

Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour-A study of Educational Administrators in Kashmir

Basu Mudasir

Research Scholar, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India
E-Mail: showkat80ahmad@gmail.com

Abstract: The present study was aimed to investigate the Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators at Secondary Level of Education. The sample comprised of 250 Educational Administrators (119 Educational Administrators from High School Level and 120 Educational Administrators from Higher Secondary School Level). The data were collected by using Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale and Administrative Behaviour Scale. Percentage statistics, t-test and Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation was used to analyse the data. The overall results revealed that majority of educational administrators possessed average occupational efficacy while a good number of educational administrators possessed less effective administrative behaviour. A significant positive relationship exists between occupational efficacy and administrative behaviour of educational administrators. Again, it was found that Effective Educational Administrators differ significantly from Ineffective Educational Administrators with respect to Administrative Behaviour. A significant positive correlation exists between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour of Effective Educational Administrators and low correlation exists between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour of Ineffective Educational Administrators.

[Basu Mudasir. **Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour-A study of Educational Administrators in Kashmir**. *Researcher* 2012;4(11):30-37]. (ISSN: 1553-9865). <http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>. 3

Key Words: Administrative Behaviour, Effective Educational Administrators, Ineffective Educational Administrators, Occupational Efficacy.

Introduction

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 analysis of the many treatises regarding administrative behaviour, functions or processes has revealed much similarity. The terms and relative emphasis may differ, but there is a general agreement about the functions that are central to the role. These include making decisions, organizing, providing leadership, communication, dealing with conflict, managing change, relating to the environment of the organization, securing compliance and planning and controlling. Educational administrators carry out all these functions within a given educational organization.

Thus, administrators in education are needed for the accomplishment of set educational objectives within the available resources; who put in least human efforts and give a psychological satisfaction to all the concerned persons. How far an

administrator is able to do all this determines his/her effectiveness. Hence the quality and standard aspect of education requires effective educational administrators more than anything else.

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 have also been carried out on Administrative Behaviour of educational administrators. Kujar (2008) found a positive correlation between administrative effectiveness and the academic performance of the students; Kanchan (2001) found that administrative personality of principals had an impact on teachers that stimulated teachers to work sincerely for the benefit of the school; Ropers, Patil, Basanagouda (1994) found that most of the heads were neglecting their responsibilities and their lines of communication were almost closed. Haseen (1992) found that attitude towards teaching profession, job satisfaction and personal inter personal and social adequacy were found to be significant predictors of the administrative behaviour of secondary school heads.

The studies reviewed, however, showed that great deals of researches on Efficacy and its impact on learning goal motivation, student's enrolment, student's achievement and such other variables have been conducted. These studies have suggested that efficacy augments educational administrators in producing greater amount of performance and outcomes. Some of the studies have explained that Administrative Behaviour influences the achievement of students and teachers work. However, there has been no study examining the effect of Administrative Behaviour 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 and Administrative Behaviour of educational administrators with the object to find out their efficacy in transacting their administrative job at Secondary level of education.

Operational Definition of Important Terms:

i) Occupational Efficacy: Occupational Efficacy for the present study refers to the scores obtained by the sample subjects 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) Administrative Behaviour: Administrative Behaviour for the present study refers to the scores obtained by the sample subjects on Administrative Behaviour Scale (ABS) prepared by Haseen Taj.

Objectives of the Study:

The following objectives were formulated for the present investigation:

1. To describe the sample of Educational Administrators with regard to Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour.
2. To undertake correlational analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators.
3. To identify Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators at Secondary Level.
4. To study and compare the Administrative Behaviour of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators at secondary level.
5. To undertake correlational analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators.

The study empirically tested the following hypotheses:

1. Occupational Efficacy is significantly related with Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators.
2. Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly on Administrative Behaviour.

Delimitation of the study:

- 1) The present study was confined to Kashmir Province only having 10 districts namely-Anantnag, Bandipora, Baramulla, Budgam, Ganderbal, Kulgam, Kupwara, Pulwama, Shopian and Srinagar.
- 2) The present study was delimited to a total of 250 Educational Administrators and their 500 immediate Subordinates who were working at Government Secondary School Level of Education.

Methodology:

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

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
Grand Total = 250													

Tools Employed:

1. Occupational Self Efficacy Scale-OSES

prepared by Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari and Upinder Dhar (1999). The scale consists of nineteen items and has six sub-scales namely: Confidence, Command, Adaptability, Personal Effectiveness, Positive Attitude and Individuality. In this scale, the respondents are asked to respond on the 5 points given against each statement which are scored in the pattern as: Strongly Disagree-01, Disagree-02, Neutral-03, Agree-04, Strongly Agree-05. The reliability coefficient of the scale is .98. The scale has indicated high validity on account of being .99.

2. Administrative Behaviour Scale-ABS prepared by Haseen Taj (1998)

The scale consists of ninety items in four major areas of the scale namely: Planning, Organisation, Communication, and Decision-Making. In this scale the respondents are asked to respond on the 5 points given against each item which are scored in the pattern as: Always-4, Frequently-3, Sometimes-2, Rarely-1 & Never-0. The test-retest reliability of the Scale was found to be 0.85, split half reliability as 0.71 and the reliability was found to be 0.83 after applying Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. The Criterion Related validity of the scale was found to be 0.74 with LBDQ and 0.91 with the SABDQ. The inter-correlations among the

areas of the scale are very high, indicating the homogeneity of the scale.

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

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 and Administrative Behaviour.

(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%

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

(ii) Administrative Behaviour:

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

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

The analysis of the above table (1.2) shows the Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators at Secondary Level of Education. A perusal of the table reveals that out of 250 educational administrators, 18.4% of educational administrators possess extremely effective Administrative Behaviour. This implies that these administrators always plan and evenly distribute the work to be carried out by each member of their group. They organise their institutional work effectively keeping in view the work requirements and the accommodation available. They show speediness and flexibility in their decision making process and make appropriate decisions on right time. It has also been found that only 6% of educational administrators possess highly effective Administrative Behaviour. This exhibited that these educational administrators frequently fix up the targets of achievement of all institutional activities in the beginning of the academic year. They often call staff meetings to make their ideas known to the group. Time and again they supervise the work of their group members. The data further revealed that 19.2% of educational administrators possess effective Administrative Behaviour. This indicates that these educational administrators sometimes plan their activities in such a way that every activity has a time

frame and those have been finalised by consulting the group members. They sometimes keep themselves available for who-so-ever needs their assistance. It has also been found that majority of educational administrators i.e. 39.2% fall in the less effective category. This exhibited that these educational administrators always plan their tasks in a haphazard manner with the result every activity seems as a misfit in the total time frame. They display authoritarian attitude while distributing the work among the staff members which didn't suit their interest and capacity. The data again revealed that 17.2% of educational administrators possess ineffective Administrative Behaviour. This implies that these educational administrators never fix up their institutional goals in the beginning of the year. They distribute the work allotment in such a manner which for no reason suits to the interest and capability of their group members. They are slower in making decisions and never consult their group members in this process.

B. Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators.

To find out the correlational analysis between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour

of Educational Administrators, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (r) has been used.

Table 1.3 Correlation between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators-(N=250)

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

Table 1.3 depicts that there is a significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.507 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that Occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators is moderately influenced by their Administrative Behaviour. It can again be inferred from the same table that these educational administrators plan and distribute the work for each member of their group for the academic year. They adjust themselves with almost all challenging situations and shows positive attitude in resolving conflicts at their work place. They often maintain a communication link with their group and often take the decisions relating to institutional matter together with their group members. For the improvement of their profession and professional growth of their staff, different training programmes are attended and organised by them from time to time.

In view of the above empirical evidence, the hypothesis number one which reads as, "**Occupational Efficacy is significantly related with Administrative Behaviour 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. 67 educational administrators possessing high score were identified as Effective Educational Administrators and. 67 educational administrators possessing low score were identified as Ineffective Educational Administrators. This was followed by the comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Administrative Behaviour.

Table 1.4 Showing Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on four areas and total score of Administrative Behaviour Scale (N=67 each)

Areas	Group	Mean	Sd	T-Value	Level Of Significance
Planning	EEA	48.35	10.88	2.78	0.01 level
	IEA	43.56	8.97		
Organisation	EEA	54.01	16.68	4.09	0.01 level
	IEA	43.58	12.65		
Communication	EEA	63.80	16.75	4.84	0.01 level
	IEA	52.02	10.84		
Decision Making	EEA	46.56	2.43	7.73	0.01 Level
	IEA	40.53	5.98		
Total Score	EEA	212.74	42.65	4.87	0.01 level
	IEA	179.71	35.58		

EEA- Effective Educational Administrators

IEA- Ineffective Educational Administrators

- 1. Planning:** Table 1.4, row (i) shows a significant mean difference between Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Planning area of ABS. The obtained 't' value came out to be 2.78 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA in comparison to IEA which highlights that EEA plan and distributes the work to be carried out by each member of their group before the commencement of the academic year. Different meetings and training programmes to be conducted by the institution are also planned in advance. On the other hand IEA plan their tasks in a haphazard manner with the result every activity seems as a misfit in the total time frame. Also, they don't feel it necessary to consult their staff members while planning the institutional tasks.
- 2. Organisation:** A look on the above table, row (ii) exhibits that there is a significant mean difference between the Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Organisation area of ABS. The obtained 't' value came out to be 4.09 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA in comparison to IEA which highlights that EEA ensure proper organisation of institutional tasks. They supervise the work of their group members as per the time and schedule. On the other hand IEA fail to organise various activities because of the lack of material and accommodation. They fail to fix up the responsibility of each group member and don't consider it necessary to supervise their work. This finding is supported by the study of **Attri Kanchan-(2001)** who has found that administrative personality of principals had an impact on teachers that stimulated teachers to work sincerely for the benefit of the school.

Similarly, **Borowiec-Koczera-(2001)** found significant positive impact of administrators' participation in professional development activities on school climate.

3. **Communication:** It is also evident from the row (iii) of the table that there is a significant mean difference between the Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Communication area of ABS. The obtained 't' value came out to be 4.84 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA in comparison to IEA which highlights that EEA believe in direct and clear-cut sort of communication and always maintain a healthy communication link with their group members. The finding is in line with that of **Mensik-(2006)** who found that effective principals were visionary; they set a positive climate by communicating well with others. On the other hand IEA maintain a visible communication gap with their group members who don't have a say in the institutional matters. They discourage their colleagues to communicate with them and so fail to receive any communication on relevant matter. The finding is in agreement with that of **Patil, Basanagouda-(1994)** who indicated that most of the secondary school heads were neglecting their responsibilities and their lines of communication were almost closed. It was further found that their behaviour was not conducive to high teacher morale and organizational climate of the school.
4. **Decision Making:** Row (iv) of the same table shows that there is a significant mean difference between the Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Decision Making area of ABS. The obtained 't' value came out to be 7.73 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA in comparison to IEA which highlights that EEA analyse the situation thoroughly before taking any decision. They show flexibility in their decision making process and make appropriate decisions on right time together with the group members. On the other hand IEA never analyse the situation before taking any decision. They are slower in their decision making process and consider it least important to take the opinion of their group members in this process. The finding is in line with **Cobb-(1996)** who found that principal's perception of teacher's involvement in decision making at local school level was higher than teacher's perception of their involvement.
5. **Total Score:** A perusal of the above table, last row shows the significance of difference between the mean scores of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on overall dimensions

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

In view of the above empirical evidence, the hypothesis number two which reads as, **"Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly on Administrative Behaviour"** stands accepted.

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

Table 1.5 Showing the correlation between Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators (N=67each)

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

EEA: Effective Educational Administrators

IEA: Ineffective Educational Administrators

Table 1.5 indicates that there is significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Administrative Behaviour of Effective Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.641 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that more the Occupational Efficacy; higher shall be the rating of Administrative Behaviour of EEA. This again indicates that EEA plan different institutional activities with great confidence and work independently and effectively even under the pressure of deadline. They display their ability to handle unforeseen situations at their work place and if there occur any kind of failure in any of the tasks, they re-evaluate their strategies. They show flexibility in their decision making process and makes appropriate decisions with their group members. For the growth of their staff, different training programmes are attended and organised by them from time to time. The same row of the table again revealed that there is low correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Administrative Behaviour of Ineffective Educational Administrators. The coefficient of correlation came out to be 0.018 which has failed to arrive at any level of significance. This implies that Occupational Efficacy negligibly influences the Administrative Behaviour of Ineffective

Educational Administrators. It again depicted that Ineffective Educational Administrators plan their institutional activities in such a manner that every activity seems as a misfit in the total time frame. They maintain a visible communication gap with their group members who don't have a say in institutional matters. Also they are slower in their decision making process which are hardly directed towards the fulfilment of goals.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS:

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

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

Bibliography

1. Attri, Kanchan (2001). Administrative Background of the School Principals on School Climate, *Journal of Education*, Vol.40, No.1, PP.49-52.
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. Borowiec-Koczera, Ann (2001). *Professional Development for School Administrators: Effects on school climate*, Dissertation Abstract International. Vol. 68, No. 6, PP. 2253-A.
8. Chakraborty, S. K. (1987). *Managerial Effectiveness and Quality of Work Life*, New Delhi: McGraw Hill Publishing Company.
9. Cobb, R. Claxton (1996). *Shared Decision Making in the Schools of the South Carolina Department of Corrections*, Unpublished PhD. Thesis, University of South Carolina.
10. Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1985). *Research Methods in Education*, London: Croom Helm Publishers.
11. Donald, H. McBurney (2003). *Research Methods*, 5th Edition, USA: Wads Worth/Thomson, Learning Belmont.
12. Garrett, H. E. (2007). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 12th Edition, Paragon International Publishers.
13. Goel, S. L. & Goel Aruna (1994). *Educational Policy and Administration*, Deep and Deep Publications
14. Good, C.V. (1963). *Introduction to Educational Research*, New York: Appleton Century-Crofts.
15. Gorton, R.A. (1983). *School Administration & Supervision: Leadership Challenges and Opportunities*, Dubuque, IA: W.M. C. Brown Company Publishers.
16. Guilford, J. P. (1956). *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 3rd Edition, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
17. Hansom, E. M. (1999). *Educational Administration and Organizational Behaviour*, Bost: Allyn and Bacon Publications.
18. Kerlinger, Fred, N. (2007). *Foundations of Behavioural Research*, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc.
19. Khan, M. S. (1980). *Educational Administrators*, New Delhi: Ashish Publishing House.
20. Khanna, S.D.; Saxena, V.K.;Lamba, T.P & Murthy, V. (2000). *Educational Administration Planning, Supervision and Financing*, Delhi: Doeba Publications.
21. Kimbrough, B. Ralph & Michael Y. Nunnery (1988). *Educational Administration- An Introduction*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

22. Koul, Lokesh (1996). *Methodology of Educational Research*, 2nd Edition, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Private Limited.
23. Kujar, A. S. (2008). *A Study of Administrative Effectiveness and Academic Performance of the Students of Senior Secondary Schools in Ranchi*, Unpublished M. A. Dissertation, JMI, New Delhi.
24. Mangal, S. K. (2002). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 2nd Edition, New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
25. Mensik, John (2006). *The Framework of an Effective Principal: A Community's Perspective*, Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.68, No.12, PP.4935-A.
26. Mishra, B. K. & Mohanty, R. K. (2003). *Trends and Issues in Indian Education*, 3rd Edition, Surya Publications.
27. 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.
28. Pandya, S. R. (2001). *Administration and Management of Education*, 1st Edition, Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
29. Patil, Chanappagoda, B. (1994). *A Study of Administrative Behaviour of Headmasters of Secondary Schools in Karnataka*, Unpublished PhD. Thesis (Education), Karnataka University.
30. Pethe, S; Chaudhari S. & Dhar, U. (2005). *Manual for Occupational Self Efficacy Scale (OSES)*, Agra: National Psychological Corporation.
31. Prasad, L. M. (1996). *Organizational Behaviour*, New Delhi: Sultan Chand & Sons.
32. Rasool,G., & Minakshi Chopra (1990). *Introduction to Educational Administration and Supervision*, Jalandhar: Narendara Publishing House. PP.36.
33. 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.
34. Rebore, R.W. (1985). *Educational Administration- A Management Approach*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, INC.
35. Redden, C.W. (1987). *Managerial Effectiveness*, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
36. Robbins, P. Stephen (2003). *Organisational Behaviour*, Singapore: Pearson Education.
37. Robore, R. W. (1985). *Educational Administration: A Management Approach*, New Jersey: Printice Hall.
38. 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.
39. Ryburn, M. W. (1953). *The Organization of Schools*, Oxford University Press.
40. Schofield, Ken (2008). *A Case Study of an Effective Elementary Principal*, Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.69, No.03, PP. 840-A.
41. Taj, Haseen (1992). *Social-Psychological and Situational Correlates of the Administrative Behaviour of Secondary School Heads*, Ph.D. Education, Bangalore University, In M.B. Buch (Ed.), *Fifth Survey of Educational Research*, Vol. II PP.1825.
42. Thakar, A. S., Mussazi, J. C. S. & Aminu, P. M. (1980). *Educational Administration*, New Delhi: National Publishing House.
43. Thomas, K. Crowl (1993). *Fundamentals of Educational Research*, W.C. Brown Communication, Inc.
44. 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.
45. Vashist, S. R. (1994). *Encyclopaedia of Educational Administration-Educational Administration in India*, New Delhi: Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd.