

## JOB VALUE AND JOB ACTIVITY: IMPACT ON OCCUPATIONAL EFFICACY

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 administrators' efficacy lies in the fact how much he is cognizant, understands the process, possesses stable job ideas and copes with the change. The study sought to investigate the Occupational Efficacy, Job Value and job activity of Educational Administrators. The sample comprised of 250 Educational Administrators (119 Educational Administrators were taken from High School Level and 120 Educational Administrators were taken from Higher Secondary School Level). The data were collected by using two adopted and one self-constructed questionnaire. Percentage statistics, t-test and Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation was used to analyse the data. The overall results revealed that Effective Educational Administrators differ significantly from Ineffective Educational Administrators with respect to their Job Value and job activity. A significant positive correlation exists between Occupational Efficacy and Job Value and Occupational Efficacy and Job activity of Effective Educational Administrators and low correlation exists between Occupational Efficacy and Job Value and Occupational Efficacy and Job activity of Ineffective Educational Administrators.

[Basu Mudasir. **JOB VALUE AND JOB ACTIVITY: IMPACT ON OCCUPATIONAL EFFICACY.** *Researcher* 2012;4(11):1-11]. (ISSN: 1553-9865). <http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>. 1

**Key Words:** Effective Educational Administrators, Ineffective Educational Administrators, Job Value, job activity, Occupational Efficacy.

### BACKGROUND

Our new millennium society, which is an increasingly diverse, globalized and complex, media-saturated society, is changing rapidly, so new techniques are being adopted in education to meet its needs. 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. 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. An administrators' efficacy lies in the fact how much he is cognizant, understands the process, possesses stable job ideas and copes with the change. Further, administrator's stable values are what make the foundation for an efficient administration. 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.

It is being increasingly realised that job values are important to the study of characteristics of educational administrators because they lay the foundations for understanding of job stability and job-hopping in educational organizations. Values are the important and stable ideas, beliefs and assumptions that underlie and are deserved in our behaviours across a number of different situations. They represent the general ideals that we strive to meet in our life, such as collaboration, creativity, dignity, and justice. Administration is increasingly linked with values. Administrators enter the organisation with certain preconceived notions of what "ought to be" and what "ought not to be". Of course, these notions are not value free. On the contrary, they contain interpretations of right and

wrong. But with the change in times, the values keep on changing. Hence they need to be reviewed and renewed with the advancements and developments. There is a need for school leaders to especially review their values in order to facilitate beneficial change. "If values are seldom discussed and consciously reflected upon, it should not be surprising that administrative decisions are frequently naïve in their value assumptions."-Skillbeck-(1972). The educational administrators henceforth are expected to recognise various values since these provide guidelines and directions in the effort towards work effectiveness.

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. 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.

A number of studies have been carried out on Occupational Efficacy of educational administrators. 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. Schofield (2008) has identified six recurring characteristics necessary for an effective principal to lead a school effectively. These include: relationships, culture and climate, leadership, curriculum, philosophy and commitment. 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 researches carried out on job value established the following facts: Southam (1980) found that employee's work values and climate are significant factors in relation to their job satisfaction and turn over state. Lobo (1983) found principals whose value system manifested coreness achieved a relatively higher degree of institutional efficiency. Kumar (1986) reported that work value of the principals was significantly related with their administrative effectiveness. Mathew (2003) revealed that there is a positive relationship between organizational commitment with that of work values and leadership behaviour of the principals. 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. Some of the studies have explained that job value and job activity of principals influences the institutional climate and institutional efficiency. However, there has been no study examining the effect of job value 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, job value and job activity of educational administrators with the object to find out their efficacy in transacting their administrative job at Secondary level of education. The focus of the study revolved around the following objectives:

1. To describe the sample of Educational Administrators with regard to Occupational Efficacy, Job Value and job activity.
2. To undertake correlational analysis between Occupational Efficacy, Job Value and Job Activity of Educational Administrators.
3. To identify Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators at Secondary Level.
4. To study and compare the Job Value and cognizance of Job activity of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators at secondary level.
5. To undertake correlational analysis between Occupational Efficacy, Job Value and cognizance of Job activity within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators.

The study empirically tested the following hypotheses:

1. Occupational Efficacy is significantly related with Job Value and cognizance of Job activity of Educational Administrators.
2. Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly on Job Value and cognizance of Job activity.

#### Operational Definition of Important Terms:

- i) **Occupational Efficacy:** Occupational Efficacy for the present study refers to those Educational

Administrators who score high on Occupational Self Efficacy Scale (OSES) prepared by Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari and Upinder Dhar.

#### ii) Effective Educational Administrators:

Effective Educational Administrators for the present study refers to those Educational Administrators who score high on Occupational Self Efficacy Scale (OSES) prepared by Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari and Upinder Dhar.

#### iii) Ineffective Educational Administrators:

Ineffective Educational Administrators for the present study refers to those Educational Administrators who score low on Occupational Self Efficacy Scale (OSES) prepared by Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari and Upinder Dhar.

- iv) **Job Value:** Job Value for the present study refers to the scores obtained by the sample subjects on Job Value Questionnaire (JVQ) prepared by Seema Sanghi.

- i) **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.

**Table 1. 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
<b>Grand Total = 250</b>													

#### Instruments Employed:

1. **Occupational Self Efficacy Scale-OSES** prepared by Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari and Upinder Dhar (1999).

2. **Job Value Questionnaire-JVQ** prepared by Seema Sanghi (1998).

3. **Job Activity Analysis Scale-JAAS** prepared by the investigator (2011)

**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:

- A. Descriptive Analysis of Educational Administrators.
- B. Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy, Job Value and Job Activity.
- C. Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Job Value and Job Activity.

- D. Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy, Job Value and Job Activity within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational

**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, Job Value and Job Activity.

**(A) 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 perusal of the table 1.1 shows the Occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators at Secondary Level of Education. The data 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.

**Table 1.2 Showing overall Percentage of Educational Administrators on Job Value Questionnaire at Secondary level of Education (N=250)**

Range of scores obtained on JVQ	Classification	N	Percentage
205-250	High	44	17.6%
159-204	Average	159	63.6%
113-158	Low	47	18.8%

While analysing the Job Value of educational administrators (N=250) at secondary level of education, it has been found that 17.6% of the educational administrators possess high job value. This indicates that these educational administrators appreciate the financial stability and non-financial benefits provided by their job and cherish its opportunities for personal and professional development. They appreciate the appropriateness of supervision and the nature of supervisor in their job.

Further, they adore their job for providing them proper recognition for their work done. The results again indicated that majority of educational administrators i.e. 63.6% fall in the average category. This indicates that these educational administrators moderately value their job as it has chances for good salary and allowances. They enjoy the benefits in terms of leaves and moderately utilises the opportunities provided by their job to do new things. It has also been found that 18.8% of educational

administrators fall in low category. This implies that these educational administrators depreciate their job by holding that there is financial instability in it. Also the chances for good salary and allowances are very low having little chances of accelerated raise in salary. They neither welcome nor enjoy the facilities

provided by their job that they believe are little enough to fulfil their requirements. They hold their job provides little opportunities for personal and professional growth and feel insecure of being expelled out any time from their employment.

**(B) 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 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 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 and its follow up is taken as an academic reformatory. 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.

**(C) Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Job Value of Educational Administrators.**

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

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

Occupational Efficacy & Job Value	r = 0.423	Sig. at 0.01 level
-----------------------------------	-----------	--------------------

Table depicts that there is significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Job Value of Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.423 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that Occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators is moderately influenced by Job Value. Further, it implies that these educational administrators value their job that seems interesting to them and their personality. It gives them the confidence to make an impact on others. They value the kind of work their job contains which helps them to work even under the pressure of deadline. As they believe in continuous improvement of their profession these educational administrators treasure the opportunities provided by their job for personal and professional development. It can again be revealed from the above table that these educational administrators acknowledge the recognition they got for the work done from their group members which

develops in them the confidence to handle unforeseen situations at their workplace.

**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 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 evidences, the hypothesis number one which reads as, **"Occupational Efficacy is significantly related with Job Value and cognizance of Job Activity of Educational Administrators"** stands accepted.

### **C. Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Administrative Behaviour.**

**Table 1.6 Showing Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on eleven areas and total score of Job Value Questionnaire (N=67each)**

AREAS	GROUP	MEAN	SD	t-VALUE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Financial Benefits	EEA	17.31	3.97	5.23	0.01 level
	IEA	14.17	3.03		
Non-Financial Benefits	EEA	14.59	2.92	5.89	0.01 level
	IEA	11.86	2.44		
Opportunities for Development & Promotion	EEA	19.83	4.27	5.62	0.01 level
	IEA	15.85	3.92		
Opportunities for Responsible & Independent Action	EEA	18.95	4.36	4.46	0.01 level
	IEA	15.43	4.76		
Job & Personal Security	EEA	28.05	6.38	4.61	0.01 level
	IEA	22.70	7.03		
Type or Kind of Work	EEA	17.17	6.26	6.24	0.01 level
	IEA	11.88	3.01		
Job According to Interest & Abilities	EEA	18.31	2.81	7.71	0.01 level
	IEA	15.64	1.24		
Supervisor- Supervision & Management	EEA	16.59	2.44	6.58	0.01 level
	IEA	14.10	1.93		
Co- workers & Subordinates	EEA	15.67	4.09	5.50	0.01 level
	IEA	12.46	2.49		
Recognition & Appreciation for Accomplishment of Job	EEA	19.19	5.98	7.53	0.01 level
	IEA	13.14	2.76		
Working Conditions	EEA	15.52	2.35	6.96	0.01 level
	IEA	13.07	1.69		
Total Score	EEA	201.23	40.00	7.18	0.01 Level
	IEA	160.34	23.88		

EEA- Effective Educational Administrators

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 Job Value and Job Activity.

#### IEA- Ineffective Educational Administrators

While comparing the Effective and Ineffective educational administrators on various dimensions and composite scores of Job Value Questionnaire, the calculated 't'-value came out to be 5.23, 5.89, 5.62, 4.46, 4.61, 6.24, 7.71, 6.58, 5.50, 7.53, 6.98 & 7.18 which have been found significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA which indicates that EEA display better Job Values than the IEA. This indicated that EEA appreciates the financial stability and non-financial benefits provided by their job. They cherish the opportunities lying in their job for intellectual and personal development and for their promotions as well. EEA acknowledge the way their job provides life, health and social security. They rate highly the type of work carried in by their job which they said is quite interesting and competitive. EEA appreciate the appropriateness of supervision and the nature of supervisor in their job. They apprehend the high amount of respect and cooperation in their job which they got from co-workers and subordinates. EEA adore their job as they get proper recognition and appreciation for their work done. They respect highly

the quality of work, working hours and working conditions of their job. The findings are supported with the study of **Singh (1979)** who showed that occupational values are significantly related to the individual's background factors (experience, age, position in the organisational hierarchy, decision making culture of the units and parental style), further, **Southam (1980)** found that employee's work values and climate are significant factors in relation to their job satisfaction and turn over state. Similarly, **Lobo (1983)** found principals whose value system manifested coreness achieved a relatively higher degree of institutional efficiency. Further, effective principals established priorities, classified values and communicated them successfully. On the other hand IEA disregard their job by reporting it has meagre financial and non-financial benefits. They neither welcome nor enjoy the facilities provided by their job which they believe are little enough to fulfil their requirements. They believe their job doesn't provide any opportunity to do responsible work independently, also it provides meagre security benefits. They feel insecure of being expelled out any time from their employment. IEA rate poorly the kind of work carried in by their job that they believe is quite non-intellectual and non-discretionary. They disrespect their job which they believe doesn't even fit their qualification and personality. The results again revealed that IEA disrespect their job as they hold that there is visible partiality in the attitudes of supervisor and management. They believe they are bound in their job to maintain an authoritarian relation with their group members. IEA also devalue their job as they feel that they don't get proper recognition and appreciation for their work done either from workers, subordinates, supervisor, management and others.

**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

#### IEA- Ineffective Educational Administrators

While comparing the Effective and Ineffective educational administrators on various dimensions and composite scores of Job Activity Analysis Scale, the calculated 't'-value came out to be 3.98, 3.25, 2.23, 3.31, 2.80, 5.07 which have been found significant at 0.01 & 0.05 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA which indicates that EEA display better cognizance of Job activity than the IEA. This 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 are utilized on the tasks meant for it. EEA maintain a perfect balance between their administrative and academic work. 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 finding 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. It again 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. They 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. EEA supervise the institutional task directly instead of delegating the responsibility to subordinates and then discuss the inputs recorded in the inspection dairy 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. Lastly, the data depicted 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.

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. IEA believe that task of teaching and administration is very hectic. 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. 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 small faculties had a greater measure of success in two of the dimensions of professional learning community.

In view of the above empirical evidence, the hypothesis number two which reads as, "**Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly on job value and cognizance of Job Activity**" stands accepted.

**Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy and job value within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators.**



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

Variable	Groups	Value of 'r'	Level of Significance
Job Value	EEA	0.758	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.112	Not Significant
Job Activity	EEA	0.652	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.102	Not Significant

**EEA: Effective Educational Administrator**

**IEA: Ineffective Educational Administrators**

Table 1.8, row (i) indicates that there is significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Job Value of Effective Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.758 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The same row of the table again revealed that there is low correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Job Value of Ineffective Educational Administrators. The coefficient of correlation came out to be 0.112 which has failed to arrive at any level of significance. This implies that Occupational Efficacy negligibly influences the Job Value of Ineffective Educational Administrators. The findings are in agreement with that of **Kumar-(1986)** who reported that work values of the principals were significantly related with their administrative effectiveness. Similarly **Mathew-(2003)** revealed that there is a positive relationship between organisational commitments with that of work values of principals.

Table 1.8 row (ii) 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, the Effective Educational Administrators 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 characteristics in turn positively influence the Occupational Efficacy of Effective Educational Administrators. The results also showed that majority of educational administrators were having 'Moderate Level' of Job Value. Therefore, Special orientation programmes should be organized to improve and raise the Job Value of educational administrators. 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 administration 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, planners, Ministries of Education etc, in the sense that, it will provide useful hints on the appointment, promotion, evaluation and training 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:**

1. Ahmad, Basharat (1996). Improving Our School Education, Kashmir: New Nagina Printing Press.
2. Ahmad, Basharat (1997). Elementary Education in Jammu and Kashmir State- Present Status and Future Prospects, Kashmir: New Nagina Printing Press.

3. Alan, Mumford (1989). *Management Development Strategies For Action*, Fronne Somerset: The Eastern Press Ltd.
4. Baron, A. Robert (1983). *Behaviour In Organizations: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work*, London: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
5. Bernard, M. Bass (1960). *Leadership Psychology and Organisational Behaviour*, New York: Harper and Row
6. Best, John, W. & Kahn, James V. (2003). *Research in Education*, New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd.
7. Bhat, K. S. & Shankar, R. Ravi (1985). *Administration of Education*, New Delhi: Seema Publications.
8. Bhatnagar, R.P & Aggarwal, Vidya (1988). *Educational Administration*, Meerut: Loyal Book Depot.
9. Bhattacharya, S. (1983). *Management Effectiveness*, New Delhi: Oxford & I.B.H. Publications.
10. Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational Research-An Introduction*, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, New York: Longman Inc.
11. Borowiec-Koczera, Ann (2001). *Professional Development for School Administrators: Effects on school climate*, Dissertation Abstract International. Vol. 68, No. 6, PP. 2253-A.
12. Bredeson, P. V & Johansson, O. (2000). *The School Principal's Role in Teacher Professional Development*, Journal of In-service Education, Vol.26, No.2, PP.385-401.
13. Chakraborty, S. K. (1987). *Managerial Effectiveness and Quality of Work Life*, New Delhi: McGraw Hill Publishing Company.
14. Chandan. J.S. (1986). *Fundamentals of Modern Management*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishers.
15. Cohen, L & Manion, L. (1985). *Research Methods in Education*, London: Croom Helm Publishers.
16. Donald, H. McBurney (2003). *Research Methods*, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, USA: Wads Worth/ Thomson, Learning Belmont.
17. Dowine, N.M. (1967). *Fundamentals of Measurement Techniques and Practices*, New York: Oxford University Press.
18. Flick, Uwe (2009). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. London: Sage Publication.
19. Garrett, H. E. (2007). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 12<sup>th</sup> Edition, Paragon International Publishers.
20. Goel, S. L. & Goel Aruna (1994). *Educational Policy and Administration*, Deep and Deep Publications
21. Good, C. V. (1959). *Dictionary of Education*, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc.
22. Good, C.V. (1963). *Introduction to Educational Research*, New York: Appleton Century- Crofts.
23. Gorton, R.A. (1983). *School Administration & Supervision: Leadership Challenges and Opportunities*, Dubuque, IA: W.M. C. Brown Company Publishers.
24. Guilford, J. P. (1956). *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
25. Gupta, S. P. (1991). *Statistical Methods*, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition, New Delhi: Sultan Chand and Sons.
26. Hansom, E. M. (1999). *Educational Administration and Organizational Behaviour*, Bost: Allyn and Bacon Publications.
27. Kerlinger, Fred, N. (2007). *Foundations of Behavioural Research*, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc.
28. Khan, M. S. (1980). *Educational Administrators*, New Delhi: Ashish Publishing House.
29. Khanna, S.D.; Saxena, V.K.;Lamba, T.P & Murthy, V. (2000). *Educational Administration Planning, Supervision and Financing*, Delhi: Doeba Publications.
30. Kimbrough, B. Ralph & Michael Y. Nunnery (1988). *Educational Administration- An Introduction*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
31. Koul, Lokesh (1996). *Methodology of Educational Research*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Private Limited.
32. Kumar, U. (1986). *A Study of College Principal's Administrative Effectiveness in Relation to their Work Values, Attitudes and Self Concept*, Unpublished PhD. thesis (Education), Meerut University.
33. Lobo, Sr. Stella Anne (1983). *A Study of Values Manifested in Principals with Reference to Institutional Efficiency*, Unpublished PhD. thesis (Education), MSU.
34. Mangal, S. K. (2002). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
35. Mathew, Thomas C. (2003). *A Study of Organizational Commitment of Degree College Teachers in Relation to Work Values, Self Actualization and Leader Behaviour of Principals*, Indian Educational Abstracts, Vol. 4, No.1.
36. Mathur, S.S. (1990). *Educational Administration and Management*, Ambala: The Indian Publications.
37. Mensik, John (2006). *The Framework of an Effective Principal: A Community's Perspective*,

- Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.68, No.12, PP.4935-A.
38. Meyers, Lisa. H. (2008). An Examination of Leadership Behaviours of Lutheran High School Principals, Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.53, No.4, PP.4566.
  39. Mishra, B. K. & Mohanty, R. K. (2003). Trends and Issues in Indian Education, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Surya Publications.
  40. Mohanty, Jagannath (1995). Educational Administration, Supervision and School Management, New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publication.
  41. 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.
  42. Musaazi, J. C. S. (1987). The Theory and Practice of Educational Administration, New York: MacMillan Publishers.
  43. 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.
  44. Nadeem, N. A. (1989). Profile of the Effective Teachers, Srinagar: Fulbright Publishing Company.
  45. NEPA. (1978). Educational Administration in Jammu and Kashmir-A Survey Report, NUEPA Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-16.
  46. Pandya, S. R. (2001). Administration and Management of Education, 1<sup>st</sup> Edition, Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
  47. Prasad, L. M. (1996). Organizational Behaviour, New Delhi: Sultan Chand & Sons.
  48. Rasool,G., & Minakshi Chopra (1990). Introduction to Educational Administration and Supervision, Jalandhar: Narendara Publishing House. PP.36.
  49. Rasool,G., & Minakshi Chopra (1998). Education in Jammu and Kashmir-Issues and Documents, Jammu: Jay Kay Book House.
  50. Robore, R.W. (1985). Educational Administration- A Management Approach, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, INC.
  51. Redden, C.W. (1987). Managerial Effectiveness, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
  52. Robbins, P. Stephen (2003). Organisational Behaviour, Singapore: Pearson Education.
  53. Robore, R. W. (1985). Educational Administration: A Management Approach, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
  54. 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.
  55. Ryburn, M. W. (1953). The Organization of Schools, Oxford University Press.
  56. Singh (1979). A Study on Certain Myths held by Academia and Management Professionals in India, PhD. Education, Cited from Rashmi Diwan's Unpublished PhD. thesis, Education (1992), JMI, PP.117.
  57. Southam, K. D. (1980). A Study of the Relationship Among Work Values, Communicational Climate and Job Satisfaction for Personnel at Ohio University, Unpublished PhD. Thesis (Education), Ohio University, Michigan: Ann Arbov.
  58. Sudsberry, M. Jane (2008). The Role of the Principal in Leading School Improvement, Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.69, No.3, PP.841-A.
  59. Szabocsik, Sandra (2008). An Examination of Administrators' Leadership Content Knowledge in Literacy and their Self Reported Approaches to Supervision, Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.69, No.03, PP. 841-A.
  60. Thakar, A. S., Mussazi, J. C. S. & Aminu, P. M. (1980). Educational Administration, New Delhi: National Publishing House.
  61. Thomas, K. Crowl (1993). Fundamentals of Educational Research, W.C. Brown Communication, Inc.
  62. Travers, Robert, M.W. (1969). An Introduction to Educational Research, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, London: The MacMillan Limited.
  63. 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.
  64. 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.

9/5/2012