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This study focuses on the critical review of literature undertaken on Leadership behaviour of educational administrators. Leadership is an “Influencing Process” where leaders motivate the members of an organisation to get their best efforts and achieve organisational objectives. They also create a shared vision and lead the organisation towards it, solving problems on the way and overcoming obstacles as and when they arise. In this study it has been found that a great deal of studies on leadership behaviour and its impact on institutional climate and such other variables has been conducted. However, there has been no study examining the effect of leadership on administrators’ occupational efficacy, effect of perceived leadership style on work motivation and organizational commitment. So, attempts should be made to make up the deficiencies and fill up the existing gap in research in the areas related to Leadership behaviour of educational administrators.
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INTRODUCTION

In educational institutions there is a vast amount of self-restraint, good sense, objectivity and rationality. Education takes place most effectively in an atmosphere of regard, respect and warmth. Leadership is required for the effective and efficient operation of the structure to achieve the ends. Similarly, each and every institution of society needs leadership more than anything else for it to make a mark. Shields (2004) recognized Educational Leadership as complex and challenging. Educational leaders are expected to develop learning communities, build the professional capacity of teachers, take advice from parents, engage in collaborative and consultative decision making, resolve conflicts, engage in educative instructional leadership and attend respectfully, immediately and appropriately to the needs and requests of families with diverse cultural, ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds. Increasingly educational leaders are faced with tremendous pressure to demonstrate that every child for whom they are responsible is achieving success.

Effective leadership behaviour creates inspiring and stimulating climate for the group so that they can enjoy a high level of morale and are motivated to receive new ideas and are always ready to venture into new goals. The behaviour of a leader is the inspiring force that begets healthy climate, high morale and motivation for the receptivity of new ideas for taking the organisation to higher and still higher plane. This is true in the context of educational institutions as well. An administrator is viewed from almost every quarter as being the leader of an institution. The education board has hired him/her to lead. The community holds him/her responsible if he/she does not lead. It is apparent that the question facing an administrator is not whether he/she must behave as a leader, rather it is a question of how shall he/she behave to be an effective leader. In short, an administrator is expected to possess all desirable qualities for leadership. At the same time he/she should also act as a friendly liaison officer between the organisation and the community. Thus, he/she is expected both to lead and to carry other activities as well. A great amount of credit goes to him/her when he/she is able to perform all these activities effectively and to take the institution on the path of progress. Furthermore, the effectiveness of education depends largely upon the effectiveness of a ‘leader’ who is a necessity in all complex educational institutions intent on the achievement of excellence. It has been rightly said that an effective administrator is a “Leader of Thoughts”
whose job is to mobilize human minds and train on such healthy lines that may help to achieve the national goals. Therefore, a number of researches have been carried out on various parameters of Leadership Behaviour in respect of educational administrators. Theses are briefly presented as under:

A. Leadership Behaviour of Educational Administrators.
B. Leadership Effectiveness of Educational Administrators.
C. Leadership Practice of Educational Administrators.
D. Leadership Style of Educational Administrators.
E. Effect of Leadership Behaviour on Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction.

A). Leadership Behaviour of Educational Administrators:


Dinesh (2010) found aided schools head leadership behaviour better than the govt. school head leadership behaviour and unaided schools head leadership behaviour was better than the govt. schools head leadership behaviour. Luechai (2008) found no significant differences on the basis of gender, school size, position within any aspect of leadership behaviour. Mills (2008); Stout (2005); Hoo-Ballade (2005) and Verma (1989), found no significant difference between leadership behaviour of male and female principals, between rural and urban principal’s leadership behaviour patterns and between principal’s gender and school achievement.

Brown, Howard and Jannet (2007) found significant relationship between leadership behaviour and teachers motivation. Turner (2007) concluded that principals who have exited Program Improvement display specific leadership behaviours like establishing strong lines of communication, clear goals and having quality contact and interaction with teachers and students at high level. Principals of these schools have strong, consistent ideals in education with clearly articulated goals. They are communication facilitators for and with the stakeholders; Graham (2007) found that in more negative leadership schools, teachers commented about communication problems and minimal rewards. Derrick (2007) showed that male and female principals hold opposing priorities and task emphases and therefore principal’s behaviour is often influenced by their gender. Love (2007) found that male principals are more effective in their leadership behaviour; Richard (2006) indicated that significant difference might be influenced by superintendents and board members years of experience as well as the gender of board members. Guttenberg (2006) revealed that principal leadership is highly idiosyncratic and determined by a combination of factors including a principal’s personal and professional experiences, the context within which he/she leads, the school’s socio-political-historical context and school size. Harris, Brown and Abbott (2006) found that executive leadership is a powerful lever for change when it is able to mobilize and release leadership energy between and across schools. Ruff and Shaio (2005) demonstrated differing levels of integration as well as variation regarding the conceptualization of instructional leadership among the elementary school principals. Waters (2005) found no statistical significant difference between teacher’s and principal’s perceptions of principal leadership as measured on the PIMRS. Dinham (2005) found leadership as a key factor in the achievement of outstanding educational outcomes. Wilson (2005) found a strong and significant relationship between principal’s use of elements and the distribution of leadership throughout the school. Hoo-Ballade (2005) found statistically significant differences based on level of education for program management and instructional goals on the Principal’s Survey. The differences indicated that higher the degree held by the principal, the more frequently principal used those two leadership behaviours. Johnson (2005) found significant difference between how principals from various schools perceived themselves performing leadership behaviour for the variables-communicate the school goals, monitor student progress, protect instructional time and provide incentives for learning. Geter (2005) implied that Black Elementary School teachers were not as pleased with their principals’ leadership in integrating technology into teaching. This indicated a need for principals to involve all stakeholders in decision-making and efforts that impact the schools’ overall programs and initiatives. Garner (2005) found a significant difference among elementary, middle, and high school teachers’ perceptions of principal leadership behaviours with regard to gender. Thomas (2004) found significant differences in perception of elementary teachers towards the twelve leadership behaviour components as measured by LBDQ. Siddiqui (1994) found leadership behaviour pattern and school performance of principals were correlated. Shamir et al (1993) found that leaders behaviour activate self-concepts which in turn affect further motivational mechanisms of followers. Verma (1989) found that as far as the leadership behaviour of principals as perceived by teachers is concerned, the principal have been rated high
on all dimensions as well as leadership as a whole. Further, no significant relationship exists between the leadership behaviour of principals with teaching experience and administrative experiences. Krishnaraj (1987) found principals in autonomous and affiliated colleges differed in their decision making process. Veearaghwan (1986) found no significant difference in leadership adaptability which was significantly higher in high performance schools than in low performance schools.

With a different approach Anderson (2006) found a negative relation between principal's perceptions of leadership behaviour and student achievement. Stout (2005) found a significant difference between leadership behaviour patterns and the percentage of full time students enrolled. Kelly (2004) showed no significant correlation between principal's leadership behaviour and student achievement and school climate.

B). Leadership Effectiveness of Educational Administrators:


Bhat (2011) found a significant difference between effective and ineffective educational administrators' Leadership Effectiveness. Ekundayo (2010) found that there is a positive relationship between leadership behaviour and effectiveness of principals of the secondary schools. It was further found that behaviour of the principals in the area covered was satisfactorily encouraging. Victor (2009) indicated that effective principals are to establish trust, create structures that promote principal-teachers communication and maintain a high level of moral values. Abdullah and Alzaidyein (2009) found spirituality has an important role to play as an aide to leadership development as well as leadership effectiveness. Adams and Gamage (2008) found that the effects of gender, length of service, educational discipline did not have a substantial effect on head teacher's leadership effectiveness. Banyard (2007) revealed that there is a widespread support from the teachers for the performance of the principals as educational leaders and majority of teachers seemed to have a positive view of their principal's leadership effectiveness. Mailot (2005) found that the voluntary principals exhibited behaviours and practices that are congruent with the research and literature on effective leadership. Jesus (2003) found a significant positive relationship between emotional competence and leadership effectiveness among Academic Deans. Kulsum (1999) found headmasters with higher initiating structure quality make them more effective. Sudha (1997) found effective leaders/ principals of govt/govt aided and private schools were administratively effective and managerially flexible. Jones and Holdway (1996) found that deans were having high leadership effectiveness and were found very effective in their work with respect to faculty-related activities. Raut (1995) observed that there existed a significant difference between the principals showing different levels of effective leadership in their perception of organisational effectiveness. Mahashabde (1990) found the relationship between leadership effectiveness and teachers' morale was significant.

Contrary to these Don and David (2008), found a significant difference between the self-perceived leadership effectiveness of the head teachers and the leadership effectiveness perceived by the teachers; Nanda (1992) found that out of 30 heads of primary schools, only 10 were most effective leaders. Further, it was found that ineffective leaders show more considerate behaviour and less initiating behaviour. Mahashabde (1990) found relationship between leadership effectiveness and institutional climate, job satisfaction of teachers and students’ academic achievement was not significant.

C) Leadership Practice of Educational Administrators:


Jonathan and Henry (2009) indicated the importance of principal work for student learning because of their indirect influence on teachers’ practices through the fostering of collaboration and communication around instruction. Meyers (2008) found that principals that did not attend the workshops and smaller faculties had a greater measure of success in two of the dimensions of professional learning community. Braun (2008) found a significant positive relationship between the essential preparation practices and the leadership behaviour for deep change, the school learning environment and student achievement. Murphy and Seashore Louis (2008) identified a shift in the organizational structure in schools, illustrating that principals should be able to work with others to implant the vision into the structures and processes of the school, they should be able to communicate the vision of the staff of what their schools should become. Karney (2007) demonstrated a
significant relationship between student outcomes and administrative support, leadership for community collaboration and leadership for school improvements. Study conducted by Provost (2007) found that based upon the principal's perspectives it seems likely that the group of principals will continue to refine the teaching and learning processes at their schools to attain higher levels of student achievement, but they are not likely to initiate radical transformations of their school's culture; Rowe (2007) concluded that the practices and actions facilitating implementation of school-wide differentiated instruction are within the purview of all educational leaders. Mc William (2007) found principals developed shared instructional decision making, ideals and beliefs about students achievement with their teachers; monitored the instructional program frequently, provide time for teachers to make collaborative data driven decisions, created multiple opportunities for students to receive additional instructions, maintained continuous positive communication with teachers and fostered strong working relationships between teachers. Principals worked to expand teacher's instructional capacity and excellence. Meier (2007) indicated that teachers perceived principals with more experience exhibit leadership behaviour practices more frequently than do principals with less experience. Heiken (2007) found school leaders demonstrated fairly high level of emotional intelligence and found a modest positive relationship between emotional intelligence and practice of leadership. Littleford (2007) found that teacher's perception was for principals to self-evaluate their leadership strategies and style. Siemens (2007) found leadership practice most forecast was challenging the process and least forecast was encouraging others. Barrett (2007) indicated that junior high school principals relied on their professional judgement to interpret and enact the district requirement in their local school context. They were supportive of this expectation and used information from their direct and regular presence in classrooms to inform other aspects of leadership practices. Kosner (2006) revealed that principal's leadership strategies provided a nurturing, non-threatening environment where the school's stakeholders were allowed to participate in the school improvement planning process. Anderson (2006) found that principals of large schools reported more involvement in institutional leadership management behaviours. Barrenger (2006) found that regarding leadership practices, administrators from both schools maintain a visible presence with their staff, students and community, support and recognize students, teachers, staff and administrators. Banks (2006) demonstrated that principals had a strong sense of purpose and unrelenting passion for unleashing the power of learning among the students. Jacobson et al (2005) found principals shared some common characteristics: most notably all demonstrated facility with the core leadership practices of direction setting, developing people and redesigning the organization; Day et al (2001) found that principals addressing clear set of goals and communicate personal and educational value are good leaders. It was also revealed that good leaders must possess the following qualities like respect for others, fairness and equality, caring for the well-being and whole development of students and staff, integrity and honesty. Yadav (1996) found that the principals who have more concern for the task, their student achievement is very significant. It was found that the principals showing more concern for task enthuse the teachers to make more interest in teaching. The students perceiving study under such principals feel more motivated and secure better results. Pounder, Ogawa and Adams (1995) identified that principals play critical role in recruiting, developing and retaining teachers, and also in creating a learning environment within the school. Naik (1982) has found a significant and positive relationship between building facilities, evaluation of students, supervisory and colleague relations. Also integration was significantly related to material and equipment, special services and supervisory relations.

D). Leadership Style of Educational Administrators:


Runhaar and Sanders (2010) found positive relationship between occupational self-efficacy and transformational leadership. Jayasingam (2009) found autocratic power to have a negative influence on leadership effectiveness. Abgoli (2008) found that headmasters were more adhered to transformational leadership style followed by transactional one. It was also found that headmaster's leadership style was not significantly related with their demographic variables such as gender, age, educational qualification, subject and experience. Mills (2008) found significant positive correlation between transformational leadership and school achievement. Giri and Santra (2008) revealed that transformational and transactional leaders have positive and significant relationship with the employees’
satisfaction, productivity and organizational effectiveness as against laissez-faire leadership was negatively related to these factors. Griffin (2007) revealed that a large percentage of the African American Women used transformational leadership and believed it to be a positive leadership style to promote teacher empowerment, teacher buy-in, and teacher ownership for the school. Neal (2007) found that leadership styles exhibited by principals in working with their school communities during and after a school crisis differed tremendously; each was unique in their response to the crises situation. Elliot (2007) revealed that principal leadership resonated with transformational and authentic leadership models, although discrepancies existed between principal’s perceived theories action and their theories-in-use as perceived by teachers. Also it was found that leadership was so co-constructed adaptively as an active process of sense making between leaders and followers as participants responded day by day to organizational and individual contingencies. Renahan (2007) observed a relationship between transformation leadership and happiness as well as servant leadership and a relationship between the demographics of school type and leadership style and demographics of staff size and happiness. Jones and Rudd (2007) found that academic programme leaders in college of agricultural and life sciences tend to use transformational leadership more often than transactional or laissez-faire leadership. Heads were depicting transformational leadership style more often. It was also found that males more often show transformational as well as transactional leadership behaviour than their female counter parts. Chen (2007) found that principal’s collaborative working style with teacher leaders seems to have positive impact on student achievement. Somech and Wenderow (2006) suggested that participative and directive leadership styles were both positively associated with the teachers’ performance, however, the impact of directive leadership on teachers’ perception was contingent in nature, whereas the positive effect of participative leadership on teachers’ performance was above and across specified studied conditions. Miller (2006) found no significant differences between principals serving in schools that met Adequate Yearly Program (AYP) and principals in schools identified as being improvement after not having met AYP targets of the No Child Behind Federal Act. Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) found that the transformational leadership style of principals significantly affects the teachers’ classroom practices but not students’ achievement. It was also revealed that motivation, capacity and work settings act as mediating variables between transformational leadership and teachers’ classroom practices. Ross and Gray (2006) found that schools with higher levels of transformational leadership had higher collective teacher efficacy, greater teacher commitment to school mission, school community, and school-community partnerships, and higher student achievement. Further, it was also found that transformational leadership has strong effect on the teachers’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour. Barnett et. al. (2004) suggested that teachers’ perception of satisfaction with leadership is significantly related to the leadership style as exercised by their principals. Laissez-faire leadership indicated a negative relation with satisfaction. Lagomarsino and Cardona (2003) found that transactional leadership increases the followers’ continuance commitment and decreases their growth commitment, whereas transformational leadership behaviour increases followers’ growth commitment and normative commitment. Mehrotra and Neelima (2002) found principals of govt and private schools manifest different leadership styles, the majority of the govt. school principals had low initiation-high consideration style, while majority of private school principals had a unique high initiation-high consideration pattern. Further, Mehrotra (2002) found no significant difference between the leadership style of govt and private school principals but Panday (1985) found a significant difference between the leadership of rural and urban principals. James (1999) concluded that schools having principals’ changes had greater use and more students who were new to the district, to school, economically disadvantaged and minority. Nagarajan (1998) found that in Arts and Science colleges autonomy has resulted in promoting only Human Consideration aspect of leadership behaviour and not of Initiating Structure. Leithwood et. al. (1998) found that transformational leaders may challenge teachers to examine their assumptions about their work and rethink instructional processes; they may also establish expectations for quality pedagogy and support teachers’ professional growth. Beer (1996) found a significant twoway interaction for teacher experience and leadership style. Less experienced teachers rated principals’ performance lower than did more experienced teachers. Lee (1996) found that both consideration and initiating dimensions of leadership style of the principals correlated significantly with their need for achievement. Rashmi (1993) has found school principals resort to either task or relationship or balance of both in their styles of behaviour management. They behave in accordance with the demands of situation. Hallinger (1992) found that to improve organizational performance, transformational school leaders’ focus on the individual and collective understanding, skills and commitment of teachers. Urmila (1992) found male teachers were higher on the consideration dimension of leadership behaviour of principals. Sergiovanni (1990) found school principals particularly in “effective” or “innovative” K-12 schools as transformational leaders. It was also found that practicing value and value-added leadership based on transformational leadership principals together provides the bridge between helping teachers and students meet basic expectations and achieving levels of performance...
and commitment that are extraordinary. Eagly and Johnson (1990) reported that women tend to use more participative and inclusive style while men tend to use a more directive and controlling style. This indicates that women tend to use more transformational styles while men use transactional styles. Deluge (1988) also stated that transformational leadership was more closely associated with the employee satisfaction. For promoting organizational productivity transformational leadership was found to be more effective in influencing employees' behaviour. Virmaini (1984) has found style flexibility of head of schools related to pass percentage of students and to his own intelligence and creativity but found that the basic leadership style of school heads were not related to students pass percentages; Patel (1983); Panday (1985); Singh (1985) and Nasreen (1986) found positive relationship between initiative structure and consideration style of leadership behaviour, teacher self-concept and teachers job satisfaction. Significant mean difference were found between leaders self-perception and faculty perception of his actual leadership behaviour. Shukla (1981) found the consideration style of leadership more dominant in the administrative behaviour of the educational leaders at the district level. Further, Initiative Structure and Consideration styles of educational leadership emerged significantly correlated with teacher's morale. Wager (1965) found a significant relationship between leadership style along initiating structure and the need for power. It was also found that principals were high in both initiating structure and consideration leadership dimensions. However, no significant relationship was found between leadership style and the need for affiliation.

With a different approach Snacar (2009) found no significant relationship between schools principal's perceived 'initiation of structure' behaviour and expressed teacher's job satisfaction level.

E) Effect of Leadership Behaviour on Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction:


Robert (2010) demonstrated that superintendent Leadership Practices is an important factor in the job satisfaction and efficacy of their principals. Superintendents who take steps to improve their leadership may help alleviate pressure on principals and increase the likelihood of getting and retaining good principals in the future. Rowland (2008) revealed that principal's daily behaviour plays a vital role in the environment of the school. Rad et. al. (2008) found that job satisfaction and leadership style were positively and significantly correlated. It was also found that job satisfaction was correlated with several factors like process of leadership, motivating factors, communication, process of decision making and characteristics of the control process. But the best predictors of job satisfaction were found to be leadership and communication. Biswas (2008) found that psychological climate and transformational leadership style was significantly correlated with job satisfaction. Camp (2007) showed that principals created a positive environment in the school, modelling enthusiasm for the vision, focussing on the best for students and supporting the staff. Together the principal and teacher leaders developed an exemplary program where technology is used effectively to enhance teaching and learning. Emery and Baker (2007) found that transformational factors of charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration were more highly correlated with job satisfaction. Rad and Yarmohammadian (2006) found that participative leadership as the dominant style. It was also demonstrated that employees found less satisfaction with salaries, benefits, work conditions, promotion and communication and more satisfaction with factors such as the nature of the job, co-workers and supervision type factors. It was further revealed that leadership behaviour and employees job satisfaction were significantly correlated. Nguni et al (2006) found job satisfaction to be a mediator of the effects of transformational leadership on teachers’ organizational commitment. Further, transformational leadership was found to have an add-on effect to transactional leadership in prediction of the organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour. Koopman (2006) found that positive relationship existed between restrictive principal behaviour and the number of principals for which a teacher has worked and a negative relationship was found for the directive school climate. Lee (2005) found that the style of transformational leadership has significant and positive effects on job satisfaction and school commitment among Taiwanese secondary school teachers. Khaled (2005) found that there is significant positive correlation between the two dimensions of leadership behaviour (consideration and initiating structure) with job satisfaction. Therefore, the greater the degree of perceived consideration and initiating structure behaviours in managers, the higher the degree of extrinsic, intrinsic and general job satisfaction reported by the staff. Mishra (2005) Asbillel (1994) and
Nasreen (1986) found that leadership behaviour is positively related to teachers’ job satisfaction. High desirable leadership behaviour of the principals generated a higher degree of conformity and normally in the teachers and vice versa. Al-Shuwairekh (2005) indicated that initiating structure and consideration of leadership style were significantly related with the level of job satisfaction. Therefore, the greater the degree of perceived consideration and initiating structure behaviours in the managers, the higher the degree of extrinsic, intrinsic and general job satisfaction reported by the staff members. Mishra (2005) and Appalwar, Rao (1995) found leadership behaviour of headmasters influenced the organisational climate of schools in a significant way. Bechtold (2004) found that the primary basis for employee satisfaction and loyalty to leaders is ‘Trust’. Chen and Silverthorne (2004) found that higher the leader’s leadership score, the more effective is the leader’s influence. However, the leadership score did not predict employee job satisfaction. Peter and Jhon (2004) found that innovative and supportive culture, and a consideration leadership styles, had positive effects on both job satisfaction and commitment. Hines (2004) reported that school location promotes a distinct but potentially complementary approach to understanding the effect of school context influence on principal decision making. Kelly (2004) found significant positive relationship between principal’s leadership behaviour and school climate. Kim (2002) found that managers’ use of a participative management style and employees’ perception of participative strategic planning processes are positively associated with high levels of job satisfaction. Bogler (2001) proclaimed that principal’s transformational leadership style affected teacher’s satisfaction and motivation directly and indirectly through their occupation perceptions. He further enunciated that more the teachers perceive their occupation in terms of a profession, the more they perceived their school principal to be transformational leaders, the more they perceived their principals as participative, and the less they exhibited transformational leadership, the greater is their job satisfaction. He also asserted that principals’ transactional leadership style affected teachers’ satisfaction negatively. Shamir et. al. (1993) found that the subordinates’ perception of their supervisor’s leadership style is positively related to their job satisfaction, work motivation and job performance. Jayajothi (1992) found that the open climate related best to the perception of leadership behaviour of principals by the teachers. Knoop (1982) found that work values did not seem to moderate the relationship between leaders’ behaviour and satisfaction of subordinates. Instead, both leader’s dimensions and the moderators influenced satisfaction with job and with supervision directly.

With a different approach King Betty (2006) found no significant difference for principals, superiors, teachers, parents and community representatives in the use of structural, human resources, political and symbolic frames for the schools making adequate progress or for the schools at risk. Singh (2004) found no significant relationship between leadership behaviour of secondary school principals and school management climate. Jayajothi (1992) found that leadership behaviour of principals differed with organisational climate. Nongrum (1992) found that the leadership characteristics of principals appeared to be associated with teachers’ job satisfaction, the govt. school teachers showing significantly more satisfaction. Sharma (1982) found a significant difference between the different types of school climate and leadership behaviour. A significant difference was found among open, controlled, familiar and parental type of school climate of the leadership behaviour.

**CRITICAL SUMMARY**

There is a good deal of empirical research that has been carried out on Leadership Behaviour of Educational Administrators. Most of these studies have been carried out in abroad. Generally these studies are doctoral dissertations while others are project reports. The variables that have been studied through these researches are Leadership Behaviour, Leadership Practices, Leadership Effectiveness, Distributed Leadership, Instrumental Leadership Behaviour, Transformational Leadership, Instructional Leadership Practices, Leadership Styles, Leadership Skills, Leadership Characteristics, etc. These studies are largely descriptive in nature using ex-post facto method, case study method, causal-comparative research design and correlational methods. Few studies have used phenomenological research method while some are ethnographic studies. The sampling procedures used in most of the studies appear to be good. The generalizations are based on well acceptable sample sizes, some of which are randomly drawn using systematic, stratified or multistage techniques and others are drawn through Quota or purposive sampling techniques.

In almost all these studies, the most frequently used instrument includes that of Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire- LBDQ of Halpine and Winer, Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire- LBDQ of Halpine and Croft, Leadership Behaviour Scale of Stogdill, Leadership Practices Inventory of Kouzes and Posner, Leadership Behaviour Inventory of Boelman and Deal and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. However, in some studies following tools have been administered by the researchers: Modified Version of Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Questionnaire- LEAD of Hersey and Blanchard, Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire of E.A. Fleishman, Boelman and Deal’s Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey. The
researchers in a few cases have also developed their own questionnaires, however, there is very little added in the form of standardised instruments to the already existing resource base. Researchers has also used various other data gathering devices like Interviews (Face-to-Face, Structured and unstructured, Individual Interviews), Field Observations, Document Analysis, Field Notes, Focus Groups and Discussions.

The data in most of these studies have been analysed by applying ANOVA, MANOVA, ‘t’- test, correlation, Percentage and Chi-Square while in few cases Aitken's Pivotal Condensation method, Range, Scheffe Multiple Comparison and Krushal Wallis Non-parametric Independent Group Comparison, Multiple Regression Analysis, Linear Regression Analysis and Duncan's Multiple Range Test are used.

The reviewed studies showed that a great deal of researches on Leadership Behaviour and its impact on institutional climate and other such variables has been conducted. Leadership Behaviour, which has been found as a key factor in the achievement of outstanding educational outcomes influences the organizational climate of an institution in a significant way. These studies clearly demonstrate that administrators as effective leaders are those who possess certain qualities like trust, communicating clear goals and vision, high level of moral values, respect for their colleagues and staff members, caring, participative and inclusive in working style etc. The role of an administrator is to increase the organizational effectiveness as well as staff’s morale. Studies have also found that Leadership Behaviour of administrators has direct impact upon an institution and its functioning which builds up its positive climate. The above stated studies also focused on the role of effective administrator or their leadership qualities, leadership style and effectiveness in schools or other organizations. With respect to gender, studies have found that men tend to use a more directive and controlling style and women tend to use more transformational, participative and inclusive style, whereas in few studies researchers argued that the leadership style of school principal does not have any impact on students’ achievement, but studies have shown that there is an indirect relationship between transformational leadership practices and students’ overall achievement in the school. Further on the basis of these studies, we can say that principals’ leadership style and teachers’ job satisfaction are the two important components which determine the organizational effectiveness to a greater extent. While exploring the leadership style most of the studies have emphasised on participative leadership style which was found to be positively correlated with ‘teachers’ performance. In contrast to this authoritarian leadership was found to be least effective in terms of output as well as satisfaction. These studies have been conducted in different organizations and schools. Most of them are based on qualitative as well as quantitative techniques.

However, very few Indian studies have explored transformational and transactional leadership specifically in relation to job satisfaction. They have either focused on democratic/autocratic/laissez-faire or on situational approach. There is also lack of such studies which have investigated this phenomenon especially in school organization. The importance of transformational and transactional leadership and job satisfaction has been explored mostly in international studies. Thus, there is a great need to explore such studies in Indian educational settings as well.

Again the studies reviewed have suggested that transformational leadership augments transactional leadership in producing greater amount of performance, outcomes and leads to increased work motivation. Some of the studies have also explained that transformational leadership also influences the organizational commitment of teachers. There exists a positive relationship between perceived leadership and motivation and also perceived leadership and organizational commitment. There have been quite a lot of studies of the schools examining the effect of perceived leadership styles on teachers' outcomes, students' outcomes etc. however, the researcher has not come across any study examining the effect of perceived leadership styles on work motivation and organizational commitment. Also there has been no study investigating the effect of discipline and designation on the perceived leadership style. Very few studies have explored the relationship of demographic or personal variables like age, marital status, educational qualification etc with perceived leadership styles. Since leadership is the act of influencing people, it is important to take subordinates' perspectives into account, that how do the subordinates perceive their heads and how does it effect their motivation, performance, outcomes etc. Again a very critical area here has been left out focusing on the counselling and training of the leaders to help to become effective and to change their lifestyles if they are not conducive to the functioning of the institution.

Thus, it can be concluded that the scope of research is unlimited and beyond boundary of imagination. The findings and conclusions of various investigations and researches indicated that there are certain spheres that have remained unexplored. So, attempts should be made to make up the deficiencies and fill up the existing gap in research in the areas related to leadership behaviour of educational administrators.
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