

Administrative Behaviour of Educational Administrators with Special reference to their Administrative Experience

Osia Majid

Department of Education and Psychology

ABSTRACT

The present study was carried out to find and compare the Administrative Behaviour of Government and Private Administrators with reference to their experience. A sample of 200 administrators was drawn randomly from the Government and Private Secondary Schools of Kashmir. Administrative behaviour scale by Haseen Taj was administered for data collection. Mean, S.D and Test of Significance was used to analyse the data. The results revealed that Government administrators have better planning and have a fleeter decision making style than private administrators whereas, private administrators were found to have a proper organisation and good communication than their counterparts. Furthermore, results showed that senior administrators were found enhanced on planning, organisation and decision making styles than junior administrators whereas both were found similar on communication dimension of administrative behaviour.

Keywords: *Administrative Behaviour, Government administrators, Private administrators, Experience.*

INTRODUCTION

Administration is an ultimate part of any organization. An appropriate administrative behaviour 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). In order to deliver the agreed policy within the institution, the administrator is required to lead, manage and develop the institute in order to realize the utmost possible standards of excellence in all activities. There is also emerging evidence that people improve a perception, of what makes a “good administrator” or ways in which “good administrators” would behave in a given situation (Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborn, 2000). “Administrative behaviour 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 characterised 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. In this new era of culpability where school leaders are expected to reevaluate bottom line results & use data to drive decisions, skills & knowledge of principals matter more than ever. During the last 15 years, the administrator’s key role has transformed into one that focuses more on being a facilitator than a figurehead (Andero, 2000) and in Today’s epoch of accountability, the administrators role has developed into one of an instructional leader (DiPaola and Hoy, 2008; McEwan, 2003).

Over the past few decades, educational institutions all over the world have been confronted with new demands and challenges in terms of restructuring, management and maintaining standards to improve their competitiveness (Chevaillier, 2002; Gamage & Mininberg, 2003; Harman, 2002; Henkel, 2002). The study of administrative behaviour is very interesting & challenging too. The study becomes more challenging when situational factors interact. Administrators under whom the whole educational system is functioning should be able to explain, predict, evaluate & modify behaviour that will largely depend upon knowledge, skill and experience of the administrator in handling the problems in diverse situations.

II.OBJECTIVES

1. To find and compare the administrative behaviour of Government and Private administrators of the secondary schools.
2. To find and compare the administrative behaviour of senior and junior administrators of secondary schools with respect to their experience.

Hypotheses:

1. There is a significant difference between the Government and Private administrators of the secondary schools.
2. There is a significant difference between the senior and junior administrators of secondary schools with respect to their experience.

Sample

The sample of 200 administrators was drawn randomly from the two types of institutions of the Kashmir, J&K a) Secondary Schools run by the Government and b) Secondary schools maintained by the Private management.

Tool:

The following standardized tool was administered by the investigator for data collection.

Administrative Behaviour Scale (2011): This scale has been developed by Haseen Taj and is available at National Psychological Corporation, Agra. It has the following four areas: a) Planning b) Organization c) Communication d) Decision-Making.

Statistical Treatment of the Data:

The data collected was subjected to the statistical analysis by using Mean, S.D. and Test of Significance.

Table 01 Showing the Significance of Difference between the Mean Scores of Government and Private Administrators on Administrative Behaviour (N=100 each)

Dimensions		Government		Private		“t” value	Level of Significance
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
i	Planning	78.95	6.10	66.56	6.91	13.44	**

ii	Organisation	90.75	5.70	93.31	6.28	3.17	**
iii	Communication	95.47	6.88	100.93	7.76	5.26	**
iv	Decision-Making	51.36	3.77	45.85	5.25	8.51	**
Composite Score		316.53	11.46	306.65	14.76	5.28	**

Note: **p<0.01

Table 02 Showing the Significance of Difference between the Mean Scores of Senior and Junior Administrators on Administrative Behaviour

Dimensions		Senior N= 102		Junior N=98		“t” value	Level of Significance
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
i	Planning	74.45	7.85	70.99	9.76	2.76	**
ii	Organisation	92.86	6.01	91.16	5.55	2.07	**
iii	Communication	98.95	7.79	97.42	7.79	1.39	*
iv	Decision-Making	50.31	4.55	46.83	5.52	4.87	**
Composite Score		316.58	11.50	306.40	14.69	5.46	**

Note: **p<0.01; *insignificant

Senior: >6 years of experience as an administrator

Junior: <6 years of experience as an administrator

III.INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

A perusal of the **Table 01** reveals a significant mean difference between two groups on all the four dimensions of administrative behaviour. The results reveal that both the groups differ significantly on *Planning* dimension. The mean score of government heads (M=78.95) is higher than the private heads (M=66.56) and the obtained ‘t’ value (t=13.44) came out to be significant at 0.01 level of confidence. From the results, it can be inferred that government heads show better *Planning* ability and are found to be determined in achieving the various objectives. They carry out the responsibilities and design work without detailed guidelines, make suggestions, undertake extra responsibilities and take decisions well in advance as what and when to do a particular task. On *organisation* dimension of administrative behaviour the mean score favours the private heads (M=93.31) which implies that it’s higher than the mean score of government heads (M=90.75). The calculated ‘t’ value came out to be significant at 0.01 level of confidence (t=3.17). It can be inferred, that private heads are more concerned about the performance of all departments in the school than the government heads. They arrange the resources of time, space and supervise maximum effect on student learning. They ensure the proper organisation of

academic and administrative matters of the school and occasionally arrange extension lectures for the benefit of staff and students as well. Private heads allocate the work among the teachers as per their capabilities and are strict in maintaining the discipline in their school premises. From the results, reflecting in the **Table 01** it is obvious that on *communication* dimension the private heads ($M=100.93$) are observed to have a higher mean score than the government heads ($M=95.47$) and the 't' value came out to be significant at 0.01 level of confidence ($t=5.26$). The results reveal that both the groups differ significantly on this dimension of administrative behaviour. It can be inferred that private heads are better in *communication* and are clear in giving instructions and direction to their subordinates and encourage them to communicate informally on daily routines. Government heads on the other hand, are found to have poor *communication* even though they converse with the authorities on existing problems of the school and ways to resolve them. This is because they seem to be incapable of conveying ideas clearly and effectively as compared to the private heads. On *decision-making* dimension of administrative behaviour, the results reflecting in the **Table 01** reveal that the mean score favours government heads ($M=51.36$) which is higher than the private heads ($M=45.85$). The 't' value calculated came out to be significant at 0.01 level of confidence ($t=8.51$). From the results, it can be inferred that Government heads are flexible enough to arrive at correct decisions. They analyse thoroughly the situation and always consult the colleagues before taking any decision. Their decisions are tied down to the goals of their schools only and explore all the alternative choices of decision-making before taking a decision, while as the private heads make speedier decisions without analysing the problem skilfully and don't consider the plausible consequences before arriving at a decision.

However the results depicting in the **Table 01** reveal that both the groups (government and private heads) differ significantly on the composite score of administrative behaviour. The mean score of government heads ($M=316.53$) is higher than the private heads ($M=306.65$) and the obtained 't' value for each dimension of administrative behaviour came out to be significant at 0.01 level of confidence ($t=5.28$).

In the light of above results, the hypothesis No. 1 which reads as, "*There is a significant difference between the government and private administrators of the secondary schools*" stands accepted.

A perusal of the **Table 02** shows a significant difference between the senior and junior heads on various dimensions of Administrative Behaviour. The results reveal that the mean score of senior heads ($M=74.45$) on *Planning* is higher than that of the junior heads ($M=70.99$) and the calculated 't' value ($t=2.76$) is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The results reveal that both the groups (senior & junior) differ significantly on this dimension. It is obvious from the results that on *Organisation* dimension of administrative behaviour the mean score favours senior heads ($M=92.86$) which is higher than the junior heads ($M=91.16$) with a significant 't' value ($t=2.07$) at 0.01 level of confidence. It is clear that both the groups differ significantly on this dimension. Further the results reveal that on *Decision-making* dimension of administrative behaviour, the mean score of senior heads ($M=50.31$) is higher than the mean score junior heads ($M=46.83$) with a 't' value ($t=4.87$) which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It implies that senior and junior heads differ significantly on this dimension. From the results, it is obvious that the senior heads are more competent in planning, organisation and decision making dimensions of administrative behaviour than the junior heads. They plan their work-allotment for teachers and give due importance to co-curricular activities. They arrange the meetings with parents, teachers and look into the regularity of the students. They are more organised towards maintaining any work

effectively and make a reasonable time frame for the tasks to be accomplished. Senior heads avoid taking on more than they can handle and work steadily towards the achievement of their goals. Senior heads have a right work-life balance that helps them to organise the resources and events competently to achieve goals. While making a decision senior heads employ a practical method and optimise the best solution for the problem. They believe in team-work and constantly strive to build good relationships with colleagues, students and other community members. They possess a conceptual understanding of the decision-making and escalate worthy efforts from their colleagues. On the other hand, junior heads are found to be less competent in Planning, Organisation and Decision-making dimensions of administrative behaviour. They are less likely to give proper and efficient work allotment to teachers. They are less organised towards maintaining a right work-life balance. They are less likely to know their capability to handle more work.

However, it is evident from the results depicting in the **Table 02** that on *Communication* dimension of Administrative behaviour both the groups failed to reach any level of confidence. The results reveal that both the groups (senior & junior heads) choose proper communication channels & keep informed their staff on important issues. Both the groups state own thoughts clearly and briefly and exercise a professional approach with others.

In the light of above results the hypothesis No. 2 which reads as, “*There is a significant difference between the senior and junior administrators of secondary schools with respect to their experience.*” stands accepted.

IV. CONCLUSION

On the basis of interpretation and discussion of the results, it is concluded that government heads have good planning ability that guides them to make efficient and accurate decisions. Private heads though being good in organisation and communication fail to make productive suggestions, carry out plans, and derive effective decisions. As far as the experience is concerned, senior heads of both the government and private secondary schools are proficient in planning, organising and in decision-making than the junior heads. Hence experience plays an integral role in undertaking responsibilities, responding to the situations, organising the tasks effectively and analysing the problems skilfully.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Andero, A. (2000). The Changing Role of School Superintendent with Regard to Curriculum Policy and Decision-Making. *Education Review*, Vol. 121, No. 2, Pp. 276-286.
- [2.] DiPaola, M.F. & Hoy, W.K. (2014). Improving instruction through supervision, evaluation, and professional development. Information Age Publishing.
- [3.] Gmelch, W. H. (2000). Leadership succession: how new deans take charge and learn the job. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 3, Pp. 68-85.
- [4.] Gmelch, W. H. (2002). *The call for department leaders*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New York, NY.
- [5.] Chevaillier, T. (2002). Higher education and its clients: institutional responses to changes in demand and in environment. *Higher Education*, Vol. 33(6), 303-308.

- [6.] Gamage, D. T., & Mininberg, E. (2003). The Australian and American higher education: key issues of the first decade of the 21st century. *Higher Education*, Vol. 45(4), 183-202.
- [7.] Harman, G. (2002). Academic leaders or corporate managers: deans and heads in Australian higher education, 1977 to 1997. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, Vol.14(2), 53-70.
- [8.] Henkel, M. (2002). Academic identity in transformation? the case of the United Kingdom. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, Vol. 14(3), 137-147.
- [9.] Hess, F. M., & Kelly, A. P. (2005a). The accidental principal: What doesn't get taught at ed schools? *Education Next* Vol. 5(3), 34-40.
- [10.] Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (2000). *Managing organizational behaviour (Fifth Edition)*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.