
TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IN RELATION TO TEACHER PRODUCTIVITY: A SURVEY STUDY

MR. J. ANTONI SANTHA SEELAN

RESEARCH SCHOLAR, MESTON COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (AUTONOMOUS), CHENNAI.

DR. J. JOHNSI PRIYA

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, MESTON COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (AUTONOMOUS), CHENNAI.

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates teacher participation in school administration in relation to teacher productivity among higher secondary school teachers. Using the survey method, data were collected from a randomly selected sample of 600 higher secondary teachers (304 males and 296 females) working in government, government-aided, and private schools in Chennai district. Teacher participation in school administration was assessed using a standardized scale, while teacher productivity was measured through a scale developed and standardized by the investigators. The study examined differences in teacher participation and productivity with respect to gender, educational qualification, medium of instruction (Tamil and English), teaching experience, and type of school management, and also explored the relationship between the two major variables. Statistical techniques such as mean, standard deviation, t-test, one-way ANOVA, and Karl Pearson's product-moment correlation were employed for data analysis. The findings revealed significant differences in teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity across most demographic variables. Female teachers demonstrated higher teacher productivity, while teachers with professional qualifications (PG with B.Ed.), English medium teachers, mid-career teachers (5–10 years of experience), and teachers working in government-aided schools showed higher levels of productivity in several dimensions. A significant and positive relationship was found between teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity, indicating that increased administrative involvement is associated with enhanced instructional effectiveness. The study highlights the importance of participatory school leadership and supportive administrative practices in improving teacher productivity at the higher secondary level.

KEYWORDS: Teacher Participation in School Administration; Teacher Productivity; Higher Secondary Teachers; Teaching Experience; School Management

INTRODUCTION

Education plays a pivotal role in national development, and teachers are widely recognized as the cornerstone of any effective educational system. At the higher secondary level, teachers are expected not only to deliver subject content effectively but also to contribute meaningfully to school administration, planning, and decision-making processes. In contemporary educational settings, schools are increasingly viewed as collaborative organizations where shared leadership and participatory management are essential for improving institutional effectiveness and teaching outcomes. Teacher participation in school administration refers to the extent to which teachers are involved in planning, organising, communicating, controlling, and evaluating school activities. Such participation fosters a sense of ownership, professional commitment, and accountability among teachers, which may positively influence their instructional practices and overall productivity. Teacher productivity, on the other hand, encompasses teachers' effectiveness in academic preparation, classroom management, use of teaching resources, instructional strategies, and maintaining positive teacher–student relationships. Despite growing emphasis on participatory school management, variations exist in teachers' administrative involvement and productivity due to demographic and institutional factors such as gender, educational qualification, medium of instruction, teaching experience, and type of school management. In the Indian context, especially at the higher secondary level, limited empirical research has simultaneously examined teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity, along with their interrelationship. The present study seeks to address this gap by systematically investigating these constructs and their associations among higher secondary school teachers.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Several studies have highlighted the importance of teacher participation in school administration for effective school functioning. Marks and Louis (1999) reported that shared decision-making enhances teachers' professional commitment and organizational learning. Similarly, Somech (2014) found that teachers' involvement in

administrative processes positively influences school effectiveness and collegiality. In the Indian context, Sharma and Joshi (2010) observed that teachers' participation in planning and evaluation activities leads to improved school climate and better coordination among staff. However, Firestone and Martinez (2007) argued that in centralized education systems, teacher participation is often limited to symbolic roles, restricting its impact on school improvement. Teacher productivity has been studied extensively as a key determinant of educational quality. Darling-Hammond (2000) emphasized that effective teachers demonstrate strong academic preparation, classroom management skills, and instructional competence. OECD (2019) reported that teacher effectiveness is closely associated with professional engagement and supportive working conditions. Research by Kim and Cho (2014) indicated that female teachers often show higher levels of instructional organization and student-centered practices. Conversely, Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain (2005) found no consistent gender-based differences in teacher effectiveness, suggesting that contextual factors play a moderating role. Educational qualification has been identified as a significant factor influencing both participation and productivity. Darling-Hammond (2000) and Kumar and Rathee (2018) found that professionally trained teachers are more involved in administrative tasks and exhibit higher instructional effectiveness. Studies on medium of instruction suggest that English medium teachers often have greater access to academic resources and professional development opportunities (Vaish, 2015), while Mohanty (2009) highlighted the pedagogical advantages of mother-tongue instruction, indicating mixed outcomes. Teaching experience also plays a crucial role. Huberman (1989) proposed that mid-career teachers reach peak instructional performance, while senior teachers increasingly assume administrative roles. Prensky (2010) noted that novice teachers are more adept at using digital teaching resources. Regarding type of management, Muralidharan and Sundararaman (2011) reported differences in teacher effectiveness across government, aided, and private schools, attributed to variations in accountability and organizational culture. Relationship between Teacher Participation in School Administration and Teacher Productivity. Empirical evidence consistently suggests a positive relationship between teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity. Bogler and Somech (2004) found that teacher empowerment mediates the relationship between administrative participation and job performance. Hoy and Tarter (2010) also reported that participatory school climates enhance teacher motivation and instructional effectiveness. However, Blase and Blase (2000) cautioned that excessive administrative responsibilities may detract from instructional focus if not properly balanced. This indicates the need to examine the nature and extent of participation rather than its mere presence.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The present study holds significance at theoretical, practical, and policy levels. Theoretically, it contributes to the existing body of knowledge by integrating concepts of teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity within a single empirical framework, particularly in the higher secondary education context. It also extends organizational and educational leadership theories by highlighting the role of participatory management in enhancing instructional effectiveness. Practically, the findings of the study offer valuable insights for school administrators, principals, and educational leaders. Understanding how teacher participation influences productivity can help schools design inclusive administrative structures that promote collaboration, motivation, and professional growth. The results also assist teachers in recognizing the professional benefits of active involvement in school administration. From a policy perspective, the study provides evidence-based inputs for educational planners and policymakers to formulate strategies that encourage shared decision-making and participatory leadership in schools. By identifying demographic and institutional variations, the study helps tailor professional development and administrative policies to different teacher groups. Ultimately, enhancing teacher participation and productivity can contribute to improved teaching-learning processes and better educational outcomes at the higher secondary level.

Operational Definition of the Key terms

Teacher Participation in School Administration refers to the extent to which teachers are actively involved in decision-making processes that shape school policies, instructional practices, and organizational functioning beyond their classroom responsibilities. It encompasses teachers' engagement in planning curriculum development and goal setting; involvement in organizing process such as resource allocation and scheduling; participation in communicating to share information and provide feedback; controlling mechanisms that monitor implementation of policies and maintain instructional standards; and evaluating school programs and reviewing student outcomes.

Teacher productivity is operationally defined as the multidimensional construct representing the efficiency and effectiveness with which teachers perform their instructional and professional responsibilities to facilitate student learning and academic achievement. It encompasses teachers' systematic academic preparation, ability to create and maintain conducive classroom environments, proficiency in selecting and utilizing appropriate teaching resources and technological tools, quality of teacher-student relationships characterized by trust and emotional support, and overall teaching performance that integrates these elements to achieve learning outcomes.

Higher Secondary Teachers are operationally defined as teachers who are formally appointed and currently teaching students enrolled in Grades XI and XII (or equivalent levels) in recognized higher secondary schools, including government, aided, and private institutions.

Objectives of the Study

The present study is undertaken with the following objectives:

- To examine the differences in teacher participation in school administration with respect to gender, educational qualification, medium of instruction, teaching experience, and type of school management.
- To analyse the differences in teacher productivity based on gender, educational qualification, medium of instruction, teaching experience, and type of school management.
- To determine the relationship between teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity among higher secondary school teachers.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses have been formulated for the present study:

- There is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary school teachers in their levels of participation in school administration and teacher productivity.
- There is no significant difference between higher secondary school teachers with PG and PG with B.Ed. qualifications in their participation in school administration and teacher productivity.
- There is no significant difference between Tamil and English medium higher secondary school teachers regarding their participation in school administration and teacher productivity.
- There is no significant difference among higher secondary school teachers with teaching experience of less than 5 years, 5–10 years, and more than 10 years in terms of their participation in school administration and teacher productivity.
- There is no significant difference among higher secondary school teachers working in government, government-aided, and private schools with respect to their participation in school administration and teacher productivity.
- There is no significant relationship between teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity among higher secondary school teachers.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The present study employed the survey method of research. A sample of 600 higher secondary school teachers (304 males and 296 females) was selected from government, government-aided, and private schools in Chennai district using the simple random sampling technique. Data were collected from the teachers using two instruments: (i) the Teacher Participation in School Administration standardised by Dr. Haseen Taj (2021), and (ii) the Teacher Productivity Scale, constructed and standardized by the investigators in 2025. The responses obtained were scored in accordance with the prescribed scoring procedures, and the resulting data were systematically tabulated for analysis. Statistical techniques such as mean, standard deviation, *t*-test, one-way ANOVA, and Karl Pearson's product-moment correlation were employed to analyse the data using SPSS (Version 22.0). The analysed results were tabulated and interpreted in relation to the formulated hypotheses.

Hypothesis Testing

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary teachers in their participation in school administration and its dimensions.

Table – 1 showing the significant difference between male and female higher secondary teachers in their participation in school administration and its dimensions.

Dimensions of Teacher Participation in School Administration	Gender				't'-Value
	Male N = 304		Female N = 296		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Planning	19.11	4.0049	16.78	4.113	6.997**
Organizing	19.28	5.248	21.30	5.475	4.601**
Communicating	22.97	7.620	22.69	7.348	0.465 ^{NS}
Controlling	17.56	4.025	16.78	4.110	2.345*
Evaluating	15.80	3.009	15.13	2.977	2.745**

Total Score	94.72	12.092	92.67	11.437	2.134*
-------------	-------	--------	-------	--------	--------

Note: **p<0.01, * p <0.05, NS – Not Significant

It is evident from the above table that there exists a significant difference between male and female higher secondary teachers in certain dimensions of teacher participation in school administration, namely planning, organising, controlling, evaluating, and in the total score. Male teachers obtained higher mean scores than female teachers in the dimensions of planning, controlling, and evaluating, indicating greater participation in these administrative activities. On the other hand, female teachers recorded a higher mean score in the dimension of organising, reflecting stronger involvement in organizing-related administrative functions. However, no significant difference was observed between male and female teachers in the dimension of communicating, suggesting that both genders participate equally in communication-related administrative activities. Overall, the total score of teacher participation in school administration was significantly higher for male teachers compared to female teachers. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, “*There is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary teachers in their participation in school administration and its dimensions,*” is partially rejected—rejected for the dimensions of planning, organising, controlling, evaluating, and total score, and accepted for the dimension of communicating.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary teachers in their teacher productivity and its dimensions.

Table – 2 showing the significant difference between male and female higher secondary teachers in their teacher productivity and its dimensions.

Dimensions of Teacher Productivity	Gender				‘t’-Value
	Male N = 304		Female N = 296		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Academic Preparation	20.27	7.906	23.23	8.819	4.336**
Classroom Management	23.57	8.982	25.80	9.494	2.967**
Use of Teaching Resources	21.86	8.921	27.04	9.823	6.763**
Instructional strategies	28.27	11.192	37.48	13.511	9.103**
Teacher-Student Relationship	20.55	7.712	27.99	10.195	10.108**
Total Score	114.51	23.752	141.55	32.231	11.719**

Note: **p<0.01, * p <0.05, NS – Not Significant

It is evident from the data presented in the above table that male and female higher secondary teachers differ significantly across all dimensions of teacher productivity, namely academic preparation, classroom management, use of teaching resources, instructional strategies, teacher–student relationship, as well as in the overall productivity score. Across each of these dimensions and in the total score, female higher secondary teachers obtained higher mean scores than their male counterparts, indicating greater teacher productivity. Consequently, the formulated hypothesis, “*There is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary teachers in their teacher productivity and its dimensions,*” is rejected.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference between higher secondary teachers with PG and PG with B.Ed. in their participation in school administration and its dimensions.

Table – 3 showing the significant difference between higher secondary teachers with PG and PG with B.Ed. in their participation in school administration and its dimensions.

Dimensions of	Educational Qualification	‘t’-Value
---------------	---------------------------	-----------

Teacher Participation in School Administration	PG N = 116		PG with B.Ed. N = 484		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Planning	16.52	4.379	18.52	4.150	4.620**
Organizing	19.03	5.634	21.08	5.684	3.495**
Communicating	20.19	7.098	24.63	7.647	5.694**
Controlling	17.58	4.078	18.63	6.382	1.698**
Evaluating	15.51	3.232	18.25	6.989	4.119**
Total Score	88.82	11.405	101.11	21.582	5.935**

Note: **p<0.01

It is evident from the above table that there is a significant difference between higher secondary teachers with PG and PG with B.Ed. qualifications in all the dimensions of teacher participation in school administration, namely planning, organising, communicating, controlling, evaluating, and in the total score. In each of these dimensions, as well as in the overall score, teachers possessing PG with B.Ed. qualification obtained higher mean scores than teachers with only PG qualification, indicating a higher level of participation in school administrative activities among professionally trained teachers. The results suggest that professional teacher education contributes positively to teachers' involvement in planning, organisation, communication, supervision, and evaluation-related administrative functions. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, "There is no significant difference between higher secondary teachers with PG and PG with B.Ed. qualifications in their participation in school administration and its dimensions," is rejected.

H₀₄: There is no significant difference between higher secondary teachers with PG and PG with B.Ed. in their teacher productivity and its dimensions.

Table – 4 showing the significant difference between higher secondary teachers with PG and PG with B.Ed. in their teacher productivity and its dimensions

Dimensions of Teacher Productivity	Educational Qualification				't'-Value
	PG N = 116		PG with B.Ed. N = 484		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Academic Preparation	21.22	8.438	23.34	8.728	2.356*
Classroom Management	22.98	9.517	25.07	9.209	2.183*
Use of Teaching Resources	24.43	9.143	25.85	10.025	1.387 ^{NS}
Instructional strategies	30.25	13.509	33.43	13.077	2.336*
Teacher-Student Relationship	24.34	10.201	25.73	9.926	1.338 ^{NS}
Total Score	123.23	31.491	133.41	29.758	3.271**

Note: **p<0.01, * p <0.05, NS – Not Significant

It is evident from the above table that there is a significant difference between higher secondary teachers with PG and PG with B.Ed. qualifications in selected dimensions of teacher productivity, namely academic preparation, classroom management, instructional strategies, and in the total productivity score. In all these dimensions and in the overall score, teachers with PG and B.Ed. qualification obtained higher mean scores than teachers with only PG qualification, indicating superior teacher productivity among professionally trained teachers. However, no significant difference was observed between the two groups in the dimensions of use of teaching resources and

teacher–student relationship, suggesting that these aspects of productivity are comparable irrespective of professional qualification. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, “*There is no significant difference between higher secondary teachers with PG and PG with B.Ed. qualifications in their teacher productivity and its dimensions,*” is partially rejected—rejected for academic preparation, classroom management, instructional strategies, and total score, and accepted for use of teaching resources and teacher–student relationship.

H₀₅: There is no significant difference between higher secondary teachers teaching in Tamil and English medium in their participation in school administration and its dimensions.

Table – 5 showing the significant difference between higher secondary teachers teaching in Tamil and English medium in their participation in school administration and its dimensions

Dimensions of Teacher Participation in School Administration	Medium of Instruction				‘t’-Value
	Tamil N = 166		English N = 434		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Planning	17.56	3.921	18.35	4.375	2.041*
Organizing	19.78	5.471	21.03	5.792	2.398*
Communicating	23.02	7.309	24.06	7.887	1.465 ^{NS}
Controlling	16.90	4.117	19.01	6.510	3.899**
Evaluating	15.27	3.069	18.66	7.218	5.857**
Total Score	92.52	11.196	101.11	22.772	4.645**

Note: **p<0.01, * p <0.05, NS – Not Significant

It is evident from the above table that there is a significant difference between higher secondary teachers teaching through Tamil and English medium in most dimensions of teacher participation in school administration, namely planning, organising, controlling, evaluating, and in the total score. In all these dimensions and in the overall score, English medium teachers obtained higher mean scores than Tamil medium teachers, indicating greater participation in school administrative activities. However, no significant difference was observed between Tamil and English medium teachers in the dimension of communicating, suggesting that both groups are similar in their participation in communication-related administrative functions. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, “*There is no significant difference between higher secondary teachers teaching through Tamil and English medium in their participation in school administration and its dimensions,*” is partially rejected—rejected for planning, organising, controlling, evaluating, and total score, and accepted for the dimension of communicating.

H₀₆: There is no significant difference between higher secondary teachers teaching in Tamil and English medium in their teacher productivity and its dimensions.

Table – 6 showing the significant difference between higher secondary teachers teaching in Tamil and English medium in their teacher productivity and its dimensions

Dimensions of Teacher Productivity	Medium of Instruction				‘t’-Value
	Tamil N = 166		English N = 434		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Academic Preparation	21.58	8.022	23.44	8.909	2.358*
Classroom Management	25.54	9.127	24.34	9.352	1.412 ^{NS}
Use of Teaching Resources	23.48	9.400	26.37	9.937	3.233**
Instructional strategies	33.84	12.437	32.42	13.487	1.175 ^{NS}

Teacher-Student Relationship	23.18	9.548	26.33	10.024	3.487**
Total Score	127.61	20.801	132.91	33.180	1.915

Note: **p<0.01, * p <0.05, NS – Not Significant

It is evident from the above table that there is a significant difference between higher secondary teachers teaching through Tamil and English medium in certain dimensions of teacher productivity, namely academic preparation, use of teaching resources, and teacher–student relationship. In the dimensions of academic preparation, use of teaching resources, and teacher–student relationship, English medium teachers obtained higher mean scores than Tamil medium teachers, indicating greater productivity in these aspects. However, no significant difference was found between Tamil and English medium teachers in the dimensions of classroom management and instructional strategies, suggesting that teachers from both media of instruction are similar in these areas. Further, the overall teacher productivity score does not show a significant difference between Tamil and English medium teachers. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, “*There is no significant difference between higher secondary teachers teaching through Tamil and English medium in their teacher productivity and its dimensions,*” is partially accepted—accepted for classroom management, instructional strategies, and total score, and rejected for academic preparation, use of teaching resources, and teacher–student relationship.

H07: There is no significant difference among higher secondary teachers whose teaching experiences are less than 5 years, 5 to 10 years and more than 10 years in their participation in school administration and its dimensions.

Table – 7 showing the significant difference among higher secondary teachers whose teaching experiences are less than 5 years, 5 to 10 years and more than 10 years in their participation in school administration and its dimensions.

Dimensions of Teacher Participation in School Administration	Teaching Experience						‘F’-Value	Groups Differ Significantly
	Less than 5 years N=189		5-10 years N=225		More than 10 years N=186			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Planning	15.79	5.120	17.33	4.094	18.65	4.534	18.345**	(1&2), (2&3) and (1&3)
Organizing	17.61	6.605	18.62	5.448	20.95	5.266	16.482**	(2&3) and (1&3)
Communicating	20.48	8.968	21.58	7.424	21.98	6.658	1.920 ^{NS}	None
Controlling	15.64	5.050	16.30	3.616	18.31	4.898	17.941**	(2&3) and (1&3)
Evaluating	13.98	3.853	14.97	2.762	17.01	4.456	32.730**	(1&2), (2&3) and (1&3)
Total Score	83.51	22.258	88.80	13.741	96.90	16.370	27.552**	(1&2), (2&3) and (1&3)

Note: **p<0.01, * p <0.05, NS – Not Significant

It is evident from the above table that there exists a significant difference among higher secondary teachers with different levels of teaching experience (less than 5 years, 5–10 years, and more than 10 years) in most dimensions of teacher participation in school administration, namely planning, organising, controlling, evaluating, and in the total score. Teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience obtained the highest mean scores, followed by teachers with 5–10 years of experience, and those with less than 5 years of experience, indicating a progressive increase in administrative participation with experience. Post-hoc analysis revealed that significant differences were observed between the groups (less than 5 years vs. 5–10 years), (less than 5 years vs. more than 10 years), and (5–10 years vs. more than 10 years) in the dimensions of planning, organising, controlling, evaluating, and total administrative participation. However, no significant difference was found among the three experience groups in the dimension of communicating, suggesting comparable levels of participation in communication-related administrative activities across experience levels. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, “*There is no significant difference among higher secondary teachers with varying teaching experience in their participation in school administration and its dimensions,*” is partially rejected—rejected for planning, organising, controlling, evaluating, and total score, and accepted for the dimension of communicating.

H08: There is no significant difference among higher secondary teachers whose teaching experiences are less than 5 years, 5 to 10 years and more than 10 years in their teacher productivity and its dimensions.

Table – 8 showing the significant difference among higher secondary teachers whose teaching experiences are less than 5 years, 5 to 10 years and more than 10 years in their teacher productivity and its dimensions

Dimensions of Teacher Productivity	Teaching Experience						'F'-Value	Groups Differ Significantly
	Less than 5 years N=189		5-10 years N=225		More than 10 years N=186			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Academic Preparation	20.29	8.51	24.08	9.200	20.73	8.372	11.866**	(1&2) and (2&3)
Classroom Management	23.31	9.702	26.78	8.988	22.69	9.510	11.590**	(1&2) and (2&3)
Use of Teaching Resources	25.77	10.27	22.99	9.850	23.65	9.551	4.301**	(1&2), (2&3) and (1&3)
Instructional strategies	29.95	13.55	33.28	12.008	29.76	13.870	4.829**	(1&2) and (2&3)
Teacher-Student Relationship	22.83	9.913	26.20	9.881	23.04	10.084	7.572**	(1&2), and (2&3)
Total Score	122.15	28.694	133.33	26.486	119.87	33.654	12.484**	(1&2), and (2&3)

Note: **p<0.01, * p <0.05, NS – Not Significant

It is evident from the above table that there exists a significant difference among higher secondary teachers with varying teaching experience (less than 5 years, 5–10 years, and more than 10 years) in all dimensions of teacher productivity, namely academic preparation, classroom management, use of teaching resources, instructional strategies, teacher–student relationship, and in the total productivity score. The mean scores indicate that teachers with 5–10 years of teaching experience obtained the highest scores in academic preparation, classroom management, instructional strategies, teacher–student relationship, and in the overall teacher productivity, suggesting that mid-career teachers demonstrate greater effectiveness in these dimensions compared to their less experienced and more experienced counterparts. Post-hoc analysis revealed significant differences between teachers with less than 5 years and 5–10 years of experience, as well as between teachers with 5–10 years and more than 10 years of experience across these dimensions. In the dimension of use of teaching resources, teachers with less than 5 years of experience recorded higher mean scores than teachers with 5–10 years and more than 10 years of experience, indicating greater use of instructional resources among relatively less experienced teachers. Overall, the findings suggest that teaching experience significantly influences teacher productivity. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, “*There is no significant difference among higher secondary teachers with different levels of teaching experience in their teacher productivity and its dimensions,*” is rejected.

H09: There is no significant difference among higher secondary teachers who are working in government, government aided and private schools in their participation in school administration and its dimensions.

Table – 9 showing the significant difference among higher secondary teachers who are working in government, government aided and private schools in their participation in school administration and its dimensions

Dimensions of Teacher Participation in School Administration	Type of Management						'F'-Value	Groups Differ Significantly
	Government N=206		Government Aided N=181		Private N=213			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Planning	18.22	5.481	18.34	5.028	20.74	4.760	16.000	(2&3) and (1&3)
Organizing	19.05	5.896	20.12	6.224	19.28	5.421	1.762	None

Communicating	23.51	7.924	22.70	7.839	24.97	7.934	4.205	(2&3)
Controlling	16.57	5.285	18.52	5.427	18.64	5.057	10.023	(1&2) and (1&3)
Evaluating	16.28	5.313	16.22	4.374	15.17	3.515	4.042	(2&3) and (1&3)
Total Score	93.64	20.006	95.91	18.660	98.80	13.689	4.533	(1&3)

Note: **p<0.01, * p <0.05, NS – Not Significant

It is evident from the above table that there exists a significant difference among higher secondary teachers working under different types of management (government, government-aided, and private) in most dimensions of teacher participation in school administration, namely planning, communicating, controlling, evaluating, and in the total score. However, no significant difference was observed among the three management types in the dimension of organising, indicating similar levels of participation in organising activities across schools. The mean scores reveal that private school teachers obtained higher scores in planning and communicating, suggesting greater involvement in planning processes and communication-related administrative functions. Government-aided and private school teachers scored higher than government school teachers in controlling, while government and government-aided school teachers demonstrated higher participation in evaluating activities compared to private school teachers. With regard to the overall teacher participation in school administration, private school teachers recorded the highest mean score, followed by government-aided and government school teachers. Post-hoc analysis indicated significant differences between government-aided and private school teachers, as well as between government and private school teachers in several dimensions and in the total score. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, “There is no significant difference among higher secondary teachers working in government, government-aided, and private schools in their participation in school administration and its dimensions,” is partially rejected—rejected for planning, communicating, controlling, evaluating, and total score, and accepted for the dimension of organising.

H₀10: There is no significant difference among higher secondary teachers who are working in government, government aided and private schools in their teacher productivity and its dimensions.

Table – 10 showing the significant difference among higher secondary teachers who are working in government, government aided and private schools in their teacher productivity and its dimensions.

Dimensions of Teacher Productivity	Type of Management						‘F’-Value	Groups Differ Significantly
	Government N=206 (1)		Government Aided N=181		Private N=213 (3)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Academic Preparation	22.28	9.492	23.18	9.024	23.99	9.208	1.797 ^{NS}	None
Classroom Management	24.82	10.375	27.25	9.649	25.68	9.737	2.943*	(1&2)
Use of Teaching Resources	23.96	10.314	25.24	10.126	26.24	10.484	2.572 ^{NS}	(1&3)
Instructional strategies	32.37	14.688	35.04	14.151	31.67	13.380	3.048*	(2&3)
Teacher-Student Relationship	23.56	10.541	25.66	10.240	27.38	10.686	6.930**	(1&2) and (1&3)
Total Score	126.99	31.274	136.37	28.958	134.96	31.257	5.480**	(1&2) and (1&3)

Note: **p<0.01, * p <0.05, NS – Not Significant

It is evident from the above table that there exists a significant difference among higher secondary teachers working under different types of management (government, government-aided, and private) in selected dimensions of teacher productivity, namely classroom management, instructional strategies, teacher–student

relationship, and in the total productivity score. However, no significant difference was observed among the three types of management in the dimensions of academic preparation and use of teaching resources, indicating similarity across management types in these aspects of productivity. The mean scores reveal that government-aided school teachers obtained higher scores in classroom management and instructional strategies, suggesting greater effectiveness in managing classrooms and employing instructional techniques. Private school teachers recorded higher mean scores in teacher–student relationship, indicating stronger interpersonal engagement with students. Regarding the overall teacher productivity, government-aided school teachers achieved the highest mean score, followed by private and government school teachers. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between government and government-aided teachers, as well as between government and private school teachers in teacher–student relationship and total productivity. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, “*There is no significant difference among higher secondary teachers working in government, government-aided, and private schools in their teacher productivity and its dimensions,*” is partially rejected—rejected for classroom management, instructional strategies, teacher–student relationship, and total score, and accepted for academic preparation and use of teaching resources.

H₀₁₁: There is no significant relationship between teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity among higher secondary teachers.

Table 11 - showing the significant relationship between teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity among higher secondary teachers

Variables and Its Dimensions	Planning	Organising	Communicating	Controlling	Evaluating	Teacher Participation	Academic Preparation	Classroom Management	Use of Teaching Resources	Instructional Strategies	Teacher-Student Relationship	Teacher Productivity
Planning	1	0.321**	0.329**	0.161**	0.255**	0.617**	0.150**	0.012	0.080*	0.010	0.083*	0.098*
Organising	*	1	0.259**	0.302**	0.365**	0.688**	0.073	0.107**	0.116**	0.170**	0.258**	0.233**
Communication	*	*	1	0.162**	0.244**	0.694**	0.096*	0.080	0.079	0.015	0.068*	0.088*
Controlling	*	*	*	1	0.424**	0.589**	0.068	0.096*	0.018	0.057	0.058	0.092*
Evaluating	*	*	*	*	1	0.651**	0.059	0.071	0.055	0.022	0.049	0.077
Teacher Participation	*	*	*	*	*	1	0.137**	0.115**	0.110**	0.072	0.161**	0.182**
Academic Preparation	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	0.278**	0.383**	0.246**	0.277**	0.653**
Classroom Management	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	0.249**	0.246**	0.167**	0.589**
Use of Teaching Resources	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	0.227**	0.248**	0.640**
Instructional strategies	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	0.255**	0.683**
Teacher-Student	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	0.610**
Teacher Productivity	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1

It is evident from the above table that teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity is positively and significantly related among higher secondary school teachers. All the dimensions of teacher participation in school administration—namely planning, organising, communicating, controlling, and evaluating—show significant positive correlations with overall teacher participation in school administration, indicating strong internal consistency among the administrative dimensions. Further, the dimensions of teacher participation in school administration exhibit significant positive correlations with various dimensions of teacher productivity. Overall teacher participation in school administration shows a significant positive relationship with academic preparation, classroom management, use of teaching resources, instructional strategies, teacher–student relationship, and overall teacher productivity. This suggests that higher involvement of teachers in school administrative activities is associated with enhanced instructional effectiveness and professional performance.

Among the productivity dimensions, academic preparation, classroom management, instructional strategies, and teacher–student relationship are strongly and positively interrelated, and each of these dimensions contributes significantly to overall teacher productivity. The correlation between overall teacher participation in school administration and overall teacher productivity is positive and statistically significant, indicating that teachers who

actively participate in planning, organising, decision-making, supervision, and evaluation tend to be more productive in their teaching roles. Hence, the findings clearly indicate that teacher participation in school administration plays a vital role in enhancing teacher productivity, and the formulated null hypothesis, “*There is no significant relationship between teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity among higher secondary school teachers,*” is rejected.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The present study examined teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity among higher secondary school teachers with reference to selected demographic variables such as gender, educational qualification, medium of instruction (Tamil and English), teaching experience, and type of management, and also explored the relationship between teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity. The findings are discussed in relation to earlier research.

The findings revealed significant gender differences in teacher productivity, with female teachers outperforming male teachers across all dimensions, including academic preparation, classroom management, instructional strategies, use of teaching resources, teacher–student relationship, and overall productivity. This finding is consistent with studies by OECD (2019), which reported that female teachers often demonstrate higher instructional organization, student engagement, and relational competence. Similarly, Kim and Cho (2014) found that female teachers exhibit stronger pedagogical commitment and classroom effectiveness. However, this result contradicts the findings of Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain (2005), who reported that teacher effectiveness does not consistently vary by gender, suggesting that institutional and accountability mechanisms may minimize gender-based differences.

With respect to teacher participation in school administration, partial gender differences were observed across dimensions, supporting the work of Somech and Bogler (2002), who noted that gender roles and organizational expectations influence teachers’ administrative involvement. In contrast, Firestone and Martinez (2007) reported minimal gender-based variation in administrative participation in centralized school systems. The study found that teachers with PG and B.Ed. qualifications demonstrated significantly higher levels of participation in school administration and higher teacher productivity than teachers with only PG qualifications. This supports Darling-Hammond (2000), who emphasized that professional teacher education enhances instructional competence, classroom management, and administrative awareness. Likewise, Kumar and Rathee (2018) reported that professionally trained teachers are more actively involved in school planning, decision-making, and evaluation. However, Korthagen (2010) argued that formal qualifications alone may not guarantee effectiveness unless supported by reflective practice and conducive school environments, which partially contradicts the present findings.

Significant differences were observed between Tamil and English medium teachers in both teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity. English medium teachers demonstrated higher participation in administrative dimensions such as planning, organising, controlling, evaluating, and overall administrative participation. This may be attributed to greater exposure to policy documents, administrative communication, and professional development materials, which are often available predominantly in English. These findings are supported by Annamalai (2012), who highlighted the role of English proficiency in professional participation and institutional engagement in Indian educational contexts. In terms of teacher productivity, English medium teachers scored significantly higher in academic preparation, use of teaching resources, and teacher–student relationship, while no significant differences were found in classroom management, instructional strategies, and overall productivity. Similar findings were reported by Vaish (2015), who found that English medium instruction often facilitates access to diverse teaching resources and pedagogical materials. However, Mohanty (2009) emphasized that mother-tongue instruction supports pedagogical effectiveness and learner engagement, contradicting the assumption that English medium teachers are uniformly more effective.

The results indicated significant differences among teachers with varying levels of teaching experience. Teachers with more than 10 years of experience showed higher participation in school administration, while teachers with 5–10 years of experience demonstrated the highest levels of teacher productivity. This finding aligns with Huberman’s (1989) teacher career stage theory, which suggests that experienced teachers increasingly assume administrative roles, while mid-career teachers achieve peak instructional effectiveness. The finding that teachers with less than 5 years of experience were more effective in the use of teaching resources is supported by Prensky (2010), who highlighted younger teachers’ greater familiarity with digital and instructional technologies. However, Day and Gu (2007) reported a gradual increase in teaching effectiveness with experience, partially contradicting the present findings. The study revealed significant differences across government, government-aided, and private schools in both teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity. Government school teachers exhibited stronger collaborative and evaluative participation, while private school teachers demonstrated better communication practices and teacher–student relationships. Government-aided school teachers recorded higher overall teacher productivity.

These findings are consistent with Bush and Glover (2014), who emphasized that organizational culture and management practices significantly shape teacher roles and performance. Similarly, Muralidharan and Sundararaman (2011) reported notable differences in teacher effectiveness across school management types in India. However, Kingdon (2007) found minimal differences when accountability mechanisms were comparable,

offering a contrasting perspective. A significant and positive relationship was found between teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity, indicating that teachers who actively engage in planning, organizing, decision-making, and evaluation tend to demonstrate higher instructional effectiveness. This finding strongly supports Bogler and Somech (2004) and Hoy and Tarter (2010), who reported that participative school climates enhance teacher motivation, professional commitment, and performance. Conversely, Blase and Blase (2000) cautioned that excessive administrative responsibilities may reduce instructional focus if not well managed. Nevertheless, the present study suggests that meaningful and well-supported administrative participation enhances teacher productivity rather than diminishing it. The findings of the present study indicate that teacher participation in school administration and teacher productivity is significantly influenced by demographic variables such as gender, educational qualification, medium of instruction, teaching experience, and type of management. Moreover, the significant positive relationship between administrative participation and productivity highlights the importance of inclusive and participatory school leadership practices. While most findings are consistent with earlier research, some contradictions underscore the role of contextual and institutional factors. The study contributes empirical evidence from the higher secondary school context and emphasizes the need to strengthen participatory administrative structures to enhance teacher productivity.

Educational Implications

The findings of the present study highlight the importance of teacher participation in school administration as a key factor in enhancing teacher productivity at the higher secondary level. School administrators and principals should promote participatory and shared leadership practices by actively involving teachers in planning, organizing, decision-making, supervision, and evaluation processes. Such inclusive administrative practices can foster a sense of ownership, professional commitment, and accountability among teachers, which in turn may lead to improved instructional effectiveness and classroom performance. The study also reveals that demographic variables such as gender, educational qualification, medium of instruction, teaching experience, and type of management influence both teacher participation and productivity. These findings suggest the need for differentiated professional development programmes. Teachers without professional training (PG without B.Ed.) should be provided with pedagogical and administrative skill development opportunities, while Tamil medium teachers may benefit from greater access to instructional resources and administrative communication in both languages. Additionally, mentoring and leadership opportunities should be systematically extended to mid-career and experienced teachers to utilize their administrative strengths while supporting novice teachers in instructional practice. Further, the significant differences observed across types of school management indicate that best practices from government, government-aided, and private schools should be shared across institutions. Policymakers and educational authorities should design frameworks that encourage collaboration, reduce administrative overload, and create supportive work cultures that enhance both teacher participation and productivity. Emphasis should also be placed on strengthening positive school work culture through effective communication, professional autonomy, and recognition of teachers' contributions to school administration.

CONCLUSION

The present study provides empirical evidence that teacher participation in school administration is significantly and positively related to teacher productivity among higher secondary school teachers. The study reveals that teachers who actively engage in administrative roles demonstrate higher levels of academic preparation, classroom management, instructional effectiveness, and positive teacher–student relationships. Variations in participation and productivity across gender, educational qualification, medium of instruction, teaching experience, and type of management underscore the influence of both individual and institutional factors. The findings emphasize the need for participatory school leadership and supportive administrative structures to enhance teacher effectiveness. By fostering inclusive and collaborative school environments, educational institutions can strengthen teacher productivity and ultimately improve the quality of higher secondary education.

REFERENCES

1. Annamalai, E. (2012). *Language policy and language planning in education in India*. New Delhi, India: Orient Blackswan.
2. Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 130–141. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320082>
3. Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(3), 277–289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.02.003>
4. Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership & Management*, 34(5), 553–571. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.928680>
5. Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000>

6. Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2007). Variations in the conditions for teachers' professional learning and development: Sustaining commitment and effectiveness over a career. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(4), 423–443. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980701450746>
7. Firestone, W. A., & Martinez, M. C. (2007). Districts, teacher leaders, and distributed leadership: Changing instructional practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(4), 474–517. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X07307234>
8. Hargreaves, A. (2001). Emotional geographies of teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1056–1080. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0161-4681.00142>
9. Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2010). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(3), 339–356. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231011041044>
10. Huberman, M. (1989). The professional life cycle of teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 91(1), 31–57.
11. Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Who controls teachers' work? Power and accountability in America's schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
12. Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 491–525. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325693>
13. Kelchtermans, G. (2005). Teachers' emotions in educational reforms: Self-understanding, vulnerable commitment, and micropolitical literacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(8), 995–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.06.009>
14. Kim, K., & Cho, Y. (2014). Gender differences in teaching effectiveness. *Educational Psychology*, 34(3), 345–362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2013.785063>
15. Kingdon, G. G. (2007). The progress of school education in India. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 23(2), 168–195. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/grm015>
16. Korthagen, F. A. J. (2010). How teacher education can make a difference. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(4), 407–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2010.513854>
17. Kumar, R., & Rathee, N. (2018). Teacher participation in school management and its impact on school effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(6), 1045–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-04-2017-0095>
18. Marks, H. M., & Louis, K. S. (1999). Teacher empowerment and the capacity for organizational learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(5), 707–750. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X99355003>
19. Mohanty, A. K. (2009). *Multilingual education: A bridge too far?* New Delhi, India: Orient Blackswan.
20. Muralidharan, K., & Sundararaman, V. (2011). Teacher performance pay: Experimental evidence from India. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(1), 39–77. <https://doi.org/10.1086/659655>
21. Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34(2), 145–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143206062496>
22. OECD. (2018). *Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2018 results*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en>
23. OECD. (2019). *TALIS 2018 results (Volume I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.
24. Prensky, M. (2010). *Teaching digital natives: Partnering for real learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
25. Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417–458. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0262.2005.00584.x>
26. Sharma, R., & Joshi, S. (2010). Teacher participation in school administration and school effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Research and Extension*, 47(4), 23–31.
27. Somech, A. (2014). Teacher empowerment and team effectiveness: An organizational perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(5), 685–719. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13514485>
28. Somech, A., & Bogler, R. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of teacher organizational commitment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(4), 555–577. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316102237672>
29. Vaish, V. (2015). Bilingual education and English medium instruction in India. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.988113>