In the preceding chapters, objectives, theoretical framework review of related studies, hypotheses, and methodology of research for the study were presented.

This chapter deals with the analysis of data, interpretation and discussion of results. Analysis involves a careful study of the tabulated material, which enables the investigator to interpret the results and generalize them to arrive at meaningful conclusions. The analysis of data and results have been presented in section I and II.

Section-I

This section deals with the analysis of data and discussion of results on the basis of correlational analysis.

Correlation is a statistical technique that is used to measure the relationship between two variables. Although correlation has a number of different applications, the main application of this technique is the prediction of results. In other words if two variables are known to be related in some systematic way, it is possible to use one of the variables to make accurate prediction about the other variable.

In order to know the relationship between each of the independent variables of job stress, job satisfaction, attitude towards administration with the dependent variable of administrative behaviour, Pearson’s Product Moment coefficient of correlations were computed with the help of computer. This technique was used in
order to test the hypotheses 1-3, which are reproduced here for ready reference:

1. There will be significant relationship between job stress and administrative behaviour of the principals.

2. There will be significant relationship between job satisfaction and administrative behaviour of the principals.

3. There will be significant relationship between attitude towards administration and administrative behaviour of the principals.

The results of coefficient of correlation between independent variables and dependent variable of administrative behaviour have been presented in table 5.1.

**Job-Stress and Administrative Behaviour:**

From the results of table 5.1, it was observed that variable of job stress insiginificantly correlated with the dependent variable of administrative behaviour \( r = 0.083 \). These results suggest that stress due to job does not influence the administrative behaviour of the principals in a significant way.

The reasons for the above results may be that in these days principals have decentralized their powers. There are different departments working under the charge of different teachers. In government schools teachers take the responsibilities of different funds or departments due to the fear of confidential report which is written by principal. In private schools, teachers have to work because they have the feeling of insecurity of job. Due to all these reasons, and due to change in the outlook of principals, in the present time, principals are not working under too much stressful conditions.

Therefore, hypothesis (1) that there will be significant relationship between job stress and administrative behaviour of principals was not retained in the present study.
Table 5.1

Table Showing Coefficient of correlation Between Independent Variables and Dependent Variable of Administrative Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable of Administrative behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Stress</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.967 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attitude Towards Administration</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level
Above results of the present study were in line with the result of Cooper and Kelley (1993) but contrary to Evans and Johnson (1990).

**Job-Satisfaction and Administrative Behaviour:**

The variable of job satisfaction was found to be significantly positively correlated with the dependent variable of administrative behaviour as value of co-efficient of correlation was found to be significant at .01 level (r=.967). These results suggest that high job satisfaction of the principals leads to their better administrative behaviour and vice versa.

Significant positive correlation between the job satisfaction and administrative behaviour of the principal, may be explained on the basis of definition and theories of job satisfaction. Salary, human needs-physical needs, safety (security) needs, social (affiliation) needs, esteem (recognition) and self actualization, all these needs help the principals in improving the work efficiency, give positive reinforcement and sense of achievement, provide motivation to them. This satisfaction leads to better performance and behaviour on the part of the principals.

Thus, hypothesis-2 that there will be significant relationship between job satisfaction and administrative behaviour of principals was retained in the present investigation.

Results of the present study were in line with the results of Brown (1967) and Taj (2002).

**Attitude Towards Administration and Administrative Behaviour**

As per the results of the present study insignificant correlation was obtained between the independent variable of attitude towards administration and administrative behaviour of the principals due to insignificant r-value (r=.057) at .05 level. In other words attitude towards administration was neither helping nor hindering the principals in showing their administrative behaviour.
Although significant positive correlation was expected between the attitude towards administration and administrative behaviour of the principals yet in the present study the contrary results may be due to environment factors and socio-cultural background. Most of the principals work on routine line, they may not be in a position to judge which is right and which is wrong due to certain compulsions. For majority of them, attitude does not serve as fabric for their philosophy of life.

Hence, hypothesis-3 that there will be significant relationship between attitude towards administration and administrative behaviour of the principals was not retained here.

Results of the present study did not resemble with Panda (1975) and Taj (2002).

Section-II:

This section deals with the analysis in order to find the difference in the administrative behaviour of principals in relation to their educational qualification, teaching experience, sex-differences, type of institution and type of recruitment. For this purpose, descriptive statistics- mean, SD and t-ratio was employed, the results of which have been presented from table 5.2 to 5.8.

Hypotheses ( from 4a to 4g ) which have been tested with the help of t-ratio technique are given below for ready reference:

4(a) There will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to different levels of educational qualification.

4(b) There will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to different levels of professional qualification.
4(c) There will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to different levels of teaching experience.

4(d) There will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to different levels of administrative experience.

4(e) There will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to sex-differences.

4(f) There will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to type of management.

4(g) There will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals who have been recruited directly and those who have been promoted.

1. Educational Qualification and Administrative Behaviour:

From the results of table 5.2, it was observed that there was insignificant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to difference in the educational qualification as t-value was found to be insignificant at .05 level (t = .56). These results suggest that whether the principals are graduate or post-graduate, this is not going to effect their administrative behaviour in significant manner.

The reasons for the above results may be that as majority of principals are not supposed to teach any class and for administrative neck, it may be that experience, insight, courage, knowledge about administration require which ultimately leads to confidence and work efficiency of the principals. Now work efficiency will definitely leads to refinement in the administrative behaviour of the principals.

Therefore, hypothesis 4(a) that there will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to different levels of educational qualification was not accepted in the present study.
Table 5.2

Table Showing mean, SD and t-value to locate difference in the Dependent Variable of Administrative Behaviour due to Independent Variable of Educational Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66.07</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>68.51</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3

Table Showing mean, SD and t-ratio to locate difference in the Administrative Behaviour of Principals due to Independent Variable of Professional Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Professional Qualification</td>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>67.10</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73.13</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant of .01 level**
Table 5.4

Table Showing mean, SD and t-value to locate difference in the Administrative Behaviour due to Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Less than or equal to 10 yrs.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.52</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10 yrs.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>67.89</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
Above results of the present study were in agreement with the results of McMurray (1987).

2. Professional Qualification and Administrative Behaviour:

In case of independent variable of professional qualification, significant difference was found in the mean scores of principals on administrative behaviour scale due to significant t-value ($t=3.02$, vide table 5.3) at .01 level of significance. When mean scores were compared, it was observed that principals with higher level of professional qualification i.e. M.Ed. scored higher (mean = 73.13) as compared to B.Ed. qualification (mean = 67.10) on administrative behaviour scale. Thus, professional qualification of the principals significantly effect their administrative behaviour.

Now the reasons for the above results may be that with higher level of professional qualification principals become more confident, they work with ease and systematic. These things do not bring tension in their mind. With the higher level of professional qualification they learn the art and science of administration very well which help them in the refinement of their administrative behaviour.

Therefore, hypothesis 4(b) that there will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to different levels of professional qualification was retained here.

3. Teaching Experience and Administrative Behaviour:

On the variable of teaching experience significant difference in the mean scores of administrative behaviour scale was obtained due to significant t-value at .05 level ($t=2.05$, vide table 5.4). When their mean scores were compared, it was found that administrative behaviour of principals who were having less than 10 years teaching experience were higher in their administrative behaviour (mean = 73.52) as compared to the principals who were having teaching experience more than 10 years (mean = 67.89). In other words
younger principals having less age were better in their administrative behaviour as compared to the principals who have taught for more years.

Above results may be due to the fact that younger persons are more energetic, they have more strong will-power, they want to learn new things including administration, they have some goal before them. Now all these things help them in the reinforcement of their administrative behaviour.

Thus hypothesis 4(c) that there will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to different levels of teaching experience was retained here in this study.

The results of the present study were in line with the results of Singh (1978) but contrary to the results of Phillips (1990).

4 Administrative Experience and Administrative Behaviour:

On the variable of administrative experience, insignificant difference was obtained between the mean scores of experience less than or equal to five years and experience more than five years on the dependent variable of administrative behaviour due to insignificant t-value (t= .059, vide table 5.5). In other words administrative experience of the administrator was not found affecting his/her administrative behaviour. Moreover, there was not much difference in the mean scores of both the groups.

The reasons for the above insignificant difference in the administrative behaviour of administrator in relation to their administrative experience may be that most of the principals have similar routine work to perform specially in the government schools. Second reasons may be that few of them must be officiating/acting principals who may not be very much serious in their work and that is why there is no change in their behaviour.
Table 5.5

Table Showing mean, SD and t-ratio to locate difference in the Administrative Behaviour due to Administrative Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Administrative Experience</td>
<td>Less than or equal to 5 yrs.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>68.40</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5 yrs.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68.30</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6

Table Showing mean, SD and t-value to locate difference in the Administrative Behaviour due to Independent Variable of Sex Difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sex-Differences</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>68.19</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68.77</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

155
### Table 5.7

Table Showing mean, SD and t-value to locate difference in the Administrative Behaviour due to Independent Variable of Types of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Type of Management</td>
<td>Govt.</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>69.33</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65.82</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level*
Therefore, hypothesis 4(d) that there will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to different levels of administrative experience was not accepted here.

These results of the present study were in line with the results of Singh (1978) but contrary to Owen (1986).

5 Sex-differences and Administrative Behaviour:

From the results of table 5.6, it was revealed that there was insignificant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to sex-difference as t-value was found to be insignificant at .05 level. Moreover, there was slight difference in the mean scores on administrative behaviour scale between male and female principals.

Reasons for the above mentioned results may be that in these days female also excel in many fields and same may be true in the field of administration also. Second reason may be that field of administration has become scientific where male and female both get the training through some seminar or workshop in order to know more and more about this field, and hence no difference in their administrative behaviour.

Thus, hypothesis 4(e) that there will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to sex-difference was not accepted here.

Above results of the present study were similar to Singh (1978) and Phillips (1990).

6. Type of Management and Administrative Behaviour:

From the results of present study as presented in Table 5.7, significant difference was obtained in the administrative behaviour of principals due to difference in management as t-value was found to be significant at .05 level (t=2.06). It means type of management i.e. government or private has strong bearing on the administrative behaviour of the principals. After comparing the mean scores of the principals on administrative behaviour scale, it was found that mean
Table 5.8

Table Showing mean, SD and t-ratio to locate difference in the Administrative Behaviour due to Independent Variable of type of Recruitment of Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66.28</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promoted</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>68.83</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scores of principals working in government schools was higher as compared to the principals of private schools.

Reasons for the above mentioned results may be that in private schools, principals have less freedom of work, many times the management of the institution dominates the behaviour of the principal. Many times he/she has to work according to the wishes of the management.

Therefore, hypothesis 4(f) that there will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals due to type of management was retained in the present study.

These above results of the present study were not in line with the results of Mahant (1979) who found that irrespective of type of management, principal’s behaviour was uniform.

7. Type of Recruitment and Administrative Behaviour:

From the results of table 5.8, it was revealed that insignificant difference was obtained between the administrative behaviour of principals who were recruited directly and those who were promoted due to insignificant t-value at .05 level ( t=1.37). It means recruitment process on the post of principal hardly affect their administrative behaviour although the behaviour of principals who were promoted was slightly better ( mean = 68.83) as compared to the behaviour of those who were recruited directly on the post of a principal ( mean = 66.28).

Reasons may be the maturity level and skill in handling the situation, which the promoted principals learn in their early career as teacher or officiating head.

Hence, hypothesis 4(g) that there will be significant difference in the administrative behaviour of principals who have been recruited directly and those who have been promoted was not retained in the present investigation.

Similar results were obtained by McMurray (1987).