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1.1 The Context (of the study)

Society never remains primitive or dormant. It is dynamic; it changes, grows, and develops, with time. Every society for its growth has variety of needs to be fulfilled, expectations from the outside world as well as from its members, and thus sets up different institutions with a view to help to develop the personality and life of its members. Life is not just to live, but to live successfully, gracefully, rationally and humanly as social beings. So, societal expectations for training and educating its members are mirrored on education and hence the educational system endeavors to cater to the multifarious needs of society. It is therefore, the primary function of educational organizations and educational institutions to enable the members of society to acquire knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, desired character traits etc. by which they will not only enrich their lives but also leave their society better than what they found or experienced.

India, with a population exceeding a billion and with an ever expanding system of education, has the largest number of schools and institutions of higher education in the world today. Fallout of this unprecedented growth of schools has increased complexity of school administration and management at all levels in the hierarchy of education. Thus, to have structural and functional control over educational organizations and educational institutions, educational administration
came into existence. Thus, educational administration is concerned with the administration and management of educational institutions. Educational administration is believed to be a machinery through which educational institutions and other resources are harnessed and managed for the smooth and efficient working of the educational edifice.

Educational administration in schools bear onus of execution of the programmes/policies/plans of the Nation/State, programmes and activities designed by the educational institutions themselves and promotion and development of human qualities so that the objectives of education are realized. Thus, educational administration deals with the human processes that are influenced by various factors such as philosophical, psychological, sociological and political. In other words, educational administration is responsible and accountable to the growth of children, adults (teachers and other staff members) and all the people involved in the management, operating the educational institutions on guidelines and recommendations of established norms, rules and policies from time to time. Besides the human element, educational administration also deals with the material aspects such as buildings, grounds, equipment and instructional supplies, which have a bearing on the educational process. Russell Greg defined educational administration as the process of utilizing appropriate materials in such a way so as to promote development of human qualities effectively. It is concerned with not only the development of children and youth but also with the growth of adults and particularly with the growth of school
personnel. Thus, educational administration integrates the human as well as the material resources along with effective laws and regulations.

According to NPE (1986), ‘Education needs to be managed in an atmosphere of utmost intellectual rigor, seriousness of purpose and at the same time of freedom essential for innovation and creativity’. Thus, the efficiency of administration is the most crucial factor for bringing improvement in the school. Thus, school as a formal agency of education has a vast responsibility not only towards the constant development of the human resource, but ensuring that it produces a productive human resource.

1.2 Hierarchy of Educational Administration

In India, education is the joint responsibility of the Central Government as well as the respective State Government/Union Territory. At the central level, the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) Government of India undertakes for the development of the human resource. The Department of Education at the MHRD is responsible for all matters pertaining to education, including overall planning of programmes and providing guidance for their implementation. At the State level, the Directorate of Education (Secondary Education) under the control of the State Government functions to implement plans and policies of the MHRD, besides implementation of its own polices, plans and rules.
1.2.1 Hierarchy of Educational Administration at the Central Level

The administrative setup graphically shown in figure 1 is inter alia responsible for the following with regard to school education:

- to make available free and compulsory education up to the age of 14 as envisaged in the Constitution of India;

- equalization of educational opportunities with special reference to the reduction of interstate differences and the advancement of the weaker sections of the society;

- to make arrangements for the provision of scholarships to the needy and competent students;

- to promote vocationalization of secondary education in all States;

- to improve standard of education at the school stage;

- to improve the status of teachers and organize teacher education programmes;

- to facilitate and organize open school education programme in all parts of the country;

- to promote educational research in the country;
• to promote and organize special education programmes;

• to administer school education directly in Union Territories and Centrally Administered areas;

• to provide assistance to States, local bodies and non-governmental organizations for development of education; and,

• to provide guidance wherever required.

Figure 1 is presented on next page
Figure 1 Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education)
1.2.2 Hierarchy of Educational Administration at the State Level

School education is under the direct control of the respective State Government. Every State Government prepares educational plans based on their own needs and conditions and also by considering the plans and policies prepared at the Central Level.

The hierarchy of educational administration as prevailing in the State of Goa is graphically represented in figure 2. The graphical representation expounds the structural setup of the Directorate of School Education.

The administrative setup graphically shown in figure 2 is inter alia responsible for the following with regard to school education:

- to establish and maintain educational institutions;
- to give recognition for the establishment of schools;
- to provide grants to schools managed by private bodies;
- to pass laws for different types of school education;
- to supervise schools through Education Officers and Supervisors at the local level;
- to recruit and place teachers in schools;
- to prescribe the syllabus and supply books;
• to establish school boards to conduct examinations;

• to provide special assistance to poor and backward students;

• to organize training programmes for teachers and supervisors;

• to initiate action against teachers and schools in case of any lapse;

• to provide information to the Central Government about schools;

• to provide academic and training support to schools through its institutions created for the purpose; and,

• to promote research and development in education.

Figure 2 is presented on next page
Figure 2 Hierarchy of Educational Administration in Goa
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The head of school as depicted in the graphical representation of the educational administrative hierarchy, occupies a vital seat. By virtue of the position 'head of school' the principal functions associatively with the various positions in the administrative hierarchy of the Directorate of Education such as the Deputy Education Officer(s), Assistant Director(s) of Education, Deputy Director(s) of Education, Director of Education etc, besides the school management which is the governing body of the school. However, in the government schools, a slight variation exists in the sense that, the school management is the Directorate of Education itself and to which the principal of a government school is accountable/answerable. This leaves the principal dignified as a diplomat integrating the school, management and Directorate of Education in the case of aided schools, and the school and management (Directorate of Education) in the case of government schools. However, the jurisdiction of operation (administrative and academic control) of the school principal is delimited to only the school and matters pertaining to its functioning.

Appointment to the post of head of school, in the case of government aided schools, is exercised by the school management, while in the case of government schools; the Directorate of Education exercises the right to appoint. Eligibility for the post of principal of secondary school as stipulated by Rule 78 of the Goa School Education Rules 1986 necessitates that a direct recruit must possess: (i) Masters degree from a recognized university; (ii) degree in Education/Teaching from a recognized university or equivalent; and, (iii) at least five years teaching experience after graduation in a secondary school or a training
institute, out of which at least three years teaching experience after training. On the other hand, a promotee to the post of principal requires: (i) degree from a recognized university; and, (ii) degree in Education/Teaching from a recognized university with seven years teaching experience as an Asst. Tr. in the school after graduation out of which five years should be post B.Ed/B.T. experience; failing clause (ii), promotee should possess Diploma in Education (two years course) of any recognized university or a diploma sanctioned as equivalent by the Government with nine years teaching experience in the school after graduation out of which at least seven years should be post training experience.

Further Rule 86(2) stipulates that the vacancy of Principal in Higher Secondary School/Primary Training Institutes, Headmasters of Secondary Schools and Middle Schools, and the Asst. Headmasters of Secondary Schools shall be filled up by promotion subject to the eligibility conditions prescribed in Rule 78. While filling up of these posts, the managements should first explore the possibility of selecting the senior most teacher from the next below category as indicated in Rule 78. While making such selection, the management shall also give very careful consideration and shall select the best-qualified and most competent person among those available for selection/appointment to the post. Seniority shall be the first criteria subject to fitness and merit.

The concept of transferability of principals exists in the government schools setup so also in aided institutions run by trusts/management under which many schools operate. However, any principal from the aided setup desiring to
enter the government setup as Assistant Director of Education (ADE)/Deputy Director of Education (DD) enters as a direct recruit.

1.3 Determinants of Effective School Administration

School administration is viewed as a process. It is referred to as a process because it combines the human and material resources effectively. The human resource in the schools comprise of the school principal, teachers, non-teaching staff and students. Effective school administration is determined by different behavioral factors/dimensions. The important behavioral factors/dimensions are leadership behavior, organizational climate, emotional intelligence and job satisfaction which are presented below under appropriate sub-headings.

1.3.1 Leadership Behavior

Leadership is an area, which has been and is still extensively studied. Infact, a lot of attention is paid towards this behavioral dimension more because of its importance in the contemporary times. Leadership studies have remained and still are an emerging discipline of research and thus, the leadership styles and behavior will continue to evolve. However one unified version on leadership is that it is an influence relationship between the leader and the followers who intend real changes that reflect their shared purposes (Rost, 1993).

Leadership has been viewed both as a process and as a property. Process because it influences others through use of non-coercive influence to shape the goals of a group or organization, to help define group or organizational culture, to
motivate behavior toward the achievement of those goals and direct the organization in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent. As a property, leadership is the set of characteristics attributed to those who are perceived to be leaders. Leaders are people who are able to influence the behaviors of others without having to rely on threats or other forms of force.

Fielder defined leadership behavior as "the specific behavior of a leader while in the process of directing and controlling the activities of a work unit. For instance, the leader can commend, make helpful suggestions, and demonstrate consideration".

Three different perspectives on leadership emerged which tried to study and analyze leadership closely. The perspectives/approaches are the trait approach, the behavioral approach, and the contingency approach.

The maxim of the trait approach was that "leaders are born, not made" and this formed the basis for early studies of leadership. So, attention was focused on natural traits of individuals such as physical attributes, personality traits, and general ability characteristics. The assumption of the trait approach was that some basic traits or set of traits differentiate leaders from non-leaders, and if those traits could be determined, potential leaders could be identified. Numerous studies attempted to identify the traits that set leaders apart. From 1920 to 1950, psychological researchers tried to isolate the specific traits that endow leaders with unique qualities that differentiate them from followers. However, attempts to identify traits consistently associated with leadership behavior were to an extent
successful. Six traits on which leaders differed from nonleaders included: (i) drive and ambition; (ii) the desire to lead and influence others; (iii) honesty and integrity; (iv) self-confidence; (v) intelligence; and, (vi) in-depth technical knowledge related to their area of responsibility.

The leadership studies based on traits were questioned. It was argued that the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers and that leadership does not merely result from individual traits of leaders. Leaders with one set of traits may be successful in one situation but not in others. Moreover, leaders with different combinations of traits can be successful in the same or similar situations. The trait approach thoroughly ignored situational factors and only advocated that possession of the appropriate traits made a good leader.

In the late 1940’s through the 1960’s research on leadership, emphasized and focused attention on the preferred behavioral styles that leaders demonstrated/showed. The behavioral studies on leadership opened new vistas wherein leadership researchers began to look at the behaviors or actions of leaders. The assumption was that the behaviors of effective leaders were somehow different from the behaviors of ineffective leaders. It was hoped that the behavioral approach provide more definitive answers to leadership. A number of studies were conducted to find out behavioral determinants of leadership. The main studies were the Ohio State Studies and the University of Michigan Studies.
The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) emerged from a systematic program of research on leadership organized by Carroll Shartle in 1945 at Ohio State University. In their attempt to identify leadership behavior that was necessary for the achievement of organizational tasks, researchers at Ohio State University who were engaged in studying and identifying dimensions of leader behavior, found two basic dimensions / leader behaviors or styles. These dimensions / leader behaviors or styles were called initiating structure and consideration.

1. **Initiating structure:** this behavior occurs when the leader clearly defines the leader-subordinate role so that everyone knows what is expected, establishes formal lines of communication and determines how tasks will be performed. The leader characterized as high in initiating structure could be described as one who “assigns group members to particular tasks”, expects followers to maintain definite standards of performance and emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.

2. **Consideration:** this behavior occurs when the leader shows concern for subordinates and attempts to establish a warm, friendly, and supportive climate. This type of a leader shows concern for the followers' comfort, well being, status and satisfaction. A leader high on consideration could be described as one who helps subordinates with personal problems, is friendly and approachable and treats all subordinates as equals.
Researchers at the University of Michigan were also involved in locating behavioral characteristics of leaders. Renis Likert and others at the University of Michigan identified two styles of leader behavior:

1. **Production oriented**: this type of behavior occurs when a leader pays close attention to the work of subordinates, explains work procedures, and is keenly interested in performance.

2. **Employee oriented**: this leader behavior occurs when the leader is interested in developing a cohesive work group and ensures that employees are satisfied with their jobs.

These two styles of leader behavior were believed to lie at the ends of a single continuum. Likert found that employee oriented leader behavior generally tended to be more effective. However, it was not reasonable to believe that two factors were sufficient enough to account for all the observable variance in leader behavior. In one of the most comprehensive attempts to identify and measure the key elements of leader behavior, Ralph Stogdill and his colleagues at Ohio State University proposed twelve dimensions of leadership. The twelve dimensions of leadership were divided into two categories: (i) system-oriented behavior which was concerned with production emphasis, initiation of structure, representation, role assumption, superior orientation and persuasion; and, (ii) person-oriented behavior which emphasized tolerance of freedom, tolerance of uncertainty, consideration, demand reconciliation, predictive accuracy, and integration. Thus,
Stogdill’s study introduced a new theory of role differentiation and group achievement.

From the behavioral approaches it can be summarized that, inspite of the diversity of settings and approaches, two general and distinct categories of leader behavior emerge: (i) one concerned with people and interpersonal relations; and, (ii) the other with production and task achievement.

The contingency approach assumes that appropriate leader behavior varies from one situation to another. Contingency theories attempted to identify key situational factors and specify how they interact to determine appropriate leader behavior. According to this perspective, it is necessary to specify the conditions, or situational variables that moderate the relationship between leader traits and performance criteria. The emerging evidence indicates that under one set of circumstances, one type of leader is effective; while under another set of circumstances, another different type of leader is needed. There is no best leadership style; it depends. The contingency approach attempts to predict which types of leaders will be effective in different types of situations. The two most widely held contingency theories are Fiedler’s Contingency Model and Situational Theory by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard’s.

1.3.2 Organizational Climate

Organizational Climate is the perception of how it feels to work in a particular environment. It is the ‘atmosphere of the workplace’ and includes a complex mixture of norms, values, expectations, policies and procedures that
influence individual and group patterns of behavior. Organizational climate can also be described as a combination of shared history, expectations, unwritten rules and social mores that affect the behavior of everyone in a school or organization. Therefore, organizational climate of a school shows the pattern of social interaction that takes place within the school family. The main units of interaction are individuals constituting the community in the institution i.e. the group as a whole and the leader. Terms such as organizational climate and school climate are often used interchangeably in the school context.

School climate has been defined as the “feel” of a school (Halpin and Croft, 1963). Freiberg (1983) defined the school climate as “Climate is the human environment within which the teachers of a school do their work. Like the air in a room, climate surrounds and affects everything that happens in an organization” while Norton (1984) defined school climate as its “collective personality”.

During the past four and half decades, substantial amount of research has been conducted on the importance of school climate. Nelson (1960) had classified organizational climate into four types viz: (i) the bureaucratic; (ii) the autocratic; (iii) the idiocratic; and, (iv) the democratic. However, Halpin and Croft’s landmark study on organizational climate spearheaded research by proposing six organizational climates or climate types which yielded the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ), an instrument to assess the climate of organizations. According to the authors of the OCDQ, climate emerges as a result of interactional processes between the leader (principal) and the group (teachers). It is the nature, extent and quality of this interaction that creates a climate in the
institution, which either facilitates or hinders the attainment of the institution’s
goals. The proposed six climates lie on a continuum from open to closed. The
climate types identified were open climate, autonomous climate, controlled
climate, familiar climate, paternal climate and closed climate. The characteristic
behaviors of the principal and the teachers were determined based on eight
dimensions/sub-tests. The eight dimensions/sub-tests were; disengagement,
hindrance, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and
consideration. Eventually based on the performance on the sub-tests the climate
types were assigned to the schools. According to Halpin and Croft (1963), the
‘open’ climate is characterized by functional flexibility where esprit, thrust and
consideration were high; disengagement, hindrance, production emphasis and
aloofness were low and intimacy average. A ‘closed’ climate is characterized by
functional rigidity where hindrance, disengagement, production emphasis and
aloofness were high; esprit, thrust and consideration were low and intimacy
average. The OCDQ stresses that the climate types; open, autonomous and
controlled lean towards openness in descending degree and the climate types
familiar, paternal and closed manifest closedness in increasing degree. For
studying the organizational climate at different stages of education and in
different contexts modifications were made to the OCDQ. Hoy and Clover (1986)
revised the OCDQ for use in elementary schools, while Kottkamp, Mulhern and

In the Indian context, Sharma (1973) conducted a replication study of the
OCDQ on the lines of its originators and developed an adaptation of the OCDQ
for Indian schools. The adaptation of the OCDQ for the Indian context was called the School Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (SOCDQ). Sharma's (1973) study revealed that out of the eight dimensions, four dimensions/sub-tests differed in structure and content from those identified by Halpin and Croft. The dimensions common to both were: (i) disengagement; (ii) esprit; (iii) intimacy; and, (iv) production emphasis. These four dimensions were similar in content and structure for both the studies. However, the four new dimensions identified by Sharma (1973) were: (i) psycho physical hindrance; (ii) alienation; (iii) controls; and, (iv) humanized thrust.

Thus, the SOCDQ comprised of eight dimensions which were categorized under two categories namely: (i) group behavior characteristics; and, (ii) leader behavior characteristics. The group behavior characteristics comprised: (i) disengagement; (ii) alienation; (iii) esprit; and, (iv) intimacy while the leader behavior characteristics comprised: (i) psycho physical hindrance; (ii) controls; (iii) production emphasis; and, (iv) humanized thrust.

Another modification made to the original OCDQ by Sharma (1973) was concerning the school climates. Halpin and Croft (1963) in their research tool OCDQ had suggested that, the six climates lie on a continuum with the open climate at one end and the closed climate at the other end of the continuum. In between the open and close climate were the autonomous, controlled, familiar and paternal climates. However, Sharma (1973) too suggested that the six climate lie on a continuum with the open climate at one end followed by the autonomous, familiar, controlled, paternal and closed climate at the other end of the continuum.
However, the difference between the SOCDQ and OCDQ existed in terms of the position of the controlled and familiar climates on the continuum. The SOCDQ till today finds wide applicability in studying the organizational climate of schools in the Indian context.

1.3.3 Emotional Intelligence

The term "emotional intelligence" appears to have originated with Wayne Payne (1985), but was popularized by Goleman (1995). However, academic research with "emotional intelligence" was formalized by Peter Salovney and John Mayer way back in 1990 and they can be rightfully credited with the honor of coining the term ‘emotional intelligence’. Many definitions and so also different theories/models emerged trying to explain/describe the construct most accurately and measure emotional intelligence.

Goleman (1998) defined emotional intelligence as “the capacity of recognizing ones own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships”. According to Mayer et.al (1997) “emotional intelligence refers to an ability to recognize the meanings of emotion and their relationships and to reason and problem-solve on the basis of them”. Emotional intelligence is the capacity to perceive emotions, assimilate emotion-related feelings, understand the information of those emotions and manage them.

Theoretically emotional intelligence was conceptualized from two perspectives – ability and mixed models. Peter Salovey and John Mayer’s model
(ability model) perceives emotional intelligence as a form of pure intelligence, which means that, emotional intelligence is a cognitive ability. The mixed models of emotional intelligence on the other hand combine mental ability with personality characteristics. The Reuven Bar-On model (mixed model) regards emotional intelligence as mixed intelligence, consisting of cognitive ability and personality aspects. This model emphasizes how cognitive and personality factors influence general well-being. The second mixed model proposed by Daniel Goleman, perceives emotional intelligence as a mixed intelligence involving cognitive ability and personality aspects. However, unlike the model proposed by Reuven Bar-On, Goleman's model focuses on how cognitive and personality factors determine workplace success.

Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) four branch model of emotional intelligence proposed that, emotional intelligence comprises of two areas namely experiential (ability to perceive, respond, and manipulate emotional information without necessarily understanding it) and strategic (ability to understand and manage emotions without necessarily perceiving feelings well or fully experiencing them). They further divided each of these areas into two branches that range from basic psychological processes to more complex processes integrating emotion and cognition. The first branch emotional perception was the ability of an individual to be aware i.e. self-aware of emotions and to be able to express emotions and emotional needs accurately to others. Emotional perception also includes the ability to distinguish between honest and dishonest expressions of emotion. The second branch emotional assimilation was the ability of an individual to identify or distinguish clearly among the different emotions that one is feeling and to
identify those that are influencing their thought processes. The third branch *emotional understanding* was the ability or capacity of an individual to sense and understand complex emotions (such as feeling of two or maybe more emotions at one time) and the ability to recognize transitions from one to the other. The fourth branch *emotion management* was the ability to connect or disconnect from an emotion depending on its usefulness in a given situation (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Reuven Bar-On for the first time introduced the term "Emotion Quotient" for measuring emotional intelligence. Bar-On model of emotional intelligence relates to the potential for performance and success, rather than performance or success itself, and is considered process-oriented rather than outcome-oriented (Bar-On, 2002). The model focuses on an array of emotional and social abilities, including the ability to be aware of, understand and express oneself, the ability to be aware of, understand and relate to others, the ability to deal with strong emotions, and the ability to adapt to change and solve problems of a social or personal nature (Bar-On, 1997). The Bar-On model presented in table 1.1 defines five components of emotional intelligence namely intrapersonal, interpersonal, adaptability, stress management, general mood and the sub-components within each of the components.
Table 1.1

Bar-On Model of Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Sub - Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td>Self Regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Self-Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Actualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Reality Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>Stress Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impulse Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Mood Components</td>
<td>Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daniel Goleman inspired by the work of Mayer and Salovey began conducting research in the area of emotional intelligence. Goleman's model describes emotional intelligence by way of an emotional competence framework. The framework outlines/classifies four main emotional intelligence dimensions. The dimensions are (i) self-awareness- is the ability to read one's emotions and recognize their impact while using gut feelings to guide decisions., (ii) self-management- involves controlling one's emotions and impulses and adapting to changing circumstances., (iii) social awareness- includes the ability to sense, understand, and react to other's emotions while comprehending social networks.,
and, (iv) relationship management—indicates the ability to inspire, influence, and develop others while managing conflict. Thus, the four dimensions or constructs stem from recognition of self and the other AND regulation of self and the other. Goleman further included a set of emotional competencies within each dimension. Emotional competencies are not innate talents, but rather learned capabilities that must be worked on and developed to achieve outstanding performance. The emotional intelligence framework presented in table 1.2 shows the placement of the different emotional competencies under each of the four dimensions namely: (i) self-awareness; (ii) self-management; (iii) social awareness; and, (iv) relationship management.

Table 1.2 is presented on next page
Table 1.2

Goleman’s Model of Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOGNITION</th>
<th>SELF</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SELF-Awareness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social Awareness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Self-Awareness</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accurate Self-Assessment</td>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULATION</td>
<td><strong>Self Management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relationship Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Control</td>
<td>Developing Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement Drive</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Change Catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building Bonds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the models of emotional intelligence proposed by different psychologists and researchers it was summarized that, emotional intelligence as a construct concerns with helping individuals to develop awareness about themselves, to self assess i.e. the ability to perceive emotions, to monitor own feelings and emotions, to understand and differentiate between the different emotions, integration of emotions to facilitate thought, to manage oneself so as not only to promote and enhance personal growth but also to contribute towards
the social order by encouraging, taking and facilitating initiatives, building channels for communication and relationship building.

Various scales and inventories such as the Multibranch Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) by Mayer and Salovey, Baron Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i), and the Emotional competency Inventory ECI by Daniel Goleman etc serve as instruments for measuring emotional intelligence. In the Indian context, these tools would perhaps not serve their intended purpose mainly due to the cultural differences between Indian/European cultures, the level of language used etc. Thus, for the Indian milieu initiatives were taken by Hyde et.al. (2002) and the Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) was developed.

1.3.4 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a complex behavior which many scholars, experts, researchers have tried to explain by proposing different theories/models so as to make clear and provide insights into the concept of job satisfaction. Definitions on job satisfaction by some theorists and scholars are presented in the next paragraph.

Hoppock (1977) defined job satisfaction as essentially any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that cause a person to say, “I am satisfied with my job”. Siegel and Lane (1982) defined job satisfaction as “job satisfaction is generally considered to be the overall feeling that a worker has about a job”. Young (1984) defined job satisfaction as “the affective reaction that employees have about their jobs”. Lofquist and Dawis
(1984) defined job satisfaction as "the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of the extent to which the work environment fulfills an individual's requirement".

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weik (1970) divided the theories of job satisfaction into two groups' namely: (i) content theories; and, (ii) process theories. Content theories give an account of the factors that influence job satisfaction and process theories try to give an account of the process by which variables such as expectations, needs, and values relate to the characteristics of the job to produce job satisfaction. Maslow's (1943) needs hierarchy theory and Herzberg (1968) two factor theory of job satisfaction are examples of content theory. While the equity theory, fulfillment and Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory are examples of process theory. Content theories were concerned with determining what is it within the individual or within the environment that motivates people to perform, to be energized and sustain that behavior. Maslow suggested that people are driven by unsatisfied needs that shape their behavior. He also suggested that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction share a single continuum and described one end of this continuum as "growth" needs and, at the other end of the continuum as "deficiency" needs. Herzberg (1968) viewed satisfaction and dissatisfaction separately/individually. In other words satisfaction and dissatisfaction were not ends of a continuum, but, each ran independently from satisfaction to neutral and from dissatisfaction to neutral. Thus, causes of satisfaction were not causes for dissatisfaction and that different job facets influence feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Herzberg (1968) theorized that
satisfaction (growth or motivation factors) was associated with factors intrinsic to the job such as: achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth for advancement while dissatisfaction (hygiene factors) was associated with factors that produce dissatisfaction such as: company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security.

The process theories on the other hand endeavored to explain and describe the process of how behavior is energized, directed, sustained, and even stopped. Process proponents theorized that job satisfaction is not only being determined by the nature of the job and its context within the organization, but also by the needs, values and expectations that the individuals have in relation to their job. Equity theory was most influenced by James Stacy Adams and originated around 1965. According to the equity theory, a person consciously or otherwise compares his outcome/input ratio with that of another person or other classes of persons who he has perceived as relevant to such a comparison. Outcome would mean pay, fringe benefits, status, promotion and other factors that the individual perceives to have utility or value to him and input would mean the individuals qualifications, general education levels, efforts and other similar factors. Thus, equity is said to exist when an individual perceives his outcome/input ratio to be equal to that of the other person and inequity if the person's outcome/input ratio is indifferent with respect to the other.

Fulfillment theorists theorized that, people's satisfaction is a function of how much reward or outcome they are receiving for their work. In other words
satisfaction was based on the extent to which the job was instrumental in bringing benefits to the individual. Satisfaction was viewed to be depending on how much of a given outcome or set of outcomes a person receives (Lawler et. al., 1970). Theorists believed that satisfaction was determined by the differences between the actual outcomes a person receives and some other outcome level which means what is received should be compared with another outcome level, and when the outcome level is below the other outcome level, dissatisfaction results. Vroom (1964) developed two forms of need fulfillment theory. The first model was the subtractive model which expounds that job satisfaction is a function of both expectation and perception. It states that job satisfaction results as a function of the size of discrepancy between what the worker needs (expectation) and the extent to which the job meets those needs (perception). Vroom’s second model was the multiplicative model in which the need for importance was taken into account by multiplying the perceived amount of need fulfillment offered by the job with the importance of the individual of that need (Gruneberg, 1979). The theory of work adjustment is based on the concept of correspondence between the individual and his environment (Dawis and Lofquist, 1984). Work represents one such environment in which one must relate. Satisfaction then indicates the correspondence between the individual and the work environment (Dawis and Lofquist, 1984).

**Determinants of Job satisfaction**

According to Greenberg and Baron (1999), determinants of job satisfaction are classified as organizational determinants and personal
determinants. Both these determinants along with specific aspects under each are explained below.

A. Organizational determinants

1. **Reward system**: Reward system includes pay benefits, promotions, fringe benefits etc.

2. **Quality of supervision**: Satisfaction tends to be higher when people in the organization believe that their superiors are competent, have best interests in mind and treat them with dignity and respect. Communication is another important aspect of quality supervision. Research has shown that people are more satisfied with their jobs when they have the opportunity to communicate with their superiors openly.

3. **Decentralization of power**: It refers to decision making wherein the capacity for decision making resides with many people as against one single person. When decision making is concentrated in the hands of a single person or select few and when negative bias prevails the staff tend to believe that they are relatively powerless and not surprisingly feel dissatisfied.

4. **Work and social stimulation**: Staff feel satisfied with their work so long as the work doesn’t exceed the overall workload. The work should also possess freedom for experimentation and variety so as
not to make the work boring. Staff members look for congenial social relationships amongst the different members on the staff which brings closeness and boosts the morale of the group.

5. **Pleasant working conditions**: job satisfaction is affected by overcrowded conditions and dark noisy environment with varied temperatures and poor air quality, improper ventilation, lack of appropriate seating arrangement etc.

### B. Personal determinants

1. **Personality variables**: Would include aspects such as self esteem, need for recognition, high level of competitiveness, time urgency, ability to withstand stress, emotional stability, openness to experiment, trustworthiness, conscientiousness etc.

2. **Status and seniority**: Status would refer to the position the person enjoys in the organization. In other words, higher is ones position in the organizational hierarchy the more satisfied that individual tends to be.

3. **Job congruent with their interests**: This would mean asking; does the different staff employed in the organization have an interest and aptitude for performing the tasks they are appointed to perform. The better their work positions match with their interests, the more satisfied the staff will be with their jobs.
4. Ones own general life satisfaction: The more people are satisfied with aspects of their lives unrelated to their jobs, the more they tend to be satisfied with their jobs.

From the definitions and theories on job satisfaction it was inferred that, job satisfaction depends on a multiplicity of factors. So job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is conceived as a mental feeling or emotional response and may be attributed to many factors. In the context of a school, job satisfaction or dissatisfaction may be attributed to factors such as remuneration, poor or insufficient infrastructural facilities, lack of freedom or autonomy in work, blocked channels of communication, bias and rigidity, exploitation, social status, level of aspiration, promotions in the job, attainment of needs, job challenge, work involvement, leave facilities, rules and policies of the institution, satisfaction with the authority which includes the school principal/management, personal background etc. Many tools/instruments were and are still developed to measure different aspect of job satisfaction. However, in the present study the focus is placed on the organizational factors which are determinants for causing job satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the teaching and non-teaching staff at schools.

1.4 Role of the Principal in School Administration

Traditionally the principal/head of the school performed variety of functions but in the contemporary times with emphasis placed on secondary education by the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India, the role of the principal is redefined. The principal in
today's school is a personality performing multiple roles right from an administrative controller, academician, to community development facilitator. Thus, the principal serves as a strategic bridge linking the school (teachers, office staff, students, parents) and the outside such as; the Directorate of Education, Goa Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education, and other competent bodies of the State Government of Goa.

According to the Goa School Education Rules 1986 (Rule 46), the head of the school shall:-

(i) function as the head of office of the school under his/her charge and carry out all administrative duties required of a head of office as assigned to him/her by the Managing Committee;

(ii) be responsible for drawing and disbursing the salaries of the employees of the school if so authorized by the Managing Committee as per the scheme of direct payment of the Education Department through the banks except that, in the case of an unaided school, he/she may perform only such function as drawing and disbursing officer as may be specified in the instructions issued by the Director;

(iii) be responsible for the proper maintenance of accounts of the school, subject to such authorization by the Managing Committee, and maintain school records, service books of teaching and non-teaching staff and such
other registers, returns and statistics as may be specified by the Director from time to time;

(iv) handle official correspondence relating to the school except the establishment matters and financial matters and furnish, within the specified dates, the returns and information required by the Director; and in case of correspondence relating to establishment and financial matters, he/she shall cause to furnish the information by the Management; all representations of the staff including the heads of schools shall be routed through the Management;

(v) make, in the case of unaided schools all payments (including salaries and allowances of teachers and non-teaching staff) in time and according to the instructions governing such payment, provided that where he/she is so authorized by the Administrator, make, in the case of an aided school, all such payments according to the instructions governing such payments;

(vi) cause to purchase stores and other materials required for the school in accordance with the rules governing such purchases and enter all such stores in the stock register and shall scrutinize the bills and cause to make payments;

(vii) ensure that the tuition fees, where levied, are realized and appropriately accounted for and duly appropriated for the purpose for which they were levied;
(viii) conduct physical verification of school property and stocks at least once a year and ensure the maintenance of stock registers neatly and accurately;

(ix) be responsible for proper utilization of the pupils fund;

(x) make satisfactory arrangements for the supply of good drinking water and provide other facilities for the pupils and ensure that the school building, its fixtures and furniture, office equipment, lavatories, play grounds, school garden and other properties are properly and carefully maintained;

(xi) supervise, guide and control the work of the teaching and non teaching staff of the school;

(xii) be in charge of admission in the school, preparation of school time-table, allocation of duties and teaching load to the teachers and shall provide necessary facilities to the teachers in the discharge of their duties and conduct of school examinations in accordance with the instructions issued by the Director from time to time and he/she shall discharge these duties in consultation with and assistance of his/her colleagues;

(xiii) plans the years academic work in advance in consultation with his/her colleagues and holds staff meeting at least once a month, reviews work done during the month and assesses the progress of the pupils;
(xiv) help and guide the teachers and promote their professional growth and actively encourage their participation in courses designed for in-service education;

(xv) promote the initiative of the teachers for self-improvement and encourage them to undertake experiments which are educationally sound;

(xvi) supervise classroom teaching and secure cooperation and coordination amongst teachers of the same subject area as well as inter-subject coordination; so as to eliminate the isolation both vertical and horizontal;

(xvii) arrange for special remedial teaching of the children belonging to the weaker sections of the community as also of other children who need such remedial teaching by drawing a regular annual programme in consultation with the teachers and review the progress periodically;

(xviii) arrange for informal and non-classroom teaching;

(xix) plan and specify a regular time-table for the scrutiny of pupils written work and home assignments and ensure that the assessment and corrections are carried out timely and effectively;

(xx) make necessary arrangements for organizing special instructions for the pupils according to their needs with the cooperation and assistance of teachers;
(xxi) organize and coordinate various co-curricular activities through the house system or in such other effective ways as he/she may think fit;

(xxii) cause to develop and organize the library resources and reading facilities in the school and ensure that the pupils and teachers have access to and use of books, and journals of established value and usefulness;

(xxiii) cause to send regularly the progress reports of the students to their parents or guardians through the class teachers;

(xxiv) promote the physical well-being of the pupils, secure high standards of cleanliness and health habits, and arrange periodical medical examinations of students and cause to send medical reports to parents or guardians through the class teachers; and,

(xxv) be present in the school premises during school hours and shall be available to the public and Departmental Officers in the school premises for consultation during school hours and devote at least twelve periods in a week to teaching of the pupils.

In the context of the present study, the specific roles/functions/responsibilities of the head of the institution in relation to the four variables of the study viz: leadership behavior, emotional intelligence, job satisfaction and organizational climate are listed below. The functions listed are spelt out elaborately only with reference to the variables in the study - not inconsistent with Rule 46 of the Goa School Education Rules 1986.
The school principal is required to:

- implement educational policies, rules and regulations, guidelines, directives issued by competent agencies in Education in the State on aspects of the educational and school system;

- educate the teachers and other staff in the school on rules related to service conditions, promotions (career selection scales), leave facilities etc;

- enlighten the staff on the school management’s perspective of defining the school mission, identifying goals and their achievement, also to communicate to the staff the expectations of the school management;

- exercise decentralization and delegation of responsibility;

- give freedom to make suggestions, decision making, request for guidance and direction from the teachers;

- make provision for not only teacher appraisal but also for mentoring besides introducing a model paradigm for his/her appraisal as a leader;

- bring about and maintain order and discipline, conducive school climate and a pleasant working atmosphere;

- be vigilant and observant of the changes in the school environment;
• contribute immensely towards relationship building, group development, teacher morale by establishing positive and dynamic communication networks;

• offer self as an example of hard-work, integrity, honesty etc;

• refrain from destructive criticism, any sorts of bias, partiality, favoritism which may affect the school's functioning;

• encourage social interaction and provide opportunities for social needs satisfaction for the staff in the school;

• encourage assessment and evaluation of various behavioral aspects on a regular basis;

• encourage action research in order to improve school processes;

• encourage teacher professionalism, aid in developing skills and competencies in the staff; and,

• ensure staff welfare, as healthy staff make a positive contribution towards the school.
1.5 Need and Significance of the Study

In the administration of a school, various factors operate in multiplicity. Leadership behavior, job satisfaction, emotional intelligence and organizational climate are some of the factors which are responsible for the coherent and synchronous functioning of a school. Every school is unique and so every school differs in the type of leadership behavior it receives from the head of the school, the type of school organizational climate that prevails in the school and the job satisfaction of the teaching and non-teaching staff.

Today, in school administration, principal’s leadership is considered as an important factor as it effects sound management, harnesses available social and interpersonal resources, uses expert knowledge on matters concerning education, schooling and contributes towards building a unique school climate. Thus, the principal’s leadership behavior and his/her style of dealing determine processes such as perspectives on education, the tone of the school i.e. the school organizational climate and the quality of the teaching and non-teaching staff. In a holistic sense, leadership of the principal constructs the quality of the school edifice. Considering the modern perspective/thinking on school leadership and administration, leadership qualities of the principal impress, both the staff and students alike, and, serve as an impetus for self-development of the different staff in the school and contribute positively towards school climate. Barth (2001) reports that principals must be leaders of reform, for few school improvement initiatives succeed without support from the school principal.
The success and growth of a school depends on the quality of the human potential/human resources. The human resource is the most important factor considering its ability to govern/control variety of other resources. The school principal as the leader of the group harnesses searches and exploits the untapped potentialities of the group members for their own growth and for the institutional growth. Hence, principal as a leader of the school is assumed to take initiative, anticipate and recognize changes in the organizational environment, and explore possible courses of action to respond to those changes. According to Pejzá (1985), leaders continuously scan the environment to find where changes/modifications are needed. School principals are assumed proactive because they challenge the status quo of their school to respond to changes that are detrimental to its growth and usher in various changes conducive to school growth. Leaders of change recognize shifts in the environment and guide their schools to be responsive to those changes. They are aware of the realities of their environment and thus guide the school to rethink (Joiner, 1987; Barnes and Kriger, 1986). Thus, the leadership behavior of the principal plays a significant role in the effective functioning of the institution.

A good administrator needs to be a good leader. Diwan’s (1993) study shows that there is a crisis of effective leadership in schools as most of the heads of institutions were only good administrators but very few of them were good leaders. As administrators occupy a pivotal position in the school, they take-on almost a total control over the functioning of varied aspects of the schools, which at times could adversely affect the school functioning. Research reviews suggest
that principals human relations skills, managing staff in the school, production emphasis, inability to bring about staff convergence and cohesion, the way decisions are made, the failure to empower subordinates, aloofness of the principals, inability to deal with conflict are some of the reasons why principals are not successful as leaders. It is important that schools become places where principals along with teachers and non-teaching staff engage in school reform/renewal efforts for improving the schools. This helps to foster collegiality and a professional environment. It thus becomes necessary to inquire into the type of leadership behavior exhibited by the principals and to also find out as to what is the bearing of such behavior on the organizational climate and job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff in the schools.

Raising educational standards by studying the leadership behavior of principals has been high on the agenda of modernists, but, what about exploring the relationship between leadership behavior and emotional intelligence? Does emotional intelligence have any association with the quality of leadership provided by the school principal? Emotions affect performance and this is an established fact. The role of a school principal transcends that of an ordinary education practitioner and therefore his/her performance is expected to be of the highest caliber/standard. The role of emotional intelligence in school administration cannot be sidelined as effective educational administration emphasizes on both the cognitive aspects of the principal in managing the school and its resources and the affective side of his/her personality, which could serve as collateral. Emotional intelligence may at times help to transcend the cognitive
decisions or even delay premature judgments through ability of recognizing the meanings of emotions and their relationships and to reason and problem-solve on the basis of them, thereby achieving outstanding performance. Research has indicated that a close association exists between leadership and the emotional intelligence of the leader. According to Robbins (2000), intelligence quotient (IQ) and technical skills are "threshold capabilities" which are necessary but not sufficient requirements for leadership. The emotional competencies allow individuals to become star performers. A person may have outstanding training, a highly analytical mind, a long-term vision, and an endless supply of ideas, but, without emotional intelligence, will not make a great leader. Findings by Picard and Cosier (1997), Howard et. al. (2002), Cavallo and Brienza (2001) strongly support existence of a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and the leadership behavior. Thus, the present study attempts to not only measure the level of emotional intelligence of the principals in the high performing and low performing schools but also investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership behavior of principals.

Teachers experience greater satisfaction in their work when they perceive their principal as someone who shares information with them, delegates authority and keeps channels of communication open with them. Betancourt-Smith, et.al. (1994) report that teacher job satisfaction is linked to satisfaction with the principal's leadership. Other research studies indicate that a significant relationship exists between the leadership behavior of the principal and the job satisfaction of the staff (Nasreen, 1986; Sarma, 1991; Singh, 1992; Butler, et.al.
1997; Jaskyte, 2003). The review done by the researcher did not yield any study in which job satisfaction of the non-teaching staff was studied, but, in the present investigation the non-teaching staff too formed a part of the sample in order to study their level of job satisfaction. The non-teaching staff too are a part of the system and they too are affected by the leadership of the school principal.

Different researchers have reported that the leadership behavior exhibited by the principals have a close bearing on the school organizational climate (Sharma, 1982; Pandey, 1985; Sampuransingh, 1985; Chakraborthi, 1990; Appalwar 1995; Scott, 2003). Kottkamp, et.al. (1987) reported that in an open climate where principals are perceived as democratic managers who maintain open channels of communication, the staff would be more satisfied with their job as compared to schools where principals exhibit a harsh and autocratic attitude. The school organizational climate was also found to affect the academic achievement of students (Jani, 1993; Singh, 1998). The way principals interact with teachers and non-teaching staff influences the overall school climate and this has tremendous consequences on the functioning of schools. A healthy supervisory practice contributes to positive staff morale and higher performance of staff. Therefore, it is imperative that attention must be focused on studying the school organizational climate. This is necessary in order to offer proactive support if necessary to the schools.

Research studies on organizational climate reveal that organizational climate affects the job satisfaction of the school staff. Studies by Chakraborthi,
(1990); Patel, (1995); Singh, (1988) indicate that there exists an association between the organizational climate of schools and the job satisfaction of the teachers. An open climate was characterized by better relationships between the principal and the teachers while, a closed climate was one in which the principals did not treat the teachers humanly. If there are artificial and volatile relationships, malfunctioning channels of communication, authoritarian and dictatorial environment, the group morale will destabilize eventually leading to the institution’s/school’s breakdown/collapse. In the local context the present study attempts to find out whether organizational climate has any effect on the job satisfaction of staff.

In India, different Commissions/Committees have stressed the importance of education with quality. The Education Commission (1964-1966) observed that “the destiny of India is now being shaped in her classrooms”. Thus, a school must provide for training in the art of living together, contribute towards the development of the students and teachers personality, create a stimulating and enriching environment, provide opportunities for self discipline, provide opportunities for staff development, provide/implement appropriate service conditions and security for staff, encourage group relationships thereby heightening group morale etc. This appears to have remained illusionary and far fetched from the reality which is rather primitive.

A school is not a vacuous entity, but rather a powerhouse wherein human beings coexist. Therefore, all that is generated within its precincts or made
available for its nourishment from the outside must be deemed fit for its growth. Thus, the need to critically examine and appraise the reality as existing within our schools. A healthy school builds a healthy community and a healthy nation and therefore, educational administration within the school must contribute to develop the different facets of the school. It is observed that in the State of Goa, there is no mechanism to evaluate and appraise the functioning of schools besides the annual inspection carried out by the Directorate of Education, Government of Goa. Sometimes the schools are not inspected even for two successive years. The competent agencies of education in Goa fail to measure the variety of aspects which in reality support sound and healthy education of children who are a precious national resource of the country. The aspects which should essentially be a constituent part of the inspection/supervision agenda, but, which receive scant attention are: (i) what is the type of leadership behavior exhibited by the heads of schools, the emotional climate prevalent in the schools, the school climate/school organizational climate, job satisfaction of the teachers and other staff.

Traditionalism and tendencies to maintain status quo is very interestingly and aptly seen in the rules/regulations related to promotion/appointment to the post of principal defined by Rules 78 and 86(2) of the Goa School Education Rules – 1986. The rules emphasize the academic and professional qualifications, academic experience and seniority which in reality today are insufficient credentials to shoulder such an important position. There are neither competence evaluation paradigms nor other suitable mechanisms through which an objective assessment of candidates can be done to determine their suitability. This pathetic
situation itself evidences that, any one who fulfils the conditions as stipulated in Rules 78 and 86(2) in terms of mere possession of qualifications and completed years of service is deemed the right choice for the post of principal.

The present investigation therefore strives to unearth and provide empirical evidence on the status of leadership behavior of principals as existing in the high performing and low performing schools, the level of emotional intelligence of principals in the high performing and low performing schools, the organizational climate in the high performing and low performing schools and job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff in the high performing and low performing schools. Further, the study aims to provide research evidence on the interrelationships between each of the four variables viz: leadership behavior, emotional intelligence, schools organizational climate and the job satisfaction of the teaching and non-teaching staff. The study commands significance as it attempts to showcase camouflaged skeletons in the institutions cupboards (the words camouflaged skeletons in the institutions cupboards mean- depicting an unreal or illusionary picture to outsiders hiding the reality happening within the precincts of the school) such as, the leadership behavior of the principals, organizational climate prevailing in the schools and job satisfaction of staff which otherwise remain unexplored and unexposed as ground reality, so as to draw attention of the Directorate of Education, Government of Goa and other competent agencies of education in Goa. Moreover, in the administration of schools the inherent need for the principals to possess a good level of emotional intelligence will also be felt by the appropriate agencies of education in the State.
The study can also be perceived as an awakening to curb/arrest damage caused by principals' leadership behavior unintentionally or otherwise to the school education system in Goa lest it crumbles to smithereens.

The findings of the study would provide a solid foothold for professional development programmes, which can be conducted, to train administrators in areas such as leadership, developing emotional intelligence competencies, skills to improve school administration and management, relationship building between the staff and principal and amongst staff members leading to betterment of the school organizational climate etc. Thus, training of the principals on these aspects would help to better the school processes.

The study could draw attention of policy and decision-makers thereby impacting policy decisions leading to amendment of rules and regulations especially related to framing of stringent criteria for appointment of school principals (suitably modifying the current practice of appointments), service conditions, better inspection and supervision schedules, development and maintenance of a congenial school climate, introducing the concept of regular school appraisal etc. The outcomes of the present study can also be used as guidelines by school authorities to match their school attributes and if necessary redefine the school mission or overhaul and restructure the human resource management policy in the school setup.

The study being the first of its kind in Goa, contributes immensely to the furtherance of knowledge in the field of educational administration in Goa. It may
serve as a base and impetus for other researchers from Goa or elsewhere to do research in this area. Thus, it contributes to the expansion and growth of knowledge in the field of educational administration in general and educational administration in Goa in particular.

1.6 Specification of the Problem

The present investigation intended to study and appraise the leadership behavior of the principals in the high performing and low performing secondary schools of Goa in relation to their emotional intelligence, job satisfaction of the teaching and non-teaching staff and the organizational climate of the schools.

Thus, the present study proposed to find out answers to the following major research questions:

- Are there differences in leadership behavior of principals of high performing and low performing schools?

- How a high performing school is distinguished from a low performing school in terms of organizational climate?

- What is the pattern of organizational climate of high performing and low performing schools?

- What is the status of emotional quotient of principals of high performing and low performing schools?
- What is the relationship between principals' emotional quotient and job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff?

1.6.1 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were:

1. To identify high performing and low performing schools in terms of students performance.

2. To find out the leadership behavior patterns of principals of high performing and low performing schools.

3. To find out the pattern of organizational climate in high performing and low performing schools.

4. To study the relationship between leadership behavior and emotional intelligence of principals of high performing and low performing schools.

5. To study the associationship between the leadership behavior of principals and the school organizational climate of high performing and low performing schools.

6. To study the associationship between emotional intelligence of principals and the school organizational climate of high performing and low performing schools.
7. To find out the difference, if any, in the leadership behavior of principals of different age groups.

8. To find out the difference, if any, in the leadership behavior of male and female principals.

9. To find out the difference, if any, in the leadership behavior of principals having varied length of experience in administration.

10. To study the variation in the leadership behavior of principals of:
    a. high performing and low performing schools; and,
    b. schools with different types of organizational climate.

11. To study the variation in emotional intelligence of principals of:
    a. high performing and low performing schools; and,
    b. schools with different types of organizational climate.

12. To study the variation in job satisfaction of teachers with reference to:
    a. leadership behavior of principals;
    b. emotional intelligence of principals;
    c. school organizational climate; and,
    d. school performance.
13. To study the variation in job satisfaction of non-teaching staff with reference to:
   a. leadership behavior of principals;
   b. emotional intelligence of principals;
   c. school organizational climate; and,
   d. school performance.

14. To prepare profiles of principals of high performing and low performing schools.

1.6.2 Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses of the study were:

1. There is no significant difference in the school organizational climate of high performing and low performing schools.

2. There is no significant correlation between the leadership behavior and emotional intelligence of principals of high performing schools.

3. There is no significant correlation between the leadership behavior and emotional intelligence of principals of low performing schools.

4. There is no significant correlation between the leadership behavior and emotional intelligence of principals irrespective of school performance.
5. There is no significant association between leadership behavior of principals and school organizational climate of high performing schools.

6. There is no significant association between leadership behavior of principals and school organizational climate of low performing schools.

7. There is no significant association between leadership behavior of principals and school organizational climate irrespective of school performance.

8. There is no significant association between emotional intelligence of principals and school organizational climate of high performing schools.

9. There is no significant association between emotional intelligence of principals and school organizational climate of low performing schools.

10. There is no significant association between emotional intelligence of principals and school organizational climate irrespective of school performance.

11. There is no significant difference in the mean leadership behavior scores of principals of different age groups in the high performing schools.

12. There is no significant difference in the mean leadership behavior scores of principals of different age groups in the low performing schools.
13. There is no significant difference in the mean leadership behavior scores of male and female principals of high performing schools.

14. There is no significant difference in the mean leadership behavior scores of male and female principals of low performing schools.

15. There is no significant difference in the mean leadership behavior scores of principals having varied length of administrative experience in high performing schools.

16. There is no significant difference in the mean leadership behavior scores of principals having varied length of administrative experience in low performing schools.

17. There is no significant difference in the mean leadership behavior scores of principals of high performing and low performing schools.

18. There is no significant difference in the mean leadership behavior scores of principals in schools with different types of school organizational climate.

19. There is no significant difference in the mean emotional intelligence scores of principals of high performing and low performing schools.

20. There is no significant difference in the mean emotional intelligence scores of principals in schools with different types of school organizational climate.
21. There is no significant difference in the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers with reference to leadership behavior of principals.

22. There is no significant difference in the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers with reference to emotional intelligence of principals.

23. There is no significant difference in the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers in schools with different types of school organizational climate.

24. There is no significant difference in the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers of high performing and low performing schools.

25. There is no significant difference in the mean job satisfaction scores of non-teaching staff with reference to leadership behavior of principals.

26. There is no significant difference in the mean job satisfaction scores of non-teaching staff with reference to emotional intelligence of principals.

27. There is no significant difference in the mean job satisfaction scores of non-teaching staff in schools with different types of school organizational climate.

28. There is no significant difference in the mean job satisfaction scores of non-teaching staff of high performing and low performing schools.
1.6.3 Operationalization of Terms/Variables

1. School Performance:

School performance in the present study refers to the combined academic performance of a school for five years at the public examination from the academic years 1999 - 2000 to 2003 - 2004 conducted in the months of March-April by the Goa Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education (GBS&HSE). The combined academic performance is expressed in terms of Combined Grade Point Average (CGPA). Schools obtaining CGPA of 2.50 and above are categorized as high performing schools and below 2.50 are categorized as low performing school.

2. Head of the School:

According to the Goa School Education Rules 1986, head of the school means the principal academic officer, by whatever name called, of a recognized school. Thus, in the present study, the terms; head of the school and principal are used synonymously. The designations as headmaster and headmistress too mean head of the school. However, the parish priests officiating as principals, in parochial schools, managed by the Archdiocese of Goa, serve only as administrator/manager of the school and therefore cannot be considered as the head of the school as per the definition of head of school stipulated by the Goa School Education Rules 1986.
3. **Leadership Behavior:**

It refers to the behavior exhibited by the school principal as a leader of the group in creating an inspiring and stimulating atmosphere for the staff. In the present investigation, the leadership behavior of the school principal was studied/assessed by determining the teachers' perceptions on the leadership behavior of their own school principal. Leadership behavior of the principals in the present study was measured using the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) Form XII by Ralph Stogdill. The different dimensions of the LBDQ on which teachers expressed their perception were: representation, demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiating structure, tolerance of freedom, consideration, role assumption, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration and superior orientation. The composite score (sum of all the 12 averaged scores) obtained was termed as the leadership behavior score for the principal. On the basis of the composite score the principal was assigned under the appropriate category of leadership behavior viz: more effective leaders, moderately effective leaders and less effective leaders.

4. **Organizational Climate:**

Organizational climate refers to the pattern of social interaction that takes place within the school. The main units are the principal (leader) and the teachers (group). Organizational climate of schools in the present study was determined using the School Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (SOCDQ) by M. L. Sharma. The different dimensions of
SOCDQ on which teachers expressed their perception were: disengagement, hindrance, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration. The schools were assigned the appropriate school organizational climate type viz: open, autonomous, familiar, controlled and closed by matching the schools climate profile with the six prototypic profiles as prepared by the author of the SOCDQ.

5. **Emotional Intelligence:**

Emotional intelligence refers to the capacity of the heads of schools in recognizing their own feelings and those of others, for motivating themselves and for managing emotions well in themselves and in their relationship with the teachers and non-teaching staff at the schools. Emotional intelligence of the principals was measured by using the Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) by Hyde et.al. The dimension of EIS on which the principals expressed their perception were: self awareness, empathy, self motivation, emotional stability, managing relations, integrity, self development, value orientation, commitment and altruistic behavior. The composite score (summated score of the ten dimensions) obtained was referred to as the emotional intelligence score for the principal. On the basis of the composite score the principal was assigned under the appropriate category of emotional intelligence viz: high level of emotional intelligence, moderate level of emotional intelligence and low level of emotional intelligence.
6. **Job Satisfaction:**

   Job satisfaction refers to the cognitive, affective and evaluative reactions of the teaching and non-teaching staff towards their jobs under the leadership of the school principal. In the present research study, job satisfaction of the teaching and non-teaching staff was studied in relation to three specific aspects of job satisfaction viz. satisfaction with institutional plans and policies, satisfaction with authority including school management and satisfaction with service conditions. Separate job satisfaction scales were prepared for the teaching and non-teaching staff by the investigator.

7. **Contextual Variables:**

   (A) **Location** (Rural and Urban schools)

   Schools located/situated in rural areas are known as Rural schools, while those located/situated in urban areas are Urban schools. This classification is as per the 2001 census report and specification of the same by the Directorate of Education, Government of Goa.

   (B) **Management** (Government schools and Government aided schools)

   Schools which are established by the Government of Goa and managed by the Directorate of Education, Government of Goa are designated as Government schools. Those schools established and managed by missionaries/trusts/charitable organizations/voluntary agencies/non governmental agencies but aided by the Government of Goa, are designated as Government aided schools.
1.6.4 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The present research study serves as an impetus for intensive and extensive research in the area of educational administration. However, the present research study was delimited to appraising the leadership behavior of the principals of high performing and low performing secondary schools in relation to certain relevant variables. The following were the limitations of the study:

1. The study was restricted to the secondary (high) schools in Goa.

2. Only the government schools and those aided by the government were considered in the investigation.

3. Schools were categorized as high performing schools and low performing schools based on the pass percentage of students in the annual Board examinations as stated by the researcher.

4. The research study was restricted to the principals, teaching and non-teaching staff of schools selected under the sample for the study.

5. A total number of 145 schools were sampled. However, poor response rate compelled the researcher to eliminate some schools. Thus, the final sample comprised of only 110 schools.

6. Only those schools were considered a part of the sample in which the head of school was serving as its head for not less than two years six months. So also,
the teaching and non-teaching staff had to be serving for a minimum period of at least two years six months under the principal-ship of the same incumbent.

7. The research study was concerned with determining the relationship between leadership behavior of the principals, emotional intelligence of the principals, job satisfaction of the teaching and non-teaching staff and the school organizational climate in the high performing and low performing schools.

8. The findings of the study thus can be generalized to only the government and government aided schools in the State of Goa.