Qualification	Traditionalism			Progressiveness			Dogmatism		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Untrained	38.57	7.13	1.11	37.83	8.07	2.48*	32.01	10.08	0.51
Diploma	40.46	7.23	1.96	43.12	6.92	5.14**	35.34	8.34	2.63**
B.Ed./B.T.	37.21	3.33	1.65	42.00	4.74	0.58	34.00	5.63	0.58
M.Ed.	39.00	5.39	0.88	38.60	8.08	1.44	34.60	8.47	0.18
Ph.D.	38.84	7.03	0.05	39.17	6.87	0.19	32.15	9.09	0.60

Professional Qualification	Venturesomeness			Conservatism			Change Proneness		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Untrained	33.71	9.30	1.99*	32.10	9.60	2.88**	40.58	8.09	1.94
Diploma	32.46	8.87	1.02	35.02	8.24	2.39*	42.44	9.52	1.61
B. Ed./B.T.	37.43	4.27	2.06*	30.14	3.74	2.18*	43.29	6.29	0.32
M.Ed.	33.00	9.67	0.18	33.20	7.50	1.42	35.60	3.78	1.19
Ph.D.	32.94	7.36	0.02	29.93	8.86	0.82	41.51	7.75	1.73

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.55 shows the relationship between professional qualification and the components of Change Related Values. Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed between untrained and Diploma holders in favour of Diploma holders on Progressivism and Dogmatism and Ph.D. and untrained in favour of untrained on Conservatism. Significant relationship at .05 level also existed between Ph.D. and untrained in favour of Ph.D. on Progressivism and in favour of untrained on Venturesomeness; Diploma and B.Ed./B.T. in favour of B.Ed./B.T. on Venturesomeness and in favour of Diploma holders on Conservatism and untrained and Diploma holders in favour of Diploma holders on Conservatism.

The highest and lowest means were of Diploma holders and untrained, respectively, on Progressivism and Dogmatism, of Diploma holders and B.Ed./B.T., respectively, on Traditionalism; of B.Ed./B.T. and Diploma holders, respectively, on Venturesomeness; of Diploma holders and Ph.D., respectively, on Conservatism and of B.Ed./B.T. and M.Ed., respectively on Change Proneness. The lowest SD Scores were of B.Ed./B.T. on all components except Change Proneness. The highest SD scores of these components were of Diploma holder on Traditionalism, of M.Ed. on Progressivism, of untrained on Dogmatism and Conservatism and of M.Ed. on Venturesomeness. The highest and lowest SD scores on Change Proneness were of Diploma holders and M.Ed., respectively.

Table 4.56 : Distribution of Teachers according to Mobility

Type of School		Response	With mobility		Without Mobility	
			No	%	No	%
Part A - K.V.						
K.V. in Gujrat		30	24	80	6	20
Outside		60	50	83	10	17
	Total	90	74	82	16	18
	%			35		13
Part B - Unisex Schools						
Boys		50	40	80	10	20
Girls		32	24	75	8	22
	Total	82	64	78	18	22
	%			30		15
Part C - Medium of Instruction						
English		35	5	14	30	86
Gujrati		40	31	78	9	22
Sindhi		29	7	24	22	76
Hindi		31	25	81	06	19
Marathi		15	4	27	11	73
Urdu		10	2	20	8	80
	Total	160	74	46	86	54
	%			35		72
Grand Total		332	212	64	120	36

Table 4.56 shows the distribution of teabhers according mobility. Those who had taught in another institution for one year or more before joining the present institution were regarded to be witk mobile and others without mobility. 64% were mobile and 36% 'without' mobility. Schoolwise distribution of mobile teachers was : K.V. 82%, Hindi 81%, Boys 80% Gujrati 78%, Girls 75%, Marathi 27%, Sindhi 24%, Urdu 20% and English 14%. The ratio of mobile teachers was 35% in the K.V. and medium of instruction schools and 30% in the Unisex schools.

Table 4.57 : Mobility and Innovative Proneness scale
a Whole

Mobility	Mean	SD	t-value
With Mobility	535.32	78.78	1.87
Without Mobility	545.34	81.98	

Table 4.57 shows the relationship of teacher mobility with I.P.S. as a Whole. No significant relationship was found. The mean and SD scores were higher for 'without' mobility group.

Table 4.58 : Mobility and Attitude to Innovation as a Whole

Mobility	Mean	SD	t-value
With Mobility	116.53	20.82	1.86
Without Mobility	119.16	21.61	

Table 4.58 shows the relationship of teacher mobility with Attitude to Innovation as a whole. No significant relationship was found. The higher mean as well as SD scores were of 'without' mobility group.

Table 4.59 : Mobility and Components of Attitude to Innovation

Components	With Mobility		Without Mobility		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Individualisation	20.64	3.84	20.58	4.29	0.22
Curriculum Organisation	11.91	3.21	12.39	2.87	2.33*
Teaching Learning Process	19.92	4.18	20.65	4.10	2.60**
Teaching Resource	15.05	3.72	15.36	6.05	1.00
Internal School Organisation	18.60	4.33	19.18	4.34	2.04*
Staff Development	18.89	4.39	19.22	4.43	1.11
School Community Relationship	11.47	3.02	12.12	3.16	3.17**

**Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant 0.05 level.

Table 4.59 shows the relationship of teacher mobility with the components of Attitude to Innovation. Highly significant relationships at .01 level was found in favour of without mobility group on Teaching Learning Process and School Community Relationship. Significant relationship at .05 level was also found in favour of without mobility group. On Curriculum Organisation and Internal Schools Organisation. The highest and lowest means of the mobile group were for Individualisation and School Community Relationship, respectively, and of no mobility group on Teaching Learning Process and Curriculum Organisation, respectively. The highest and lowest SD scores of mobile group were on Staff Development and School Community Relationship, respectively and for Without mobility group on Teaching Resource and Curriculum Organisation, respectively.

Table 4.60 : Mobility and Situation and Innovation Characteristics as a Whole

Mobility	Mean	SD	t-value
With Mobility	204.92	40.73	0.33
Without Mobility	204.02	41.03	

Table 4.60 shows the relationship of teacher mobility with the Situation and Innovation Characteristics as a Whole. No significant relationship was found. The higher mean and SD scores were of mobile and without mobility group, respectively.

4.61 : Mobility and Components of Situational and
Innovation Characteristics

Components	With Mobility		Without Mobility		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Administrative Support	26.88	7.76	27.30	6.40	0.90
Staff Norms	33.43	14.45	34.33	14.62	0.92
System Norms	16.71	7.15	17.17	7.58	0.95
Complexity	22.19	5.70	21.75	5.22	1.18
Compatibility	22.64	5.58	22.18	5.35	1.23
Riskness	32.40	7.05	31.69	6.64	1.53
Localiteness	32.91	6.76	31.99	6.91	2.03*
Cosmopoliteness	17.49	7.04	17.79	7.26	0.63

Table 4.61 shows the relationship of teacher
mobility with the components of Situational and
Innovation Characteristics. Significant relationship at
.05 level existed on Localiteness in favour or mobile
group. The highest and lowest means of both groups were
for Staff Norms and System Norms, respectively. The
highest and lowest SD scores of mobile group were for
Staff Norm and Compatibility, respectively and of 'without'
mobility group for Staff Norms and 'Complexity',
respectively.

Table 4.62 : Mobility and Change Related Values as a Whole

Mobility	Mean	SD	t-value
With Mobility	213.89	36.16	3.46**
Without Mobility	222.43	38.27	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.62 shows the relationship of teacher mobility with Change Related Values as a Whole. Highly significant relationship at .01 level was found in favour of without mobility group. The higher mean and SD scores were also of without mobility group.

Table 4.63 : Mobility and Components of Change Related Values

Components	With Mobility		Without Mobility		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Traditionalism	38.87	7.30	38.83	6.55	0.10
Progressivism	38.91	7.20	39.85	7.27	1.95
Dogmatism	31.83	9.36	33.81	8.18	3.28**
Venturesomeness	32.91	7.65	33.76	7.90	1.63
Conservatism	29.99	9.21	32.76	8.40	4.62**
Change Proneness	41.42	8.16	41.36	7.57	0.12

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table 4.63 shows the relationship of teacher mobility with the components of Change Related Values. Highly significant relationship at .01 level was found in favour of without mobility group on Dogmatism and Conservatism. The highest and lowest means of both groups were on Change Proneness and Conservatism, respectively. The highest and lowest SD scores of mobile group was on Dogmatism and Progressivism, respectively, and of without mobility group on Progressivism and 'Venturesomeness', respectively.

Table 4.64 : Distribution of Teachers According to Prior Professional Experience.

| Type of School | Response | Level of Experience | | | |
| | | Some | | None | |
		No	%	No	%
Part A - K.V.					
K.V. in Gujrat	30	8	27	22	73
Outside K.V.	60	18	30	42	70
Total	90	26	29	64	71
%			65		22
Part B - Unisex Schools					
Boys	50	5	10	45	90
Girls	32	3	9	29	91
Total	82	8	10	74	90
%			20		25
Part C - Medium of Instruction					
English	35	2	6	33	94
Gujrati	40	-	-	40	100
Sindhi	29	-	-	29	100
Hindi	31	4	13	27	87
Marathi	15	-	-	15	100
Urdu	10	-	-	10	100
Total	160	6	4	154	96
%			15		53
Grand Total	332	40	12	292	88

Table 4.64 shows the distribution of teachers according to Prior Professional Experience. This variable included non-teaching experience only. 88% teachers has no such experience. The broad distribution of prior experience group which formed 12% of the total was : K.V. 65%, Unisex schools 20% and medium of instruction schools 15%. Their School-wise distribution was : were 30% outside K.V., 27% K.V. in Gujrat, 10% Boys, 9% Girls, 13%, Hindi and 6% English medium schools. Details of no experience group is not being discussed.

Table 4.65 : Prior Professional Experience and Innovatige
Proneness as a Whole

Experience	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	62.47	77.04	3.82**
None	27.08	69.40	

** Highly significant at .01 level

Table 4.65 shows the relationship of Prior Professional
Experience with innovative proneness as a whole. Highly
significant relationship at .01 level was found in favour
of experience group. The higher mean and SD scores were
also of this group.

Table 4.66 : Prior Professional Experience and Attitute
to Innovation as a Whole

Experience	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	118.20	19.70	1.23
None	115.01	21.20	

Table 4.66 shows the relationship of Prior Professional
Experience with Attitude to Innovation as a whole. No
significant relationship was found. The higher mean and
SD scores were of some&None groups, respectively.

4

318

Table 4.67 : Prior Professional Experience and Components
of Attitude to Innovation

Components	Some		None		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Individualisation	20.90	3.69	20.01	4.40	1.77
Curriculum Organisation	12.44	2.56	12.00	3.06	1.27
Teaching Learning Process	20.01	3.70	20.00	4.48	0.04
Teaching Resources	15.25	3.68	15.10	3.91	0.34
Internal School Organisation	19.50	4.40	18.72	4.44	1.51
Staff Development	20.11	3.82	18.58	4.51	3.93**
School Community Relationship	11.97	2.52	11.70	3.18	0.74

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table 4.67 shows the relationship of Prior Professional
Experience with the components of Attitude to Innovation.
Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed in
favour of experienced group. The highest and lowest means
of some group were on Individualisation and School
Community Relationship, respectively, and of none group
were on Individualisation and School Community Relation-
ship, respectively. The highest and lowest SD. scores
of some group were on Internal School Organisation and
school community relationship, respectively, and of none
group were on Staff Development and Curriculum
Organisation, respectively.

Table 4.68 : Prior Professional Experience and Situation
and Innovation Characteristics as a Whole

Level of Experience	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	216.16	39.12	3.78**
None	199.15	36.89	

** Highly significant at .01 level.

Table 4.68 shows the relationship of Prior Professional Experience with the Situation and Innovation Characteristics as a Whole. Highly significant relationship at .01 level was found in favour of experience group. Higher mean and SD scores were also of the same group.

Table 4.69 : Prior Professional Experience and Components of Situation and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Some		None		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Administrative Support	28.14	7.71	26.55	6.46	2.01
Staff Norms	37.21	14.14	32.72	14.80	3.61**
System Norms	19.10	7.76	16.07	7.05	3.60**
Complexity	22.86	5.24	21.71	5.46	1.80
Compatibility	24.11	3.95	21.86	5.40	3.72**
Riskness	33.36	5.90	31.72	6.87	2.09*
Localiteness	33.74	5.83	31.96	7.05	2.22*
Cosmopoliteness	18.75	6.25	17.70	6.42	1.41

** Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

Table 4.69 shows the relationship of Prior Professibnal Experience with the components of Situation and Innovation Characteristics. Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed in favour of the experience group on Staff Norms, Systems Norms and Compatibility. Significant relationship at .05 level also existed in favour of the experience group on Administrative Support, Riskness and 'Localiteness'. The highest mean and SD scores of both groups were Staff norms. The lowest mean and SD scores of the experience group were on Cosmopoliteness and Complexity, respectively, and of the none group were on System norms and Compatibility, respectively.

Table 4.70 : Prior Professional Experience and Change
Related Values as a Whole

Experience	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	225.38	30.14	3.24**
None	210.56	40.20	

**Highly significant at .01 level

Table 4.70 shows the relationship of Prior Professional Experience with the Change Related Values as a whole. Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed in favour of 'some' group. The higher mean and SD scores were of 'some' and 'none' groups, respectively.

Table 4.71 : Prior Professional and the Components of Change Related Values

Components	Some		None		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Traditionalism	40.59	6.31	37.56	6.88	3.82**
Progressivism	40.36	5.36	38.30	7.90	2.36*
Dogmatism	34.91	8.53	31.65	9.50	2.97**
Venturesomeness	35.52	7.77	32.26	7.97	3.51**
Conservatism	32.23	9.30	30.81	9.21	1.35
Change proneness	43.34	5.19	39.19	8.80	4.37**

** Highly significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level.

Table 4.71 shows the relationship of Prior Professional Experience with the components of Change Related Values. Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed in favour of the experience group on Traditionalism, Dogmatism, Venturesomeness, and change proneness. The Significant relationship at .05 level also existed in favour of some group on Progressivism. The highest and lowest means of both

groups were of Change Proneness and Conservatism,
respectively. The highest SD scores of some and none
groups were of Conservatism and Dogmatism, respectively,
and the lowest SD scores of these groups were of Change
Proneness and 'traditionalism', respectively.

Table 4.72 : Distribution of Teachers According to
In-Service Education.

Type of School		Response	Some		None	
			No	%	No	%
Part A - K.V.						
K.V. in Gujrat		30	-	-	30	100
Outside K.V.		60	-	-	60	100
	Total	90	-	-	90	100
	%					28
Part B - Unisex Schools						
Boys		50	4	8	46	92
Girls		32	-	-	32	100
	Total	82	4	5	78	95
Part C - Medium of Instruction						
English		35	2	6	33	94
Gujrati		40	-	-	40	100
Sindhi		29	-	-	29	100
Hindi		31	1	3	30	97
Marathi		15	-	-	15	100
Urdu		10	-	-	10	100
	Total	160	3	2	157	98
	%			43		48
Grand Total		332	7	2	325	98

Table 4.72 shows the distribution of teachers as
per in-service education. The response was evaluated in
'Some' and 'None' Categories only. Teachers having attended
any course in education organised by the Extension
Department, NCERT or K.V. during the last three years were
in the 'Some' group and others in the 'None' group.

In general, 98% teachers had received no in-service education. The 'Some' group was found to be 57% in Boys, 29% in English and 14% in Hindi medium Schools. Other schools gave 100% 'none' response.

Table 4.73 : In-Service Education and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

In-Service Education	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	544.70	81.43	3.40**
None	526.55	75.62	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table 4.73 shows the relationship of In-service Education with I.P.S. as a whole. Highly significant relationship at .01 level was in favour of 'Some' group. The mean as well as the SD scores were also higher of 'some' group.

Table 4.74 : In-Service Education and Attitude to Innovation as a Whole

In-Service Education	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	118.49	20.88	2.29*
None	115.25	21.43	

*Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.74 shows the relationship of In-service Education and Attitude to Innovation as a Whole. Significant relationship at .05 level existed in favour of 'some' group. The mean score was higher for 'some' group and the SD scores was higher for 'None' group.

Table 4.75 : In-service Education and Components of
Attitude to Innovation

Components	Some		None		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Individualisation	20.67	3.86	20.51	4.25	0.61
Curriculum Organization	12.26	2.65	11.30	3.74	5.65**
Teaching-Learning Process	20.19	4.08	20.11	4.35	0.28
Teaching Resources	15.19	3.77	15.01	6.02	0.29
Internal School Organisation	19.01	4.46	18.37	4.06	2.10*
Staff Development	19.20	4.26	18.60	4.66	2.03*
School Community Relationship	11.77	3.07	11.51	3.10	1.27

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.75 shows the relationship of in-service education with the components of Attitude to Innovation. The highly significant relationship at .01 level existed in favour of some group on Curriculum Organisation and significant relationship at .05 level also existed in favour of some group on Internal School Organisation and Staff Development. The highest means of the two groups were of 'Individualisation' and the lowest means were on School Community Relationship for some group and Curriculum Organisation for none group. The highest and lowest SD scores of 'some' group were on Curriculum Organisation and Internal School Organisation, respectively and of none group were on Teaching Resource and School Community Relationship, respectively.

Table 4.76 : In-Service Education and Situational and
Innovation as a Whole

In-service Education	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	207.79	40.19	3.51**
None	198.24	41.37	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table 4.76 shows the relationship of in-service
education with Situation and Innovation Characteristics
as a whole. Highly significant relationship at .01
level existed in favour of Some group. The higher mean
was of 'Some' group and the SD was of 'None' group.

Table 4.77 : In-Service Education and Components of
Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Some		None		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Administrative Support	27.37	7.05	26.28	7.82	2.22*
Staff Norms	34.70	14.49	31.78	14.37	3.01**
System Norms	17.20	7.12	16.21	7.59	2.02*
Complexity	22.41	5.30	21.30	5.95	2.97**
Compatibility	23.23	4.99	20.98	6.15	6.22**
Riskness	32.83	6.62	32.43	7.49	0.86
Localiteness	33.38	6.85	33.85	6.74	1.47
Cosmopoliteness	18.27	6.87	16.23	7.40	4.31**

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.77 shows the relationship of in-service
education with the components of Situational and
Innovation characteristics. Highly significant relation-
ship at .01 level existed in favour of 'Some' group on
Staff Norms, Complexity, Compatibility and Cosmopoliteness.

Significant relationship at .05 level also existed
in favour of some group on Administrative Support and
System Norm. The highest mean of 'Some' group and SD
scores of both groups were of Staff Norms. The lowest
means of both the groups were of System Norms. The
highest mean of None group was of 'Localiteness! The
lowest SD scores of the two groups were of Compatibility and
'Complexity', respectively.

Table 4.78 : In-service Education and Change Related
Value as a Whole

Level of In-Service Education	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	218.64	37.87	2.29*
None	212.96	35.19	

*Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.78 shows the relationship of in-service
education with change Related values as a Whole.
Significant relationship at .05 level existed in favour
of 'Some' group. The higher mean as well as SD Scores
were also for 'Some' group.

Table 4.79 : In-Service Education and Components of
Change Related Values

Component	Some		None		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Traditionalism	39.05	7.17	38.46	6.83	1.24
Progressivism	39.28	7.38	39.27	6.94	0.13
Dogmatism	33.43	8.99	31.41	9.02	2.68**
Venture Someness	33.60	7.93	32.38	7.30	2.37*
Conservatism	31.37	9.10	30.01	8.84	2.25*
Change Proneness	41.48	7.84	41.47	8.21	0.21

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.79 shows the relationship of In-service Education with the components of Change Related Values. Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed in favour of 'Some' group on 'Dogmatism' and significant relationship at .05 level also in favour of 'Some' group on 'Venturesomeness' and 'Conservatism'. The highest and lowest means of both groups were of Change Proneness and Conservatism, respectively, and the lowest SD scores of both the groups were of Traditionalism . The highest SD scores of some and none groups were for Conservatism and Dogmatism, respectively.

Table 4.80 : Distribution of Teachers According to Professional Reading Habit.

Type of School	Response	Some		None	
		No	%	No	%
Part A - K.V.					
K.V.in Gujrat	30	3	10	27	90
Outside K.V.	60	6	10	54	90
Total	90	9	10	81	90
%			90		25
Part B - Unisex Schools					
Boys	50	—	—	50	100
Girls	32	—	—	32	100
Total	82	—	—	82	100
%					25
Part C - Medium of Instruction					
English	35	1	3	34	97
Gujrati	40	—	—	40	100
Sindhi	29	—	—	29	100
Hindi	31	—	—	31	100
Marathi	15	—	—	15	100
Urdu	10	—	—	10	100
Total	160	1	1	159	99
%			10		50
Grand Total	332	10	3	322	97

Table 4.80 shows the distribution of teachers according to professional reading habit. In all 97% teachers formed the 'None' group i.e. in the past 3 years they did not read any research study in education. 90% of the teachers having access to professional material were in the K.V. and 10% in English medium schools. They were however only 10% of the K.V. and 3% of the English medium school teachers.

Table 4.81 : Professional Reading Habit and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

Reading Habit	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	443.34	61.20	3.35**
None	423.49	53.95	

**Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table 4.81 shows the relationship of Professional Reading Habit with Innovative Proneness as a Whole. Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed in favour of 'some' group. The higher mean as well as SD scores were also of 'some' group.

Table 4.82 : Professional Reading Habits and Attitude to Innovation as a Whole

Reading Habit	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	118.60	22.42	3.23**
None	113.55	20.84	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.82 shows the relationship of Professional Reading Habit with Attitude to Innovation as a whole. Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed in favour of 'Some' group. The mean and SD scores of this group were also higher.

Table 4.83 : Professional Reading Habits and Components
of Attitude to Innovation

Components	Some		None		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Individualisation	20.79	4.91	20.06	4.20	2.46*
Curriculum Organisation	12.26	3.98	11.46	3.42	3.48**
Teaching-Learning Process	20.24	4.12	19.93	4.31	1.00
Teaching Resources	15.28	4.83	14.77	3.89	1.48
Internal School Organisation	18.91	4.27	18.43	4.55	1.48
Staff Development	19.30	4.85	18.04	4.76	3.86**
School Community Relation	11.79	2.87	11.35	3.66	1.95

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.83 shows the relationship of Professional
Reading Habit with the components of Attitude to Innovation.
Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed in
favour of 'some' group on 'Curriculum Organisation' and
Staff Development, and significant relationship at .05
level also in favour of some group on Individualisation.
The highest and lowest means of both groups and highest
and lowest SD scores of 'some' group were of Individua-
lisation and School Community Relationship, respectively.
The highest and lowest SD scores of the 'none' group were
of Teaching-Learning Process and Curriculum Organisation,
respectively.

Table 4.84 : Professional Reading Habits and Situational
Innovation Characteristics as a Whole

Reading Habits	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	207.46	41.48	4.00**
None	195.36	37.16	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table 4.84 shows the relationship of Professional Reading Habit with the Situation and Innovation Characteristics as a whole. Highly significant relationship at .01 level was in favour of 'some' group. The higher mean and SD scores were also of 'some' group.

Table 4.85 : Professional Reading Habit and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Some		None		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Administrative Support	26.97	7.60	17.12	6.41	0.27
Staff Norms	34.53	14.47	31.15	14.37	3.14**
System Norms	17.39	7.34	15.16	7.24	4.14**
Complexity	22.26	5.78	21.52	4.89	2.27*
Compatibility	23.03	5.43	20.12	5.59	5.72**
Riskness	32.41	6.94	31.55	6.82	2.05*
Localiteness	31.92	6.84	31.59	6.65	2.61**
Cosmopoliteness	17.81	7.12	16.89	7.05	1.74

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.85 shows the relationship of Professional Habit with the components of Situation and Innovation Characteristics. Highly significant relationship at .01 level in favour of 'some' group was found on Staff Norms,

System Norms, Compatibility and Localiteness and the
significant relationship at .05 level also in favour of
'some' group was on Complexity and Riskness. The highest
SD scores of both group and the highest mean of 'some'
group were of Staff Norms. The highest and lowest means
of 'none' group were of Localiteness and Cosmopoliteness,
respectively. The lowest SD scores of both groups were
for Compatibility. The lowest mean of 'some' group was
of System Norms.

Table 4.86 : Professional Reading Habits and Change
Related Values as a Whole

Reading Habits	Mean	SD	t-value
Some	217.43	36.23	1.04
None	214.55	39.71	

Table 4.86 shows the relationship of Professional
Reading Habit with the Change Related Values as a Whole.
The relationship was not significant. The higher mean was
of 'some' group and the higher 'SD' score of 'None'
group.

Table 4.87 : Professional Reading Habit and Components of
Change Related Values

Components	Some		None		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Traditionalism	39.43	6.90	37.00	6.98	4.66**
Progressivism	39.32	7.01	38.92	7.92	0.74
Dogmatism	32.57	9.35	32.55	7.92	0.47
Venturesomeness	33.59	7.76	31.92	7.56	2.90**
Conservatism	30.95	9.40	30.82	7.77	0.20
Change Proneness	41.70	8.82	40.42	8.63	21.15*

**Highly significant at 0.01 level
*Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.87 shows the relationship of professional reading habit with the components of Change Related Values. Highly significant relationships at .01 level existed on traditionalism and Venturesomeness and Significant relationship at .05 level on change proneness, all in favour of some group. The highest and lowest means of both groups were of Change Proneness and Conservatism, respectively. The lowest SD scores of both the groups were for Traditionalism. The highest SD scores of both groups were of Conservatism and Change Proneness, respectively.

Table 4.88 : Distribution of teachers according to Professional Satisfaction

Type of School		Response	Very Satisfied		Not very Satisfied	
			No	%	No	%
Part A - K.V.						
K.V.in Gujrat		30	20	67	10	33
Outside K.V.		60	36	60	24	40
	Total	90	56	62	34	38
	%	...		42		17
Part B - Unisex Schools						
Boys		50	14	28	36	72
Girls		32	10	31	22	69
	Total	82	24	29	58	71
	%			18		29
Part C - Medium of Instruction						
English		35	8	23	27	77
Gujrati		40	7	17	33	83
Sindhi		29	16	55	13	45
Hindi		31	7	23	24	77
Marathi		15	10	67	5	33
Urdu		10	5	50	5	50
	Total	160	53	33	107	67
	%			40		
Grand Total		332	133	40	199	60

Table 4.88 shows the distribution of teachers according to professional satisfaction. It was presumed that all respondents were satisfied from their profession and the difference lie in being Very satisfied and not being very satisfied. In all, 40% teachers were very satisfied and 60% were not so satisfied. 42% of the satisfied group was from K.V. and 40% from medium of instruction schools. Their schoolwise distribution was : 67% K.V. in Gujrat and Marathi, 60% outside K.V., 55% Sindhi, 50% Urdu, 31% Girls school 28% Boys school, 23% Hindi, and English and 17% Gujrati medium schools.

Table 4.89 : Professional Satisfaction and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

Satisfaction Level	Mean	SD	t-value
Very Satisfied	543.29	79.55	3.80**
Not Very Satisfied	518.88	78.95	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.89 shows the relationship of professional satisfaction with Innovative Proneness as a Whole. Highly significant relationship at .01 level in favour of very satisfied group. This group also had the higher mean and SD scores.

Table 4.90 : Professional Satisfaction and Attitude to Innovation as a Whole

Satisfaction Level	Mean	SD	t-value
Very Satisfied	118.03	20.86	1.92
Not Very Satisfied	114.76	22.01	

Table 4.90 shows the relationship of Professional
Satisfaction with Attitude to Innovation as a whole. No
significant relationship was found. The higher mean was of
the 'Very Satisfied' group and the higher SD score of
the not Very Satisfied group.

Table 4.91 : Professional Satisfaction and Components of
Attitude to Innovation

Components	Very Satisfied		Not Very Satisfied		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Individualization	20.67	3.96	20.39	4.14	0.88
Curriculum Organization	12.06	3.05	12.14	3.32	0.34
Teaching-Learning process	20.26	4.15	19.75	4.24	1.54
Teaching Resources	15.23	4.71	14.86	4.26	0.99
Internal School Organisation	18.91	4.26	18.31	4.64	1.72
Staff Development	19.15	4.87	18.37	4.50	2.19*
School Community Relationship	11.13	3.12	11.07	2.81	3.00*

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.91 shows the relationship of Professional
Satisfaction with the componentsof Attitude to Innovation.
Significant relationship at .05 level in favour of Very
satisfied group existed on School Community Relationship
and Staff Development. The highest and lowest means of
both groups were of Individualisation and School community
relationship, respectively. The highest and lowest SD
scores of very satisfied group were Staff Development
and curriculum organisation, respectively and of the not
very satisfied group of Internal School Organisation and
School Community Relationship, respectively.

Table 4.92 : Professional Satisfaction and Situational
and Innovation Characteristics as a Whole

Satisfaction Level	Mean	SD	t-value
Very Satisfied	207.36	40.88	4.44**
Not Very Satisfied	192.85	40.69	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.92 shows the relationship of Professional
Satisfaction with Situational and Innovation Characteristics
as a whole. Highly significant relationship at .01 level
was in favour of very satisfied group. The higher mean and
SD scores were also of this group.

Table 4.93 : Professional Satisfaction and Components of
Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Very Satisfied		Not Very Satisfied		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Administrative Support	27.44	7.33	25.14	7.07	3.91**
Staff Norms	34.34	14.66	31.15	14.48	2.73**
System Norms	17.10	7.39	15.86	6.80	2.10*
Complexity	22.22	5.49	21.26	5.74	2.15*
Compatibility	22.68	5.50	21.64	5.46	2.33*
Riskness	32.33	8.65	30.59	7.82	3.48**
Localiteness	32.98	6.55	30.96	7.68	3.69**
Cosmopoliteness	17.84	7.22	16.55	6.56	2.24*

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.93 shows the relationship of professional
satisfaction with the components of Situational and
Innovation Characteristics. Relationships on all Components
were significant in favour of very satisfied group.

The highly significant relationship at .01 level were on
Administrative Support, Staff Norms, and Localiteness and
signifidant relationship at .05 level were on Staff Norms,
Compatibility, Cosmopoliteness and Complexity. The highest
means and the SD scores of both groups were of Staff Norms
and the lowest means of both groups were of System Norms.
The lowest SD scores were of Complexity for very satisfied
group and of Compatibility for not very satisfied group.

Table 4.94 : Professional Satisfaction and Change Related
Values as a Whole

Satisfaction Level	Mean	SD	t-value
Very Satisfied	218.05	37.11	2.30*
Not Very Satisfied	211.18	36.54	

*Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.94 shows that relationship of Professional
Satisfaction with the Change Related Values as a whole.
Significant relationship at .05 level existed in favour
of very satisfied group. The higher mean and SD scores
were also of this group.

Table 4.95 : Professional Satisfaction and Components of
Change Related Value

Components	Very Satisfied		Not Very Satisfied		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Traditionalism	38.88	7.00	38.78	7.33	0.18
Progressivism	39.60	7.22	37.59	7.09	3.46**
Dogmatism	32.55	9.11	32.26	8.70	0.40
Venturesomeness	33.38	7.83	32.42	7.32	1.53
Conservatism	30.75	9.15	30.68	8.50	1.28
Change Proneness	41.94	8.70	39.09	8.66	4.48**

** Highly significant at 0.01 level.

Table 4.95 shows the relationship of Professional Satisfaction with the components of Change Related Values. Highly significant relationship at .01 level existed in favour of very satisfied group on Progressivism and Change Proneness. The highest and lowest means of both groups were on Change Proneness and Conservatism, respectively and the highest SD scores of both groups were on Dogmatism. The lowest SD scores were on Traditionalism for Very Satisfied group and on Progressivism for not very satisfied group.

4.5 Analysis of L.B.D.Q. Data

The data yielded by the L.B.D.Q. has been analysed on the basis of 4 patterns of leadership behaviour of the School Principals and Quadrant Scheme given by Halpin (1966). The results are being presented in this Chapter. The four leadership behaviour patterns are as follows :-

(1) HH Pattern - where the Principals are found high on Initiating Structure as well as consideration dimensions.

(2) LH Pattern- where they are low on Initiating Structure and high on Consideration.

(3) LL Pattern - where they are low on both dimensions.

(4) HL Pattern - where they are high on Initiating Structure and low on consideration.

Table 4.96 : Distribution of Principals on the Four
Leadership Behaviour Patterns

Type of School		LB	HH	HL	LH	LL
Part A - K.V.						
K.V.in Gujrat		10	6	2	1	1
Outside K.V.		10	6	1	2	2
	Total	20	12	3	3	2
	%		28	23	50	7
Part B - Unisex Schools						
Boys		10	3	2	1	4
Girls		10	5	2	1	2
	Total	20	8	4	2	6
	%		19	31	33	22
Part C - Medium of Instruction						
English		10	6	1	1	2
Gujrati		10	5	2	0	3
Sindhi		10	5	0	0	5
Hindi		10	3	2	0	5
Marathi		5	2	0	0	3
Urdu		5	2	1	0	2
	Total	50	23	6	1	20
	%		53	46	17	71
Grand Total		90	43	13	6	28
%			48	14	7	31

Table 4.96 shows the distribution of School
Principals as per 4 leadership behaviour patterns in different
types of schools. In all it was 48% HH (effective), 31% LL
(ineffective), 14% HL (with work bias) and 7% LH (with human
bias). Schoolwise distribution of effective Principals was :
60% K.V. and English medium; 50% Girls, Gujrati and Sindhi
medium; 40% Marathi and Urdu medium and 30% Boys and Hindi
medium schools. The ineffective Principals were distributed

as : 60% Marathi, 50% Hindi and Sindhi; 40% Boys and Urdu, 30%, Gujrati, 20% Girls and English and 10% K.V. The over all ratio of HL (work bias) Principals was double that of LH (human bias) Principals. Schoolwise distribution of HL Principals was : 20% K.V. in Gujrat Boys Girls, Gujrati, Hindi and Urdu medium schools and 10% outside K.V. and English medium schools. The LH Principals on the other hand were found only in outside K.V. (20%), K.V. in Gujrat, Boys, Girls and English medium schools (10%). These types of Principals were in equal ratio in the K.V. and Unisex group of schools. The medium of instruction group had 12% HL and 2% LH Principals. Plotting of this data has been show in table 4.97.

Table 4.97 : The Quardrant Scheme Describing Principal's Leadership Behaviour.

Consideration

		Below Mean	Above Mean	

Initiating Structure	Above Mean	HL S+
		   C—
		14 Principals
		(4)
			HH S+
			   C+
			48 Principals
			(1)
				Mean of Initiating Structure 39.54

	Below Mean	(3)
		LL S—
		   C—
		31 Principals
			(2)
			LH S—
			   C+
			7 Principals	

Mean of Consideration 38.04   S = Initiating Structure
N = 90 Schools   C = Consideration

1	HH	48%
2	LH	7%
3	LL	31%
4	HL	14%

Table 4.97 describes the leadership behaviour
patterns of the Principals on the dimensions of Initiating
Structure and as per the LBDQ data explained in the
Table 4.96. The results confirm the hypothesis that the
ratio of effective Principals (HH) is higher than the
ineffective Principals (LL). The mean scores of Initiating
Structure and Consideration dimensions were 39.54 and
38.04, respectively, the difference being 1.50 only. There
is a high positive correlation between these two
dimensions (r = 0.78, highly significant at .01 level).
The mean scores indicate that the leadership behaviour of
the Principal is balanced at sufficiently high lever. It
is in confirmity with the conclusion drawn from the
explanations of the components of the quadrant scheme given
by Halpin (1966). According to him the leader in any
organisation, to be really effective, should maintain
balance between 'Initiating Structure' and 'Consideration'
at sufficiently high level, because changes in the attitudes
and group characteristics such as harmony, intimacy and
procedural clarity are significantly associated with the
leadership behaviour style of the leader.

The behaviour of leader is a Key Factor in
maintaining high level of group efficiency and healthy and
inspiring environment in the institution in which the
group functions. High 'Initiating Structure' combined with
high 'Consideration' is associated with favourable group
attitudes and with favourable changes in group attitudes.
The persons occupying the leadership position should be
specially careful about how the group perceives their
behaviour in the organisation and should make necessary
changes in their behaviour to bring out effectiveness.
Halpin in one of his studies of leadership behaviour of
educational administrators in U.S.A. arrived at the mean
scores of 39.90 of 'Initiating Structure' and 41.10 of

'Consideration'. The Principals under study with relative
scores of 39.54 and 38.04, respectively, seem to be lower
on both 'dimensions. Darji (1975) with near similar
results explained the ~~autocratic~~ possible cause of this
difference as the autocratic leadership background of the
country. In India the Principals, generally regard the
teachers as their subordinates in all respects. As against
this the Principals in the U.S.A. consider the teachers as
their colleagues. The present study has nevertheless
revealed satisfactory results in Indian situation. This
conclusion is supported by the position explained in
table 4.98.

Table 4.98 : Comparative Results of Four Studies

SHELAT(Baroda District)   Darji(Panchmahal District)

Consideration   Consideration
Below   Above   Below   Above
Mean   Mean   Mean   Mean

Initiating Structure

Above Mean

| HL 17% (4) | HH 35% (1) |
| (3) LL 37% | (2) LH 11% |
(N=100)

| HL 9% (4) | HH 49% (1) |
| (3) LL 36% | (2) LH 6% |
(N=100)   I.S. Mean 40.07

Consideration Mean = 39.08

TRIVEDI(Saurashtra)   PRESENT STUDY
                                           (Gujrat State and Outside KV)

Above Mean

| HL 13% (4) | HH 46% (1) |
| (3) LL 34% | (2) LH 7% |
(N=100)
Consideration Mean 36.04
I.S Mean 37.34

| HL (14%) (4) | HH (48%) (1) |
| (3) LL (31%) | (2) LH 7% |
I.S. Mean 39.54

Consideration Mean = 38.04

Table 4.98 reveals that the present investigation
covering the entire Gujrat State and the K.V. located in
other States of India compares well with the previous
investigations of Shelat (1974), Darji (1975), and
Trivedi (1981) conducted in the Baroda District,
Panchmahal District and Saurashtra, respectively. The
common conclusion of 3 of these studies is that in the
secondary schools there are more effective than the
ineffective Principals the difference in ratio being
between 12% and 17% and the Principals with LH style
(humas bias) is the least. Shelat's study of Baroda
district deviated in so far as the first part of
conclusion is concerned and indicated higher ratio of
ineffective Principals, the margin of difference, however,
being insignificant (2%).

Table 4.99 : Distribution of Teachers Among the Schools
having Principals with Four Leadership
Behaviour Patterns

Type	Total Response	HH	HL	LH	LL
		Part A - K.V.			
K.V.in Gujrat	30	18	6	3	3
Outside K.V.	60	36	12	6	6
Total	90	54	18	9	6
%		34	33	45	9
		Part B - Unisex Schools			
Boys	50	15	10	5	20
Girls	32	15	7	3	7
Total	82	30	17	8	27
%		19	32	40	27
		Part C - Medium of Instruction			
English	35	21	3	3	8
Gujrati	40	20	8	–	12
Sindhi	29	14	–	–	15
Hindi	31	9	6	–	16
Marathi	15	6	–	–	9
Urdu	10	4	2	–	4
Total	160	74	19	3	64
%		47	35	15	64
Grand Total	332	158	54	20	100
%		48	16	6	30

Table 4.99 shows the distribution of teachers in different types of schools with various leadership patterns. In all 48% teachers were under effective leadership and 30% in the ineffective leadership. K.V. had 34% teachers in the effective and 9% in the ineffective leadership schools. Of the K.V. teachers 60% were working under effective and 10% under ineffective Principals. The distribution in other schools was : 30% and 40%, respectively, in Boys; 47% and 22% in Girls, 60% and 23%, respectively, in English; 50% and 30%, respectively, in Gujrati; 48% and 52%, respectively, in Sindhi; 29% and 52%, respectively in Hindi; 40% and 60%, respectively, in Marathi and 40% and 40%, respectively, in Urdu medium schools.

Relative L.B.Patterns

Table 4.100 : Patterns of Leadership Behaviour in the K.V.

Type of K.V.	Total	HH	HL	LH	LL
K.V.in Gujrat	10	6	2	1	1
Outside K.V.	10	6	1	2	1
Others	70	31	10	3	26
	(100)	(44)	(14)	(5)	(37)

Figures in parantheses show percentages.

Table 4.100 shows the relative ratios of LB patterns in K.V. and other schools. The highest and lowest ratios of effective and ineffective Principals were in the K.V. The pattern of response from the two types of K.V. was similar on HH and LL leadership.

Table 4.101 shows the relationship of Initiating Structure of mean difference between the K.V. and other schools. No significant difference was found. The means of

Table 4.101 : Relationship of Principals' Response of
K.V. with other Schools on Initiating
Structure

Type	Total	Mean	SD	Variable	t-value
K.V.in Gujrat	10	37.18	7.28	1-2	0.26
Outside K.V.	10	37.50	6.88	2-3	1.48
Others	70	34.89	5.61	1-3	1.29

both types of K.V. were higher than other schools and that
of outside K.V. was higher than the K.V. in Gujrat.

Table 4.102 : Relationship of Principals' Response on
Consideration

Type	Total	Mean	SD	Variable	t-value
K.V.in Gujrat	10	35.68	5.44	1-2	0.86
Outside K.V.	10	32.40	5.53	1-3	1.79
Others	70	30.75	6.91	2-3	1.27

Table 4.102 shows the relationship of mean difference
on consideration. The difference was not significant. The
Means of both types of K.V. were higher than others and
the highest mean was of the K.V. in Gujrat.

Table 4.103 : Patterns of Leadership Behaviour in Unisex
of Schools

Type	Total	HH	HL	LH	LL
Boys	10	3	2	1	4
Girls	10	5	2	1	2
Mixed	70 (100)	42 (60)	6 (8)	4 (6)	18 (26)

Figures in parantheses show percentages.

Table 4.103 shows the relative ratio of LB pattern
in the unisex and other schools. The highest ratio of

effective Principals was in the Mixed Schools followed
by Girls and Boys Schools. The highest ratio of
ineffective Principals was in the Boys schools followed
by the Mixed and Girls Schools. These findings are in
confirmity with Trivedi (1981).

Table 4.104 : Relationship of Principals' Response of
Unisex and other schools on Initiating
Structure

Type	N	Mean	SD	Variables	t-value
Boys	10	34.31	7.61	1-2	1.13
Girls	10	36.24	7.56	1-3	1.70
Mixed	70	37.81	6.11	2-3	0.21

Table 4.104 shows the relationship of Initiating
Structure mean difference on Unisex and Mixed school. No
significant difference was found. The highest and lowest
means were of the Mixed and Boys schools, respectively.

Table 4.105 : Relationship of Principal's Response on
Consideration

Type	Total	Mean	SD	Variables	t-value
Boys	10	35.19	7.99	1-2	1.53
Girls	10	37.58	9.04	1-3	1.78
Mixed	70	38.81	8.61	2-3	0.10

Table 4.105 shows the relationship of mean difference
on Consideration. No significant difference was found.
The highest and lowest means were of the mixed and Boys
schools, respectively.

Table 4.106 : Patterns of Leadership Behaviour in the
Medium of Instruction Schools

Medium	Total	HH	HL	LH	LL
English	10	6	1	1	2
Gujrati	10	5	2	0	3
Sindhi	10	5	0	0	5
Hindi	10	3	2	0	5
Marathi	5	2 (40)	0	0	3 (60)
Urdu	5	2 (40)	1 (20)	0	2 (40)
Others	40 (100)	20 (50)	7 (18)	5 (12)	8 (20)

Figures in parantheses show percentages

Table 4.106 shows the relative ratios of L.B. patterns
in the Medium of Instruction and other schools. The ratio
of effective Principals in English medium schools was
higher and in Gujrati and Sindhi medium schools equal
as compared to the non-medium group schools. The ratio of
ineffective Principals was lower in English medium and
higher in all other medium schools in relation to other
schools. The ratio of LH pattern of all medium schools was
lower than non-medium schools. The ratio of Urdu medium
schools only was higher than the non-medium schools on
HL pattern.

Table 4.107 shows the relationship of Initiating
Structure mean difference between the Medium of
Instruction and other schools. No significant difference
was found. The mean of English medium was highest and of

Table 4.107 : Relationship of Principals' Response of the Medium of Instruction Schools on Initiating Structure

SN	Medium	Total	Mean	SD	Variables	t-value
1	English	10	39.17	7.60	1-2	0.60
					-3	0.45
2	Gujrati	10	38.72	7.28	-4	0.18
					-5	0.17
3	Sindhi	10	38.32	8.12	-6	0.40
					-7	1.82
4	Hindi	10	37.75	7.64	2-3	0.14
					-4	0.70
5	Marathi	5	36.78	7.19	-5	0.49
					-6	0.96
6	Urdu	5	36.30	4.27	-7	1.62
					3-4	0.57
7	Others	40	36.31	7.34	-5	0.55
					-6	0.75
					-7	1.40
					4-5	0.01
					-6	0.18
					-7	0.98
					5-6	0.20
					-7	0.87
					6-7	0.59

Urdu Schools lowest. The means of other medium schools were higher than non-medium schools.

Table 4.108 : Relationship of Principals' Response of the Medium of Instruction Schools on Consideration

SN	Medium	N	Mean	SD	Variables	t-balue
1.	English	10	37.56	7.77	1-2	0.21
					-3	0.96
2.	Gujrati	10	37.19	9.46	-4	0.69
					-5	0.63
3	Sindhi	10	39.11	9.02	-6	1.48
					-7	1.21
4	Hindi	10	34.54	10.21	2-3	0.60
					-4	0.75
5	Marathi	5	34.82	8.71	-5	0.71
					-6	1.42
6	Urdu	5	34.02	5.48	-7	1.06
					3-4	1.47
7	Others	40	35.21	7.00	-5	1.44
					-6	2.18*
					3-7	1.80
					4-5	0.09
					-6	0.58
					-7	0.80
					5-6	0.74
					-7	0.69
					6-7	0.64

* Significant at .05 level

Table 4.108 shows the relationship of Consideration mean difference between the Medium of Instruction and other schools. Significant difference at .05 level was found between Sindhi and Urdu medium schools in favour of Sindhi medium. The highest and Lowest means were of Sindhi and Urdu schools, respectively. The means of English and Gujrati schools also remained above the non-medium schools.

4.6   L.B.Patterns and Innovative Proneness

In this section the relationship of Principals' Leadership behaviour Patterns and their innovative proneness has been analysed. In all 25 tables have been prepared - 21 for I.P.S. components, 3 for different sections and one for the I.P.S. as a whole. No significant difference was revealed on any component.

Table 4.109 : L.B. Patterns and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

	HH (1)	HL (2)	LH (3)	LL (4)
Mean	551.04	531.43	515.03	519.02
SD	38.04	34.56	32.48	37.74
t-value	1-2 :0.48	1-3:0.19	1-4 :	0.38
	2-3 :0.73	2-4:1.39	3-4 :	0.54

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LH patterns, respectively.

Table 4.110 : L.B.Patterns and Individualisation

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	21.20	21.07	20.96	21.88
SD	2.21	1.12	3.17	1.82
t-value	1-2 : 0.21	1-3 : 0.88	1-4 :	0.65
	2-3 : 0.61	2-4 : 1.00	3-4 :	1.01

The highest and lowest means were of LL and HL patterns, respectively.

Table 4.111 : L.B.Patterns and Curriculum Organisation

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	12.59	11.98	11.93	12.15
SD	1.13	1.50	2.72	1.83
t-value	1-2 : 0.76	1-3 : 0.85	1-4 : 0.73	
	2-3 : 0.93	2-4 : 0.22	3-4 : 0.64	

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LH Patterns, respectively.

Table 4.112 : L.B.Patterns and Teaching Learning Process

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	20.36	20.06	20.00	19.96
SD	1.63	1.40	2.00	1.54
t-value	1-2 : 0.21	1-3 : 0.69	1-4 : 0.82	
	2-3 : 0.37	2-4 : 0.58	3-4 : 0.49	

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LL Patterns, respectively.

Table 4.113 : L.B. Patterns and Teaching Resources

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	15.53	15.37	15.33	14.87
SD	1.60	0.81	1.81	1.02
t-value	1-2 : 0.29	1-3 : 0.45	1-4 : 0.38	
	2-3 : 0.36	2-4 : 0.51	3-4 : 0.70	

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LL Patterns, respectively.

Table 4.114 : L.B.Patterns and Internal School Organisation

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	19.51	17.60	18.11	18.00
SD	2.95	5.06	2.42	2.86
t-value	1-2 : 1.73	1-3 : 1.18	1-4 : 1.29	
	2-3 : 0.23	2-4 : 0.32	3-4 : 0.06	

The highest and lowest means were of HH and HL Patterns, respectively.

Table 4.115 : L.B.Patterns and Staff Development

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	19.43	20.04	19.02	19.01
SD	3.00	3.67	1.31	2.28
t-value	1-2 : 0.69	1-3 : 0.41	1-4 : 0.74	
	2-3 : 0.78	2-4 : 1.26	3-4 : 0.04	

The highest and lowest means were or HL and LL Patterns, respectively.

Table 4.116 : L.B.Patterns and School Community Relationship

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	13.05	12.43	12.51	11.85
SD	4.47	3.01	1.30	1.75
t-value	1-2 : 0.51	1-3 : 0.36	1-4 : 1.48	
	2-3 : 0.11	2-4 : 0.82	3-4 : 0.92	

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LL patterns, respectively.

Table 4.117 : L.B.Patterns and Atti-tude to Innovation as a whole

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	124.81	121.69	121.10	121.70
SD	12.60	14.70	18.51	12.61
t-value	1-2 : 0.80	1-3 : 0.75	1-4	: 1.91
	2-3 : 1.00	2-4 : 1.31	3-4	: 0.56

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LH Patterns, respectively.

Table 4.118 : L.B.Patterns and Administrative Support

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	25.95	27.38	27.92	29.49
SD	5.38	5.02	4.91	4.27
t-value	1-2 : 0.78	1-3 : 0.52	1-4 : 1.60	
	2-3 : 0.65	2-4 : 0.77	3-4 : 1.19	

The highest and lowest means were of LL and HH Patterns, respectively.

Table 4.119 : L.B.Patterns and Staff Norms

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	33.88	32.89	32.82	34.88
SD	8.17	18.11	5.45	7.33
t-value	1-2 : 0.39	1-3 : 0.13	1-4	: 1.21
	2-3 : 0.26	2-4 : 0.38	3-4	: 0.80

The highest and lowest means were of LL and LH patterns, respectively.

Table 4.120 : L.B. Patterns and System Norms

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	22.07	19.03	18.42	18.82
SD	3.48	8.65	2.34	4.38
t-value	1-2 : 1.16	1-3 : 0.56	1.4 :	0.35
	2-3 : 0.60	2-4 : 1.06	3-4 :	0.33

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LH patterns, respectively.

Table 4.121 : L.B.Patterns and Complexity

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	28.48	26.92	26.19	26.30
SD	5.61	9.41	5.88	6.49
t-value	1-2 : 1.06	1-3 : 0.22	1-4 :	0.85
	2-3 : 0.36	2-4 : 1.22	3-4 :	0.59

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LH patterns, respectively.

Table 4.122 : L.B.Patterns and Compatibility

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	25.91	25.77	23.15	22.73
SD	9.90	8.65	3.43	2.59
t-value	1-2 : 0.10,	1-3 : 0.80	1-4 :	1.92
	2-3 : 0.86	2-4 : 1.96	3-4 :	0.38

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LL patterns, respectively.

Table 4.123 : L.B.Patterns and Riskness

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	39.57	35.35	35.11	34.08
SD	4.37	13.84	3.12	4.42
t-value	1-2 : 1.71	1-3 : 0.13	1-4 :	1.19
	2-3 : 0.73	2-4 : 0.99	3-44 :	0.78

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LL patterns, respectively.

Table 4.124 : L.B.Patterns and Localiteness

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	40.75	36.57	34.69	34.10
SD	15.90	8.02	3.93	4.59
t-value	1-2 : 1.80	1-3 : 1.10	1-4 :	2.10
	2-3 : 0.95	2-4 : 1.24	3-4 :	0.82

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LL patterns, respectively.

Table 4.125 : L.B. Patterns and Cosmopoliteness

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	19.12	19.85	19.03	18.89
SD	15.25	6.00	1.53	3.29
t-value	1-2 : 0.28	1-3 : 0.34	1-4 :	0.74
	2-3 : 0.05	2-4 : 0.12	3-4 :	0.12

The highest and lowest means were of HL and LL patterns, respectively.

Table 4.126 : L.B. Patterns and Situational and Innovative Characteristics as a Whole

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	233.43	223.46	217.03	218.08
SD	14.19	34.35	13.13	23.76
t-value	1-2 : 0.77	1-3 : 0.32	1-4 : 0.83	
	2-3 : 0.90	2-4 : 0.81	3-4 : 0.06	

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LH Patterns, respectively.

Table 4.127 : L.B.Patterns and Traditionalism

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	39.33	40.6^1	37.0^1	39.43
SD	10.0^1	7.30	2.14	3.50
t-value	1-2 : 0.18	1-3 : 1.38	1-4 : 0.95	
	2-3 : 0.53	2-4 : 0.66	3-4 : 1.78	

The highest and lowest means were of HL and LH patterns, respectively.

Table 4.128 : L.B.Patterns and Progressivism

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	40.50	39.35	38.88	38.01
SD	11.81	7.30	3.00	3.01
t-value	1-2 : 1.42	1-3 : 0.06	1-4 : 0.85	
	2-3 : 0.88	2-4 : 1.36	3-4 : 0.52	

The highest and lowest means were or HH and LL patterns, respectively.

Table 4.129 : L.B.Patterns and Dogmatism

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	35.95	35.82	32.20	30.09
SD	8.48	10.93	2.63	4.08
t-value	1-2 : 0.85	1-3 : 1.15	1-4 : 2.00	
	2-3 : 1.52	2-4 : 1.60	3-4 : 0.62	

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LL patterns, respectively.

Table 4.130 : L.B.Patterns and Venturesomeness

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	33.50	34.24	32.79	33.62
SD	6.21	7.47	2.42	3.95
t-value	1-2 : 0.32	1-3 : 0.50	1-4 : 0.43	
	2-3 : 0.28	2-4 : 0.07	3-4 : 0.52	

The highest and lowest means were of HL and LH patterns, respectively.

Table 4.131 : L.B.Patterns and Conservatism

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	33.13	30.36	29.17	29.30
SD	15.22	7.48	3.05	3.27
t-value	1-2 : 0.84	1-3 : 0.30	1-4 : 1.11	
	2-3 : 0.58	2-4 : 1.49	3-4 : 0.45	

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LH patterns, respectively.

Table 4.132 : L.B.Patterns and Change Proneness

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	42.12	40.54	40.32	41.07
SD	4.85	5.23	4.85	4.60
t-value	1-2 : 0.79	1-3 : 0.11	1-4 : 0.84	
	2-3 : 0.58	2-4 : 0.77	3-4 : 0.44	

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LH patterns, respectively

Table 4.133 : L.B.Patterns and Change Related Values as a Whole

	HH	HL	LH	LL
Mean	224.80	219.65	210.82	212.25
SD	23.44	38.41	11.45	19.29
t-value	1-2 : 1.03	1-3 : 0.54	1-4 : 1.04	
	2-3 : 0.48	2-4 : 1.29	3-4 : 0.51	

The highest and lowest means were of HH and LH patterns, respectively.

4.7 Analysis of O.C.D.Q. Data

The O.C.D.Q. data collected from the 90 schools has been classified into six climate types and subsequently related to the variables under consideration. For classification of data the procedure developed by Halpin (1966 - pp. 166-170) has been followed. It involved four steps; (1) Construction of school Profiles by computing school by school, a school - mean sub-test score for each of the eight sub-tests (dimensions). At this stage, the school profiles are expressed in terms of raw scores.

(2) Conversion of raw scores into standard scores. This
is done twice - first normatively and second ipsatively.
For both processes a standard score system based upon
a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10 is chosen.
(3) Computation of six sets of school-profiles and
(4) Computation of a Single prototypic profile for each
of the six sets of school profiles. The resultant
proto-types can be viewed as six different organizational
climates (viz Open, Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar,
Paternal, and closed) and are ranked on a continuum.

Table 4.134 : Distribution of Schools on the Six
Climates

Type		No.of School	Open (1)	Auto- nomous (2)	Contro- lled (3)	Fami- liar (4)	Pater- nal (5)	Closed (6)
Part A - K.V.								
K.V.in Gujrat		10	4	4	1	-	-	1
Outside K.V.		10	4	4	1	-	-	1
	Total	20	8	8	2	-	-	2
	%		44	66	12			7
Part B - Unisex Schools								
Boys		10	1	1	3	1	1	3
Girls		10	3	1	1	3	1	1
	Total	20	4	2	4	4	2	4
	%		22	17	25	100	17	14
Part C - Medium of Instruction								
English		10	2	1	2	-	1	4
Gujrati		10	2	1	2	-	4	1
Sindhi		10	2	-	1	-	1	6
Hindi		10	-	2	2	-	-	8
Marathi		5	-	-	2 (40)	-	1 (20)	2 (40)
Urdu		5	-	-	1 (20)	-	3 (60)	1 (20)
	Total	50	6	2	10	-	10	22
	%		34	17	63		83	79
Grand	Total	90	18	12	16	4	12	28
	%		20	13	18	5	13	31

Figures in parantheses show percentages.

Table 4.134 shows the organizational climates in different types of schools. The overall distribution was : Open climate 20%, Autonomous climate 13%, Controlled Climate 18%, Familiar Climate 5%, Paternal Climate 13% and Closed climate 31%. Controlled and closed climate types of schools were found in all types of schools and the other four types of climates were not found in 3 or more types of schools. Both types of K.V. did not have the Familiar and Paternal Climates. Both types of Unisex schools had all the six types of Climates. The English and Gujrati medium schools did not have Familiar Climate. Sindhi medium schools did not have Autonomous and Familiar Climates. Hindi medium schools did not have Open, Autonomous, Familiar and Paternal Climates. Marathi and Urdu medium schools did not have open, Autonomous and Familiar climates.

Both types of K.V. had 40% Open and Autonomous climates the highest and 10% Controlled and Closed climates. Boys schools had 30% Controlled and closed climates and 10% each of the other types of Climates. Girls Schools had 30% Open and Familiar climates and 10% each of the remaining types. English medium schools had 40% closed, 20% Open and Controlled and 10% Autonomous and Paternal climates. Gujrati medium schools had 40% Paternal, 20% Open and Controlled climates and 10% Autonomous and Closed climates. Sindhi medium schools had 60% closed, 20% Open, and 10% Controlled and Paternal climates. Hindi medium schools had 80% closed and 20% Controlled climates. Marathi medium schools had 40% Controlled and Closed climates and 20% Paternal climate. Urdu medium schools had 60% Paternal and 20% Controlled and Closed climates.

Of the open climate schools, 44% were in the K.V. 34% in the Medium of Instruction Schools and 22% in the Unisex schools. Of the closed Climate schools, 79% were in the M.I.Schools, 14% in the Unisex schools, and 7% in the K.V. Of the Autonomous Climate schools, 66% were in the K.V., 17% in the Unisex schools and 17% in the M.I.Schools. Of the Controlled Climate schools 63% were in the M.I. schools, 25% in the Unisex schools and 12% in the K.V. 100% Familiar Climates schools were in the Unisex schools - 75% in the Girls and 25% in the Boys schools. 83% of the Paternal Climate schools were in the M.I. schools and remaining 17% in the Unisex schools.

Table 4.135 : Distribution of Teachers in the Six Climate Types Schools

Types of School	Res-ponse	Open	Autono-mous	Contro-lled	Fami-liar	Pater-nal	Closed
Part A - K.V.							
K.V.in Gujrat	30	12	12	3	—	—	3
Outside K.V.	60	24	24	6	—	—	6
Total	90	36	36	9	—	—	9
%		57	71	15			9
Part B - Unisex Schools							
Boys	50	5	5	15	5	5	15
Girls	32	10	3	3	10	3	3
Total	82	15	8	18	15	8	18
%		21	15	30	100	21	19
Part C - Medium of Instruction							
English	35	7	3	7	—	3	15
Gujrati	40	8	4	8	—	16	4
Sindhi	29	6	—	3	—	3	17
Hindi	31	—	—	7	—	—	24
Marathi	15	—	—	6	—	3	6
Urdu	10	—	—	2	—	6	2
Total	160	21	7	33	—	31	68
%		29	14	55	—	79	72
Grand Total	332	72	51	60	15	39	95
%		22	15	18	4	12	29

Table 4.135 shows the distribution of teachers in the six climate types schools. In all 29% teachers were in the Closed climate, 22% in the Open climate, 18% in the Controlled climate, 15% in the Autonomous climate, 12% in the Paternal Climate and 4% in the Familiar climate schools. Of the teachers in Open climate schools 56% were in K.V. 29% in M.I. Schools and 21% in Unisex schools. Distribution in Autonomous Climate was 71% the K.V., 15% Unisex schools and 14% M.I.schools. Distribution in Controlled climate was 55% M.I. schools, 30% Unisex schools, and 15% K.V. All the teachers in Familiar climate were in the Unisex schools. Other climates need no mention.

Table 4.136 : O.C. and the K.V.

Types of K.V.	Total	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
K.V.in Gujrat	10	4	4	1	—	—	1
Outside K.V.	10	4	4	1	—	—	1
Others	70	10 (14)	4 (6)	14 (20)	4 (6)	12 (17)	26 (37)

Figures in parantheses show percentages

Table 4.136 shows the Organizational Climate of the K.V. and other schools. The distribution pattern in the two types of K.V. was identical. K.V. had no Familiar and Paternal climate. K.V. had the largest ratio of Open and Autonomous Climate schools. The ratio of other climate schools was higher for other schools.

Table 4.137 : O.C. and the Unisex Schools

Type	Total	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Boys	10	1	1	3	1	1	3
Girls	10	3	1	1	3	1	1
Mixed	70	14 (20)	10 (14)	12 (17)	—	10 (14)	24 (35)

Figures in parantheses show percentages.

Table 4.137 shows the Organizational Climate of
Boys and Girls schools as compared to other schools. Girls
schools had the highest ratio of open climate Schools
followed by the mixed and Boys schools. Mixed schools had
relatively higher rate of Autonomous and Paternal
Climates than the Boys and Girls schools. Mixed schools
also had higher ratio of Controlled Climate than the
Girls schools. Girls schools had the highest ratio of
Familiar climate and the Mixed schools had no such
school. Mixed schools had the highest ratio of Closed
climate schools and the Girls schools the least.

Table 4.138 : O.C. and the Medium of Instruction
Schools

Medium	Total	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
English	10	2	1	2	-	1	4
Gujrati	10	2	1	2	-	4	1
Sindhi	10	2	-	1	-	1	6
Hindi	10	-	-	2	-	-	8
Marathi	5	-	-	2 (40)	-	1 (20)	2 (40)
Urdu	5	-	-	1 (20)	-	3 (60)	1 (20)
Others	40	12 (30)	10 (25)	6 (15)	4 (10)	2 (5)	6 (15)

Figures in parantheses show percentages

Table 4.138 shows the Organizational climate in the
Medium of Instruction schools. Open climate existed only
in English, Gujrati and Sindhi medium schools (in equal
ratio) and the ratio was higher in the non-medium schools.
Autonomous Climate also existed only in English and
Gujrati medium schools (in equal ratio) and the ratio was
higher of the non-medium schools. On Paternal climate,
Hindi schools had no score and all the M.I. Schools had

ratio
higher/than the non-medium schools. On Controlled
Climate, except for Sindhi medium schools all the M.I.
schools had lower ratio than the non-medium schools.
No M.I. school had any response on Familiar Climate.
On Closed climate Gujrati medium schools had the least
ratio but all other medium schools had higher ratio
than the non-medium schools.

4.8 Organizational Climate and Innovative Proneness

In this section the relationship of six
organizational climates of schools with innovative
proneness has been presented. The six climates are :
(1) Open, (2) Autonomous, (3) Controlled, (4) Familiar,
(5) Paternal and (6) Closed. In all 25 tables have been
prepared on six of which seven highly significant and
six significant relationship have been found.

Table 4.139 : O.C. and Innovative Proneness asa Whole

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	582.79	562.21	549.65	570.57	548.81	537.12
SD	33.86	96.36	90.96	45.80	33.42	35.85
t-value	1-2 : 0-43	1-3 : 0-35	1-4: 0.84	1-5 : 0.83		
	1-6 : 0.10	2-3 : 0.59	2-4: 0.67	2-5 : 0.10		
	2-6 : 1.80	3-4 : 0.82	3-5:1.00	3-6 : 0.87		
	4-5 : 0.70	4-6 : 1.54				

No significant difference was found. The highest mean
was on open and lowest on closed climates.

Table 4.140 : O.C. and Individualisation

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	22.71	22.61	22.04	22.70	22.18	22.91
SD	4.10	3.88	3.27	2.27	3.54	3.80

t-value 1-2 : 0.92 1-3 : 0.71 1-4 : 0.78 1-5 : 0.85

1-6 : 0.22 2-3 : 0.24 2-4 : 0.16 2-5 : 0.09

2-6 : 0.69 3-4 : 0.32 3-5 : 0.15 3-6 : 0.49

4-6 : 0.23 4-6 : 0.58 5-6 : 0.61

No Significant difference was found. The highest mean was on Closed and lowest on the controlled climates.

Table 4.141 : O.C. and Curriculum Organisation

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	12.96	12.58	12.14	12.64	12.69	12.16
SD	1.11	1.71	3.51	4.46	3.11	3.81

t-value 1-2 : 0.93 1-3 : 0.88 1-4 : 0.57 1-5 : 0.51
1-6 : 0.16 2-3 : 1.64 2-4 : 0.07 2-5 : 1.42
2-6 : 0.89 3-4 : 0.96 3-5 : 0.31 3-6 : 1.18

4-5 : 0.85 4-6 : 0.56 5-6 : 0.73

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was on Open and lowest on Controlled Climates.

Table 4.142 : O.C.and Teaching Learning Process

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	20.75	2.66	20.47	20.73	20.51	20.35
SD	4.17	3.58	3.18	3.87	4.26	5.08

t-value 1-2 : 1.57 1-3 : 0.50 1-4 : 0.56 1-5 :0-41 1-6:0.35

2-3 : 1.44 2-4 : 0.23 2-5 : 1.05 2-6:1.33 3-4:0.95

3-5 : 0.81 3-6 : 0.30 4-5 : 0.67 4-6:0.64

5-6 : 0.64

No Significant difference was found. The highest mean was on open and lowest on closed climates.

Table 4.143 : O.C.and Teaching Resource

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	15.81	15.00	15.22	20.50	16.45	15.25
SD	4.91	4.40	4.54	5.70	4.50	4.65

t-value 1-2 : 0.94 1-3:0.63 1-4:2.04 1-5 : 0.54

1-6 : 0.61 2-3:0.41 2-4:2.36* 2-5 : 0.92

2-6 : 0.53 3-4:2.11* 3-5:0.81 3-6 : 0.22

4-5 : 1.51 4-6:2.40* 5-6:0.86

*Significant at .05 level

Significant difference at .05 level existed between Autonomous and Familiar, Controlled and Familiar, and Familiar and closed climates. The highest mean score was on Familiar and lowest on Autonomous Climates.

Table 4.144 : O.C. and Internal School Organization

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	20.11	17.26	18.83	18.50	19.93	18.18
SD	3.65	5.61	2.89	3.11	1.50	2.46

t-value 1-2 :1.60 1-3:1.10 1-4:0.87 1-5:0.95 1-6 : 1.39

2-3 : 0.38 2-4:0.23 2-5:1.91 2-6:1.02 3-4 : 0.20

3-5 : 0.16 3-6:0.30 4-5:0.80 4-6:0.22 5-6 : 0.47

No Significant difference was found. The highest mean scores was on Open and lowest on Autonomous Climates.

Table 4.145 : O.C. and Staff Development

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	19.34	19.77	19.38	19.52	20.69	19.31
SD	2.45	3.41	2.63	3.59	2.01	2.85

t-value 1-2 : 0.53 1-3:0.55 1-4:0.21 1-5 :1.56 1-6:0.41

2-3 : 0.70 2-4:0.82 2-5:0.80 2-6:0.70 3-4:0.41

3-5 : 1.50 3-6:0.93 4-5:1.20 4-6:0.90 5-6:1.39

No Significant difference was found. The highest mean was on Paternal and lowest on Closed Climates.

Table 4.146 : O.C. and School Community Relationship.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	13.75	12.26	11.11	12.00	11.29	11.92
SD	5.93	2.78	1.87	2.61	1.98	1.58
t-value	1-2 : 0.51	1-3:1.85	1-4:0.84	1-5:0.90	1-6:1.33	
	2-3 : 1.80	2-4:0.93	2-5:0.73	2-6:1.38	3-4:0.78	
	3-5 : 1.22	3-6:0.33	4-5:0.70	4-6:0.71	5-6:1.03	

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was on Open Climate and lowest on Controlled Climates.

Table 4.147 : O:C. and Attitude to Innovation as a Whole

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	125.49	125.09	122.02	125.51	129.32	119.90
SD	21.10	24.34	17.29	12.27	9.81	10.45
t-value	1-2:0.6	1-3:1.12	1-4:0.53	1-5:0.80	1-6:1.80	
	2-3 :1.25	2-4:0.59	2-5:0.92	2-6:1.98	3-4:0.11	
	3-5:0.57	3-6:0.90	4-5:0.37	4-6:0.50	5-6:1.61	

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was of Familiar and lowest on Closed Climates.

Table 4.148 : O.C. and Administrative Support

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	25.04	25.10	26.61	28.00	28.23	27.63
SD	6.22	6.41	4.73	3.51	4.27	3.70
t-value	1-2 :1.85	1-3:0.81	1-4:0.30	1-5:0.70	1-6:0.25	
	2-3 :1.50	2-4:1.04	2-5:1.75	2-6:1.58	3-4:0.45	
	3-5 :0.79	3-6:0.61	4-5:0.10	4-6:0.33	5-6:0.36	

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was of Paternal and lowest on open climates.

Table 4.149 : O.C. and Staff Norms

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	34.22	33.89	33.28	40.52	32.46	33.00
SD	8.21	15.74	8.95	5.21	8.12	7.71
t-value	1-2:0.05	1-3:0.35	1-4:1.14	1-5:0.26	1-6:0.56	
	2-3:0.52	2-4:0.96	2-5:0.92	2-6:0.72	3-4:1.46	
	3-5:0.21	3-6:0.70	4-5:1.77	4-6:1.28	5-6:0.21	

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was on Familiar and lowest on Paternal Climates.

Table 4.150 : O.C.and System Norms

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	21.35	19.71	11.77	12.75	18.30	14.78
SD	7.79	3.23	3.49	5.23	3.26	3.67
t-value	1-2:1-23	1-3:0.64	1-4:0.33	1-5:0.41	1-6:0.42	
	2-3:1.83	2-4:0.64	2-5:1.00	2-6:1.70	3-4:0.04	
	3-5:0.66	3-6:0.82	4-5:0.63	4-6:0.11	5-6:0.48	

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was on open and lowest on Controlled Climates.

Table 4.151 : O.C. and Complexity

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	25.81	24.18	23.93	25.30	23.58	23.10
SD	2.65	3.30	2.32	2.39	3.44	3.73
t-value	1-2:0.80	1-3:1.38	1-4:0.91	1-5:1.19	1-6:1.21	
	2-3:1.84	2-4:0.68	2-5:1.34	2-6:1.84	3-4:0.90	
	3-5:0.54	3-6:1.54	4-5:0.43	4-6:0.97		
	5-6:0.68					

No Significant difference was found. The highest mean was on Open and the lowest on Closed Climates.

Table 4.152 : O.C. and Compatibility

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	29.01	25.69	24.34	21.00	23.13	25.26
SD	7.89	13.30	2.90	4.67	3.54	2.15
t-value	1-2:0.10	1-3:1.10	1-4:0.78	1-5:0.69	1-6:1.77	
	2-3:2.28	2-4:1.14	2-5:1.35	2-6:1.66	3-4:1.66	
	3-5:0.14	3-6:1.41	4-5:1.80	4-6:1.11	5-6:0.17	

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was on Open and lowest on Familiar Climates.

Table 4.153 : O.C. and Riskness

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	36.84	31.39	34.87	30.57	34.58	32.90
SD	13.86	6.51	2.83	4.75	3.56	4.00
t-value	1-2:1.63	1-3:0.63	1-4:1.50	1-5:0.57	1-6:0.74	2-3:1.21
	2-4:1.80	2-5:0.83	2-6:1.80	3-4:1.33	3-5 : 0.60	
	3-6:1.77	4-5:1.68	4-6:1.80			

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was on Open and lowest on Familiar climates.

Table 4.154 : O.C. and Localiteness

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	38.64	34.51	34.33	30.52	33.33	33.80
SD	17.59	17.10	2.58	4.72	4.37	3.59
t-value	1-2:0.93	1-3:0.44	1-4:1.18	1-5:0.48	1-6 : 1.83	
	2-3:1.04	2-4:1.31	2-5:1.52	2-6:1.84	3-4:1.91	
	3-5:1.19	3-6:1.58	4-5:1.33	4-6:0.48	5-6: 1.62	

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was on open and lowest on Familiar Climates.

Table 4.155 : O.C. and Cosmopoliteness

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	22.51	20.81	17.65	17.05	16.13	16.86
SD	12.53	9.33	3.15	7.88	4.32	3.15
t-value	1-2:1.42	1-3:1.13	1-4:0.45	1-5:1.93	1-6:1.64	
	2-3:1.63	2-4:0.85	2-5:1.32	2-6:1.26	3-4:1.61	
	3-5:0.84	3-6:0.93	4-5:0.44	4-6:0.22	5-6:0.89	

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was on Open and lowest on Paternal Climates.

Table 4.156 : O.C. and Situational Characteristics and Innovative Characteristics as a Whole

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	253.07	212.93	223.93	205.80	208.96	205.60
SD	14.18	30.51	21.25	23.60	26.32	19.85
t-value	1-2:0.67	1-3:0.88	1-4:0.94	1-5:0.48	1-6:1.35	
	2-3:0.43	2-4:0.53	2-5:0.63	2-6:1.23	3-4:0.97	
	3-5:0.20	3-6:0.68	4-5:0.19	4-6:0.23	5-6:0.37	

No significant difference wasfound. The highest mean was on Open and lowest on Closed climates.

Table 4.157 : O.C. and Traditionalism

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	38.00	41.76	38.92	42.35	38.26	38.54
SD	10.77	10.35	3.63	3.10	2.44	3.63
t-value	1-2:1.40	1-3:0.92	1-4:0.92	1-5:1.02	1-6:1.95	
	2-3:0.65	2-4:0.89	2-5:0.26	2-6:0.32	3-4:2.17*	
	3-5:0.66	3-6:1.01	4-5:3.14**	4-6:2.73**	5-6:0.45	

** Highly significant at .01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level

Highly significant difference at .01 level existed between Familiar and Paternal and Familiar and Closed climates and significant difference at .05 level between controlled and Familiar climates. The highest mean was on Familiar and lowest on Open Climates.

Table 4.158 : O.C. and Progressivism

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	42.80	37.59	41.01	42.00	39.45	39.13
SD	15.22	7.51	8.35	1.62	4.02	3.64
t-value	1-2:1.56	1-3:1.38	1-4:0.66	1-5:0.77	1-6:1.27	
	2-3:0.95	2-4:0.73	2-5:0.99	2-6:1.09	3-4:0.30	
	3-5:0.45	3-6:1.55	4-5:0.64	4-6:1.54	5-6:1.10	

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was on Open and lowest on Autonomous Climates.

Table 4.159 : O.C. and Dogmatism

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	31.55	36.33	30.87	39.52	35.18	32.25
SD	6.03	6.48	8.80	1.62	2.46	4.10
t-value	1-2:0.62	1-3:0.58	1-4:0.66	1-5:0.41	1-6:1.80	
	2-3:0.68	2-4:0.49	2-5:0.81	2-6:0.45	3-4:0.53	
	3-5:0.46	3-6:1.33	4-5:2.53*	4-6:3.81**	5-6:1.17	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level

Highly significant difference at .01 level existed between Familiar and Closed Climates and significant difference at .05 level between Familiar and Paternal Climates. The highest mean was on Familiar and lowest on Controlled Climates.

Table 4.160 : O.C. and Venturesomeness

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	32.69	33.26	35.55	37.57	32.33	31.16
SD	8.99	9.88	11.05	4.62	5.66	7.14
t-value	1-2:0.16	1-3:1.84	1-4:1.10	1-5:1.77	1-6:1.46	
	2-3:1.36	2-4:1.37	2-5:1.67	2-6:1.66	3-4:2.07	
	3-5:0.54	3-4:1.10	4-5:4.44**	4-6:3.13**	5-6:0.63	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Highly significant difference at .01 level existed between Familiar and Paternal, and Familiar and Closed Climates. The highest mean was on Familiar and lowest on Closed climates.

Table 4.161 : O.C. and Conservatism

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	33.29	32.56	30.58	33.57	27.02	30.01
SD	16.42	11.68	4.25	4.88	3.63	3.13
t-value	1-2:0.48	1-3:0.10	1-4:0.43	1-5:0.99	1-6:0.10	
	2-3:0.74	2-4:0.09	2-5:1.04	2-6:0.73	3-4:0.97	
	3-5:1.38	3-6:0.53	4-5:2.23*	4-6:1.53	5-6:1.81	

* Significant at .05 level

Significant difference at .01 level existed between Familiar and Paternal climates. The highest mean was on Familiar and lowest on Paternal Climates.

Table 4.162 : O.C. and Change Proneness

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	42.33	41.03	43.60	42.99	43.99	41.23
SD	3.28	6.34	3.63	3.62	3.95	4.32
t-value	1-2:0.59	1-3:1.81	1-4:0.95	1-5:1.81	1-6:0.23	
	2-3:0.69	2-4:0.53	2-5:0.67	2-6:0.59	3-4:0.17	
	3-5:0.42	3-6:1.63	4-5:0.41	4-6:0.54	5-6:1.14	

No significant difference was found. The highest mean was on Paternal and lowest on Autonomous Climates.

Table 4.163 : OC and Change Related Values as a Whole

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	232.13	230.41	221.00	235.67	213.41	212.11
SD	60.73	38.99	70.16	51.13	8.17	19.32
t-value	1-2:1.02	1-3:1.01	1-4:0.74	1-5:0.37	1-6:0.56	
	2-3:1.31	2-4:1.31	2-5:0.74	2-6:1.60	3-4:0.52	
	3-5:1.01	3-6:1.54	4-5:4.30**	4-6:3.33	5-6:0.98	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Highly significant difference at .01 level existed between Familiar and Paternal and Familiar and Closed Climates. The highest mean was on Familiar and lowest on closed climates.

4.9 Analysis of the J.S.I. Data

In this section the data yielded by the tool "Job Satisfaction Inventory" has been presented. The J.S.I. has been constructed by the investigator for use in this study, the details of which have been discussed in Chapter III. 30 job aspects have been included in the tool to ascertain the views of the teachers. Job Satisfaction has been distinguished from the professional satisfaction which has been included as a personal variable in this study. Profession is a career and Job is a specific work of the profession performed at a particular time and place. A job has several aspects which satisfy or dissatisfy the worker. A teacher may be satisfied from the profession of teaching but may not be so from the job of teaching in a particular school, class, management or medium of instruction etc. Satisfaction from teaching job has been evaluated through the J.S.I.

The responding teachers were to indicate their
opinions on one of the five classifications against each
job aspect. Two of these classification dealt with the
negative side (very dis-satisfied and somewhat
dissatisfied) and two with the positive side(somewhat
satisfied and very satisfied). One column was provided
for the undecided group who were neither satisfied nor
dissatisfied. While analysing the data however only
3 categories were made viz : Satisfied, dissatisfied and
undecided. In all 11 tables have been prepared.

Table 4.164 shows the rate of teacher job satisfaction
and dissatisfaction in different types of schools.
Over-all satisfaction rate was 33.43 and dissatisfaction
rate 25.23. The satisfied group analysis reveals that
in all 33% (a rate regarded as reconable) were satisfied
on 12 job aspects of which 8 aspects had 50% or more
satisfaction rate. These aspects were : -

Colleagues' respect (85%), Job Involvement(80%),
Job Leadership(80%),Colleagues& relations(55%),
Liking for Job (55%), Possibility of advancement
(51%), Job prestige (50%), Technical facility(50%),
Fairness of authority(50%), Working Condtions(40%),
Interest by Dept. head(39%), and Salary(36%).

On the aspect of Job prestige only K.V. has below
reasonable rate satisfaction. Also, on 7 aspects the
responses of the two types of K.V. were not identical
though the rate remained reconable. These were :-

Salary, Colleagues' relations, Interest by
Dept. head, Relations with Dept. head, Working
conditions, Liking for job, and Job achievement.

Table 4.164 : Rate of Job S

Differe

Types of Schools		Job Aspects →	Salary	Colleague Relations	Interest by Dpt. Head	Job Security	Rela. with Dpt. Head	Working Condition	Liking for the Job	Job Achievement	Use of talents	Job Responsibility	Job Autonomy	Competence of Dpt. Head
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
PART-A	K.V. in Gujrat	S	50	53	63	56	47	77	83	33	37	40	10	13
		D	23	3	37	27	20	6	7	47	23	33	63	40
	Outside K.V.	S	83	69	71	56	33	85	81	45	37	40	10	13
		D	15	3	29	27	20	6	7	47	23	33	63	40
	Total	S	72	64	69	56	38	83	82	41	37	40	10	13
		D	18	3	31	27	20	6	7	47	23	33	63	40
PART-B	Boys	S	20	66	48	4	20	40	46	12	30	10	14	8
		D	24	-	18	70	18	18	40	18	20	10	70	36
	Girls	S	47	50	50	22	34	56	72	54	60	22	12	9
		D	12	-	41	31	-	28	12	12	28	16	47	19
	Total	S	30	60	94	11	26	46	56	28	42	14	13	9
		D	20	-	27	55	11	22	29	16	23	12	61	29
PART-C	English	S	8	68	20	3	18	29	63	17	6	2	11	14
		D	9	6	6	57	34	28	-	18	6	23	66	43
	Gujrati	S	25	37	38	7	3	8	50	15	14	15	-	15
		D	47	7	12	63	7	10	-	5	7	-	60	35
	Simdhi	S	17	31	6	3	10	10	24	17	17	4	3	-
		D	14	28	17	69	3	38	28	14	10	7	55	-
	Hindi	S	20	38	6	3	16	14	32	23	39	13	10	7
		D	16	35	29	65	6	6	-	6	16	10	58	19
	Marathi	S	7	47	-	-	-	6	-	27	46	20	20	-
		D	60	33	47	67	20	67	47	-	27	20	47	20
	Urdu	S	-	70	-	-	-	-	-	40	70	20	20	-
		D	50	10	40	80	20	50	50	40	30	40	40	20
	Total	S	16	46	17	4	10	13	39	20	24	16	42	8
		D	28	19	20	64	14	26	12	11	11	12	58	25
Grand Rate		S	36	55	39	20	21	40	55	28	32	22	10	10
		D	24	10	25	52	15	20	15	22	18	18	60	30
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

S : Satisfied

D : Dissatisfied

K.V. had reconable rate of Satisfaction on 18 aspects
of which 14 aspects had 50% or more. There were :-

> Job Leadership(100%), Possibility of advancement(97%),
> Colleagues' respect (97%), Job involvement(90%),
> Technical facilities (84%), Working conditions(83%),
> liking for job (82%), Fairness of authority(77%),
> Sense of belonging (73%), Salary(72%), Interest by
> Dept. Head (69%), Colleagues relations(64%),
> Fringe benefits(59%), Job Security (56%), Job
> achievement (41%), Job responsibility (40%), Relation
> with Dept. head (38%) and use of talents(37%).

Among the Unisex schools Boys schools had reconable
satisfaction rate on 9 aspects, 5 of which had the rate of
50% or more. These were :-

> Colleagues' respect (98%), Job involvement(90%), Job
> leadership (68%), Colleagues' relations(66%), Job
> prestige (64%), Interest by Dept. Head (48%), Liking
> for job (46%), Working conditions(40%) and Challange
> in assignment (40%).

In the Girls schools reconable satisfaction rate was on
15 aspects of which 10 aspects had 50% or more. These
were :-

> Colleagues' respect (93%), Job Involvement(88%),
> Job leadership (81%), liking for job(72%), Technical
> facilities (66%), use of talents (60%), Working
> conditions (56%), Job achievement (54%), Colleague
> relations (50%), Interest by Dept. Head (50%), Salary
> (47%), Job Prestige (47%), Freedom of expression(44%),
> Challange in assignment (34%), and Relationship with
> Dept. Head (34%).

Among the M.I. Group the English medium had reconable
rate on 7 aspects (all 50% or more). These were :-

Colleagues' respect(100%), Job involvement(94%), Job
leadership (77%), Colleagues' relations(68%), liking
for the job (63%), Technical facilities (57%), and
Fairness of authority (51%).

In the Gujrati medium reconable rate was on 12 aspects
of which 5 aspects had 50% or more. These were :

Job leadership (90%), Job involvement (80%), Job
prestige (75%), Fairness of authority (60%), liking
for job (50%), Procedural formalities(45%), Colleagues'
respect (45%), Freedom of expression (42%), Interest
by Dept. Head (38%), Possibility of advancement(38%),
Colleagues' relations (37%), and Technical facilities
(37%).

In the Sindhi medium reconable rate was on 6 aspects of
which 3 aspects had 50% or more. These were :-

Freedom of expression (80%), Job prestige (70%),
Job leadership (55%), Colleagues' respect (49%),
Possibility of advancement (41%), and Job involvement
(34%).

In the Hindi medium reconable rate was on 9 aspects of
which 6 aspects had 50% or more. These were :

Job leadership (97%), Colleagues' respect (97%),
Job involvement (77%), Job prestige (74%), Technical
facilities (65%), Freedom of expression(55%), Use of
talents (39%), Possibility of advancement (39%) and
Colleagues' relations (38%).

In the Marathi medium reconable rate was found on 8
aspects of which 4 aspects had 50% or more. These were :-

Freedom of expression(73%), Job prestige(67%),
Possibility of advancement (66%), Colleagues respect
(60%), Colleagues relations (47%), Job Involvement
(47%), Use of talents (46%) and Job leadership (40%).

In the Urdu medium reconable rate was on 9 aspects of
which 7 aspects had 50% or more. These were :-

Colleagues' respect (100%), Job prestige (80%),
Freedom of expression (80%), Colleagues' relations
(70%), Use of talents (70%), Possibility of
advancement (50%), Job involvement (5%), Job
achievement (40%), and challange in assignment (40%).

Jobs Aspect-wise Analysis of the satisfied group
reveals that all schools had reconable satisfaction rate
on the aspects of Involvement in job and Respect from
Colleagues. On the other hand, no school had such a rate
on 8 aspects which were :-

Autonomy in job, Competence of Dept. Head, Promotion
level reached in job, Recognition of work, Help
from administration, Status in job, Participation in
decision making and Work load.

Only K.V. had reconable satisfaction rate on the
aspects of Job security, Responsibility in job, Fringe
benefits and Sense of belonging. Also, only Girls schools
had such rate of satisfaction on Procedural formalities.
Further, only K.V. and Girls schools had such a rate on
Salary received and Relations with Dept. head.

On the aspect of Relations with Colleagues all
schools other than Sindhi medium had reconable satisfaction
rate. On Interest in work shown by Dept. Head K.V., Unisex,
Gujrati and Hindi medium schools had such a rate. On
Working conditions K.V. and the Unisex schools had such
rate. On Liking for the nature of job K.V., Unisex,
English and Gujrati medium schools had such a rate. On
Achievement in job K.V., Girls and Urdu medium schools had
such a rate. On Use of talents K.V. Girls, Hindi, Marathi
and Urdu medium schools had such a rate of satisfaction.
On prestige of job all schools except K.V.and English
medium schools had such a rate. On Fairness of authority
K.V., English, Gujrati and Marathi medium schools had
such a rate. On Freedom of expression all schools except
K.V. Unisex and English medium schools had such a rate.
On challange in assignment K.V., Unisex and Urdu medium
schools had such a rate. On Possibility of advancement
all schools except Unisex and English medium schools had
such a rate. On Leadership in job all schools except
Urdu medium had such a rate. On Technical facilities, K.V.,
Girls, English Gujrati and Hindi medium schools had
reconable satisfaction rate.

The dissatisfied group analysis of table 4.164 reveals
that the reconable dissatisfaction rate (33% or more) was
found on 7 aspects on 5 of which at least 50% rate was
found. These aspects were :-

Salary (73%), Job autonomy(60%), Job security(52%),
Administrative help (50%), Recognition of works(51%),
Working conditions (45%) and Job Status (45%).
K.V. had the reconable rate of dissatisfaction on 11
aspects of which 6 had at least 50% rate. They were :-
Work load (97%), Promotion level (80%), Job autonomy
(63%), Recoghition of work (63%), Job Prestige(50%),
Administrative help (50%), Job achievement (47%),

Competenceof Dept. head (40%), Job responsibility
(33%), Freedom of expression (33%), and Participa-
tion in decision making (33%).

Among the Unisex schools Boys schools had reconable
dissatisfaction rate on 7 aspects of which on 5 the rate
was above 50%. These were :-

> Work load(80%), Administrative help (80%), Job
> autonomy (70%), Job security (70%), Status in
> job (68%), Liking for job (40%), and Competence
> of Dept. head (36%).

Girls schools had reconable rate on 6 aspects of which
on 2 the rate was above 50%. These were :-

> Workload (62%), Administrative help (52%), Job
> autonomy (47%), Status in job (41%), Interest by
> Dept. Head (41%), and Promotion level reached
> (37%).

Among the M.I. Group English medium schools had reconable
dissatisfaction rate on 11 aspects of which on 6 the rate
was at least 50%. These were :-

> Work load (86%), Status in job (72%), Possibibity
> of advancement (71%), Job autonomy (66%), Job
> security (57%), Freedom of expression (57%),
> Promotion level reached (46%), Competence of Dept.
> head (43%), Job prestige (43%), Relations with
> Dept. Head (34%), and Work recognition(34%).

Gujrati medium schools had reconable dissatisfaction rate
on 10 aspects of which on 5 the rate was at least 50%.
These were :-

> Workload (75%), Job security (63%), Job autonomy
> (60%) Work recognition (50%), Possibility of

advancement(50%), Salary.(47%), Status in Job
(42%), Freedom of expression (37%), Competence
of Dept. head (35%) and Promotion level reached
(33%).

Sindhi medium schools had reconable dissatisfaction rate
on 8 aspects of which on 6 the rate was at least 50%.
These were :

Administrative help (76%), Job security(69%),
Work recognition (69%), Interest in work by Dept.
head (69%), Job autonomy (55%), Possibility of
advancement (52%), Status in job (51%) and working
conditions (38%).

Hindi medium schools had reconable dissatisfaction rate
on 7 aspects of which on 5 the rate was at least 50%.
These were :

Job security (65%), Job autonomy (58%), Status in
job (55%), Work recognition (52%), Possibility
of advancement (51%), Administrative help (38%),
and relations with Colleagues (35%).

Marathi medium schools had reconable dissatisfaction rate
on 11 aspects of which on 5 the rate was atleast 50%.
These were :-

Work recognition (100%), Status in job (73%), Job
security (67%), Working conditions (67%), Salary
(60%), Interest in work by Dept. head (47%), liking
for job (47%), Job autonomy (47%), Promotion level
reached (47%), Colleagues' relations (33%) and Job
autonomy (33%).

Urdu medium schools had reconable dissatisfaction rate
on 12 aspects of which on 7 the rate was at least 50%.
These were :-

> Work recognition (100%), job security (80%),
> Status in job (80%), Salary (50%), Working condition
> (50%), Liking for job (50%), Promotion level
> reached (50%), Interest in work by Dept. head (40%),
> Job achievement (40%), Job responsibility (40%),
> Job autonomy (40%) and Possibility of advancement
> (40%).

Job Aspect-wise Analysis of the dissatisfied group
reveals that all schools had reconable dissatisfaction
rate on the aspect of Autonomy in job. On the other hand,
no schools had such a rate on 10 aspects which were :

> Use of talents, Fairness of authority, Challange in
> assignment, Fringe benefits, Involvement in job,
> Leadership in job, Procedural formalities, Sense
> of belonging, Respect from colleagues and Technical
> facilities.

Only K.V. had reconable dissatisfaction rate on the
aspect of Participation in decision making. On the other
hand, all schools except K.V. had such a rate on Status
in job. Only English medium schools had such a rate on
Relations with Dept. head. On recognition of work Unisex
schools had such a rate.

On the aspect of Salary received Gujrati, Marathi and
Urdu medium schools had reconable dissatisfaction rate.
On relations with colleagues Hindi and Marathi medium
schools had such a rate. On Interest in work shown by
Dept. head K.V. in Gujrat, Girls, Marathi and Urdu medium

schools had such a rate. On Job security all schools except
K.V. and Girls schools had such a rate. On working
conditions Sindhi, Marathi and Urdu medium schools had
such a rate. On Liking for the nature of job Boys, Marathi
and Urdu medium schools had such a rate. On Achievement
in job K.V. and Urdu medium schools had such a rate. On
Responsibility in job K.V. and Urdu medium schools had
such a rate. On Competence of Dept. head K.V., Boys,
English and Gujrati medium schools had such a rate. On
Promotion level reached all schools except Boys, Sindhi and
Hindi medium schools had such a rate. On Prestige of Job
K.V., English and Marathi schools had such a rate. On
Freedom of expression K.V., English and Gujrati medium had
such a rate. On Possibility of advancement English,
Gujrati, Sindhi, Hindi and Urdu medium schools had such a
rate. On Help from administration K.V., Unisex, Sindhi
and Hindi medium schools had such a rate. On Workload all
schools except Hindi, Marathi and Urdu medium had reconable
dissatisfaction rate.

Table 4.165 shows the rate of undecided response on
J.S.I. aspects in different types of schools. This category
of response revealed the gap between positive and negative
groups and had zero score value. The overall undecided rate
was 41.33. The average rate of undecided response in
different school groups was : K.V. 24.10, Unisex 44.47
and M.I. 49.77. In all 21 aspects had reconable rate (33%
or more) 10 of which had 50% or more. The remaining 9
aspects having below reconable rate were :-

        Job Security, Liking for job, Job autonomy, Job
        prestige, Possibility of advancement, Job involvement,
        Job leadership, Colleagues' respect and Workload.

K.V. had reconable rate on 10 aspects of which 4 had 50%
or more. Boys schools had such a rate on 19 aspects of which

Table 4.165 : Rate of Undecided Response in Different Types of Schools

Job Aspect \ Type of School	K.V. in Guj.	Outside KV	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	English	Gujrati	Sindhi	Hindi	Marathi	Urdu	Total	Grand Rate
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Salary 1	27	2	10	56	41	50	83	28	69	64	33	50	56	40
Col. Rela. 2	44	28	33	34	50	40	26	56	41	27	20	20	35	35
Int./Head 3	–	–	–	34	9	24	74	50	77	65	53	60	63	36
J. Security 4	17	17	17	26	47	34	40	30	28	32	33	20	32	28
Rel./Head 5	33	47	42	62	66	63	48	90	87	78	80	80	76	64
Work.Comd. 6	17	9	11	42	16	32	43	82	52	80	27	50	61	40
Liking for J. 7	10	12	11	14	16	15	37	50	48	58	53	50	49	30
J. Achievement 8	20	8	12	70	34	56	65	80	69	71	73	20	69	50
U. of Talents 9	40	40	40	50	12	35	88	79	73	45	27	–	64	50
J. Responsib. 10	27	27	27	80	62	74	51	85	89	77	60	40	72	60
J. Autonomy 11	27	27	27	16	41	26	23	40	42	32	33	40	34	30
Comp./Head 12	47	47	47	56	72	62	43	50	100	74	80	80	67	60
Prom. Level 13	–	–	–	74	45	62	37	45	73	55	53	50	51	40
J. Prestige 14	33	33	33	8	31	17	29	10	–	26	–	–	14	20
F. Authority 15	13	13	13	64	66	64	40	35	62	64	40	60	49	43
Fr./Expr. 16	67	67	67	58	37	50	37	21	3	32	–	–	20	40
Work Recog 17	13	30	24	68	82	73	54	50	28	35	–	–	36	42
Challange/J. 18	33	33	33	30	47	37	68	75	72	45	73	50	66	50
Fr. Benefits 19	13	15	14	80	56	71	71	68	93	94	80	80	80	60
P. Advance. 20	13	13	13	66	53	62	3	12	7	10	7	10	8	20
J. Involve. 21	10	10	10	10	12	11	6	20	66	23	53	50	31	20
Hr./Admin. 22	30	30	30	10	22	15	83	65	24	45	73	70	59	40
J. Status 23	60	60	60	22	28	24	14	58	49	35	27	20	37	40
J. Leadership 24	–	–	–	32	19	27	23	10	45	3	60	90	28	20
P./Decision M. 25	53	53	53	62	72	66	83	75	90	62	80	80	78	68
Pr. Formalit. 26	73	73	73	92	72	84	86	50	69	68	79	80	69	74
S./Belonging 27	20	20	20	92	88	90	71	95	97	84	93	90	88	70
Col. Respect 28	–	–	–	2	–	1	–	40	41	3	20	–	20	10
T. Facilities 29	13	13	13	70	25	52	34	45	62	29	86	80	49	40
Work Load 30	–	–	–	20	16	18	5	25	31	36	73	80	32	20
Grand Rate 31	24.77	23.90	24.10	46.67	41.23	44.47	45.50	50.63	56.23	48.40	48.97	46.33	49.77	41.33
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14

16 had 50% or more. Girls schools had such a rate on 18 aspects of which 11 had 50% or more. English medium schools had such a rate of 21 aspects of which 12 had 50% or more. Gujrati medium schools had such a rate on 22 aspects of which 17 had 50% or more. Sindhi medium schools had such a rate on 23 aspects of which 17 had 50% or more. Hindi medium school had such a rate on 20 aspects of which 5 had 50% or more. Marathi medium schools had such a rate on 21 aspects of which 17 had 50% or more. Urdu medium schools had such a rate on 20 aspects of which 18 had 50% or more.

Table 4.166 shows the teacher scores on the aspects of J.S.I. The highest and lowest J.S.I. scores for the positive group were of outside K.V.(1197) and Urdu medium (103), respectively. Similarly, the highest and lowest J.S.I. scores for the negative group were of Outside K.V. (569) and Urdu medium (115), respectively. All schools except Sindhi, Hindi, Marathi and Urdu medium on the positive side and all except Marathi and Urdu medium on the negative side had reconable scores viz. 33% of the highest i.e. above 395 for positive and 188 for negative groups.

The J.S.I. means of the positive and negative groups were 149.90 and 96.53, respectively. The schoolwise means of the positive group in relative order were : Outside K.V. (39.90), K.V. in Gujrat (19.67), Boys(18.83), Girls (16.57), Gujrati (13.83), English (13.63), Hindi (13.10) Sindhi (7.33), Marathi (4.23) and Urdu medium schools (3.43). Similarly, the schoolwise means of the negative group were : Outside K.V. (18.97), Boys(15.27), English (10.57), K.V. in Gujrat (9.90), Gujrati(9.70), Sindhi(7.77), Girls (7.80), Hindi (7.40), Maßathi (5.63) and Urdu medium schools (3.43).

Leadership	Participation in Decision	Procedural Formalities	Sense of Belonging	Colleague Respect	Technical Facilities	Work Load	Grand Score	Mean (÷30)	Teacher Mean
4	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
	4	5	22	49	25	1		572	19.67	19.67
-	10	3	2	1	1	29	297	9.90	9.90
	8	10	44	98	50	2	1197	39.90	19.95
-	20	6	4	2	2	58	569	18.97	9.98
	12	15	66	147	75	3	1769	58.97	19.66
-	30	9	6	3	3	87	866	28.87	9.73
	4	2	2	79	10	-	565	18.83	11.30
-	15	2	2	-	5	40	458	15.27	9.16
	4	8	3	40	21	7	497	16.57	15.53
-	5	1	1	2	3	20	225	7.50	7.03
	8	10	5	119	31	7	1062	35.40	12.95
-	20	3	3	2	8	60	683	29.43	8.33
	2	5	8	63	20	3	409	13.63	11.69
	4	2	2	-	3	30	317	10.57	9.06
	4	18	-	20	15	-	415	13.83	10.38
	6	2	2	6	7	30	291	9.70	7.28
	2	7	-	15	3	-	220	7.33	7.59
	1	-	1	3	8	20	233	7.77	8.03
	2	10	4	55	20	10	392	13.10	12.85
	10	2	1	-	2	10	222	7.40	7.16
	2	1	-	11	1	-	127	4.23	8.47
	1	2	1	3	1	4	169	5.63	11.27
	1	-	-	18	1	-	103	3.43	10.30
	1	-	1	-	1	2	115	3.83	11.50
	13	41	12	182	60	13	1,666	55.53	10.41
	23	8	8	12	22	96	1,347	44.90	8.42
	33	66	83	448	166	23	4,497	149.90	13.55
	73	20	17	17	33	243	2,896	96.53	8.71
	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33

Table 4.166 :   J.

Types of Schools		R	S/D	Salary (1)	Colleague Relations (2)	Interest by Dpt. Head (3)	Job Security (4)	Rela. with Dpt. Head (5)	Working Condition (6)	Liking for the Job (7)	Job Achievement (8)	Use of talents (9)	Job Responsibility (10)
PART-A	K.V. in Gujrat	30	S	20	31	26	34	22	26	35	16	14	13
			D	7	1	21	8	6	3	2	19	7	10
	outside K.V.	60	S	67	81	57	68	37	57	69	38	28	26
			D	9	2	32	16	12	6	4	38	14	20
	Total	90	S	87	112	83	102	59	83	104	54	42	39
			D	16	3	53	24	18	9	6	57	21	30
PART-B	Boys	50	S	10	63	30	4	14	25	42	8	20	5
			D	14	-	15	35	9	14	20	14	10	5
	Girls	32	S	25	31	20	14	16	21	39	22	25	8
			D	4	-	22	10	-	13	4	4	9	5
	Total	82	S	35	94	50	18	30	46	81	30	45	13
			D	18	-	37	45	9	27	24	18	19	10
PART-C	English	35	S	4	46	9	2	9	10	32	6	3	11
			D	6	2	2	20	12	15	-	9	2	8
	Gujrati	40	S	14	27	20	6	2	3	30	8	9	6
			D	19	3	10	25	3	6	-	2	3	-
	Sindhi	29	S	7	17	3	2	3	3	12	6	7	1
			D	4	8	9	20	1	15	8	6	3	2
	Hindi	31	S	9	23	3	2	7	4	23	10	19	5
			D	5	11	16	20	2	3	-	2	5	3
	Marathi	15	S	1	12	-	-	-	1	-	7	10	3
			D	12	5	13	10	3	16	7	-	4	3
	Urdu	10	S	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	4	11	2
			D	7	1	8	8	2	8	5	6	3	4
	Total	160	S	35	138	35	12	21	21	97	41	59	28
			D	53	30	58	103	23	63	20	25	20	20
Grand Score		332	S	157	344	168	132	110	150	282	125	146	80
			D	87	33	148	172	50	99	50	100	60	60
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

S = Satisfied   D = Diss

The highest and lowest aspect means of the positive group were of Involvement in job (48.5) and Workload (2.3), respectively, and of the negative group were of Workload (24.3) and job involvement and Job leadership (both zero), respectively. Reconable aspect means of the positive group showing higher satisfaction rate were scored on 4 aspects viz. Job involvement (48.5) Colleagues' respect (44.8), Colleagues' relation (34.4) and Job leadership (33.2). No aspect had reconable mean in the negative group .

The highest and lowest means of the positive group of K.V. were on the aspects of Colleagues' respect and Freedom of expression, respectively, Boys schools on Job involvement and Work recognition as well as Work load, respectively; of Girls schools on Job involvement and Work recognition, respectively; of English medium schools on Job involvement and Fringe benefits as well as Administrative help; respectively; of Gujrati medium schools on Job involvement and Job autonomy, as well as 3 more aspects, respectively; of Sindhi medium schools on Freedom of expression and Competence of Dept. head as well as 4 more aspects, respectively; of Hindi medium schools on Colleagues' respect and Fringe benefits, respectively; of Marathi medium schools on Freedom of expression and Interest by Dept. head as well as 10 more aspects, respectively; and Urdu medium schools on Colleagues' respect and Salary as well as 13 more aspects respectively.

The highest and lowest means of the negative group of K.V. were on Promotion level reached and Possibility of advancement and 2 more aspects, respectively; of Boys schools on Administrative help and Colleagues' relations and 3 more aspects, respectively; of Girls schools on Administrative help and colleagues' relations and 3 more

aspects, respectively; of English medium schools on Status in job and liking for job and 3 more aspects, respectively; of Gujrati medium schools on Job security and Liking for job and 4 more aspects, respectively; of Sindhi medium schools on work recognition and Competence of Dept. head and 4 more aspects, respectively, of Hindi medium schools on Job status and Liking for job and 4 more aspects, respectively; of Marathi-medium schools on work recognition and Job achievement and 3 more aspects, respectively; and of Urdu medium schools on Work recognition and Job involvement and 3 more aspects, respectively.

The conclusions emerging from Table 4.16$ reverse some earlier foreign and Indian findings with regard to certain job dissatisfiers. Anjunuluyu(1968) confirming the previous findings revealed 6 common dissatisfiers among the schools under all types of management, and among the teachers with various personal variables. Out of these the present study, included only the "workload" in the list of 7 common dissatisfiers. The present findings on these six aspects were as follows :-

(a) "Salary received" was no more a common dissatisfier. K.V., Girls, English, and Sindhi medium schools regarded it to be satisfying and the Boys, English, Gujrati, Marathi and Urdu medium schools found it to be dissatisfying.

(b) "Work load" was still a common dissatisfier. Even the K.V. running on model lines were no exception.

(c) "Freedom of expression in job" (academic freedom) was no more a common dissatisfier. For K.V., Boys, English and Sindhi medium schools, however, it was still a dissatisfier.

(d) "Prestige in Job" (social status) was no more a
common dissatisfier. K.V. however, regarded it to be
a dissatisfier.

(e) "Possibility of advancement"(Prospects in job) was
no more a common dissatisfier. It was, however, a
dissatisfier in the English, Gujrati and Hindi medium
schools.

(f) "Job security" (Lack of security) was still a common
dissatisfier though for the K.V. and Girls schools it
was a satisfier.

The present study revealed some common dissatisfiers,
Common satisfiers and mixed response aspects. The 7 common
dissatisfiers were :

Autonomy in job, Competence of Dept. head, Promotion
level reached, Recognition of work, Help from the
administration. Participation in decision making, and
work load.

None of these factors were found to be common dissatisfier
earlier. Further study is needed to ascertain whether some
of these common dissatisfiers can be converted into satisfiers
or made less dissatisfying. The 8 common satisfiers were :-

Relations with colleagues, liking for the nature of
job, Use of talents in job, Fairness of authority,
Involvement in job, Leadership in job, Sense of
belonging and respect from colleagues.

None of these aspects were earlier reported to be common
dissatisfiers. The remaining 15 aspects of the J.S.I. were
found to have mixed response i.e. certain types of schools
found them to be satisfiers and other schools dissatisfiers.
The combination of job aspects however kept on changing

with the types of Schools.

K.V. found 12 of these aspects to be satisfiers,
Unisex schools found 5 of these to be satisfiers and 2 to
be dissatisfiers. One aspect was a satisfier for the Boys
schools but dissatisfier for the Girls schools. For English
medium schools 10 of these aspects were dissatisfiers and
4 satisfiers. For Gujrati medium schools 7 aspects were
dissatisfiers and 8 satisfiers. For Sindhi medium schools
6 aspects were dissatisfiers and 7 satisfiers. For Hindi
medium schools 5 aspects were dissatisfiers and 9
satisfiers. Marathi medium schools had 8 dissatisfiers and
5 satisfiers. Urdu medium schools had 8 dissatisfiers and
4 satisfiers.

Job
Table 4.167 : Relative scores/of satisfied and Dissa-
tisfied groups of Teachers.

Type of Schools	Res- ponse	Percentage of Teachers		Teacher Mean of	
		Satis- fied	Dissa- tisfied	Satis- fied	Dissa- tisfied
Part - A : K.V.					
K.V. in Gujrat	30	47.13	28.10	19.67	9.90
Outside	60	49.10	28.67	19.95	9.98
Average	90	45.20	27.37	19.66	9.73
Part 'B' : Unisex Schools					
Boys	50	26.93	26.40	11.30	9.16
Girls	32	38.60	19.17	15.53	7.03
Average	82	31.50	24.37	12.95	8.33
Part C : Medium of Instruction					
English	35	21.33	32.17	11.69	9.06
Gujrati	40	33.52	22.50	10.38	7.28
Sindhi	29	19.97	23.43	7.59	8.03
Hindi	31	30.40	20.87	12.65	7.16
Marathi	15	21.87	29.90	8.47	11.27
Urdu	10	23.00	30.33	10.30	11.50
Average	160	26.83	24.53	10.41	8.42
Grand Average	332	33.43	25.23	13.55	8.71

Table 4.167 shows the percentages and mean scores of
the satisfied and dissatisfied teachers together. (Summary
of Tables 4.164 and 4.166). In general, the score of
satisfied group was higher than the dissatisfied group. The
satisfied group average was highest for the K.V. followed
by Unisex and medium of instruction groups. The dissatisfied
group average was highest for the K.V. followed by medium
of instruction and Unisex groups. Only the K.V. group had
higher scores (both) than the grand average of both the
groups.

Schoolwise analysis reveals that the highest percentage
as well as teacher mean scores of the satisfied group were
of outside K.V. followed by K.V. in Gujrat and Girls schools.
In other schools the order of the percentages and teacher
mean scores changed. The order as per percentages were :
Gujrati, Hindi, Boys, Urdu, Marathi, English and Sindhi
medium schools and as per teacher mean the order was :
Hindi, English, Boys, Gujrati, Urdu, Marathi and Sindhi,
medium schools. In this group the individual school
percentages of the K.V., Girls and Gujrati medium schools
were higher than the grand average. In case of mean scores,
however, only the K.V. and Girls schools had higher mean
than the grand mean.

The highest percentage of the dissatisfied group was
of English followed by Urdu, Marathi outside K.V., K.V.
in Gujrat, Boys, Sindhi, Gujrati, Hindi medium and Girls
Schools. The highest mean score of this group was of Urdu
medium followed by Marathi, K.V. in Gujrat, Outside K.V.,
Boys, English, Sindhi, Gujrati, Hindi Medium and Girls
schools. In this group the percentages as well as the means
of individual schools were higher than the grand scores for
the K.V., Boys, English, Marathi and Urdu medium schools.

Table 4.168 : Relationship of the Satisfied and Dissatisfied
groups on the Aspects of Job

Sl. No.	Job Aspect	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		t-value
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1.	Salary Received	15.70	0.71	8.70	0.95	2.40*
2.	Relations/Colleagues	34.40	19.41	3.30	6.35	7.64**
3.	Interest/Dept.Head	16.80	1.81	14.80	5.15	0.28
4.	Job Security	13.20	1.79	17.20	7.55	2.76*
5.	Relations/Dept.Head	11.00	3.99	5.00	4.65	1.53
6.	Working Conditions	15.00	0.01	9.90	0.35	1.50
7.	Liking for Job	28.20	13.21	5.00	4.65	3.44**
8.	Achievement in job	12.50	2.49	10.00	0.35	0.23
9.	Use of talents	14.60	0.39	6.00	3.65	3.46**
10.	Responsibility in job	8.00	6.99	6.00	3.65	0.33
11.	Autonomy in job	3.30	11.69	19.90	10.25	3.31**
12.	Competence/Dept.Head	3.20	11.79	10.00	0.35	2.10*
13.	Promotion level	6.70	8.29	23.20	13.55	2.47*
14.	Prestige of job	19.90	4.91	10.00	0.35	1.78
15.	Fairness of authority	18.30	3.31	2.60	7.05	3.97**
16.	Freedom of Expression	13.20	1.79	10.00	0.35	1.11
17.	Recognition of work	2.31	12.69	21.90	12.25	3.41**
18.	Challange in job 7	12.10	2.89	6.50	3.15	1.17
19.	Fringe Benefits	7.40	7.59	6.60	3.05	0.66
20.	Possibility of Advancement	22.00	8.01	9.60	0.05	2.34*
21.	Involvement in job	48.50	33.51	0.00	9.65	8.89**
22.	Help/Administration	3.30	11.69	21.60	11.95	3.31**
23.	Status in job	5.00	9.99	21.50	11.85	1.32
24.	Leadership in job	33.20	18.21	0.00	9.65	9.01**
25.	Participation in Decision	3.30	11.96	7.30	2.35	2.36*
26.	Procedural formalities	6.60	8.39	2.00	7.65	1.31
27.	Sense of belonging	8.30	6.69	1.70	7.95	1.23
28.	Respect from colleagues	44.80	29.81	1.70	7.95	8.77**
29.	Technical Facilities	16.60	1.61	3.30	6.35	2.33*
30.	Technical Work load	2.30	12.69	24.30	14.65	8.73**
	Overall Mean	14.99	8.94	9.65	5.92	2.51

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.169 shows the relationship between the job satisfied and dissatisfied groups in different types of schools on the basis of aspect mean. Highly significant difference at 0.01 level was found in case of two types of K.V. and Urdu schools in favour of the satisfied group and in case of Marathi schools in favour of the dissatisfied group. Significant difference at 0.05 level was found in favour of the satisfied group in case of Girls schools and in respect of the overall mean.

Table 4.170 : Relationship of the Job Satisfied and Dissatisfied Groups between Different Types of Schools

Types of Schools	Satisfied			Dissatisfied		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
K.V.	19.66	13.63	3.43**	9.73	8.36	1.14
Others	8.22	6.81		6.10	4.11	
Boys	11.30	10.11	0.21	9.16	8.13	2.66*
Others	11.84	10.37		7.32	6.61	
Girls	15.53	13.17	1.07	7.03	5.98	0.34
Others	12.05	9.01		8.05	7.02	
English medium	11.69	9.10	0.36	9.06	6.77	2.77*
Others	12.31	10.36		7.77	5.33	
Gujrati	10.38	8.63	0.67	7.28	6.03	0.22
Others	12.30	11.01		7.85	7.01	
Sindhi	7.59	6.61	1.65	8.03	6.63	0.01
Others	12.88	11.31		8.02	7.88	
Hindi	12.65	7.89	0.11	7.16	5.93	0.34
Others	12.36	8.66		8.08	6.17	
Marathi	8.47	6.34	1.45	11.27	9.16	3.87**
Others	13.63	7.47		8.24	7.11	
Urdu	10.30	8.30	0.99	11.50	4.13	3.91**
Others	13.23	11.17		8.38	6.70	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
*Significant at 0.05 level

Table 4.170 shows the relationship of the satisfied
and dissatisfied groups between different types of schools.
In the satisfied group highly significant relationship
at 0.01 level existed in favour of the K.V. between the
K.V. and other schools and in the dissatisfied group such
relationship was found in favour of other schools between
Marathi medium and other schools and between Urdu medium
and other schools. The dissatisfied group also revealed
significant relationship at 0.05 level between Boys and
other schools in favour of Boys schools and between
English medium and other schools in favour of English
medium schools. This indicates that the teachers find
more satisfiers and at higher rate in K.V. as compared
to other schools and more dissatisfiers in the Boys and
English schools.

4.19 J.S.I. and Innovative Proneness

This section presents the relationship of job
satisfaction and dissatisfaction with innovative proneness.
There is no previous finding to compare the results of the
present study.

Table 4.171 shows the relationship of job satisfaction
and dissatisfaction with innovative proneness. Highly
significant relationship at .01 level was found in favour
of the satisfied group on Progressivism, and Change
proneness. Significant relationship at .05 level was also
found in favour of the satisfied group on School Community
Relationship, System Norms, Compatibility, Localiteness,
Cosmopoliteness, Change Related Values as a whole and
innovative proneness as a whole and in favour of the
dissatisfied group on Curriculum Organisation, Internal
School Organisation and Riskness. The highest and lowest
means of the satisfied group were on Change Proneness and

Table 4.171 : Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction and Innovative Proneness of Teachers

Sl. No.	Components of I.P.S.	Satisfaction		Dissatisfaction		t-value
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1.	Individualisation	9.01	1.87	5.11	0.51	1.32
2.	Curriculum Organisation	7.42	0.28	8.02	3.42	2.33*
3.	T-L Process	6.13	1.01	4.20	0.40	0.67
4.	T. Resource	3.44	3.70	5.33	0.73	0.66
5.	I.S.Org.	2.11	5.03	4.44	0.16	2.68*
6.	Staff Development	4.08	3.06	4.06	0.54	0.02
7.	S.C.Relationship	8.23	1.09	2.23	2.37	2.38*
8.	A.I. as a whole	5.77	1.37	4.77	0.17	0.34
9.	Admin Support	4.12	3.02	2.31	2.29	0.69
10.	Staff Norms	6.07	1.07	4.23	0.37	0.87
11.	System Norms	9.14	2.00	3.10	1.50	2.22*
12.	Complexity	9.42	2.28	5.91	1.31	1.48
13.	Compatibility	8.19	1.05	3.42	1.18	2.65*
14.	Riskness	10.36	3.22	12.61	7.41	2.47*
15.	Localiteness	9.45	2.31	1.46	3.14	2.97*
16.	Cosmopoliteness	8.71	1.57	3.04	1.56	2.08*
17.	SC & IC as a whole	8.18	1.04	4.43	0.17	1.33
18.	Traditionalism	3.08	4.06	2.61	1.99	0.21
19.	Progressivism	12.33	5.19	6.33	1.73	3.27**
20.	Dogmatism	2.18	4.96	2.45	2.15	0.31
21.	Venturesomeness	11.87	4.73	13.12	8.52	0.59
22.	Conservatism	2.22	4.92	1.15	3.45	0.31
23.	Change Proneness	12.34	5.20	2.00	2.60	3.98**
24.	C.R.V.as a whole	7.34	0.20	4.61	0.01	2.01*
25.	I.P. as a whole	7.14	2.93	4.60	2.25	2.33*

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at .05 level

Internal School Organisation, respectively, and of the
dissatisfied group on Venture-someness and Conservatism,
respectively. The highest and lowest SD scores of the
Satisfied group were on Change Proneness and Change Related
Values as a whole, respectively, and of the dissatisfied
group on Venturesomeness and CRV as a whole, respectively.

4.11 Correlation Matrix

In this section the correlations between the
Componentsof the tools and different variables have been
presented. In all 13 matrices representing 5 correlation
matrices have been prepared. These are : (1) Components
of I.P.S. and the variables, (2)Leadership behaviour
patterns and components of I.P.S. (four matrices),
(3) Organizational climate and the components of I.P.S.
(Six matrices), (4) Job aspects and the variables, and
(5) Job aspects and the components of I.P.S. In the C.M.
1 and 4 the two types of K.V. have been represented as
one school variable.

Correlation Matrix No.1

In this matrix the relationships of schools and
Personal variables with the components of the I.P.S.have
been examined. In all 35 variables have been considered
on both the scales.

K.V. was highly significantly related with
professional qualification, In-service education,
professional satisfaction, Curriculum organisation, school
community relationship, system norms, progressivism and
I.P.S. as a whole; significant with mobility, professional
reading habit, teaching learning process, teaching
resource, internal school organisation, staff development,
section I as a whole, administrative support, staff norms,

.I)

	A.Q.	P.Q.	Mob.	P.E.	J.S.E.	P.R.H.	P.S.	Jmd.	C.O.	T.L.P.	T.R.	J.S.D.	S.D.	S.C.R.	I	A.S	St.N.	Sys-N	Compl	Compt	Risk	LoCal	Cosm	II	Trad.	Proj.	Deg.	Vent	Cons.	C.P	III J.P.S.		
	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	
																																1	K.V.
																																2	Boys
																																3	Girls
																																4	Eng.
																																5	Guj.
																																6	Sind.
																																7	Hind.
																																8	Mar.
																																9	Urdu
																																10	34 Yr.
																																11	More
																																12	Male
																																13	Fem.
																																14	5 Yr.
																																15	More
																																16	BA.
																																17	B.Com.
																																18	B.Sc.
																																19	M.Sc.
																																20	M.Com
																																21	M.A.
																																22	Unt.
																																23	Dip
																																24	B.Ed/T.
																																25	M.Ed
																																26	Mob.
																																27	No
																																28	P.E.
																																29	No
																																30	J.S.E.
																																31	No
																																32	P.R.H
																																33	No
																																34	P.S.
																																35	No
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	

II)

	3	4 A.Q	5 P.Q	6 Mob.	7 P.E.	8 J.S.E	9 P.R.H	10 P.S.	11 Jmd.	12 C.O.	13 T.L.P	14 T.R.	15 J.S.O	16 S.D.	17 S.CR	18 H	19 A.S	20 St.N	21 Sys.N	22 Compl	23 Compt	24 Risk	25 Loel	26 Cosm	27 II	28 Trad	29 Prog	30 Dog	31 Vent	32 Cons	33 C.P	34 III	35 J.P.S		
										.62	.31	.32	.43	.46	.49	.47	.58	.08	.02	.01	.05	.06	.03	.06	.05	.06	.39	.06	.33	.00	.12	.09	.28	1	Jmd.
											.40	.41	.42	.46	.47	.44	.43	.06	.04	.01	.02	.03	.05	.04	.06	.04	.04	.02	.04	.03	.05	.02	.26	2	C.O.
												.61	.52	.56	.40	.56	.74	.61	.12	.43	.71	.60	.12	.11	.10	.42	.11	.06	.01	.16	.14	.10	.47	3	T.L.P
													.43	.51	.16	.64	.47	.76	.64	.42	.19	.14	.17	.16	.43	.42	.13	.02	.01	.20	.12	.15	.43	4	T.R.
														.60	.06	.49	.76	.50	.31	.31	.32	.07	.30	.43	.33	.31	.09	.04	.30	.06	.31	.48	5	J.S.O
															.48	.49	.78	.66	.03	.08	.09	.03	.00	.05	.42	.06	.06	.04	.08	.07	.04	.45	.40	6	S.D.
																.06	.63	.40	.08	.02	.08	.09	.04	.03	.46	.03	.04	.05	.08	.06	.00	.04	.31	7	S.CR.
																	.66	.64	.39	.36	.31	.36	.37	.39	.47	.45	.30	.11	.30	.01	.34	.08	.36	8	I
																		.80	.31	.37	.52	.06	.32	.33	.44	.31	.36	.06	.04	.31	.34	.32	.39	9	A.S
																			.36	.60	.31	.20	.32	.31	.33	.38	.36	.02	.30	.31	.34	.39	.34	10	St.N
																				.56	.60	.52	.50	.41	.51	.70	.48	.01	.31	.41	.44	.49	.42	11	Sys.N.
																					.50	.48	.51	.54	.46	.58	.45	.0?	.31	.36	.43	.17	.46	12	Compl.
																						.60	.61	.51	.57	.53	.59	.61	.41	.44	.40	.43	.40	13	Compt.
																							.64	.53	.60	.04	.30	.31	.41	.46	.44	.40	14	Risk.
																								.60	.60	.61	.43	.32	.42	.46	.42	.46	15	Loel.
																									.53	.60	.47	.31	.39	.41	.43	.44	16	Cosm
																										.66	.42	.02	.31	.41	.47	.49	17	II
																											.43	.31	.20	.44	.41	.43	18	Trad.
																												.04	.43	.04	.43	.42	19	Prg.
																													.14	.44	.06	.34	.18	20	Dog.
																														.04	.43	.24	.42	21	Ven.
																															.06	.06	.06	22	Cons.
																																.55	.28	23	C.P
																																	.66	24	III
																																		25	J.P.S
	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35		

compatibility, cosmopoliteness, change proneness,
section III as a whole and I.P.S. as a whole and negatively
with complexity, dogmatism, and conservatism. Boys schools
were significantly related with progressvism and negatively
with conservatism. Girls schools were significantly related
with professional qualification, progressivism and change
proneness. English medium was highly significantly related
with teaching resource, school community relationship and
system norms; significantly with professional satisfaction,
curriculum organisation, internal school organisation,
staff development, section I as a whole, administrative
support, staff norms, systems norms, cosmopoliteness
progressivism, and section III as a whole; and negatively
with complexity. Gujrati medium was highly significantly
related with change proneness and I.P.S. as a whole and
significantly with professional satisfaction, teaching
learning process, teaching resource, school community
relationship, section I as a whole, cosmopoliteness,
progressivism, venturesomeness, and section III as a whole
and negatively with Complexity. Sindhi medium was negatively
related with progressivism, change proneness and Section III
as a whole. Hindi medium was highly significantly related
with individualisation and change proneness; significantly
with section I as a whole, administrative support,
progressivism, venturesomeness, Section III as a whole and
I.P.S. as a whole and negatively with conservatism. Marathi
medium was significantly related with professional
satisfaction, individualisation, traditionalism, dogmatism
and conservatism and negatively with progressivism,
section III as a whole and I.P.S, as a whole. Urdu medium
was highly significantly related with individualisation
and significantly with professional satisfaction, riskness,
traditionalism and conservatism.

Upto 34 years (lower) age was significantly related
with staff norms, system norms, compatibility and
cosmopoliteness. Higher age was significantly related with
teaching learning process, teaching resource, localiteness,
section II as a whole, progressivism, dogmatism, venture-
someness, change proneness and IP as a whole.

Female sex was significantly related with individualism,
curriculum organisation, teaching learning process,
teaching resource, internal school organisation, school
community relationship, section I as a whole, administrative
support, localiteness, section II as a whole, traditionalism,
progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness, conservatism,
change proneness, IP as a whole. Male sex was significantly
related with mobility, in-service education, professional
reading habit, school community relationship, venture-
someness and change proneness.

Teaching experience (upto 5 years) was significantly
related with staff norms. Higher teaching experience was
significantly related with individualisation, curriculum
organisation, teaching learning process, section I as a
whole, localiteness, traditionalism, progressivism,
dogmatism, venturesomeness, conservatism, change proneness,
section III as a whole and I P as a whole.

Academic qualification of Arts stream (B.A. and M.A.)
was significantly related with curriculum organisation,
teaching learning process, internal school organisation,
school community relationship, section I as a whole,
localiteness, traditionalism, dogmatism, venturesomeness,
conservatism, change proneness, Section III as a whole and
I P as a whole. Science stream (B.Sc./M.Sc.) was
significantly related with individualisation, curriculum

as a whole, administrative support and progressivism;
significantly with teaching-learning process, teaching
resource, progressivism and venturesomeness and negatively
with system norms, complexity, riskness, localiteness,
traditionalism and change proneness. Curriculum organisa-
tion was highly significantly related with teaching
learning process, teaching resource, internal school
organisation, staff development, school community
relationship, section I as a whole and administrative
support and negatively with system norms and conservatism.
Teaching learning process was highly significantly related
with teaching resource, internal school organisation, staff
development, school community relationship, section I as
a whole, administrative support, staff norms, complexity,
compatibility; riskness, traditionalism, and I P S as a
whole and significantly with system norms, localiteness
cosmopoliteness, section II as a whole, progressivism,
conservatism, change proneness, and section III as a whole.
Teaching resource was highly significantly related with
internal school organisation, staff development, section I
as a whole, administrative support, staff norms, system
norms, complexity, section II as a whole, traditionalism,
progressivism, and I P S as a whole and significantly with
school community relationship, compatibility, riskness,
localiteness, cosmopoliteness, conservatism, change
proness, and section III as a whole. Internal school
organisation was highly significantly related with staff
development, section I as a whole, administrative support,
staff norms, compatibility, section II as a whole and
I P S as a whole; significantly with system norms,
complexity, cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, progressivism,
conservatism and section III as a whole and negatively
with riskness. Staff development was highly significantly
related with school community relationship, Section I as
a whole, administrative support, staff norms, section II

and significantly with venturesomeness. Compatibility was
highly significantly related with riskness, localiteness,
cosmopoliteness, section II as a whole, traditionalism,
progressivism, dogmatism venturesomeness, conservatism,
change proneness section III as a whole and I P S as a
whole. Riskness was highly significantly related with
localiteness, cosmopoliteness, Section II as a whole,
venturesomeness, conservatism, change proneness, section
III as a whole and I P S as a whole and significantly with
progressivism and dogmatism. Localiteness was highly
significantly related with cosmopoliteness, section II
as a whole, traditionalism, progressivism, venturesomeness,
conservatism, change proneness, section III as a whole
and I P S as a whole and significantly related with
dogmatism. Cosmopoliteness was highly significantly related
with Section II as a whole, traditionalism, progressivism,
conservatism, change proneness, section III as a whole and
I P S as a whole and significantly with dogmatism and
venturesomeness. Section II as a whole was highly signifi-
cantly related with traditionalism, progressvism, conser-
vatism, change proneness, section III as a whole and I P S
as a whole and significantly with venturesomeness.

Traditionalism was highly significantly related
with progressivism, conservatism, change proneness,
section III as a whole, and I P S as a whole and signifi-
cantly with dogmatism. Progressivism was highly significantly
related with venturesomeness, change proness, section III
as a whole and I P S as a whole. Dogmatism was highly
significantly related with conservatism and significantly
with section III as a whole. Venturesomeness was highly
significantly related with change proneness and I P S as a
whole. Change proneness was highly significantly related
with section III as whole and I P S as a whole. Section III
as a whole was highly significantly related with the I P S
as a whole.

C. M. II
L.B. P$_S$ & I.P.

(A) – H.H.

	Cur.Org	T-L Process	T.Res.	G.S.Org.	Staff Dev.	S.C.Rela.	Sec.I	Adm.Sup	Staff Norms	Sys.Norms	Complex.	Compat	Riskness	Localite	Cosmopolite	Sec II	Tradi.	Progress.	Dogmat.	Venture.	Conserva.	Change P.	Sec III	I.P.S.		
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25		
1	.38	.62	-.04	.59	.40	.33	.35	.38	.37	.18	.36	.12	.35	.28	.26	.06	.33	.24	.23	.34	.26	.56	.11	.37	1	Ind.
2		.39	.00	.32	.27	.11	.15	.21	.25	.26	.36	.06	.26	.16	.15	.08	.16	.25	.12	.05	.04	.43	.11	.24	2	C.O
3			.15	.64	.49	.37	.42	.23	.03	-.02	.59	.27	.62	.28	.24	.10	.39	.32	.24	.38	.18	.60	.11	.24	3	T-L P.
4				.03	.26	.08	.04	.00	-.23	.22	.13	.05	.12	.06	.07	-.05	.12	-.12	-.04	-.13	.03	.45	-.02	.06	4	T. Res
5					.43	.79	.81	.06	.18	.48	.72	.68	.72	.65	.73	-.04	.68	-.05	.50	.53	.60	.40	.06	.33	5	G.S.O.
6						.29	.26	.20	.15	-.11	.47	.08	.41	.36	.15	.39	.15	.34	.19	.19	-.06	.62	.05	.37	6	Staff D.
7							.97	.51	.04	-.16	.58	.92	.66	.85	.83	.07	.87	.41	.57	.62	.77	.16	.08	.23	7	S.C.R
8								.49	.04	-.24	.62	.94	.75	.86	.95	.06	.90	.38	.61	.62	.81	.21	-.02	.25	8	I
9									.48	.15	.88	.59	.32	.48	.43	.16	.51	.46	.28	.15	-.33	.32	.08	.18	9	A·S
10										.43	.07	.09	.17	.04	.18	-.18	-.02	.15	-.12	.33	.12	.34	.28	.54	10	St. N.
11											.04	.24	.06	.06	.36	.24	-.17	.26	.06	.28	.19	-.02	-.16	.11	11	Sys. N.
12												.63	.71	.63	.55	.09	.56	.08	.34	.38	.38	.45	.05	.30	12	Compl.
13													.73	.84	.92	.06	.88	.45	.55	.55	.82	.03	-.07	.11	13	Compat.
14														.76	.66	.09	.74	.04	.55	.41	.66	.49	.09	.30	14	Risk
15															.81	.38	.84	-.32	.53	.54	.63	.35	.13	.45	15	Local.
16																-.04	.86	.46	-.51	.82	.77	.16	-.16	.26	16	Cosmo.
17																	.06	.02	.09	.03	.21	.43	.16	.82	17	II
18																		.44	.52	.68	.77	.23	-.16	.32	18	Trad.
19																			.21	.61	.27	.37	.74	.22	19	Prog.
20																				-.02	.77	.13	.68	.21	20	Dog
21																					.37	.26	.62	.60	21	Vent
22																						.02	.22	.11	22	Cons.
23																							.02	.10	23	C.P
24																								.61	24	III
25																									25	I.P.S.

Correlation Matrix 2

In this matrix the relationship of four Leadership
Behaviour Patterns with the components of I P S has been
shown. Separate matrices have been prepared for each
pattern.

C.M.2.(A) HH Pattern

Individualisation was highly significantly related
with curriculum organisation, teaching learning process,
internal school organisation, staff development, adminis-
trative support, complexity and change proneness;
significantly with school community relationship, section I
as a whole, staff norms, riskness, traditionalism,
venturesomeness and I P S as a whole and negatively with
teaching resource. Curriculum organisation was highly
significantly related with teaching-learning process,
complexity, and change proneness and significantly with
internal school organisation. Teaching learning process
was highly significantly related with staff development,
section I as a whole, complexity, riskness, traditionalism,
venturesomeness, and change proneness; significantly with
school community relationship, localiteness and pro-
gressivism and negatively with system norms. Teaching
resource was negatively related with staff norms, tradi-
tionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and
section III as a whole. Internal school organisation was
highly significantly related with staff development, school
community relationship, section I as a whole, complexity,
compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness,
traditionalism, dogmatism, venturesomeness, conservatism
and change proneness and significantly with I P S as a
whole. Internal school organisation was negatively related
with progressivism. Staff development was highly

significantly related with complexity, riskness,
section II as a whole, change proneness and I P S as
a whole; significantly with localiteness and progressivism
and negatively with system norms and conservatism. School
community relationship was highly significantly related
with Section I as a whole, administrative support,
complexity, compatibility, riskness, localiteness,
cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism,
venturesomeness and conservatism and negatively with
section III as a whole. Section I as a whole was highly
significantly related with administrative support,
complexity, compatibility, riskness, localiteness,
cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism,
venturesomeness and conservatism and negatively with
section III as a whole.

Administrative support was highly significantly
related with staff norm, compatibility, localiteness,
cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, progressivism and
conservatism; significantly with riskness, dogmatism,
and change proneness and negatively with conservatism.
Staff norms was highly significantly related with system
norms and I P S as a whole; significantly related with
venturesomeness and change proneness and negatively with
section II as a whole, traditionalism , progressivism,
and dogmatism. System norms was significantly related with
cosmopoliteness and negatively with section III as a
whole. Complexity was highly significantly related with
compatibility, riskness, localiteness, change proneness
and significantly with dogmatism, and I P S as a whole.
Compatibility was highly significantly related with
riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, traditionalism,
progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism
and negatively with section III as a whole. Riskness was
highly significantly related with localiteness,
cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, dogmatism, venturesomeness,

conservatism, and change proneness. Localiseness was
highly significantly related with cosmopoliteness,
traditionalism, dogmatism, venturesomeness, conservatism
and I P S as a whole and negatively with Section II as a
whole and change proneness. Cosmopoliteness was highly
significantly related with traditionalism, venture
someness, conservatism and negatively with section II as
a whole, progressivism, dogmatism and section III as a
whole. Section II as a whole was highly significantly
related with change proneness and I P S as a whole.

Traditionalism was highly significantly related
with progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and
conservatism; significantly with I P S as a whole and
negatively with section III as a whole. Progressivism was
highly significantly related with venturesomeness, and
section III as a whole and significantly with change
proneness. Dogmatism was highly significantly related with
conservatism and section III as a whole and negatively with
venturesomeness and I P S as a whole. Venturesomeness was
significantly related with conservatism and negatively with
section III as a whole and I P S as a whole. Change
proneness was highly significantly related with I P S as
a whole. Section III as a whole was highly significantly
related with I P S as a whole.

C M 2(B) - HL Pattern

Individualisation was highly significantly related
with curriculum organisation and I P S as a whole and
negatively with teaching resource, internal school organi-
sation, traditionalism, and section III as a whole.
Curriculum organisation was significantly related with I P S
as a whole and negatively with staff norms, traditionalism
and conservatism. Teaching learning process was negatively

(B) - H.L.

	1 Individual	2 Cur. Org.	3 T-L Process	4 T. Res.	5 I.S. Org.	6 Staff Dev.	7 S.C. Rela	8 Sec. I	9 Adm. Sup.	10 Staff Norms	11 Sys. Norms	12 Complex	13 Compat.	14 Riskness	15 Localite	16 Cosmopol.	17 Sec. II	18 Trad.	19 Progress.	20 Dogmat.	21 Venture.	22 Conserva.	23 Change P.	24 Sec. III	25 I.P.S.		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25		
1		.72	.32	-.05	.04	.05	.57	.31	.11	.04	.15	.36	.37	.52	.53	.28	.22	-.24	.25	.24	.24	.13	.16	.27	.71	1	Ind
2			.21	.12	-.13	.04	.29	-.09	.18	-.18	.01	.18	.18	.08	.09	.10	.26	-.06	.08	.14	.08	.15	.39	.03	.65	2	C.O
3				.49	-.22	-.06	.23	.25	-.32	.11	.11	.15	.18	.31	.18	.23	-.06	.24	-.18	.15	.08	.21	.18	.19	.21	3	T-L P.
4					.51	.29	.46	.45	.27	.51	.44	.43	.44	.48	.40	.47	.46	.53	.41	.31	.29	.30	.07	.46	.04	4	T. Res
5						.77	.76	.91	.82	.91	.92	.84	.86	.91	.93	.96	.31	.91	.92	.89	.86	.95	.78	.94	.13	5	I.S.O.
6							.54	.75	.72	.74	.78	.68	.72	.79	.74	.77	.18	.76	.71	.71	.75	.76	.77	.82	.08	6	S-D
7								.92	.48	.82	.80	.87	.91	.52	.87	.90	.55	.56	.91	.83	.84	.79	.45	.84	.08	7	S.C.R
8									-.16	.93	.97	.96	.96	.97	.98	.98	.50	.98	.98	.91	.90	.92	.66	.98	.07	8	I
9										.75	-.74	.65	.72	.82	-.77	.76	.13	.65	.75	-.80	.76	-.86	.61	.72	.11	9	A.S.
10											.96	.87	.87	.88	.91	.92	.52	.91	.92	.85	.86	.92	.68	.85	.19	10	St.N.
11												.95	.95	.94	.96	.97	.56	.95	.96	.88	.91	.93	.73	.95	.06	11	Sys.N
12													.98	.94	.97	.95	.65	.94	.94	.83	.85	.84	.58	.92	.02	12	Compl
13														.96	.98	.95	.63	.93	.95	.87	.87	.86	.58	.92	.03	13	Compat
14															.47	.95	.51	.85	.91	.85	.84	.91	.66	.95	.05	14	Risk
15																.97	.52	.95	.96	.88	.88	.91	.67	.96	.04	15	Local
16																	.49	.95	.96	.90	.93	.95	-.74	.94	.02	16	Cosmo
17																		.53	.54	.35	.40	.31	.04	.44	.03	17	II
18																			.91	.77	.81	.85	.67	.98	.07	18	Trad
19																				.92	.94	.93	.63	.98	.03	19	Prog
20																					.97	.89	-.61	.85	.14	20	Dog
21																						.42	-.61	.81	.11	21	Venture
22																							-.74	.88	.08	22	Cons.
23																								.77	.33	23	C.P
24																									.14	24	III
25																										25	I.P.S.

related with internal school organisation, staff development, administrative support, section III as a whole and traditionalism. Teaching resource was negatively related with internal school organisation, staff development, administrative support and Traditionalism. Internal School Organisation was highly significantly related with staff development, administrative support, staff norms, complexity, compatibility, cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness, and change proneness and negatively with school community relationship, section I as a whole, system norms, riskness, localiteness, section II as a whole, conservatism and section III as a whole. Staff development was highly significantly related with administrative support, riskness, traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness, conservatism, change proneness and section III as a whole and negatively with school community relationship, section I as a whole, staff norms, system norms, complexity, compatibility, localiteness and cosmopoliteness. School community relationship was highly significantly related with section I as a whole, system norms, complexity, compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, section III as a whole, traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness, conservatism and section III as a whole and negatively with administrative support. Section I as a whole was highly significantly related with staff norms, system norms, complexity, compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, conservatism and section III as a whole; significantly with change proneness and negatively with administrative support.

Administrative support was highly significantly related with cosmopliteness, progressivism, and section III as a whole; significantly with traditionalism and change

proneness and negatively with staff norms, system norms,
complexity, compatibility, riskness localiteness, dogmatism,
venturesomeness and conservatism. Staff norms was highly
significantly related with complexity, compatibility,
riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, traditionalism,
progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism
and negatively with system norms, change proneness,
section III as a whole and IPS as a whole. System norms
was highly significantly related with complexity,
compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness,
traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness,
conservatism, Change proneness; significantly with
Section II as a whole and negatively with I P S as a whole.
Complexity was highly significantly related with compa-
tibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness,
traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness
and conservatism; significantly with section II as a
whole and change proneness and negatively with Section III
as a whole. Compatibility was highly significantly related
with riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, traditiona-
lism, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness,
conservatism and section III as a whole and significantly
with section II as a whole. Riskness was highly signi-
ficantly related with localiteness, cosmopoliteness,
progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and conserva-
tism; significantly with change proneness and negatively
with traditionalism and section III as a whole.
Localiteness was highly significantly related with
cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, progressvism, dogmatism,
venturesomeness, conservatism, change proneness and
section III as a whole. Cosmopoliteness was highly
significantly related with section II as a whole,
traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness
and conservatism and negatively with change proneness and
section III as a whole. Section II as a whole was

significantly related with progressivism.

Traditionalism was highly significantly related with dogmatism and change proneness and negatively with progressivism, venturesomeness and conservatism. Progressivism was highly significantly related with venturesomeness, conservatism and section III as a whole and significantly with dogmatism and change proneness. Dogmatism was negatively related with conservatism, change proneness and Section III as a whole. Venturesomeness was negatively related with conservatism and section III as a whole. Conservatism was negatively related with change proneness, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole. Change proneness was negatively related with section III as a whole.

C M 2(C) - LH Pattern

Individualisation was negatively related with cosmopoliteness and change proneness. Curriculum Organisation was negatively related with teaching learning process, internal school organisation, localiteness and cosmopoliteness. Teaching learning process was significantly related with section I as a whole and progressivism and negatively with administrative support, staff norms and system norms. Teaching resources was significantly related with staff development, section I as a whole, compatibility and traditionalism and negatively with administrative support and conservatism. Internal school organisation was significantly related with staff development compatibility, and change proneness and negatively with dogmatism. Staff Development was highly significantly related with Section I as a whole, compatibility, progressivism and change proneness; significantly with compatibility traditionalism, venturesomeness, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole and negatively with dogmatism. School community relationship was significantly related with system norms

(C) – L. H.

	Individual (1)	Cur. Org. (2)	T-L Process (3)	T. Resource (4)	I.S. Org. (5)	Staff Dev. (6)	S.C. Rela. (7)	Sec I (8)	Adm. Sup. (9)	Staff N. (10)	Sys. N. (11)	Complex. (12)	Compat. (13)	Riskness (14)	Localite. (15)	Cosmopol. (16)	Sec. II (17)	Tradi. (18)	Progress. (19)	Dogmat. (20)	Venture. (21)	Conservat. (22)	Change P. (23)	Sec. III (24)	I.P.S (25)		
1		.09	.06	.06	.07	.02	.06	.16	.55	.25	.56	.28	.32	.15	.59	-.02	.06	.26	.01	.51	.42	.43	.12	.25	.19	1	Ind.
2			-.61	.04	-.05	.37	.90	.56	.38	.13	.28	.65	.08	.43	-.18	-.37	.61	.48	.51	.37	.37	.02	.52	.50	.67	2	C.O.
3				.55	.32	.65	.51	.77	-.12	-.30	.20	.50	.56	.53	.68	.53	.47	.86	.79	.34	.40	.06	.53	.64	.63	3	T-L P.
4					.64	.82	.20	.74	-.06	.55	.06	.47	.31	.41	.56	.04	.30	.70	.68	.38	.57	-.05	.54	.42	.47	4	T. Res.
5						.82	.11	.64	.32	.19	.22	.49	.78	.06	.24	.05	.60	.50	.63	.08	.71	.55	.74	.10	.71	5	I.S.O.
6							.52	.96	.25	.13	.15	.76	.86	.45	.50	.11	.71	.85	.91	.05	.84	.33	.88	.62	.85	6	S.D.
7								.67	.34	.01	.75	.61	.27	.45	.22	.06	.54	.61	.68	.08	.45	.04	.71	.56	.63	7	S.C.R.
8									.12	.18	.01	.82	.83	.65	.66	.22	.75	.92	.91	.22	.84	.28	.84	.87	.84	8	I
9										.71	.98	.41	-.22	.52	.65	.12	.51	.21	.02	.06	.26	.21	.42	.18	.33	9	A.S.
10											.66	.16	.36	.54	.65	.28	.46	-.12	-.25	.42	.12	.62	.24	.18	.24	10	St. N.
11												.32	.32	.55	.72	.05	.46	-.30	-.08	.15	.13	.28	.05	.22		11	Sys. N.
12													.51	.55	.34	.36	.92	.61	.56	.32	.92	.47	.65	.78	.88	12	Compl.
13														.61	.76	.05	.42	.87	.84	.07	.72	.55	.72	.75	.68	13	Compat.
14															.55	.05	.25	.76	.54	.24	.55	.15	.31	.52	.47	14	Risk.
15																.15	.16	.84	.64	.24	.45	.15	.51	.52	.43	15	Local.
16																	.47	.06	.03	.78	.22	.27	-.06	.28	.55	16	Cosmo.
17																		.47	.56	.44	.84	.64	.72	.84	.93	17	II
18																			.94	.06	.65	.12	.15	.77	.74	18	Trad.
19																				.02	.66	.15	.88	.79	.77	19	Prog.
20																					.24	.54	.02	.41	.58	20	Dog.
21																						.65	.70	.88	.92	21	Ventu.
22																							.31	.65	.60	22	Cons.
23																								.85	.84	23	C.P.
24																									.96	24	III
25																										25	I.P.S

and negatively with conservatism. Section I as a whole was highly significantly related with traditionalism, progressivism, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole and significantly with complexity, compatibility, venturesomeness and change proneness.

Administrative support was highly significantly related with system norms and negatively with compatibility. Staff norms was negatively related with riskness, traditionalism and progressivism. System norms was negatively related with traditionalism, progressivism and dogmatism. Complexity was highly significantly related with section II as a whole, venturesomeness and I P S as a whole and significantly with section III as a whole. Compatibility was highly significantly related with traditionalism and significantly with localiteness, progressivism and section III as a whole. Riskness was highly significantly related with localiteness and significantly with traditionalism. Localiteness was significantly related with traditionalism. Cosmopoliteness was significantly related with dogmatism and negatively with change proneness. Section II as a whole was highly significantly related with I P S as a whole and significantly with venturesomeness and section III as a whole.

Traditionalism was highly significantly related with progressivism and significantly with change proneness and section III as a whole. Progressivism was highly significantly related with section III as a whole and I P S as a whole. Dogmatism was negatively related with change proneness. Venturesomeness was highly significantly related with I P S as a whole and significantly with section III as a whole. Change proneness was significantly related with section III as a whole and I P S. Section III as a whole was highly significantly related with I P S as a whole.

(D) – L.L.

	Individual	Cur. Org.	T-L Process	T.Resource	4.S.Org.	Staff Dev	S.C.Rela	Sec.I	Adm.Sup.	Staff N.	Sys.N.	Complex	Compat.	Riskness	Localit.	Cosmopol.	Sec.II	Tradi.	Progress.	Dogmat.	Venture.	Conservat.	Change P	Sec.III	J.P.S.		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25		
1		.42	.20	.22	.16	.15	.22	.25	.19	.07	.10	.24	.15	.15	.16	.16	.24	.25	.18	.05	.18	.38	.14	.05	.24	1	Ind.
2			.15	.32	.35	.66	.28	.72	.23	.16	.16	.05	.14	.30	.12	.24	.25	.52	.31	.16	.24	.13	.31	.38	.50	2	C.O
3				.55	.66	.68	.72	.63	.46	.36	.35	.44	.38	.42	.24	.25	.52	.28	.46	.03	.06	.32	.51	.26	.86	3	T-L P
4					.13	.64	.56	.64	.32	.06	.12	.43	.10	.56	.51	.52	.55	.11	.09	.13	.06	.41	.39	.05	.56	4	T. Res.
5						.42	.46	.64	.42	.36	.42	.49	.20	.16	.18	.26	.48	.06	.27	.05	.22	.31	.33	.15	.52	5	I.SO
6							.43	.84	.43	.17	.21	.35	.51	.66	.37	.33	.55	.29	.31	.06	.02	.51	.52	.30	.63	6	S.D.
7								.66	.35	.48	.38	.26	.13	.31	.24	.27	.54	.25	.38	.17	.11	.23	.43	.27	.66	7	S.C.R.
8									.55	.36	.38	.50	.51	.56	.39	.41	.68	.37	.41	.06	.02	.46	.59	.23	.88	8	I
9										.51	.65	.50	.58	.23	.27	.42	.75	.38	.35	.21	.12	.35	.29	.21	.64	9	A.S.
10											.77	.22	.14	.04	.20	.58	.66	.22	.28	.34	.23	.23	.02	.37	.64	10	St.N.
11												.28	.21	.05	.12	.64	.66	.04	.03	.02	.02	.01	.08	.02	.53	11	Sys.N.
12													.79	.47	.49	.22	.67	.25	.33	.12	.14	.53	.56	.12	.64	12	Compl.
13														.63	.68	.43	.73	.10	.13	.23	.20	.51	.41	.05	.59	13	Compat.
14															.75	.06	.53	.25	.32	.28	.14	.43	.14	.12	.54	14	Risk.
15																.03	.49	.31	.27	.13	.22	.52	.64	.12	.45	15	Local.
16																	.64	.02	.08	.08	.36	.02	.12	.11	.56	16	Cosmo.
17																		.35	.37	.05	.01	.34	.47	.26	.92	17	II
18																			.55	.49	.21	.16	.39	.71	.57	18	Trad.
19																				.42	.09	.04	.51	.72	.51	19	Prog.
20																					.36	.33	.01	.77	.21	20	Dog.
21																						.26	.09	.54	.11	21	Ventu.
22																							.37	.29	.22	22	Cons.
23																								.44	.59	23	C.P
24																									.51	24	III
25																										25	J.P.S

C M 2(D)-L L Pattern

Individualism was negatively related with conservatism.
Curriculum organisation was highly significantly related with
teaching learning process, staff development, section I as
a whole, traditionalism and I P S as a whole and significan-
tly with teaching resource and internal school organisation.
Teaching learning process was highly significantly related
with teaching resource, internal school organisation, staff
development, school community relationship, section I as a
whole, administrative support, complexity, riskness,
section II as a whole, progressivism, change proneness and
I P S as a whole; significantly with staff norms and
compatibility and negatively with conservatism. Teaching
resource was highly significantly related with staff
development, section I as a whole, compatibility, riskness,
localiteness, cosmopoliteness, section II as a whole and
I P S as a whole; significantly with school community
relationship, complexity and change proneness and negatively
with dogmatism and conservatism. Internal school organisation
was highly significantly related with school community
relationship, section I as a whole, complexity, section II
as a whole and I P S as a whole; significantly with staff
development, administrative support, staff norms and system
norms and negatively with venturesomeness and conservatism.
Staff development was highly significantly related with
compatibility, riskness, section II as a whole, change
proneness and I P S as a whole; significantly with school
community relationship, section I as a whole, administrative
support, complexity and localiteness and negatively with
dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism. School community
relationship was highly significantly related with section I
as a whole, staff norms, section II as a whole and I P S as
a whole; significantly with administrative support, system,
norms, progressivism and change proneness and negatively
with conservatism. Section I as a whole was highly

significantly related with administrative support,
compatibility, riskness, Section II as a whole, conserva-
tism, change proneness and I P S as a whole and signifi-
cantly with staff norms, system norms, complexity,
localiteness, cosmopoliteness, traditionalism and
progressivism.

Administrative support was highly significantly
related with staff norms, complexity, compatibility and
Section II as a whole; significantly with system norms,
cosmopoliteness, traditionalism and progressivism and
negatively with venturesomeness and conservatism. Staff
norms was highly significantly related with system norms,
Section II as a whole and I P S as a whole; significantly
with dogmatism and section III as a whole and negatively
with riskness, localiteness and cosmopoliteness. System
norms was highly significantly related with cosmopoliteness,
section II as a whole and I P S as a whole and negatively
with localiteness and conservatism. Complexity was highly
significantly related with compatibility, riskness,
localiteness, section II as a whole and I P S as a whole
and negatively with dogmatism, venturesomeness and
conservatism. Compatibility was highly significantly related
with riskness and localiteness and section II as a whole
and negatively with dogmatism, venturesomeness, conservatism
and change proneness. Riskness was highly significantly
related with localiteness, section II as a whole, change
proneness, and I P S as a whole and negatively with
venturesomeness and conservatism. Localiteness was highly
significantly related with section II as a whole and change
proneness and negatively with conservatism. Cosmopoliteness
was highly significantly related with section II as a whole
and I P S as a whole; significantly with venturesomeness
and negatively with progressivism and change proneness.
Section II as a whole was highly significantly related with

change proneness and I P S as a whole and significantly
with traditionalism and progressivism.

Traditionalism was highly significantly related with
progressivism, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole,
significantly with dogmatism and change proneness and
negatively with conservatism. Progressivism was highly
significantly related with change proneness, section III
as a whole and I P S as a whole and significantly with
dogmatism. Dogmatism was highly significantly related
with section III as a whole; significantly with venture-
someness and negatively with change proneness. Venture-
someness was highly significantly related with section III
as a whole and negatively with change proneness. Conser-
vatism was significantly related with change proneness.
Change proneness was significantly related with section III
as a whole and negatively with I P S as a whole. Section III
as a whole was negatively releated with I P S as a whole.

Correlation Matrix No 3

In this matrix relationship of six types of school
organisational climates and the components of the I P S
has been analysed. Separate matrices have been prepared
for each type of climate.

C M 3(A) - Open Climate

Individualisation was highly significantly related
with curriculum organisation, teaching learning process,
teaching resource, internal school organisation and change
proneness and significantly with complexity. Curriculum
organisation was significantly related with teaching
resource and negatively with system norms, dogmatism and
conservatism. Teaching learning process was highly
significantly related with complexity, riskness and change
proneness; significantly with teaching resource, internal

C. M. III
O. C. & A. P. S.

(A) OPEN

	Individual.	Cur.Org.	T-L Progess	T.Resource	g.S.Org	B.Deplot.	S.C.Rela	Sec.I	Adm.Sup.	Staff N.	Sys.N.	Complex.	Compat	Riskness	Localite.	Cosmopol.	Sec.II	Tradi.	Progress.	Dogmat.	Venture	Conservat.	Change P.	Sec.III	J.P.S.		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25		
1		.65	.65	.57	.55	.37	.28	.31	.08	.16	.15	.48	.21	.34	.28	.29	.07	.34	.29	.17	.36	.13	.62	.14	.36	1	Ind.
2			.34	.50	.44	.14	.06	.09	.28	.36	-.15	.36	.00	.15	.03	.13	.05	.11	.32	.02	.12	-.03	.47	.20	-.25	2	C.O.
3				.46	.55	.45	.52	.35	-.03	.30	-.23	.66	.57	.77	.31	.24	.05	.35	.31	.32	.49	.31	.66	.25	.27	3	T-L P.
4					.51	.28	.28	.29	-.02	-.02	-.25	.65	.26	.46	.37	.21	.16	.38	.16	.23	.30	.13	.56	.02	.45	4	T. Res.
5						.24	.81	.87	.55	.08	.07	.84	.85	.81	.81	.82	-.04	.81	.36	.74	.84	.74	.36	-.14	.28	5	G.S.O.
6							.28	.18	.09	.46	-.17	.33	.07	.35	.43	.13	.74	.12	.20	.11	.31	.05	.81	.54	.83	6	S.D.
7								.98	.81	.08	.26	.71	.98	.82	.91	.96	.75	.92	.89	.91	.93	.91	.13	.45	.25	7	S.C.R.
8									.83	-.11	.24	.75	.89	.85	.91	.96	.13	.94	.77	.91	.93	.91	.13	.40	.24	8	I
9										.51	.15	.44	.88	.63	.74	.77	.08	.86	.85	.81	.76	.88	.18	.35	.02	9	A.S.
10											.01	.21	-.22	.26	.07	.03	.51	.19	.08	.14	.08	.27	.27	.49	.54	10	St.N
11												.85	.29	.01	.06	.38	.26	.08	.42	.26	.09	.24	.39	-.06	-.23	11	Sys.N.
12													.77	.90	.72	.66	.11	.68	.22	.59	.68	.61	.52	.16	.33	12	Compl.
13														.83	.96	.93	.04	.94	.88	.87	.93	.83	.28	.29	.09	13	Compat
14															.82	.75	-.14	.82	.28	.76	.84	.80	.43	.20	.32	14	Risk.
15																.85	-.43	.86	.63	.81	.90	.78	.37	-.63	.55	15	Local.
16																	.11	.88	.83	.89	.81	.81	.09	.42	.27	16	Cosmo.
17																		.73	.08	.09	.24	.12	.61	.83	.92	17	II
18																			.63	.93	.93	.90	.45	.28	.26	18	Trad.
19																				.70	.54	.75	.42	.52	.09	19	Prog.
20																					.90	.94	.02	.27	.18	20	Dog.
21																						.87	.29	.35	.37	21	Ventu.
22																							.09	-.45	.03	22	Cons.
23																								-.28	-.84	23	C.P.
24																									.69	24	III
25																										25	J.P.S.

school organisation, staff development, and venturesomeness
and negatively with administrative support, staff norms
and system norms. Teaching resource was highly significantly
related with complexity and change proneness; significantly
with internal school organisation and riskness and negatively
with administrative support, staff norms and system norms.
Internal school organisation was highly significantly related
with school community relationship, section I as a whole,
complexity, compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmo-
politeness, tradition, dogmatism, venturesomeness and
conservatism and negatively with administrative support,
Section II as a whole and section III as a whole. Staff
development was highly significantly related with section II
as a whole, change proneness and I P S as a whole; signi-
ficantly with staff norms and section III as a whole and
negatively with system norms. School community relationship
was highly significantly related with section I, complexity,
compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness,
traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness
and conservatism; significantly with section III as a whole
and negatively with administrative support and staff norms.
Section I as a whole was highly significantly related with
administrative support, complexity, compatibility, riskness,
localiteness, cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, progressivism,
dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism; significantly
with section III as a whole and negatively with staff norms
and section II as a whole.

Administrative support was highly significantly
related with compatibility, cosmopoliteness, traditionalism,
progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism
and negatively with complexity, riskness and localiteness.
Staff norms was significantly related with section II as a
whole, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole and
negatively with compatibility and riskness. System norms
was negatively related with section III as a whole and

I P S as a whole. Complexity was highly significantly
related with compatibility, riskness, localiteness,
cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, dogmatism, venturesomeness
and conservatism and significantly with change proneness.
Compatibility was highly significantly related with riskness,
localiteness, cosmpoliteness, traditionalism, progressivism,
dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism. Riskness was
highly significantly related with localiteness, cosmopó-
liteness, traditionalism, dogmatism, venturesomeness,
conservatism; significantly with change proneness and
negatively with section II as a whole and progressivism.
Localiteness was highly significantly related with
cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism,
venturesomeness and conservatism; significantly with I P S
as a whole and negatively with section II as a whole and
section III as a whole. Cosmopoliteness was highly
significantly related with traditionalism, dogmatism,
conservatism and section III as a whole and negatively with
progressivism and venturesomeness. Section II as a whole
was highly significantly related with change proneness and
section III as a whole and negatively with traditionalism
and I P S as a whole.

Traditionalism was highly significantly related with
dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism and negatively
with progressivism. Progressivism was highly significantly
related with dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism
and significantly with section III as a whole. Dogmatism
was highly significantly related with venturesomeness and
conservatism. Venturesomeness was significantly related
with section III as a whole and I P S as a whole and
negatively with conservatism. Conservatism was negatively
related with section III as a whole and I P S as a whole.
Change proneness was highly significantly related with I P S
as a whole and negatively with section III as a whole.
Section III as a whole was highly significantly related with
I P S as a whole.

(B) AUTONOMOUS

	Individual	Cur.Org.	T-L Process	T.Resource	J.S.Org.	Staff D.	S.C.Rela.	Sec.I	Adm.Sup.	Staff N.	Sys.N.	Complex.	Compat.	Riskmess	Localite.	Cosmopol.	Sec.II	Trad.	Progress.	Dogmat.	Venture.	Conservat.	Change P.	Sec.III	J.P.S.		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25		
1		.14	.17	.28	.13	.05	.08	-.03	.34	.05	-.01	.04	-.06	-.04	-.03	-.05	.40	.08	.15	.02	.02	.26	.10	.06	.26	1	Ind.
2			.06	.02	.06	-.03	-.07	-.02	.45	-.04	-.02	-.03	.05	.22	.02	-.04	.02	.06	.04	.06	.08	.04	.19	.09	.26	2	C.O.
3				.50	.15	.43	.35	.28	.19	.00	.06	.14	.13	.16	.17	.11	.25	.13	.23	.48	.61	.15	.19	.12	.68	3	T-L.P.
4					.07	-.04	.58	.50	.14	.51	.51	.50	.39	.42	.41	.43	.66	-.21	.31	.42	.55	.28	-.12	-.25	.49	4	T.Res.
5						.88	.65	.83	.72	.86	.88	.86	.87	.89	.85	.84	.84	.89	.85	.64	.63	.83	.75	.34	.58	5	J.S.O.
6							.62	.74	.58	.86	.88	.79	.77	.79	.78	.81	.12	.89	.72	.51	.36	.77	.78	.89	.61	6	S.D
7								.91	.45	.85	.84	.84	.84	.84	.83	.87	.21	.80	.85	.85	.89	.82	.84	.81	.41	7	S.C.R
8									.51	.94	.96	.95	.96	.96	.99	.94	.39	.90	.89	.94	.80	.94	.88	.91	.15	8	I
9										.59	.51	.48	.55	.52	.53	.53	.45	.60	.62	.47	.42	.62	.61	.56	.62	9	A.S.
10											.99	.94	.95	.96	.96	.97	.30	.96	.90	.80	.75	.92	.73	.96	.42	10	St.N.
11												.96	.97	.97	.98	.98	.34	.93	.93	.82	.78	.95	.74	.96	.25	11	Sys.N.
12													.96	.98	.97	.98	.45	.92	.89	.79	.51	.87	.74	.93	.22	12	Compl.
13														.97	.97	.97	.34	.94	.93	.81	.78	.91	.80	.93	.26	13	Compat
14															.98	.97	.36	.90	.92	.83	.81	.71	.82	.92	.24	14	Risk.
15																.97	.35	.90	.94	.86	.89	.93	.71	.90	.26	15	Local.
16																	.38	.98	.90	.83	.80	.93	.76	.74	.25	16	Cosmo
17																		.21	.11	.26	.25	.13	.08	.26	.43	17	II
18																			.89	.68	.64	.83	.83	.38	.41	18	Trad.
19																				.92	.83	.96	.71	.84	.24	19	Prog.
20																					.90	.87	.54	.66	.08	20	Dog.
21																						.80	.45	.05	.13	21	Ventu.
22																							.66	.86	.20	22	Cons.
23																								.85	.64	23	C.P.
24																									.51	24	III
25																										25	J.P.S.

C M 3(B) - Autonomous Climate

Individualisation was negatively related with curriculum organisation, section I as a whole, compatibility, riskness, localiteness and cosmopoliteness. Curriculum organisation was negatively related with teaching learning process, staff development, school community relationship, section I as a whole, staff norms, system norms, complexity and cosmopoliteness . Teaching learning process was highly significantly related with I P S as a whole. Teaching resource was significantly related with school community relationship, section II as a whole, and venturesomeness and negatively with staff development, traditionalism, change proneness and section III as a whole. Internal school organisation was highly significantly related with staff development, administrative support, traditionalism, change proneness, and section III as a whole and significantly with school community relationship and I P S as a whole. Internal school organisation was negatively related with section I as a whole, staff norms, system norms, complexity, compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, section II as a whole, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and consefvatism. Staff development was highly significantly related with traditionalism, change proneness and section III as a whole; significantly with administrative support and I P S as a whole and negatively with school community relationship, section I as a whole, staff norms, system norms, complexity, compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, section II as a whole, progressivism, dogmatism, venture-someness and conservatism. School community relationship was highly significantly related with section I as a whole, staff norms, system norms, complexity, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and negatively with administrative support, traditionalism, change proneness, section III as a whole

and I P S. Section I as a whole was highly significantly related with staff norms, system norms, complexity, compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism and negatively with administrative support, traditionalism, change proneness, section III as a whole and IPS as a whole.

Administrative support was significantly related with traditionalism, change proneness, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole and negatively with staff norms, system norms, complexity, compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, progressivism, venturesomeness and conservatism. Staff norms was highly significantly related with system norms, complexity, compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism and negatively with traditionalism, change proneness and section III as a whole. System norms was highly significantly related with complexity, compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism and negatively with traditionalism, change proneness, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole. Complexity was highly significantly related with compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism, and negatively related with traditionalism, change proneness, section III as a whole and IPS as a whole. Compatibility was highly significantly related with riskness localiteness, cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, and progressivism and negatively with conservatism, change proneness, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole. Riskness was highly significantly related with localiteness, cosmopoliteness, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism and negatively related

with traditionalism, change proneness, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole. Localiteness was highly significantly related with cosmopoliteness, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism and negatively with traditionalism, change proneness, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole. Cosmopoliteness was highly significantly related with progressivism, venturesomeness, conservatism, change proneness and section III as a whole and negatively with traditionalism. Section II as a whole was negatively related with traditionalism, change proneness and section III as a whole.

Traditionalism was highly significantly related with progressivism, dogmatism, conservatism, change pronsness and section III as a whole and significantly with venturesomeness. Progressivism was highly significantly related with dogmatism, venturesomeness, conservatism and section III as a whole and negatively with change proneness. Dogmatism was highly significantly related with venturesomeness and conservatism and negatively with change proneness and section III as a whole. Venturesomeness was highly significantly related with conservatism and negatively with change proneness. Conservatism was negatively related with change proneness, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole. Change proneness was highly significantly related with section III as a whole.

C M 3(C) - Controlled Climate

Individualism was highly significantly related with cosmopoliteness; significantly with curriculum organisation, teaching learning process, school community relationship, section I as a whole and I P S as a whole and negatively with conservatism. Curriculum organisation was

(C) CONTROLLED

	Individual	Cur. Org.	T-L Process	T. Resource	J.S. Org.	Staff Dev.	S.C. Rela.	Sec. I	Adm. Sup.	Staff N.	Sys. N.	Complex.	Compat.	Riskness	Localite.	Cosmopol.	Sec. II	Tradi.	Progress.	Dogmat.	Venture	Conservat.	Change P.	Sec. III	J.P.S.		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25		
1		.50	.54	.51	.36	.36	.50	.52	.53	.18	.25	.28	.28	.24	.21	.63	.36	.41	.10	.12	.21	.06	.36	.07	.66	1	Ind.
2			.74	.51	.77	.58	.60	.82	.61	.35	.36	.66	.68	.68	.36	.34	.72	.53	.39	.37	.04	.22	.65	.28	.92	2	C.O.
3				.58	.75	.74	.76	.82	.56	.40	.27	.51	.59	.68	.31	.28	.59	.45	.24	.14	.24	.06	.61	.07	.34	3	T-L P.
4					.46	.62	.51	.68	.49	.42	.31	.49	.60	.26	.31	.50	.51	.35	.24	.13	.29	.22	.44	.05	.32	4	T. Res.
5						.78	.76	.31	.75	.49	.51	.46	.60	.59	.27	.29	.76	.36	.31	.25	.12	.16	.72	.24	.23	5	J.S.O.
6							.77	.85	.75	.54	.42	.56	.55	.36	.31	.08	.64	.31	.37	.22	.16	.13	.11	.19	.15	6	S.D.
7								.87	.76	.44	.35	.34	.58	.40	.25	.42	.68	.33	.32	.23	.23	.04	.65	.18	.26	7	S.C.R.
8									.75	.51	.45	.63	.62	.55	.33	.37	.74	.44	.35	.25	.19	.15	.74	.18	.31	8	I
9										.67	.68	.50	.41	.08	.05	.53	.76	.45	.15	.08	.34	.05	.89	.04	.44	9	A.S.
10											.82	.34	.29	-.06	.08	.46	.51	.63	.18	.21	.69	.15	.62	-.35	.59	10	St. N.
11												.50	.41	.24	.17	.51	.88	.64	.04	.05	.43	.11	.55	.16	.42	11	Sys. N.
12													.82	.58	.66	.46	.76	.41	.35	.13	.16	.12	.68	.13	.31	12	Compl.
13														.68	.56	.47	.70	.40	.33	.18	.13	.15	.56	.12	.30	13	Compat.
14															.66	.13	.41	.31	.38	.24	.13	.13	.22	.23	.09	14	Risk
15																.20	.36	.21	.28	.12	-.10	.00	.14	.12	-.05	15	Local.
16																	.63	.52	.00	.03	.47	-.05	.35	.16	.62	16	Cosmo.
17																		.68	.22	.03	.48	-.06	.15	.08	.55	17	II
18																			-.16	.13	.50	.20	.51	-.25	.21	18	Trad.
19																				.61	.36	.15	.06	.14	.98	19	Prog.
20																					.77	.15	.07	.03	.45	20	Dog.
21																						.64	.38	.16	.87	21	Ventu.
22																							.13	.78	.54	22	Cons.
23																								.08	.49	23	C.P.
24																									.70	24	III
25																										25	J.P.S.

highly significantly related with teaching learning process, internal school organisation, staff development, school community relationship, section I as a whole, administrative support, complexity, compatibility riskness, section II as a whole and change proneness and significantly with teaching resource, system norms, and traditionalism. Teaching learning process was highly significantly related with teaching resource, internal school organisation, staff development, school community relationship, section I as a whole, riskness, section II as a whole and change proneness and significantly with administrative support and compatibility. Teaching resource was highly significantly related with staff development, section I as a whole, compatibility and change proneness and significantly with internal school organisation, school community relationship, administrative support, complexity, cosmopoliteness and section II as a whole. Internal school Organisation was highly significantly related with school community relationship, section I as a whole, administrative support, complexity, compatibility, section II as a whole and change proneness and significantly with staff norms, system norms and riskness. Staff development was highly significantly related with school community relationship, section I as a whole, administrative support, section II as a whole and change proneness and significantly with staff norms and complexity. School community relationship was highly significantly related with section I as a whole, administrative support and change proneness and significantly with compatibility. Section I as a whole was highly significantly related with administrative support, complexity, compatibility, section II as a whole and change proneness and significantly with staff norms and riskness.

Administrative support was highly significantly related with staff norms, system norms, section II as a whole and change proneness and significantly with complexity.

Staff norms was highly significantly related with section II
as a whole, traditionalism, venturesomeness and change
proneness; significantly with cosmopoliteness and I P S as
a whole and negatively with riskness, localiteness and
section III as a whole. System norms was highly significantly
related with section II as a whole & traditionalism;
significantly with complexity and negatively with cosmopo-
liteness and section III as a whole. Complexity was highly
significantly related with compatibility, riskness,
localiteness, section II as a whole and change proneness and
significantly with cosmopoliteness. Compatibility was highly
significantly related with riskness, section II as a whole
and change proneness and significantly with localiteness.
Riskness was negatively related with localiteness.
Cosmopoliteness was highly significantly related with
section II as a whole and I P S as a whole; significantly
with traditionalism and venturesomeness and negatively with
conservatism. Section II as a whole was highly significantly
related with traditionalism and change proneness; signifi-
cantly with venturesomeness and I P S as a whole and
negatively with conservatism.

Traditionalism was negatively related with progressi-
vism, dogmatism, and section III as a whole. Progressivism
was highly significantly related with dogmatism, conservatism,
section III as a whole and I P S as a whole and negatively
with venturesomeness. Dogmatism was highly significantly
related with conservatism and section III as a whole and
negatively with venturesomeness and I P S as a whole.
Venturesomeness was highly significantly related with
conservatism and I P S as a whole. Conservatism was highly
significantly related with section III as a whole and
negatively with I P S as a whole. Change proneness was
significantly related with I P S as a whole. Section III as
a whole was significantly related with I P S as a whole.

(D) FAMILIAR

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25		
	Individual	Cur. Org.	T-L Process	T. Resource	J.S. Org	Staff Dev.	S.C. Rel.	Sec. I	Adm. Sup.	Staff N.	Sys. N.	Complex	Compat.	Riskness	Localite.	Cosmopol.	Sec II	Tradi.	Progress.	Dogmat.	Venture	Conservat.	Change P.	Sec III	J.P.S.		
1		.38	.34	.46	.12	.51	.324	.19	.04	.11	.27	.80	.44	.19	.26	.22	.21	.39	.67	.84	.92	.91	.59	.76	.57	1	Ind.
2			.75	.57	.75	.75	.84	.91	.77	.88	.18	.62	.81	.46	.71	.13	.84	.74	.52	.45	.16	.54	.75	.76	.71	2	C.O.
3				.78	.97	.86	.92	.96	.93	.93	.77	.80	.99	.95	.83	.95	.95	.55	.14	-.05	.14	.56	.95	.27	.98	3	T.L.P
4					.77	.89	.96	.84	.72	.54	.36	.69	.68	.32	.56	.68	.64	-.62	-.34	-.41	.43	.51	.84	.13	.84	4	T. Res.
5						.96	.95	.99	.59	.92	.85	.64	.91	.98	.71	.90	.92	.77	.36	-.24	-.05	.32	.86	.44	.95	5	J.S.D
6							.98	.98	.95	.87	.72	.77	.91	.93	.66	.86	.90	.71	.27	-.04	.21	.47	.92	.21	.98	6	S.D.
7								.96	.90	.79	.63	.68	.83	.89	.55	.77	.86	.76	.36	.12	.26	.41	.85	.16	.96	7	S.C.R
8									.98	.90	.82	.69	.90	.96	.71	.89	.91	.77	.34	-.12	.05	.41	.91	.38	.97	8	I
9										.95	.91	.56	.86	.97	.71	.98	.91	.84	.44	-.31	-.16	.25	.82	.56	.93	9	A.S
10											.95	.67	.93	.98	.90	.98	.98	.56	.15	-.33	-.18	.44	.84	.54	.92	10	St. N
11												.33	.74	.87	.76	.86	.88	.68	-.38	-.66	-.52	.09	.62	.82	.74	11	Sys. N
12													.86	.71	.75	.77	.73	-.05	.40	.43	-.61	.93	.92	.26	.81	12	Compl
13														.99	.91	.96	.96	.44	.67	.63	.18	.68	.97	.23	.95	13	Compat
14															.85	.98	.99	.65	.17	.07	.09	.44	.88	.47	.95	14	Risk.
15																.89	.87	.22	.25	.03	-.66	.75	.38	.43	.81	15	Local.
16																	1.00	-.49	-.03	-.25	.06	.55	.88	.44	.91	16	Cosmo.
17																		-.52	-.09	-.26	-.06	.51	.88	.45	.92	17	II
18																			.86	.36	.30	.30	-.40	.62	.60	18	Trad.
19																				.44	.46	-.71	.09	.58	.16	19	Prog.
20																					.97	-.53	-.22	.97	.05	20	Dog.
21																						.69	.39	.90	.22	21	Ventu.
22																							.74	.46	.56	22	Cons.
23																								.81	.97	23	C.P.
24																									.50	24	III
25																										25	J.P.S

C M 3(D) - Familiar Climate

Individualisation was negatively related with curriculum organisation, teaching learning process, teaching resource, internal school organisation, staff development, school community relationship section I as a whole, staff norms, compatibility, riskness, localiteness, cosmopoliteness, change proneness and section III as a whole. Curriculum organisation was negatively related with section II as a whole, traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism and change proneness. Teaching learning process was significantly related with internal school organisation, staff development, section I as a whole, compatibility and Riskness and negatively with traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, section III as a whole and IPS as a whole. Teaching resource was significantly related with school community relationship and negatively with traditionalism and progressivism. Internal school organisation was highly significantly related with section I as a whole, administrative support; significantly with riskness and I P S as a whole and negatively with progressivism, dogmatism, staff development and venturesomeness. Staff development was highly significantly related with school community relationship, section I as a whole and I P S as a whole and negatively with traditionalism, progressivism and conservatism. School community relationship was significantly related with section I as a whole and I P S as a whole and negatively with traditionalism, progressivism and conservatism. Section I as a whole was highly significantly related with administrative support; significantly with riskness and I P S as a whole and negatively with traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism and conservatism.

Administrative support was significantly related with traditionalism, progressivism and venturesomeness. Staff

norms was highly significantly related with riskness and cosmopoliteness and negatively with traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism and conservatism. System norms was negatively related with progressivism, dogmatism and venturesomeness. Complexity was negatively related with traditionalism and conservatism. Compatibility was significantly related with riskness, cosmopoliteness, section II as a whole, change proneness and I P S as a whole and negatively with traditionalism, dogmatism and conservatism. Riskness was highly significantly related with section II as awhole; significantly with cosmopoliteness and I P S as a whole and negatively with traditionalism, dogmatism, conservatism and section III as a whole. Localiteness was negatively related with traditionalism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and change proneness. Cosmopoliteness was highly significantly related with section II as a whole and negatively with traditionalism, progressivism, and dogmatism. Section II as a whole was negatively related with traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, venturesomeness, conservatism, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole.

Traditionalism was negatively related with change proneness and I P S as a whole. Progressivism was negatively related with conservatism and I P S as a whole. Dogmatism was significantly related with venturesomeness and section III as a whole and negatively with conservatism and change proneness. Change proneness was significantly related with I P S as a whole.

G M 3(E) - Paternal Climate

Individualisation was highly significantly related with section I as a whole, complexity and compatibility; significantly with internal school organisation, school community relationship, localiteness, section II as a whole, conservatism and I P S as a whole and negatively with staff

(E) PATERNAL

	1 Ind.	2 C.O.	3 T-L P.	4 T.Res.	5 I.S.O.	6 S.D.	7 S.C.R.	8 I	9 A.S.	10 St.N.	11 Sys.N.	12 Compl.	13 Compat.	14 Risk.	15 Local.	16 Cosmo.	17 II	18 Trad.	19 Prog.	20 Dog.	21 Ventu.	22 Cons.	23 C.P.	24 III	25 I.P.S.	
1		.06	.21	.16	.63	.45	.58	.69	.37	-.01	.28	.12	.12	.42	.65	.21	.56	.07	.30	.10	.16	.55	.37	.12	.63	1
2			.34	.45	.42	.44	.11	.51	.27	-.24	.02	.03	.27	.15	.04	.15	-.11	.05	.25	.13	.02	-.24	.32	.13	.05	2
3				.41	.06	.44	.41	.73	.24	.31	.28	.26	.45	.40	.19	.38	.46	-.19	.16	.35	-.15	.30	.57	-.08	.49	3
4					.00	.61	.45	.73	.31	.37	.37	.24	.44	.20	-.09	.39	.44	-.15	.23	.12	-.04	.32	.41	.09	.55	4
5						.48	.31	.59	-.07	.11	.25	.36	.37	.11	.23	.11	.19	.10	.26	.03	.26	.12	.38	.57	.36	5
6							.65	.84	.50	.44	.29	.48	.57	.12	.33	.46	.51	.18	.67	.26	.05	.46	.46	.30	.67	6
7								.73	.64	.36	.51	.60	.41	-.15	.23	.47	.66	-.11	.45	.00	.21	.44	.26	.20	.65	7
8									.42	.19	.42	.57	.71	.28	.39	.40	.59	-.04	.48	-.21	.11	-.54	.54	.21	.73	8
9										.45	.32	.64	.56	.14	.44	.10	.79	.24	.24	-.02	.26	.35	.34	.26	.75	9
10											.86	.12	.17	.25	-.34	.83	.64	.21	-.24	-.05	.05	.44	-.21	-.06	.51	10
11												.27	.35	-.26	-.26	.84	.64	-.02	-.06	-.13	.07	.24	-.11	-.03	.55	11
12													.94	.61	.83	.39	.80	.01	.57	.13	.03	.63	.79	.42	.86	12
13														.64	.75	.41	.83	.16	.46	.01	.06	.59	.71	.37	.86	13
14															.77	.03	.36	-.06	.25	-.21	-.32	.48	.66	.05	.34	14
15																.00	.45	.11	.58	.16	-.02	.75	.75	.40	.54	15
16																	.80	-.14	.04	-.34	.11	.19	.06	.04	.70	16
17																		.18	.29	-.08	.04	-.25	.44	.26	.98	17
18																			.06	.21	.36	.35	.12	.50	.23	18
19																				.17	-.31	-.61	.67	.48	.47	19
20																					.54	-.01	.27	.76	.11	20
21																						.02	.05	.46	.16	21
22																							-.61	.06	.32	22
23																								.60	.63	23
24																									.59	24
25																										25

norms and dogmatism. Curriculum organisation was negatively
related with system norms, dogmatism and conservatism.
Teaching learning process was highly significantly related
with teaching resource and section I as a whole and
negatively with traditionalism, venturesomeness, conserva-
tims and section III as a whole. Teaching resource was
highly significantly related with section I as a whole and
negatively with traditionalism, dogmatism and conservatism.
Internal school organisation was significantly related with
section I as a whole and negatively with administrative
support and staff norms. Staff development was highly
significantly related with section I as a whole; signifi-
cantly with school community relationship compatibility,
progressivism and I P S as a whole and negatively with
venturesomeness and conservatism. School community
relationship was s ignificantly related with section I as
a whole, administrative support, section II as a whole and
I P S as a whole and negatively with riskness, traditionalism
and conservatism. Section I as a whole was highly signifi-
cantly related with compatibility and I P S as a whole;
significantly with section II as a whole and negatively
with traditionalism, dogmatism and conservatism.

Administrative support was highly significantly
related with section II as a whole and I P S as a whole and
significantly with complexity, compatibility, and
cosmopoliteness. Administrative support was negatively
related with conservatism. Staff norms was highly signifi-
cantly related with system norms and cosmopoliteness;
significantly with section II as a whole and negatively
related with riskness, localiteness, progressivism,
dogmatism and change proneness. System norms was highly
significantly related with cosmopoliteness and section II
as a whole and negatively with riskness, localiteness,
traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, change proneness
and section III as a whole. Complexity was highly signi-
ficantly related with compatibility, localiteness, section II

as a whole, change proneness and I P S as a whole and significantly with riskness and conservatism.patibility was highly significantly related with localiteness, Section II as a whole, change proneness and I P S as a whole; significantly with riskness and negatively with conservatism. Riskness was highly significantly related with localiteness and negatively with cosmopoliteness, traditionalism, dogmatism, venturesomeness and conservatism. Localiteness was highly significantly related with change proneness; significantly with progressivism and negatively with venturesomeness and conservatism. Conservatism was significantly related with I P S as a whole and negatively with dogmatism. Section II as a whole was highly significantly related with I P S as a whole and negatively with dogmatism and conservatism. Progressivism was significantly related with change proneness and negatively with venturesomeness and conservatims. Dogmatism was highly significantly related with section III as a whole and negatively with conservatism. Conservatism was negatively related with change proneness. Change proneness was significantly related with I P S as a whole. Section III as a whole was significantly related with I P S as a whole.

C M 3(F) - Closed Climate

Individualisation was highly significantly related with curriculum organisation, teaching learning process, section I as a whole, riskness, traditionalism and I P S as a whole; significantly with staff development, school community relationship and section II as a whole and negatively with teaching resource. Curriculum organisation was highly significantly related with teaching learning process, staff development, section I as a whole, traditionalism, progressivism, dogmatism, section III as a whole and I P S as a whole; significantly with school community relationship, riskness, localiteness, section II

(F) CLOSED

	1 Individual	2 Curr. Org	3 T-L Progress	4 T. Resource	5 J.S.Org.	6 Staff Dev.	7 S.C.Rel.	8 Sec. I	9 Adm. Sup.	10 Staff N.	11 Sys. N.	12 Complexity	13 Compat.	14 Riskmess	15 Localit.	16 Cosmopol.	17 Sec II	18 Trad.	19 Progress	20 Dogmat.	21 Venture	22 Conserva.	23 Change P.	24 Sec III	25 J.P.S.		
1		.51	.48	.08	.26	.42	.36	.72	.53	.16	.13	.34	.34	.51	.32	.08	.44	.51	.34	.31	.11	.69	.40	.34	.55	1	Ind.
2			.55	.06	.22	.56	.44	.77	.32	.05	.04	.13	.25	.46	.41	.28	.38	.68	.52	.52	.24	.11	.43	.59	.63	2	C.O.
3				.19	.46	.63	.52	.81	.26	.08	.03	.47	.41	.54	.28	.23	.47	.29	.69	.17	.04	.11	.50	.38	.66	3	T-L.P.
4					.02	.32	.21	.18	.08	-.38	.25	.15	.25	.19	.15	.16	.05	.07	.36	.15	.33	.05	.12	.00	.06	4	T.R
5						.26	.39	.61	.32	.25	.26	.62	.17	.08	.18	.08	.45	.08	.39	.14	.17	.22	.34	.17	.45	5	J.S.O.
6							.38	.71	.08	-.28	.34	.38	.24	.53	.44	.02	.15	.34	.55	.19	.15	.31	.22	.25	.48	6	St.D
7								.65	.06	.17	.16	.28	.06	.41	.28	.16	.42	.39	.69	.31	.11	.04	.55	.54	.61	7	S.C.R
8									.32	.11	.04	.52	.43	.63	.49	.25	.56	.52	.72	.52	.05	.05	.55	.62	.78	8	I
9										.50	.43	.38	.41	-.03	.03	.41	.68	.52	.38	.42	.02	-.05	.21	.38	.57	9	Ad.S.
10											.82	.03	.05	.07	.33	.50	.68	.18	.12	.38	.39	.48	.04	.41	.50	10	St.N
11												.05	.22	.24	.47	.41	.52	.11	.03	.31	.25	.40	.09	.24	.33	11	Sys.N.
12													.55	.41	.44	.05	.55	.23	.55	.06	-.27	.31	.45	.16	.35	12	Compl.
13														.48	.66	.22	.55	.44	.40	.00	-.14	.09	.38	.29	.50	13	Compat.
14															.71	.11	.45	.47	.55	-.04	.06	.08	.71	.46	.52	14	Risk.
15																.18	.31	.53	.48	.08	.28	.30	.55	.31	.42	15	Local.
16																	.53	.22	.15	.38	.55	.35	.06	.43	.48	16	Cosmo.
17																		.58	.57	.39	.19	.16	.48	.04	.81	17	II
18																			.55	.51	.02	.13	.47	.61	.69	18	Trad.
19																				.33	-.03	.03	.72	.69	.71	19	Prog.
20																					.36	.36	.28	.71	.55	20	Dog.
21																						.54	.05	.52	.23	21	Vent.
22																							.02	.46	.16	22	Cons.
23																								.70	.65	23	C.P.
24																									.11	24	III
25																										25	J.P.S.

as a whole and change proneness and negatively with
conservatism. Teaching learning process were highly
significantly related with staff development, school
community relationship, section I as a whole, complexity,
riskness, section II as a whole, progressivism, change
proneness and I P S as a whole; significantly with internal
school organisation, compatibility and section III as a
whole and negatively with system norms, venturesomeness
and conservatism. Teaching resource was negatively related
with internal school organisation, staff norms, system
norms, section II as a whole, dogmatism, venturesomeness
and conservatism. Internal school organisation was highly
significantly related with section I as a whole, complexity
and I P S as a whole and significantly with school
community relationship, section II as a whole and progressi-
vism. Staff development was highly significantly related
with section I as a whole, riskness, progressivism and
I P S as a whole; significantly with school community
relationship, complexity and localiteness and negatively
with staff norms and system norms. School community
relationship was highly significantly related with
Section I as a whole, progressivism, change proneness,
section III as a whole and I P S as a whole and signifi-
cantly related with riskness, section II as a whole and
traditionalism. Section I as a whole was highly signifi-
cantly related with complexity, riskness, localiteness,
section II as a whole, traditionalism, progressivism,
change proneness, section III as a whole and I P S as a
whole and significantly with compatibility and negatively
with conservatism.

Administrative support was highly significantly
related with staff norms, section II as a whole,
traditionalism and I P S as a whole; significantly with
system norms, complexity, compatibility, cosmopoliteness,
progressivism, dogmatism and section III as a whole and
negatively with riskness and conservatism. Staff norms

was highly significantly related with system norms,
cosmopoliteness, section II as a whole, conservatism and
I P S as a whole; significantly with dogmatism, venture-
someness and section III as a whole and negatively with
complexity, compatibility, riskness, and localiteness.
System norms was highly significantly related with
Section II as a whole, significantly with conservatism and
negatively with compatibility, riskness, localiteness and
change proneness. Complexity was highly significantly
related with compatibility, section II as a whole,
progressivism, and I P S as a whole; significantly with
riskness and localiteness and negatively with venturesome-
ness. Compatibility was highly significantly related with
riskness, localiteness and section II as a whole;
significantly with traditionalism, progressivism, change
proneness and I P S as a whole and negatively with
venturesomeness and conservatism. Riskness was highly
significantly related with localiteness, section II as a
whole, traditionalism, progressivism, change proneness and
I P S as a whole; significantly with section III as a whole
and negatively with cosmopoliteness, dogmatism, venture-
someness and conservatism. Localiteness was highly signi-
ficantly related with traditionalism and change proneness;
significantly with progressivism and I P S as a whole and
negatively with cosmopoliteness, venturesomeness and
conservatism. Cosmopoliteness was highly significantly
related with section II as a whole, venturesomeness and
I P S as a whole and significantly with dogmatism,
conservatism and section III as a whole. Section II as a
whole was highly significantly related with traditionalism,
progressivism, change proneness and I P S as a whole and
significantly with dogmatism.

Traditionalism was highly significantly related
with progressivism, dogmatism, change proneness, section III
as a whole and I P S as a whole. Progressivism was highly
significantly related with change proneness, section III

as a whole and I P S as a whole and negatively with
venturesomeness and conservatism. Dogmatism was highly
significantly related with section III as a whole and
I P S as a whole and significantly with venturesomeness
and conservatism. Venturesomeness was highly significantly
related with Conservatism and section III as a whole and
negatively with change proneness. Conservatism was signi-
ficantly related with section III as a whole. Change
proneness was highly significantly related with section III
as a whole and I P S as a whole. Section III as a whole
was highly significantly related with I P S as a whole.

Correlation Matrix No.4

This matrix shows the relationship of teacher job
satisfaction with 48 variables which are : 9 types of
schools, 3 innovative categories, 4 leadership behaviour
patterns, 6 types of organisation climate and the 26
ingredients of 10 personal variables.

K.V. were highly significantly related with salary,
colleagues relations, job security, relations with dept.
head, working conditions, liking for job, job prestige,
fairness of authority, possibility of advancement, Job
involvement, job leadership, sense of belonging, colleagues
respect and technical facilities; significantly with
interest by dept. head, job challange, job status and job
satisfaction as a whole and negatively with job achievement,
job autonomy, competence of dept. head, promotion level
reached, freedom of expression, work recognition, help from
administration, participation in decision making, work
recognition and work load. Boys schools were highly signi-
ficantly related with colleague relations, job prestige,
fairness of authority, job involvement and colleagues
respect; significantly with interest by dept. head,
relations with dept. head, working conditions, liking for

(Pt. I)

	Salary	Col. Rla.	Int. D/Head	Job Sec.	Rel. D/Hd	Work. Cond.	Liking/J.	Job Achiv.	Use/Talents	J. Resp.	J. Autono.	Comp/D.H	Prom. Lvl.	J. Prestige	F. Auth.	Fr. Exp.	W. Recog.	Chal. J.	F. Ben.	P./Adv.	J. Invol.	H./Admin	Status/J.	J. Lead.	Part. D.M.	Pro. For.	S. of Bel.	Col. Resp.	Tech. F.	W. Load	J.S. Whole		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31		
1	.72	.83	.33	.71	.55	.88	.51	.02	.18	.06	.21	.79	.66	.71	.83	.51	.41	.21	.19	.91	.99	.23	.21	.76	.19	.11	.55	.89	.73	.57	.23	1	K.V.
2	.12	.78	.21	.33	.22	.21	.23	.12	.17	.00	.18	.21	.23	.34	.57	.21	.46	.16	.24	.21	.73	.41	.38	.27	.19	.00	.00	.48	.19	.36	.10	2	Boys
3	.69	.62	.11	.17	.24	.18	.41	.22	.09	.01	.16	.11	.16	.22	.27	.18	.21	.14	.14	.23	.41	.33	.04	.24	.01	.79	.21	.28	.23	.21	.14	3	Girls
4	.16	.73	.18	.19	.17	.10	.53	.03	.11	.11	.17	.16	.20	.35	.23	.18	.22	.37	.26	.18	.52	.23	.22	.29	.02	.10	.28	.55	.21	.33	.12	4	Eng.
5	.13	.61	.22	.23	.16	.19	.46	.19	.18	.17	.24	.11	.02	.02	.24	.24	.33	.23	.18	.11	.51	.32	.24	.31	.01	.18	.01	.21	.11	.41	.19	5	Guj.
6	.11	.53	.31	.18	.15	.23	.19	.00	.11	.01	.33	.00	.04	.08	.26	.27	.22	.22	.08	.06	.23	.38	.24	.28	.01	.13	.01	.28	.19	.21	.03	6	Sindhi
7	.41	.41	.42	.19	.23	.01	.29	.23	.20	.06	.30	.18	.03	.09	.23	.24	.21	.00	.07	.01	.34	.16	.16	.22	.17	.09	.10	.41	.27	.00	.11	7	Hindi
8	.58	.30	.51	.17	.01	.31	.03	.22	.17	.00	.03	.03	.08	.07	.21	.33	.22	.19	.01	.13	.19	.19	.11	.08	.02	.01	.16	.00	.00	.14		8	Mar.
9	.69	.33	.58	.15	.01	.19	.02	.01	.02	.03	.02	.06	.16	.28	.29	.21	.16	.00	.00	.11	.17	.12	.08	.06	.00	.01	.13	.00	.04	.27		9	Urdu
10	.11	.10	.21	.11	.13	.10	.22	.21	.00	.23	.04	.06	.19	.11	.09	.21	.17	.03	.00	.22	.09	.17	.24	.21	.06	.21	.16	.11	.02	.24		10	H.G.
11	.09	.07	.16	.13	.02	.10	.21	.28	.21	.03	.05	.17	.10	.07	.20	.14	.04	.24	.07	.22	.20	.02	.20	.14	.08	.01	.16					11	M.G.
12	.05	.04	.16	.17	.01	.07	.88	.11	.07	.15	.16	.01	.03	.11	.08	.03	.03	.11	.01	.11	.05	.12	.10	.17	.02	.16	.11	.65	.04	.21		12	L.G.
13	.06	.22	.21	.09	.28	.26	.21	.21	.21	.20	.04	.04	.03	.20	.21	.20	.06	.08	.10	.04	.23	.11	.21	.21	.03	.18	.16	.06	.02	.21		13	H.H
14	.05	.18	.17	.19	.17	.19	.20	.21	.19	.21	.19	.04	.06	.06	.16	.19	.21	.28	.03	.10	.20	.18	.20	.21	.06	.21	.11	.03	.26			14	H L
15	.08	.21	.16	.10	.08	.19	.12	.11	.18	.18	.11	.03	.02	.07	.13	.23	.01	.12	.02	.04	.02	.09	.01	.18	.10	.03	.02	.10	.28	.16	.19	15	L H
16	.01	.11	.14	.18	.11	.22	.13	.16	.16	.06	.01	.03	.04	.14	.09	.21	.20	.19	.20	.18	.08	.11	.09	.12	.03	.21	.11	.17	.11	.21		16	L L
17	.03	.23	.11	.22	.19	.17	.27	.19	.16	.04	.20	.09	.20	.28	.14	.05	.11	.14	.11	.18	.22	.20	.21	.11	.14	.20						17	Open
18	.04	.21	.10	.20	.18	.26	.20	.21	.11	.06	.18	.06	.12	.28	.17	.16	.16	.10	.16	.20	.17	.20	.05	.19	.20	.11	.11	.20				18	Auto.
19	.03	.16	.12	.01	.21	.15	.14	.13	.08	.09	.11	.08	.16	.15	.11	.24	.04	.13	.22	.16	.20	.02	.19	.16	.10	.17						19	Cont
20	.04	.11	.02	.01	.11	.14	.06	.09	.11	.10	.28	.10	.09	.12	.12	.03	.20	.09	.10	.07	.14											20	Fam.
21	.01	.04	.08	.04	.01	.06	.10	.10	.10	.02	.20	.09	.16	.01	.08	.02	.11	.01	.08	.89	.08											21	Pat.
22	.11	.03	.02	.10	.04	.01	.02	.02	.01	.04	.06	.06	.08	.06	.08	.11	.01	.68	.19	.02	.26	.24										22	Closed
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31		

(Pt II)

	Salary	Col. Rela.	Int. Dept. Hd.	I. Sec.	Rel. D./H.	Work. Cond	Liking /J	Job Achiv.	Use/Talents	J. Resp.	J. Automo.	Comp./D.H	Prom. Lvl.	J. Prestige	F. Auth.	Fr. Exp.	W. Recog.	Chal. J	F. Ben.	P./ Adv.	J. Invol.	H./Admin.	Status/J.	J. Lead.	Part. D.M	Prof. Form.	S. of Bel.	Col. Rusp.	Tech. F.	W. Load	J.S. Whole		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31		
	.06	.07	.15	.11	.08	.11	.06	.06	.10	.11	.10	.04	.11	.08	.04	.06	.04	.16	.04	.05	.02	.04	.05	.06	.06	.02	.10	.03	.11	.03	.16	23	Upto 34 yrs
	.05	.09	.16	.21	.16	.21	.24	.09	.21	.12	.09	.01	.19	.07	.03	.05	.10	.22	.03	.10	.18	.20	.04	.11	.10	.06	.03	.11	.02	.10	.20	24	More
	.14	.16	.21	.16	.11	.11	.18	.09	.14	.13	.10	.04	.18	.04	.11	.16	.11	.04	.04	.17	.20	.06	.10	.06	.10	.08	.06	.13	.10	.10	.10	25	Male
	.20	.18	.22	.15	.18	.12	.18	.16	.15	.14	.10	.06	.18	.04	.18	.19	.17	.11	.05	.17	.16	.04	.23	.10	.10	.09	.05	.14	.11	.11	.11	26	Female
	.17	.17	.02	.18	.11	.10	.16	.18	.06	.16	.11	.08	.16	.14	.16	.10	.13	.16	.03	.14	.11	.11	.14	.10	.11	.10	.16	.13	.14	.14	.14	27	5 yrs.
	.21	.18	.03	.17	.12	.10	.20	.21	.20	.18	.12	.11	.19	.21	.20	.19	.20	.21	.02	.16	.21	.20	.14	.21	.11	.14	.18	.11	.11	.27	.27	28	Above
	.11	.03	.06	.11	.08	.11	.11	.18	.20	.16	.06	.01	.11	.12	.08	.19	.01	.04	.11	.13	.04	.14	.14	.12	.13	.19	.08	.01	.10	.10	.10	29	B.A.
	.12	.02	.04	.12	.09	.11	.12	.17	.11	.18	.04	.02	.12	.15	.10	.07	.18	.06	.04	.12	.13	.03	.14	.10	.12	.18	.07	.02	.11	.11	.11	30	B. Com.
	.13	.04	.08	.15	.07	.11	.13	.16	.16	.16	.05	.01	.13	.14	.06	.17	.01	.04	.04	.12	.12	.14	.11	.10	.12	.16	.06	.04	.10	.10	.10	31	B. Sc.
	.29	.11	.16	.16	.06	.14	.14	.14	.22	.21	.05	.03	.11	.21	.09	.20	.03	.03	.12	.12	.01	.23	.14	.14	.11	.21	.05	.14	.14	.20	.20	32	M. Sc.
	.19	.10	.25	.18	.03	.15	.14	.18	.28	.03	.04	.04	.13	.28	.10	.18	.03	.03	.12	.14	.15	.10	.21	.07	.11	.14	.14	33	M. Com			
	.14	.16	.11	.20	.20	.13	.15	.14	.20	.19	.04	.04	.14	.22	.17	.06	.21	.04	.03	.11	.10	.02	.13	.14	.16	.21	.06	.10	.20	34	M.A.		
	.19	.11	.12	.20	.10	.10	.08	.11	.08	.06	.03	.02	.11	.10	.10	.02	.11	.08	.04	.03	.04	.11	.16	.11	.06	.11	.16	.05	.04	35	Untr.		
	.18	.10	.11	.20	.11	.14	.08	.16	.10	.11	.04	.10	.19	.16	.03	.06	.04	.11	.13	.16	.14	.16	.05	.12	.18	.09	.03	.10	36	Dipl			
	.18	.19	.16	.20	.19	.16	.20	.20	.11	.11	.10	.04	.10	.19	.16	.11	.03	.11	.20	.16	.18	.21	.10	.14	.20	.01	.14	37	B.Ed/B.T			
	.20	.19	.17	.19	.20	.21	.04	.18	.16	.20	.06	.11	.21	.20	.12	.11	.03	.18	.14	.21	.17	.21	.11	.04	.20	38	M. Ed.				
	.11	.14	.14	.11	.12	.21	.17	.19	.20	.20	.05	.06	.16	.08	.21	.20	.21	.06	.01	.11	.11	.16	.11	.06	.11	.11	.12	.01	.06	39	Mobility		
	.10	.06	.18	.20	.19	.19	.11	.16	.11	.21	.07	.14	.11	.11	.14	.16	.16	.05	.08	.11	.10	.01	.08	.20	.04	.19	.11	.06	.02	40	No		
	.08	.10	.11	.11	.14	.28	.16	.24	.11	.20	.16	.17	.14	.15	.10	.11	.06	.10	.20	.16	.18	.20	.10	.14	41	Pr. Exp.						
	.08	.06	.10	.08	.11	.11	.16	.14	.11	.11	.06	.12	.11	.11	.11	.08	.06	.10	.11	.10	.11	.11	42	No							
	.06	.05	.11	.18	.04	.11	.18	.17	.19	.16	.11	.06	.11	.14	.11	.12	.06	.16	.01	.18	.11	.12	.14	.24	.14	.08	43	J.S.E.				
	.06	.04	.10	.16	.02	.10	.10	.11	.11	.11	.10	.04	.02	.09	.11	.10	.09	.06	.08	.10	.01	.10	.08	.04	.11	.20	.11	.09	.08	44	No		
	.03	.11	.11	.10	.18	.11	.21	.20	.20	.18	.21	.06	.06	.02	.20	.21	.11	.21	.08	.09	.11	.02	.18	.21	.18	.06	.08	.21	.09	.02	.20	45	P.R.H.	
	.01	.08	.10	.08	.10	.11	.11	.10	.11	.18	.14	.11	.03	.06	.13	.01	.16	.06	.02	.07	.11	.08	.04	.09	46	No							
	.03	.10	.11	.18	.12	.11	.24	.11	.24	.21	.06	.16	.11	.20	.04	.11	.10	.02	.11	.10	.20	.21	.09	.10	.01	47	P. Sat.					
	.02	.06	.10	.10	.13	.11	.11	.11	.08	.02	.01	.10	.08	.10	.12	.14	.10	.02	.11	.10	.06	.10	.02	48	No							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31		

job, possibility of advancement and job leadership and
negatively with job security, job achievement, job
autonomy, competence of dept. head, promotion level reached,
freedom of expression, job recognition, fringe benefits,
help from administration, job status, participation in
decision making and work load. Girls schools were highly
significantly related with salary received, colleagues
relations, liking for job and job involvement; signifi-
cantly with relations with dept. head, job achievement,
job prestige, fairness of authority, possibility of
advancement and job leadership and negatively with interest
by dept. head, job autonomy, competence of dept. head,
promotion level reached, job recognition, fringe benefits,
help from administration, job status, participation in
decision making and work load.

English medium was highly significantly related with
colleagues relations; liking for job, job prestige, job
involvement and colleagues respect; significantly with
promotion level reached, fairness of authority, job
leadership, sense of belonging and technical facilities and
negatively with interest by dept. head, job security,
relations with dept. head, working conditions, job achieve-
ment, job autonomy, competence of dept. head, freedom of
expression, job recognition, job challange, fringe benefits,
possibility of advancement, help from administration, job
status, participation in decision making and work load.
Gujrati medium was highly significantly related with
colleagues relation, liking for job, job involvement, and
job leadership; significantly with interest by dept. head;
fairness of authority, challange in job, and colleagues
respect and negatively with job security, relations with
dept. head, working conditions, liking for job autonomy,
competence of dept. head, promotion level reached, freedom
of expression, work recognition, fringe benefits, possibi-
lity of advancement, help from administration, job status,

participation in decision making, sense of belong and
work load. Sindhi medium was significantly related with
colleagues relations, fairness of authority, challange in
job, job involvement and colleagues' respect and negatively
with interest by dept. head, job security, working condi-
tions, job responsibility, job autonomy, promotion level
reached, freedom of expression, work recognition, help
from administration, job status, sense of belonging,
technical facility, work load and J S I as a whole. Hindi
medium was highly significantly related with job involvement
and colleagues respect; significantly with salary,
colleagues relation, relations with dept. head, liking for
job, job achievement, use of talents, fairness of authority,
job leadership and technical facility and negatively with
interest by dept. head, job security, job autonomy,
competence of dept. head, promotion level reached, freedom
of expression, work recognition, fringe benefits, help
from administration, job status and participation in
decision making. Marathi medium was significantly related
with colleagues' relations, job achievement and faireness
of authority, and negatively with salary, interest by
dept. head, job security;relations with dept. head, working
conditions, liking for job, job autonomy, competence of
dept. head, promotion level reached, freedom of expression,
work recognition, fringe benefits, help from administration,
job status, procedural formalities, sense of belonging, work
load and J S I as a whole. Urdu medium was significantly
related with colleagues' relations, fairness of authority and
J S I as a whole; and negatively with salary, interest by
dept. head, job security, relations with dept. head, working
conditions, liking for job, job achievement, job respon-
sibility, job autonomy, competence of dept. head, promotion
level reached, freedom of expression work recognition, help
from administration, job status, sense of belonging and
work load.

Highly innovative category was significantly related
with interest shown by dept. head, liking for job, job
achievement, job autonomy, work recognition, job involvement,
job leadership, participation in decision making, sense of
belonging and the J S I as a whole and negatively with
work load. Moderate innovative category was significantly
related with liking for job, job autonomy, work recognition,
job involvement, job leadership, participation in decision
making, sense of belonging and negatively with work load.
Low innovative category was significantly related with
work load and negatively related with liking for job,
job autonomy and work recognition.

Effective pattern (HH) was significantly related with
colleagues relations, interest shown by dept. head, liking
for job, job achievement, use of talents, job responsi -
bility, job autonomy, fairness of authority, freedom of
expression, work recognition, participation in decision
making and J S I as a whole. HL Pattern was significantly
related with liking for job, job achievement, job
respomsibility, work recognition, challange in work, job
involvement, help from administration, job leadership,
participation in decision making, sense of belong and JSI
as a whole. LH Pattern was significantly related with
colleagues relations and negatively with job involvement,
help from administration, job status, sense of belonging
and work load. Ineffective (LL) pattern was negatively
related with salary, colleagues' relations, interest by
dept. head, relations with dept. head, liking for job,
job achievement, job prestige, work recognition, challange
in work, possibility of advancement, job involvement, help
from administration, job status, job leadership, partici-
pation in decision making, procedural formalities, sense
of belonging, technical facilities and J S I as a whole.

Open climate was significantly related with colleagues
relations, job security, liking for job, fairness of
authority, help from administration, participation in
decision making, sense of belonging, colleagues' respect
and J S I as a whole and negatively with work load.
Autonomous climate was significantly related with
colleagues' relations, job security, liking for job, job
achievement, help from administration, participation in
decision making, colleagues' respect and J S I as a whole
and negatively with work load. Controlled climate was
significantly related with job responsibility, challange
in job, job involvement and job leadership and negatively
with participation in decision making. Familiar climate
was negatively related with job leadership. Paternal
climate was negatively related with job achievement, job
autonomy, job status and participation in decision making.
Closed climate was significantly related with work load
and negatively with salary, colleagues' relations, job
security, relation with dept. head, working conditions,
liking for job, job achievement, job autonomy, job
recognition, help from administration, job leadership,
participation in decision making, sense of belonging,
respect from colleagues, and J S I as a whole.

Above 34 years age was significantly related with job
security, working conditions, liking for job, use of
talents, challange in job, help from administration and
JSI as a whole. Male sex was significantly related with
interest by Dept. head, job involvement and participation
in decision making. Female sex was significantly related
with salary and interest by dept. head. Above 5 years
teaching experience was significantly related with salary,
liking for the job, job achievement, use of talents, job
prestige, fairness of authority, job recognition, job
challange, job involvement, help from administration,
participation in decision making and J S I as a whole.

M.Sc. qualification was significantly related with salary, job achievement, use of talents, job responsibility, job prestige, job recognition, job status, colleagues respect, and J S I as a whole and negatively with work load. M.Com. qualification was significantly related with colleagues' respect and negatively with work load. M.A. qualification was significantly related with job security, job achievement, use of talents, job prestige, job recognition, job status, colleagues respect and J S I as a whole and negatively with work load. Untrained and diploma holders were significantly related with job security. B.Ed/B.T. qualification was significantly related with relations with dept head, job achievement, job involvement, participation in decision making and colleagues' respect and negatively with workload. M.Ed. qualification was significantly related with salary,, relation with dept. head, working conditions, job responsibility, job prestige, fairness of authority, job status, participation in decision making, colleagues respect and J S I as a whole and negatively with work load. Mobility was significantly related with liking for job, job responsibility, job autonomy, freedom of expression, job recognition, challange in job and job status and negatively with J S I as a whole. No mobility was significantly related with job security, and participation in decision making. Prior professional experience was significantly related with job achievement, use of talents, job responsibility and participation in decision making. Professional reading habit was significantly related with liking for job, job achievement, use of talents, job autonomy, fairness of authority, freedom of expression, job challange, job involvement, job leadership, colleagues' respect and J S I as a whole. Professional satisfaction was significantly related with liking for job, job achievement, use of talents, job responsibility, job autonomy, job challange, possibility

of advancement, job involvement, participation in decision
making, sense of belong, respect from colleague and J S I
as a whole and negatively with work load. Absence of
professional satisfaction was negatively related with
use of talents.

<u>Correlation Matrix No.5</u>

This matrix shows the relationship of job satis-
faction with innovative proneness - component-wise and
aspectwise. No significant relationship was found between
the J S I as a whole and I P S as a whole.

Individualisation was significantly related with
job achievement, job responsibility, job recognition,
challange in job, job involvement, job leadership, sense
of belonging, colleagues respect and J S I as a whole and
negatively with job autonomy. Curriculum organisation was
significantly related with job responsibility and help from
administration. Internal school organisation was signifi-
cantly related with colleagues' relations and competence of
dept. head. Staff development was significantly related
with competence of dept. head. School community relationship
was significantly related with job leadership, colleagues
respect and J S I as a whole. Administrative support was
significantly related with interest shown by Dept. head,
relations with dept. head, use of talents, job responsi-
bility, help from administration and sense of belonging.

Staff norms was significantly related with
colleagues' relations. System norms was significantly
related with job responsibility. Complexity was signifi-
cantly related with technical facilities. Compatibility was
significantly related with job prestige. Riskness was
significantly related with interest shown by dept. head,
relations with dept. head, job liking, job achievement,

	Individual	Cur. Org	T-L Process	T. Res.	J. S. Org	Staff Dev.	S. C. Rela.	Sec. I	Adm. Sup.	Staff N	Sys. N.	Complex	Compat.	Riskness	Localite.	Cosmopol.	Sec II	Trad.	Progress.	Dogmat.	Venture.	Conser.	Change P.	Sec III	J.P.S.		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25		
1	.02	.02	.06	.04	.03	.05	.04	.03	.02	.01	.03	.03	.01	.11	.10	.14	.08	.06	.07	.06	.05	.04	.05	.05	.06	1	Salary
2	.11	.06	.13	.18	.20	.18	.19	.19	.16	.20	.14	.10	.11	.10	.09	.11	.13	.15	.16	.11	.10	.06	.11	.12	.15	2	Col. Rela.
3	.06	.10	.11	.10	.19	.18	.19	.13	.20	.14	.13	.14	.13	.21	.08	.14	.03	.16	.10	.15	.10	.14	.11	.13	3	Int/Head
4	.14	.03	.10	.10	.09	.11	.17	.11	.10	.10	.11	.10	.14	.11	.20	.10	.09	.10	.04	.18	.06	.16	.10	.08	.09	4	J. Sec
5	.02	.02	.11	.10	.12	.13	.19	.10	.20	.16	.14	.11	.10	.20	.14	.21	.18	.02	.06	.14	.08	.16	.09	.15	5	Rel/Hd.
6	.02	.11	.10	.09	.12	.06	.18	.10	.18	.10	.11	.06	.16	.19	.09	.18	.14	.02	.16	.03	.14	.06	.20	.10	.11	6	W. Con.
7	.18	.11	.16	.15	.09	.14	.06	.14	.04	.05	.03	.01	.10	.20	.20	.11	.11	.12	.20	.10	.24	.08	.20	.17	.14	7	J. Likg.
8	.21	.09	.10	.30	.11	.06	.03	.12	.06	.10	.11	.06	.10	.20	.14	.21	.13	.03	.19	.06	.20	.11	.21	.13	.13	8	J. Achi.
9	.17	.14	.11	.10	.10	.18	.11	.13	.21	.11	.19	.10	.18	.20	.10	.19	.16	.04	.22	.08	.21	.10	.23	.15	.25	9	Talents
10	.23	.20	.18	.11	.16	.14	.18	.17	.20	.14	.21	.03	.10	.22	.11	.13	.14	.16	.10	.18	.11	.13	.14	10	J. Res.
11	.09	.10	.11	.09	.10	.11	.19	.10	.11	.10	.10	.08	.14	.19	.06	.20	.12	.14	.20	.08	.21	.09	.06	.09	11	Auton.
12	.10	.17	.16	.18	.21	.22	.23	.19	.14	.10	.16	.11	.18	.09	.19	.12	.06	.16	.05	.14	.02	.19	.10	12	Comp/Hd.
13	.19	.06	.05	.06	.14	.10	.11	.10	.03	.05	.04	.01	.09	.16	.17	.08	.07	.06	.07	.04	.05	.14	.06	.05	.14	13	Prom.
14	.14	.10	.11	.09	.08	.09	.14	.11	.18	.14	.19	.18	.20	.11	.19	.10	.18	.28	.08	.10	.11	.08	.14	.05	.07	14	J. Pres.
15	.14	.06	.08	.10	.11	.09	.06	.09	.04	.05	.06	.01	.17	.18	.05	.10	.08	.10	.16	.06	.12	.08	.16	.13	.14	15	F. A.
16	.18	.08	.04	.03	.11	.10	.01	.04	.08	.10	.16	.19	.07	.21	.11	.02	.19	.04	.17	.06	.16	.11	.09	16	Fr. Ex.
17	.23	.10	.08	.14	.10	.16	.11	.13	.06	.10	.12	.11	.14	.21	.20	.20	.14	.08	.16	.02	.22	.06	.20	.11	.08	17	W. Rec.
18	.20	.06	.04	.03	.06	.09	.11	.08	.08	.09	.14	.10	.16	.21	.01	.20	.13	.05	.20	.03	.22	.06	.20	.12	.13	18	Chal.
19	.14	.04	.02	.01	.03	.04	.06	.04	.05	.06	.06	.03	.02	.11	.03	.18	.13	.05	.04	.04	.03	.06	.20	.13	.11	19	F. Ben.
20	.17	.02	.02	.01	.03	.06	.09	.05	.06	.03	.02	.05	.19	.18	.03	.16	.04	.04	.03	.05	.04	.06	.04	.04	20	P. Adv.
21	.22	.06	.04	.05	.08	.10	.19	.11	.10	.08	.14	.01	.10	.19	.11	.10	.16	.05	.18	.06	.24	.05	.19	.13	.16	21	Invol.
22	.08	.20	.10	.16	.18	.15	.22	.10	.11	.04	.05	.18	.11	.11	.18	.20	.06	.24	.08	.21	.13	.11	22	A. Help
23	.16	.10	.15	.10	.14	.18	.19	.15	.11	.12	.14	.16	.18	.16	.14	.14	.06	.20	.06	.24	.14	.15	23	J. Stat.
24	.24	.08	.08	.10	.11	.09	.20	.12	.16	.03	.18	.08	.14	.20	.14	.14	.01	.16	.13	.16	.14	.15	.13	24	J. L.
25	.21	.06	.04	.14	.15	.16	.10	.10	.03	.08	.16	.14	.20	.14	.09	.16	.13	.16	.20	.14	.13	25	P.D.M.
26	.21	.02	.03	.10	.11	.02	.03	.05	.12	.14	.11	.18	.10	.04	.18	.11	.09	.20	.06	.21	.04	.20	.11	26	Pro. F.
27	.21	.15	.04	.03	.16	.18	.12	.18	.19	.08	.03	.10	.04	.07	.14	.18	.21	.03	.20	.11	27	S. B.
28	.23	.20	.06	.08	.06	.03	.20	.11	.12	.18	.19	.18	.11	.21	.20	.18	.27	.16	.19	.22	.18	.20	.19	.09	28	Col. R.
29	.03	.17	.14	.18	.15	.10	.03	.11	.14	.23	.20	.22	.16	.10	.16	.19	.04	.04	.21	.13	.13	29	T. F.
30	.20	.24	.10	.11	.10	.12	.19	.17	.20	.10	.02	.13	.09	.12	.18	.05	.21	.09	.21	.13	.12	30	W. L.
31	.24	.10	.09	.12	.11	.22	.10	.12	.14	.03	.04	.08	.07	.14	.18	.04	.20	.24	.06	.08	31	J.S.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25		

use of talents, job recognition, challange in job, colleagues' respect and J S I as a whole and negatively with job security and work load. Localiteness was significantly related with job security, liking for job, job responsibility, job recognition, job leadership, sense of belonging, and colleagues respect and negatively with work load. Cosmopoliteness was significantly related with relations with dept. head, job achievement, job autonomy, freedom of expression, job recognition, possibility of advancement, job leadership, sense of belonging, colleagues' respect and J S I as a whole and negatively with procedural formalities. Traditionalism was significantly related with job prestige and sense of belonging and negatively with job autonomy.

Progressivism was significantly related with job liking, use of talents, job autonomy, challange in job, possibility of advancement, help from administration participation in decision making, technical facilities, and J S I as a whole and negatively with job security and work load. Dogmatism was negatively related with job autonomy and participation in decision making. Venturesomeness was significantly related with job liking, job achievement, use of talents, job autonomy, job recognition, challange in job, possibility of advancement, job leadership, participation in decision making, sense of belonging, technical facilities and J S I as a whole and negatively with job security, and work load. Conservatism was negatively related with job autonomy and participation in decision making. Change proneness was significantly related with working conditions, liking for job, job achievement, use of talents, job autonomy, freedom of expression, job recognition, job challange, job involvement, help from administration, job status, job leadership, participation in decision making, sense of belonging, colleagues respect, technical facilities and J S I as a whole and negatively with work load.

4.12 Conclusion

This Chapter contains the outcome of present
research. This study has confirmed as well as
disconfirmed the earlier results and understanding
of Innovative proneness of secondary school teachers,
leadership behaviour patterns of the Principals,
Organizational Climate of the Schools and the job
satisfaction of the teachers. Quite a few new findings
have been brought out. Innovative proneness is
necessary for the secondary school teachers for
sustaining the growth of education but the present
activities in this regard are far behind the desired
level. The inner desire to acquire it is missing.

The present study has revealed that several
personal variables of teachers alongwith certain types
of leadership behaviour patterns of the Principals
and specific types of organisational climate stimulate
innovative proneness in the teachers. Also, combination
of certain other variables bring out the undesirable
effects. These variables when viewed alongwith the
teacher job satisfaction give clear indication of
positive and negative factors for identification,
encouragement and sustaining the desirable level of
innovative proneness. The dissatisfiers must be
eliminated or converted into satisfiers forpositive
results. Also, the school leadership and environment
must be controlled to provide necessary backing to the
right teachers at the right time in right manner.

For the achievement of these aims the existing
professional training of teachers will have to be
reoriented, in-service education of teachers and of

Principals will have to be re-designed and the
conditions of employment of teachers will have to
be revised. The teachers and Principals are to be
frequently reminded of the necessity of being
innovative prone and research oriented. The
conspicuous gap of feed-back has to be filled up
by meaningful programmes. Since the researches on
educational innovation are of recent origin in India
and the extension of study of job satisfaction to the
teaching profession is very recent, it is too early
to evaluate the effect of the present study on the
system of education and society. The present study
is one of the few pioneering works on the job
satisfaction of teachers and the first to relate it
to their innovative proneness. It is, therefore,
necessary to repeat this study after a few years
for finding new vistas to sustain educational growth.