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THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

Education is a central agency in shaping the future of the individuals and the nation. Long ago, Plato observed "The quality of the citizens depends upon the education that is imparted to them." It has been a vital force in the regeneration of nations.

Education has been the basic institution of society throughout the ages. Educationists have defined it in a number of ways, but by and large it means an acquisition of knowledge and experience as well as the development of skills, habits and attitudes which help a person lead a worthwhile life in the world. In fact, it is the process of training the individual so as to draw out the best in him.

Education in the nineteenth century tended to be equated with instruction in the elements of three R's. Twentieth century is characterised by new ideals and their practices in all walks of life. Education
too has come out of its narrow walls of subjectivity and reflects in the total personality of the individual.

In so far as good education is recognised as the basis of adequate individual and social development, need for research in education to improve educational practices and policies is being increasingly recognised. The educationists are constantly searching for more effective methods of instruction, more satisfactory techniques of evaluation, richer learning materials, more comfortable physical facilities, more efficient systems of administration and so on. This search is assuming greater urgency because of the very rapid expansion and democratization of education throughout the world.

Recently there has been a lot of hue and cry over the deteriorating situation in educational institutions. Some educationists hastily concluded that whole educational system itself is a failure. Adequate accommodation, furniture, laboratory facilities and other equipment are lacking in almost all schools.

Ever since the finding of the Mudaliar Commission that the existing system was stereo-typed, monotracked,
examination-ridden and otherwise not suitable, it was recommended that diversified courses to cater to the needs of all students be introduced. In view of all the criticism, a few modifications were made in our state in 1963, after an appraisal of the system.

The deterioration of academic standards in our schools has posed a serious problem to all parents, teachers, educationists and administrators. Most of the parents and many educational administrators held teachers responsible for mass failures in the examinations. On the other hand, teachers point to the numerous handicaps under which they have to operate, such as large classes, excessive teaching load, heavy courses of study, too many extra-curricular activities, unsystematic classification and so on.

There is need for investigation, because of the growing realization among educationists that a good school administration is vital to achieve the aims of education and the educational administration involves new knowledge which leads to new insights into administrative behaviour. Administration in modern times has become more and more complex and scientific. The new principles of administration based on various researches are advanced and changes are made to
implement these principles. Fayol (1949) advanced the search for age-old principles of administration given by Wilson (1887) when he defined administration comprising of five "elements" namely (i) to plan, (ii) to organise, (iii) to command, (iv) to co-ordinate, and (v) to control. Fayol identified fourteen "principles" out of which unit of command, authority, initiative and morale, were considered to be more important. As the study of the problems of organization, management and administration was established more and more firmly in the educational institutions, these principles received increased attention and challenge from scholars and investigators.

Educational administration was affected very little by the evolution of administration as a field of study until the middle of this century. A little research in educational administration dealt with testing of theoretical propositions none of which involved the insights and research methods that had been developed by behavioural scientists. The current excitement arises from the fact that within recent years educational administration has become a field of study and development as well as a vocation.
The present-day organization has become more scientific and complex and represents some kind of synthesis of the two concepts, that is formal organization and informal organization. More recently a more appropriate term "scientific management" has been in vogue. New theories of management have been advanced, of which social system theory has made important contribution. The social system theory as a way of understanding school organization provides for two types of systems "open" and "closed." A closed system is independent of its environment whereas an open system is characterised by an input-output relationship with its environment. Griffiths (1964) gave the distinguishing characteristics of an open system such as maintenance of steady state, self-regulating and system of feedback. Therefore, a school exists in a large environment which is composed of social and physical elements. Principals and teachers are often concerned with maintaining their legitimate authority and defending their place in school situation when parental interest is interpreted as a challenge. Therefore, a school organization has certain role structure and expectations which may be called nomothetic dimensions of the organization. An
organization establishes roles and the incumbents of an institution are expected to exhibit the kind of behaviour which will contribute to the goals of organization. The individuals also have their own personality structure and needs and they occupy various institutional roles which represent the idiographic dimensions of the organization. It is the mechanism of effective organization by which the needs of the institution and the needs of the individuals are modified so that they come together in one compact working group. Getzels (1960) gave the dimensions of the school social system and remarked that the shaping the institutional role, the development of a climate within the social system and the very personality of the participants all dynamically interact with one another.

Litchfield (1956) sees administration as a cycle of activities which begins and ends with decision making. Although school administrators have always been expected to be decisive and to make reasonable adequate decisions, little attention has been devoted to systematic study and teaching in this area. There is a systematic relationship which exists between certain personality characteristics of principals
and the way they perform their jobs. Hemphill and others (1962) confirmed that the principal's personality has a dynamic influence on the administration of a school. To facilitate higher morale, the teachers should be given the privilege of contributing their ideas to the formulation of general policy structure of the school. Minser and others (1963) have advocated that the principal must involve the teaching staff in decision-making so that they feel concerned about the execution of such decisions. In addition to decision-making, the role of the principal as a leader occupies an important place in the school administration. He is supposed to motivate and move the organizational machinery as a whole to achieve the laid down goals.

Ever since the development of modern psychology as a discipline, considerable effort has been made to pursue studies of leadership, and to identify the traits that contribute to leadership ability.

**DYNAMICS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE**

Any one who visits more than a few schools notes quickly how schools differ from one another in their 'feel.' In one school, the teachers and principal are zestful and exude confidence in what they are doing. They find pleasure in working with each other. This
pleasure is transmitted to the students, who thus are given at least a fighting chance to discover that school can be a happy experience. In a second school, the brooding discontent of teachers is palpable, the principal tries to hide his incompetence and his lack of a sense of direction behind the cloak of authority and yet he wears this cloak poorly because the attitude he displays to others vacillates randomly between the absequious and the officious. And the psychological sickness of such a faculty spills over on the students who, in their own frustration, feed back to the teachers a mood of despair. A third school is marked by neither joy nor despair, but by hallow ritual. Here one gets the feeling of watching an elaborate charade in which teachers, principal, and students alike are acting out parts. And so, too, as one moves to other schools, one finds that each appears to have a "personality" of its own. It is this "personality" that we describe as the organizational climate of the school.

As discussed above, we find that there is a great difference in schools, not only in their buildings and composition of students but also in their own individuality and uniqueness. This individuality and
uniqueness may be called as the environment of a school, tone of a school, the school's climate or personality of the school. In one school, we find that the staff is relaxed and at ease with each other, whereas in another school, we find tension, factions, and the teachers show worry on their faces. In some of the schools, the principal seems to emphasize his authority and status, always stressing formality and correctness in dealing with others and may give the impression of being too busy to give much personal attention to any individual. These are the differences which characterise the psychological environment. Argyris (1964) has called it the living system of organization which are the domains of organizational climate. Analogously, Halpin (1966) states "personality is to the individual, what organizational climate is to the organization."

The term "organizational climate" has been given somewhat more precise meaning in recent years through the contribution of a number of researches. Argyris (1964) is generally credited with the first attempt to describe systematically the factors which comprise organizational climate in the study of organizational relationship in a bank. The main emphasis of recent
research supports the view that organizational behaviour in a general way can be seen as a function, a dynamic inter-relationship between the needs of the individual and the needs of the organization as they are expressed by demands on the individual. The popular "Gotzels-Gube-Model" which describes the inter-connection between the organizational dimensions and personal dimensions, has paved to be a useful framework for expressing one way of viewing this concept. Chris (1957) has argued that the individual needs cannot be totally congruent with the demands of the organization and suggests that it is important to find ways to manage this inevitable conflict and keep it within tolerable bounds. Etzioni (1961) contends that the conflict between individual needs and organizational demands will depend, to a considerable extent, upon how the organization attracts participants and keeps them involved.

The unique contribution of research on organizational climate has been to provide us with (i) dimensions along which we may take measurements of certain factors which make up the climate of an organization's environment and (ii) normative data from many schools which enables us to determine more
accurately where a given school stands in comparison with others.

The assessment of organizational climate may very readily be used as one measuring criterion of a school. By knowing the results only the principal can think of any improvement, if possible. Organizational data can be extremely useful in a practical way if (i) it is not construed to be a test or a criterion measure in the judgmental or evaluative sense, (ii) if it is preferred to the school staff as feedback for their analysis, evaluation, discussion. If there is concern among teachers about organizational effectiveness of the school, then there is a need for more adequate feedback about the consequence of their actions. If the staff is expressing concern about the organisational effectiveness, communicate failures, bickering, tension between faction's or confusions over goals and policies, it is showing some recognition of the fact that problems do exist and some one interested in doing something about these problems. In a school the discussion of organizational data by the administrators and teachers permit them to open up discussion of sensitive matters which would otherwise be very difficult to deal with from objective point of view.
**Leadership Behaviour**

Besides studies on organizational climates, research on leadership behaviour is also important for on what kind of leadership a school head provides depends the efficiency of the school and its contribution to education. Also leadership behaviour is an important determinant of school climate. We can increase our understanding of leadership phenomena if we abandon the notion of leadership as a trait, and concentrate instead upon an analysis of "the behaviour of leaders." In education, we often confuse leadership with sheer bigness. But this use of the term applies equally to either things or people and fails to take into account the central psychological characteristic of leader behaviour. The behaviour of the leader and the behaviour of group members are inextricably interwoven and the behaviour of both is determined to a great degree by formal requirements imposed by the institution of which the group is a part. For example, a teacher is formally designated leader of the children in his class. How he behaves as a leader is influenced by the behaviour of the children. Moreover, his behaviour is conditioned by the policies and regulations of the particular school system in which he is employed.
The research on leader behaviour shows that effectiveness in respect to one criterion of leadership is not necessarily correlated with effectiveness in regard to the other criteria. For example, the behaviour of a leader who is effective in maintaining high morale and good human relations within the group is not necessarily effective in accomplishing high production and goal achievement.

Stogdill has shown that the trait approach to leadership, as it has been used in most studies reported in the literature, has yielded negligible, and often contradictory results. Sanford has summarized that (a) there are either no general leadership traits or if they do exist, they are not to be described in any of our familiar psychological or common sense terms, (b) in a specific situation, leaders do have traits which set them apart from followers, but what traits set what leaders apart from what followers will vary from situation to situation.

In short, the behaviour of leaders varies widely from one leadership situation to another. In this connection, Hemphil, in an elaborate and careful study has demonstrated empirically that variance in leader behaviour is significantly associated with situational
variance. Hemphill has analysed in detail the relation between the leader's behaviour and the size of the group and has concluded that, as compared with small groups, large groups make more and different demands upon the leader. In general, the leader in a large group tends to be impersonal and is inclined to enforce rules and regulations firmly and impartially. In smaller groups, the leader plays a more personal role. He is more willing to make exceptions to rules and to treat such group member as an individual.

Moral Judgment

Another characteristic of the head of the institution which needs to be studied is level of moral development. Attempts to assess moral values have frequently focussed on observable behaviour from values are inferred, or have attempted to predict overt behaviour from subjective values. Rarely have subjective values been studied in their own right. While the delineation of the links between values and behaviour is clearly a desirable objective, many investigators in their eagerness to focus on behaviour, have paid insufficient attention to the conceptualization of moral values and appropriate methods for their measurement. Both experience and research literature point to the
complexity of the relationship between the moral values and moral behaviour.

Moral values assessed by any method do not indicate a subject's worth as a person, or his loyalty, kindness or sociability. Moral judgment scores attempt to tap the basic conceptual framework by which a subject analyses a social moral problem and judges the proper course of action. Moral judgement assessment is an assessment of conceptual adequacy of moral thinking. Moral judgment, scores do not portray a person's overall personality organization, although they do indicate an important aspect of personality.

EMERGENCE OF THE PROBLEM

From the above discussion, it is concluded that (i) there may be a relationship between the behaviour of the principal and the school climate, (ii) there may be a relationship between the moral development of the principal and the school climate.

The present investigator is at present working as Deputy District Education Officer was conscious to explore the above mentioned problems. His frequent contacts with school teachers, school heads and his observations of the school climate in various schools
added to his urge to enquire into the various factors that constitute school climate, leadership behaviour, and moral level of school heads.

It has been further observed that this field is a relatively new one. This led to the emergence of the problem which the investigator proposes to study. There is a general impression that the present-day heads of schools have failed to provide leadership. The head and his institution have consequently failed to meet the needs of the time and fulfil the expectations of society. The investigator thus considers himself duty-bound to carry out this investigation.
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