

AN ANALYTICAL STUDY ON THE LEADERSHIP STYLES OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Dr. Suman Lata Katiyar,

Assistant Professor, Dept. Of Education R. B. S. College, Agra

Preeti Shakya,

Assistant Professor, Dept. Of Education, Baikunthi Devi Kanya Mahavidyalaya Agra

ABSTRACT

The current research problem is titled "An analytical study on the leadership styles of School Principals at Agra District." The key educational policy trends noticed globally place the school at centre of reforms. Growing decentralization & autonomy lay primary burden for reform implementation on head teachers and their abilities to bring all staff and students together to work toward common goals. Leadership is a multifaceted phenomenon. Management delegated a broad function, which included duties for schools, students, instructors, and other educational components. This research aims to highlight the essential role that principals may play in supporting school administration in dealing with some of the difficulties that schools face today. A small sample (N=297) was utilised in this study to assess the leadership style of principals of upper primary schools from the standpoint of educational leadership. This suggested to the researcher that all principals confront comparable obstacles as leaders and must learn the required leadership qualities to deal well in a leadership role. This study supports the idea that improving leadership abilities may have a good influence on the role that principals play in schools now, and can help them become self-actualizing leaders of the future.

KEYWORDS- Leadership, leadership style, school principals, management & Administration

INTRODUCTION

In the past few years, a researcher has started taking serious interest in the area of leadership styles of principals of schools. Numerous models and exists to explains how the individuals differ with the leadership styles, however there seems a wide agreement between leader and researcher supporting the existence of the individual leadership styles among principals. The development of leadership styles has assumed a specific significance and now many authorities believe that the way the principal's administrates is perhaps the single most important factor in their institutional planning and achievement. The notion of the principle as a leader has been nominated in educational research on school success during the last 30-40 years. Recent style primary school study has also focused on the principle as a leader. The emphasis on the principle as a leader may have introduced a new dimension to the tradition to the traditional difference between the twin responsibilities of principal as educator and principal is expected to behave as a leader in the school. The principal has now emerged as a pivotal figure in the educational process. When we dive deep into the process of leadership, whether as a researcher, a teacher, or a leader of the school educational of individual variations, we discover that leaders have varied styles of leadership. The notion of principle as a leader has recently dominated research in school structure and administration. The principal's position as a leader is crucial in developing school conditions that contribute to improved student academic achievement. Planning and coordinating with staff having an orientation towards innovation parents through communicating students' style. The "Leadership

style”, term 'perform' implies to do or achieve something. The act of performing denotes the accomplishment of a goal or the fulfilment of a task. Style is what is really accomplished—a result, an outcome, or the output of an organisation. Organizations are traditionally considered as tools for achieving a goal. Intentions and objectives are considered as coordinating factors. As a result, organisational style may be described as "an organization's actual input or outcomes as assessed against its planned outputs, purpose, or objectives". Style is still one of management's classic issues. The issue is long-standing and ageless, dating back to the dawn of management. In a typical company, high style is a sign of positive deviance. Leadership style refers to the manner a leader operates. Style shifts our focus away from activity and toward effectiveness. Appropriate execution of a position necessitates a certain setting—one that is friendly and supportive, allowing the role occupants to fulfil that job well. Adequate information, as well as downward and upward communication, are required for effective style. Effective leaders use knowledge strategies to improve style and fit with organisational goals, rather than to attain isolated knowledge goals. A leader with solid knowledge and strong abilities may accomplish high style in an effective and efficient manner. Satisfaction motivates style, and style motivates satisfaction. Satisfaction and style are both reward functions. Awards lead to happiness, and rewards based on present style have an impact on future style. According to Avolio (1999), leadership does not and should not have a direct influence on style, but rather has an indirect impact on the processes that directly or indirectly contribute to style. When considering executive leadership, the majority of leadership impact in a company is indirect; many of these effects are two-way or system wide.

Some academics have previously claimed that leaders' actual effect on organisational outcomes is overstated and romanticised as a result of biased attributions regarding leaders (Meindl and Ehrlich, 1987). Despite these comments, practitioners and scholars generally understand and embrace the importance of leadership, and evidence supports the assumption that leaders do contribute to critical organisational outcomes (Kaiser et al., 2008). It is critical to understand and effectively measure leadership effectiveness in order to support successful style. In general, style refers to behaviour that is intended to contribute to organisational success (Campbell, 1990). Campbell recognised a number of distinct sorts of style characteristics, among which leadership was one. There is no universally accepted definition of leadership style (Yukl, 2006). Many various concepts are frequently grouped together under the tent of leadership style, such as outcomes such as leader effectiveness, leader progress, & leader emergence (Kaiser et al., 2008). Each of these measurements has a separate conceptual basis. While these elements may be connected, they are distinct outcomes, & their inclusion should be determined by the applied or research emphasis.

LEADERSHIP OF PRINCIPALS

According to Leggard (1991), an effective school has a purposeful and ordered atmosphere, high standards of style, a clear sense of mission, strong goal & accomplishment focused leadership, & a staff that is active in planning. The efficiency of the school is dependent on leadership style of its principal, just as the success of any organisation is dependent on quality of its leadership. There is evidence to suggest that a strong principal is one of the characteristics shared by effective schools (Vanzanton, 1989). In a successful school, the principal plays an important role. The quality of educational programmes is determined by the principal-staff relationship and the principal's leadership style, which makes him a successful leader. The school principal must shoulder a wide range of tasks while also dealing with societal pressures, expectations, and demands (Praba, 2005).

If the responsibilities and functions allocated to the principle are carried out properly, it is expected that the principal will have a strong style, which will lead to an increase in the quality of learning services and school administration (Ansar, 2015). A principal is essential in developing a school atmosphere that motivates and encourages pupils to succeed (Jones, 1997). Strong leadership is a prominent theme in school style research, according to Vernotica (1989). According to these research, effective schools have strong leadership from the school principal. He investigated principal goal clarity, goal-related interaction, and principle-teacher consensus on student accomplishment. Lechner (1987) explains the principal's participation in an urban elementary school's school reform initiative. At the same time, it describes how a principle might utilise a reflective approach to track, monitor, and innovate change. Fitch (1988) emphasised the role of the principle as a leader in connection to the level of effectiveness of a school building in his research on effective schools. The principal's position has changed from that of a school building manager to that of an educational leader who articulates the goals of the school building and offers the support mechanism required for the goals to be fulfilled. In general, leadership is critical to the growth of an institution. It is the institution's leadership that propels it forward in a competitive environment (Jeyaraj, 2003).

ANALYSIS

TABLE 1 level of leadership of upper primary school principals with regard to personal variables

PERSONAL VARIABLE		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	(55 Y) Below	0	00	70	60.0	47	40
	(55 Y) Above	2	1.2	116	64.4	62	34.4
Gender	Male	1	.07	102	61.4	63	37.9
	Female	0	0.0	85	64.9	46	35.1
Marital status	Married	2	0.7	177	63.2	101	36.1
	Un-married	1	5.9	9	52.9	7	41.2
Type of stay	Lonely	1	4.0	13	52.0	11	44.0
	Family	2	0.7	174	64.0	96	35.3

According to the chart above, more than half of the principals of upper primary schools have a moderate degree of leadership style in terms of personal factors.

TABLE 2 level of leadership style to professional variables

PERSONAL VARIABLE		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Qualification	B.Ed./M. Ed	0	0.0	67	58.8	47	41.2
	M. Phil.	1	0.5	120	65.6	62	33.9
Total Experience (Years)	Below 30	1	0.5	133	62.4	79	37.1
	Above 31	1	1.2	54	64.3	29	34.5
Experience as HM (years)	1 to 5	0	0	35	59.3	24	40.7
	6 to 10	1	0.5	120	64.9	64	34.6
	11 to 15	1	1.8	31	58.5	21	39.6

According to the following table, almost three-fifths of the principals of upper primary schools have a moderate degree of leadership style in terms of professional factors.

TABLE 3 level of leadership style to institutional variables

INSTITUTIONAL VARIABLE		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH	
		NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
Locality	Rural	1	0.5	133	63.3	76	36.2
	Urban	2	2.3	53	60.9	32	36.8
School type	Government	0	0	66	66.0	34	34.0
	Aided	1	.9	70	62.5	41	36.6
	Matriculation	1	1.2	50	58.8	34	40.0
School nature	Boys	1	6.7	10	66.7	4	26.6
	Girls	0	0	15	65.2	8	34.8
	Coeducation	2	0.8	161	62.2	96	37.0
No. of student	751 to 1000	1	.6	103	64.4	56	35.0
	1001 to 1250	0	0	60	61.8	38	39.2
	More than 1251	1	2.5	24	60.0	15	37.5
No. of teachers	Below 40	0	0	66	63.5	38	36.5
	41 to 50	0	0	54	63.5	31	36.5
	51 to 60	0	0	40	62.5	24	37.5
	Above 61	1	2.3	28	63.6	15	34.1

According to the above data, more than half of the principals of upper primary schools have a moderate degree of leadership style in terms of institutional characteristics.

TABLE 4 level of leadership to familial variables

FAMILY VARIABLE		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH	
		NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
Family type	Nuclear	2	1.1	118	66.3	58	32.6
	Joint	0	0	68	57.1	51	42.9
Spouse employee	Employee	1	0.5	126	65.9	64	33.6
	Unemployed	0	0.0	61	57.5	45	42.5
No. of siblings	Nil	0	0	9	60.0	6	40.0
	One	1	1.2	58	67.4	27	31.4
	Two	1	0.6	99	63.9	55	35.5
	Three & above	0	0	20	48.9	21	51.1

According to the above data, more than half of the principals of upper primary schools have a moderate level of leadership style, while those with three or more children have a high level of leadership style in terms of familial characteristics.

TABLE 5 difference in leadership style to age

DIMENASION	AGE	N	MEAN	S.D	T-VALUE	P-VALUE
Visionary	Below 55	117	71.77	9.646	1.043	0.298 ^{NS}
	Above 56	180	70.91	9.930		
Operational	Below 55	117	68.18	11.564	0.870	0.385 ^{NS}
	Above 56	180	67.30	12.261		
Instructional	Below 55	117	70.98	10.916	0.273	0.785 ^{NS}
	Above 56	180	71.22	10.579		
Learning	Below 55	117	72.43	10.987	0.719	0.473 ^{NS}
	Above 56	180	71.77	11.071		
Collaborative	Below 55	117	73.74	14.562	1.210	0.227 ^{NS}
	Above 56	180	72.36	12.857		
Strategic	Below 55	117	68.34	9.991	0.970	0.333 ^{NS}
	Above 56	180	67.57	9.145		
Total	Below 55	117	70.95	8.971	1.045	0.296 ^{NS}
	Above 56	180	70.19	8.495		

The above table indicates that the p-value is larger than 0.05, implying that null hypothesis is accepted. It demonstrates that there is no significant difference in leadership style of upper primary school principals based on age.

TABLE 6 difference in leadership style to gender

DIMENASION	GENDER	N	MEAN	S.D	T- VALUE	P-VALUE
Visionary	Male	166	71.57	9.706	0.881	0.378 ^{NS}
	Female	131	70.85	9.966		
Operational	Male	166	67.69	12.020	0.101	0.920 ^{NS}
	Female	131	67.59	11.971		
Instructional	Male	166	71.44	10.462	0.801	0.424 ^{NS}
	Female	131	70.73	11.015		
Learning	Male	166	72.61	10.951	1.455	0.146 ^{NS}
	Female	131	71.29	11.115		
Collaborative	Male	166	73.47	13.755	1.151	0.250 ^{NS}
	Female	131	72.18	13.3.2		
Strategic	Male	166	68.37	9.001	1.427	0.154 ^{NS}
	Female	131	67.25	10.059		
Total	Male	166	70.91	8.511	1.329	0.184 ^{NS}
	Female	131	69.95	8.895		

The above table indicates that the p-value is larger than 0.05, implying that the null hypothesis is accepted. It demonstrates that there is no substantial variation in the leadership style of upper primary school principals based on gender.

TABLE 7 difference in leadership to marital status

DIMENSIO N	MARITAL STA TUS	N	MEAN	S.D	T- VALUE	P-VALUE
Visionary	Married	280	71.35	9.759	0.932	0.352 ^{ns}
	Unmarried	17	69.71	10.841		
Operational	Married	280	67.69	11.800	0.305	0.760 ^{ns}
	Unmarried	17	67.3	15.034		
Instruction	Married	280	71.04	10.635	0.812	0.417 ^{ns}
	Unmarried	17	72.60	11.907		
Learning	Married	280	72.02	10.934	0.142	0.887 ^{ns}
	Unmarried	17	72.30	12.792		
Collaborative	Married	280	72.98	13.605	0.566	0.572 ^{ns}
	Unmarried	17	71.61	12.937		
Strategic	Married	280	67.81	9.550	0.671	0.502 ^{ns}
	Unmarried	17	68.95	8.430		
Total	Married	280	70.49	8.650	0.053	0.958 ^{ns}
	Unmarried	17	70.41	9.445		

The above table indicates that the p-value is larger than 0.05, implying that the null hypothesis is accepted. It demonstrates that there is no substantial variation in the leadership style of upper primary school principals based on marital status.

TABLE 8 difference in leadership to type of stay

DIMENSION	TYPE STAY	N	MEAN	S.D	T- VALUE	P-VALUE
Visionary	Lonely	25	71.23	9.754	0.160	0.873 ^{NS}
	Family	272	71.47	10.621		
Operation	lonely	25	67.63	11.860	0.164	0.870 ^{NS}
	Family	272	67.92	13.466		
Instructional	Lonely	25	71.10	10.756	0.211	0.833 ^{NS}
	Family	272	71.43	10.222		
Learning	Lonely	25	71.88	10.919	1.098	0.273 ^{NS}
	Family	272	73.69	12.234		
Collaborative	Lonely	25	72.76	13.522	0.854	0.393 ^{NS}
	Family	272	74.49	14.044		
strategic	Lonely	25	67.70	9.479	1.468	0.143 ^{NS}
	family	272	69.78	9.477		
Total	Lonely	25	70.38	8.615	0.969	0.333 ^{NS}
	Family	272	71.64	9.476		

The above table indicates that the p-value is larger than 0.05, implying that the null hypothesis is accepted. It demonstrates that there is no substantial variation in the leadership style of upper primary school principals based on the kind of stay.

TABLE 9 difference in leadership to experience as principals

SOURCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	P-VALUE
Between Groups	151.536	3	75.768	1.004	0.367 ^{NS}
Within Group	44600.162	294	75.466		
total	44751.698	297			

TABLE 10 difference in leadership to locality

DIMENSION	LOCALITY	N	MEAN	S.D	T- VALUE	P- VALUE
Visionary	Rural	210	70.94	9.490	1.265	0.206 ^{NS}
	Urban	87	72.06	10.575		
Operation	Rural	210	67.50	11.898	0.512	0.609 ^{NS}
	Urban	87	68.06	12.241		
Instructional	Rural	210	70.65	10.245	01.699	0.090 ^{NS}
	Urban	87	72.29	11.717		
Learning	Rural	210	71.91	11.101	0.372	0.710 ^{NS}
	Urban	87	72.28	10.916		
Collaborative	Rural	210	72.92	13.812	0.016	0.987 ^{NS}
	Urban	87	67.94	12.997		
Strategic	Rural	210	67.73	9.277	0.602	0.547 ^{NS}
	Urban	87	67.25	10.010		
Total	Rural	210	70.31	8.560	0.786	0.432 ^{NS}
	Urban	87	70.93	9.015		

The above table indicates that the p-value is larger than 0.05, implying that the null hypothesis is accepted. It demonstrates that there is no substantial variation in the leadership style of upper primary school principals based on their location.

TABLE 11 DIFFERENCE IN LEADERSHIP TO SCHOOL TYPE

SOURCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	P-VALUE
Between Groups	232.118	3	116.059	1.541	0.215 ^{NS}
Within Group	44519.579	294	75.329		
total	44751.698	297			

The above table indicates that the p-value is larger than 0.05, implying that the null hypothesis is accepted. It demonstrates that there is no substantial variation in the leadership style of upper primary school principals based on school type.

TABLE 12 difference in leadership to school nature

SOURCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	P-VALUE
Between Groups	265.008	3	132.504	1.760	0.173 ^{NS}
Within Group	44486.690	294	75.274		
total	44751.698	297			

The above table indicates that the p-value is larger than 0.05, implying that the null hypothesis is accepted. It demonstrates that there is no significant difference in the leadership style of upper primary school principals based on the nature of the school.

TABLE 13 difference in leadership to number of students

SOURCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	P-VALUE
Between Groups	72.247	3	36.123	0.478	0.620 ^{NS}
Within Group	444679.451	294	75.600		
Total	44751.698	297			

The above table indicates that the p-value is larger than 0.05, implying that the null hypothesis is accepted. It demonstrates that there is no substantial variation in the leadership style of upper primary school principals based on the number of pupils.

CONCLUSION

This research aims to highlight the essential role that principals may play in supporting school administration in dealing with some of the difficulties that schools face today. A small sample (N=297) was utilised in this study to assess the leadership style of principals of upper primary schools in Agra district from the standpoint of educational leadership. It is hoped that findings of this study would spark future research into the critical relevance of principal leadership style and the role of principals in educational administration. The researcher thinks that this study will add to body of information about leadership style and its potential value to educational management. At addition to collecting data for this study, the researcher worked as a principal in an upper primary school throughout the period she was collecting data for it. This suggested to the researcher that all principals confront comparable obstacles as leaders and must learn the required leadership qualities to deal well in a leadership role. This study supports the idea that improving leadership abilities may have a good influence on the role that principals play in schools now, and can help them become self-actualizing leaders of the future.

REFERENCES

1. Alford, L.R. & Beauty, H.R. (1951). Principles of industrial management. New York: Ronald Press Co.
2. Avolio, B.J. (1999). Full leadership development: Building the vital force in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
3. Bowman, R.F. (2014) Learning leadership skills in high school, Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 87(2), 59-63.

4. Bradley, S.P. & Schneider, P. (2013) Making sense of leading schools; A study of the school principalship, University of Washington.
5. Chemers, M. M. (1997). An integrative theory of leadership, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
6. Davis, K. (1972). Human behavior at work: Human relations and organizational behavior. (4th ed.). New York: Mc Graw Hill.
7. Graczewski, C. et al. (2009) Instructional leadership in practice, *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 14, 72-96.
8. Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (1988). Management of organizational behaviour: utilizing human resources. Englewood cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
9. Jago, A.G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science*, 3, 315-336.
10. Kafka, J. (2009). The principalship in historical perspective. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 84, 318-330.
11. Katz, D. & Khan, R.L. (1978) The social psychology of organizations. (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
12. Koontz, H. & O'Donnel, C. (1959). Principles of management. (2nd ed.) New York: Mc Graw Hill.
13. Mintzberg, H. (1973) The nature of managerial work. NY: Harper and Row.
14. Paul, M.T. (1981). Managerial effectiveness and motivation, leadership personality and organizational climate. Ph.D. Thesis, Chennai: Madras University.
15. Roger, C. (2015). Examining teamwork and leadership in the fields of public administration, Leadership and management. Team performance management.
16. Salfi, N.A. (2011) Successful leadership practices of head teachers for school improvement: Some evidence from Pakistan, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49 (4), 414-432.
17. Simkin, L. et al. (2010) Emerging education issues: Findings from the Wallace Foundation Survey. Academy for Educational Development Unpublished 2010, 9-10.
18. Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I.R.,& Massarik, F. (1961). Leadership and organization. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
19. Telfer, R.G. (2010) Staff involvement key to curriculum improvement, *The clearing house*, 43(9), 539-542.
20. Terry, G.R. (1960). Principles of management, Irvin, Homewood: Dorsey Press.
21. Uma, K.V. (2000) Leadership and organizational effectiveness, Ph. D., Thesis, Madras University.
22. Weigel, R.A. (2013) School leadership skill development, Pro Quest, LLC, Ed. D. Dissertation, Eastern Michigan University.
23. Yukl, G. & Van Fleet, D.D. (1992) Theory and research on leadership in organizations, Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
24. Yukl, G. (1994). Leadership in organizations (3rd ed.), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.