

## Principals' Administrative Patterns in Their Institutions



### Education

KEYWORDS :

**Dr. Keisham Shitaljit Singh**

Assistant Professor, Department of Education Manipur University Canchipur – 795003

### ABSTRACT

*The five null hypotheses of the present study have all rejected. Hence, there exists significant difference between planning and organizational behavior of higher secondary school principals of the selected four valley districts of the state. Similarly, there is also significant difference between the planning and communication behavior of all the selected schools and between the planning and decision making behavior etc. These forty secondary school principals were tested their behavior levels by using the Dr. Huseen Taj's Administrative behavior Scale (ABS) from the four valley districts of Manipur state. All the tests have been found significant both at .01 and .05 levels of significance. It can be concluded that there is significant difference between the different types of the components of the administrative behavior. Principals as leaders are responsible for leading in all educational directions for running successful academic institutions. He or she is responsible to run all areas that relate to the educational programs including the instructional program. The behavior characteristics of the principals of the principals include the best responsibilities in planning, organization, communication and decision making of their schools. Their organizational components like pride, cohesiveness, climate, feeling about institutional roles correlates with the different dimensions of their administrative behaviors.*

### Introduction

Administrative behavior is of utmost importance in the development of any significant, ongoing movement designed to improve social, economic, political or educational conditions in our society. The ultimate solutions to educational problems will be discovered according to the vision and skill of educational leaders, the abilities and competencies of the professional personnel and their administrative behaviors must be developed to the fullest degree possible. In growing numbers educational leaders are realizing that the individuals affected by a policy should have an opportunity to participate in the shaping of that policy. Since organizations exist to achieve goals, someone has to define these goals and the means by which they can be achieved. Management is that someone. The planning function encompasses defining an organization's goals, establishing an overall strategy for achieving these goals and developing a comprehensive hierarchy of plans to integrate and coordinate activities. Managers and administrators are also responsible for designing an organization's structure which is called as organizing. It includes the determination of what tasks are to be done, who is to do them, how the tasks are to be grouped, who reports to whom and where decisions are to be made. Every organization contains people and it is management's job to direct and coordinate these people. This is the leading function. When the leaders motivate subordinates, direct the activities of others, select the most effective communication channel or resolve conflicts among members, they are engaging in leading. The final function of the administrators perform is controlling. After the goals are set; the plans formulated; the structural arrangements delineated; and the people hired, trained and motivated, there is still the possibility that something may go amiss. To ensure that things are going as they should, management must monitor the organization's performance. Actual performance must be compared with the previously set goals. If there are any significant deviations, it is management's job to get the organization back on track. This monitoring, comparing and potential correcting is what is meant by the controlling function.

Technical skills, human skills, conceptual skills, knowledge and norms acquired through extensive professional training ideally permit and hierarchical structure. Self-determination and self-responsibility are norms with each practitioner exercising a great deal of autonomy in the performance of this professional specialty. Generally, a group exercise more control over an individual than all the formal administrative directives in the world. Most group norms are self-determined group members are more likely to accept them. Secondary school administrators came to know

and understand what motives the groups in their organization all attempts at team work and co-operation, whether at the classroom or the organizational level with prove to be effective. The energy and talent might have been more productive for the total organization. The role which the leader plays should be flexible and adaptable to the problem of had neither a role devoted to maintenance of complete stability nor a role totally change oriented will serve every purpose. Hence, the leader should be adapted to both roles and he should be suited to any given set of circumstances.

### Statement of the Problem

The present study has stated as **"Principals' Administrative Patterns in Their Institutions"**. Here, the independent four components which are measured in different levels of administration namely planning, organization, communication and decision making are considered as the psychological levels of the present study.

### Objectives of the Study

1. To find out the significant difference between the planning and organization behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.
2. To find out the significant difference between planning and communication behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.
3. To find out the significant difference between planning and decision making behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.
4. To find out the significant difference between organization and communication behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.
5. To find out the significant difference between organization and decision making behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.
6. To find out the significant difference between communication and decision making behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.

### Hypotheses of the Study

1. There is no significant difference between planning and organization behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.
2. There is no significant difference between planning and communication behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.
3. There is no significant difference between planning and decision making behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.
4. There is no significant difference between organization and

communication behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.

5. There is no significant difference between organization and decision making behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.
6. There is no significant difference between communication and decision making behavior of higher secondary school principals of the four valley districts of Manipur state.

**Methodology Adopted**

A sample of 40 secondary school principals including both private and government schools have been selected randomly from the four valley district of the Manipur state. For the collection of the behavior levels for the different forty secondary school principals, the present investigator has used the Administrative Behavior Scale (ABS) developed by Dr. Haseen Taj (1998). It consists of 90 items in the form of five point scale. The whole items are divided into four independent components of administration viz. planning, organization, communication and decision making. The first component includes 21 items, the second component includes 26 items, the third component includes 28 items and the fourth component made up of 15 items. All the items are presented with a 5 point scale that has scoring weights of zero to four depending on the item orientation to the total dimension.

For analyzing the collected information, the present investigator applied t-test as a statistical technique.

**Table No: 1**  
**Showing the Significance Level of the t- value of Planning and Organization Behavior of the Higher Secondary School Principals**

| Type of component | Mean  | Number | Standard Deviation | t-test  |
|-------------------|-------|--------|--------------------|---------|
| Planning          | 77.64 | 40     | 6.23               | 11.50** |
| Organization      | 94.54 | 40     | 6.88               |         |

\* indicates significant at .05 level and \*\* indicates significant at .01 level

**Analysis and Interpretation**

From the above table, it is observed that the calculated t value, that is, 11.50 is greater than the tabulated t value at .05 and .01 levels of significance. Hence, the test is significant at both the levels of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. So, it can be concluded that there is significance differences between the planning and organization administrative behavior of the higher secondary school principals.

**Table No: 2**  
**Showing the Significance Level of the t- value of Planning and Communication Behavior of the Higher Secondary School Principals**

| Type of component | Mean   | Number | Standard Deviation | t-test  |
|-------------------|--------|--------|--------------------|---------|
| Planning          | 76.66  | 40     | 4.98               | 12.27** |
| Communication     | 104.45 | 40     | 7.67               |         |

\* indicates significant at .05 level and \*\* indicates significant at .01 level

**Analysis and Interpretation**

Table no. 2 indicates that the observed t value is 12.27 is greater than the theoretical t value. So, it is significant at both .05 and .01 levels of significance. Hence, the present null hypothesis has found rejected. Therefore, this finding can be concluded that there is significant difference between planning and communication administrative behavior of the higher secondary school principals.

**Table No: 3**  
**Showing the Significance Level of the t- value of Planning and Decision Making Behavior of the Higher Secondary School Principals**

| Type of component | Mean  | Number | Standard Deviation | t-test  |
|-------------------|-------|--------|--------------------|---------|
| Planning          | 74.63 | 40     | 5.43               | 19.67** |
| Decision making   | 48.66 | 40     | 6.34               |         |

\* indicates significant at .05 level and \*\* indicates significant at .01 level

**Analysis and Interpretation**

The above table no. 3 revealed that the calculated t value 19.67 is greater than the theoretical t value. So, at both .05 and .01 levels of significance, the present null hypothesis has been found rejected. Hence, there is significant difference at .05 and .01 levels between planning and decision making administrative behavior of the higher secondary school principals.

**Table No: 4**  
**Showing the Significance Level of the t- value of Organization and Communication Behavior of the Higher Secondary School Principals**

| Type of component | Mean   | Number | Standard Deviation | t-test |
|-------------------|--------|--------|--------------------|--------|
| Organization      | 89.32  | 40     | 6.26               | 8.96** |
| Communication     | 104.20 | 40     | 8.44               |        |

\* indicates significant at .05 level and \*\* indicates significant at .01 level

**Analysis and Interpretation**

From the table, it is observed that the calculated t value of 8.96 is greater than the theoretical tabulated values at .05 and .01 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is found as rejected. So, there is significant difference between organization and communication administrative behavior of the higher secondary school principals.

**Table No: 5**  
**Showing the Significance Level of the t- value of Organization and Decision Making Behaviour of the Higher Secondary School Principals**

| Type of component | Mean  | Number | Standard Deviation | t-test  |
|-------------------|-------|--------|--------------------|---------|
| Organization      | 92.33 | 40     | 7.12               | 29.24** |
| Decision making   | 47.88 | 40     | 6.47               |         |

\* indicates significant at .05 level and \*\* indicates significant at .01 level

**Analysis and Interpretation**

It is observed that the calculated t value of 29.24 has found very much greater than the tabulated values at .05 and .01 levels of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis has been found rejected. So, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between organization and decision making administrative behavior of the higher secondary school principals.

**Table No: 6**  
**Showing the Significance Level of the t- value of Communication and Decision Making Administrative Behavior of the Higher Secondary School Principals**

| Type of Component | Mean  | Number | Standard Deviation | t-test  |
|-------------------|-------|--------|--------------------|---------|
| Communication     | 99.33 | 40     | 8.67               | 26.89** |
| Decision making   | 51.74 | 40     | 6.74               |         |

\* indicates significant at .05 level and \*\* indicates significant at .01 level

### Analysis and Interpretation

It has also been found rejected the null hypothesis. So, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between communication and decision making administrative behavior of the higher secondary school principals.

### Conclusion

By keeping the views of the significant difference between the different types of the components of the administrative behavior, the leader in the school is responsible for providing the leadership that result in establishing common entire goal for both teaching and non-teaching staff. So, he is responsible for leading not only his teachers but the entire staff towards those goals. For running a successful academic institution, the leader is responsible to run all areas that relate to the educational programs including the instructional program and process, personal administration, relations with the staff and students, day to day school management and building and maintaining community relations.

### Educational Implications

1. The various components of the administrative behavior of higher secondary school principals inculcate the best responsibilities for the development of his institution, so that to study the planning, organization, communication and decision making of secondary school principals are highly useful.
2. The present study helps to assess administrative behavior components among the principals of the higher secondary schools, and it will keep a peaceful organizational climate.
3. It also helps the principals to adopt administration behavior dimensions depending in the situation.
4. The findings of the study help planning of the institution, organization of an institution and communication within the students.
5. It helps to adopt the cooperation between the heads of the institutions and their teaching and non teaching staffs.
6. The different components of education like discipline, effect, good personal adjustment, rationality, efficiency, willingness of behavioral characteristics and the total behavior characteristics correlates with organization, communication, planning and administrative behavior.
7. The components of organizational climate like pride, cohesiveness, climate, feeling about institutional roles, individual ambition towards accomplishment of goals sub components of group spirit correlates with planning, organization and communication dimensions of administrative behavior.

### Delimitations of the study

1. The study has confined to the forty higher secondary schools of the four valley districts of the Manipur state.
2. The psychological components of administration have confined to only four.

### Suggestions for further study

1. The same study can be conducted to other hilly districts of Manipur state.
2. A comparative study between the principals of private and government higher secondary principals of the state can also be conducted.
3. A comparative study also can be conducted between the principals of higher secondary schools of valley and hilly districts of Manipur state.
4. Similarly, another comparative study between the male and female principals of higher secondary school principals of Manipur state can be done and so on.

## REFERENCE

1. Hersey, P and Blanchard, K.: Management of Organizational Behavior- Utilizing Human Resource, Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi, 1982 | 2. Robbins, S.P.: Organizational Behavior – Concepts, Controversies and Application, Prentice Hall International (UK), Limited London, 1991. | 3. Seashore, S.F.: Group Cohesiveness in the Industrial Work Group, Ann Arbor, Mich.: Survey Research Centre, University of Michigan, 1954. | 4. Seiler, J.A.: Systems Analysis in Organizational Behavior. Homewood, Ill: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1967. | 5. Stogdill, R.M.: Patterns of Administrative Performance, Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1956. |