

Decision Making Style of Secondary School Head Masters with Reference to Their Length of Service

Abstract

The main purpose of the study was to examine the decision making style of secondary school headmasters with reference to their length of service. The sample of two hundred (200) headmasters was drawn through systematic random sampling technique from different government secondary schools of the Kashmir Valley. Decision making style scale developed by Ganihar (2005) was administrated to collect data from sample subjects. Collected data was analyzed with the help of Mean, S.D, & Test of significance. The results of the study revealed that senior headmasters are applying heuristic type of decision as compared to junior headmasters who were observed in routine decision making styles. The study further revealed that length of service has no impact on making the compromise style of decisions as both the groups of headmasters are applying compromise type of decisions as far as it benefits the school.

Keywords: Decision Making Style, Secondary Schools, Headmasters, Length of Service.

Introduction

The headmaster is the major component of any educational enterprise. Everything in the school plant- the staff, the curriculum, methods and techniques of teaching, co-curricular activities, human relationships bear the impression of the personality of the headmaster. The headmaster is believed to be the keystone in the arch of school administration. He is the hub round whom the educational efforts revolve. He is a group leader who knows how to involve people, how to arrange conditions and initiate processes that will bring out the best in each participant. The Headmaster is the group leader to direct and stimulate group effort. In the school management, the headmaster occupies a unique position. Decision-making is the selection of an alternative, from two or more alternatives to determine and opinion or a course of action. A decision is the selection of a course of action from two or more alternatives; the decision making process is sequence of steps leading to that selection (Williams, 2007). Educational institutions are complex organizations in the sense that they deal with human beings at every level. The input (students), the process (rules and regulations), as well as the output (learning outcomes), all are human beings. Therefore, the headmaster who manages the educational organization should have a deep and expert knowledge of decision- making.

Review of Literature

Decision-making is the most crucial aspect of educational administration. Research suggests that decision-making is one of the salient factors upon which the survival of any organization is based. Decision making is affected directly by leadership style and interpersonal communication Syarif (2014). Leadership skills needed by principals for effective administration include among others: principal co-operating with teachers to define objectives, principal providing facilities, supervising lesson plans, teaching and learning activities, evaluating curriculum plan and implementation (Oluwadare, et al., 2011). Kumar (2010) found that aided schools head leadership behaviour was better than the Government schools head leadership behavior & unaided schools head leadership behaviour was better than the Government schools heads leadership behaviour. Roelle (2010) confirmed that principals who rated their own job satisfaction and efficacy as high gave their superintendent a high rating on their decision making potential. Dunham (1995) asserts that the wellbeing of all the school community members and the survival of the school heavily



Hakeem Sayar Ahmad Shah

Research Scholar,
Faculty of Education,
University of Kashmir,
Srinagar

depended upon the decision-making skills of managers. For this reason, the most critical task in an organization is the process of deciding a desirable course of action. Therefore, headmasters in educational organizations should have a profound knowledge of decision-making, and be able to make effective decisions. According to George and Jones (2000) "the success of any organization depends on managers' abilities to make effective decisions". The concept of decision-making consists of decision taking and decision-making process. A decision is judgment. It is a choice between two or more alternatives. This definition implies three things: 1) when managers make decisions they are choosing. 2) managers have alternatives available when they are making a decision and 3) managers have a purpose in mind when they make a decision. Decisions are not made in vacuum. There is an orderly process underlying decision-making. According to (Glueck 2006), decision making is the process of thought and deliberation that leads to a decision. Kumar (2010) found that aided schools head leadership behaviour was better than the Government schools head leadership behaviour & unaided schools head leadership behaviour was better than the Government schools heads leadership behaviour. Roelle (2010) confirmed that principals who rated their own job satisfaction and efficacy as high gave their superintendent a high rating on their decision making potential. Decision-making is considered as an indispensable component of management process and headmasters' life is filled with making decisions after decisions. They see decision making as their central job. Since decisions making involves one's competence, his personality make up, besides administrative orientation. For that the head of institution should possess a balanced type of personality which helps him to accommodate all quires as an when a particular situation allows them to rise.

Statistical Analysis

Table 1: Showing the Significance of difference between the Mean scores of Senior and Junior High School Headmasters on various dimensions of Decision Making Style (N=100 each).

Dimension	Group*	N	Mean	S.D	't'-Value	Result															
Routine	SH	100 Each	05.830	5.500	2.860	0.01 level															
	JH		08.300	6.615			Compromise	SH	16.770	4.978	0.557	Not Significant	JH	17.140	4.401	Heuristic	SH	25.400	6.334	3.211	0.01 level
Compromise	SH		16.770	4.978	0.557	Not Significant															
	JH		17.140	4.401			Heuristic	SH	25.400	6.334	3.211	0.01 level	JH	22.560	6.174						
Heuristic	SH		25.400	6.334	3.211	0.01 level															
	JH		22.560	6.174																	

* SH-Senior Headmasters
JH-Junior Headmasters

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the decision making style of senior and junior Secondary School Headmasters.
2. To compare senior and junior Secondary School Headmasters on various dimensions of decision making style.

Study Duration

The duration of this study is from year 2015 to year 2017.

Hypothesis

Senior school headmasters differ significantly from Junior Secondary School Headmasters on various dimensions of decision making style.

Operational Definition of Variables

Decision Making Style

Decision-making style in the present study refers to the dominant set of scores as measured by the Decision Making Scale designed by Ganihar, N.

Length of Service

Length of Service in the present investigation means the number of years put in the service career by the sample subjects. Subjects with more than eight years and less than five years of field experience have been considered as senior and junior headmasters respectively.

Sample

The sample for the present investigation consisted of (200) headmasters drawn from various high schools of Kashmir Valley by adopting systematic random sampling technique.


Tool Used

Decision Making Style Scale developed by Ganihar (2005).

Statistical Treatment

The collected information was subjected to statistical treatment by calculating mean, SD, and test of significance.

Fig. I: Showing the Mean Comparison of Senior and Junior High School Headmasters on Decision Making Style (N=100 each)



Discussion and Interpretation of Results

The results presented in the table 1 shows significance of difference between the mean scores of senior and junior headmasters on routine dimension of decision making style. The mean score in case of senior headmasters is reported to be lower (M=5.830) than junior ones (M=8.300). The obtained ‘t’ value was found to be 2.860 which is significant at 0.01. From these results it can be inferred that junior headmasters are taking routine type of decisions while solving Entrepreneurial, Administrative, Academic and Personnel problems as compared to senior headmasters. They take Routine decisions to keep the institution going. This type of decision is programmed. They are in favour of traditional methods and are not taking the step of making any change.

On compromise dimension of decision making scale the mean scores in case of senior headmasters was found to be (M=16.770) than junior headmasters (M=17.140). The obtained ‘t’ value came out to be 0.557 which failed to arrive at any level of significance. The results reveal that junior and senior headmasters equally apply compromise decisions while solving entrepreneurial, administrative, and academic and personnel problems. It can be concluded that length of service do not matter in taking the decisions of compromising nature. Both the groups of headmasters are taking the compromising decisions as far as they benefit the institution.

On heuristic dimension of decision making style the results show significance of difference between the mean scores of senior and junior headmasters on Heuristic component of decision making. The mean score of senior headmasters is higher (M=25.00) than the mean score of junior ones (M=22.00). The obtained ‘t’ value is reported to be 3.211 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The results further reveal that senior headmasters are in favour of Heuristic type of decisions as compared to their counterparts. This type of decision the emotional and social tone is relatively relaxed; openness, originality and seeking of consensus are the essentials of Heuristic decision-making. In nutshell this type of decision is creative. In heuristic decisions there is lack of emphasis on hierarchical structure,

role behaviour is characterized by freedom for each individual to explore all ideas .The emotional and social tone is relatively relaxed; openness, originality and seeking of consensus are the essentials of heuristic decision making. In nutshell it is a creative type of decision.

In view of the above mentioned results the hypothesis which reads as:

“Senior school headmasters differ significantly from junior school headmasters on various dimensions of decision making styles” stands partially retained.

The findings are in conformity with the findings of some earlier researchers in the field (Syarif, 2014; Oluwadare, *et al.* 2011; Kumar, 2010; Roelle, 2010; Ejimofor 2007; Antoinette & Love (2000). The findings are in conformity with the findings of some earlier researchers in the field (Syarif, 2014; Oluwadare, *et al.* 2011; Kumar, 2010; Roelle, 2010; Ejimofor 2007; Antoinette & Love (2000)Syarif (2014) found that the principals’ decision making is affected directly by leadership style and interpersonal communication. Oluwadare, *et al.* (2011) concluded that the instructional leadership skills needed by principals for effective administration include among others: principal co-operating with teachers to define objectives, principal providing facilities, supervising lesson plans, teaching and learning activities, evaluating curriculum plan and implementation. Kumar (2010) found that aided schools head leadership behaviour was better than the Government schools head leadership behavior & unaided schools head leadership behaviour was better than the Government schools heads leadership behaviour. Roelle (2010) confirmed that principals who rated their own job satisfaction and efficacy as high gave their superintendent a high rating on their decision making potential. Ejimofor (2007) found principals’ that decision making styles significantly effects teachers’ job satisfaction. Antoinette and Love (2007) found that teachers’ length of service did not have any significant effect on the principal’s perceived leadership effectiveness and decision making behavior.

Conclusions

On the basis of interpretation and discussion of the results, following conclusions were drawn:

1. It has been observed that junior headmasters apply Routine type of decisions while solving Entrepreneurial, Administrative, Academic and Personnel problems as compared to senior headmasters.
2. Both the groups (senior and junior headmasters) apply Compromise decisions while solving Entrepreneurial, Administrative, Academic and Personnel problems to an equal extent. On this basis, it is concluded that Length of Service has no impact in taking compromise nature of decisions.
3. It has been found that senior headmasters are applying Heuristic decisions to solve Entrepreneurial, Administrative, Academic and Personnel problems as compared to junior headmasters. Senior headmasters are reported to be inclined to good and cordial relations with students. Their decisions are based on fact finding lines. Senior headmasters are seen to be in favour of engaging the students in seminars, library work and self-study along with organizing group discussions for teachers

References

1. Antoinette and Love, (2007). *Teacher's Perception of the Leadership Effectiveness of Female and Male Principals*. ETD Coll. for Tennessee State University.
2. Bhatnagar, R. P. and Agrawal, V. (1997). *Educational Administration, Supervision Planning and Financing*, Meerut: Surya Publications, p.512.
3. Dunham, J. (1995). *Developing Effective School Management*. N. York: USA.
4. Ejimofor, F.O. (2007). *Principals Transformation Leadership Skills and Their Teacher's Job Satisfaction in Nigeria*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis Cleveland State University.
5. Ganihar, N. J. (2005). *Decision Making Style Scale*. Catalogue. Agra: National Psychological Corporation Kacheri Ghat Agra (India).
6. George, J. M., and Jones, G. R. (2000). *Essentials of Managing Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
7. Glueck, W.F. (2006). *Decision Making: Organization Choice*. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 27, No. 1. Pp.77-79.
8. Griffith, J. (2004). *Relation of Principal Transformational Leadership to School Staff, Job Satisfaction, Staff Turnover and School Performance*. *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 42, No. 3, Pp. 333-356.
9. Kumar, U. (2010). *A Study of College Principal's Administrative Effectiveness in Relation to their Work Values, Attitudes and Self Concept*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Education, Meerut University (India).
10. Nelson, D. L., and Quick, J.C. (2009). *Organizational Behavior: Science, the Real World and You* (6th ed.). United States: South-Western Cengage Learning.
11. Oluwadare, et al. (2011). *Administrative Competency needs of Principals for Affective UBE Administration at JSS Level in North West Geo – Political Zone of Nigeria*. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, Vol. 1, No.3.
12. Roelle, R. J. (2010). *Better School Superintendents, more Effective Principals: a Study of the Relationship between Superintendent Leadership Practices and Principal Job Satisfaction*. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 52, No. 02, P. 612.
13. Syarif, H. (2014). *Analysis of the Emotional Intelligence Influences, Leadership Style and Interpersonal Communication of the Decision Making by Principals of State Junior High Schools in South Jakarta*. *International Journal of Latest Research in Science and Technology*. Vol. 3, No. 4: Pp. 22-30.
14. Williams, G.J (2007). *HR practices, Organizational Climate and Employee Outcomes: Evaluating Social Exchange Relationships in Local Government*. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* pp. 1627-1.