

A Study of Administrative Behavior of Secondary School Heads of Aurangabad District

Shaikh Summaiya Naznin¹, Dr. Mohammadi Shaikh²

¹Research Scholar, Milind College of Arts, Aurangabad, Maharashtra, India

²Assistant Professor, DSR College of Education, Aurangabad, Maharashtra, India

ABSTRACT

In the present study an attempt has been made to study secondary school heads Administrative behavior. Dr. Haseen Taj Administrative behavior inventory was administered to a sample of 240 heads. The finding of the study showed that male and female heads do not differ significantly in their Administrative behavior, the finding of the study also showed that government and private heads do not differ significantly in their Administrative behavior but urban and rural heads differ significantly in their Administrative behavior.

KEYWORDS: Administrative behavior, Government, Private, male and female, urban and rural secondary school heads.

How to cite this paper: Shaikh Summaiya Naznin | Dr. Mohammadi Shaikh "A Study of Administrative Behavior of Secondary School Heads of Aurangabad District" Published in International

Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd), ISSN: 2456-6470, Volume-8 | Issue-1, February 2024, pp.129-134,

URL: www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd61340.pdf



Copyright © 2024 by author (s) and International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development Journal. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)



INTRODUCTION

The word 'administer' is derived from the Latin word *administere*, which means to care for or to look after people, to manage affairs. Administration may be defined as "group activity which involves Cooperation and coordination for the purpose of achieving desired goals or objectives".

Brooks Adams- "Administration is the capacity of coordinating many, and often conflicting, social energies in a single organism, so adroitly that they shall operate as a unity".

Administration is an ultimate part of any organization. An appropriate administrative behavior is an elementary step towards the successful achievement of goals of any organization. Educational administrators have an accountability to play a key role in incessantly marching ahead to achieve the desired goals. Administrator occupies an imperative position and his role is judged to be a significant aspect of institutional leadership. (Gmelch, 2000).

"Administrative behavior is not just a matter of retorting to problems; it should be noticed, rather in a broader perspective, in terms of preparing the school organization for responsive action, a frame of reference which suggests that the school administrator's primarily responsibility is to develop the school as an adoptive organization (Gaynor, 2012)." The position as heads of an academic department has been characterized as having no equivalent in business or industry (Gmelch, 2002). The challenging outlook & accountabilities of educational administrators as described by (Hess & Kelly, 2005) are the front-line managers, charged with foremost levels of effectiveness.

Administration covers four basic aspects Planning, Organization, Communication and Decision making.

Planning is the fundamental management function, which involves deciding beforehand, what is to be done, when is it to be done, how it is to be done and who is going to do it. It is an intellectual process

which lays down an organisation's objectives and develops various courses of action, by which the organisation can achieve those objectives. It chalks out exactly, how to attain a specific goal.

Planning is nothing but thinking before the action takes place. It helps us to take a peep into the future and decide in advance the way to deal with the situations, which we are going to encounter in future. It involves logical thinking and rational decision making.

Organization: An organization refers to a group of people who work together to achieve a common goal. It involves creating a formal structure of roles, responsibilities, and relationships that enable individuals to work together effectively. This structure may include hierarchies, departments, teams, and job descriptions. In an organization, people are allocated specific roles based on their skills and expertise, and work is coordinated through a system of rules and procedures.

Decision-making is a common everyday phenomenon. Decision-making is the basis of all organisations be it Public or Private. It is the essence of management. Of all the problems in management, the problem of decision-making is the most difficult. In Public administration, decision making is not as easy as in business and we cannot keep things pending indefinitely. In Public administration, we need right decisions. Decision-making in Public administration is not free from outside influences. All types of pressures, direct and indirect, exert themselves and a decision may have to be taken, much to the displeasure and disapproval of the decision-maker. While, the business administration is much more free from pressures. Effective management, of public or private organisations, believes in making right and responsible decisions.

Decision-making is defined as selection of a course of action from amongst alternatives, and it covers matters relating to planning, organising, directing, staffing and controlling. A decision is an act of choice wherein an executive forms a conclusion about what must be done in a given situation. Webster's dictionary defines the-term Decision-making as "the act of determining in one's mind upon an opinion or course of action." According to Terry, it is "the selection of one behaviour alternative from two or more possible alternatives." In the words of Seckler-Hudson, "Decision making in government is a plural activity. One individual may pronounce the decision, but may contribute to the process of reaching the decision. It is part of the political system." According to Ishwar Dayal, "Decision is the commitment of the decision maker to act, thereby committing the

personnel, material and financial resources of the organisation towards the action objectives." Decision-making includes all the considerations that go into identifying a problem, reaching a conclusion and then taking action. Characteristics: 1. Decisions are usually made to achieve some purpose or goal. 2. No decision stands alone. They are all linked together in a sequential chain. 3. It occurs over a period of time so that concurrent events influence the outcome.

Communication is one of the most basic functions of administration. The organisation cannot succeed unless it has a properly developed communication system. The word 'Communication' has been derived from the Latin word *Communis* which means common. Communication, therefore, refers to the sharing of ideas, facts, opinions, information and understanding. It is the transfer or transmission of some information and understanding from one person to another. Pfiffner has rightly described it as "the heart of management". Millet says communication means "shared understanding of a shared purpose." Peter Drucker has defined communication as "the ability of the various functional groups within an enterprise to understand each other and each other's functions and concerns." A very simple and concise definition of communication may be that it is a process of transmitting information, thoughts, opinions, messages, facts, -ideas or emotions and understanding from one person, place or thing to another person, place, or thing. Features of Communication: The features are as follows: (i) It involves people, (ii) It involves shared meaning, (iii) It is symbolic, (iv) It is a two-way process, (v) It is a pervasive function, applying to all phases of management and to all levels.

Need and Importance:-

The effectiveness of any school system is largely dependent on its Head, who is responsible for managing the staff, morale and satisfaction and constant evaluation of their work and qualitative student outcomes. The introduction of modern technology in this era of globalization calls for a conscious approach in the management of schools. Secondary school is the target for moulding the child for higher education. This makes the principal who is regarded as the administrative heads of the secondary schools thus responsible. As such, they are responsible for the day-to-day running of the schools. The effectiveness of the principals in their job performance in secondary schools cannot therefore be over-emphasized. However, the general schools system has seen a general degradation both in facilities, academic performance, staff welfare and a host of others. Role performance of principals in

secondary schools is essential and it is meant to enhance the performance of the schools.

Objectives of the study:-

1. To find out the level of Administrative Behavior of school Heads working in secondary schools based on their Gender.
2. To find out the level of Administrative Behavior of Government and Private school Heads working in secondary schools.
3. To find out the level of Administrative Behavior of school Heads working in secondary schools based on their Locality.

Hypothesis of the study:-

1. There is no significant difference between Administrative Behavior of school Heads working in secondary schools based on their Gender.
2. There is no significant difference between Administrative Behavior of school Heads working in Government and Private secondary schools.
3. There is no significant difference between Administrative Behavior of school Heads working in secondary schools based on their Locality.

Review of related literature:

Spauding, Angela (1994) Studied a case study that explored the micro political strategies used by a principal to influence teachers in a school- based on decision making context.

Chen, Addi, Audrey (1995) studied the changing roles of principals and found that the role of principal and other school leaders changes as the system moves towards autonomous school organization. Specifically the study examined the extent to which principals employed Supervisory behaviors, teaching-activating behaviours, and school restructuring initiatives.

Terry, Paul (1996) studied the effective school principals and found that successful schools are invariably led by effective principals who are recognized as instructional leader.

Thomas, Vernadine (1997) studied the leadership theories, Leadership styles and the effect of Principal leadership on teachers morale, performance and student achievement.

Bogler, Ronit (1999) studied the effects of behaviour of principals as multiple factor in teacher’s job satisfaction. The findings show that teachers perceptions of occupational prestige, self-esteem, autonomy at work, and professional self-development contribute the most to job satisfaction.

Day, Harris, Hadfield (1999) studied the nature and practice of effective leadership in schools in England and Wales in the 1990s. The findings explored how existing theories of effective leadership, purposeful leadership, transformational leadership, or moral leadership compared to the practices of successful head teachers in times of change.

Leech, Fulton, Ray (2002) studied on principals of a large urban school district examines the difference in middle school and high school teachers perceptions of the leadership practices of educational leaders. The findings of the study were middle school and high school teachers reported similar perceptions of their principal’s leadership practices.

Population:-

All secondary school heads of Aurangabad city.

Sample:-

The present study was conducted upon 240 school Heads. The sample was taken randomly from different secondary schools in Aurangabad District.

Tool:-

For data collection standard tool of Dr. Haseen Taj Administrative behavior inventory was used.

Method:-

Survey method was conducted by the researchers to collect relevant data regarding the research topic.

Procedure:-

The data was collected with the help of Dr. Haseen Taj Administrative behavior inventory. The test was administered to the sample subject in the respective schools. The researcher visited various schools in order to collect the data for the present study. The Scoring was strictly done as per the manual of the tests.

Statistical Treatment:-

For statistical analysis mean, S.D, and T-score were used.

Analysis and Interpretation: The data collected through the administration of Dr. Haseen Taj Administrative behavior inventory was statistically analyzed by applying “t” test. The analysis and Interpretation of data have been arranged in a tabular form in the following manner.

Table 1: Mean comparison of male and female secondary school teacher’s Administrative behavior.

Group	Mean	S.D	“t” value	Level of significance at 0.05
Male	199.82	34.32	0.124	Insignificant
Female	200.75	32.61		

Interpretation:

Table no.1 shows that the obtained Mean for Administrative behavior of male teachers is 199.82 and S.D was 34.32. The obtained Mean for Administrative behavior of female teachers is 200.75 and S.D was 32.61. The obtained t-value was

0.124 which is smaller than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is no significant difference between the Administrative behavior of male and female teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table 2: Mean comparison of Dimensions of Administrative behavior of Male and Female secondary school teachers.

Dimension	Male		Female		t-value	Level of significance at 0.05
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
Planning	51.8	17.18	52.67	16.35	0.23	Insignificant
Organization	55.52	16.91	52.97	18.79	0.63	Insignificant
Communication	54.72	18.77	58.35	18.13	0.88	Insignificant
Decision Making	37.77	5.97	36.75	7.16	0.69	Insignificant

Interpretation

Table no.2 shows that the obtained mean for Planning of male teachers is 51.8 and S.D was 17.18. The obtained Mean for Planning of female teachers is 52.67 and S.D was 16.35. The obtained t-value was 0.23 which is smaller than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is no significant difference between the Planning of male and female teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table no.2 shows that the obtained mean for Organization of male teachers is 55.52 and S.D was 16.91. The obtained Mean for Organization of female teachers is 52.97 and S.D was 18.79. The obtained t-value was 0.63 which is smaller than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is no significant difference between the Organization of male and female teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table no.2 shows that the obtained mean for Communication of male teachers is 54.72 and S.D was 18.77. The obtained Mean for Organization of female teachers is 58.35 and S.D was 18.13. The obtained t-value was 0.88 which is smaller than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is no significant difference between the Communication of male and female teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table no.2 shows that the obtained mean for Decision Making of male teachers is 37.77 and S.D was 5.97. The obtained Mean for Organization of female teachers is 36.75 and S.D was 7.16. The obtained t-value was 0.69 which is smaller than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is no significant difference between the Decision Making of male and female teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table 3: Mean comparison of Dimensions of Administrative behavior of Government and Private secondary school teachers.

Dimension	Government		Private		t-value	Level of significance at 0.05
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
Planning	48.67	9.97	42.45	15.26	0.63	Insignificant
Organization	67.05	17.60	67.92	16.48	0.22	Insignificant
Communication	65.15	17.01	61.30	19.27	0.94	Insignificant
Decision Making	33.1	8.40	31.9	9.34	0.60	Insignificant

Interpretation

Table no.3 shows that the obtained mean for Planning of Government teachers is 48.67 and S.D was 9.97. The obtained Mean for Planning of Private teachers is 42.45 and S.D was 15.26. The obtained t-value was 0.63 which is smaller than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is no significant difference between the Planning of Government and Private teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table no.3 shows that the obtained mean for Organization of Government teachers is 67.05 and S.D was 17.60. The obtained Mean for Organization of Private teachers is 67.92 and S.D was 16.48. The obtained t-value was 0.22 which is smaller than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is no significant difference between the Organization of Government and Private Teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table no.3 shows that the obtained mean for Communication of Government teachers is 65.15 and S.D was 17.01. The obtained Mean for Organization of Private teachers is 61.30 and S.D was 19.27. The obtained t-value

was 0.94 which is smaller than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is no significant difference between the Communication of Government and Private teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table no.3 shows that the obtained mean for Decision Making of Government teachers is 33.10 and S.D was 8.40. The obtained Mean for Organization of Private teachers is 31.97 and S.D was 7.16. The obtained t-value was 0.69 which is smaller than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is no significant difference between the Decision Making of Government and Private teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table 4: Mean comparison of Dimensions of Administrative behavior of Urban and Rural secondary school teachers.

Dimension	Urban		Rural		t-value	Level of significance at 0.05
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
Planning	47.05	12.06	38.77	12.08	3.07	significant
Organization	78.47	12.52	64.9	20.32	3.59	significant
Communication	83.22	13.54	68.2	21.09	3.79	significant
Decision Making	46.17	6.88	42.3	10.17	2	significant

Interpretation

Table no.4 shows that the obtained mean for Planning of Urban teachers is 47.05 and S.D was 12.06. The obtained Mean for Planning of Rural teachers is 38.77 and S.D was 12.08. The obtained t-value was 3.07 which is greater than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is significant difference between the Planning of Urban and Rural teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table no.4 shows that the obtained mean for Organization of Urban teachers is 78.47 and S.D was 12.52. The obtained Mean for Organization of Rural teachers is 64.9 and S.D was 20.32. The obtained t-value was 3.59 which is greater than 1.96 at 0.5 level of significance which indicates that there is significant difference between the Organization of Urban and Rural Teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table no.4 shows that the obtained mean for Communication of Urban teachers is 83.22 and S.D was 13.54. The obtained Mean for Organization of Rural teachers is 68.2 and S.D was 21.09. The obtained t-value was 3.79 which is greater than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is significant difference between the Communication of Urban and Rural teachers of Aurangabad District.

Table no.4 shows that the obtained mean for Decision Making of Urban teachers is 46.17 and S.D was 6.88. The obtained Mean for Organization of Rural teachers is 42.3 and S.D was 10.17. The obtained t-value was 2 which is greater than 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance which indicates that there is significant difference between the Decision Making of Urban and Rural teachers of Aurangabad District.

Conclusion

The present investigation revealed that the high school heads working in the Aurangabad district of Maharashtra India were found to have a better

administrative behavior which gives a very high level of achievement for school heads.

On the basis of interpretation and discussion of the results, it is concluded that government and private heads do not differ significantly in the dimensions of administrative behavior like planning, organization, communication and in decision-making. Government and private heads have good planning ability that guides them to make efficient and accurate decisions. Both the government and private secondary school heads are proficient in planning, organizing and in decision-making.

The present study also reveals that male and female secondary school heads do not differ significantly in the dimensions of administrative behavior like planning, organization, communication and in decision-making. Male and female heads of secondary school plays an integral role in undertaking responsibilities, responding to the situations, organising the tasks effectively and analyzing the problems skillfully.

The present investigation revealed that the urban and rural high school heads differ significantly in the dimensions of administrative behavior like planning, organization, communication and in decision-making. Urban School heads have better administrative behavior than rural. So, it can be revealed from the investigation that the rural high school heads should develop the administrative behaviour in their constructive way.

References

- [1] Aydin Balyer. (2012). Transformational Leadership Behaviors of School Principals: A Qualitative Research Based on Teachers Perceptions. International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 4(3), 581-591. Retrieved

- from
http://www.iojes.net/userfiles/article/iojes_949.pdf
- [2] Akhilesh Chandra, Ravi Krovi & Balaji Rajagopalan. (2012). Risk Visualization: A Mechanism for Supporting Unstructured Decision Making Processes. *International Journal of Applied Management and Technology*, 6(4), 48-70. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/ijamt/vol6/iss4/3/>
- [3] Basu Mudasir. (2012). Administrative Behavior and Job Activity in Relation to Administrators Occupational Efficacy. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Educational Research and Review*, 1(8), 172-181. Retrieved from <http://garj.org/garjerr/index.htm>
- [4] Bennis, Warren, G. (2016). Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior: The Problem of Authority. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 4(3), 259-301. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2390911>
- [5] Basavaraj, M.H. (2013). A Study of Administrative Behavior and Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Heads of North Karnataka. Available at <http://www.ssmrae.org/admin/images/612a655426e8cff7bc95774358b7ab35.pdf>
- [6] Campbell, Roald F. & Faber, Charles F. (2016). Administrative Behavior: Theory and Research. *Review of Educational Research*, 31(4), 353-367. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1168886>
- [7] Hemalatha D., Dr. S. Thanalakshmi S. (2022) A Study on Administrative Behaviour of High School Male and Female Headmasters in Vellore District. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) ISSN: 2319-7064*
- [8] Jesper Simonsen Herbert A. Simon (1994). Administrative Behavior: How organizations can be understood in terms of decision processes. Roskilde University, 1-9. Retrieved from <http://jespersimonsen.dk/Downloads/Simon-introduction.pdf>
- [9] Martha Oruku & Mumenlugard. (n.d). Administrative Theory, National Open University of Nigeria, MGS1172.1-281. Retrieved from <http://www.nou.edu.ng/uploads/NOUNOCL/pdf/SMS/MGS%20712.pdf>
- [10] Mohan Lal Arya. (2014). Teacher's Perception of Principal's Administrative Effectiveness in Government and Public Secondary Schools in Moradabad district. *International Journal of Education and Science Research*, 1(5), 47-57. Retrieved from <http://www.ijesrr.org/publication/12/IJESRR%20V-1-5-6.pdf>
- [11] Mohan Lal Arya. (2015). Relationship between Principal's Administrative Behavior and Senior Secondary School's Effectiveness in Moradabad. *Global Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(5), 98-109. Available at www.gjms.co.in.
- [12] Nandisha, B.V. (2015). Secondary school headmasters Administrative Behavior and Occupational Efficacy effects on their school improvement. *Global Journal for Research Analysis*, 4(2), 78-79. Retrieved from <http://www.worldwidejournals.com/gra/articles.php?val=MjcyNA==&b1=129&k=33>
- [13] Oseph Besong Besong. (2014). Principals Administrative Effectiveness and Staff Productivity in Selected Secondary School in South West Region, Cameroon. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 3(2), 155-166. Retrieved from <http://elvedit.com/journals/IJARM/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Joseph-Besong-Besong.pdf>
- [14] Osia Majid (2018) Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators with Special reference to their Administrative Experience. ICSSR
- [15] Pramod Kumarnaik & Nishantmishra. (2016). Administrative behavior of principal's on organizational health of secondary schools - A Study. *Journal of International Academic Research for Multidisciplinary*, 4(2), 1-9. Available at www.jiarm.com.
- [16] Ravi Kant & Bhimappa Rangannavar. (2013). Effect of Administrative Behavior of School Heads and Some Socio-Psychological Factors on the Organizational Commitment of Secondary School Teachers, *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology*, 4(3), 73-80. Retrieved from www.soeagra.com/ijert/ijert.htm.