

Full Length Research Paper

Occupational efficacy and job satisfaction of educational administrators- A question of outcome

Basu Mudasir

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

Accepted February 27, 2013

This paper explains the job satisfaction of educational administrators' and how it affects their occupational efficacy. The sample comprised of 250 Educational Administrators (119 Educational Administrators were taken from High School Level and 120 Educational Administrators were taken from Higher Secondary School Level). The data were collected by using two adopted questionnaire. Percentage statistics, t-test and Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation was used to analyse the data. The overall results revealed that Effective Educational Administrators differ significantly from Ineffective Educational Administrators with respect to their Job Satisfaction. A significant positive correlation exists between Occupational Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Effective Educational Administrators and low correlation exists between Occupational Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Ineffective Educational Administrators.

Keywords: Effective Educational Administrators, Ineffective Educational Administrators, Job Satisfaction, Occupational Efficacy.

INTRODUCTION

Our new millennium society, which is an increasingly diverse, globalized and complex, media-saturated society, is changing rapidly, so new techniques are being adopted in education to meet its needs. It is a hard fact that education is a complex and highly specialised field and its efficient administration requires technical competence, administrative acumen and understanding of the educational development. Competent and effective administrators are of vital importance to the success of every dynamic organization that has the ability to persuade others to accomplish the goals of the organization. An administrators' efficacy lies in the fact how much he is cognizant, understands the process, possesses stable job ideas and copes with the change. Further, administrator's stable values are what make the foundation for an efficient administration. Today, educational administrators have multifaceted roles to

play. They are expected to uphold the highest standards in professional commitment, communication skills, interpersonal skills, classroom personality, emotional maturity and academic integrity.

Administrator's occupational efficacy relates to the maximization of return to the organization by all means. An administrator's efficacy can be understood in terms of his capacity to adapt, maintain itself and grow regardless of the particular functions it fulfils, how much he understands the process and copes with the changes. Similarly, 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.

The studies reviewed however showed that a great

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	x	10	x	01	11
Grand Total = 250													

deal of researches on Efficacy and Job satisfaction and their its impact on learning goal motivation, student's enrolment, student's achievement and such other variables has been conducted. These studied have suggested that efficacy augments educational administrators in producing greater amount of performance and outcomes. However, there has been no study examining the effect of job Satisfaction 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 Job Satisfaction of educational administrators with the object to find out their efficacy and satisfaction in transacting their administrative job at Secondary level of education. The focus of the study revolved around the following objectives:

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

The study empirically tested the following hypotheses:

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

Operational definition of important terms

Occupational efficacy

Occupational Efficacy for the present study refers to those Educational Administrators who score high on

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

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.

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.

Job satisfaction

Job Satisfaction for the present study refers to the scores obtained by the sample subjects on Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) prepared by Amar Singh and T.R Sharma.

METHODOLOGY

The ten districts of Kashmir Province were involved in the collection of data. From the total population of 841 educational administrators, 250 educational administrators served as the sample for the present study which were identified on the basis of random sampling technique from the list obtained from Directorate of School Education, Kashmir (DESK).

Among 250 educational administrators, 119 educational administrators (Headmasters and ZEOs) were taken from High School Level, 120 educational administrators (Principals) were taken from Higher Secondary School Level and 11 educational administrators (CEOs and Director) were taken from both High and Higher Secondary School Level.

Table 1.1 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 and Above	Above Average	37	14.8%
65-82	Average	171	68.4%
64 and Below	Below Average	42	16.8%

Table 1.2 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%

Instruments employed

Occupational Self Efficacy Scale-OSES

Prepared by Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari and Upinder Dhar (1999).

Job Satisfaction Scale- JSS

Prepared by Singh and Sharma (1999).

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

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 Job Satisfaction.

Occupational efficacy

A perusal of the table 1.1 shows the Occupational Efficacy

of Educational Administrators at Secondary Level of Education. The data revealed that out of 250 educational administrators, 14.8% of the educational administrators fall in above average category. This implies that these educational administrators always set targets higher than those set by their organizations. They possess greater ability for doing their work independently and show immense capability to work effectively even under the pressure of deadline. It has also been found that a predominant majority of educational administrators i.e. 68.4% fall in the average category. This indicates that these educational administrators exhibit moderate level of confidence in their institutional tasks and show reasonable adjustability to different challenges that come in their work. When they fail in a task, they often re-evaluate their strategies. The data further revealed that 16.8% of educational administrators fall in below average category. This indicates that these educational administrators lack confidence to work independently and so can't make an impact on others. They are easily moved over unforeseen consequences and display their worries when facing a challenging situation.

Job satisfaction

The analysis of the above table 1.2 revealed 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

Table 1.3 Correlation between Occupational Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators (N=250)

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

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.

Correlational analysis between occupational efficacy and job satisfaction of educational administrators

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

Table 1.3 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 and 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.

In view of the above empirical evidence, the hypothesis number one which reads as, "Occupational Efficacy is significantly related with job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators" stands accepted.

Comparison of effective and ineffective educational administrators on job satisfaction

In order to realize the third major objective of the study,

as a first step effective and ineffective educational administrators were identified with the help of Occupational Self Efficacy Scale. The high and low groups were drawn by employing extreme group technique of 27% above and below. As such the above 27% i.e. 67 educational administrators possessing high score were identified as Effective Educational Administrators and 27% i.e. 67 educational administrators possessing low score were identified as Ineffective Educational Administrators. This was followed by the comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on Job Satisfaction.

Table 1.4 gives the Mean Comparison of Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators on the five areas and composite scores of Job Satisfaction scale:

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.

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.

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

Table 1.4 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

EEA are better satisfied in Psychological Factors area than the IEA

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.

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 Chapleyn-(2001) who found that highest levels of job satisfaction among primary head teachers came from personal factors and organisational factors.

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.

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

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

A perusal of the table 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

Table 1.5 Showing the correlation of Occupational Efficacy with job Satisfaction amongst the Effective and Ineffective Educational Administrators (N=67each)

Variable	Groups	Value of 'r'	Level of Significance
Job Satisfaction	EEA	0.686	0.01 Level
	IEA	0.017	Not Significant

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 finding 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.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

On the basis of the findings of the present study, the Effective Educational Administrators has emerged as those who possess greater ability in doing their work independently and ensure proper planning and organization of their institutional matters. They quickly adjust to different challenges that came in their task and are able to handle them effectively. They abide by the rules of their institution and make their ideas known to the group. All these characteristics in turn positively influence the Occupational Efficacy of Effective Educational Administrators. The results also showed that majority of educational administrators were moderately contented with their job. Therefore, Special orientation programmes should be organized to improve and raise the Job Satisfaction of educational administrators. Thus, responsibility lies on various institutions that should organise special programmes so that the behaviour of ineffective educational administrators can be brought up to effective level. A Hand Book may be prepared for administrators that may guide them in administering their institutions effectively and to become effective institutional leaders. Special in-service orientation programmes should be organised for ineffective educational administrators to orient them with different dimensions of administration behaviour and train them in techniques of effective management. The educational administrators should be given special incentives and promotional avenues in order to reward their better performance in their respective fields.

This study has meaningful implications for school educational administrators, planners, Ministries of Education etc, in the sense that, it will provide useful hints on the appointment, promotion, evaluation and

training of educational administrators. This study also helps in understanding the job satisfaction that has been increasingly recognized as a means to enhance efficiency of educational administrators.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad B (1996). Improving Our School Education, Kashmir: New Nagina Printing Press.
- Ahmad B (1997). Elementary Education in Jammu and Kashmir State- Present Status and Future Prospects, Kashmir: New Nagina Printing Press.
- Alan M (1989). Management Development Strategies For Action, Fronne Somerset: The Eastern Press Ltd.
- Baron AR (1983). Behaviour In Organizations: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work, London: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Bernard MB (1960). Leadership Psychology and Organisational Behaviour, New York: Harper and Row
- Bhat KS, Shankar RR (1985). Administration of Education, New Delhi: Seema Publications.
- Bhatnagar RP, Aggarwal Vidya (1988). Educational Administration, Meerut: Loyal Book Depot.
- Bhattacharya S (1983). Management Effectiveness, New Delhi: Oxford and I.B.H. Publications.
- Borg WR, Gall MD (1989). Educational Research-An Introduction, 5th Edition, New York: Longman Inc.
- Borowiec-Koczera A (2001). Professional Development for School Administrators: Effects on school climate, Dissertation Abstract International. Vol. 68, No. 6, PP. 2253-A.
- Chakraborty SK (1987). Managerial Effectiveness and Quality of Work Life, New Delhi: McGraw Hill Publishing Company.
- Chandan JS (1986). Fundamentals of Modern Management, New Delhi: Vikas Publishers.
- Chaplain RP (2001). Stress and Job Satisfaction Among Primary Head-Teachers: A Question of Balance, Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.68, No.9, PP. 3675-A.
- Cohen L, Manion L (1985). Research Methods in Education, London: Croom Helm Publishers.
- Donald HM (2003). Research Methods, 5th Edition, USA: Wads Worth/ Thomson, Learning Belmont.
- Dowine NM (1967). Fundamentals of Measurement Techniques and Practices, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Flick U (2009). An Introduction to Qualitative Research, 4th Edition. London: Sage Publication.
- Garrett HE (2007). Statistics in Psychology and Education, 12th Edition, Paragon International Publishers.
- Goel SL, Goel A (1994). Educational Policy and Administration, Deep and Deep Publications
- Good CV (1959). Dictionary of Education, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Good CV (1963). Introduction to Educational Research, New York: Appleton Century- Crofts.
- Gorton RA (1983). School Administration and Supervision: Leadership Challenges and Opportunities, Dubuque IA: W.M. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Guilford JP (1956). Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, 3rd Edition, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
- Gupta SP (1991). Statistical Methods, 7th Edition, New Delhi: Sultan

- Chand and Sons.
- Hansom EM (1999). Educational Administration and Organizational Behaviour, Bost: Allyn and Bacon Publications.
- Kerlinger FN (2007). Foundations of Behavioural Research, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Khan MS (1980). Educational Administrators, New Delhi: Ashish Publishing House.
- Khanna SD, Saxena VK, Lamba TP, Murthy V (2000). Educational Administration Planning, Supervision and Financing, Delhi: Doebea Publications.
- Kimbrough BR, Michael YN (1988). Educational Administration- An Introduction, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Koul L (1996). Methodology of Educational Research, 2nd Edition, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Private Limited.
- Mangal SK (2002). Statistics in Psychology and Education, 2nd Edition, New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
- Mathur SS (1990). Educational Administration and Management, Ambala: The Indian Publications.
- Mishra BK, Mohanty RK (2003). Trends and Issues in Indian Education, 3rd Edition, Surya Publications.
- Mohanty J (1995). Educational Administration, Supervision and School Management, New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publication.
- Musaazi JCS (1987). The Theory and Practice of Educational Administration, New York: MacMillan Publishers.
- Mweemba AN (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.
- Nadeem NA (1989). Profile of the Effective Teachers, Srinagar: Fulbright Publishing Company.
- NEPA (1978). Educational Administration in Jammu and Kashmir-A Survey Report, NUEPA Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-16.
- Nobile J, McCormie J (2005). Job Satisfaction and Occupational Stress in Catholic Primary School, Educational Management Abstracts, Vol. 27, No.1-12.
- Pandya SR (2001). Administration and Management of Education, 1st Edition, Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
- Prasad LM (1996). Organizational Behaviour, New Delhi: Sultan Chand and Sons.
- Rasool G, Minakshi C (1990). Introduction to Educational Administration and Supervision, Jalandhar: Narendara Publishing House. PP.36.
- Rasool G, Minakshi C (1998). Education in Jammu and Kashmir-Issues and Documents, Jammu: Jay Kay Book House.
- Raut SR (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.
- 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.
- Rebore RW (1985). Educational Administration- A Management Approach, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, INC.
- Redden CW (1987). Managerial Effectiveness, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
- Robbins PS (2003). Organisational Behaviour, Singapore: Pearson Education.
- Robore RW (1985). Educational Administration: A Management Approach, New Jersey: Printice Hall.
- Runhaar P (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.
- Ryburn MW (1953). The Organization of Schools, Oxford University Press.
- Saxena J (1995). A Study of Teacher Effectiveness in Relation to Adjustment, Job Satisfaction and Attitude Towards Teaching Profession, Indian Educational Abstract, Vol. II- NCERT.
- Schofield K (2008). A Case Study of an Effective Elementary Principal, Dissertation Abstract International, Vol.69, No.03, PP. 840-A.
- Thakar AS, Mussazi JCS, Aminu PM (1980). Educational Administration, New Delhi: National Publishing House.
- Thomas KC (1993). Fundamentals of Educational Research, W.C. Brown Communication, Inc.
- Travers RMW (1969). An Introduction to Educational Research, 3rd Edition, London: The MacMillan Limited.