

LEADERSHIP STYLES IN EDUCATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF GOVERNMENT & PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Avneet Bhushan

Moga College of Education for Girls, Ghall Kalan, Moga

ABSTRACT

This study examines the leadership styles of government and private secondary school principals in Moga, as perceived by their teachers. A self-developed tool was used to measure three leadership dimensions: Democratic, Autocratic, and Laissez-faire. Data was collected from 100 teachers (50 private and 50 govt.) across 10 secondary schools and analyzed using descriptive statistics and independent t-tests. The results revealed significant differences in the perception of leadership styles between private and government school principals, particularly in the Democratic and Laissez-faire styles. Implications for leadership development and the need for context-specific leadership training in educational institutions are discussed.

Keywords: Leadership styles, Democratic, Autocratic, Laissez-faire, private schools, government schools, secondary schools, teacher perceptions

INTRODUCTION

Leadership in schools plays a crucial role in shaping the educational environment and influencing student outcomes. Effective school leaders, whether principals or instructional leaders, create a vision that fosters collaboration, innovation, and a culture of continuous improvement. They are responsible for setting high expectations, supporting teachers through professional development, and engaging parents and the community in the educational process. Leadership styles can vary widely; some leaders adopt a transformational approach, inspiring and motivating staff, while others may lean towards a more transactional style, focusing on structure and performance management. Regardless of the approach, strong leadership is essential for establishing a positive school climate, enhancing student engagement, and driving academic achievement. By cultivating trust and open communication, effective leaders empower their teams, enabling them to navigate challenges and seize opportunities for growth, ultimately creating an environment where both students and educators can thrive. Effective leadership is a critical component in the functioning of educational institutions. Principals, who are at the helm of school administration, exert significant influence over teacher morale, student outcomes, and overall school performance. Leadership styles in schools can vary significantly, with different styles being more effective in different contexts. Broadly, leadership styles are categorized as Democratic, Autocratic, and Laissez-faire, each reflecting different levels of participation, decision-making, and control exercised by the principal (Bush & Glover, 2003).

LEADERSHIP IN SCHOOLS The educational environment is unique in requiring a balance between instructional leadership and administrative management (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Principals who adopt a democratic leadership style encourage participation, teamwork, and collective decision-making. Teachers feel empowered and are more likely to be innovative and motivated (Northouse, 2010). In contrast, autocratic leadership emphasizes control and authority, with decision-making centralized in the hands of the principal. While this style may yield quick decisions, it can limit teacher autonomy and lead to dissatisfaction

(Bass & Bass, 2009). The laissez-faire leadership style is characterized by a lack of direct control, where teachers are left to make decisions independently. Though it fosters independence, it can sometimes lead to a lack of direction and reduced accountability (Avolio& Bass, 2004).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Research on educational leadership suggests that principals' leadership styles can have profound impacts on teacher satisfaction and student achievement. Democratic leadership has been associated with improved teacher collaboration and higher student outcomes (Leithwood&Jantzi, 2005). Studies by Harris (2013) indicate that principals in private schools tend to exhibit more democratic leadership due to the autonomy of the institutions, whereas principals in government schools may lean toward autocratic leadership styles due to bureaucratic constraints (Bush & Glover, 2003). Additionally, laissez-faire leadership, although fostering a hands-off approach, can result in a lack of accountability if not balanced with adequate guidance (Hallinger, 2011). This study aims to investigate how these leadership styles are perceived by teachers in government and private secondary schools in Moga.

OBJECTIVES

To compare the leadership behavior of principals as perceived by their teachers in private and government secondary schools.

HYPOTHESES

1. There exists no significant difference in the democratic leadership behavior of principals as perceived by their teachers in private and government secondary schools.
2. There exists no significant difference in the autocratic leadership behavior of principals as perceived by their teachers in private and government secondary schools.
3. There exists no significant difference in the laissez-faire leadership behavior of principals as perceived by their teachers in private and government secondary schools.

DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

1. The study was delimited to ten secondary schools inMoga.
2. The study was delimited to 100 teachers only (50 private and 50 govt. teachers).

METHODOLOGY

- Research Method: The descriptive survey method was adopted for this study. This method enables the researcher to describe and analyze the leadership styles of principals based on teachers' perceptions, facilitating comparisons across different school types.
- Sample of the Study: The sample consisted of 100 teachers (50 govt. and 50 pvt.) selected from 10 secondary schools in Moga. Five government schools and five private schools were selected purposively from different regions of Moga. From each school, five male teachers and five female teachers were randomly selected to ensure equal gender representation.

RESEARCH TOOLS USED

A self-developed Leadership Style Scale was used for data collection. The scale consisted of 54 items, divided into three dimensions: Democratic Leadership, Autocratic Leadership, and

Laissez-faire Leadership. The scale was designed to measure teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership behaviors. Teachers were asked to rate each item on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Scoring of Tools: The Leadership Style Scale was scored by summing the responses for each dimension. Higher scores in each dimension indicated stronger perceptions of that particular leadership style (e.g., a higher score in Democratic Leadership indicated a more democratic style)

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED

Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were used to summarize the data. Independent group t-tests were employed to examine differences between the leadership styles of principals in government and private schools, as well as between male and female teachers' perceptions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS OF THE STUDY

The study findings are reported and discussed below with the help of a combined table.

Table -1

The difference in leadership behavior scores as perceived by teachers for principals between pvt.and govt. secondary.

Sr. No	Teacher Group	Teacher Groups	No	Mean	S.D.	t-ratio	Result
1.	Democratic Style	Private Schools	50	69	5.1	4.76	Significant
		Govt. School	50	64	5.4		
2.	Autocratic Style	Private Schools	50	58	5.1	1.83	Not Significant
		Govt. Schools	50	56	5.5		
3.	Laissez-faire	Private Schools	50	60	5.1	6.06	Significant
		Govt. Schools	50	53	4.8		

The results of the independent t-test showed a significant difference in the perception of democratic leadership between government and private school principals. Private school principals were perceived as more democratic in their leadership behavior compared to their government counterparts ($t = 4.76$, $p < 0.05$). This aligns with the findings of Harris (2013), who noted that the flexible administrative structures in private schools often allow for more participatory leadership styles.

No significant difference was found between government and private school principals in terms of autocratic leadership behavior ($t = 1.83$, $p > 0.05$). Both government and private school principals exhibited similar levels of control and authority in decision-making. This result supports the argument made by Bush and Glover (2003) that principals in both school types may need to exercise authority in certain situations to maintain order and discipline.

A significant difference was observed in the laissez-faire leadership style, with government school principals perceived as more laissez-faire compared to their private school counterparts ($t = 6.06$, $p < 0.05$). Government schools, bound by stricter regulations and bureaucratic oversight, may sometimes allow teachers more autonomy in decision-making, possibly contributing to this perception.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study suggest several important implications for leadership development in schools. Private school principals, while perceived as more democratic, could benefit from more structured training in autocratic leadership to maintain discipline and structure in larger schools. Government school principals, on the other hand, should focus on developing more participatory and democratic leadership behaviors to foster better teacher engagement and motivation. Additionally, the significant differences in laissez-faire leadership suggest the need for more balanced leadership training, ensuring that principals provide enough guidance while still allowing teachers autonomy.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals important differences in the leadership styles of government and private secondary school principals. Private school principals are perceived as more democratic, while government school principals lean towards laissez-faire leadership. These differences highlight the need for contextspecific leadership training in educational institutions, particularly for principals in government schools to adopt more participatory and inclusive leadership behaviors.

REFERENCES

1. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Third edition manual and sampler set. Mind Garden.
2. Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2009). The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications. Free Press.
3. Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2003). School leadership: Concepts and evidence. National College for School Leadership.
4. Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125-142.
5. Harris, A. (2013). Distributed leadership: Friend or foe? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(5), 545-554.
https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/198069/15/15.1_publications.pdf
6. Joshi et al. (2010). Effect of self-learning module on achievement in English grammar at secondary level. *The Inside*, 5, 186-192.
7. Joshi, A. (2010). Effectiveness of Self-Learning Module on Retention in English Grammar for Ninth Grade Students: An Experimental Study. *International Research Journal of Commerce, Arts and Science (CASIRJ)*, 1(1), 424 – 426.
http://www.casirj.com/Artical_details?id=17775.
8. Joshi, A. et al. (2018). Co-curricular involvement and academic achievement of secondary school students in relation to some demographic variables: A comparative study. *Bhartiyam International Journal of Education & Research*, 7(2), 1-9.
<http://www.gangainstituteofeducation.com/NewDocs/march2018/01.pdf>.
9. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). Transformational leadership. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 177-199.
10. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(1), 27-42.
11. Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Sage.

12. Sadique, Z. (2016). A study of leadership behaviour of schools heads. *IJELLH*, IV (II), 473-492. Retrieved from
13. Thapliyal P., & Joshi. A. (2016). Teacher freezing of secondary school teachers in relation to job satisfaction. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education (IJARIIE)*, 2(2), 1955-1958.
https://ijariie.com/AdminUploadPdf/TEACHER_FREEZING_OF_SECONDARY_SCHOOL_TEACHERS_IN_RELATION_TO_JOB_SATISFACTI ON_ijariie21416.pdf.
14. Thapliyal, P. & Joshi, A. (2022). Perceived Leadership Behavior for Principals In Government & Non-Government Senior Secondary Schools In Delhi. *International Journal of All Research Education & Scientific Methods, (IJARESM)*, 10(1), 1416-1422.http://www.ijaresm.com/uploaded_files/document_file/Dr_Poonam_Thapliyal7Ira.pdf
15. Thapliyal, P. (2022). Job Satisfaction of Senior Secondary School Teachers In Relation To Perceived Leadership Behavior of Principals. *International Journal of All Research Education and Scientific Methods (IJARESM)*, 10(6), 3511-3514. Retrieved from http://www.ijaresm.com/uploaded_files/document_file/Dr._Poonam_Thapliyal_JsXv.pdf.
16. Thapliyal, P. (2022). Leadership Behavior As Perceived By Senior Secondary School Teachers in Private & Government Schools in Delhi. *International Journal of All Research Education and Scientific Methods (IJARESM)*, 10(5), 3040-3043. Retrieved from http://www.ijaresm.com/uploaded_files/document_file/Dr._Poonam_Thapliyal_oUT2.pdf.
17. Thapliyal, P., & Joshi, A. (2014). Perceived Leadership Behaviour of Principals and Psychological Well-Being of Secondary School Teachers. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 1(5), 577-580.
<http://www.jetir.org/papers/JETIR1701A83.pdf>.
18. Thapliyal, P., & Joshi, A. (2012). Verbal Communication Skills of Teachers Teaching English in Govt. & Non-Govt. Senior Secondary Schools. *Bhartiyam International Journal of Education & Research*, 2(1), 40-46