CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The present day education system has come a long way and the age old traditions have undergone a new makeover. Government is doing lots of efforts in this field so that the objective of inclusive growth can be achieved very soon by it. In Haryana education has been made too easy for the students so that more and more students can enter into the scope of education system. A great achievement of the government is a big jump in the literacy rate from 29.20% of males and 9.20% of females in 1960-61 to 78.49% of males and 55.73% of females in 2010-11. Such an achievement is the result of a lot of efforts by the government in the education sector. The government is improving the education status to enhance the standard of living of the people and also to achieve other goals like, overcoming the problem of poverty and unemployment, social equality, equal income distribution, etc. Education contributes to the individual’s well being as well as the overall development of the country. Education is not only an instrument of enhancing efficiency but is also an effective tool of widening and augmenting democratic participation and upgrading the overall quality of individual and societal life. Thus, the importance of education can’t be ignored.

Literacy Status of the State

In Haryana the total number of literates persons are 16,904,324 out of which in rural the numbers are 10,393,591 and in urban the total number are 6,510,733 (Rural Urban Distribution of Population, India, Census of India 2011). If Haryana wants to make its place better in terms of literacy, then total number of literates needs to be increased in the coming years. Although total number of literates in rural Haryana is higher than the urban areas, yet the position is quite disappointing in case of rural literates as most of the population of the state still resides in the rural areas. The male urban literacy rate of Haryana is lower than that of India as a whole. Female literacy rate of Haryana is very low in 2011. Just like male urban literacy rate, female
urban literacy rate of Haryana is less than the national average. The total literacy rates in Haryana are in total 76.64% out of which males are 85.38% and females are 66.77% (Rural Urban Distribution of Population, India, Census of India 2011)

As per Census 2011, the literacy rate in the state of Haryana is 76.64%. The government of Haryana has also increased the amount allocated for the education sector over the years.

The education system in Haryana has various levels. The different levels in the education system comprise primary school education, middle level, high school, and senior secondary level school education. As of March 2011, the government of Haryana upgraded as many as 1758 government run schools between 2010 and 2011. Of these 1072 were primary schools, 267 were middle schools, and 419 were high schools to the higher level. Educational Statistics at a Glance as on 01.11.2009 For The Year 2009-10 shows that the total number of schools of Government Senior Secondary Schools are 1518, Non-Government (Aided) Senior Secondary Schools are 104, Non-Government (Un-Aided) are 954. Central government Schools are 28 and Navodya Vidyalaya’s are 19.

Gross Enrolment Ratio

The Gross Enrollment Ratio is a statistical measure used in the education sector to determine the number of students enrolled in school at several different grade levels (like elementary, middle school and high school).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States/UTs</th>
<th>Classes I-V (6-11 years)</th>
<th>Classes VI-VIII (11-14 yrs)</th>
<th>Classes I-VIII (6-14 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>88.56</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>90.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross enrolment ratio of Haryana in the age group of 6 to 11 years is 90.10, which is less than this ratio of India as a whole and all the neighbouring states under the study.

**Drop-Out Rates**

Drop-out rate is the proportion of children which cease to remain enrolled in the schooling system. The following table shows the different drop-out rates of students in the states under study in the year 2009-10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States/UTs</th>
<th>Classes I-V (6-11 years)</th>
<th>Classes VI-VIII (11-14 yrs)</th>
<th>Classes I-VIII (6-14 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-2.24</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Abstract of Selected Educational Statistics 2009-10.*

Dropout is a universal phenomenon of education system, spread over all levels of education, and across all the socio-economic groups of population. The dropout rates are much higher for educationally backward districts. Girls tend to have higher dropout rates than boys. The drop-out rate among girls in the elementary stage is high. Similarly, children belonging to the socially disadvantaged groups like Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes have the higher dropout rates in comparison to general population. There is a need for further research to know the actual reasons for drop-outs, lower female literacy rates, less rural education level and low gross enrolment ratio in the Haryana so that remedial measures can be taken according to the requirements and level of education can be upgraded.

Although school success is influenced by many people but, the Principal plays a pertinent role. Principals play a critical role in focusing decisions and actions on improving students’ achievements and well-being. They set directions, build relationships, develop people and the organization, lead the instructional program, and secure accountability. Principals are usually the main source and the driving force that
sustain the welfare of the school. Their effectiveness as a leader is critical to the success and sustainability of system-wide improvement which depends on their behaviour.

“The Principal of the future must lead a complex learning organization by helping to establish new cultures in schools that have deep capacities to engage in continuous problem solving and improvement”(Fullan, 2003, p. 28). However, Heck, Larsen and Marcoulides (1990) opine that the behaviours of the Principal have an indirect impact on students’ achievement.

Effective behaviour is widely accepted as being a key constituent for school improvement. A highly effective school Principal is not called to the job per se, but more importantly to the opportunity to make a difference in the school. This could mean a change in the educational landscape, heal an ailing school, or work for the concepts of greater accountability, equity and excellence. School Principal has the responsibility to lead their school to higher achievements. In the eyes of society, a successful and excellent school is most likely to be associated with an equally successful Principal with good behaviour. We often hear talk about just how poorly the school performs if the Principal is ineffective in his performance behaviour. Thus, a key element of an effective school is an effective Principal and effective behaviour.

The performance behaviour of the Principal is the significant factor in shaping the learning environment. The Principal, who articulates clear goals, holds high expectations of pupils and teachers, and exercises strong educational leadership is instrumental to the school in achieving their goals (Miller, 1995).

Basic education institutions are often forced to deal with recurrent internal and external problems in their operation. These problems to the extent can be resolved by analyzing principal’s behaviour’s. So, considering the entire aspects researcher analyzed that the behaviour issues is considered to be on the forefront of education, it is imperative that research examines the responses of school Principals, teachers, students and parents regarding behaviors which will lead to the form of being leading professionals who act as mentor, educator, advisor, ambassador. To summarize, school excellence begins with the presence of a leader who is the head
Principal with high values, commitments and good performance behaviour. Therefore, this study hopes to explore various dimensions of performance seeking behaviours of Principals which helps to contribute towards the achievement as well as the development of potential in the school and helps in leading the school towards excellence.

2 INTRODUCTION TO THE TOPIC

Education humanizes humanity and makes life progressive, cultured and civilized. It is through education that man develops his thinking and reasoning, problem solving and creativity, intelligence and aptitude, positive sentiments, skills, good values, behaviour and attitudes. It is through education that he/she is transformed into human, social, moral and spiritual being. An educational institute with an excellent material resource like infrastructure and a good curriculum is unlikely to achieve its goal if the Principals are ineffective, misfit, indifferent to their responsibility and having ineffective behaviour.

A Principal plays an important role in the social reconstruction and in the transmission of wisdom, knowledge and experiences of one generation to another. Children are the potential wealth of a nation. They are always exposed to the information provided by the Principals and teachers in the schools. It is therefore necessary to realize that the emerging Indian society can achieve all round development with the help of the Principals who act as a powerful agency in transmitting its cherished values through effective behaviour. A Principal is not only a custodian of a nation’s values but is also an architect par excellence of new values.

The progress and success of all students in schools is contingent upon the cooperation and mutual support of school Principals in terms of good behaviour. In order to embrace the dynamic needs of the learners in schools, effective behaviour is paramount. This is the underlying spirit of the Principal performance behaviour system. Appraisal of performance seeking behaviour is a unique need of Principals in their role. Though the Principal is a leader and leader is“ the one who can make people follow the right or wrong deeds with appearance and personality and is able to transform his/her ideas and will into the followers’ ideas and will” (Garih, 2000).
Leaders have existed in every era of the history and it will not be wrong to say that, due to the hierarchical nature of humankind, leaders will be a part of societal alone by forming groups with people with the same needs and interests. This need has led leaders, who will enable them to reach the targets and will direct the organizations they are in, to emerge (Koç, 2007).

Therefore, it could be said that “leaders are the ones who can direct the followers to the behaviour in line with the leaders’ desires in order to realize the individual and group objectives. Principals are expected to be strong instructional leaders with effective behaviour, who directs the followers to behave positively. To be able to lead a group in a democratic way, the leader him/herself must be a learner of good behaviour (cf. Moos et al 2000). That requires official arenas for collaboration between teachers, other school Principals, parents and other stakeholders, treated as a continuous learning process. Today, in a rapidly changing era of standards-based reform and accountability, a different conception has emerged which focuses with great clarity on what is essential, what needs to be done and how to get it done.

This shift brings with it dramatic changes in what needs from Principals. They can no longer function simply as building managers, tasked with adhering to district rules, carrying out regulations and avoiding mistakes. Over the past decade, the role of the Principal has shifted from more managerial to including greater emphasis on instructional and transformational leadership (Lashway, 2002). As efforts toward school improvement continues, it is necessary for Principals to have effective behaviour that will allow them to adjust their leadership style to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Their effectiveness in behaviour is necessary to the success and sustainability of system-wide improvement. A school Principal is accountable to the society and many different constituencies. As Sockett (1993:17) has framed it, ‘professions work within some moral vision of human betterment, some set of professional ideals which describe the moral purpose of the enterprise’. A Principal cannot remain an old feudal lord in the changed climate of democracy and socialism. He is basically required to keep his eyes focused on the basic purposes. The Principal is the real legal authority accountable to the Government department, management, staff, students, parents and
the community at large. The Principal of the school is a designated leader. His responsibility as a leader of the school is multifarious. All the responsibility can better be manifested in the healthy school climate and the behaviour of the Principal can contribute in building up the climate to a considerable extent. Today School leader’s behaviour matters as “The Principal of the future must lead a complex learning organization by helping to establish new cultures in schools that have deep capacities to engage in continuous problem solving and improvement.”

Principal behaviour is to support achievement and well-being by attracting and developing skilled and passionate school and system leaders. Behaviour of the Principal influences the behaviour of teachers, their morale, their zeal and enthusiasm for practicing new ideas and practices in the class room which result into better achievement of the pupils. The behaviour of school Principal constitutes either a favorable climate or creates hindrances to the diffusion of educational innovations and change, bringing about effective improvement of instructional programme of school.

Behaviours of Principals create far – reaching effects on the persons working in their organization. Their behaviour in the school has a greatest meaning. In any organization there are purposes, set up, size, status and security factors, pressures and crises. School Principal should behave effectively to improve the standard of quality in the school through the improvement of school climate, assimilation of new ideas with the changing time; maintenance and improvement of trace her morale and of the motivation of students towards the school but that is due to manifestation of leader behaviour towards effective achievement of the set goals.

The study emphasizes to evaluate Principal’s task and citizenship behaviour which is a collaborative approach. So as to develop personal leadership in individuals and promote effective leadership practices to have the greatest possible impact on student achievement and well-being; develop leadership capacity and coherence in organizations to strengthen their ability to deliver on education priorities.

3 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Principal Performance seeking behaviour was the key topic of this study. The conceptual framework has been developed on three significant notions, Principal,
performance, and behaviour. This conceptual framework, was detailed in the review of literature and depicted as an exploratory model, was used to guide this research study and provides a focus to accomplish the purpose of this study. The aim of the current review was to identify conceptual frameworks regarding performance seeking behaviour of school Principals. A framework of performance seeking behaviour of Principals was proposed in the study which emphasizes on two behavioural dimensions, namely, task performance, contextual performance behaviour. These two types of behaviour used in the study can be considered to capture the range of behaviour that constitutes individual performance on the job. The literature on performance behaviour provides a broad base for understanding how well a school Principal can perform in different aspects of its dynamic process. The literature on behaviour suggests the significant role of Principal behaviour. Although, Principal performance behaviour appraisals has been characterized as late, infrequent and an administrative burden (Reeves, 2004).

Behaviour has been a critical topic of discussion for decades, especially for school leaders. In a time when schools are facing increased accountability, the role of the Principals has not only changed, but has become been more crucial. Knowledge is imparted, nurtured, developed and tested in the schools. Effective Principals are considered to be strong educators, anchoring their work on central issues of learning and teaching and continuous school improvement. This process involves working collaboratively with staff and school community with effective behaviour. The school Principal performance seeking behaviour is an important measure for overall school effectiveness. Performance seeking behaviour of each individual challenges their mental and physical abilities. This includes behaviour at work. The ability and behaviour to handle conditions at work influence ones performance.

3.1 Defining the Performance and Behaviour

Performance is conceived of in a variety of ways in research but it is a key variable within both organizational and educational settings. Despite this, performance as a construct has received comparatively little theoretical attention. Most traditional performance concepts assume that an outside task or goal is given, and that this goal or task is simply taken over (see, for a similar argument, Staw &
Boettger, 1990). While there has been much contention over the precise definition of the performance criterion, in recent years researchers have come to accept that performance is best defined as being a function of employees’ workplace behaviours (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Rotundo and Sackett (2002) defined performance as ‘those actions and behaviours that are under the control of the individual and contribute to the goals of the organization. Individual performance is a core concept within work and organizational psychology. During the past 10 or 15 years, researchers have made progress in clarifying and extending the performance concept (Campbell, 1990). Moreover, advances have been made in specifying major predictors and processes associated with individual performance. With the ongoing changes that we are witnessing within organizations today, the performance concepts and performance requirements are undergoing changes as well (Ilgen & Pulakos, 1999).

Performance is measured in terms of how far the employee actually has achieved the goal or the task. Most performance factors discussed by Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, and Sager (1993) take the task as a given. The goal is also assumed to be a given in goal setting research (Locke & Latham, 1990). Though, Performance means something that the person leaves behind and that exists apart from the purpose. The Oxford English Dictionary defines performance as: ‘The accomplishment, execution, carrying out, working out of anything ordered or undertaken.’ This refers to outputs/outcomes (accomplishment) but also states that performance is about doing the work as well as being about the results achieved. Performance could therefore be regarded as behaviour – the way in which organizations, teams and individuals get work done. However performance is more usefully defined as actual behaviour that can be scaled and measured in terms of proficiency rather than outcomes (Campbell, et al, 1993).

Campell (1990) believes that performance is behaviour and should be distinguished from the outcomes because they can be contaminated by systems factors. Performance can be refers to the behaviours which an individual displays whereas concepts like output and effectiveness reflect the outcomes of those behaviours, which may or may not be within the control of the individual (Campbell,

A more comprehensive view of performance, however, is achieved if it is defined as embracing behaviour. Performance is ‘both behaviour (what an Principal does) and result (the outcomes of an principal behaviour). Individual performance is highly important for an organization as a whole and for the individuals working in it. Performance comprises both a behavioral and an outcome aspect. It is a multidimensional and dynamic concept. With the ongoing changes that we are witnessing within organization today, the performance concept and performance requirements are undergoing changes.20 The author agrees that when conceptualizing performance one has to differentiate between an action (i.e. behavioral) aspect and an outcome aspect of performance.21 The behavioral aspects refer to what an individual does in the work situation. Not every behaviour is subsumed under the performance concept, but only behaviour which is relevant for the organizational goals: performance is what the organization hires one to do, and do well. Thus performance is not defined by the action itself but by judgmental and evaluative processes.22

Campbell defines performance as behaviour. It is something done by the employee. This concept differentiates performance from outcomes. Outcomes are the result of an individual's performance, but they are also the result of other influences. In other words, there are more factors that determine outcomes than just an employee's behaviours and actions.

On a school Principal job, a favorable outcome is a certain level of result generated. Result can be generated or not, depending on the behaviour of employees. When the school Principal performs this job well, he is able to produce more effective result. However, certain factors such as Principal behaviour influence result generated. These two can be decoupled because performance is not the same as effectiveness.23

In this study the researcher emphasized on the behavioral aspect of the performance. Behaviour can be defined as the way in which an individual behaves or acts. It is the way an individual conducts himself or herself. It should be viewed in
reference to a phenomenon, an object or person. It can be seen in reference to society norms, or the way in which one treats others or handles objects.24

Behaviours’ emanate from the performer and transform performance from abstraction to action. Not just the instruments for results, behaviours’ are also outcomes in their own right-the product of mental and physical effort applied to tasks- and can be judged apart from results.25 The human behaviour (B) is a purposive reaction of a human being (P) to an idiosyncratic meaningful situation (S) .B=f (P,S).
In other words the observed variability in behaviour is attributable to differences in the person’s characteristics’, to differences in situation and \or to the interplay of both. This definition implies that human behaviour:
Change from one state into another state.

- Always goal- oriented.
- A reaction to an external observable stimulus or to an internal covert stimulus.
- Has three interrelated components-a cognitive, a psycho-motor and a socio – affective component.
- An integration of several physiological and mental processes.
- Individualized because each individual interprets the objective characteristics of the situation.
- Neither necessary rational nor the most appropriate reaction under given circumstances.

Behaviour refers to the actions of a system or organism, usually in relation to its environment, which includes the other systems or organisms around as well as the physical environment. It is the response of the system or organism to various stimuli or inputs, whether internal or external, conscious or sub conscious, overt or covert, and voluntary or involuntary. Human behaviour can be common, unusual, acceptable, or unacceptable. Human evaluate the acceptability of behaviour using social norms regulate behaviour by means of social control. In sociology, behaviour is considered as having no meaning, being not directed at other people and thus is the most basic
human action, although can play a part in diagnosis of disorder such as autism. Behaviour became an important construct in early 20th century.

Although, the thing that drives performance is behaviour –how you act. It’s what you do that matters, not what you are or who you are. The oxford dictionary defines behaviour as the way in which one acts or conducts oneself. Behaviours’ are the action you take and the decisions you can decide what to do and when to do it. And because you can decide what to do in any situation you can determine your performance. High level performance results from doing the right thing at the right time. Performance is determined by what Principal’s in the schools do. The ability to adapt the Principals behaviour to changing circumstances lies at the heart of effective performance. Therefore, to perform a role effectively a Principal need to have a clear picture of the behaviour required by the role in order that they can do the right things- i.e. the things that leads to performance improvement- and not the wrong things. The effectiveness with which Principal’s manages their job i.e. the level of performance that is achieved- is dependent on the degree to which their behaviour matches the behavioral demands of the job. The greater the overlap of the two circle, the higher the level of performance.26

**Figure—Levels of Performance**

The behaviour that makes a Principal successful in one job won’t necessarily be what make them successful in another. Behaviour change is all about performance improvement. A performance matter everybody and everything is measured by performance. In this study the performance improvements is about examining the principal’s current behaviour, recognizing what they do to meet the changing requirements of the job. Performance improvement of the Principal’s are about
assessing the demands of the situation, examining the current behaviour to determine its appropriateness or fit, and adjusting what to do to meet the challenges. The behaviour drives performance. The behaviour-performance link is job specific.

However, the literal meaning of performance does not include the results of an employee’s behaviour but only the behaviours’ themselves. Performance is about how things are done as well as what is done. This is the so called ‘mixed model ‘ of performance, which covers competency levels and achievements. Therefore, performance is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct consisting of more than one kind of behaviour. Campbell (1990) proposed an eight factor model of performance based on factor analytic research that attempts to capture dimensions of job performance existent (to a greater or lesser extent) across all jobs.

1. The first factor is task specific behaviours which include those behaviours that an individual undertakes as part of a job. They are the core substantive tasks that delineate one job from another.

2. On the other hand, non-task specific behaviours, the second factor, are those behaviours which an individual is required to undertake which do not pertain only to a particular job.

3. Written and oral communication tasks refer to activities where the incumbent is evaluated, not on the content of a message necessarily, but on the adaptness with which they deliver the communication. Employees need to make formal and informal oral and written presentations to various audiences in many different jobs in the work force.

4. An individual's performance can also be assessed in terms of effort, either day to day, or when there are extraordinary circumstances. This factor reflects the degree to which people commit themselves to job tasks.

5. The performance domain might also include an aspect of personal discipline. Individuals would be expected to be in good standing with the law, not abuse alcohol, etc.
6. In jobs where people work closely or are highly interdependent, performance may include the degree to which a person helps out the groups and his or her colleagues. This might include acting as a good role model, coaching, giving advice or helping maintain group goals.

7. Many jobs also have a supervisory or leadership component. The individual will be relied upon to undertake many of the things delineated under the previous factor and in addition will be responsible for meting out rewards and punishments. These aspects of performance happen in a face to face manner.

8. Managerial and administrative performance entails those aspects of a job which serve the group or organization but do not involve direct supervision. A managerial task would be setting an organizational goal or responding to external stimuli to assist a group in achieving its goals. In addition a manager might be responsible for monitoring group and individual progress towards goals and monitoring organizational resources.

In the past ten years or so more attention has been paid to the definition and exploration of performance at least from the perspective of organizational behaviour research. Much of this work has been either directed or inspired by the United States Army Selection and Classification Project overseen by John Campbell and his colleagues (Campbell, Gasser, & Oswald, 1996).28

Of the dimensions of performance, two general behaviour dimension namely task performance and contextual performance are discussed in the study so it can be concluded that the measurement of performance is complicated by the fact that what counts for performance is itself complex, changes over time and situation, and consists of multiple dimensions (Hough & Oswald, 2001)29. In whatever way it is defined performance remains an abstract concept which is socially constructed, and there are many judgment calls required when it is being operationalised even when it relies on apparently ‘objective’ measures such as behavioral counting, organizational records and the like (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995).30
3.2 Conceptualization of Behaviour Dimensions of Performance

Campbell postulated that there are two primary types of behaviour that encompass job performance, those behaviours that are unique to a specific job and those behaviours that are the same for all jobs within an organization. Borman and Motowidlo (1993)\textsuperscript{31} expand upon the work of Campbell and suggest that the domain of performance can be subdivided into at least two separate theoretical domains: task performance and contextual performance. In summary, based on these two behaviour dimensions the performance of the principal’s in the study is measured in terms of these two aspects.

CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF PERFORMANCE SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

In order to further generalize the performance seeking behaviour into a more parsimonious structure, the performance domain that is task performance and contextual performance are associated with task behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. According to Agunis (2007),\textsuperscript{32} also there are two important factors of performance they are task performance and contextual performance.
Task performance involves that behaviour that directly transforms raw materials into the goods and services that are the organization’s products. It is defined as those activities and behaviour that contribute to the technical core of an organization, vary between different jobs within an organization, contain variability in proficiency, and are role-prescribed (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).  

Task refers to the specific activities required to be performed by one’s job. Task performance seeking behaviour includes Principal’s behaviours that are directly involved in the transformation of organizational resources into goods and services that the organization produces. It also refers to an Principal’s proficiency with which he or she performs activities which contribute to the organization technical core. This contribution can be direct or indirect.

Therefore, the behaviours encompassed in task performance are what one typically thinks of as job performance. Task performance behaviours, however, are not the only behaviours that help organizations reach their goals. (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997). That is to say that task performance is either directly related to the technical core or it services the requirements of the technical core (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994).

Technical or task activities are dependent on knowledge, skills and abilities, and are role-prescribed. These activities are commonly included within formal job descriptions and are what is focused upon by most traditional forms of job analysis. Task performance has long been recognized by researchers as the most important aspect of work behaviours, and has sometimes been regarded as being synonymous with overall job performance. Task performance is therefore the degree to which employees demonstrate proficiency in activities which are formally recognized and which contribute to the organization’s technical core either directly or indirectly (Arvey & Murphy, 1998).

Task performance in itself is multi-dimensional. The eight performance components proposed by Campbell (1990), there are five factors which refer to task performance (cf. Campbell, Gasser, & Oswald, 1996):  

1. job-specific task proficiency,  
2. non-job-specific task proficiency,  
3. written and oral communication proficiency,  
4. supervision—in the case of a supervisory or leadership position—and
partly (5) management/administration. Each of these factors comprises a number of sub factors which may vary between different jobs. For example, the management/administration factor comprises sub dimensions such as (1) planning and organizing, (2) guiding, directing, and motivating subordinates and providing feedback, (3) training, coaching, and developing subordinates, (4) communication effectively and keeping others informed. In recent years, researchers paid attention to specific aspects of task performance. For example, innovation and customer-oriented behaviour become increasingly important as organizations put greater emphasis on customer service (Anderson & King, 1993).  

Motowidlo & Schmit (1999) also described the task performance that includes behaviours that contribute to the core transformation and maintenance activities in an organization. It is this aspect of performance that would seem particularly relevant for Principal’s with supervisory or management responsibilities because of the need to facilitate the technical, job-specific activities of others.

According to Borman and Motowidlo (1993) task performance is “the proficiency with which job incumbents perform activities that are formally recognized as part of their jobs; activities that contribute to the organization’s technical core either directly by implementing a part of its technological process, or indirectly by providing it with needed materials or services”. Similarly, Murphy (1989) defines task performance as the accomplishment of tasks within an incumbent’s job description. Campbell et al. (1993) and Campbell (1990) also include elements related to task performance in their taxonomies of job performance (e.g., core technical proficiency, general soldiering proficiency, job-specific task proficiency, and non-job-specific task proficiency).

However, Rotundo (2000) notes that restricting a definition of task performance (or any aspect of job performance) to include only those behaviours listed in a job description is problematic because job descriptions for the same job may differ from one organization to the next, which makes it difficult to compare performance across organizations. Furthermore, Rotundo notes that jobs are constantly changing without these changes being reflected in job descriptions. Therefore, measures of performance that depend on the content of a job description
may not be accurate. On the basis of these arguments, Rotundo recommends that task performance be defined as actions and behaviours that contribute directly or indirectly to the production of a good or the provision of a service.

Almost all frameworks mentioned task performance as an important dimension of individual work performance. Other labels sometimes used for task performance are job-specific task proficiency, proficiency, or in-role performance. It includes, for example, work quantity, work quality, and job knowledge. In Murphy’s framework, the first dimension, labeled task behaviours, could be considered task performance. Campbell himself stated that his first two dimensions, job-specific task proficiency (core job tasks) and on–job-specific task proficiency (tasks not specific to a given job, but expected of all employees), represent task performance.

Viswesvaran’s first three dimensions, productivity, quality, and job knowledge, could be considered task performance. Later developed individual work performance frameworks all included one dimension to describe task performance. The only exception was Renn and Fedor’s framework, in which task performance was split into work quantity and quality.

Arvey and Mussio described task performance of clerical workers, using the dimensions of working accurately, showing concern for time and detail and planning. Jiambalvo described task performance for public accountants as understanding, planning, and revising work. Engelbrecht and Fischer divided task performance for managers into action orientation (e.g. getting things done, decisiveness), task structuring (e.g. leadership, planning), and probing, synthesis, and judgment (problem resolution). Further more, Tett et al divided task performance for managers into traditional.

Furthermore, task-oriented leaders tend to focus on communications, directing, performance measurement, establishing rules and regulations, procedural methods, organizational patterns, and ability to attend to task, procedures, and policies (Lord, 1977).
A task-oriented leadership approach tends to be more directive and less collaborative. Beech (2002) from ProQuest database maintains the following behaviours are distinguishing characteristics identifiable in successful leaders: “intelligence, initiative, self-assurance, decisiveness, and enthusiasm”. Ultimately, the fitness and the applicability of a task-oriented leader approach are evaluated on the basis of accomplishments that are actionalized by the leader (Byrne & Rees, 2006). Regardless of the leadership approach required, the role of leadership remains to foster a shared sense of commitment within the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

In the competitive business world, employees are often expected to perform at not only satisfactory levels, but to exceed the required roles of their respective jobs and perform tasks that may not be included in their job descriptions; this behaviour is referred to as contextual performance behaviour which help to measure the organizational citizenship behaviour (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

Contextual are defined as behaviours which contribute to the goals of the organization through their effect on the social and psychological conditions.

Contextual or citizenship performance involves activities of the Principal’s directed at maintaining the interpersonal and psychological environment that needs to exist to allow the technical or task core to operate. As such, such citizenship activities are common to most if not all jobs, are dependent upon motivational and predisposition variables such as personality, and are rarely role-prescribed. The contextual refers to the activities that contribute to organization’s effectiveness by providing a good environment in which task performance can occur. Contextual performance of the Principal’s refers to activities which do not contribute to the technical core but which support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which organizational goals are pursued. Both are needed for organizational success and both should be included in a performance management system. However, another feature of contextual activities is that these are voluntary, discretionary acts directed toward other individuals or the organization as a whole (Organ & Paine, 1999).
The contextual performance measures the proactive behaviour which aim at changing and improving work procedures and organizational processes, it includes personal initiatives etc. 64

Borman and Motowidlo (1993)65 identified six broad areas of managerial work particularly saturated with elements of contextual performance. These areas included (a) organizational commitment (b) representing the organization to customers and the public (c) maintaining good working relationships (d) persisting to reach goals (e) training, coaching, and developing subordinates and (f) communicating effectively and keeping others informed.

It is defined as performance that is not formally required as part of the job but that helps shape the social and psychological context of the organization (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993).66

Contextual performance and related elements of performance, such as organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB: Bateman and Organ, 1983),67 Prosocial organizational behaviour (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986),68 and extra-role performance (Van Dyne et al., 1995),69 contribute to organizational effectiveness. Contextual performance of the Principal’s includes behaviours that contribute to organizational effectiveness through its impact on the psychological, social, and organizational context of work. These behaviours of the Principal’s influence others to carry out organizationally valuable work, defusing hostility and conflict, and encouraging interpersonal trust. These types of behaviours should also lead to cooperation, cohesiveness, and improved morale at the group level and will positively impact group members’ performance. Principal’s can also benefit the schools and work group through their own readiness and preparation to contribute. These behaviours of the Principal’s can also include sharing knowledge with others, preparing adequately for job assignments, and proactively addressing work issues. Therefore, a Principal that helps others, performs their own job well, and effectively utilizes organizational resources will contribute substantially to the contextual aspect of their work. Subsequent research has empirically organized and refined taxonomy of contextual performance by analyzing thousands of examples of contextual performance across several jobs (Borman, Buck, Hanson, Motowidlo, Stark, & Dr Asgow, 2001).70
A related construct to contextual performance was provided by Organ (1988) who described organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) as individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly recognized by formal rewards systems, and that aggregates to promote the effective functioning of the organization. Organ (1997) later redefined the construct to capture the similar thrust of contextual performance which includes behaviours that contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance.

Recent research has supported organizational citizenship behaviour as distinct from, albeit strongly related to, task performance (Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2007). Different researchers can use contextual performance or OCB to define the counterpart to task performance, however contextual performance will be the term used in this research unless certain studies were specifically addressing the OCB construct. Additionally, task performance and contextual performance factors contribute to the overall performance in managerial jobs (Conway, 1999). Thus, contextual performance is not a single set of uniform behaviours, but is in itself a multidimensional concept. Thus, research has established that the relative importance given to task versus contextual behaviours has important implications for the definition of performance that is used in formulating human resource decisions. For example, Murphy and Shiarella (1997) showed that the validity of selection procedures depends on the relative values placed on task and contextual performance. Research has also demonstrated that supervisors differ in the relative weight they give to the two dimensions when judging an employee’s overall contribution to the organization (e.g., Johnson, 2001; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002).

Other research has demonstrated that the relative importance that an organization places on task and contextual performance may influence adverse impact and minority hiring (Hattrup, Rock, & Scalia, 1997). Therefore task performance of the Principal’s describes obligatory behaviours, contextual behaviours of the Principal’s describes as behaviours that do not fulfill specific aspects of the job's required role.
### 3.3 Overview of Identified Conceptual Framework of Performance and Classification of their Dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic Framework</th>
<th>Task performance (Task Behaviour)</th>
<th>Contextual performance (OCB)</th>
<th>Counter productive work behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Murphy(^{80})</td>
<td>Task Behaviour</td>
<td>Interpersonal behaviour</td>
<td>Downtime behaviour, Destructive behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Cambell(^{81})</td>
<td>Job specific task proficiency, Non job specific</td>
<td>Written &amp; oral communication Demonstrating effort Maintaining personal Facilitating peer and team performance Supervision &amp;leadership Mgt&amp; admin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Borman and Motowidlo(^{82})</td>
<td>Task performance</td>
<td>Contextual performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Viswesvaran(^{83})</td>
<td>Productivity Quality Job Knowledge</td>
<td>Communication competence Effort Leadership Administrative competence Interpersonal competence Compliance with an acceptance of Authority</td>
<td>Overall work performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Hunt(^{84})</td>
<td>Adherence to rules Industriousness Thoroughness Schedule Flexibility Attendance</td>
<td>Off-task behaviour Unruliness Theft Drug misuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Allworth and Hesketh(^{85})</td>
<td>Task performance</td>
<td>Contextual Performance</td>
<td>Adaptive performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Viswesvaran &amp; ones(^{86})</td>
<td>Task performance</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>Counter productive behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Miched&lt;sup&gt;87&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Task performance</td>
<td>Interpersonal performance</td>
<td>Civic performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Pulakos&lt;sup&gt;88&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Renn and Fedor&lt;sup&gt;89&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Work quantity</td>
<td>Work quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Bakker et al&lt;sup&gt;90&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>In role performance</td>
<td>Extra role performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Burton et al&lt;sup&gt;91&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- Giffin et al&lt;sup&gt;92&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Task proficiency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Allan&lt;sup&gt;93&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- Escorpizo&lt;sup&gt;94&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- Fluegge&lt;sup&gt;95&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Task performance</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- Arvey and Mussio&lt;sup&gt;96&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Working accurately</td>
<td>Cooperating &amp; extra time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Showing concern for time</td>
<td>Dealing with others in organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detail planning</td>
<td>Dealing with people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Showing responsibility and initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- Jiambalvo&lt;sup&gt;97&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Understanding Planning</td>
<td>Promoting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revising</td>
<td>Providing training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizing problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggesting solution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewing work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19- Campbell et al&lt;sup&gt;98&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Job specific proficiency</td>
<td>Non job specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- Campbell et al&lt;sup&gt;99&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Core technical proficiency</td>
<td>General soldiering proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effort and leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical fitness &amp; military bearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- Lance et al&lt;sup&gt;100&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Technical proficiency</td>
<td>Interpersonal proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22- Luo et al\textsuperscript{101}</td>
<td>Military training</td>
<td>Helping others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task accomplishment</td>
<td>Love of learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work capability</td>
<td>Promoting organizational benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23- Mael et al\textsuperscript{102}</td>
<td>Providing clinical services</td>
<td>Managerial behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Source: Compiled}

The importance of the four dimensions, and their exact indicators, may however differ on the basis of the specific context. In accordance with two previous narrative reviews,\textsuperscript{103} Surprisingly, none of the identified frameworks included all four dimensions proposed in the framework, except for the recent Sinclair and Tucker framework for work performance of soldiers.\textsuperscript{104}

3.4 \textbf{Approaches to Measure Performance}

Principals do not perform in a vacuum. Principal’s work in an organizational context in a specific situation, engaging in specific behaviours that produce certain results. Thus, there are three approaches that is trait, behaviour and result approach that can be used to measure performance of the Principal’s. The present study was concerned only with the behaviour approach. Therefore, the study focused on behavioural aspect of principal’s rather than outcomes. The study emphasized on what Principal’s do on the job and the study does not considered outcomes resulting from their behaviours.

3.5 \textbf{Relationship between Task, and Contextual Performance Seeking Behaviour}

In a meta-analysis of jobs, Conway (1999)\textsuperscript{105} found that task and contextual performance seeking behaviour contributed uniquely to overall performance.

Recently, Griffin et al.\textsuperscript{106} (2007) presented and tested a model that aimed at integrating major performance concepts. These authors argued that two principle changes (i.e., increasing interdependence and uncertainty of work systems) require an integrative model of different performance dimensions. They defined three core
performance dimensions, namely proficiency, adaptivity, and pro activity which they classified at three levels (individual, team and organization). Proficiency covers the fulfillment of role requirements that can be formalized, adaptivity refers to the extent of adaptation to changes at the workplace and pro activity describes the extent of self-directed action necessary to adapt to changes. Griffin et al. (2007)\textsuperscript{107} regarded individual task proficiency to be comparable to task performance, and adaptivity and pro activity to be especially important in uncertain situations. Furthermore, these different types of behaviour are not considered to be mutually exclusive but their importance should vary depending on the uncertainty of the environment. In sum, performance should be seen as a multidimensional construct with the dimensions being multidimensional themselves.

Moreover, each performance dimension is related to different aspects of organizational success (e.g., task performance helps to satisfy technical core requirements). Task performance and contextual performance seeking behaviour are two distinct dimensions of behaviour at work that can contribute independently to effectiveness outcomes for organizations that is schools. Contextual performance of the Principal’s is important because it represents a type of behaviour that is largely under the motivational control of individuals. Task performance is distinct, albeit strongly positively related, with contextual performance\textsuperscript{108}.

Both types of behaviour independently contribute to overall performance, but through different means.\textsuperscript{109} Increasingly, contextual behaviours are implicitly or explicitly required as task behaviours. Schools need highly performing Principal’s with effective behaviour in order to meet their goals, to deliver the products and services they specialized in, and finally to achieve competitive advantage. Accomplishing tasks and performing at a high level behaviour can be a source of satisfaction, with feeling of mastery and pride. Performance is a major although not the only prerequisite for future career development and success.
3.6 Models of Performance Seeking Behaviour (Task and Contextual Performance Behaviour)

In response to this complexity researchers have adopted a range of approaches for dealing with the complexity of performance. In a review of models of performance Viswesvaran and Ones (2000)\textsuperscript{110} used ideas developed by Binning and Barrett (1989)\textsuperscript{111} to analyze the approaches for handling the complexity of performance used by various writers. For these writers performance dimensions have been either designed for specific jobs or related to work generally, and have been either developed as stand-alone measures or as a set of dimensions intended to cover a large proportion of the total performance variance of employees. Stand-alone measures for specific jobs are exceedingly numerous and this represents one of the difficulties in understanding performance generally; what is considered a central aspect of performance in one line of work can be totally ignored in another because of the requirements of individual jobs or occupations. This can be a problem even when more comprehensive sets of dimensions are used. Although clearly useful within their context, it is difficult for example to generalize from entry-level performance criteria (Hunt, 1996)\textsuperscript{112} to managerial performance measures (Borman & Brush, 1993)\textsuperscript{113} and vice-versa.

Yet the nature of work has been changing over the last few decades with a move towards more flexible definitions of work roles to accommodate more dynamic and interchangeable jobs, as well as cross-functional tasks and skills in response to the increasing rate of change in economic and organizational conditions (Hough & Oswald, 2001).\textsuperscript{114}

These changes have required more ability to generalize performance from occupation to occupation. Research on the links between employment relations practices and overall firm performance (Addison & Belfield, 2001)\textsuperscript{115} would likewise benefit from models of performance which allow generalizations from individual to organizational levels of analysis, something which necessitates more general models of individual performance.

Fortunately Viswesvaran and Ones (2000)\textsuperscript{116} also highlighted a growing number of studies aimed at developing more widely applicable models of
performance which address these needs for generalisability of findings and cross-level analysis of performance. More comprehensive models are those presented by Viswesvaran et al. (1996).

Campbell et al. (1996) explicitly deny that these represent orthogonal factors of job performance and state that they are not necessarily present in every job and are definitely not the last word in defining the performance domain. However they do suggest that these components account for most of the variation in performance assessments. They also present evidence that suggests that the various components are relatively independent and are relevant for performance research.

The Viswesvaran et al. (1996) model is derived from an application of the lexical hypothesis Goldberg, 1990 which suggests that all practically significant variation in performance will have been identified and labeled at some point by someone in the employment relations or organizational behaviour literature. Their ten dimensions of performance were identified using content analysis and conceptual grouping and are as follows:

1. Productivity
2. Effort
3. Job Knowledge
4. Interpersonal competence
5. Administrative competence
6. Quality
7. Communication competence
8. Leadership
9. Compliance with authority
10. Overall performance

These models have something else in common in that they both appear to reflect broader and more fundamental structures of performance. Campbell et al (1996) concluded from their research that there were at least two general factors or major types of job performance: aspects which are ‘job-specific’ and reflect technical and specific competencies, and ‘non-job-specific’ aspects which are considered to be broadly similar for every job. Each category was conceived as being multi-
dimensional with the latter category including things such as team-work, self-development, compliance with organizational norms and customs, perseverance etc (Campbell et al., 1990).\textsuperscript{120} Campbell (1990a; Campbell et al., 1993)\textsuperscript{121} provided one of the first large scale attempts to integrate the numerous dimensions of performance into a comprehensive model. According to Campbell, the latent structure of job performance can be modeled using the following eight general factors According to Campbell (1990a),\textsuperscript{122} these eight factors represent the highest-order factors that can be useful for describing performance in every job in the occupational domain, although some factors may not be relevant for all jobs. As mentioned previously, he contends that core task proficiency, demonstrating effort, and maintaining personal discipline are important components of performance in every job. While this model represents one of the most comprehensive treatments of the latent structure of job performance currently available, it has rarely been empirically tested. In response, they call for future construct validation efforts to test the adequacy of the eight-factor model.

Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994)\textsuperscript{123} demonstrated that task and contextual performance contributed independently to overall performance in a sample of 421 U.S. Air Force mechanics. Further, their findings suggested that job experience was more highly correlated with task performance than with contextual performance, and personality variables (e.g., dependability) were more predictive of contextual performance than of task performance.

Campbell, Gasser and Oswald (1996)\textsuperscript{124} present a multi-factor model of job performance based on a review of the job performance literature and provide confirmatory research from military settings. The eight components of job performance identified in their model are:

1. Job-Specific Task Proficiency
2. Non-Job-Specific Task Proficiency
3. Written and Oral Communication Task Proficiency
4. Demonstration of Effort
5. Maintenance of Personal Discipline
6. Facilitation of Peer and Team Performance
7. Supervision/Leadership
8. Management/Administration

Viswesvaran (1993)\textsuperscript{125} provides an excellent comprehensive review of historical developments in the conceptualization of job performance. In the 1970s and 1980s research on pro social and organizational citizenship behaviours proliferated (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983).\textsuperscript{126} This resulted in the introduction of a variety of criterion measures such as teamwork and altruism.

Similarly, Borman and Motowidlo (1993) outlined the conceptual basis for expanding the criterion domain beyond task performance to include elements of contextual performance. Within this framework, contextual performance is defined as behaviours that support the broad organizational, social, and psychological environment of the organization in contrast to behaviors that support the organization's technical core. Contextual performance is further distinguished from task performance in that it is typically more discretionary as opposed to role prescribed. The authors describe five categories of contextual performance as follows: (1) volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job, (2) persisting with extra enthusiasm when necessary, (3) helping and cooperating with others, (4) following organizational rules and procedures, and (5) endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives.

Borman, W.C.\textsuperscript{127} in particular developed a model based on two key types of performance - technical and contextual - which are somewhat reminiscent of the venerable distinction between task and maintenance processes in group research. Technical performance relates to what Borman & Motowidlo (1993)\textsuperscript{128} call the 'technical core' of the organization or job, the activities directly or indirectly involved with transforming resources into products for economic exchange.

Contextual performance on the other hand involves activities directed at maintaining the inter-personal and psychological environment that needs to exist to allow the technical core to operate. As such contextual activities are common to most if not all jobs, are dependent upon motivations and predispositions such as personality, and are rarely role-prescribed. Contextual performance and similar variables have been growing in importance in discussions of organisational performance criteria (Borman, Hanson & Hedge, 1997).\textsuperscript{129}
Taxonomy of performance was proposed and developed for the US Navy by Murphy (1989). This is significantly broader and breaks performance into only four dimensions.

1. Task-oriented behaviours are similar to task-specific behaviours in Campbell's model. This dimension includes any major tasks relevant to someone's job.

2. Interpersonally oriented behaviours are represented by any interaction the focal employee has with other employees. These can be task related or non-task related. This dimension diverges from Campbell's taxonomy because it included behaviours (small talk, socializing, etc.) that are not targeting an organization's goal.

3. Down-time behaviours are behaviours that employees engage in during their free time either at work or off-site. Down-time behaviours that occur off-site are only considered job performance when they subsequently affect job performance (for example, outside behaviours that cause absenteeism).

4. Destructive/hazardous behaviours

In addition to these models dividing performance into dimensions, others have identified different types of behaviours making up performance.

### 3.7 Conceptualization of OCB

As opposed to task performance (performance defined by job descriptions and formally rewarded) contextual performance includes behaviours that are neither outlined for nor expected of an employee (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

Contextual performance of the Principal’s (organizational citizenship behaviour) is a facet of the broader domain of job performance. Job performance is described by Motowidlo, Borman and Schmit (1997, p.72) as the “degree to which an individual helps the organization reach its goals”. Job performance is further described by Motowidlo et al as behavioral, episodic, evaluative, and multidimensional (Campbell 1990).

It is the behaviour of schools principal’s that does not support the technical core itself so much as they support the broader organizational, social, and
psychological environment in which the technical core must function. In other words, it enhances the environment in which the work is performed. Organizational citizenship behaviour of the Principal’s is a personal and volunteer behaviour that is not mentioned directly in official rewards system of a schools. However, it contributes to effectiveness and efficiency in an organization. It is a collection of volunteer and non-obligatory behaviour of the Principal’s that is not defined in the job descriptions but contribute to effective improvement of duties and roles in schools. It emphasizes on three main characteristics of citizenship behaviour. The behaviour of the Principal’s should: 1) be voluntary (they are not pre-defined obligations and are not included in official job descriptions), 2) be beneficial to schools and 3) be multi-dimensional. A good organizational citizen not only should be aware of current issues of an organization but also should express an opinion about them and actively participate in solving organizational problems. This set of behaviours is not explicitly and directly mentioned in official rewards system of an organization but it contributes to effectiveness of organizational operations.

OCB in schools as “voluntary and discretionary behaviour of that exceeds the formal requirements of the job”. OCB is a relatively new construct. It has been widely researched in the business community, but only a small amount of research has been directed toward its applicability to schools. OCB is an organizational characteristic that was first introduced by Bateman and Organ (1983). They suggested OCB “lubricate(s) the social machinery of the organization.” They also described OCB as those worker behaviours that are not formally prescribed, but freely occur and are important to the organization as whole.

**Early Research Related to OCB**

OCB related research can be traced to the early 20th century. Katz (1964) identified three employee behaviours necessary for successful organizational functioning: (a) dependability in carrying out roles, (b) willingness to enter and commitment to stay with the company, and (c) participation in spontaneous and innovative actions beyond formal obligations. Those organizations where employees only perform formally prescribed duties are at a high risk for failure. Employees’
behaviours can be classified as either in-role or extra-role behaviours. Both types of behaviours are important to organizational functioning. However, extra-role behaviours carry organizational functioning to an optimal level. Extra-role behaviours are those where actions go beyond formal job descriptions.

**Development of the OCB Construct**

Bateman and Organ (1983) formally introduced the construct of OCB when they attempted to connect job satisfaction with organizational functioning. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) examined organizational characteristics of two large Midwestern banks to measure their effect on OCB in the organization. Results indicated OCB to have two dimensions: altruism and generalized compliance. Altruism is voluntary behaviour in a manner to help another specific individual. Assisting a fellow employee with a task in which they have sought help would be an example of altruistic behaviour. Organizational characteristics of job satisfaction and educational level of employees were found to have significant and direct effects on altruism. This behaviour is described as “going the extra mile” to help specific individuals. Job satisfaction promotes OCB and productivity, which ultimately allows management more free time to commit to important organizational tasks.

Generalized compliance is where one acts upon the lines of what is considered moral and proper for the best interest of organizational functioning. Proper use of time in the workplace is an example of generalized compliance. Other findings by Smith et al. (1983) illuminated the relationship between employees’ OCB and both mood states and job satisfaction. They also communicated the importance of leaders in an organization to model OCB because of the likelihood of it promoting OCB throughout the rest of the organization via social exchanges.

Organ (1988) added to his earlier explanation of OCB, saying it “included behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization.” He further clarified the construct of OCB by offering five different types of discretionary behaviour: (a) altruism, (b) conscientiousness, (c) sportsmanship, (d) courtesy, and (e) civic virtue. Altruism concerns discretionary
behaviours that are directed toward helping a specific individual complete an organizationally related task. Conscientiousness is behaviour that goes beyond the expectations of meeting formal organizational obligations.

Sportsmanship behaviours as those that reflect such things as team concept, flexibility, avoidance of complaining, respect for organizational resources, and acceptance of reasonable organizational standards. These behaviours promote productive time spent toward organizational goals. Courtesy concerns effective communication and assistance toward others in order to improve effectiveness of the organization. Civic virtue concerns the involvement of employees in efforts to promote organizational interests. DiPaola and Hoy (2005b) cited examples of this behaviour to be voluntary attendance of organizational functions or serving on organizational committees.

**Organizational Citizenship within the School Environment**

OCB is a cluster of behaviours that benefit an organization and individuals within it”. Compliance described OCB directed at the organization. Altruism is linked to individual’s orientation within the organization (Penner, Midili & Kegelmeyer, 1997). Dimensions of organizational citizenship in schools are associated with both benefits for the individual and the organization. Benefits for the individual are related to receipt of praise and encouragement (verbal and nonverbal), increasing activity and responsibility (both teachers and students), adoption and implementation of different ideas; warmth, trust, intimacy, and enthusiasm. For the school, OCB is important in the following areas: innovative approaches to training volunteering, involvement in individual and collective extracurricular activities to promote greater responsibility, tolerance and respect in students; invest additional efforts to achieve the objectives of school cohesion in teams and more open relations in the teacher-student dyad, increased levels of school performance, which in turn leads to fully support of the positive image of the school. DiPaola and Tschanne-Moran (2001) found a positive relationship between OCB and four school climate characteristics: collegial Principal leadership, teacher professionalism, academic press, and community engagement. If Principals and teachers are dedicated to their work, the levels of organizational citizenship behaviour are higher in the whole school. Employees who
feel that they are treated with fairness, tend to express their organizational citizenship behaviour (Samudi, AliFarnia, Vahidifar & Zemestani, 2012). Another study found positive and significant correlations between personal teaching efficacy and organizational citizenship behaviours such as altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, and civic virtue, while general teaching efficacy was only related to sportsmanship (Dussault, 2006). Educational organizations are dependent on social structures and relationships, especially trust, cooperation and leadership. Trust is a more important factor than the leadership style to increase organizational citizenship behaviour in teachers (Trust and OCB, 2013). Studies also indicate that commitment is an important mediating variable between relational trust between leader and teachers, and OCB (Elstad, Christophersen & Turmo, 2012). School leadership is the key to the overall success of the school and it is important that attention be given to the role and functions of the educational manager for maintaining an effective working environment. Under the new socio-economic conditions, the role and functions of the school Principal to maintain and manage an effective working environment acquire new dimensions. In this sense, the Principal of the school has become an educational manager. This circumstance essentially changes some basic requirements to explore and predict phenomena in the field of educational management.

4 PROCESS AT A GLANCE

To foster strong leadership, effective behaviour should be there. It aimed at attracting and developing skilled and passionate school and system leaders. It promotes a collaborative approach through which schools, districts, education partners, and the ministry work in partnership to support student achievement and well-being.

The Principal behaviour, an essential component, which is to be measured for their growth and development. The performance behaviour appraisal process focuses efforts to achieve these goals. The Framework provides an opportunity to evaluate the Principals behaviours.

The Framework identifies evaluation of behaviour of Principals on school system. It is designed to promote a common language that fosters an understanding of
behaviour and provides a resource for school and system leaders to identify practices and competencies in terms of behaviour for building expertise Principals in relation to a wide range of leadership capacities, and can be used to guide the design and implementation of professional learning and development.

**Framework of Evaluation of Principal Behaviour**

The Framework comprises of evaluation of Principal behaviour, which is designed to focus on leadership development. The Framework evolved to reflect the latest research based on task and organizational citizenship behaviour of school Principal’s of Haryana. It is designed to:
1. Promote a common language that fosters an understanding of behaviour and what it means to a school or system leader.

2. Identify the behaviour that describe and helps to develop effective leadership.

3. Guide the design and implementation of professional learning and development for school and system leaders.

The Principals behaviour appraisal, in meaningful ways, allows the Principals to understand leadership responsibility for achieving goals that support the school plan. It can be made possible in a climate of sharing, trust, and support. Such a climate should be developed by Principals. Therefore, effective Principals behaviour appraisal supports an approach to leadership focused on improving and well-being of all.

**Key Components of the framework**

This framework for Principals is intended to support and promote professional growth and development. When all the components are implemented in a coherent way, linked to school improvement goals, and connected to ongoing professional learning, the process becomes fully integrated into the daily work that school Principals do that is it will enhance the effectiveness in the behaviour. The key components of the framework for school system are as follows:

a. Goals and Priorities

b. Plan

c. Strategies ,Methods and Action

d. Evaluation of Behaviour

e. Performance (Behavioural aspect)

**Goals and Priorities**- Setting goals is one of the most important components of an effective process made by Principals that reflects the goals and priorities of the ministry, the school board, and the school improvement plan .The Principals consider the goal aspect taking into consideration priorities of the ministry, the school board. In addition, Principals are encouraged to collect input from staff (such as teachers and education assistants), parents, and students that are linked to their goals. In order to
accomplish his/her task and responsibilities the Principals in the schools set the goals and priorities them accordingly.

**Plan-** It is developed by Principals, taking into account the school improvement plan, the board’s improvement plan, and ministry priorities. Other considerations could include personal development goals as well as the school and community context. The Plan is developed by Principals so as to accomplish the goals.

**Strategies/Actions-** In determining the actions the Principals will consider various practices and competencies. The Principals identify the actions that he or she will take to realize the stated goals. The Principals work on the job so as to accomplish the objectives by using various strategies and methods.

**Evaluation of behaviour–** It emphasizes on the evaluation of performance seeking behaviour of school Principals that is task and contextual behaviour. Researcher measures the performance behaviour of Principals which they perform on the job.

**Performance results-** are the outcomes in term of behaviour of the Principals behaviour towards work that is in terms of task and organizational citizenship behaviour. When assessing the behaviour in terms of performance, an researcher took various behavioural dimensions into consideration.

**A summative report** is used to document the results of the appraisal process of performance behaviour and becomes a tool to assist Principals in reflecting on feedback they receive in order to monitor their own growth. The summative report includes an overall performance behaviour rating, comments related to the behaviour performance that were analyzed in the interview and observation session of survey that contributed to the Principal’s overall performance, that could be strengthened in the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOURS</th>
<th>LINES OF MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Scheduling Work</td>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE, OBSERVATION, INTERVIEW</td>
<td>4 POINT RATING SCALE WITH STATEMENTS FOR EACH EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE SEEKING BEHAVIOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Relationship and Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embracing Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Self and Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Dedication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws and Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (Rewards and Recognition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning and Scheduling work

The Principal’s exemplary behaviour in planning is evident in all aspects of his/her activities and operations. Planning is an articulating shared direction and coherent policies, practices, and procedures for realizing high standards of performance. Effective Principals are highly skilled planners and in fact, they are proactive in their planning work (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).¹⁴⁵

The Principal should exhibit adequate behaviour in planning for all aspects of school organization and operation within his/her sphere of influence. Performance in planning always meets and sometimes exceeds expectations. This behavioural aspect is considered to be a part of task behaviour.

Culture of learning

Cunningham and Cordiero (2000)¹⁴⁶ argue that culture is “a continuous process of creating meaning in social and material contexts”. Kleiman (2000)¹⁴⁷ defines culture as “a society’s set of assumptions, values and rules about social interactions”. Organizational culture refers to a system of shared meaning held by members, distinguishing the organization from other organizations. The Principals builds collaborative cultures, structures the organization for success, and connects the school to its wider environment for effective learning. The Principals builds a learning culture within the school to build effective learning organization. It builds a harmonious culture of learning which works, reflects the organization. The schools Principals emphasizes on this behaviour by establishing and maintaining a positive school culture that promotes learning and engagement for students and teachers. Building culture of learning is the prime responsibility of Principals in schools which is task oriented behaviour.

Interpersonal Facilitation

Interpersonal facilitation refers to behaviours which contribute to organizational outcomes through interpersonal means. It includes altruism, helping coworkers as well as a range of other behaviours which address issues such as barriers to performance, morale and cooperation. It is helping others which make the work system more efficient (Neihoff & Yen, 2004).¹⁴⁸ The positive outcomes of such social
interaction cross psychological disciplines (Datton, 1996). High quality interpersonal facilitation is the key to readiness for performance feedback and it is considered to be main dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour.

**Collaborative relationship and Communication**

Leading a school with high expectations and academic achievement for all students requires robust connections to the external community. These connections include linkages to family and/or other people and institutions in the community that advance academic and social learning. There is a substantial research base that has reported positive relationships between family involvement and social and academic benefits for students. Similarly, schools with well-defined parent partnership programs show achievement gains over schools with less robust partnerships. External collaboration is part of the strategic vision of the school; this collaboration is closely linked to the academic and social learning goals of the school. Learning-centered leaders “model community collaboration for staff, establish norms about the importance of parent connections, and provide opportunities for staff to develop the collaborative skills needed to work effectively with parents.”

The Principals need to be able to develop behavior in which he/she effectively communicate to others so as to engage them in the process of reshaping the organization and articulating essential beliefs regarding learning. Good communication skills helps to build supporting systems designed to achieve goals. It is also considered to be the prime responsibility of Principals to maintain collaborative relationship among the stakeholders and thus considered to be associated with the task behaviour.

**Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment is a concept related to a lot of variables which affect the organizational behaviour. Thus, this behaviour is considered to be the dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour. Organizational commitment is defined as a process in which Principal’s internalize the values of the organization, keep on staying at the organization to get the results of their investments on the organization and they think that staying at the organization is a moral and ethical
responsibility. Organizational commitment means the bound between schools and the Principals. The Principal’s engaged in the schools want to have active roles in the organization. They want to have an impact on the programs, procedures or strategies of the organization. Organizational commitment has been examined in three dimensions: Affective commitment means Principal’s being identified with the schools they work for. Continuance commitment is related to Principal’s staying in the schools considering the price he/she will have to pay if he/she leaves the organization. Normative commitment is associated with the obligation that Principal’s feel about staying in the schools.

Assessment

It refers to systematically collecting and analyzing data to make judgments that guide decisions and actions for continuous improvement. The Principal demonstrates it thorough knowledge and excellent application of student assessment, personnel evaluation, and program evaluation and it is considered to be a dimension of task behavior. Principals consistently demonstrate excellence in developing, interpreting and using assessment and evaluation data.

Performance behaviour in assessment and evaluation is acceptable and has contributed to improvement efforts.

Organizing for results

The Principal demonstrates thorough behaviour of, and expertise in, developing an organization that contributes to accomplishment of the school’s vision, mission, and goals, and to meeting the needs of its customers. The school is one in which learning, teaching, and continuous improvement are always the primary focus of the Principal’s activities, and change, when needed, is embraced. This behaviour indicate that the Principal has demonstrated knowledge of alternative organizational structures, change processes, quality management and marketing strategies in planning, implementing, and accomplishing improvement within his/her sphere of influence which is considered to be prime responsibility of Principals.

The Principal demonstrates some behaviour in the development of an school i.e., an school where learning, teaching and continuous improvements are the primary
focus and meeting customer needs is a priority. He/she sometimes, meets expectations for performance.

**Innovation**

“The key to our success will be to compete by developing new products, by generating new industries, by maintaining our role as the world’s engine of scientific discovery and Technological innovation. It’s absolutely essential to our future.”

– President Barack Obama, November 17, 2010

According to innovation expert Larry Keeley, “Innovation that works is a disciplined process…. The real frontier is to not think of it as a creative exercise, but to think about it as being disciplined in using the right methods.” Systematic innovation requires well-managed and repeatable processes, to move an organization beyond a dependence on the lightning-strike of sporadic innovations and to create a more constant and dependable flow of new ideas. There are a wide range of new methodologies and strategies that have been developed to help foster and promote innovation. Innovation is “the successful exploitation of ideas, generated at the intersection of invention and insight, which leads to the creation of social or economic value.”

In some schools the Principal’s are engaged with a range of tools and techniques that can help foster creative thinking, problem solving and innovative practices, and emerging digital technologies that can lead to more diverse and dynamic learning experiences by harnessing the potential of a networked society. Today, a need of a broader culture of innovation is established in schools by Principals, so that practice and skills can be shared and suited to local contexts and needs, and so that the development of networks and hubs of innovation can emerge to help disseminate and diffuse practice. It is considered to be apart of task responsibility of Principals to inculcate innovative practices in the school.

**Organizational Justice**

Organizational justice refers to perceptions of fairness within an organizational setting (Greenberg, 1990). It has been widely accepted that organizational justice contributes to employee performance. An Principal can alter his
quality and quantity of work to restore justice when he/she perceives the outcome/input ratio to be unjust. The equity theory has provided a theoretical explanation to the distributive justice’s effect on performance. Prior research has demonstrated that organizational justice has three distinct dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. (1) Distributive justice refers to outcomes that are consistent with implicit norms for allocation, such as equity or equality (Adams, 1966). (2) Procedural justice refers to voice during a decision making process, influencing the outcome (Thibaut and Walker, 1975). In other words, procedural justice means the fairness of means and procedures by which the decision are made.(3) Interactional justice refers to the perceived fairness of interpersonal treatment from those administering the procedures used to arrive at certain outcomes (Bies and Moag, 1986). This type of justice reflects the degree to which people feel that they are treated with respect and dignity by authority figures (De Cremer et al., 2007). The relationship between organizational justice and job performance has been tested by some studies, the results of regression analysis revealed that distributive justice has a significant and positive effect on task performance (â = 0.513, p < .01). In support of this, the work of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice had significant positive effects on task and contextual performance (standardized regression coefficient .13, p < .05, .33, .17, .26, .29, and .26, p < .01, respectively) (Devonish and Greenidge, 2010). This behaviour of Principals are basically required and is the main dimension of organizational citizenship behaviour.

**Developing self and others**

Self-development of Principals is a form of OCB where as developing others is the prime responsibility of Principals that is considered to be task behaviour of Principals. Continuous learning is an increasingly important element of performance in light of today’s environmental and organizational trends (London & Mone, 1999). To do so, Principal’s need to actively and continuously acquire KSAs in reaction to, or in anticipation of, changing performance requirements. These acts of developing and enhancing one’s skills, when exhibited voluntarily and proactively by Principal’s are what termed as self development behaviour. However it is believed
that self development, with its specific focus on training & development to enhance one’s KSA, involve activities that require a much more extensive commitment of Principal’s time & resources. It refers to improving one’s own knowledge or working skills. This might include keeping abreast of latest development in one’s field and area, or even learning a new set of skills so as to expand the range of one’s contribution to an organization.

**Job dedication**

Job dedication has become a well-known construct to both researchers and practitioners and is a form of organizational citizenship behaviour. An emerging body of research is beginning to converge around a common conceptualization of job dedication as connoting high levels of personal investment in the work tasks performed on a job (Macey and Schneider, 2008). Many researchers have argued that dedication as a motivational variable, should lead to high levels of job performance.(Rich, B. L., LePine, J. A., and Crawford, E.R., 2010)

Work engagement represents a commonality among physical, emotional, and cognitive energies that Principal bring to their work role. In this sense, work engagement is more than just the investment of a single aspect of the self. It represents the investment of multiple dimensions (physical, emotional, and cognitive), leading to the simultaneous and holistic experience. Work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption:

1. **Vigor** is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one’s work, not being easily fatigued, and persistence even in the face of difficulties.

2. **Dedication** is characterized by deriving a sense of significance from one’s work, by feeling enthusiastic and proud about one’s job, and by feeling inspired and challenged by it, and the last,

3. **Absorption** is characterized by being totally and happily immersed in one’s work and having difficulties detaching oneself from it. In short, highly engaged employees have high levels of energy and are enthusiastic about their work. Moreover, they are often fully immersed in their work so that time flies.
Engagement focuses work performed at a job and represents the willingness to dedicate physical, cognitive, and emotional resources to this work. In support of this, results from a meta-analytic study testing the role of engagement as a mediator of the relation between antecedents and job performance found a direct effect between work engagement and task, and contextual performance (standardized path coefficient .36, .38 p < .01, respectively) (Christian et al., 2011).

Laws and policies

The Principal should demonstrate a thorough understanding of all applicable federal, state, and local laws and policies and appropriate application in all aspects of his/her leadership and management; (e.g., personnel supervision and evaluation, disciplinary procedures, development and implementation of building level and program level policies and procedures). The Principal develops and implements building level and program level policies and procedures consistent with local, state, and federal laws and policies. The Principal regularly interprets existing laws and policies to stakeholders and encourages their support. He/she also interprets existing policies and laws to stakeholders and encourages their support. Laws and policies is considered to be a major task responsibility and behaviour of school Principals.

Discipline management

The term “discipline” is derived from the Latin terms “disco” and “discipline”, which mean “to learn” and “instruction, knowledge and learning communicated to the disciples or learners” respectively (Van Rensburg, Landman, Bodenstein, 1994). In the broader sense discipline applies not only to external discipline but also to personal or inner discipline prompted by spiritual acceptance of disciplined behaviour. It also denotes restraint by means of positive guidance, by indicating the correct way and by ensuring adherence to the correct way. In the opinion of Treffry, Summers, O’Neil, Hasset and Todd (1997) the concept discipline can be defined as a “practice of imposing strict rules of behaviour on the people” and also as an “ability to work in a controlled manner”. In this regard, Burden (1995) states that discipline involve the actions that the educators take to restore order. It is a form of task behaviour. A
Principal must maintain discipline in the school and classroom situations so that the education of learners flourishes, without disruptive behaviour and offences. Principals should also consider self-discipline strategy in order to maintain school discipline. Although it is the process of maintaining order by assisting learners to discover the value, utility and necessity of obeying reasonable rules and procedures and to assume responsibility for their behaviour. According to Rich (1982)\textsuperscript{166} and Savage (1991)\textsuperscript{167} disciplined people have orderly habits, are able to observe the rules of conduct and can exert self-control in learning duties. They show relevant, intellectual, worthwhile standards.

**Motivation (Contingent reward)**

The leader rewards followers for attaining common goals and objectives. The interaction between Principal’s, teachers and students is one of positive reinforcement, based on an exchange of desired items. For the success of the schools and to accomplish goal the individuals expects some kind of motivation in terms of rewards is expected from the Principal’s. It is a form of task and organizational citizenship behaviour.

6 **DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS**

In this section, the conceptual and operational definitions of the key terms used in this study will be determined.

**Principal**- A senior member of the school, appointed by government as administrator of the school under the guidelines and policies laid down by the Province of India. Principals are considered to be “experienced” once they complete one year in their role.

**Principal behaviour**- The behaviour of an individual Principal exercised in directing activities toward a shared goal and perceived by teachers as such.

**Researcher**- A person who carries out investigations by scientific study of a subject.

**Leadership behaviour** - Stodgill (1948)\textsuperscript{168} defined leadership as “the process of influencing the activities of an organized group towards goal setting and goal accomplishment”. This definition is much broader than previously cited definitions
for, in addition to mentioning the importance of goal and group, it takes into account the relevance of goal setting as well as accomplishment.

Operationally, leadership behaviour refers to the behaviour of the Principals under study in matters pertaining to school administration and school programmes. Specifically, it means the manner with which he/she deals with the teachers and pupils, how he/she supervises learning in the school, how handles meetings and how she communicates with the parents and support staff.

**Practices**-According to Yukl (1998), practices refer to social processes in which a member of a group or organization influences the interpretation of internal and external events, the choice of goals or desired outcomes, organization of work activities, individual motivation and abilities, power relations and shared orientations.

**Culture**-“Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behaviour acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiment in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other, as conditional elements of future action.’

**Effective and Effective management**-The term “effective” relates to getting the right things done and setting right targets to achieve an overall goal. Harold Koontz (1955), “Management is an art of getting things done through and with the people in formally organized groups. It is an art of creating an environment in which people can perform as individuals and can co-operate towards attainment of group goals”.

F.W. Taylor (1911), “Management is an art of knowing what to do, when to do and see that it is done in the best and cheapest way”. In Taylor’s view, if a work is analysed scientifically it will be possible to find one best way to do it.

It comprises planning, organizing, staffing, leading or directing, and controlling an organization. Effective management is the process used by the Principals to carry out her duties to ensure the smooth running of the school. This
involves obtaining resources for curricular activities - teaching, manipulate time for learning, ensure pupils get the best from co-curricular activities and create a climate where pupils are well disciplined and safe.

**Assessment instrument**- Any systematic means of generating tangible information about Principals behaviour.

**Principal behaviour evaluation**- The systematic assessment of a Principal behaviour.
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