

Occupational Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators in Higher Education

Shabir Ahmad Bhat, Javeed Ahmad Puju

Ph.D Scholars, Department of Education, University of Kashmir

Corresponding author: umerhassan11@gmail.com

Abstract: The research was conducted to study the occupational efficacy and job satisfaction of educational administrators in higher education. The investigators used Occupational Self Efficacy Scale (OSES) of Sanjaypot Pethe, Sushma Chowdari and Uppinar Dhar and Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) of Amar Singh and T.R. Sharma to collect the data. Certain Statistical techniques like percentage, t-test and correlation were used to analyze the data. The results confirm that effective and ineffective educational administrators differ significantly on Job Satisfaction. The effective educational administrators were found to be more satisfied with their job than ineffective educational administrators in higher education.

[Shabir Ahmad Bhat, Javeed Ahmad Puju. **Occupational Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators in Higher Education.** Researcher. 2012;4(2):36-41]. (ISSN: 1553-9865). <http://www.sciencepub.net>. 8

Keywords: Occupational Efficacy, Job Satisfaction, Effective, Ineffective, Educational Administrators, Higher Education

Introduction

Smooth operation of an educational institution requires competent educational administrators. They provide instructional leadership as well as manage day-to-day activities in Schools, Colleges and Universities. They also direct the educational programs and community service organizations. Educational administrators set educational standards and goals and establish the policies and procedures to carry them out. They also supervise and support staff, teachers, librarians, coaches, and others. They develop academic programs, monitor students, educational progress, motivate teachers and other staff, manage guidance and other student services, administer record keeping, prepare budgets, handle relations with parents, prospective and current students, and the community, and perform many other duties. Educational administrators may handle all these functions if they are well-trained and equipped with new knowledge and skills.

The Head of the institution occupies a very important position. The fate of an institution in a large measure depends upon the type of man who is heading the institution. Good institutions, for that matter are named after their Headmasters or Principals. The Head of the institution is the key educational leader and the chief executive officer of a complex and heterogeneous community comprising of eminent, devoted and dedicated professors and lecturers, students, their parents, governing bodies, Education Departments and University (Gupta, 1987). Effective leaders all share the same characteristics. Besides a drive to get the job done and accomplish the mission, the essence of

effective leaders is how they think of and treat the people they are responsible for? Leaders do not belittle people or make them feel that they have nothing to contribute. Leaders don't hide in their offices to ignore problems. Leaders have to be visible; they have to convey a sense of oneness.

Job Satisfaction is broadly defined as an individual's general attitude towards his or her job. Since Hoppock's monograph on job satisfaction in (1935), a substantial amount of research has been conducted on this topic. Hawthorne and Harwood's studies highlighted the importance of working conditions on one hand and social environment on the other, which effect human performance. The former led to the studies emphasizing the importance of motivational factors within the individual workers and the latter to the study of organizational and environmental climate of work situation. Job satisfaction is a positive emotional state that occurs when a person's job seems to fulfill important job values provided these values are compatible with one's needs. It is an individual's emotional reaction to the job itself. It is a person's attitude towards the job. People spend a sizeable amount of their time in work environment. Job satisfaction is related to but distinguishable from morale and job involvement. Since job is not an entity or physical thing but a complex of inter-relationships of likes, roles, responsibilities, interactions, incentives and rewards, job satisfaction has to be intimately related to all of them.

OBJECTIVES

The following objectives were formulated for the present study:

1. To study the occupational efficacy of Educational Administrators in Higher Education.
2. To study the Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators in Higher Education.
3. To study the relationship of Occupational Efficacy with Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators.
4. To compare effective and ineffective Educational Administrators on Job Satisfaction.

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The present study was designed to study the occupational efficacy and job satisfaction of educational administrators in higher education. As such, the descriptive method of research was employed to carry out this piece of research.

Sample

The sample for the study consisted of 120 Educational Administrators and 240 Teachers selected from University of Kashmir, Sheri- Kashmir University of Agricultural Science and Technology (SKUAST-K), Govt. Degree Colleges and Non-Government Affiliated B.Ed Colleges operating in Kashmir. The sample of educational administrators

Analysis of the Data.

The data have been analyzed and interpreted in the following tables (Tables 1.0-1.8):

Table 1.0 *Showing the levels of Occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators in Higher Education (N=120)*

Scores Obtained on OSE Scale	N	Percentage	Remarks
83 and above	41	34.16	Above Average
65-82	59	49.16	Average
Below 64	20	16.66	Below Average

A perusal of the above table shows the levels of occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators in Higher Education. The data reveals that 34.16% of the educational administrators in higher education fall in the above average category of occupational efficacy, 49.16 % of the educational administrators fall in the average category. The data further reveals that 16.66% of the educational administrators in higher education fall in the below average category so far as their occupational efficacy is concerned.

Table 1.1: *Showing the levels of job satisfaction of Educational Administrators in Higher Education (N=120)*

Scores Obtained on JS Scale	N	Percentage	Remarks
74- above	44	36.66%	Extremely Satisfied
63-73	17	14.16%	Very Satisfied
56-62	38	31.66%	Moderately Satisfied
48-55	14	11.66%	Not Satisfied
47-beow	7	5.83%	Extremely Dissatisfied

A perusal of above table shows the levels of Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators in Higher Education. The statistical data reveals that 36.66% of educational administrators were found extremely satisfied with the job, 14.16% were found very satisfied with the job. 31.66% of the educational administrators were found

was taken from 36 and 20 Departments of University of Kashmir and SKUAST-K respectively. All the Principals of Colleges in Government Sector were included in the study. However, the sample of principals from Non-Government Affiliated Colleges was drawn on the bases of systematic sampling technique.

Tools

The following tools were selected to collect the data:

1. Occupational Self Efficacy Scale developed by Sanjaypot Pethe, Sushma Chowdari and Uppinar Dhar. (2000) (OSES) was selected to measure Occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators.
2. Job Satisfaction Scale developed by Amar Singh and T.R Sharma (1999) (JSS) was selected to measure Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The data collected was subjected to the following statistical treatment.

- I. Percentage statistics, t-test and Coefficient of correlation.

moderately satisfied with the job. It was further observed that 11.66% of the educational administrators were found dissatisfied with the job and 5.83% of educational administrators in higher education were found extremely dissatisfied with the job.

Table 1.2: correlation between Occupational Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators (N=120)

Occupational Efficacy & Job Satisfaction	r=0.52	Significant at .01 Level
--	--------	--------------------------

The above table depicts that there is Positive relationship between Occupational Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators having co-efficient of correlation $r=0.52$ ($p>.01$). The above table reveals that Occupational Efficacy is positively related to the Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators. This suggests that higher the Occupational Efficacy, higher will be the Job Satisfaction.

COMPARISON OF EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS ON JOB SATISFACTION

In order to realize the objective of comparison between effective and ineffective educational administrators as first step, effective and ineffective educational administrators were identified on the basis of criterion of occupational efficacy measured 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 27% i.e., 32 educational administrators possessing high score were identified as effective educational administrators and 27% i.e. 32 educational administrators possessing low score were identified as ineffective educational administrators. This was followed by the comparison of effective and ineffective educational administrators on job satisfaction.

Table 1.3: Showing the Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Job Concrete Factor Dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale (N=68)

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Significance
Effective Educational Administrators (EEA)	34	18.77	4.33	3.50	0.01 level
Ineffective Educational Administrators (IEA)	34	14.92	4.76		

A perusal of the above table shows that there is a significant mean difference between effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Job Concrete Factor dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale, as reflected by 't'-value (3.50) which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Since the mean difference favours effective educational administrators which reveals that effective educational administrators were found better satisfied with their job on 'job concrete factor' dimension than the Ineffective educational administrators.

Table 1.4: Showing the Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Job Abstract Factor dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale (N=68)

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Significance
Effective Educational Administrators (EEA)	34	19.08	4.83	2.96	0.01 level
Ineffective Educational Administrators (IEA)	34	15.82	4.30		

The above table shows that there is a significant mean difference between effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on 'Job Abstract Factor' dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale, as reflected by 't'-value (2.96) which is greater than tabulated 't' value at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours effective educational administrator, which reveals that effective educational administrators were found better satisfied with their job on 'job abstract factor' than the Ineffective educational administrators.

Table 1.5: Showing the Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Psycho-Social Factor Dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale (N=68)

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Significance
Effective Educational Administrators (EEA)	34	21.05	6.41	2.16	0.05 level
Ineffective Educational Administrators (IEA)	34	17.97	5.31		

A perusal of above table shows that there is a significant mean difference between Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on 'Psycho-Social Factor' dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale, as reflected by 't'-value (2.16) which is greater than tabulated t-value which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean difference favours effective educational administrators, which reveals that effective educational administrators had better psycho-social orientation than ineffective educational administrators.

Table 1.6: Showing the Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Economic Factor Dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale (N=68)

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Significance
Effective Educational Administrators (EEA)	34	11.55	2.72	2.07	0.05 level
Ineffective Educational Administrators (IEA)	34	10.41	1.77		

A quick look at the above table shows that there is a significant mean difference between Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on 'Economic Factor' dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale, as reflected by t-value (2.07) which is greater than tabulated t-value which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean difference favours effective educational administrator which reveals that effective educational administrators had better Economic adjustment than ineffective educational administrators.

Table 1.7: Showing the Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Community/National Growth Factor Dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale (N=68)

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Significance
Effective Educational Administrators (EEA)	34	12.89	2.45	2.81	0.01 level
Ineffective Educational Administrators (IEA)	34	10.02	1.89		

A quick glance on the above table reveals that there is a significant mean difference between the effective and Ineffective educational administrators on 'Community/National Growth Factor' dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale. The obtained t-value came out to be 2.81 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours effective educational administrators which reveal that effective educational administrators had better community and national awareness than ineffective educational administrators in higher education.

Table 1.8: Showing the Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Overall Dimensions of Job Satisfaction Scale (N=68)

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Significance
Effective Educational Administrators (EEA)	34	83.36	14.32	4.27	0.01 level
Ineffective Educational Administrators (IEA)	34	69.14	13.15		

A quick look on the above table reveals that there is a significant mean difference between the effective and ineffective Educational Administrators on 'Overall Dimensions' of Job Satisfaction Scale. The obtained t-value came out to be 4.27 which is

significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours effective educational administrators (M= 83.36), which indicates that effective educational administrators were found

better satisfied with their job than the ineffective educational administrators.

Major Findings

The study has arrived at very interesting findings. Some of these main findings are reported here as under:

- i. It was found that 34.16% educational administrators in higher education fall in the above average category, 49.16% in average and 16.66% fall in below average category on occupational self efficacy. It was further found that the educational administrators who fall in above average category on occupational efficacy display confidence, commitment and competence in their job profile. They display mastery over the job assigned to them and complete the assigned task with a positive attitude. They attach intrinsic component in their job. They reevaluate strategies when they fail in any task and are able to handle unforeseen situation and resolve conflicts at their work places. Educational administrators who fall in average category on occupational efficacy display moderate confidence and commitment in their job profile. They attach extrinsic component in their job. They relate their personal development to revision in their pay scales, power vested in them and their execution with minimum interference. They display moderate authority on their subordinates. It has been further found that educational administrators who fall in below average category lack managerial skills to implement best healthy practices from the other institutions. They do not reevaluate strategies if they fail in any task and do not adjust quickly to challenges that come in their work. They are somewhat selfish and do not work for the overall development of the institutions.
- ii. It has been found that 36.66% of the educational administrators in higher education were extremely satisfied, 14.16% were very satisfied, 31.66% were moderately satisfied, 11.66% were not satisfied and 5.83% were extremely dissatisfied with their job. It was further found that the educational administrators who are satisfied with their job feel that the position and job they hold have a positive impact on their social status with regard to economic advantages like salary, allowance and increment they rate their job as excellent. Job satisfied educational administrators derive pleasure from their job and they are satisfied with the working conditions in their offices. They do their duty with a professional spirit and believe that work is worship. It has also been found that the educational administrators who are not satisfied with their job always hunt for excuses. They are more concerned with revision in pay scale and other monetary benefits. They oppose new trends in methodology of educational administration and maintain status quo. They do not weight or recognize the opinion of other faculty members. They are somewhat rigid and authoritative while discharging their duties.
- iii. It has been found that there is a high positive relationship between occupational efficacy and job satisfaction of effective educational administrators in higher education. The educational administrators who are effective in their profession are highly satisfied with their job. It was also found that higher the occupational self efficacy higher will be the rating of job satisfaction.
- iv. It was found that effective and ineffective educational administrators differ significantly on 'job concrete factor' dimension of job satisfaction scale. The mean difference favoured effective educational administrators which highlights that effective educational administrators were better satisfied with their job on 'job concrete factor' than ineffective educational administrators.
- v. It has been found that effective and ineffective educational administrators differ significantly on 'job abstract factor' dimension of job satisfaction scale. The mean difference favoured effective educational administrators, which implies that effective educational administrators were better satisfied with their job on 'job abstract factor' than ineffective educational administrators.
- vi. It was further found that effective and ineffective educational administrators differ significantly on 'psycho-social factor' dimension of job satisfaction scale. The mean difference favored effective educational administrators which indicate that effective educational administrators had better psycho-social orientation than ineffective educational administrators.
- vii. It was found that effective and ineffective educational administrators differ significantly on 'economic factor' dimension of job satisfaction scale. The mean difference favoured effective educational administrators which reveal that effective educational administrators have better economic adjustment than ineffective educational administrators.

- viii. It has been found that there is a significant difference between effective and ineffective educational administrators on 'community/national growth factor' dimension of job satisfaction scale. The mean difference favoured effective educational administrators which depicts that effective educational administrators showed better satisfaction on community/national growth dimension of job satisfaction.
- ix. It was found that there is a significant difference between effective and ineffective educational administrators on 'overall dimension' of job satisfaction scale. The mean difference favoured effective educational administrator which indicates that effective educational administrators were better satisfied with their job than the ineffective educational administrators.

References

1. Abraham (1997). Job Satisfaction and Teacher Effectiveness: A Study of College Teachers: *Indian Journal of Psychometry and Education* vol. 25(1&2). pp.61-64
2. Aggrawal- V. (1983). A Study of Stress Proneness, Adjustment and Job Satisfaction as Predicators of Administrative Effectiveness of Principals: *Unpublished Ph. D Thesis, Meerut University U.P.*
3. Alvin, G.W. (1950). *Studies in Leadership*: New York. Harper and Raw Publishers.
4. Anderson, Jeffrey B. (2007). A Job Satisfaction Study of Nebraska's dual- role Superintendents: *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Vol. 68, No. 6, Dec. 07 p. 2252.
5. Barry, D.A. (2002). Job Satisfaction and Leadership Style: A study of Michigan High School Principals: *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.*
6. Bhuyan, B. and M. Choudhury (2002). Correlates of Job Satisfaction among College Teachers." *Indian Journal of Psychometry and Education*, Vol. 33(2): pp.143-146.
7. Chandraiah, K. (1994). Effect of Age on Job Satisfaction among College Teachers. *The Creative Psychologist*, Vol. 6 (1&2) pp.53-56.
8. Chen, K. (2000). Job Satisfaction among High School Assistant Principals in the State of Mississippi: *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Mississippi State University Starkville.*
9. Chen, Nan-Fu (Chris) (2008). Causal Relationship Analysis between Leadership Behaviour, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and turn over intentions for Employees of College Athletic Departments in Taiwan: *Dissertation Abstracts International*, vol. 69. No.3.pp.1053 New Delhi: NCERT.
10. Chen, Xiaofeng (2008). The Relationship between Manager's Leadership style and Employee Job Satisfaction in selected Beijing computers software companies: *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol.69 no.3,pp.1054 New Delhi. NCERT.
11. Eckman, E.W. (2004). Similarities and Differences in Role Conflict, Role Commitment and Job Satisfaction for Female and Male High school Principals: *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol.40(3) pp.366-387.
12. Fuming, X. & Jiliang, S. (2008). Research on Job Satisfaction of Elementary and High School Teachers and Strategies to increase Job Satisfaction: *Chinese Education Society*, Vol.40 (5), pp.86-96.
13. Gamber, S. Jamie (2005). The relationship of self efficacy and job culture to Job Satisfaction among Certified Athletic Trainers: *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol.66 no.12 pp.4337 New Delhi: NCERT
14. Haines, Geoffrey Alan (2007). Job Satisfaction among High School Principals in Mississippi *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 69, No. 2, August 08, p. 449A.
15. Hull, D.R. (2004). Relationships between personality and Job Satisfaction in Professional Academic Advisors: *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol.65 no.2 pp. 428.
16. Jozafeen Afzal (1993). A Study of Job Satisfaction among Teachers in Relation to Their Institutional Status, Length of Service and Educational Background. *Journal of Insight in Education for Social Change. University of Kashmir* Vol. 7 pp. 139-140.
17. Khatoon, Tahira and Hassan, Z. (2000). Job Satisfaction of Secondary school Teachers in relation to their personal variables: Sex, Experience, Professional training, Salary and religion. *Indian Educational Review*, Vol.36(1), pp.64-75
18. Leary, P. A. & Hardman, T. R. (1994). Job Satisfaction of Female Public School Administrators in West Virginia: *British Educational Research Journal*.vol.4 no.1
19. Mckee, J. G. (1990). Relationship between Community College Presidents Leadership style and Faculty Job Satisfaction. *Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater Beach, FL.*