



## FUNCTIONAL EFFICIENCY OF SCHOOL HEADS

S. Murali<sup>1</sup> and Dr. A. Vasanthi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar (Reg. No. 10380), Part-Time Category - B2, Department of Education, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli.

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Institute of Advanced Study in Education, Saidapet, Chennai.

### ABSTRACT :

*This research article focuses the functional efficiency of school heads. The investigator adopted survey method for collecting the data. The investigator prepared and validated a scale to measure functional efficiency of school heads. All the school heads working in primary, secondary and higher secondary schools in Thiruvallur District formed the population of the present study. From the population, the investigator has chosen 150 school heads using simple random sampling technique. For analyzing the data, the investigator used Mean, SD, 't' Test and F test. The findings showed that the school heads (63.33%) have moderate level functional efficiency. The male school heads are found better in their functional efficiency. The school heads working in higher secondary schools are found better in their decision-making role of functional efficiency.*

**KEYWORDS :** Functional Efficiency, School Head.

### INTRODUCTION

The school has to cope with the demands of the continuously expanding the universe of knowledge. It has to provide the students with the minimum knowledge and understanding of the social world around him essential for the successful participation in social, economic, political and other areas of life. For this purpose, well-equipped, established infrastructure in the school with qualified and competent faculties are needed to go a long way in fulfilling the objectives of formal education, and this should be monitored by the competent as well as efficient school head. Then only, the teaching-learning process may be successful.

The school heads are the key to the teaching-learning process. They are the message receivers and credence as educational institutions grapple with intense pressures in their efforts to deliver high level educational standards across a broad curriculum, with fewer resources. The burden of responsibility increasingly falls on the school head to adapt positively to external pressures and catalyze action.

### FUNCTIONAL EFFICIENCY

The school heads are in a dilemma as how to identify the emerging roles, which roles are already transacted, which one require further capability building and how it could be achieved. They have to plan many activities and achieve outputs by assigning, delegating, seeking, performing etc., passing all the hurdles. Some educational institutions seem to earn a reputation because of the school head's managerial capabilities whereas some are less proficient in the efficiency level (quoted by Bhatnagar, R.P. and Vidya Agarwal, 1988).



With the growing complexities about the role of educational institutions, the superior educational authorities have become demanding the educational administrators by supplying them with rules, regulations, records and statistics.

Sometimes, the educational administrators are even held responsible for certain tasks pertaining to social concerns. They have to continue personalizing themselves with the necessary knowledge, understandings, values, attitudes and skills. Such professional behaviours are termed as functional efficiency.

Functional efficiency is usually understood as a quality performance. It is not in the form of single and discrete acts such as particular attitudes, habits of specific knowledge. It is in the form of summation of some behaviours as clustered activities (Alka Kalra, 2000, P. 29).

### NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Leadership skills are needed in all areas of life of any individual. In addition, the development of leadership skills can enrich the experience, give a greater sense of control, and prepare them to live and work for better tomorrow. To be effective leaders, the school heads must bring the core principles of quality leadership to their decision-making and interaction with others. When they exercise leadership, they become more deeply involved in and committed to shape the educational experience for themselves and for others, and are more likely to exercise leadership in their lives beyond the working spot.

The investigator being a teacher working in a higher secondary school is much involved in the school activities such as reforming the curriculum, teaching the younger generation and making interaction with the parents and society, communication with the higher officials etc. So, he had a lot of formal and informal chats with the school heads and other officials. Based on that, he is of the opinion that the functional efficiency of school heads should be analyzed in detail. Hence, the investigator has planned this study.

### DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS

#### Functional Efficiency

Functional efficiency refers to the quality performance. It is not in the form of single and discrete acts such as particular attitudes, habits of specific knowledge. It is in the form of summation of some behaviours as clustered activities (Alka Kalra, 2000, P.29). Operationally, it is the score obtained by the school heads on the "Functional Efficiency Scale" prepared and validated by the investigator.

#### School Heads

By 'School Heads', the investigator means the heads working in the different types of schools in Thiruvallur District.

### OBJECTIVES

1. To find the level of functional efficiency of school heads.
2. To find the significance of difference in the functional efficiency of school heads with regard to background variables - gender, age, length of service, qualification and category of school.

### METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The investigator adopted survey method for the present study. The investigator prepared and validated a scale to measure functional efficiency of school heads. All the school heads working in primary, secondary and higher secondary schools in Thiruvallur District formed the population of the present study. From the population, the investigator has chosen 150 school heads using simple random sampling technique. For analyzing the data, the investigator used Mean, SD, 't' Test and F test.

### ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

#### Hypothesis - 1

1. The level of functional efficiency of school heads is not high.

**Table - 1.**  
**Level of Functional Efficiency of School Heads**

Functional Efficiency	Low		Moderate		High	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interpersonal Role	35	23.33	85	56.67	30	20.00
Informational Role	28	18.67	90	60.00	32	21.33
Decision-making Role	35	23.33	84	56.00	31	20.67
Financial Role	30	20.00	82	54.67	38	25.33
Total	30	20.00	95	63.33	25	16.67

It is inferred from the above table that 63.33% of school heads have moderate level of functional efficiency. With regard to dimensions, they have moderate level in interpersonal role (56.67%), informational role (60%), decision making role (56%) and financial role (54.67%).

### Hypothesis – 2

There is no significant difference between the male and female school heads in their functional efficiency.

**Table - 2.**  
**Difference in the Functional Efficiency of School Heads with regard to Gender**

Functional Efficiency	Gender	N	Mean	SD	Calculated 't' Value	Remark
Interpersonal Role	Male	71	63.44	6.58	5.82	S
	Female	79	57.37	6.14		
Informational Role	Male	71	51.58	4.93	7.83	S
	Female	79	44.91	5.50		
Decision-making Role	Male	71	82.89	5.16	3.39	S
	Female	79	80.01	5.22		
Financial Role	Male	71	46.41	2.71	1.17	NS
	Female	79	45.91	2.49		
Total	Male	71	244.31	7.52	12.97	S
	Female	79	228.20	7.67		

(Table Value for 148 df at 5% level = 1.96); S-Significant; NS-Not Significant.

It is found from the above table that the male and female school heads differed significantly in their functional efficiency in total and in the dimensions – interpersonal role, informational role and decision making role. The male school heads are found better in their functional efficiency. But in the dimension – financial role, the male and female school heads do not differ significantly in their financial role of functional efficiency.

### Hypothesis – 3

There is no significant difference among the school heads aged upto 40 years, 41 to 50 years and above 50 years in their functional efficiency.

**Table - 3.**  
**Difference in the Functional Efficiency of School Heads with regard to Age**

Functional Efficiency	Age	Mean	SSb	SSw	Calculated 'F' Value	Remark
Interpersonal Role	Upto 40	56.89	290.40	7058.96	3.02	NS
	41 to 50	59.93				
	Above 50	61.30				
Informational Role	Upto 40	49.17	46.89	5674.44	0.61	NS
	41 to 50	48.38				
	Above 50	47.55				
Decision-making Role	Upto 40	79.28	91.90	4207.19	1.61	NS
	41 to 50	81.52				
	Above 50	81.77				
Financial Role	Upto 40	45.94	1.09	1005.68	0.08	NS
	41 to 50	46.22				
	Above 50	46.14				
Total	Upto 40	231.28	439.42	17814.08	1.81	NS
	41 to 50	236.05				
	Above 50	236.76				

(Table Value for 2, 147 df at 5% level = 3.06) NS-Not Significant.

It is found from the above table that the school heads irrespective of their age do not differ significantly in their functional efficiency in total and in all the dimensions.

#### Hypothesis – 4

There is no significant difference among the school heads those having experience of upto 10 years, 11 to 20 years and above 20 years in their functional efficiency.

**Table - 4.**  
**Difference in the Functional Efficiency of School Heads with regard to Experience**

Functional Efficiency	Experience	Mean	SSb	SSw	Calculated 'F' Value	Remark
Interpersonal Role	Upto 15	56.38	257.37	7091.99	2.67	NS
	16 to 20	59.93				
	Above 20	61.10				
Informational Role	Upto 15	50.92	121.07	5600.26	1.59	NS
	16 to 20	48.02				
	Above 20	47.63				
Decision-making Role	Upto 15	79.38	71.30	4227.80	1.24	NS
	16 to 20	81.95				
	Above 20	81.28				
Financial Role	Upto 15	45.77	13.30	993.47	0.98	NS
	16 to 20	46.52				
	Above 20	45.94				
Total	Upto 15	232.46	168.40	18085.10	0.68	NS
	16 to 20	236.41				
	Above 20	235.95				

(Table Value for 2, 147 df at 5% level = 3.06) NS-Not Significant.

It is found from the above table that the school heads irrespective of their experience do not differ significantly in their functional efficiency in total and in all the dimensions.

#### Hypothesis – 5

There is no significant difference between the UG and PG qualified school heads in their functional efficiency.

**Table - 5.**  
**Difference in the Functional Efficiency of School Heads with regard to Qualification**

Functional Efficiency	Qualification	N	Mean	SD	Calculated 't' Value	Remark
Interpersonal Role	UG	73	60.45	6.77	0.36	NS
	PG	77	60.04	7.29		
Informational Role	UG	73	47.21	6.37	1.66	NS
	PG	77	48.88	5.95		
Decision-making Role	UG	73	81.16	5.08	0.46	NS
	PG	77	81.57	5.66		
Financial Role	UG	73	46.52	2.62	1.73	NS
	PG	77	45.79	2.55		
Total	UG	73	235.34	10.84	0.52	NS
	PG	77	236.29	11.33		

(Table Value for 148 df at 5% level = 1.96) NS-Not Significant.

It is found from the above table that the UG and PG qualified school heads do not differ significantly in their functional efficiency in total and in all the dimensions.

#### Hypothesis – 6

There is no significant difference among the school heads working in primary, secondary and higher secondary schools in their functional efficiency.

**Table - 6.**  
**Difference in the Functional Efficiency of School Heads with regard to Category of School**

Functional Efficiency	Category	Mean	SSb	SSw	Calculated 'F' Value	Remark
Interpersonal Role	Primary	59.36	81.82	7267.54	0.83	NS
	Secondary	61.03				
	Hr. Sec.	60.70				
Informational Role	Primary	48.02	11.86	5709.47	0.15	NS
	Secondary	47.69				
	Hr. Sec.	48.42				
Decision-making Role	Primary	81.54	196.19	4102.90	3.51	S
	Secondary	79.59				
	Hr. Sec.	82.56				
Financial Role	Primary	46.00	3.08	1003.69	0.23	NS
	Secondary	46.36				
	Hr. Sec.	46.16				
Total	Primary	234.92	305.52	17947.98	1.25	NS
	Secondary	234.67				
	Hr. Sec.	237.84				

(Table Value for 2, 147 df at 5% level = 3.06) S-Significant; NS-Not Significant.

It is found from the above table that the school heads who are working in primary, secondary and higher secondary schools differed significantly in their decision making role of functional efficiency. The school heads working in higher secondary schools are found better in their decision-making role of functional efficiency. But, they do not differ significantly in their functional efficiency in total and its dimensions – interpersonal role, informational role and financial role.

### CONCLUSION

It is concluded that majority of the school heads (63.33%) have moderate level functional efficiency. With regard to dimensions, they have moderate level in interpersonal role (56.67%), informational role (60%), decision making role (56%) and financial role (54.67%). The male school heads are found better in their functional efficiency. The school heads working in higher secondary schools are found better in their decision-making role of functional efficiency. Hence, the investigator strongly opined that the functional efficiency of school heads working in different categories of schools, female school heads with different years of experience should be improved by conducting periodical in-service training programmes to promote better educational administration in the schools.

### REFERENCES

1. Bhatnagar, R.P. and Vidya Agarwal. 1988. Educational Administration (Planning and Supervision). Meerut: International Publishing House.
2. McShane, Steven, L. and Von Glinow, Mary Ann. 2000. Organisational Behaviour: Emerging Realities for the Workplace Revolution, Boston: McGraw Hill Inc.
3. Saxena, S.C. 1981. Business Administration and Management. Agra: Sahitya Bhawan.