



Global Advanced Research Journal of Educational Research and Review (ISSN: 2315-5132) Vol. 1(8) pp. 172-181, October, 2012  
Available online <http://garj.org/garjerr/index.htm>  
Copyright © 2012 Global Advanced Research Journals

*Full Length Research Paper*

# Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity in Relation to Administrators Occupational Efficacy

**Basu Mudasir**

Research Scholar, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India  
Email: [showkat80ahmad@gmail.com](mailto:showkat80ahmad@gmail.com)

Accepted 24 September, 2012

**This paper explores the Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity of Educational Administrators and its impact on their occupational efficacy. The sample comprised of 250 Educational Administrators (119 Educational Administrators from High School Level and 120 Educational Administrators from Higher Secondary School Level). The data were collected by using Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale, Administrative Behaviour Scale and Job Activity Analysis Scale. Percentage statistics, t-test and Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation was used to analyse the data. The overall results revealed a significant positive relationship between occupational efficacy with administrative behaviour and Job Activity of educational administrators. Also, it was found that Effective Educational Administrators differ significantly from Ineffective Educational Administrators with respect to Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity.**

**Keywords:** Administrative Behaviour, Effective Educational Administrators, Ineffective Educational Administrators, Job Activity, Occupational Efficacy

## INTRODUCTION

Administration in education is needed for the accomplishment of set educational objectives with the minimum resource utilization, putting in least human efforts and giving a psychological satisfaction to all the concerned persons. Similarly, administrators are of vital importance to the success of every dynamic organization. Other things such as capital, materials and technical know-how are no doubt important, but without administrator an organization is but a muddle of men and machines; and without effective administrators no organization can successfully compete and survive. A competent administrator has the ability to persuade others to accomplish the goals of the organization. Today, educational administrators have multifaceted roles to play. They are expected to uphold the highest standards in professional commitment, communication skills, interpersonal skills, classroom personality, emotional maturity and academic integrity. Administrator's occupational efficacy relates to the

maximization of return to the organization by all means. An administrator's efficacy can be understood in terms of his capacity to adapt, maintain itself and grow regardless of the particular functions it fulfils. Thus, administrator's effectiveness lies in the fact how much he understands the process and copes with the changes. An analysis of the many treatises regarding administrative behaviour, functions or processes has revealed much similarity. The terms and relative emphasis may differ, but there is a general agreement about the functions that are central to the role. These include making decisions, organizing, providing leadership, communication, dealing with conflict, managing change, relating to the environment of the organization, securing compliance and planning and controlling. Educational administrators carry out all these functions within a given educational organization. In reality, all educational administrators have highly rewarding and challenging jobs. They are not simply disciplinarians but are the leaders of entire communities

of learners. Job activities that an administrator is called upon to perform are important for effective functioning of an institution. It means the activities which are executed by an administrator by involving many persons for successful administration of the institution; the time he spent on these activities, resources consumed by him and the operational data that best reflect the performance of activities. In short, it means what the administrators do and need to be able to do. Good management demands that an administrator has a clear understanding of the duties and responsibilities to be performed on a job. He is 'the most visible', 'the most vulnerable', and 'potentially the most influential member' of an educational organization who is responsible for directing a variety of activities besides being in-charge of coordinating his group members. For being called as an effective educational administrator, he must have the cognizance of various activities, which he/she is supposed to perform in an institution. Thus, administrators in education are needed for the accomplishment of set educational objectives within the available resources; who put in least human efforts and give a psychological satisfaction to all the concerned persons. How far an administrator is able to do all this determines his/her effectiveness. Hence the quality and standard aspect of education requires effective educational administrators more than anything else. The studies reviewed, however, showed that great deals of researches on Efficacy and its impact on learning goal motivation, student's enrolment, student's achievement and such other variables have been conducted. These studies have suggested that efficacy augments educational administrators in producing greater amount of performance and outcomes. Some of the studies have explained that Administrative Behaviour influences the achievement of students and teachers work and that activity of principals influences school improvement and the community relations. However, there has been no study examining the effect of Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity on the Occupational Efficacy of educational administrators. Also a very critical area here has been left out focusing on the counselling and training of the educational administrators to help them to become effective, and to change their lifestyles if they are not conducive to the functioning of the institution. The present study, however, shall look into the Occupational Efficacy, Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity of educational administrators with the object to find out their efficacy in transacting their administrative job at Secondary level of education.

### Objectives of the Study

The following objectives were formulated for the present investigation:

To describe the sample of Educational Administrators with regard to Occupational Efficacy, Administrative

Behaviour and Job Activity.

To undertake correlational analysis between Occupational Efficacy, Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity of Educational Administrators.

To identify Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators at Secondary Level.

To study and compare the Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators at secondary level.

To undertake correlational analysis between Occupational Efficacy, Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators.

The study empirically tested the following hypotheses:

Occupational Efficacy is significantly related with Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity of Educational Administrators.

Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly on Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity.

### METHODOLOGY

The ten districts of Kashmir Province were involved in the collection of data. From the total population of 841 educational administrators, 250 educational administrators served as the sample for the present which were identified on the basis of random sampling technique. Among 250 educational administrators, 119 educational administrators (Headmasters and ZEOs) were taken from High School Level, 120 educational administrators (Principals) were taken from Higher Secondary School Level and 11 educational administrators (CEOs and Director) were taken from both High and Higher Secondary School Level.

### Tools Employed

The research instruments consisted of:

a) Adopted Questionnaires which includes: Occupational Self Efficacy Scale- prepared by Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari and Upinder Dhar (1999) and Administrative Behaviour Scale-ABS prepared by Haseen Taj (1998)

b) A Self constructed questionnaire-Job Activity Analysis Scale (2010).

### Statistical Treatment

The data collected was subjected to the following statistical treatment:

Percentage statistics, t-test, Karl Pearson's coefficient of correlation

The breakup of the sample of Educational Administrators

High School Level					Hr. Sec. School Level			From Both Levels						
Headmaster		ZEO			Principal			CEO			Director			
Male	Female	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
30	30	30	29	119	60	60	120	10	x	10	x	01	11	
<b>Grand Total = 250</b>														

**Table 1.1** Showing Overall Percentage of Educational Administrators on Occupational Self Efficacy Scale at Secondary Level of Education (N=250)

Range of scores obtained on OSES	Classification	N	Percentage
83 & Above	Above Average	37	14.8%
65-82	Average	171	68.4%
64 & Below	Below Average	42	16.8%

**Table 1.2** Showing Overall Percentage of Educational Administrators on Administrative Behaviour Scale at Secondary level of Education (N=250)

Range of scores obtained on ABS	Classification	N	Percentage
274-304	Extremely Effective	46	18.4%
243-273	Highly Effective	15	6%
212-242	Effective	48	19.2%
181-211	Less Effective	98	39.2%
150-180	Ineffective	43	17.2%

## ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis and discussion of the results has been carried out along the following lines:

### Descriptive Analysis of Educational Administrators

This part of analysis gives an account of the classification and description of the overall sample of educational administrators (250) at Secondary Level of Education on the dimensions of Occupational Efficacy, Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity.

#### Occupational Efficacy

Table 1.1 revealed that out of 250 educational administrators, 14.8% of the educational administrators fall in above average category. This implies that these educational administrators always set targets higher than those set by their organizations. They possess greater ability for doing their work independently and show immense capability to work effectively even under the pressure of deadline. It has also been found that a

predominant majority of educational administrators i.e. 68.4% fall in the average category. This indicates that these educational administrators exhibit moderate level of confidence in their institutional tasks and show reasonable adjustability to different challenges that come in their work. When they fail in a task, they often re-evaluate their strategies. The data further revealed that 16.8% of educational administrators fall in below average category. This indicates that these educational administrators lack confidence to work independently and so can't make an impact on others. They are easily moved over unforeseen consequences and display their worries when facing a challenging situation.

#### Administrative Behaviour

The analysis of the above table reveals that out of 250 educational administrators, 18.4% of educational administrators possess extremely effective Administrative Behaviour. This implies that these administrators always plan and evenly distribute the work to be carried out by each member of their group. They organise their institutional work effectively keeping in view the work requirements and the accommodation available. It has

**Table 1.3** Showing overall Percentage of Educational Administrators on Job Activity Analysis Scale at Secondary Level of Education (N=250)

Range of scores obtained on JAAS	Classification	N	Percentage
56-68	Above Average	60	24%
43-55	Average	138	55.2%
30-42	Below Average	52	20.8%

also been found that only 6% of educational administrators possess highly effective Administrative Behaviour. This exhibited that these educational administrators frequently fix up the targets of achievement of all institutional activities in the beginning of the academic year. They often call staff meetings to make their ideas known to the group. The data further revealed that 19.2% of educational administrators possess effective Administrative Behaviour. This indicates that these educational administrators sometimes plan their activities in such a way that every activity has a time frame and those have been finalised by consulting the group members. They sometimes keep themselves available for who-so-ever needs their assistance. It has also been found that majority of educational administrators i.e. 39.2% fall in the less effective category. This exhibited that these educational administrators always plan their tasks in a haphazard manner and display authoritarian attitude while distributing the work among the staff members. The data again revealed that 17.2% of educational administrators possess ineffective Administrative Behaviour. This implies that these educational administrators never fix up their institutional goals in the beginning of the year. They distribute the work allotment in such a manner which for no reason suits to the interest and capability of their group members. They are slower in making decisions and never consult their group members in this process.

### Job Activity Analysis

Table 1.3 depicts that out of 250 educational administrators, 55.2 % fall in Average category. This indicates that these educational administrators provide modest opportunities to their group members to express their views and are occasionally available to those who need their assistance. They show less strict attitude in monitoring the punctuality of students and staff .They supervise the institutional task either by themselves or by delegating it to some responsible group members. The data again revealed that 24% of the educational administrators possess above average job cognizance. This indicates that for the effective functioning of the institution, these educational administrators provide minimum essential facilities in their institution for its smooth functioning. Each division of work is allotted a

fixed time in the time table. Funds generated by school activities and services are utilized on the tasks meant for it. They gave adequate attention to quick frequency of meets in their institution. For the professional growth and development, these educational administrators attend various training programmes and allow their staff to attend the same. They discuss the inputs recorded with their group members and its follow up is taken as an academic reformatory exercise which is continued till results are not achieved. This highlights that a maximum number of educational administrators generally take up job activities which they are supposed to do. It has also been found that 20.8% of educational administrators fall in below average category. This indicates that these educational administrators fail to provide minimum facilities for the smooth functioning of their institution. They show least interest in changing the old and out mooted material with the latest equipment and technology. They show more interest towards curricular activities than the co-curricular activities and don't allow the students to participate in the same. They fail to provide any sort of assistance to their staff and students for carrying out the process of teaching and learning. Little time is spent by them on attending training programmes and conferences and also they didn't allow their staff to attend the same claiming it creates unnecessary disturbances in the institution. They always complain of fatigue and hand over all their responsibilities of monitoring the quality of institutional work to their subordinates.

### Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators

To find out the correlational analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation ( $r$ ) has been used.

Table 1.3 depicts that there is a significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.507 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that Occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators is moderately influenced by their Administrative

**Table 1.4** Correlation between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators-(N=250)

Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour	$r = 0.507$	Sig. at 0.01 level
--	-------------	--------------------

**Table 1.5** Correlation between Occupational Efficacy and Job Activity of Educational Administrators (N=250)

Occupational Efficacy and Job Activity	$r = 0.401$	Sig. at 0.01 level
--	-------------	--------------------

Behaviour. It can again be inferred from the same table that these educational administrators plan and distribute the work for each member of their group for the academic year. They adjust themselves with almost all challenging situations and shows positive attitude in resolving conflicts at their work place. They often maintain a communication link with their group and often take the decisions relating to institutional matter together with their group members. For the improvement of their profession and professional growth of their staff, different training programmes are attended and organised by them from time to time.

Table 1.3 depicts a significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Job Activity of Educational Administrators as being 0.401. This suggested that Occupational Efficacy of educational administrators is more or less influenced by their cognizance of Job Activity and indicates that these administrators often provide minimum essential facilities for the functioning of their institution. Some time is allotted by them to each division of institutional task ensuring its completion on said time. For the functioning of their institution, occasionally meetings are organised by them in which a freedom of 'Say' is provided to some of their group members. These administrators often try to maintain a balance between their administrative task and teaching classes and provide help to their staff ensuring good running of both academic and non-academic aspects of the institution. As they believe in continuous improvement of their profession, they sometimes attend different training programmes and occasionally allow their staff members to attend the same in order to remain cognizant about the educational updates. They sometimes supervise the institutional task either by themselves or delegate this responsibility to their subordinates and rarely discuss the institutional matter with their group. In view of the above empirical evidence, the hypothesis number one which reads as, "Occupational Efficacy is significantly related with Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity of Educational Administrators" stands accepted.

**Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Administrative Behaviour**

In order to realize the third major objective of the study, as a first step effective and ineffective educational administrators were identified with the help of Occupational Self Efficacy Scale. The high and low groups were drawn by employing extreme group technique of 27% above and below. As such the above. 67 educational administrators possessing high score were identified as Effective Educational Administrators and. 67 educational administrators possessing low score were identified as Ineffective Educational Administrators. This was followed by the comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Administrative Behaviour and Job Activity.

**Planning**

Table 1.4, row (i) shows a significant mean difference between Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Planning area of ABS. The obtained 't' value came out to be 2.78 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA in comparison to IEA which highlights that EEA plan and distributes the work to be carried out by each member of their group before the commencement of the academic year. Different meetings and training programmes to be conducted by the institution are also planned in advance. On the other hand IEA plan their tasks in a haphazard manner with the result every activity seems as a misfit in the total time frame. Also, they don't feel it necessary to consult their staff members while planning the institutional tasks.

**Organisation**

A look on the above table, row (ii) exhibits that there is a significant mean difference between the Effective and

**Table 1.6** Showing Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on four areas and total score of Administrative Behaviour Scale (N=67 each)

AREAS	GROUP	MEAN	SD	t-VALUE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Planning	EEA	48.35	10.88	2.78	0.01 level
	IEA	43.56	8.97		
Organisation	EEA	54.01	16.68	4.09	0.01 level
	IEA	43.58	12.65		
Communication	EEA	63.80	16.75	4.84	0.01 level
	IEA	52.02	10.84		
Decision Making	EEA	46.56	2.43	7.73	0.01 Level
	IEA	40.53	5.98		
Total Score	EEA	212.74	42.65	4.87	0.01 level
	IEA	179.71	35.58		

EEA- Effective Educational Administrators  
IEA- Ineffective Educational Administrators

Ineffective Educational Administrators on Organisation area of ABS. The obtained 't' value came out to be 4.09 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA in comparison to IEA which highlights that EEA ensure proper organisation of institutional tasks. They supervise the work of their group members as per the time and schedule. On the other hand IEA fail to organise various activities because of the lack of material and accommodation. They fail to fix up the responsibility of each group member and don't consider it necessary to supervise their work. This finding is supported by the study of Attri Kanchan-(2001) who has found that administrative personality of principals had an impact on teachers that stimulated teachers to work sincerely for the benefit of the school. Similarly, Borowiec-Koczera-(2001) found significant positive impact of administrators' participation in professional development activities on school climate.

### Communication

It is also evident from the row (iii) of the table that there is a significant mean difference between the Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Communication area of ABS. The obtained 't' value came out to be 4.84 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA in comparison to IEA which highlights that EEA believe in direct and clear-cut sort of communication and always maintain a healthy communication link with their group members. The finding is in line with that of Mensik-(2006) who found that effective principals were visionary; they set a positive climate by communicating well with others. On the other

hand IEA maintain a visible communication gap with their group members who don't have a say in the institutional matters. They discourage their colleagues to communicate with them and so fail to receive any communication on relevant matter. The finding is in agreement with that of Patil, Basanagouda-(1994) who indicated that most of the secondary school heads were neglecting their responsibilities and their lines of communication were almost closed. It was further found that their behaviour was not conducive to high teacher morale and organizational climate of the school.

### Decision Making

Row (iv) of the same table shows that there is a significant mean difference between the Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Decision Making area of ABS. The obtained 't' value came out to be 7.73 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA in comparison to IEA which highlights that EEA analyse the situation thoroughly before taking any decision. They show flexibility in their decision making process and make appropriate decisions on right time together with the group members. On the other hand IEA never analyse the situation before taking any decision. They are slower in their decision making process and consider it least important to take the opinion of their group members in this process. The finding is in line with Cobb-(1996) who found that principal's perception of teacher's involvement in decision making at local school level was higher than teacher's perception of their involvement.

**Table 1.7** Showing Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on five areas and total score of Job Activity Analysis Scale (N=67 each)

AREAS	GROUP	MEAN	SD	t-VALUE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Managing Institutional Support Service	EEA	14.67	2.78	3.98	0.01 level
	IEA	12.64	3.20		
Managing the Instructional Programme	EEA	15.56	2.37	3.25	0.01 level
	IEA	14.00	3.20		
Managing the Community Relations	EEA	5.32	0.92	2.23	0.05 level
	IEA	4.94	1.09		
Professional and Personal Development	EEA	4.77	1.13	3.31	0.01 level
	IEA	4.04	1.42		
Supervision and Appraisal	EEA	11.86	2.00	2.80	0.01 level
	IEA	10.85	2.21		
Total Score	EEA	52.20	0.92	5.07	0.01 level
	IEA	46.42	9.21		

### Total Score

A perusal of the above table, last row shows the significance of difference between the mean scores of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on overall dimensions of Administrative Behaviour Scale. The results reveal that there is a significant mean difference between Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on the said dimensions of Administrative Behaviour Scale. The obtained 't' value came out to be 4.87 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This implies that effective and ineffective educational administrators differ significantly with respect to their administrative behaviour.

### Managing Institutional Support Service

Table 1.7, row (i) makes it clear that the two groups of Educational Administrators differ significantly on the Managing Institutional Support Service dimension of Job Activity Analysis Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 3.98 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA than IEA which implies that for the effective functioning of the institution, EEA provide minimum essential facilities in their institution for its smooth functioning. Each division of work is allotted a fixed time in the time table. Funds generated by school activities and services are utilized on the tasks meant for it. On the other hand IEA show least interest in changing the old and out mooted material with the latest equipment. Even they fail to prepare a list for purchase requisitions when the need for any material arises.

### Managing the Instructional Programme

From the above table, row (ii) it may be inferred that the two groups of Educational Administrators differ significantly on Managing the Instructional Programme dimension of Job Activity Analysis Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 3.25 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA than IEA which implies that these educational administrators maintain a perfect balance between their administrative work and teaching classes. Besides curricular activities various co-curricular activities are also organised by them for the growth of the students. They provide enough opportunities to their staff and students to express their views. These findings are supported by the study of Richard-(2008) who found principals in higher poverty level schools spending greater amount of time on tasks. Similarly, Sudsberry-(2008) found principals of high performing schools, high needs schools are active in the role of leading school improvement; work within an environment of shared leadership and are attuned to the wants and needs of the staff. On the other hand IEA believe that task of teaching and administration is very hectic and also they fail to provide any sort of assistance to their staff for carrying out the process of teaching.

### Managing the Community Relations

It is evident from the above table, row (iii) that Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ from each other on Managing the Community Relations dimension of Job Activity Analysis Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 2.23 which is significant at 0.05

level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA IEA which implies that EEA gave adequate attention to quick frequency of meets in their institution. They prepare a formal agenda before conducting any meeting and provide a freedom of 'say' to every employee in the decisions relating to the institutional matters. On the other hand, IEA call a meeting any time without preparing an agenda or informing their staff in advance. In addition, every employee doesn't have a say in the decisions relating to the institutional matter. These educational administrators keep themselves busy in needless tasks and remain unavailable to others who need their support.

### **Professional and Personnel Development**

Table 1.7 row (iv) also reveals that Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ on Professional and Personnel Development dimension of Job Activity Analysis Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 3.31 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA than IEA which implies that for the professional growth and development, EEA attend various training programmes and allow their staff to attend the same. The finding is in tune with that of Morris, Porter-Gehrie and Hurwitz-(1984) who found that principals usually spend less than half their working day in their offices, they have a good deal of discretion in their decision making and their behaviour affects four distinct constituents-teachers and students, parents and others in the community, superiors and the principal himself or herself. On the other hand, little time is spent by IEA on attending training programmes and conferences and also they didn't allow their staff to attend the same claiming it creates unnecessary disturbances in the institution and is mere a wastage of time. The finding is in tune with that of Usmani Shaheen-(1988) who found that professional attainment had no effect on principal effectiveness. Similarly Meyers-(2008) found principals that did not attend the workshops and smaller faculties had a greater measure of success in two of the dimensions of professional learning community.

### **Supervision and Appraisal**

Row (v) of the same table indicates that Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly from each other on Supervision and Appraisal dimension of Job Activity Analysis Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 2.80 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA than IEA which depicts that these educational administrators supervise the institutional task directly instead of delegating the responsibility to subordinates and then discuss the inputs recorded in the inspection diary with their group members. Follow up of the records is taken by

them as an academic reformatory exercise and are continued till results are not achieved. IEA always complain of fatigue and hand over all their responsibilities of monitoring the quality of institutional work to their subordinates. They show leniency towards the employees and students who remain absent from the institution.

### **Total Score**

Lastly row (vi) of the above table indicates that Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly from each other on overall dimensions of Job Activity Analysis Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 5.07 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA which indicates that EEA exhibit better cognizance of activity on overall dimensions of Job Activity Analysis Scale than IEA. The findings are in tune with that of Bredeson and Johansson-(2000) who reported that school principals exercise significant influence on teacher professional development. The four areas where principals have the opportunity to have a substantial impact on teacher learning include: the principal as an instructional leader, the creation of a learning environment, direct involvement in the design delivery and content of professional development and the assessment of professional development outcomes. Further Szabocsik-(2008) found that administrators who have a deep understanding of reading can better recognize and support excellent literacy teaching as well as identify and correct instructional practices. Similarly, Borowiec-Koczera, Ann-(2001) found that school administrators participation in professional development activities hold a positive impact on school climate. In view of the above empirical evidence, the hypothesis number two which reads as, "Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly on Administrative Behaviour and Cognizance of Job Activity" stands accepted.

### **Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators**

Table 1.8 indicates that there is significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Administrative Behaviour of Effective Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.641 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that more the Occupational Efficacy; higher shall be the rating of Administrative Behaviour of EEA. The same row of the table again revealed that there is low correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Administrative Behaviour of Ineffective Educational

**Table 1.8** Showing the correlation between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators (N=67each)

Variable	Groups	Value of 'r'	Level of Significance
Administrative Behaviour	EEA	0.641	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.018	Not Significant
Job Activity	EEA	0.652	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.102	Not Significant

Administrators. The coefficient of correlation came out to be 0.018 which has failed to arrive at any level of significance. This implies that Occupational Efficacy negligibly influences the Administrative Behaviour of Ineffective Educational Administrators.

The above table also indicates that there is significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Job Activity of Effective Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.652 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that more the Occupational Efficacy; higher shall be the rating of Effective Educational Administrators' cognizance of Job Activity. The same row of the table again revealed that there is low correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Job Activity of Ineffective Educational Administrators. The coefficient of correlation came out to be 0.102 which has failed to arrive at any level of significance. This implies that Occupational Efficacy negligibly fosters Ineffective Educational Administrators' cognizance of Job Activity.

## CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

On the basis of the findings of the present study, effective educational administrators have emerged as those who possess greater ability for doing their work independently and show immense capability to work effectively even under the pressure of deadline. They ensure proper planning and organization of their institutional matters and quickly adjust to different challenges that came in their task. They abide by the rules of their institution and make their ideas known to the group. On the other hand ineffective educational administrators lack confidence to work independently and so can't make an impact on others. They maintain a visible communication gap with their group members and take all decisions themselves which are hardly directed towards the fulfilment of institutional goals.

This study has meaningful implications for school educational administrators, Ministries of Education etc, in the sense that, it will provide useful hints on the evaluation, promotion and appointment of educational administrators. This study also helps in understanding the dynamics of superior subordinate relationship in their educational context that has been increasingly recognized as a means to enhance efficiency of educational administrators.

## REFERENCES

- Attri Kanchan (2001). Administrative Background of the School Principals on School Climate, *J. Edu.* 40(1): 49-52.
- Baron Robert A (1983). *Behaviour In Organizations: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work*, London: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Bernard Bass M (1960). *Leadership Psychology and Organisational Behaviour*, New York: Harper and Row
- Best, John, W. & Kahn, James V. (2003). *Research in Education*, New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd.
- Bhat KS and Shankar Ravi R (1985). *Administration of Education*, New Delhi: Seema Publications.
- Bhattacharya S (1983). *Management Effectiveness*, New Delhi: Oxford & I.B.H. Publications.
- Borowiec-Koczera Ann (2001). *Professional Development for School Administrators: Effects on school climate*, Dissertation Abstract International. 68(6): 2253-A.
- Chakraborty SK. (1987). *Managerial Effectiveness and Quality of Work Life*, New Delhi: McGraw Hill Publishing Company.
- Cobb Claxton R (1996). *Shared Decision Making in the Schools of the South Carolina Department of Corrections*, Unpublished PhD. Thesis, University of South Carolina.
- Cohen L and Manion L (1985). *Research Methods in Education*, London: Croom Helm Publishers.
- Donald McBurney H (2003). *Research Methods*, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, USA: Wads Worth/ Thomson, Learning Belmont.
- Garrett HE (2007). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 12<sup>th</sup> Edition, Paragon International Publishers.
- Goel SL and Goel Aruna (1994). *Educational Policy and Administration*, Deep and Deep Publications
- Good CV (1963). *Introduction to Educational Research*, New York: Appleton Century- Crofts.
- Gorton RA (1983). *School Administration & Supervision: Leadership Challenges and Opportunities*, Dubuque, IA: W.M. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Guilford JP (1956). *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
- Hansom E.M (1999). *Educational Administration and Organizational Behaviour*, Bost: Allyn and Bacon Publications.
- Kerlinger Fred N (2007). *Foundations of Behavioural Research*, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Khan MS (1980). *Educational Administrators*, New Delhi: Ashish Publishing House.
- Khanna SD, Saxena VK, Lamba TP and Murthy V (2000). *Educational Administration Planning, Supervision and Financing*, Delhi: Doeba Publications.
- Kimbrough Ralph B and Michael Nunnery Y (1988). *Educational Administration- An Introduction*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Koul Lokesh (1996). *Methodology of Educational Research*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Private Limited.
- Kujar AS (2008). *A Study of Administrative Effectiveness and Academic Performance of the Students of Senior Secondary Schools in Ranchi*, Unpublished M. A. Dissertation, JMI, New Delhi.
- Mangal SK. (2002). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
- Mensik John (2006). *The Framework of an Effective Principal: A Community's Perspective*, Dissertation Abstract International, 68(12): 4935-A.

- Mishra BK and Mohanty RK (2003). Trends and Issues in Indian Education, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Surya Publications.
- Mweemba Akalpelwa Namwakili (2007). Perceived Effectiveness and Pre and Post Service Training Among High School Principals in Manitoba, Eurasian J. Edu. Res. 19(3): 121.
- Pandya SR (2001). Administration and Management of Education, 1<sup>st</sup> Edition, Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
- Patil Chanappagoda B (1994). A Study of Administrative Behaviour of Headmasters of Secondary Schools in Karnataka, Unpublished PhD. Thesis (Education), Karnataka University.
- Pethe S, Chaudhari S and Dhar U (2005). Manual for Occupational Self Efficacy Scale (OSES), Agra: National Psychological Corporation.
- Prasad LM (1996). Organizational Behaviour, New Delhi: Sultan Chand and Sons.
- Rasool G and Minakshi Chopra (1990). Introduction to Educational Administration and Supervision, Jalandhar: Narendara Publishing House. PP.36.
- Ravi (2003). A Study of the Factors Contribution to the Efficiency of the Heads of the Institution in Private Schools in Relation to their Efficiency as Administrators and as Teachers, Indian Educational Abstract, 6(02).
- Robore RW (1985). Educational Administration- A Management Approach, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, INC.
- Redden CW (1987). Managerial Effectiveness, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
- Robbins Stephen P (2003). Organisational Behaviour, Singapore: Pearson Education.
- Robore RW (1985). Educational Administration: A Management Approach, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Runhaar Piety (provide the names of the other authors) (2010). Stimulating Teacher's Reflection and Feedback Asking: An Interplay of Self Efficacy, Journal of Research and Studies, 26(05): 1154-1161.
- Ryburn MW (1953). The Organization of Schools, Oxford University Press.
- Schofield, Ken (2008). A Case Study of an Effective Elementary Principal, Dissertation Abstract International.69, (03): 840-A.
- Taj Haseen (1992). Social-Psychological and Situational Correlates of the Administrative Behaviour of Secondary School Heads, Ph.D. Education, Bangalore University, In M.B. Buch (Ed.), Fifth Survey of Educational Research, II :1825.
- Thakar AS, Mussazi JCS and Aminu PM (1980). Educational Administration, New Delhi: National Publishing House.
- Thomas. Crowl K (1993). Fundamentals of Educational Research, W.C. Brown Communication, Inc.
- Usmani Shaheen (1988). A Study of Principal Effectiveness in Relation to Professional Attainment, Socio-Economic Background, Values of Life and Attitude Towards Teaching, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Education), Aligarh Muslim University.
- Vashist SR (1994). Encyclopaedia of Educational Administration- Educational Administration in India, New Delhi: Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd.