ISSN : 2456-8856

पंजीयन संख्या RNI No.: MPHIN/2002/09510 डाक पंजीकृत क्रमांक मालवा डिवीजन/204/2024-2026 उज्जैन (म.प्र.)

UGC Care Listed and Peer Reviewed Referred Bilingual Monthly International Research Journal

प्रेषण दिनांक 30 पृष्ठ संख्या 28

# आश्वस्त

वर्ष 26, अंक 249 जुलाई 2024

## तस्मै श्री गुरुवे नमः

संपादक – डॉ. तारा परमार

भारती दलित साहित्य अकादमी मध्यप्रदेश, उज्जैन की अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मासिक शोध पत्रिका

आश्वस्त

वर्ष : 26 अंक 249
जुलाई 2024

# आश्वस्त

(सन् 1983 से निरंतर प्रकाशित)

RNI No.: MPHIN/2002/09510
ISSN : 2456-8856

भारती दलित साहित्य अकादमी मध्यप्रदेश, उज्जैन (पंजीयन क्रमांक 2327 दिनांक 13/05/1999) की मासिक पत्रिका



## अनुक्रमणिका



UGC Care Listed Journal
खाते का नाम - आश्वस्त (A[illegible]st)
खाते का नं.- 63040357829
बैंक - भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शाखा- फ्रीगंज, उज्जैन (Freeganj, Ujjain)
IFS Code - SBIN0030108

Web : www.aashwastujjain.com
E-mail : aashwastbdsamp@gmail.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| एक प्रति का मूल्य | : | रुपये 20/- |
| वार्षिक सदस्यता शुल्क | : | रुपये 200/- |
| आजीवन सदस्यता शुल्क | : | रुपये 2,000/- |
| संरक्षक सदस्यता शुल्क | : | रुपये 20,000/- |

विशेष : सम्पादन, प्रकाशन एवं प्रबंध अवैतनिक तथा पत्रिका में प्रकाशित विचारों से सम्पादक-मंडल का सहमत होना आवश्यक नहीं है। विवाद की स्थिति में न्यायालय क्षेत्र उज्जैन रहेगा।

**References :**

Ahlstrom, D., Bruton, G.D. and Yeh, K.S. (2008), "Private firms in China: building legitimacy in an emerging economy", Journal of World Business, Vol.43, No.4, pp.385-399.

Al-Ali, A.A., Singh, S.K., Al-Nahyan, M. and Sohal, A.S. (2017), "Change management through leadership: the mediating role of organizational culture", International Journal of Organizational Analysis, Vol.25, No.4, pp. 723-739.

Amui, L.B.L., Jabbour, C.J.C., de Sousa Jabbour, A.B.L. and Kannan, D. (2017), "Sustainability as adynamic organizational capability: a systematic review and a future agenda toward a sustainable transition", Journal of Cleaner Production, Vol.142, No. 1, pp.308-322.

Atkinson, C., Mallett, O. and Wapshott, R. (2016), "You try to be a fair employer': regulation and employment relationships in medium-sized firms", International Small Business Journal, Vol.34No.1, pp.16-33.

Bartram, T. (2005), "Small firms, big ideas: the adoption of human resource management", Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 137-154.

# A Study of Principals' Administrative Effectiveness and Their Institutional Academic Performance

**- Dr. Mohan Lal 'Arya'**
Professor
**- Gaurav Kumar**
Research Scholar

**Abstract :** The present research paper is a description of the Principals' Administrative Effectiveness and their Institutional Academic Performance in the important salient aspect of School Administration and Management. The study under this division : U.P. and C.B.S.E. Boards. This division is done to keep proper representation of schools from all areas. The total 68 secondary schools were selected randomly. The sample belongs 68 secondary schools from U.P. Board and C.B.S.E. The selection of the schools indicates the selection of principals and academic performance of that school. To get data on Principal's Administrative Effectiveness, "Administrative Effectiveness Scale" was administered on teachers of that school. So the 5 teachers were selected randomly from each secondary schools of the sample. All students of IIX classes were selected from 68 secondary schools for getting scores on "Institutional Academic Performance". The total

numbers of students were 8803.

**Key Words :** Principal, Teachers, Academic Performance, Effectiveness, Students. Introduction: - A sound administration is a sine qua non for any organization aiming at achieving its goals. Administration is the growth of skills in dealing with human relationship which constitute the essential knowledge of administration effectiveness. The difference between effectiveness and efficiency is that the test of effectiveness is the accomplishment of the common purpose of organization, while the test of the efficiency is the eliciting of the individuals will to co - operate. Administration denotes the ability of the administration to achieve the goals and objective of the organization .the discussion relates the administration which consist of the definitions, history and Background, administration effectiveness and how to be an effective administrator. Management procedure in any organization significantly influence how well organization often its goals and objective. Management procedures that are effective invariably foster the attainment of goals of the organization.

**Need and Significance of the Study: -** In a school, the principal holds a key position and is the coordinating agency the balance and ensuring the harmonious development of pupils. He has the ability to design such an organizational climate in his institution, which is conductive for the total personality development of the learners. His administrative ability affects teachers directly satisfy them, provides the freedom of work and affects students indirectly through the medium of teachers. Many researches have been done in this context as the effect of principal's leadership or administrative behaviour on the climate of the organization, teachers alienation etc. very few researchers have been conducted to look the direct impact of principals administrative behavior on students academic achievement. This was tried to know only that different types of administrative style keep an impact on students to gain more achievement or not. A set of desirable behaviours requires operating the functioning the school for a principal.

**Objectives of the Study : -**

1. To find out difference between the Institutional Academic Performance of Principal's with High Administrative Effectiveness and Low Administrative Effectiveness.

2. To find out difference between the Principal's Administrative Effectiveness

of U.P. Board and C.B.S.E. Board Secondary Schools.

3. To find out difference between the Academic Performance of U.P. Board and C.B.S.E. Board Secondary Schools.

**Hypothesis : -**

1. That there is no significant difference between the Institutional Academic Performance of the Principal's with High Administrative Effectiveness and Low Administrative Effectiveness.

2. That there is no significant difference between the Principal's Administrative Effectiveness of U.P. and C.B.S.E. Board Secondary Schools.

3. That there is no significant difference between the Institutional Academic Performance of U.P. and C.B.S.E. Board Secondary Schools.

**Methods of the Study :** The researcher has used the Ex-Post factor method in which an attempt is made to study the administrative effectiveness of the Principals of Secondary Schools.

**Population and Sample : -** The population for the study is consisted of the total number of Principals, Teachers and Students of all U.P. and C.B.S.E. Boards Secondary Schools of Moradabad District.

**Statistical Techniques : -** The researcher has used Pearson Product Moment techniques to calculate scores, to test. 't' test and 'f' test were also use to calculate scores.

**Delimitations of the Study :-** This study is delimited to rural and urban Secondary schools Students, Teachers and Principals of Moradabad District.

**Analysis and Interpretation of Data :**

**Hypothesis-1** That there is no significant difference between the Institutional Academic Performance of the Principal's with High Administrative Effectiveness and Low Administrative Effectiveness.

**Table No- 1**

**Institutional Academic Performance of Principal's with High Academic Effectiveness (HAE) and Low Academic Effectiveness (LAE)**

| | Group-A | Group-B |
|---|---|---|
| Mean on Institutional Academic Performance (IAP) Principal's with HAE and LAE (M) | 267.88 | 242.41 |
| SD on Institutional Academic Performance (IAP) with HAE and LAE ($\sigma$) | 30.41 | 22.03 |
| Numbers of Schools (N) | 40 | 28 |
| t – value – 5.42 | df = 70 | |
| Table value - | .01 - 2.65<br>.05 - 2.00 | |

In the table-1 it is clearly shows that the mean on Institutional Academic Performance (IAP) of Principals with high Administrative Effectiveness is having the mean score 267.88 and the mean on Institutional Academics Performance (IAP) of Principals with low Administrative Effectiveness (PAE) have the mean scores 242.41. SD for both the group is 30.41 and 22.03 respectively. The number of schools is 40 and 28 related to both groups. After applying the t- test (Independent group and large sample), the value observed as 5.42. The level of significance, given in the D table at .01 levels is 2.65 and the significance level at .05 levels is 2.00. The number of schools is 68 but the researcher used 70 df for the convenience. This shows that the t- value of the both group is significant at both the levels of means difference between Institutional Academic Performance (IAP) of Principals with high Administrative Effectiveness and low Administrative Effectiveness.

**Hypothesis-2** That there is no significant difference between the Principal's Administrative Effectiveness of U.P. and C.B.S.E. Board Secondary Schools.

**Table No- 2**

**Principal's Administrative Effectiveness of U.P and C.B.S.E. Boards Schools**

| | Group-A | Group-B |
|---|---|---|
| Mean on Principal's Administrative Effectiveness (PAE) of U.P. and C.B.S.E. Schools (M) | 127.21 | 124.21 |
| SD on Principal's Administrative Effectiveness (PAE) of U.P. and C.B.S.E. Schools ($\sigma$) | 9.25 | 16.67 |
| Numbers of Schools (N) | 39 | 29 |
| t – value – 0.86 | | |
| df = 70 | | |
| Table value - .01 - 2.65 | | |
| .05 - 2.00 | | |

In the table 2, it is clearly shown that the mean on Principal's Administrative Effectiveness (PAE) of U.P. board schools is 127.21 and the mean on Principal's Administrative Effectiveness (PAE) of C.B.S.E. board schools is 124.25. SD for both the group is 9.25 and 16.87 respectively. The numbers of Government and Public schools are 39 and 29. After applying the t-test (Independent group and large sample), the value observed is 0.86. The level of significance given in the table at .01 level is 2.65 and the significance level at .05

levels is 2.00. The df is considered 70. This shows that the t-value is not significant at both levels of mean difference between Principal Administrative Effectiveness of U.P. and C.B.S.E. Schools.

**Hypothesis-3** That there is no significant difference between the Institutional Academic Performance of U.P. and C.B.S.E. Board Secondary Schools.

**Table No- 3**
**Institutional Academic Performance of U.P and C.B.S.E. Boards Schools**

| | Group-A | Group-B |
|---|---|---|
| Mean on Institutional Academic Performance (IAP) of U.P. and C.B.S.E. Schools (M) | 256.05 | 271.62 |
| SD on Institutional Academic Performance (IAP) of U.P. and C.B.S.E. Schools ($\sigma$) | 24.17 | 38.96 |
| Numbers of Schools (N) | 39 | 29 |
| t – value – 1.898 | | |
| df = 70 | | |
| Table value - .01 – 2.56 | | |
| .05 – 2.00 | | |

In the table-.3, it is clearly shown that mean on Institutional Academic Performance (IAP) of U.P. schools is 256.05 and the mean on Institutional Academic Performance of C.B.S.E. schools is 271.62. SD for both the groups is 24.17 and 38.96 respectively. The numbers of U.P. board schools are 39 and C.B.S.E. board are 29. After applying t-test (Independent group and large sample), the observed value is 1.898. The level of significance given in table at .01 levels is 2.65 and the significance level of .05 levels is 2.00. The df is considered 70. This shows that the t- value of either of the groups is not significant at both the levels of mean difference. The difference between Institutional Academic Performance of U.P. and C.B.S.E. Schools is not significant.

**Findings/Result :** It is clear that Principal is that direct force to motivate or make much healthy environment of the schools, where students can develop their potential at maximum level. This study shows that Principal's Administration affect the Academic Performance of Students. If a principal is high or more effective in his/her functioning of Administration, the Institution/school will get good performance in the form of high academic scores of students. The finding of this hypothesis-2 is that Administ-

rative behaviour of principals is same in U.P. and C.B.S.E. boards secondary schools. Both principals are performing a variety of behaviour. Therefore, it is not matter of principals' Administrative Effectiveness whether they are working in U.P. and C.B.S.E. boards schools. Both types of schools are administered by high and low administrative Effectiveness Principals. The finding of this hypothesis-2 is that Institutional Academic Performance is found similar in U.P. and C.B.S.E. boards secondary schools. The students of both groups of schools are same in their Academic Performance. The students of these schools get the same level of academic scores. It is not necessary that students of U.P. and C.B.S.E. boards schools will achieve only high Institutional Academic Performance or low Institutional Academic Performance. These schools perform both high and low level of academic performance of their students.

**- Dr. Mohan Lal 'Arya' Professor**
Department of Education
IFTM University, Moradabad, U.P.
Mob. 8126543884

**- Gaurav Kumar**
Research Scholar
Department of Education
IFTM University, Moradabad, U.P.

**References :**

1. 'Arya', Mohan Lal (2014), *"Educational Administration and Management" (Hindi)*, Surya Publication, Meerut.
2. Agarwal, Vidya (1993), "A study of Stress Proneness, Adjustment and Job-Satisfaction of Administrative Effectiveness of Principal", Fourth Survey of Educational Research.
3. Aphalwar, S. Manohar Rao (1996), "Evaluation of Administration of Secondary Schools of Adilabad and Karimnagar Districts of Andhra Pradesh with Special Reference to Headmasters", Indian Educational Abst. Issue-I, July.
4. Barnard, Chester I. (1964), *"The Function of Executive"*, Cambridge, Mass, Harward University Press.
5. Deightan, Lec. C. (1971), "Encyclopedia of Education." Editor- in- chief, Vol.-3, The Machmillan Company & the free press, USAS.
6. E.G. Guba and Bidwell (1957), *"Administrative Relationships"*, University of Chicago: Chicago Midwest Administrative Center.
7. Good, Carter V. (1959), *"Dictionary of Education"*, 2nd ed., New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
8. Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham and Ronald F. Campbell, *"Educational Administration As a Social Process"*, New York, Evanston and Landon: Harper and Row Publishers.
9. Lal, Dr. Mohan and Singh, Rajkumari (2018), "A Study of Principal's Administrative Effectiveness and His Institutional Academic Performance in Moradabad District", Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, IFTM University, Moradabad.
10. National Policy on Education-1986, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India (Deptt. Of Education), New Delhi.
11. Paul R. Mort (1946), *"Principles of School Administration"*, New York, McGraw Hill.
12. Sears, Jesse B. (1950), *"The Nature of the Administrative Process"*, New York, McGraw Hill.
13. Sharma, R. A. (2004) *"Educational Administration and Management"*, Surya Publication, Meerut.
14. Steppen J. Knezevich (1984), *Administration of Public Education*, 4th Ed., Harper and Row Publishers, New York.