Research Article

A STUDY OF PERSONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL CORRELATES OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR OF HEADS OF SCHOOLS

Dr. Noorjehan N. Ganihar * & Aravind V. Karabasanagoudra**

Abstract

The present study investigates the personal and institutional correlates of leadership behaviour among heads of secondary schools in Dharwad district. Using a descriptive survey method, a sample of 67 school heads and 450 assistant teachers was drawn from government, aided, and unaided schools. Standardized tools were employed to measure leadership behaviour, job satisfaction, personal effectiveness, organizational culture, and organizational climate. Findings revealed significant differences in leadership behaviour with respect to age, gender, educational qualification, teaching experience, and type of school management. Heads aged 49 years and above, males, graduates, and those with longer teaching experience exhibited higher scores on various dimensions of organizational climate and job satisfaction. Moreover, government school heads reported greater psycho-social job satisfaction compared to their counterparts in unaided institutions. Leadership styles also influenced outcomes, with initiating structure style being associated with higher job satisfaction and stronger organizational culture and climate. The study highlights the importance of strengthening leadership capabilities of school heads to enhance institutional effectiveness.

Keywords: *Leadership behaviour, School heads, Job satisfaction, Personal effectiveness, Organizational climate, Organizational culture, Secondary schools, Descriptive survey*

Introduction

Over the years, leadership has been studied extensively in various contexts and theoretical foundations. In some cases, leadership has been described as a process, but most theories and research on leadership look at it as a person to gain understanding.

Leadership is typically defined by the traits, qualities, and behaviours of a leader. The study of leadership has spanned across cultures, and theoretical beliefs. A summary of what is known and understood about leadership is important to proceed further research on the term leadership.

In a comprehensive review of leadership theories, several different categories were identified by Stogdill (1974) that capture the essence of the study of leadership in the twentieth century. The first category dealt with the attributes of great leaders. Leadership was explained by the internal qualities with which a person is born. The thought was that if the traits that differentiated leaders from followers could be identified, successful leaders could be quickly identified and put into positions of leadership. Personality, physical, and mental characteristics were examined. This research was based on the idea that leaders were born, not made, and the key to success was simply in identifying those people who were born to be great leaders. Through much research was done to identify the ?its, no clear answer was found with regard to which traits consistently were associated with great leadership. One flaw with this line of thought was in ignoring the situational and environmental factors that play a role in a leader's level of effectiveness.

Importance of the Head of the school as a leader in a secondary school situation has been discussed above at length. To emphasize it again, Head of secondary school owes a great responsibility to the nation in setting right the temples of learning where future of the youth is shaped. They play an important, predominant role in the making of these institutions. It is a common experience that, social climate of a secondary school is chiefly determined by leadership behaviour of its Head master. It is the Head of the school who mainly exerts leadership for the welfare of his school. But for his leadership, the secondary school cannot progress and show notable results. This suggests that there is an immediate need for research in this field. It is however, noted that in India, adequate attention has not so far been given to

the leadership behaviour of Head of schools. *Professor and Chairperson, Department of Education, Kamatak University, Dharwad - 580 001. **Research Fellow, Department of Education, Kamatak University, Dharwd - 580 001.

Concept of Leadership

Leadership has attracted the attention of sociologists, social psychologists, and political-. scientists in various contexts.

Now unanimity is however found on the precise meaning of the term among the different social scientists.

Bass (1985) referred leadership as; "Leadership is a kind of interaction between or among people. Any attempt on part of a group member to change the behaviour of one or more members of a group is an attempt at leadership".

In the words of Edinger (1967); "As scientists have probed beneath the manifest aspects of leadership and have become correspondingly more sensitive to the relevance of numerous, complex and latest facts, they have found it more difficult to agree as what leadership is and does". •

Katz and Khan (1978) maintain that, "The concept of leadership as generally understood in social sciences has three major meanings; the attribute of a position, the characteristics of a person, and a category of behavior".

Lippit and White (1939) have classified leaders into three main types, namely;

- autocratic or authoritarian
- democratic, and
- Laissez-faire or free reign.

An autocratic leader is a one-man bank. He is fully convinced that he alone can run the organization and that his subordinates are there merely to help him by doing what they are told. They should not, therefore, be permitted to act without his specific approval. In consequence, the special characteristics of such leaders are:

- Retention of maximum power in his own hands.
- Use of commands or direct, emphatic orders covering minute details, and
- Maintenance of close supervision.

The democratic leader realizes that his followers are indispensable for his success; so he wants to carry the group with him. His techniques of direction are calculated to evoke co

operation rather than mere obedience from the group. In making plans, in giving order, in involving policies he wants to keep the group in the picture as far as possible. He regards himself as one of the groups and not as a superior entirely apart.

The laissez-faire type of leader is hardly a leader. He does not try to make his presence felt. He lets the group function more or less on its own. He does not administer but leaves all responsibility and most of the work to his subordinates. He is a mere figurehead. At higher levels, if competent assistance is available, such a manager may be useful as an ornamental head. At lower levels, a laissez-faire type of leader cannot be very successful. As he hardly. gives any guidance and does not exercise any control over his subordinates, the subordinates just muddle on, virtually leaderless. In consequence, under free-rein management discipline is lax and efficiency at low ebb.

Thus, in autocracy the seat of responsibility is the leader; in democracy responsibility resides in the group; and under laissez-faire management it is distributed among the members as individuals.

Concept of Leadership Behavior

Leadership is of utmost importance in the development of any significant, ongoing movement, designed to improve social, economic, political and educational conditions in our society. Since 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 must be developed to the fullest degree possible.

We are living in the most exciting and challenging period of time in the whole history of the world; The challenge of this revolutionary period extends into all aspects of life. Education can no more remain complacent to the needs that such a challenge can resist the effect of the sun and rain at springtime. Our Educational structure, programmes, and practices must change. The rapidity and degree to which this ·change will occur are dependents upon the educational leaders at all levels of administration.

Two major dimensions of leadership behaviour are 'consideration' and 'initiating structure'.

Consideration:

'Consideration' refers to the extent to which leader is considerate towards subordinates and concerned about the quality of his or her relationship with subordinates. Leader behaviour included in the consideration dimension is friendliness, ·consultation with subordinates,

recognition of subordinates, open communication with subordinates, supportiveness and representative of subordinate interests.   •

Consideration refers to behaviour indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff.

Initiating Structure:

'Initiating Structure' refers to the extent to which a leader is task oriented and concerned with utilizing resources and personal effectively in order to accomplish group goals. Specific types of leader behaviour included in the initiating structure dimension include planning, co ordinating, directing, problem solving, classifying subordinate roles, criticizing poor work and pressurizing subordinates to perform more effectively.

Significance of the Study

Importance of the Head of the school as a leader in a secondary school situation has been discussed above at length. To emphasize it again, Head of secondary school owes a great responsibility to the nation in setting right the temples of learning where future of the youth is shaped. They play an important, predominant role in the making of these institutions. It is a common experience that, social climate of a secondary school is chiefly determined by leadership behaviour of its Head master. It is the Head of the school who mainly exerts leadership for the welfare of his school. But for his leadership, the secondary school cannot progress and show notable results. This suggests that there is an immediate need for research in this field. It is however, noted that in India, adequate attention has not so far been given to the leadership behaviour of Head of schools.

ltis of paramount importance to know about the leadership behaviour of secondary school Heads of the schools in terms of those traits and characteristics which go to make them effective leaders. It would be interesting to get answers to question like; how far is their leadership behaviour related to job satisfaction factors, personal effectiveness and how it helps in bringing about a congenial organizational climate and culture in the organization. Do male and female Heads differ significantly in their leadership behaviour? Is behaviour related to age, teaching experience, type of management of the school, administrative experience of the Heads of schools?

The Problem

The problem undertaken for the investigation can be stated as:

"A Study of Personal and Institutional Correlates of Leadership Behaviour of Heads of Schools".

Objectives

The Objectives are

- To study the relationship between leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) of Heads of schools and personal effectiveness and its dimensions
- To study the relationship between leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) of Heads of schools and organizational climate and its dimensions
- To study the relationship between leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) of Heads of schools and organizational culture and its dimensions
- To study the relationship between leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) and age of Heads of schools.
- To study the relationship between leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) and type of management of Heads of schools.
- To study the relationship between leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) and educational qualification of Heads of schools.

Hypotheses:

1. Heads of schools below 49 years and 49 and above years do not differ in their job satisfaction and its dimensions. (i) Job satisfaction (ii) Job concrete statements (iii) Job abstract statements {iv) Psycho-social (v) Economic and (vi) Community / national growth

2. Heads of schools below 49 years 49 and above years do not differ with respect to leadership behaviour and its dimensions. (i) Consideration (ii) Initiating structure.

3. Heads of schools below 49 years 49 and above years do not differ with respect to personal effectiveness and its dimensions (i) Self disclosure (ii) Openness to feed back (iii} Perceptiveness

4. Heads of schools below 49 years and 49 and above years do not differ with respect to organizational culture and its dimensions {i} Openness (ii) Confrontation (ii} Trust (iv) Authenticity (v) Pro-action (vi) Autonomy (vii) Collaboration (viii) Experimentation

5. Heads of schools below 49 years and 49 and above yeaIS do not differ with respect to organizational climate and its dimensions (i) Performance standards (ii) Communication flow (iii) Reward system (iv) Responsibility (v) Conflict resolution (vi) Organizational structure (vii) Motivational level (viii) Decision making Process (viii) Support system (ix) Warmth (x) Identity problem.

6. There is no significant difference between male and female Heads of schools with respect to job satisfaction and its dimensions

7. There is no significant difference between male and female Heads of schools with respect to leadership behaviour and its dimensions

8. There is no significant difference between male and female Heads of schools with respect to personal effectiveness and its dimensions

9. There is no significant difference between male and female Heads of schools with respect to organizational culture and its dimensions.

10. There is no significant difference between male and female Heads of schools with respect to organizational climate and its dimensions

11. Heads of schools with different years of teaching experience do differ in job satisfaction and its dimensions.

12. Heads of schools with different years of teaching experience do not differ in leadership behaviour and its dimensions

13. Heads of schools with different years of teaching experience do not differ in personal effectiveness and its dimensions

14. Schools under Heads with different years of teaching experience do not differ in organizational culture and its dimensions.

15. Schools under Heads with different years of teaching experience do not differ in organizational climate and its dimensions

16. UG and PG Heads of schools do not differ in job satisfaction and its dimensions

17. UG and PG Heads of schools do not differ in leadership behaviour and its dimensions

18. UG and PG Heads of schools do not differ in personal effectiveness and its dimensions

19. UG and PG Heads of schools do not differ in organizational culture and its dimensions

20. Schools under UG and PG Heads do not differ in organizational climate and its dimensions

21. Schools with Heads under different types of management (Government, Aided and Unaided) do not differ with respect to job satisfaction and its dimensions

22. Heads of schools under different types of management (government, Aided and Unaided) do not differ with respect to leadership behaviour and its dimensions

23. Heads of schools under different types of management (Government, Aided and Unaided) do not differ with respect to personal effectiveness and its dimensions

24. Schools with Heads under different types of management (Government, Aided and Unaided) do not differ with respect to organizational culture and its dimensions

25. Schools with Heads under different types of management (Government, Aided and Unaided) do not differ with respect to organizational climate and its dimensions

26. Heads of schools having different leadership behaviour (consideration and initiating structure) do not differ with respect to their job satisfaction (total) and its dimensions.

27. Heads of schools having different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) do not differ with respect to their personal effectiveness (total) and its dimensions.

28. Schools with Heads with different leadership 'behaviour .(initiating structure and consideration) do not differ with respect to the organizational culture (total) and its dimensions.

29. Schools with Heads different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) do not differ with respect to the organizational climate (total) and its dimensions.

Methodology

In the present investigation descriptive survey research method was employed.

Population and Sample

The population of the study consis1s of all Heads of schools and Assistant teachers who are working in secondary schools in Hubli-Dharwad.

The sample of the study was selected from Dharwad district. The investigator has used the stratified random sampling technique.

In Dharwad district presently there are 204 high schools in total (government, Aided, Un-aided) out of which 67 schools have been selected based on the total number of schools under each category of management (Government-IO, aided-37 and un-aided-20). The data was collected from 67 Heads of schools and 450 assistant teachers.

Tools Used

The following tools were used to measure the variables of the study.

1. Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire -by E. A. Fleishman (1973)

2. Job Satisfaction Scale by Amar Singh and T. R. Sharma (1999)

3. Personal Effectiveness Scale by Udai Pareek (2002)

4. Organizational Culture Scale (OCTAPACE Profile) by Udai Pareek (2002)

5. Organizational Climate Inventory by S. N. Chattopadhya and K G. Agarwal (1988).

Data Collection

The investigator personally collected the data from 67 Heads of secondary schools and 450 assistant teachers of Dharwad district. Heads of schools and assistant teachers were personally, administered the tools. Clear-cut instructions were given to fill up the responses to the items in the tools. The filled in proformas and tools were collected. The Heads of schools and assistant teachers was informed the purpose of the study. The Job Satisfaction Scale and Personal Effectiveness Scale were administered to the Heads of schools. The Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire, Organizational Cultural Scale (OCTOPACE Profile) and Organizational Climate Inventory were administered to the assistant teachers. The confidentiality of the responses was assured. The collected data was systematically pooled for analyses.

Statistical Techniques Used

The data was analyzed using differential statistics.

Table-1: Results oft-test Between Age of Heads of Schools and Organizational Climate and its Dimensions

Variable	Mean	Std.Dev	Mean	Std.Dev.	t-value	p-value	Sig.
Organizational climate	63.4238	2.8744	65.4083	2.2952	3.1428	<0.05	s
Dimensions Performance standards	60.2711	5.4241	63.0367	4.58	2.2607	<0.05	s
Responsibility	63.1478	5.0528	65.8392	5.7471	1.9996	<0.05	s

Decision making Process	61.4992	4.4237	64.2779	4.4738	2.5311	<0.05	s
Support system,	61.1205	4.2035	63.8744	4.5611	2.5322	<0.05	s
Warmth	64.4394	6.255	69.0924	5.9874	3.0915	<0.05	s

Heads of schools with below 49 and 49 and above years of age differ significantly with respect to their organizational climate (t=3.1428, <0.05) and its dimensions performance standards (t=2.2607), responsibility (t=1.9996), decision making process (t=2.5311), support system (t=2,5322) and warmth (t=3.0915) at0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypotheses accepted. Schools with Heads aged 49 and above are high on organizational climate and its dimensions - performance- standards, responsibility, decision making process,\support system and warmth when compared to schools with Heads aged below 49.

Table-2: Results oft-test Between Sex of Heads of Schools and Leadership Behaviour and its Dimensions

1. Male and female Heads of schools differ significantly with respect to second dimension of leadership behaviour initiating structure (t=2.1329, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis accepted. Male Heads of schools are high on initiating structure when compared to female Heads of schools. ·

Leadership behaviour							
Dimension							
Initiating structure	60.1282	16.6024	51.25	17.085	2.1329	<0.05	S

Table-3: Results of t-test Between Age of Heads of schools and Organizational Climate and its Dimensions

1. Schools with male and female Heads of schools differ significantly with respect to second dimension of organizational culture confrontation (t=2.5638, >0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis accepted. Schools with female Heads are high on organizational culture when compared to schools with

Organizational culture						
Dimension						
Confrontation	71.4241	3.8112	74.1751	4.97294	2.5638	<0.05	S

male Heads of schools.

Table-4: Results of t-test Between Age of Heads of Schools and Job Satisfaction and its Dimensions

1. Heads with schools with graduate and post graduate educational qualifications differ significantly with respect to third dimension of job satisfaction psycho-social (t=2.9202, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative

Job satisfaction						
Dimension						
Psycho-social	64.8849	14.9682	53.9871	15.3525	2.9202	<0.05	S

hypothesis is accepted. Graduate Heads of schools are high on job satisfaction dimension psycho-social when compared to post graduate Heads of schools.

Table-5: Results of ANOVA test Between Teaching Experience (0-15 years, 16-25 years and 25+ years) of Heads of Schools and Organizational Climate and its Dimensions

Schools with Heads with different teaching experiences (0-15years, 16-25 years and 25+years) differ significantly with respect to ninth dimension of organizational climate support system (f =4.3635, <0.05) at0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis

Variable	**ss Effect**	**df Effect**	**MS Effect**	**ss Error**	**df Error**	**MS Error**	**F-value**	**P-value**	**Sig.**
Organizational climate									
Dimension									
Support system,	166.7	2	83.3501	1222.51	64	19.1017	4.3635	<0.05	s

is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Table-6: Results of 't' test Between Teaching Experience of Heads of Schools and Organizational Climate Dimension Support System

A significant difference was observed between teachers with 1-15 years of teaching experience and 16-25 years of teaching experience with respect to support system scores

TE	Mean	SD	value	p-value	Sig.
1-15	59.8803	2.4642	2.6153	<0.05	s
16-25	63.3463	4.8329			
1-1525+	59.8803	2.4642	2.9875	<0.05	s
	63.7122	4.7860			

(t=Z.6153, <0.05, S) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. Schools with Heads with 16-25 years of teaching experience are high on the organizational climate dimension-support system when compared toschools with Heads with 1-15 years of teaching experience.

A significant difference was observed between Teachers with 1-15 years of teaching experience and more than 25 years of teaching experience With respect to support system scores (t=2.9875, <0.05, S) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. School with heads with more than 25 years of teaching experience are high on the organizational climate dimension-support system when compared to schools with Heads with 16-25 years of teaching experience.

Table-7: Results of ANOVA test Between Types of Management (Government, Aided and Unaided) of Heads of Schools and Job Satisfaction and its Dimensions

1. Heads with schools with graduate and post graduate educational qualifications differ

Job satisfaction								
Dimension								
Economic	2521.81	2	1260.9	24814	64	387.7153	3.2521	<0.05	s

significantly with respect to third dimension of job satisfaction psycho-social (t=2.9202, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. Graduate Heads of schools are high on job satisfaction dimension psycho-social when compared to post graduate Heads of schools.

Table-8: Results of 't' test between Types of Management (Government, Aided and Unaided) and Job Satisfaction Dimension-Psycho-Social

Types of management	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Sig.
Government	65.3409	11.6470	2.5759	<0.05	s
Unaided	47.1875	21.6007			

1. A significant difference was observed between government and unaided types of management with respect to psychosocial dimension of job satisfaction (t=2.5759, <0.05, S) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. Heads of government schools are high on the dimension of job satisfaction-psycho-social when compared to Heads of unaided schools.

Table-9: Results of ANOVA test Between Types of Management (Government, Aided and Unaided) of Heads of Schools and Organizational Climate and its Dimensions

Organizational climate								
Dimensions								
Support system	184.123	2	92.0617	1205	64	18.8295	4.8892	<0.05	S

1. Schools with Heads belonging to different types of management (government, aided and unaided) differ significantly with respect to the dimension of organizational climate support system (f =4.8892, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Table-10: Results oft-test between Types of Management (Government, Aided and Unaided) and Organizational Climate Dimension - Support System

Types of Management	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Sig.
Government	65.1381	3.9445	3.4155	<0.05	s

Unaided	60.3650	3.6038			
Aided	63.2196	4.7889	2.3218	<0.05	s
Unaided	60.3650	3.6038			

1. Schools with Heads belonging *to* different types of management (government, aided and unaided) differ significantly with respect to the dimension of organizational climate support system (t=3.4155, <0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. Government schools are high on support system dimension of organizational climate when compared to unaided schools.

2. Schools with Heads belonging to different types of management (government, aided and unaided) differ significantly with respect to the dimension of organizational climate support system (t=2.3218, <0.05) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. Aided schools are high on support system dimension of organizational climate when compared to unaided schools.

Variable	Initiating structure (n=37)		Consideration (n=30)		t-value	p-value	Sig.
	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.			
Job satisfaction	65.9581	8.8526	60.9828	8.8132	2.2827	<0.05	s
Job Concrete statements	62.5991	10.446	56.7778	10.3265	2.1409	<0.05	s
Community/ national growth	71.7568	14.9637	72	14.1177	2.2932	<0.05	s
Personal effectiveness	49.6351	6.7622	44.8333	8.0404	2.6077	<0.05	s

Self disclosure	53.1351	10.9638	59.000	11.8734	2.0803	<0.05	s
Perceptiveness	68.8378	12.4116	63.3333	8.0297	2.1908	<0.05	s
Organizational culture	72.6725	3.3031	70.5248	2.5498	3.0027	<0.05	s
Authenticity	69.454	4.7978	72.9822	5.6883	2.7055	<0.05	s
Pro-action	4.0927	5.9032	70.5382	5.5891	2.5241	<0.05	s
Autonomy	69.9367	6.7935	73.2337	5.9093	2.1231	<0.05	s
Organizational climate Inventory	63.4966	3.0178	65.6143	2.3704	3.2166	<0.05	s
Performance standards	60.4937	4.895	63.4997	4.9599	2.4814	<0.05	s
Communication flow·	61.5875	4.8784	63.5676	2.0437	2.2385	<0.05	s
Reward system	69.6707	7.7009	65.4681	7.0578	2.3265	<0.05	s
Conflict resolution	63.5925	4.7695	60.5963	4.7034	2.5766	<0.05	s
Organizational structure	62.1454	4.0343	64.5674	4.9453	2.1619	<0.05	s

Support system	63.9312	4.2842	61.129	4.9544	2.4443	<0.05	s
Identity problem	71.3448	7.2448	75.9731	5.9954	2.8612	<0.05	s

Table-11: Results of t-test between leadership Behaviour (Initiating Structure and Consideration) of Heads and Job Satisfaction (Total)

1. Schools with Heads having different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to their job •satisfaction (t=2.2827, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on job satisfaction when compared to teachers with consideration leadership behaviour.

2. Heads of schools having different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly on the first dimension of job satisfaction job concrete statements (t=2.1409, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis accepted. Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on job concrete dimension of job satisfaction when compared to Heads having consideration leadership behaviour.

3. Heads of schools having different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to the last dimension of job satisfaction community/national growth (t=2.2932, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis.is rejected. Heads having consideration leadership behaviour are high on community/ national growth dimension of job satisfaction when compared to Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

4. Heads of schools having different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to their personal effectiveness (t=2.6077, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads having initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on personal effectiveness when compared to Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.

5. Heads of schools having different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to the third dimension of personal effectiveness perceptiveness (t=2.1908, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads having initiating structure leadership style are high on perceptiveness when compared to Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.

6. Heads of schools having different leadership behaviour {initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to the organizational culture (t=3.0027, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on organizational culture when compared toschools with Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.

7. Heads of schools with different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to the fourth dimension of organizational culture authenticity (t=2.7055, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Schools with Heads high on consideration leadership behaviour are high on authenticity dimension of organizational culture when compared toSchools with Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

8. Heads of schools with different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to the fifth dimension of organizational culture pro-action (t=2.5241, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Schools with Heads high on initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on pro-action dimension of organizational culture when compared toschools with Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.

9. Heads of schools with different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect *to* the sixth dimension of organizational culture autonomy (t=2.1231, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads high on consideration behaviour of leadership are high on autonomy dimension of organizational culture when compared to schools with Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

10. Heads of schools with different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to the organizational climate

(t=3.2166, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on organizational climate when compared *to* schools with Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.

11. Heads of Schools with different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to the first dimension of organizational climate performance standards (t=2.4814, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads with consideration leadership behaviour are high on performance standards dimension of organizational climate when compared to Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

12. Heads of Schools with different leadership ·behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to the second dimension of organizational climate communication flow (t=2.4814, <0.05) at 0.-05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads having consideration leadership behaviour are high on communication flow dimension of organizational climate when compared toschools with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

13. Schools with Heads with different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect *to* the third dimension of organizational climate reward system (t=2.3265, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads having consideration leadership behaviour are high

14. on reward system dimension of organizational climate when compared to schools with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

15. Schools with Heads with different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration differ significantly with respect to the fifth dimension of organizational climate conflict resolution (t=2.5766, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads having initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on conflict resolution dimension of organizational climate when compared to schools with Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.·

16. Schools with Heads with different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to the sixth dimension of organizational climate organizational structure (t=2.1619, <0.05) at·0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads having consideration leadership behaviour

are high on organizational structure dimension of organizational climate when compared to schools with Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

17. Schools with Heads with different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to the ninth dimension of organizational climate support system (t=Z.4443, <0.05) at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads having initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on support system when compared to schools with Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.

18. Schools with Heads with different leadership behaviour (initiating structure and consideration) differ significantly with respect to the eleventh dimension of organizational climate identity problem (t=2.4443, <0.05} at 0.05% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Heads having consideration leadership behaviour are high on identity problem when compared to schools with Heads having with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

.**Major Findings**

1. Schools with Heads aged 49 and above are high on organizational climate and its dimensions- performance standards, responsibility, decision making process, support system and warmth when compared to schools with Heads aged below 49. ,.

2. Male Heads of schools are high on initiating structure when compared to female Heads of schools.

3. Schools with female Heads are high on organizational culture when compared to schools with male Heads of schools.

4. Schools with Heads with 16-25 years of teaching experience are high on the organizational climate dimension-support system when compared to schools with Heads with 1-15 years of teaching experience.

5. Schools with Heads with more than 25 years of teaching experience are high on the organizational climate dimension-support system when compared to schools with Heads with 16-25 years of teaching experience.

6. Graduate Heads of schools are high on job satisfaction dimension- psycho-social when compared to post graduate Heads of schools.

7. Heads of government schools are high on the dimension of job satisfaction-psycho social when compared to Heads of unaided schools.

8. Government schools are high on support system dimension of organizational climate when compared to unaided schools.

9. Aided schools are high on support system dimension of organizational climate when compared to unaided schools.

10. Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on job satisfaction when compared to teachers with consideration leadership behaviour.

11. Schools with Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on job concrete dimension of job satisfaction when compared to Heads having consideration leadership behaviour.

12. Heads having consideration leadership behaviour are high on community/ national growth dimension of job satisfaction when compared to Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

13. Heads having initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on personal effectiveness when compared to Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.

14. Heads having consideration leadership behaviour are high on self-disclosure when compared to Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

15. Heads having initiating structure leadership style are high on perceptiveness when compared to Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.

16. Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on organizational culture when compared to schools with Heads with consideration leadership behaviour. .

17. Heads high on consideration leadership behaviour are high on authenticity dimension of organizational culture when compared to schools with Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

18. Heads high on initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on pro-action dimension of organizational culture wh?:1 compared to schools with Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.

19. Heads high on consideration behaviour of leadership are high on autonomy dimension of organizational culture when compared to schools with Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

20. Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on organizational climate when compared to schools with Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.

21. Schools with consideration leadership behaviour are high on performance standards dimension of organizational climate when compared to schools with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

22. Heads having consideration leadership behaviour are high on communication. flow dimension of organizational climate when compared to schools with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

23. Heads having consideration leadership behaviour are high on reward system dimension of organizational climate when compared to schools with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

24. Heads having initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on conflict resolution dimension of organizational climate when compared to schools with Heads. with consideration leadership behaviour.

25. Heads having consideration leadership behaviour are high on organizational structure dimension of organizational climate when compared to schools with Heads with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

26. Heads having initiating structure leadership behaviour are high on support system when compared to schools with Heads with consideration leadership behaviour.

27. Heads having consideration leadership behaviour are high on identity problem when compared to schools with Heads having with initiating structure leadership behaviour.

Conclusions of the Study

1. In conclusion, the present study shows that the institutional and personal correlates of the leadership behaviour of the Heads of the schools are due to the influence of job satisfaction, personal effectiveness and organizational climate and organizational culture of the schools. The effective leadership behaviour, the impact *of* organizational culture and climate would lead not only to better performance of school students and teachers but also good quality education.

2. Whatever is leadership behaviour of the Heads, it needs to be effective. The study reveals that any leadership behaviour of a Head of school will affect any member of school in one way or the other; only the degree of influence differs. The Heads of all

sorts either from rural or urban areas should realize the significance and importance of the role in improving the organizational culture and organizational climate as well as their job satisfaction and personal effectiveness.

3. This study has been very much helpful in understanding how the leadership behaviour has an impact oh the personal and institutional correlates of the Heads of schools. According to Halpin (195 7) "the Principal must be a good leader, approachable as well as open minded, able to bring out the best in others and tap their strength to enhance the operation of the school".

4. Today it is the competitive world. The competitive spirit is felt everywhere and anywhere. This type of situation compels the present Heads of schools to work more enthusiastically and also efficiently. It is said, healthier the organizational dynamics of an institution, greater the degree of teachers trusts in the Heads, trust in the colleagues and trust in the organization itself.

5. In the light of the present study, the researcher desires that Heads of schools through their strategic leadership behaviour develop their personal effectiveness and job satisfaction and improve the organizational culture and organizational climate of the institution in order to make the organizations effective and efficient.

References

♣ Airan, J. W. (1969) The Nature of Leadership. A Practical Approach. Bombay: Lalvani Publishing House.

♣ Allen L. A. (1974) *The Management Profession.* New York: McGraw Hill, Pp.134.

♣ Andrews, R. and Bamburg, J. (1990) School Goals, Principles and Achievement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement.*

♣ Argyris, C. (1958) Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate. A Case Study of a Bank Administrative. Science *Quarterly,* 2, March.

♣ Askins, G. J. (2002) Teachers' Perceptions of the Instructional Leadership Role of the Principal in the Implementation of the Virginia Standards of Learning. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 63 (6) Pp. 2051-A.

♣ Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J. S. (1964) *The Managerial Grid.* Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.

- Bogardus, J. W. (1969) *The Nature of Leadership Practical Approaches.* Bombay: Lalvani Publishing House.

- Chattopadhya, S. N. and Agarwal, K G. (1988) *Manual for Organizational Climate Inventory.* Agra: National Psychological Corporation.

- Edinger, J. L. (1967) *Political Leadership in Industrialized Societi?.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- Ellison, R. L. , McDonald, B.; James, L. Fox, and Taylor, C. W. (1968) *An Investigation of Organizational Climate.* Greensboro, N.C: Richardson Foundation.

- Gibb, J. R. (1967) *Dynamics of Leadership. In Search of Leaders,* Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association.

- Hallinger, P. and Murphy, J. (1985) Assessing the Instructional Management Behaviour of Principals. *Elementary School Journal.*

- John, M. Briener (1927) Cause for Discharge. *Person Journal,* 6,348, Pp. 171-172.

- Jones, J., Salisbury, J., Spencer, J., Ralph, L., (1969) *Secondary School Administration.* New York: McGraw hill Book Co.,

- Pelz, D. C. (1966) *Scientists* in *Organizations.* New York: McGraw Hill.

- Pigors, P. (1935) *Leadership of Domination.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.,

- Singh, A and Sharma, T. R. (1999) *Manual for Job Satisfaction Scale.* Agra: National Psychological Corporation.

- Stogdill, R. M. (1948) Personal Factors Associated with Leadership. A Survey of the Literature, *Journal* of *Psychology,* 25, Pp. 35-71.

- Stogdill, R. M. (1974) *Handbook of Leadership.* New York: Free Press.