

## **Influence Of Authoritative, Participative And Delegative Leadership Styles On Administrative Behaviour Of School Head Masters**

**Dr. M. SOUNDARARAJAN**

Dean of Faculty

Professor and Head

Department of Value Education

Tamilnadu Teachers Education University, Chennai-97.

&

**M. ANGEL JASMINE SHIRLEY**

Research Scholar

Department of Value Education

Tamilnadu Teachers Education University, Chennai-97.

### ***Abstract***

School Head is the chief Human Resource of the educational institution. The school head plays an important role in an educational institution. He is compared with the captain of a ship. He is also described as the solar orb round whom all the teacher planets revolve. In fact, he is the head of the school both academically and administratively.

The purpose of the present study has to find out whether there is any significant influence of leadership styles of school heads with their administrative behaviour. In this study random sampling technique were used for collecting data from the population of government aided and private school head masters. The major findings displayed that there was positive influence of leadership styles of school heads with their administrative behaviour.

Keywords: Authoritative; Participative; Delegative; Administrative Behaviour; Headmasters

### **INTRODUCTION**

Some people hold the view that leaders are born and not made. This view point is not acceptable to the modern man in a democratic age. If ample and equal opportunities are provided to all, everyone who has the aptitude will make use of it and become leaders. So, leaders are not born but made. Leadership development is not an event. It is a process of participating in respectful conversations where the leader recognizes his feelings and those of others in building safe and trusting relationships. Leadership development is self-development. The crux of leadership development that works is self-directed learning; intentionally developing or strengthening an aspect of who you are or who you want to be or both. The mere fact of existence of the various qualities required of a leader is not a sufficient insurance for successful leadership. No doubt those leadership qualities should be naturally present in an

individual aspiring to become a leader. But more important than this is the provision of opportunities in schools and colleges for these qualities to get expressed and matured. Schools and colleges should provide enough opportunities to youths to plan and organize various functions and festivals (of course under the guidance of teachers) like annual day, sports day, school science exhibition, quiz programmes, cultural programmes, youth festivals, releasing the annual school magazine, etc. Through such activities alone one could foster in students vital leadership qualities like planning meticulously any programme, mobilizing the requisite resources for successfully carrying out the programme, unifying and integrating the men and materials in any given system and the flexibility and courage to incorporate necessary changes in the action plan. Even in teaching, adopting techniques like discussions, debates, assignments and quiz programmes will be of much use in promoting mutual dependence and self-confidence among students. Through proper planning and functioning, educational institutions can help in producing the leaders of the next generation.

### **NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

Education is a noble calling that entails both challenges and responsibilities. Strong accountable leadership has always been a hallmark of successful institutions. One of the main aims of education is to produce good leaders. A leader is one who guides, organizes, directs and coordinates the society (Grint and Keith, 1997). Leadership is the ability to persuade others to seek defined objectives enthusiastically. It is the human factor, which binds a group of people together and motivates them towards their goals. It is learnt that leadership skills are needed in virtually all areas of adult life. In addition, leadership development can enrich the students' experience, give them a greater sense of control over their lives and prepare them to live and work in society. At this juncture, it is understood that higher education students need to develop leadership qualities since, leadership is no longer the providence of the few or the privileged. To be an effective leader, one must bring the core principles of quality leadership to his interactions with others. Leaders frequently use emotions to influence the affective states of others. The emotional component of leadership requires the ability to perceive emotions. Leaders possessing these abilities are considered administrative behaviors.

Since administrative behaviour is the entry behaviour of any learning, the investigator brings into the purview of her research the sense of modernity, because modernity of school headmasters decide and determine their relationship with his/her subordinates and this relationship has tremendous influence on their leadership qualities. On the one hand administrative behaviour formulates or manifests the leadership style of school headmasters and on the other hand, their sense of administration decides and determines the quality and potentials within the administration system effectively. The present scenario necessitates the administrative leaders. Also the leadership of school headmasters needs the sense of administration for its effective execution and success. Being very much inspired by the above discussion, the investigator has prepared her mind to study the influence of administrative behaviour and modernity on leadership styles of school headmasters.

### **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Generally, the ability of leaders to implement successful leadership style is the result of their behavioural responses and interactions to a particular situation. Behaviour consists of feelings, actions and thoughts which are in direct relationship with one's degree of administration. Administration is an integral component of one's successful leadership. On the one hand, administrative behaviour has

influence of authoritative, participative and delegative leadership styles on administrative behaviour of school head masters

become evidently perceived as the measure for identifying potentially effective leaders and on the other hand the level of perception of administration has become an instrument for developing effective leadership styles. Having in mind the significance of leadership styles in the development of administrative behaviour among the school headmasters and the effective execution of leadership qualities in them, the investigator prepares his mind to do a study on the influence of leadership styles on administrative behaviour among the school headmasters.

## **OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS**

The investigator has adopted the following definitions for the terms used in this title.

### **1. Influence**

It refers to the relationship of emotional intelligence and modernity with the leadership styles of college students.

### **2. Administrative Behaviour**

The behavior perform by administrative personal regarding academic and administrative functions of school. It comprises following aspects i) Planning ii) Organization iii) Communication iv) Decision making.

### **3. Leadership Styles**

Leadership style is the manner and approach of providing directions, implementing plans and motivating people. It includes three dimensions namely authoritarian, participative and delegative leadership styles.

### **4. Headmasters**

Those administrator who (Regular or in charge) are appointed in all type of school.

## **NULL HYPOTHESES**

The following are the null hypotheses formulated for the present study,

1. Administrative behaviour of school headmasters with Authoritarian, Participative and Delegative Leadership Styles
2. There is no significant difference between men and women headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style in their administrative behaviour.
3. There is no significant difference between rural and urban school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style in their administrative behaviour.
4. There is no significant difference between aided and self-financed school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style in their administrative behaviour.
5. There is no significant influence of authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style on administrative behaviour school headmasters.

## **METHOD USED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY**

The investigator has adopted the survey method of research to study the influence of authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style on administrative behaviour school headmasters.

## **AREA OF THE PRESENT STUDY**

The Tiruchirappalli, Karur and Dindigul Districts of Tamil Nadu, South India is the area of the present study.

## **POPULATION OF THE PRESENT STUDY**

The population of the present study consists of the headmasters (both men and women) of 170 schools in Tiruchirappalli, Karur and Dindigul Districts in Tamil Nadu, South India.

## **SAMPLE OF THE PRESENT STUDY**

The investigator used stratified random sampling technique for collecting the sample from the population. The sample consists of 170 school headmasters (both men and women) from Tiruchirappalli, Karur and Dindigul Districts of Tamil Nadu, South India.

## **TOOLS USED IN THE PRESENT STUDY**

The following tools are used for data collection.

1. Administrative Behaviour Scale developed by Dr. Haseen Taj's (1998) was used.
2. Leadership Styles Inventory developed by J. Kiruba and K. K. Rajendran (2009) was used.

## **ANALYSIS**

Administrative behaviour of school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style.

The following tables give a clear picture of administrative behaviour of school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style.

**Table 1**

### **Level of Administrative Behaviour of School Headmasters with Authoritarian Leadership Style, Participative Leadership Style and Delegative Leadership Style**

<b>Leadership Styles</b>	<b>Low</b>		<b>Moderate</b>		<b>High</b>	
	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Authoritarian Leadership Style</b>	12	21.6	33	67.4	9	11.0

influence of authoritative, participative and delegative leadership styles on administrative behaviour of school head masters

<b>Participative Leadership Style</b>	10	13.5	39	75.2	10	11.3
<b>Delegative Leadership Style</b>	11	19.7	39	75.2	7	5.2

It is inferred from the table that 21.6% of school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style have low, 67.4% of them have moderate and 11.0% of them have high level of administrative behaviour.

It is learnt from the table that 13.5% of school headmasters with participative leadership style have low, 75.2% of them have moderate and 11.3% of them have high level of administrative behaviour.

It is known from the table that 19.7% of school headmasters with delegative leadership style have low, 75.2% of them have moderate and 5.2% of them have high level of administrative behaviour.

#### NULL HYPOTHESIS 1

There is no significant difference between men and women headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style in their administrative behaviour.

**Table 2**

**Difference between men and women headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style in their administrative behaviour**

Leadership Styles	Men (N=53)		Women (N=117)		Calculated 't' value	Remarks at 5% level
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
<b>Authoritarian Leadership Style</b>	36.82	3.109	36.69	3.387	0.350	NS
<b>Participative Leadership Style</b>	21.88	3.187	23.90	3.246	5.534	S
<b>Delegative Leadership Style</b>	34.88	3.295	38.43	2.887	10.099	S

*(At 5% level of significance, the table value of 't' is 1.96)*

From the above table it is inferred that there is no significant difference between men and women school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style in their administrative behaviour, as the calculated 't' value 0.350 is less than the table value 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

With regard to the leadership styles of participative and delegative leadership styles, there exists significant difference between men and women school headmasters with their administrative behaviour, as the calculated 't' values 5.534 and 10.099 are greater than the table value 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

### NULL HYPOTHESIS 2

There is no significant difference between rural and urban school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style in their administrative behaviour.

**Table 3**

**Difference between rural and urban school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style in their administrative behaviour**

Leadership Styles	Rural (N=72)		Urban (N=98)		Calculated 't' value	Remarks at 5% level
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
<b>Authoritarian Leadership Style</b>	36.83	3.490	36.68	3.006	0.409	NS
<b>Participative Leadership Style</b>	23.47	3.458	22.36	3.195	2.940	S
<b>Delegative Leadership Style</b>	36.69	3.536	36.66	3.608	0.065	NS

*(At 5% level of significance, the table value of 't' is 1.96)*

From the above table it is inferred that there is no significant difference between rural and urban school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style and delegative leadership style in their administrative behaviour, as the calculated 't' values 0.409 and 0.065 are less than the table value 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

With regard to the participative leadership style, there exists significant difference between rural and urban school headmasters with their administrative behaviour, as the calculated 't' value 2.940 is greater than the table value 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

### NULL HYPOTHESIS 3

There is no significant difference between aided and self-financed school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style in their administrative behaviour.

influence of authoritative, participative and delegative leadership styles on administrative behaviour of school head masters

**Table 4**

**Difference between aided and self-financed school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style in their administrative behaviour**

Leadership Styles	Aided (N=45)		Self-Financed (N=125)		Calculated 't' value	Remarks at 5% level
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
<b>Authoritarian Leadership Style</b>	36.93	3.214	36.59	3.279	0.913	NS
<b>Participative Leadership Style</b>	22.90	3.295	22.92	3.440	0.049	NS
<b>Delegative Leadership Style</b>	36.70	3.596	36.65	3.552	0.120	NS

*(At 5% level of significance, the table value of 't' is 1.96)*

It is known from the table that there is no significant difference between aided and self-financed school headmasters with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style in their administrative behaviour, as the calculated 't' values 0.913, 0.049 and 0.120 are less than the table value 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

**Null Hypothesis 4**

There is no significant influence of authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style on administrative behaviour school headmasters.

**Table 5.a**

**Influence of Arts and Science Streams on Environmental awareness of Higher Secondary Students - Summary of Model-I**

Regression Analysis	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error
Model – I	0.591	0.528	0.520	14.5162

**Table 5.b**

**Influence of Arts and Science Streams on Environmental awareness of Higher Secondary Students – ANOVA**

Regression Analysis	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	'p'
---------------------	----------------	-------------	---	-----

Model – I	Regression	21402.025	10104.033	46.075	0.000
	Residual	36114.624	152.457		
	Total	58552.754			

Table 5.c

**Influence of Arts and Science Streams on Environmental awareness of Higher Secondary Students - Coefficients of Regression Analysis**

Regression Analysis	Unstandardized Co-efficient		Standardized Co-efficient	‘t’	‘p’
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	53.061	8.735		8.374	.000
Authoritative Leadership Style	0.364	0.059	0.176	4.100	.000
Participative Leadership Style	0.371	0.051	0.315	5.604	.000
Delegative Leadership Style	0.561	0.099	0.597	7.305	.000

From the Table 5a, it is observed that the adjusted R square value of 0.520 indicated that 52% of the variance could be predicted that leadership styles did influence on administrative behaviour of school head masters.

It is inferred from the Table 5a that the multiple correlations co-efficient ( $R=0.591$ ) showed that there was substantial correlation among authoritative, participative and delegative leadership styles with regard to school head masters.

It is learnt from the Table 5b that the significant ‘P’ value 0.000 for ANOVA ( $F=46.075$ ) indicated that authoritative, participative and delegative leadership styles differed in their influence on administrative behaviour of school head masters.

It is inferred from the Table 5c that delegative leadership style significantly influence the administrative behaviour of school head masters ( $Beta = 0.597$ , ‘t’ = 7.305) than the participative and authoritative leadership styles ( $Beta = 0.315$ , ‘t’ = 5.604) and ( $Beta = 0.176$ , ‘t’ = 4.100).

## RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

1. Majority of school headmasters are moderate level in their administrative behaviors with respect to authoritarian, participative and delegative leadership styles



influence of authoritative, participative and delegative leadership styles on administrative behaviour of school head masters

2. There is no significant difference between men and women headmasters administrative behaviour with authoritarian leadership style.
3. But, there is significant difference between men and women headmasters' administrative behaviour with participative leadership style and delegative leadership style.
4. There is no significant difference between rural and urban school headmaster's administrative behaviour with authoritarian leadership style and delegative leadership style.
5. But, there is significant difference between men and women headmasters' administrative behaviour with participative leadership style.
6. There is no significant difference between aided and self-financed school headmasters administrative behaviour with authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style.
7. There is significant positive influence of authoritarian leadership style, participative leadership style and delegative leadership style on administrative behaviour school headmasters.

The investigator with her limited observations and experiences as a teacher educator has come out with the following interpretations.

The present study reveals that a majority of school headmaster's administrative behaviour with authoritarian, participative and delegative leadership styles have moderate level. This has been confirmed by the recurrence of difference of administrative behaviour for the background variables namely gender of the students and locality of schools.

The 't' test result reveals the existence of significant difference between men and women school headmasters administrative behaviour with related to participative and delegative leadership styles. The women headmasters are better in their administrative behaviour than the men headmasters with participative and delegative leadership styles. This is because men have the capacity to think about a particular issue divergently but women are specified in their willingness, commitment and desire in performing their work. Their interactions with their family members make them emotionally stable, adjustable and they approach every phase of their lives positively and confidently. They possess genuine readiness to accept and understand others and can fulfil their needs too. They are in a better position to understand the emotions and feelings of themselves and others easily.

The 't' test result reveals that there is significant difference between rural and urban school headmasters administrative behaviour with related to participative leadership styles. The rural school headmasters with participative leadership styles are better in their administrative behaviour than the urban school headmasters. In rural areas, the level of understanding is better than their counter parts of urban areas and they exhibit their skills and talents without inhibitions. The naturally intellectual atmosphere prevailing in these rural areas helps them to understand themselves and gradually they become emotionally intelligent.

## **CONCLUSION**

Leaders are very much essential for the development of a country in the right direction as they guide or direct others by showing them the way or telling them how to behave. While administrative behaviour is an integral component of successful leadership and helps to make good relation with their peer. While administrative behaviour is the factors influencing one's leadership styles, they can

contribute a lot to one who wants to be a successful leader. Based on the findings of the present study conducted on the school headmasters, it is concluded that leadership style is influenced by the leadership styles.

## REFERENCES

1. Alimi, Olatunji. S., Alali, Festus. O. & G. B. Ehinola (2011). Teacher's Perception of Principals' Leadership effectiveness in Public and private Secondary Schools in Ondo State. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*. Retrieved from <http://globaljournals.org>.
2. Amjad, M. D. & Zabardast (2006). Administration and academic decision making and leadership in selected colleges in Delhi University. *Journal of Education and Research*, 38(2), 37-39.
3. Basavaraj M. H. (2013). A study of Administrative Behaviour and Job Satisfaction of secondary School Heads of North Karnataka. *International Indexed & Refereed Research Journal*, 41. 28-30. Source-<http://www.academia.edu>.
4. Basu Mudasir (2014). Occupational Efficacy and Administrative Behaviour-A Study of Educational Administrators in Kashmir. Source-<http://www.sciencepub.net>.
5. Jacob & Doreen (2007). Leadership preference in relation to peer relations and social interests. *Indian Journal of Teacher Education*, 7(1), 47-49.
6. Krishnaswami, O. R., & Ranganatham, M. (2007). *Methodology of research in social sciences*. New Delhi: Himalaya Publishing House.
7. Kumar (1993). *Women in contemporary Indian society*. New Delhi: Anmol Publications.
8. Kuppasamy, B. (2000). *Advanced educational psychology*. New Delhi: Anmol Publications Private Limited.
9. Mangal, S. K. (2007). *Advanced educational psychology*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited.
10. Mishra (2005). Organizational climate of different types of secondary schools and its relationship with leadership behavior of principals and teachers job satisfaction. *Edutracks*, 6(2), 16-20.
11. Mohan Lal Arya (2015). Relationship between Principal's Administrative Behaviour and Senior Secondary Schools effectiveness in Moradabad. *Global Journal of Multidisciplinary studies*. Retrieved from <http://gjms.co.in>.
12. Mohankumar and P. Suresha (2014). A Study of secondary School Headmaster's Administrative Behaviour co-relation with their school student's Academic Achievement.
13. Mumthas & Abdul Jalal (2008). School leadership and organizational climate a regression analysis. *Journal of Educational Studies*, 7(1), 34-38.
14. Nkwoh Kelechukwu (2011). Analysis of Administrative Roles of Principals in Private Secondary Schools in Aba Education Zone of Abia state. *Continental J. Education Research* 4 (1), 18-27.
15. Portia, R. (2012). Leadership potential of student teachers in Tiruchirappalli District. *Education Plus*, 1(2), 16-20.
16. Trabbodi (2008). The effects of leadership behaviour on the efficacy of university faculty. *Edutracks*, 10(3), 26-29.