



Administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals in relation to leadership styles and gender

Dr. Monika Sood¹, Monika Devi²

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Education, ICDEOL, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India

² Research Scholar, Department of Education, ICDEOL, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India

Abstract

The study attempts to find out administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals in relation to leadership styles and gender. The study was descriptive type in nature. Sample for the study was 216 senior secondary school principals. Administrative Effectiveness Scale in order to measure administrative effectiveness of principal's tool constructed by the researcher and Leadership Preference Scale standardized by L.I. Bhushan (2005) was used to assess Leadership styles of Government Senior Secondary School Principals. This Likert type 30 items scale measures authoritarian vs. democratic leadership styles of School Principals. Further, data were analyzed through two way ANOVA and t-test. Findings of the study revealed that Leadership styles and Gender on Planning, Decision-Making, Communication dimensions and Overall Administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals. Whereas in case of Organizing and Motivating and Reinforcing dimension of Administrative effectiveness no interactional effect of gender and leadership styles was found to be non-significant.

Keywords: administrative effectiveness, leadership styles and gender

Introduction

Dr. Jaswant Singh. "What the school is and what it does, is determined largely by the intelligence, scholarship, imagination, initiative, personality and social skills of the Principal, everything in the school, the plant, the staff, the co-curricular activities. Human relationships bear the impress of the personality of the head of institution and reflect his leadership. The school is a great as the principal". Adeyemi, (2010) ^[1] explains that supervision is the process of administration which involves the push to manage everyday activities of individual or group of people working in the school system. The principal is the leader and as Adesina, (2010) ^[2] observes, the leader in any group is considered as having the best ideas, possessing the greatest understanding of situations and providing the best guidance. The success of an institution to accomplish the goals depends upon the ability of the principal to lead staff members and school successfully. Leadership is one of the main functions that constitute the administrative process. Planning sets the direction and objectives; organizing brings the resources together to turn plans into action; leadership builds the commitments and enthusiasm needed for people to apply their talents fully to help accomplish plans; and controlling makes sure things turn out right. Any administrator worked according to the rules of the society, is true but the ways how he achieves these goals may be different. This difference in style is caused due to his personality. He works as an autocratic or he works in a democratic way. According to the style of work, the administrators are mainly categorized in two categories: (i) Democratic (ii) Autocratic. The principal is an administrative leader for the study purpose.

According to House (1971) "Leadership is the ability of an individual to influence, motivate and enable others to

contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members." C.V Good defines leadership as "the ability and readiness to inspire, guide, direct and manage others action". Chandan, (1987) define leadership style is the ingredient of personality embodied in leader is that causes subordinates to follow them. Okumbe, (1998) ^[5] on the other hand defines leadership styles is particular behaviours applied by a leader to motivate subordinates to achieve the objectives of the organization. The school principal is in a unique position as the manager or administrator who controls school's resources for the purpose of achievements education, Oyedeji, 1998. As such, leadership style occupies an important position in school management.

Review of Related Literature

Panda (1975) ^[13] has studied Administrative Behavior of Headmasters: Some Correlates and Backgrounds Factors, The major objectives of the study were: (i) to find out the real an ideal trends and patterns of administrative behavior of the headmasters; (ii) to study the relationship between real and ideal administrative behaviour and between the behavioral trends and the reputation of the institution and the effectiveness of the school; and (iii) to identify the background factors of administrative behavioral patterns. The study was conducted on 2000 teachers from 168 schools of Rajasthan selected through stratified random sampling technique, bases being higher secondary versus secondary, rural versus, urban and boys versus girls. The data on headmasters' behaviour idea and real, and background factors were collected through Headmaster's Behavior Description Questionnaire-Ideal and Real separate, and Background Factors Description Questionnaire. The data were analyzed by using chi-square

test. The study revealed that (i) the ideal administrative behavior were others-oriented, outcome-oriented, permissive, cooperative, constructive and adaptable and the least desired traits were authoritarian, academically apathetic, traditional and rejecting; (ii) headmasters of effective schools were more others-oriented, less authoritarian and less rejecting; (iii) the headmasters of urban schools were more adaptable, outcome-oriented and effective in communication and less rejecting.

Barry (1986) [3] conducted a study on the relationship of high school department heads' leadership behaviour to their school wide reputation for administrative effectiveness. to determine the existence of department heads (N-54) among school wide faculty, teachers (N-306) related the administrative effectiveness of all but their own department heads. Department members then described on the LBDQ the structure (task) and consideration (caring) behaviour they judged ideal in a department heads. The same teachers then described the structure and consideration behaviours of their own department heads. The difference between the ideal and actual resulted in discrepancy scores for each department head. Actual and discrepancy scores were then correlated with each department heads' administrative effectiveness. Findings: department heads have a reputation for their administrative effectiveness outside of their departments. It was reported by non-department members with a high degree of consistency and agreement. The ratings of two random groups correlated, $.82p < .01$. (2) Reputation correlated strongly with structures and consideration together, $-.70p < .05$. (3) Reputation correlated strongly with consideration $-.69p < .05$. (4) Reputation correlated moderately with structure, $.30p < .05$ and with discrepancy structure, $-.37p < .05$.

Nadarasa (2014) [10] the study was designed to investigate the effects of principals leadership styles on teachers job satisfaction the design of the study was descriptive the survey design for the data collection, only the primary data collection was used by the researcher. Research developed structural questionnaire that revised from other inventory it has three parts. Part 1 of the instrument south information on personal data of the respondent. Part 2 of the questionnaire is designed to analyze leadership style and behaviour the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MCQ) was used to collect data on the two independent variables of autocratic and democratic leadership style findings of this study states that autocratic leadership has negative impact on teachers job satisfaction. In addition with democratic leadership has positive impact on job satisfaction.

Objectives

1. To find out the differences in administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals in relation to their leadership styles.
2. To find out gender differences in administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals.
3. To find out the double interactional effects on administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals in relation to: Leadership Styles and Gender

Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant differences in leadership styles on administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals.

2. There will be no significant gender differences in administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals.
3. There will be no significant double interactional effects on administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals in relation to: Leadership Styles and Gender

Methodology

The population of the present study consisted all senior secondary school principals of Himachal Pradesh.

Sample

The sample comprised 216 principals senior secondary school located district Mandi, Hamirpur, Bilaspur, and Sirmour. Sample of the study was consist approximately of Three hundred Government Senior Secondary School Principals from the four districts of Himachal Pradesh drawn through systematic sampling technique on the basis of literacy rate ($4/12=3$) every third district i.e 1,4,7,10th district of Himachal Pradesh.

Variables

Administrative effectiveness was regarded as depended variable and Leadership styles and Gender were treated as independent variable.

Tools Used

Administrative Effectiveness Scale: in order to measure administrative effectiveness of principal's tool constructed by the researcher. The Administrative Effectiveness has been defined as a set of desirable administrative competencies on the part of the principals as perceived by themselves. Administrative Effectiveness Scale includes various dimensions of Administrative Effectiveness such as Planning, Organizing, Decision-Making, Communications and Motivating & Reinforcing. Administrative effectiveness scale has 45 items. The scoring for each response by the respondents to each statement on a 5-point scale was ranging from Always, to never. Scale contains five possible responses to each dimension or statement i.e. 4, 3, 2, 1, 0. In these items a tick on "Never" gives the item score of "0" and tick Rarely, Sometime, Frequently, Always gives the item score 1, 2, 3, 4 respectively. All are positive items. The total score after the responses of the principal was adding the numerical values assigned to each of 45 items and score of a principal had a range of probable 120 to 180.

Leadership Preference Scale: Leadership Preference Scale standardized by L.I. Bhushan (2005) [9] was used to assess Leadership styles of Government Senior Secondary School Principals. This Likert type 30 items scale measures authoritarian vs. democratic leadership styles of School Principals. There are 16 positive and 14 negative worded Statements in this scale. The scoring is 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 for positive – from Fully Agree to Fully Disagree and 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 for negative – from Fully Agree to Fully Disagree.

Research Design

In the present study a 2x2 factorial design was used for analyzing the data in respect of three level of Leadership styles (Democratic and Authoritarian) and two levels of Gender (Male and Female) in each cell of the design.

Statistical Techniques

Two-way ANOVA followed by t-test was employed in the study for analysis of data.

Results and Discussions

In order to study main effects of leadership styles and gender of sampled secondary school principals on

administrative effectiveness (overall and dimension-wise) statistical technique two-way ANOVA was applied. Total scores and means of administrative effectiveness of secondary school principals with respect to their leadership styles and gender are given in the table no. 1 as follows:

Table 1: leadership styles and gender Means and Standard Deviations of administrative effectiveness (overall and dimension-wise) of senior secondary school principals.

S. No.	Areas of administrative effectiveness	Gender Leadership Styles	Male	Female	Total
1	Planning	Democratic	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=33.63	Mean=31.31	Mean=32.47
			SD=3.09	SD=3.25	SD=3.36
		Authoritarian	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=29.72	Mean=29.17	Mean=29.19
			SD=1.17	SD=1.17	SD=1.16
2	Organizing	Democratic	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=24.67	Mean=23.50	Mean=24.08
			SD=3.59	SD=2.70	SD=3.21
		Authoritarian	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=19.30	Mean=19.33	Mean=19.31
			SD=1.87	SD=1.86	SD=1.85
3	Decision-making	Democratic	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=32.72	Mean=30.78	Mean=31.75
			SD=3.40	SD=2.73	SD=3.22
		Authoritarian	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=29.02	Mean=29.00	Mean=29.01
			SD=1.03	SD=1.04	SD=1.03
4	Communication	Democratic	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=29.57	Mean=27.85	Mean=28.71
			SD=2.44	SD=3.02	SD=2.87
		Authoritarian	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=26.72	Mean=26.70	Mean=26.71
			SD=1.72	SD=1.72	SD=1.71
5	Motivating & Reinforcing	Democratic	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=26.48	Mean=26.69	Mean=26.58
			SD=3.35	SD=2.61	SD=2.99
		Authoritarian	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=24.13	Mean=24.15	Mean=24.14
			SD=2.09	SD=2.10	SD=2.08
6	Overall	Democratic	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=147.30	Mean=140.15	Mean=143.72
			SD=12.64	SD=12.14	SD=12.85
		Authoritarian	N=54	N=54	N=108
			Mean=128.33	Mean=128.26	Mean=128.30
			SD=3.22	SD=3.25	SD=3.22

From the means of administrative effectiveness (overall and dimension-wise) of senior secondary school principals, F-

values are calculated. The results are summarized in table as follows:

Table 2: summary table of Analysis of Variance of senior secondary school principals on administrative effectiveness (overall and dimension-wise)

Independent variables	Area of administrative effectiveness					
	Planning	Organizing	Decision-Making	Communication	Motivating & reinforcing	Overall
Leadership styles (A) Main effect	107.83**	185.57**	82.54**	42.27**	47.21**	164.93**
df for leadership styles & table values of F	Df= 1, 215 F = value at 0.05 level = 3.89 F = value at 0.01 level =6.76					
Gender (B) Main effect	13.80**	2.60 NS	10.58**	8.00**	0.09 NS	9.03**
df for gender & table values of F	Df= 1, 215 F = value at 0.05 level = 3.89 F = value at 0.01 level =6.76					
Interaction (AxB)	12.94**	2.95 NS	10.19**	7.66**	0.06 NS	8.67**
df for interaction & table values of F	Df= 1, 215 F = value at 0.05 level = 3.89 F = value at 0.01 level =6.76					

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviations of Interactional Cells and T-Value of Planning Dimension of Administrative Effectiveness

Leadership / Styles Gender	Democratic	Authoritarian	Interactional effect	t- value
			1&2	10.06**
Male	M=33.631 SD=3.09 N=54	M=29.202 SD=1.17 N=54	1&3	3.86*
			1&4	10.13**
			2&3	4.58*
Female	M=31.31 3 SD=3.25 N=54	M=29.17 4 SD=1.17 N=54	2&4	0.08 NS

Table 4: Means and Standard Deviations of Interactional Cells and T-Value of Decision-Making Dimension of Administrative Effectiveness

Leadership / Styles Gender	Democratic	Authoritarian	Interaction effect	t-value
Male	M=32.72 1 SD=3.40 N=54	M=29.022 SD=1.03 N=54	1&2	5.78**
			1&3	3.28**
			1&4	7.91**
Female	M=30.783 SD=2.73 N=54	M=29.004 SD=1.04 N=54	2&3	4.63**
			2&4	0.11 NS
			3&4	4.68**

Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations of Interactional Cells and T-Value of Communication Dimension of Administrative Effectiveness

Leadership / Styles Gender	Democratic	Authoritarian	Interaction effect	t-value
Male	M=29.571 SD=2.44 N=54	M=26.722 SD=1.72 N=54	1&2	2.43*
			1&3	7.12**
			1&4	7.10**
Female	M=27.863 SD=3.02 N=54	M=26.704 SD=1.72 N=54	2&3	2.47*
			2&4	2.52*
			3&4	0.06 NS

Table 6: Means and Standard Deviations of Interactional Cells and T-Value of overall Administrative Effectiveness

Leadership/ Styles Gender	Democratic	Authoritarian	Interaction effect	t-value
Male	M=147.30 SD=12.64 N=54	M=128.33 SD=3.22 N=54	1&2	17.2**
			1&3	3.00*
			1&4	10.88**
Female	M=140.15 SD=12.14 N=54	M=128.26 SD=3.25 N=54	2&3	6.95**
			2&4	10.45**
			3&4	7.03**

Table 3 (a) reveals that male senior secondary school principals having democratic leadership styles were found to have higher mean score on planning dimension of administrative effectiveness as compared to those female senior secondary school principals having democratic leadership style. Table 4 the difference was found to be significant for male and female senior secondary school principals having democratic style of leadership on decision-making dimension of administrative effectiveness. Table 5 the other hand, there was significant difference between authoritarian male and female senior secondary

school principals was found. Table 6 reveals that there were found significant difference between male and female senior secondary school principals.

Main Effects

1. **Main effects of Leadership styles:** There was significant effect of Leadership Styles on Planning, Organizing, Decision- Making, Communication, Motivating and reinforcing dimensions of Administrative effectiveness and Overall Administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school

principals. The senior secondary school principals with democratic Leadership style were found to be more effective on Planning, Organizing Decision-Making Communication, Motivating and Reinforcing dimensions as well as Overall Administrative effectiveness as compared to those senior secondary school principals who possessed authoritarian Leadership style.

2. **Main effects of Gender:** There was significant effect on gender on Planning, Decision-Making and Communication dimensions of Administrative effectiveness and Overall Administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals. Male senior secondary school principals were found to be more effective on Planning, Decision-Making and Communication dimensions of Administrative effectiveness as compared to their counterpart female senior secondary school principals. Whereas in case of Organizing and Motivating and Reinforcing dimension of Administrative effectiveness no such difference was found among male and female senior secondary school principals. Further in case Overall Administrative effectiveness also male senior secondary school principals were found to be more effective as compared to female senior secondary school principals.
3. **Interaction Effects:** There was significant interactional effect of Leadership styles and Gender on Planning, Decision-Making, Communication dimensions and Overall Administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals. Whereas in case of Organizing and Motivating and Reinforcing dimension of Administrative effectiveness no interactional effect of gender and leadership styles was found to be non-significant.

Educational Implications

On the basis of findings of present study some implications have been drawn. They are mentioned below:

A significant effect of leadership styles on Planning, Organizing, Decision-Making, Communication, Motivating & reinforcing and Overall Administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals. The principals with democratic leadership style were found to be more effective on every dimension.

Results indicate that democratic leadership style principals have more ability to lead subordinates together on every aspects of school plant. This ability helps principals to use a variety of approaches and way to lead school plant effectively. Therefore, during induction programmes democratic leadership style must be consider an agent to decide the course of action.

Gender wise significant difference was found on administrative effectiveness. Male senior secondary school principals were found to be more effective on planning, decision-making, communication and overall administrative effectiveness, whereas in case of organizing and motivating & reinforcing dimension non-significance difference was found.

Keeping this in view, to develop many programmes for leadership styles, administrative skills, and personality development programmes need to be organized at Institution, State and National level. It will be provide an avenue for skills, leadership styles and personality and observe behaviours.

Conclusion

Results reveals that leadership styles and gender on planning, decision-making, communication dimensions and overall administrative effectiveness of senior secondary school principals. whereas in case of organizing and motivating and reinforcing dimension of administrative effectiveness no interactional effect of gender and leadership styles was found to be non-significant.

References

1. Adesina O. Some Aspects of School Management. Logas: Education Institutions, 2010.
2. Adeyem TO. Predicting Student's Performance In Senior & Junior Senior And Junior Secondary Certificate Examination In Ondo State Nigeria. Humanity And Social Science Journal. 2010; 3(1):26-360
3. Barry Arthur Curtis. The Relationship of High School Departments Head's Leadership Behaviour to their School wide Reputation for Administration Effectiveness. Batson College, 1985.198 pp. Dissertation Abstract International, 1986, 46(08).
4. Bhushan LI. Leadership Preference Scale. National Psychological Corporation, Agra, 2005.
5. Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education, New McGraw Hill Book Company, 1959.
6. Gaur, Ajai S, *et al.* Statistical Methods for Practice and Research. Second Edition SAGE, 2009. Retrieved from www.sagepublications.com.
7. House RJ. A Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly. 1971; 16:321-328.
8. Jaswant Singh. *A Successful Head Master*. New Delhi: Sterling Publisher Private Limited, 1984.
9. Koul Lokesh. Methodology of Educational Research. Forth Revised & Enlarged Edition. Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd. ISBN: 978-81259-2796-9, 2009.
10. Nadarasa Thusyanthini. The Influence of Principals Leadership Styles on School Teachers Job Satisfaction-Study of Secondary School in Jaffna District. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 2014, 4(1). ISSN: 2250-3153.
11. Okumbe JA. Educational Management Theory, A Comparative Evolution to General Theory. Nairobi: Nairobi University Printery, 1978.
12. Oyedeji NB. Management in Education Principle and Practice, Logas ARAS Publishers, 1998, 54-72.
13. Panda SN. Administrative Behaviour of Headmasters: Some Correlates and Background Factors. Education Administration: Abstract, 1975, 484.
14. Sharma RA. School Management. Revised Edition. R.Lall Book Depot, 2009.