

## INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR AND JOB ACTIVITY ON ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFICACY

Dr. Basu Mudasir

Research Scholar, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi. India

[E-Mail: showkat80ahmad@gmail.com](mailto:showkat80ahmad@gmail.com)

**ABSTRACT:** The quality and standard aspect of education requires effective educational administrators more than anything else. An administrator's efficacy lies in the fact how much he is cognizant, understands the process and copes with the change. The study sought to investigate the Occupational Efficacy, Leadership Behaviour pattern and job Activity of Educational Administrators. The sample comprised of 250 Educational Administrators and their 500 immediate Subordinates. The data were collected by using Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale, Leadership Effectiveness Scale and Job Activity Analysis Scale. Percentage statistics, t-test and Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation was used to analyse the data. The results revealed that a significant positive relationship exists between Occupational Efficacy and Leadership Behaviour of educational administrators and Occupational Efficacy and cognizance of Job Activity. Again it was revealed that Effective Educational Administrators differ significantly from Ineffective Educational Administrators with respect to leadership behaviour pattern and cognizance of Job Activity. A significant positive correlation exists between Occupational Efficacy, Leadership Behaviour Pattern and cognizance of Job Activity of Effective Educational Administrators and low correlation exists between Occupational Efficacy, Leadership Behaviour Pattern and cognizance of Job Activity of Ineffective Educational Administrators.

[Basu Mudasir. **INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR AND JOB ACTIVITY ON ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFICACY.** Researcher 2012;4(9):25-37]. (ISSN: 1553-9865).

<http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>. 4

**Key Words:** Effective Educational Administrators, Ineffective Educational Administrators, Job Activity, Leadership Behaviour Pattern, Occupational Efficacy

### BACKGROUND:

Our society is changing rapidly, so new techniques are being adopted in education to meet the needs of the society. Therefore, education has become more important in the modern world and is the basis for economic development and prosperity of India. It is a hard fact that education is a complex and highly specialised field and its efficient administration requires technical competence, administrative acumen and understanding of the educational development. There is a great need to make proper administration in our educational set up which demands competent educational administrators. Competent and effective administrators are of vital importance to the success of every dynamic organization that 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. This means administrator's adaptability who shows ability to solve problems and to react with flexibility to change; his sense of identity which represents knowledge or insight on the part of the members about the goals of the organization and how they perceive them; administrator's capacity to test reality which implies ability to search out, accurately perceive, and correctly interpret properties of environment and administrator's state of integration among the group members such that they are not working at cross purposes. Thus, administrator's effectiveness lies in the fact how much he understands the process and copes with the changes.

An institution needs leadership more than anything else for it is to make a mark. Leadership is an "Influencing Process" where leaders motivate the members of an organisation to get their best efforts and achieve organisational objectives. And it is the effective leadership behaviour of

educational administrators who creates inspiring and stimulating climate for the group so that they can enjoy a high level of morale and are motivated to receive new ideas, at the same time they are always ready to venture into new goals. The effective leader behaviour is the inspiring force that begets healthy climate, high morale and motivation for the receptivity of new ideas for taking the organisation to higher and still higher planes. This is true in the context of educational institutions as well. Thus, effective leaders in education are needed for the accomplishment of set educational objectives within the available resources; who puts 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.

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. An educational administrator needs to organize and manage the administration, provide support service and activities that facilitate the effective running of an organization. He has to provide direction and day-to-day management in their institution. Furthermore, he has to exhibit strong interpersonal and communication skills because much of his job involves working corporately with others. 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.

Research findings on educational administrators' efficacy established the following facts: Runhaar (2010) found that occupational self efficacy and learning goal motivation are positively related to reflection and feedback asking. Furthermore, positive relationship was found between occupational self efficacy and transformational leadership of school principals. Mweemba (2007) found that principal's perception of their effectiveness does not significantly differ from the staff's perception of their principal's effectiveness. Ravi (2003) has found a significant difference in the efficiency of a principal as an

administrator based on educational qualification and experience. No relationship was observed between efficiency of the principal as an administrator and as a teacher and Shaheen (1988) found that age, sex and professional attainment had no effect on principal effectiveness.

Some researchers have also been carried out on Leadership Behaviour of educational administrators. Rowland (2008) revealed that principal's daily behaviour plays a vital role in the environment of the school. Mishra (2005) found leadership behaviour positively related to teachers' job satisfaction. High desirable leadership behaviour of the principals generated a higher degree of conformity and normality in the teachers and vice versa, it was also found that leadership behaviour of headmasters influenced the organisational climate of schools in a significant way. Sudha (1997) found effective leaders/principals of govt/govt aided and private schools were administratively effective and managerially flexible. Raut (1995) observed that there existed a significant difference between the principals showing different levels of effective leadership in their perception of organisational effectiveness.

Research findings on educational administrators' Job Activity established the following facts: Sudsberry (2008) found principals of high performing, 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. Richard (2008) found principals in higher poverty level schools spending a significantly greater amount of time on tasks. Morris, Porter-Gehrie and Hurwitz (1984) described and analysed the activities of school principals and found principals usually spend less than half of their working days in their offices, they have a good deal of discretion in their decision-making and that the principal's behaviour affects four distinct constituents viz teachers and students, parents and others in the community, superiors and the principal himself or herself. Tyagi (2009) found that senior secondary school heads used reflective practices in different ways to develop teachers. They introduced innovations in their schools to provide professional support to develop teachers and coordinated with other schools to develop learning innovation for reflective practices.

The studies reviewed however showed that a great deal of researches on Efficacy and its impact on learning goal motivation, student's enrolment, student's achievement and such other variables has

been conducted. These studies have suggested that efficacy augments educational administrators in producing greater amount of performance and outcomes. Studies reviewed also showed that a great deal of researches on leadership behaviour and its impact on institutional climate and such other variables has been conducted. Some of the studies have also explained that leadership behaviour influences teachers' job satisfaction etc. However, there has been no study examining the effect of educational administrators' leadership behaviour and cognizance of Job Activity on occupational efficacy, effect of perceived leadership behaviour on work motivation and organizational commitment. Since leadership is the act of influencing people, it is important to take subordinates perspectives into account that how do the subordinates perceive their heads and how does it affect their performance. 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, Leadership Behaviour Pattern and Job Activity of educational administrators with the object to find out their efficacy in transacting their leader job at Secondary level of education. The focus of the study revolved around the following objectives:

- To describe the sample of Educational Administrators with regard to Occupational Efficacy, Leadership Behaviour Pattern and Job Activity.
- To undertake correlational analysis between Occupational Efficacy, Leadership Behaviour Pattern and Job Activity of Educational Administrators.
- To identify Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators.
- To study and compare the Leadership Behaviour Pattern and Job Activity of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators.
- To undertake correlational analysis between Occupational Efficacy, Leadership Behaviour Pattern 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 Leadership Behaviour Pattern and Job Activity of Educational Administrators.
  - Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly on Leadership Behaviour Pattern and Job Activity.
- Important Terms:
- **Occupational Efficacy:** Occupational Efficacy for the present study refers to those Educational Administrators who score high on Occupational Self Efficacy Scale (OSSES) prepared by Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari and Upinder Dhar.
  - **Effective Educational Administrators:** Effective Educational Administrators for the present study refers to those Educational Administrators who score high on Occupational Self Efficacy Scale (OSSES) prepared by Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari and Upinder Dhar.
  - **Ineffective Educational Administrators:** Ineffective Educational Administrators for the present study refers to those Educational Administrators who score low on Occupational Self Efficacy Scale (OSSES) prepared by Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari and Upinder Dhar.
  - **Leadership Behaviour Pattern:** Leadership Behaviour Pattern for the present study refers to the scores obtained by the sample subjects on Leadership Effectiveness Scale prepared by Haseen Taj.
  - **Job Activity Analysis:** Job Activity Analysis for the present study refers to the scores obtained by the sample subjects on Job Activity Analysis Scale (JAAS) constructed by the investigator.

## 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 study which were identified on the basis of random sampling technique from the list obtained from Directorate of School Education, Kashmir (DESK).

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.

**The breakup of the sample of Educational Administrators is as under:**

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	×	10	×	01	11

The sample also included 500 immediate subordinates for the selected educational administrators. These also were selected through systematic random sampling technique. As such for

each sample educational administrator, two subordinates were selected for assessment of Leadership Behaviour Pattern of their respective administrators.

**The breakup of the sample of Subordinates is as under:**

High School Level							Hr. Sec. School Level			From Both Levels							
Senior Teachers		ZEPO		Head Master			Senior Lectures				Deputy CEO		Principal		Joint Director		
Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Total	
60	60	29	29	30	30	238	120	120	240	05	05	05	05	01	01	22	
<b>Grand Total = 500</b>																	

**INSTRUMENTS 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 Leadership Effectiveness Scale (LES) prepared by Haseen Taj (2001).
- 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

**Analysis and Discussion:**

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

**(i) Occupational Efficacy:**

**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%

- A. Descriptive Analysis of Educational Administrators.
- B. Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Leadership Behaviour.
- C. Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Leadership Behaviour.
- D. Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Leadership Behaviour within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational

**A. 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, leadership Behaviour and Job Activity.

In terms of Occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators (250) at Secondary Level of Education, 14.8% of the educational administrators fall in above average category which 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 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 results 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.

### (ii) Leadership Behaviour Pattern:

**Table 1.2 Showing overall Percentage of Educational Administrators on Leadership Effectiveness Scale at Secondary level of Education (N=250)**

Range of scores obtained on LBS	Classification	N	Percentage
329-379	Extremely Effective	45	18%
278-328	Highly Effective	16	6.4%
227-277	Effective	48	19.2%
176-226	Less Effective	101	40.4%
125-175	Ineffective	40	16%

In terms of Leadership Behaviour Pattern of sample educational administrators (250), 43.6% of the educational administrators fall in the three effective levels (Extremely Effective-18%, Highly Effective-6.4%, and Effective-19.2%) of Leadership Behaviour Pattern. This revealed that these administrators are easily approachable and make their presence felt in the group. They provide well ordered climate which is conducive for effective team work. They are rational in making decisions and consult the group before implementing them. They always strive hard to analyse the group problems and tries out innovative strategies in solving them. They consider themselves accountable for their actions and place

principles above their own personal advantages. The data further revealed that 56.4% of educational administrators fall in less effective (40.4%) and ineffective (16%) category. This revealed that these educational administrators rarely mingle with their group members and didn't consider them as their equals. They seldom display their interest towards the welfare of the group or their work. They provide less democratic atmosphere in their institutions. They always depreciate the work done by their staff members and never support them. They tend to be upset and anxious by everyday occurrences and keep their staff in continuous uproar.

### (iii) Job Activity Analysis:

**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%

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.

### **B. Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Leadership Behaviour Pattern of Educational Administrators.**

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

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

Occupational Efficacy & Leadership Behaviour Pattern	$r = 0.482$	Sig. at 0.01 level
--	-------------	--------------------

Table 1.4 depicts that there is a significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Leadership Behaviour Pattern of Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.482 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that Occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators is more or less influenced by Leadership Behaviour Pattern. The finding is in line with the results of **Runhaar (2010)** who found that occupational self efficacy and learning goal motivation are positively related to reflection and feedback asking. Furthermore a positive relationship was found between occupational efficacy and transformational leadership.

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

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

Table 1.5 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

In view of the above empirical evidences, the hypothesis number one which reads as, "**Occupational Efficacy is significantly related with Leadership Behaviour Pattern and cognizance of Job Activity of Educational Administrators**" stands accepted.

### **C. 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 27% i.e. 67 educational administrators possessing high score were identified as Effective

Educational Administrators and 27% i.e. 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 leadership Behaviour Pattern and Job Activity.

**Table 1.6 Showing Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on six areas and total score of Leadership Effectiveness Scale (N=67 each)**

AREAS	GROUP	MEAN	SD	t-VALUE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Interpersonal Relations	EEA	57.47	16.51	6.96	0.01 level
	IEA	40.41	11.44		
Intellectual Operations	EEA	48.26	14.58	6.39	0.01 level
	IEA	32.40	14.16		
Behavioural & Emotional Stability	EEA	34.01	12.21	6.01	0.01 level
	IEA	23.00	8.63		
Ethical and Moral Strength	EEA	53.61	28.71	6.51	0.01 level
	IEA	28.47	13.35		
Adequacy of Communication	EEA	36.62	15.87	6.60	0.01 level
	IEA	20.97	11.19		
Operation as a Citizen	EEA	29.52	12.78	5.38	0.01 level
	IEA	19.67	7.84		
Total Score	EEA	259.52	95.67	6.87	0.01 level
	IEA	164.94	59.50		

### IEA- Ineffective Educational Administrators

**1. Interpersonal Relations:** Table 1.4 row (i) indicates that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Interpersonal Relations dimension of Leadership Effectiveness Scale. As reflected by 't'-value (6.96) which is significant at 0.01 level of significance, the mean difference favours EEA which implies that EEA identify themselves with the group and treat others as their equals. They appreciate the good work done by their group members and support them in their activities. They provide well ordered climate in their institutions which is conducive for effective team work. On the other hand IEA doesn't mingle with the group and enjoys loneliness. They are harsh and strict in their relationship with others. IEA remain adamant in taking decisions and take all decisions themselves by ignoring the view points of others. They fear to experiment with new ideas and remain stick with the traditional methods.

**2. Intellectual Operations:** The same table, row (ii) revealed that there is a significant mean

difference between EEA and IEA on Intellectual Operations dimension of Leadership Effectiveness Scale. As reflected by 't'-value (6.39) which is significant at 0.01 level of significance, the mean difference favours EEA which reveals that EEA always plans the work to be carried out by their group members. They Exhibit flexibility and rationality in decision making and encourage participative decision making. On the other hand IEA fear to experiment with new ideas and remain stick with the traditional methods.

**3. Behavioural & Emotional Stability:** Row (iii) of the same table reveals that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Behavioural and Emotional Stability dimension of Leadership Effectiveness Scale. As reflected by 't'-value (6.01) which is significant at 0.01 level of significance, the mean difference favours EEA which revealed that EEA are predictable in their behaviour. They consider themselves accountable for their actions and place principles above their own personal advantages. They provide democratic sort of

atmosphere in their institution to control their group. The findings are in line with that of **kulsum-(1999)** who found that headmasters of secondary schools with higher initiating structure (task emphasis) quality make them more effective. On the other hand IEA are easily moved by the situation and worries over unforeseen consequences. They lack the ability to face the challenging situation and gets disturbed easily.

4. **Ethical & Moral Strength:** It is evident from the above table; row (iv) that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Ethical and Moral Strength dimension of Leadership Effectiveness Scale. As reflected by 't'-value (6.51) which is significant at 0.01 level of significance, the mean difference favour EEA which exhibited that EEA place principles above their own personal advantage and are fair in their behaviour. On the other hand Ineffective educational administrators over-exercise their power and never go according to the group norms. They refuse to explain their actions and defend their mistakes. They disregard the information that challenges their status quo. IEA are vague in their expression and fail to express their ideas clearly.
5. **Adequacy of Communication:** The Table 1.4, row (v) shows that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Adequacy of communication dimension of Leadership Effectiveness Scale. As reflected by 't'-value (6.60) which is significant at 0.01 level of significance, the mean difference favours EEA which reveals that EEA display better Leadership Behaviour in Adequacy of Communication area than the IEA. This indicates that EEA makes their ideas clearly known to the group by using suitable words. They translate information into actionable instruction for subordinates and ensure that each member of the group understands their work. EEA considers themselves one among the group and strives hard to maintain group identity. They recognise and advocates rights of the group members and provide them every type of opportunity for effective construction to the institution.
6. **Operation as a Citizen:** It is also evident from the same table; row (vi) that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on

Operation as a Citizen dimension of Leadership Effectiveness Scale. As reflected by 't'-value (5.38) which is significant at 0.01 level of significance, the mean difference favours EEA which revealed that EEA considers themselves one among the group and strives hard to maintain group identity. They recognise the rights of the group members and provide them every type of opportunity for effective construction to the institution. On the other hand IEA doesn't mingle with the group and enjoys loneliness. They show least interest while listening to others and ignore the view points of others. IEA suffer from identity crises. The findings are in tune with the findings of **Upasani, Chaudhary, Deshpande V.S, Deshpande, S.S and Katre-(1991)** who found a significant difference between efficient and inefficient schools with regard to efficiency of their headmasters. The correlates of efficiency of a headmaster were found to be planning, implementation of curricular and co-curricular activities, good relationship with the staff and the community and provision of extra facilities for students. Similarly **Sudha-(1997)** found effective leaders/principals of govt./govt. aided and private schools were administratively effective and managerially flexible. They followed mostly a dominant missionary management styles, rejected deserted style of management and provided most favourable climate for learners to learn and teachers to teach were.

7. **Total Score:** Last row of the table also showed the significant difference between the mean scores of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on overall dimensions of Leadership Effectiveness Scale. The results reveal that there is a significant mean difference between Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on said dimensions of Leadership Effectiveness Scale. The obtained 't' value came out to be 6.87 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours Effective Educational Administrators which reveals that Effective Educational Administrators exhibit better Leadership Behaviour Pattern on overall dimensions of Leadership Effectiveness Scale than the Ineffective Educational Administrative.



**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		

**EEA- Effective Educational Administrators****1. 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.

**2. 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, **Sudberry-(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.

**3. 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.

4. **Professional & 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.
5. **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.

6. **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 evidences, the hypothesis number two which reads as, **"Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly on Leadership Behaviour Pattern and cognizance of Job Activity"** stands accepted.

### A. Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Leadership Behaviour Pattern within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators.

**Table 1.8 Showing the correlation of Occupational Efficacy with Leadership Behaviour Pattern amongst the Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators (N=67each)**

Variable	Groups	Value of 'r'	Level of Significance
Leadership Behaviour Pattern	EEA	0.638	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.106	Not Significant
Job Activity	EEA	0.652	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.102	Not Significant

Table 1.8 indicates that there is significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Leadership Behaviour Pattern of Effective Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.638 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that more the Occupational Efficacy; higher shall be the rating of Leadership Behaviour Pattern of EEA. The same row of the table again revealed that there is low correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Leadership Behaviour Pattern of Ineffective Educational Administrators. The coefficient of correlation came out to be 0.106 which has failed to arrive at any level of significance. This implies that Occupational Efficacy These finding are in line with the findings of **Mensik, John-(2006)** who found that effective principals are visionary; they set a positive climate by communicating well with others. Effective principals build relationships and have strong moral and ethical foundation. Similarly, **Ekundayo-(2010)** found a positive relationship between leadership and effectiveness of principals of the secondary schools. It was further found that behaviour of the principals in the area covered was satisfactory encouraging.

The same table 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. Again the results 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, the Effective Educational Administrators in Kashmir has emerged as those who possess greater ability in doing their work independently and ensure proper planning and organization of their institutional matters. They quickly adjust to different challenges that came in their task and are able to handle them effectively. They abide by the rules of their institution and make their ideas known to the group. All these leadership characteristics in turn positively influence the Occupational Efficacy of Effective Educational Administrators. The study also reveals that the presence of different characteristics of educational administrators in effective educational administrators leads to better relationship with their subordinates, which not only helps in increasing the outcomes, performance, motivation, satisfaction and efficiency of the employees but also leads to increased institutional efficiency. The study, however, found that a majority of educational administrators have 'Less Effective' Leadership Behaviour Pattern, so efforts need to be made to raise these qualities among educational administrators through rigorous programmes of sensitization and capacity building. Special orientation programmes should be organized to improve their leader behaviour. Thus, responsibility lies on various institutions that should organise special programmes so that the behaviour of ineffective educational administrators can be brought up to effective level. A Hand Book may be prepared for administrators that may guide them in administering their institutions effectively and to become effective institutional leaders. Special in-service orientation programmes should be organised for ineffective educational administrators to orient them with different dimensions of leadership behaviour and train them in techniques of effective management. The educational administrators should be given special incentives and promotional avenues in order to reward their better performance in their respective fields.

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.

### Bibliography

1. Alan, Mumford (1989). Management Development Strategies For Action, Fronne Somerset: The Eastern Press Ltd.
2. Baron, A. Robert (1983). Behaviour In Organizations: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work, London: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
3. Bernard, M. Bass (1960). Leadership Psychology and Organisational Behaviour, New York: Harper and Row
4. Best, John, W. & Kahn, James V. (2003). Research in Education, New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd.
5. Bhat, K. S. & Shankar, R. Ravi (1985). Administration of Education, New Delhi: Seema Publications.
6. Bhattacharya, S. (1983). Management Effectiveness, New Delhi: Oxford & I.B.H. Publications.
7. Chakraborty, S. K. (1987). Managerial Effectiveness and Quality of Work Life, New Delhi: McGraw Hill Publishing Company.
8. Cohen, L & Manion, L. (1985). Research Methods in Education, London: Croom Helm Publishers.
9. Donald, H. McBurney (2003). Research Methods, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, USA: Wads Worth/Thomson, Learning Belmont.
10. Garrett, H. E. (2007). Statistics in Psychology and Education, 12<sup>th</sup> Edition, Paragon International Publishers.
11. Goel, S. L. & Goel Aruna (1994). Educational Policy and Administration, Deep and Deep Publications
12. Good, C.V. (1963). Introduction to Educational Research, New York: Appleton Century- Crofts.
13. Gorton, R.A. (1983). School Administration & Supervision: Leadership Challenges and Opportunities, Dubuque, IA: W.M. C. Brown Company Publishers.
14. Guilford, J. P. (1956). Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
15. Hansom, E. M. (1999). Educational Administration and Organizational Behaviour, Bost: Allyn and Bacon Publications.
16. Kerlinger, Fred, N. (2007). Foundations of Behavioural Research, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc.
17. Mensik, John (2006). The Framework of an Effective Principal: A Community's Perspective, Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.68, No.12, PP.4935-A.
18. Mishra, B. K & Mohanty, R. K. (2003). Trends and Issues in Indian Education, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Surya Publications.
19. Mishra, M. (2005). A Study of Organizational Climate of Different Types of Secondary Schools and its Relationship with Leadership Behaviour of Principals and Teacher's Job Satisfaction, Indian Educational Abstracts, Vol. 5, No.1&2, PP.48.
20. Morris, Porter-Gehrie & Hurwitz (1984). A Study to Analyze the Activities of School Principals. Cited from Rajvir Tyagi's Project Report (2009), Department of Educational Administration, NEUPA, New-Delhi.
21. Mweemba, Akalpelwa Namwakili (2007). Perceived Effectiveness and Pre and Post Service Training Among High School Principals in Manitoba, Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, Vol.19, No3, PP. 121.
22. Pandya, S. R. (2001). Administration and Management of Education, 1<sup>st</sup> Edition, Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
23. Pethe, S; Chaudhari S. & Dhar, U. (2005). Manual for Occupational Self Efficacy Scale (OSES), Agra: National Psychological Corporation.
24. Rasool,G., & Minakshi Chopra (1990). Introduction to Educational Administration and Supervision, Jalandhar: Narendara Publishing House. PP.36.
25. Raut, S. R. (1995). Organizational Effectiveness in Relation to Leadership Behaviour, Role Performance and Conflict Management Strategies of the Principals and Teachers Work Satisfaction, Indian Educational Abstract, PP.66.
26. 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, Vol.6, No.02.
27. Rebore, R.W. (1985). Educational Administration- A Management Approach, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, INC.
  28. Redden, C.W. (1987). Managerial Effectiveness, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
  29. Richard, H. E. Baker (2008). The Principal's Workday: A Comparative Analysis of Performance Standards and Principal Practices, Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.69, No.03, PP.838-A.
  30. Robbins, P. Stephen (2003). Organisational Behaviour, Singapore: Pearson Education.
  31. Robore, R. W. (1985). Educational Administration: A Management Approach, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
  32. Rowland, Keith A. (2008). The Relationship of Principal Leadership and Teacher Morale, Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 69, No.2.
  33. Runhaar, Piety et. al. (2010). Stimulating Teacher's Reflection and Feedback Asking: An Interplay of Self Efficacy, Journal of Research and Studies, Vol.26, No.05, pp.1154-1161.
  34. Ryburn, M. W. (1953). The Organization of Schools, Oxford University Press.
  35. Schofield, Ken (2008). A Case Study of an Effective Elementary Principal, Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.69, No.03, PP. 840-A.
  36. Sudha, T. (1997). A Study of the Leadership Effectiveness in Secondary Schools of Delhi, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis (Education), JMI, New Delhi.
  37. Sudsberry, M. Jane (2008). The Role of the Principal in Leading School Improvement, Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.69, No.3, PP.841-A.
  38. Thakar, A. S., Mussazi, J. C. S. & Aminu, P. M. (1980). Educational Administration, New Delhi: National Publishing House.
  39. Tyagi, R.S. (2009). School-Based Instructional Supervision and the Effective Professional Development of Teachers. Project Report (2009), Department of Educational Administration, NEUPA, New-Delhi.
  40. 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.

9/2/2012