

Managerial Profile Of Effective Educational Administrators In Kashmir- A Study

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 and copes with the change. The present study shall investigate the managerial profile of effective educational administrators in Kashmir. The sample will comprise of 250 Educational Administrators and their 500 immediate Subordinates. For this study seven questionnaires (one self constructed) shall be employed to collect the data. Percentage statistics, t-test and Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation shall be used to analyse the data. The findings indicated a significant difference between effective and ineffective educational administrators with regard to various parameters of managerial profile and a significant relationship between various parameters of managerial profile within the groups of effective and ineffective educational administrators.

[Basu Mudasir. **Managerial Profile Of Effective Educational Administrators In Kashmir- A Study.** *Researcher* 2012;4(11):12-29]. (ISSN: 1553-9865). <http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>. 2

Key Words: Managerial Profile, Occupational Efficacy, Administrative Behaviour, Leadership Behaviour Pattern, Job Activity.

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 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..

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.

Strong accountable leadership has always been a hallmark of successful institutions. Leadership is an "Influencing Process" where leaders motivate the members of an organisation to get their best efforts and achieve organisational objectives. Administration is increasingly linked with values and administrators also enter the organisation with certain preconceived notions. Therefore, they are expected to recognise different values since these provide guidelines and directions in the effort towards work effectiveness.

Similarly, in educational settings, attitudes of an administrator towards teaching are important because they affect their job behaviour. As attitudes determine performance and effectiveness of

administrator in an educational setting so attitude of educational administrators should necessarily be favourable to facilitate the effective functioning of any educational institution and the success of its programmes.

The efficiency of an educational institution can, to a considerable extent, be assessed by the level of job satisfaction of its administrator. Unless an administrator is satisfied, he may not be able to develop desirable attitudes, values, work habits and adequate personal adjustment in his group. Similarly, job activities that an administrator is called upon to perform are important for effective functioning of an organization. In short, what and how various activities, duties and responsibilities are performed by an educational administrator in an organization determine his efficiency. 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.

Research findings of educational administrators' occupational 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. 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. 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. Kujar (2008) found a positive correlation between administrative effectiveness and the academic performance of the students; 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. Some researches have also been carried out on Leadership Behaviour of educational administrators. Research findings on educational administrators' job value established the following facts; Mathew (2003) revealed that there is a positive relationship between organisational

commitment with that of work values and leadership behaviour of principals. Singh (1999) found all the work associated values were more appealing to all the group of educational administrators. Kumar (1986) reported that work value of the principals was significantly related with their administrative effectiveness.

Study conducted by Jonathan, Philip & Henry (2009) found the importance of principals' work attitude for student learning. Lynn (2006) found some predictors of attitude, such as level of experience with gifted education and type of community among most district administrators. Raut (1995) found work satisfaction of teachers was positively correlated to organisational effectiveness. 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 their work day 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. With a different approach Neil, Carlisle et al. (2001) reported insufficient delegation of tasks by the principals which are regarded as of low value and principals don't have time to focus on activities which they say are important to them as school leaders.

For many aspects of educational administration, researchers seems to have studied much, however, they have not touched the themes that are critical for improving the quality of education including its managerial efficiency. While most of the studies are of academic interest, they have limited value in bringing changes in its organisation, administration and management of education. Thus this study explores the gap by looking into the managerial profile of educational administrators with the object to find out their efficacy in transacting their multiple tasks at secondary level of education.

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.
2. To identify Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators at secondary level.
3. To compare Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on various parameters of Managerial Profile.

4. To undertake correlational analysis between various parameters of Managerial Profile within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators.

The study empirically tested the following hypotheses:

1. Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly on various parameters of Managerial Profile.
2. Occupational Efficacy is significantly related with various parameters of Managerial Profile within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators.

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		Total	Principal			CEO			Director		
Male	Female	Male	Female		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
30	30	30	29	119	60	60	120	10	×	10	×	01	11
Grand Total = 250													

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		Total	Senior Lectures			Deputy CEO		Principal		Joint Director		Total
Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
60	60	29	29	30	30	238	120	120	240	05	05	05	05	01	01	22
Grand Total = 500																

Instruments Employed:

The research instruments consisted of:

- a) Adopted Questionnaires which includes: Occupational Self Efficacy Scale, Administrative Behaviour Scale, Leadership Effectiveness Scale, Attitude Scale Towards Teaching Profession, Job Value Questionnaire and Job Satisfaction Scale.
- b) A Self constructed questionnaire-Job Activity Analysis Scale.

Statistical Analysis:

The data collected was subjected to the following statistical treatment:

Percentage statistics, t-test, coefficient of correlation

Analysis and Discussion:

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

- A. Descriptive Analysis of Educational Administrators on various parameters of Managerial Profile.
- B. Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy and various parameters of Managerial Profile.
- C. Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on various Parameters of Managerial Profile.
- D. Correlational Analysis between various Parameters 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.

(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 organizations. 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. The data further revealed that 16.8% of educational administrators fall in below average category. This indicates that these educational administrators are easily moved over unforeseen consequences and display their worries when facing a challenging situation.

(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. 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. 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. 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. 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.

(iii) Leadership Behaviour Pattern:

Table 1.3 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. 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.

(iv) Job Value:

Table 1.4 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%

A perusal of the above table 1.4 depicts the Job Value of sample administrators. A look at the table reveals that out of total number of 250 educational administrators, 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. 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.

(v) Attitude Towards Teaching Profession:

Table 1.5 Showing overall Percentage of Educational Administrators on Attitude Scale Towards Teaching Profession at Secondary level of Education (N=250)

Range of scores obtained on ASTTP	Classification	N	Percentage
192-207	Extremely Favourable	19	7.6%
176-191	Highly Favourable	26	10.4%
160-175	Average	162	64.8%
144-159	Highly Unfavourable	02	0.8%
128-143	Extremely Unfavourable	41	16.4%

In terms of Occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators (250) at Secondary Level of Education, 64.8% i.e. majority of the educational administrators fall in above average category, which implies that these educational administrators believe that teaching widens the social sphere of a person and there are many benefits in teaching profession other than money. It has also been found that 7.6% of the educational administrators fall in extremely favourable category. These educational administrators report that teaching is one of the greatest stimulants to mental activity and a best means of self-expression. Further, the data depicted that 10.4% of educational administrators possess highly favourable attitude towards teaching profession which revealed that these educational administrators agree that teaching is a good means of self-expression and it helps in developing their character. It has also been found that 0.8% of educational administrators possess poorly favourable attitude towards teaching profession. This indicated that these educational administrators hold that it is difficult to lead a luxurious life in teaching profession. Lastly, it has been found that 16.4% of educational administrators fall in extremely unfavourable category. This implies that these educational administrators believe that there is a scope for idling away one's time in teaching profession. They further reported that the salaries paid to them are a national waste.

(vi) Job Satisfaction:

Table 1.6 Showing overall Percentage of Educational Administrators on Job Satisfaction Scale at Secondary level of Education (N=250)

Range of scores obtained on JSS	Classification	N	Percentage
74 or Above	Extremely Satisfied	50	20%
63-73	Very Satisfied	-	0%
56-62	Moderately Satisfied	155	62%
48-55	Not Satisfied	24	9.6%
47 or Below	Extremely Dissatisfied	21	8.4%

The analysis of the above table (1.6) depicts the Job Satisfaction of sample administrators. It has been found that 20% of the educational administrators are extremely satisfied with their job. This indicates that these educational administrators are extremely contented with their places of posting and appreciate the inbuilt programmes available in their job. It has also been found that majority of educational administrators i.e. 62% fall in the moderately satisfied category. This indicates that these educational administrators moderately enjoy the working conditions of their job which gives them good time and opportunities to attend their family. They like the less authoritarian functioning of their job which in its own way tries to improve the quality of life. Further the results revealed that 9.6% of educational administrators are not satisfied with their job. This implies that these educational administrators are poorly satisfied with their places of posting and its working conditions. They believe that malpractices like corruption, favouritism etc are deep rooted in their job and so if they will be given a chance they would like to shift to some other job. It has again been found that 8.4 % of educational administrators fall in extremely dissatisfied category. This indicates that these educational administrators are extremely dissatisfied with their job which they feel is irksome and inconvenient to them. They are also highly displeased with the inadequate communication network and low social status provided in their job.

(vi) Job Activity Analysis:

Table 1.7 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 1.7 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 towards 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. 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 academic than the activities and don't allow the students to participate in the same. They always complain of fatigue and hand over all their responsibilities to their subordinates.

B. Correlational Analysis between Occupational Efficacy and various parameters Managerial Profile of Educational Administrators.

To find out the correlational analysis between Occupational Efficacy and various variables of Managerial Profile of Educational Administrators, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (r) has been used.

Table 2.1 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 2.1 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.

Table 2.2 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 2.2 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 2.3 Correlation between Occupational Efficacy and Job Value of Educational Administrators- (N=250)

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

Table2.3 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.

Table 2.4 Correlation between Occupational Efficacy and Attitude Towards Teaching Profession-(ATTP) of Educational Administrators (N=250)

Occupational Efficacy & ATTP	r = 0.420	Sig. at 0.01 level
---------------------------------	-----------	--------------------

Table 2.4 depicts that there is a significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy

and the Attitude Towards Teaching Profession of Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.420 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that Occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators is more or less influenced by their Attitude Towards Teaching Profession.

Table2.5 Correlation between Occupational Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators (N=250)

Occupational Efficacy & Job Satisfaction	r = 0.501	Sig. at 0.01 level
---	-----------	--------------------

Table 2.5 depicts that there is significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.501 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that Occupational Efficacy of Educational Administrators is moderately influenced by Job Satisfaction. The finding is in agreement with the results of **Nobile & McCormick-(2005)** who found that there is strong to moderate correlation between job satisfaction and occupational variables. Further the results revealed occupational variables to be best predictor of job satisfaction variables.

Table2.6 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 1.3 depicts a significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Job Activity of Educational Administrators as being 0.401. This suggested that Occupational Efficacy of educational administrators is more or less influenced by their cognizance of Job Activity

C. Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on various parameters of Managerial profile.

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 various parameters of Managerial profile.

Table 3.1 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 3.1 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.
- 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. 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. 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. **Patil, Basanagouda-(1994)** 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. 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.

Table 3.2 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		

EEA- Effective Educational Administrators

IEA- Ineffective Educational Administrators

- 1. Interpersonal Relations:** Table 3.2 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 reveals that EEA display better Leadership Behaviour in Interpersonal Relation area than the IEA.
- 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 display better Leadership

Behaviour in Intellectual Operations area than the IEA.

- 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 reveals that EEA display better Leadership Behaviour in Behavioural & Emotional Stability area than the IEA. 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 reveals that EEA display better Leadership Behaviour in Ethical & Moral Strength area than the IEA
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.
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 reveals that EEA display better Leadership Behaviour in Operation As A Citizen area than the IEA. 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 3.3 Showing Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on eleven areas and total score of Job Value Questionnaire (N=67 each)

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

IEA- Ineffective Educational Administrators

While comparing the Effective and Ineffective educational administrators on various dimensions and composite scores of Job Value Questionnaire, it has been found that EEA exhibit greater Job Value than IEA. The calculated ‘t’-value for different dimensions 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 in Financial Benefits, Non-Financial Benefits, Opportunities for Development & Promotion, Opportunities for Responsible & Independent Action, Job & Personal Security, Type or Kind of Work, Job According to Interest & Abilities,

Supervisor- Supervision & Management, Co- workers & Subordinates, Recognition & Appreciation for Accomplishment of Job, Working Conditions areas than the. The finding 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 hieracrchy, 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.

Table 3.4 Showing Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on five areas and total score of Attitude Scale Towards Teaching Profession (N=67 each)

AREAS	GROUP	MEAN	SD	t-VALUE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Academic Aspect of Teaching Profession	EEA	33.61	2.05	9.75	0.01 level
	IEA	25.26	6.71		
Administrative Aspect of Teaching Profession	EEA	21.61	2.02	6.44	0.01 level
	IEA	18.20	3.84		
Social & Psychological Aspect of Teaching Profession	EEA	86.76	5.08	11.27	0.01 level
	IEA	73.46	8.25		
Co-curricular Aspect of Teaching Profession	EEA	16.07	3.69	7.01	0.01 level

	IEA	12.62	1.63		
Economic Aspect of Teaching Profession	EEA	19.08	2.31	8.24	0.01 level
	IEA	16.55	1.02		
Total Score	EEA	177.14	61.20	3.98	0.01 level
	IEA	146.11	17.74		

EEA- Effective Educational Administrators

IEA- Ineffective Educational Administrators

i) Academic Aspect of Teaching Profession: Table 3.4, row (i) indicates that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Academic Aspect of Teaching Profession dimension of Attitude Scale Towards Teaching Profession. As reflected by ‘t’-value (9.75), the mean difference favours EEA which implies that EEA display favourable Attitude in Academic Aspect of Teaching Profession area than the IEA.

ii) Administrative Aspect of Teaching Profession: The above table, row (ii) reveals that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Administrative Aspect of Teaching Profession dimension of Attitude Scale Towards Teaching Profession. As reflected by ‘t’-value (6.44) which is significant at 0.01 level of significance the mean difference favours EEA which implies that EEA display favourable Attitude in Administrative Aspect of Teaching Profession area than the IEA.

iii) Social & Psychological Aspect of Teaching Profession: A quick look at the same table, row (iii) makes it clear that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Social and Psychological Aspect of Teaching Profession dimension of Attitude Scale Towards Teaching Profession. As reflected by ‘t’-value (11.27) which is significant at 0.01 level of significance the mean difference favours EEA which reveals that EEA display favourable Attitude in Social & Psychological Aspect of Teaching Profession area than the IEA

iv) Co-curricular Aspect of Teaching Profession: Row (iv) of the same table further reveals that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Co-curricular Aspect of Teaching Profession

dimension of Attitude Scale Towards Teaching Profession. The obtained ‘t’-value came out to be 7.01 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA which reveals that EEA display favourable Attitude in Co-curricular Aspect of Teaching Profession area than the IEA.

v) Economic Aspect of Teaching Profession: A look on the row (v) of the table also indicates that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Economic Aspect of Teaching Profession dimension of Attitude Scale Towards Teaching Profession. The obtained ‘t’-value came out to be 8.24 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA which reveals that EEA display favourable Attitude in Economic Aspect of Teaching Profession area than the IEA

vi) Total Score: The last row (vi) of the same table also indicates that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on overall dimensions of Attitude Scale Towards Teaching Profession. The obtained ‘t’-value came out to be 3.98 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA which reveals that EEA exhibit favourable attitude towards teaching profession on overall dimensions of Attitude Scale Towards Teaching Profession than Ineffective Educational Administrators. The findings are in line with that of **Usmani Shaheen-(1988)** who found that attitude towards teaching, professional attainment, socio-economic status, economic value, political value and social value contributed significantly to principal effectiveness. Similarly, **Saxena-(1995)** found that effective teachers had relatively favourable teaching attitude than ineffective teachers.

Table 3.5 Showing Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on five areas and total score of Job Satisfaction Scale (N=67 each)

AREAS	GROUP	MEAN	SD	t-VALUE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Job Concrete Factors	EEA	18.44	5.45	8.31	0.01 level
	IEA	12.04	3.23		
Job Abstract Factors	EEA	19.58	3.68	10.70	0.01 level

	IEA	12.89	3.56		
Psychosocial Factors	EEA	19.65	7.85	7.42	0.01 level
	IEA	11.56	4.48		
Economic Factors	EEA	11.34	2.00	5.00	0.01 level
	IEA	9.89	1.32		
Community / National Growth Factors	EEA	11.64	2.12	7.34	0.01 level
	IEA	9.29	1.57		
Total Score	EEA	80.64	17.33	9.60	0.01 Level
	IEA	55.70	12.49		

EEA- Effective Educational Administrators

IEA- Ineffective Educational Administrators

Table 3.5 gives the Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on the five areas and composite scores of Job Satisfaction scale:

1. Job Concrete Factors: The results obtained in the above table, row (i) clearly indicate that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Job Concrete Factors dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 8.31 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA which reveals that EEA are better satisfied in Job Concrete factors area than the IEA.

2. Job Abstract Factors: It is evident from the table, row (ii) that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Job Abstract Factors dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 10.70 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA which reveals that EEA are better satisfied in Job Abstract factors area than the IEA.

3. Psychosocial Factors: Row (iii) of the same table shows that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Psychosocial Factors dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 7.42 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA than the IEA which reveals that EEA are better satisfied in Psychological Factors area than the IEA.

4. Economic Factors: Row (iv) of the above table also exhibits that there is a significant mean difference

between EEA and IEA on Economic Factors dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 5.00 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA than the IEA which reveals that EEA are better satisfied in Economic factors area than the IEA. These findings are in agreement with that of **Saxena-(1995)** who found that effective teachers are relatively more satisfied with their job in comparison to ineffective educational administrators.

5. Community/National Growth Factors: The row (v) of the same table clearly indicates that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on Community/National Growth Factors dimension of Job Satisfaction Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 7.34 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA than the IEA which reveals that EEA are better satisfied in Community/National Growth factors area than the IEA. These findings are in line with that of **Chaplein-(2001)** who found that highest levels of job satisfaction among primary head teachers came from personal factors and organisational factors.

6. Total Score: Last row (vi) of the same table also reveals that there is a significant mean difference between EEA and IEA on overall dimensions of Job Satisfaction Scale. The calculated 't'-value came out to be 9.60 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean difference favours EEA, which reveals that EEA are better satisfied with their job than the IEA.

Table 3.6 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

1. Managing Institutional Support Service: Table 3.6, 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 which reveals that EEA are highly cognizant in Managing Institutional Support area than the IEA

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 which reveals that EEA are highly cognizant in Managing Instructional Programme area than the IEA. 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.

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 which reveals that EEA are highly cognizant in Managing The Community Relations area than the IEA

4. Professional & Personnel Development: Table 1.3 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 which reveals that EEA are highly cognizant in Professional & Personnel Development area than the IEA. 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. 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 which reveals that EEA are highly cognizant in Supervision & Appraisal area than the IEA.

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 one which reads as, "**Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators differ significantly on various parameters of Managerial Profile.**" stands accepted.

D. Correlational Analysis between various parameters within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators.

Table 4.1 Showing the correlation of Occupational Efficacy with various parameters of Managerial Profile amongst the Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators (N=67each)

Parameters	Groups	Value of 'r'	Level of Significance
Administrative Behaviour	EEA	0.641	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.018	Not Significant
Leadership Behaviour Pattern	EEA	0.638	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.106	Not Significant
Job Value	EEA	0.758	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.112	Not Significant
Attitude Towards Teaching Profession	EEA	0.759	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.013	Not Significant
Job Satisfaction	EEA	0.686	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.017	Not Significant
Job Activity	EEA	0.652	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.102	Not Significant

EEA: Effective Educational Administrators

IEA: Ineffective Educational Administrators

Table 4.1 indicates that there is significant p correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Administrative Behaviour of Effective Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.641 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that more the Occupational Efficacy; higher shall be the rating of Administrative Behaviour of EEA. The same row of the table again revealed that there is low correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Administrative Behaviour of Ineffective Educational Administrators. The coefficient of correlation came out to be 0.018 which has failed to arrive at any level of significance. This implies that Occupational Efficacy negligibly influences the Administrative Behaviour of Ineffective Educational Administrators..

The above table again 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 negligibly fosters the Leadership Behaviour Pattern of Ineffective

Educational Administrators. These findings 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.

Further, the results in the above table indicate 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. This suggested that more the Occupational efficacy; higher shall be the rating of Job Value of EEA. 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 results further revealed that there is low relationship between Occupational Efficacy and 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 4.1 also indicates that there is significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Attitude of Effective Educational Administrators Towards Teaching Profession, having coefficient of correlation as 0.759 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that more the Occupational Efficacy; higher shall be the rating of EEA Attitude Towards Teaching Profession. The findings are in line with that of **Kumar-(1986)** who found that attitude of the principals is significantly related with their administrative effectiveness, Similarly **Taj Haseen-(1992)** who found that attitude towards teaching is significantly related to the administrative behaviour of secondary school heads. The same row of the table again revealed that there is low correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Ineffective Educational Administrators' Attitude Towards Teaching Profession. The coefficient of correlation came out to be 0.013 which has failed to

arrive at any level of significance. This implies that Occupational Efficacy negligibly aids the Attitude of Ineffective Educational Administrators Towards teaching Profession.

A perusal of the table (4.1) again indicates that there is significant positive correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Job Satisfaction of Effective Educational Administrators having coefficient of correlation as 0.686 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. This suggested that more the Occupational Efficacy; higher shall be the rating of Job Satisfaction of EEA. The same row of the table again revealed that there is low correlation between Occupational Efficacy and the Job Satisfaction of Ineffective Educational Administrators. The coefficient of correlation came out to be 0.017 which has failed to arrive at any level of significance. This implies that Occupational Efficacy negligibly influences the Job Satisfaction of Ineffective Educational Administrators. These findings are in agreement with the findings of **Raut-(1995)** who found work satisfaction of principals as positively correlated to organizational effectiveness. Similarly, **Kwong, Walker and Allan-(2010)** found a positive relationship between occupational efficacy and job satisfaction of the vice principals.

Table 4.1 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.

In the light of above empirical evidences the second hypotheses which reads as, "**Occupational Efficacy is significantly related with various parameters of Managerial Profile within the groups of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators**" stands accepted.

Conclusion and Implications

On the basis of the findings of the present study, the Managerial Profile of Effective Educational Administrators in Kashmir has emerged as under: Effective Educational Administrators 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. They assign considerable value to their job by holding that there is financial and non-financial stability in it. They utilize different opportunities provided by their job to do new things in most constructive way. Effective Educational Administrators maintain a perfect balance between their administrative work and teaching classes as they believe that teaching develops their personality and is a best means of self expression. They supervise the institutional tasks ensuring that the objectives of their institution are achieved. All these characteristics which make up the Managerial Profile of Effective Educational Administrators in turn positively influence their Occupational Efficacy.

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 and their institutional output as perceived by their subordinates. 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. Best, John, W. & Kahn, James V. (2003). *Research in Education*, New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd.
4. Bhattacharya, S. (1983). *Management Effectiveness*, New Delhi: Oxford & I.B.H. Publications.
5. 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.
6. Borowiec-Koczera, Ann (2001). Professional Development for School Administrators: Effects on school climate, *Dissertation Abstract International*. Vol. 68, No. 6, PP. 2253-A.
7. Chakraborty, S. K. (1987). *Managerial Effectiveness and Quality of Work Life*, New Delhi: McGraw Hill Publishing Company.
8. Chaplain, R.P. (2001). Stress and Job Satisfaction Among Primary Head-Teachers: A Question of Balance, *Dissertation Abstract International*, Vol.68, No.9, PP. 3675-A.
9. Cobb, R. Claxton (1996). *Shared Decision Making in the Schools of the South Carolina Department of Corrections*, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of South Carolina.
10. Cohen, L & Manion, L. (1985). *Research Methods in Education*, London: Croom Helm Publishers.
11. Ekundayo, Haastrap (2010). Principals' Leadership Behaviour as a determinant of Effectiveness of Secondary Schools in Nigeria, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No. 1.
12. Garrett, H. E. (2007). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 12th Edition, Paragon International Publishers.
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*, 3rd Edition, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
15. Jonathan, S.; Philip, S. & Henry, M. (2009). How Principals and Peers Influence Teaching and Learning, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No. 1-4, PP. 123.
16. Kerlinger, Fred, N. (2007). *Foundations of Behavioural Research*, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc.
17. Kimbrough, B. Ralph & Michael Y. Nunnery (1988). *Educational Administration- An Introduction*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
18. 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.
19. Kulsum (1999). A Factor Analytical Study of Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement of Secondary School Teachers in Bangalore City, Cited from Anju Mehrotra's Unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Education), JMI (2002), PP.59.
20. Kumar, U. (1986). A Study of College Principal's Administrative Effectiveness in Relation to their Work Values, Attitudes and Self Concept, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Education), Meerut University.
21. Lobo, Sr. Stella Anne (1983). A Study of Values Manifested in Principals with Reference to Institutional Efficiency, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Education), MSU.
22. Lynn, Jennifer Meisterhein (2006). Elementary School District Administrators' Attitude Towards Special Performing for the Gifted, *Dissertation Abstract International*, Vol.68, No.02, PP.423-A.
23. 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.
24. Mensik, John (2006). The Framework of an Effective Principal: A Community's Perspective, *Dissertation Abstract International*, Vol.68, No.12, PP.4935-A.

25. Meyers, Lisa. H. (2008). An Examination of Leadership Behaviours of Lutheran High School Principals, *Dissertation Abstract International*, Vol.53, No.4, PP.4566.
26. Mishra, B. K & Mohanty, R. K. (2003). Trends and Issues in Indian Education, 3rd Edition, Surya Publications.
27. 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.
28. 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.
29. Nobile, John & McCormie, John (2005). Job Satisfaction and Occupational Stress in Catholic Primary School, *Educational Management Abstracts*, Vol. 27, No.1-12.
30. Pandya, S. R. (2001). Administration and Management of Education, 1st Edition, Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
31. Patil, Chanappagoda, B. (1994). A Study of Administrative Behaviour of Headmasters of Secondary Schools in Karnataka, Unpublished PhD. Thesis (Education), Karnataka University.
32. Prasad, L. M. (1996). Organizational Behaviour, New Delhi: Sultan Chand & Sons.
33. Rasool,G., & Minakshi Chopra (1990). Introduction to Educational Administration and Supervision, Jalandhar: Narendara Publishing House. PP.36.
34. 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.
35. 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.
36. Redden, C.W. (1987). Managerial Effectiveness, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
37. 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.
38. Robbins, P. Stephen (2003). Organisational Behaviour, Singapore: Pearson Education.
39. Rowland, Keith A. (2008). The Relationship of Principal Leadership and Teacher Morale, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 69, No.2.
40. 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.
41. Saxena, Jyotsna (1995). A Study of Teacher Effectiveness in Relation to Adjustment, Job Satisfaction and Attitude Towards Teaching Profession, *Indian Educational Abstract*, Vol. II- NCERT.
42. Schofield, Ken (2008). A Case Study of an Effective Elementary Principal, *Dissertation Abstract International*, Vol.69, No.03, PP. 840-A.
43. 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.
44. Singh, I. (1999). A Comparative Study of Teachers Work Value, Mental Health and Attitude Towards Teaching in Different Types of Secondary Schools, PhD. Education *Indian Educational Review*, Vol. XXV, NO.4.
45. 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 Arbor.
46. Sudha, T. (1997). A Study of the Leadership Effectiveness in Secondary Schools of Delhi, Unpublished PhD. Thesis (Education), JMI, New Delhi.
47. Sudsberry, M. Jane (2008). The Role of the Principal in Leading School Improvement, *Dissertation Abstract International*, Vol.69, No.3, PP.841-A.
48. 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.
49. 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.
50. Upasani, N.K; Chaudhury, K; Deshpande,V.S; Deshpande, S.S and Katre, S.A. (1991). A Study of Some Models of Efficient and In-Efficient Administration and Management at Secondary School Level in Pune District, In M.B. Buch (Ed.), *Fifth Survey of Educational Research*, Vol. II, PP.1854.
51. 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.