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SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Leadership is the driving force of an organization. It determines the quality and success of an organization. Leadership may be described as the totality of functions performed by individuals and as a group. Leadership in an organization is the quality of behavior of an individual where he/she guides people and their activities into an organized effort. A successful leader must possess certain basic traits necessary for motivating the subordinates to improve results. Leadership is all about influencing, motivating and inspiring people to create vision and achieve it. In an educational institution the principal is to be a good leader, must have insight into the human problems and capacity to analyze the emotional forces that motivate the conduct of the teachers and the students. Schools are organizations that rely on strong leadership to ensure success (Sarros & Sarros, 2007)

Education is the most important instrument for the progress of any nation. It is never ending process of inner growth and development and its period stretches from cradle to grave. It is very important for the progress of individual and society. The schools are important social institutions for providing education. The success of every institution depends upon the alertness, imagination efficiency and capacity of heads or administrative authorities. Progress of education mainly depends upon the head. “He is the seal and school is the wax. It is the fly-wheel that regulates the machine; it is the stream engine that moves the ship.” (Warren, 2005)

Buildings and machines can be owned; people can not. Leadership does not just happen; it can be learned and develop through practice as well as by studying the leadership ideas and behavior of great leaders with a vision. It is important to remember that leadership is both an art and a science. It is an art, because many leadership skills and qualities can not be learnt from a text books. Leadership take practice and hands-on experience, as well as intense personal exploration and development however leadership is also a science because a growing body of knowledge and objective facts describes the leadership process and how to use leadership skills to attain organizational goals. Halpin, (1966) leadership consists of two important behavioral dimensions – initiating structure and consideration. Initiating
structure refers “to the leaders in delineating the relationship between him and members of the work group and in endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and method of procedure.” Consideration, on the other hand refers “to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff.” (Halpin, 1966)

5.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

In any educational institution, the principal’s leadership style of dealing with different situations has a direct influence on the working of an institution. Any organization consists of a set of people involved with different positions roles and responsibilities working for the attainment of the pre-defined goals. There is a need for an individuals who can monitor the system, guide personnel, plan, organize and lead the organizational activities towards a sustainable development by achieving goals. In educational organization so many problems or stress arise and affect the functioning and effectiveness of the organization. In educational institutions, principals have to face a number of problems while interacting with their management, staff, students and their parents.

Due to privatization of education on now a days educational management is becoming more complex, reason behind this is multiple funding, diversity of stake holders, Fast evolution of management trends, it become significant to study leadership styles of principles who are major steering force in efficient running of an institutions.

A serious scanning of the researches conducted in the area of education reveals that very few studies have been conducted to study the leadership style preferred by principals in educational institutions in this challenging scenario of change. Hence the researcher found this area challenging for research.

5.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem under investigation is stated as

LEADERSHIP STYLES OF PRINCIPALS IN RELATION TO ORGANISATIONAL ROLE STRESS EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND GENDER
5.4 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1) The study has been confined to a sample of 250 senior secondary schools principals.

2) The study has been delimitated to private unaided schools located in the five districts (Moga, Ludhiana, Jalandhar, Patiala and Ferozpur) of Punjab state only.

3) The study has been delimitated to the study of leadership styles, emotional intelligence and organizational role stress only.

5.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present investigation has been undertaken with the view to fulfill the following objectives:

1. To study the leadership styles of principals with respect to gender.

2. To study the levels of organizational role stress of principals with respect to gender.

3. To study the levels of emotional intelligence of principals with respect to gender.

4. To find out the relationship between dimensions of organizational role stress and leadership styles of principals.

5. To find out the relationship between dimensions of emotional intelligence and leadership styles of principals.

6. To find out the difference in the leadership styles preferred by principals with respect to gender.

7. To find out the difference in leadership styles among principals perceiving high and low organizational role stress.

8. To analyze the difference in the leadership preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

9. To find out the predictors of leadership styles from among the independent variables of organizational role stress and emotional intelligence in case of male principals.
10. To find out the predictors of leadership styles from among the independent variables of organizational role stress and emotional intelligence in case of female principals.

5.6 HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The present study has been carried out with the following hypotheses:

1) There will be no significant relationship between dimensions of the organizational role stress and leadership styles of male principals.

2) There will be no significant relationship between dimensions of the organizational role stress and leadership styles of female principals.

3) There will be no significant relationship between dimensions of the emotional intelligence and leadership styles of male principals.

4) There will be no significant relationship between dimensions of the emotional intelligence and leadership styles of female principals.

5) There will be no significant difference in the leadership styles of principals with respect to gender. To test this hypothesis, five minor hypotheses were stated w.r.t. the five leadership styles i.e. (LS1) Authoritarian leadership, (LS2) Bureaucratic leadership, (LS3) Nurturant task leadership, (LS4) Participative leadership and (LS5) Task-oriented leadership.

H 5(a)- There will be no significant difference in (LS1) Authoritarian leadership style preferred by principals with respect to gender.

H 5(b)- There will be no significant difference in (LS2) Bureaucratic leadership style preferred by principals with respect to gender.

H 5(c)- There will be no significant difference in (LS3) Nurturant leadership style preferred by principals with respect to gender.

H 5(d)- There will be no significant difference in (LS4) Participative leadership style preferred by principals with respect to gender.

H 5(e)- There will be no significant difference in (LS5) Task-oriented leadership style preferred by principals with respect to gender.
6) There will be no significant difference in (LS1) Authoritarian as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.

7) There will be no significant difference in (LS2) Bureaucratic as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.

8) There will be no significant difference in (LS3) Nurturant as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.

9) There will be no significant difference in (LS4) Participative as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.

10) There will be no significant difference in (LS5) Task-oriented as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.

11) There will be no significant difference in (LS1) Authoritarian as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

12) There will be no significant difference in (LS2) Bureaucratic as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

13) There will be no significant difference in (LS3) Nurturant as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

14) There will be no significant difference in (LS4) Participative as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

15) There will be no significant difference in (LS5) Task-oriented as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

16) None of the independent variables of organizational role stress and emotional intelligence would contribute significantly in predicting the leadership styles of principals independently or conjointly in case of male sample.

17) None of the independent variables of organizational role stress and emotional intelligence would contribute significantly in predicting the leadership styles of principals independently or conjointly in case of female sample.
5.7 DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The present study was conducted on principals of five districts of Punjab state. It was observed that most of the government schools had officiating principals or principals under transfer. To have a stable sample for research, private unaided senior secondary schools constituted the universe for selection of sample, as principals were to be mostly found in position in these schools. Secondly there would be diversity in educational backgrounds and personality of principals along with a wide difference in organizational stress in which they function. A sample of 250 school principals was drawn from the universe of 1150 senior secondary school principals from unaided private schools. The total sample for the study was selected by multistage randomization meaning thereby randomization was followed at the district, tehsil, block, village and school level from the five districts out of existing twenty districts of Punjab. The sample was equally balanced between male and female principals. Tools of leadership style, emotional intelligence and organizational role stress were selected. Data was collected from the sample by administering the standardized tools for leadership styles, emotional intelligence and organizational role stress to the principals of the selected schools.

5.8 SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

In the present study of the leadership styles adopted by principals in relation to organizational role stress, emotional intelligence and gender, the investigator has adopted multistage random sampling technique and selected a sample of 250 senior secondary school principals of five districts of Punjab. These were Moga, Ludhiana, Jalandhar, Patiala and Ferozepur. A sampling process involving several stages, in which units at each subsequent stage are sub sampled from previously selected larger units called multistage random sampling. Under the multistage random sampling first out of twenty districts of Punjab, five aforementioned districts were randomly selected. From each district a list of private unaided senior secondary schools was procured and randomly schools were selected as shown in table 3.1. Thus out of 1150 private unaided senior secondary schools, 250 principals were selected for the study through multistage random sampling.
5.9 TOOLS OF THE STUDY

Keeping the objectives of the study in mind following tools were used in the present study:

1. Leadership style Scale by Sinha (1983)
2. Organizational role stress scale developed by Pareek (1993)

5.10 STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES

For the data analysis, the researcher employed various statistical techniques which were as follows:-

1. Descriptive Analysis such as Mean, Median, Standard deviation, Skewness and Kurtosis were computed to study the nature of distribution for scores for all the variables of the study. Pie charts and bar digrams were used to depict the results.
2. Bi-variate correlation was employed to study the relationship between the different leadership styles and dimensions of emotional intelligence, the different leadership styles and dimensions of organizational role stress of male and female school principals.
3. Differential Analysis was employed to determine if there were any statistically differences in the mean score of leadership styles, emotional intelligence and organizational role stress between the gender.
4. Multi-variate regression Analysis was employed to study the predictor of five leadership styles from among the independent variables of dimensions of emotional intelligence and dimensions of organizational role stress in case of male and female school principals.

5.11 MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

(1)-The findings related to objective no1, 2 and 3 are enlisted as no 1 to 8

1. Participative (LSs) was the most preferred leadership style among principals with i.e. (37%).
2. On comparing different leadership style with respect to gender it was found
that both male and female principals use Participative style (LSs) i.e. 35% and 39% respectively as the most dominating style. But female principals use participative style (LSs) more as compare to male principals.

3. Principals with high emotional intelligence preferred participative (34%) as the most dominating leadership style followed by Task Oriented (19%), Nuturant (17%), Bureaucratic (16%) and Authoritarian (4%).

4. Principals with low emotional intelligence also preferred Participative (38%) as the most dominating leadership styles followed by Nuturant (19%), Task Oriented (16%), Bureaucratic (10%) and Authoritarian (5%).

5. Principals with high organizational role stress prefer Participative (38%) as the most dominating style followed by Bureaucratic (17%), Nuturant (16%), Task Oriented (14%) and Authoritarian (2%).

6. Principals with low organizational role stress prefer Participative (37%) as the most dominating style followed by Nuturant (22%), Task Oriented (15%), Bureaucratic (9%) and Authoritarian (2%).

7. 52% school principals had low emotional intelligence.

8. 51% school principals had low organizational role stress.

(2) The findings related to hypotheses no 1 to 4 concerning correlation are listed from 9 to 24

9. dimensions of emotional intelligence i.e. Self awareness (ELa) 0.21, Self motivation (ELc) 0.19, Managing relations (ELr) -0.19, Integrity (ELr) 0.18 and Self development (ELc) 0.20 were significantly correlated With (LSs) Authoritarian style of male principals.

10. Self motivation (ELc) 0.17 was significantly correlated with (LS2) Bureaucratic style of male principals.

11. Self motivation (ELc) 0.17, Self development (ELc) 0.17 were correlated significantly with (LS4) Task oriented style of male principals.

12. Managing relations (ELs) -0.17 was significantly correlated with (LSs) Participative style of male principals.

13. Three dimensions of emotional intelligence i.e. 0.25, Empathy (ELa) 0.26, Emotional stability (ELo) 0.25 and Altruistic behavior (ELr) 0.25 were
significantly correlated with (LSi) Authoritarian style of female principals.

14. Emotional stability (EI\text{d}) 0.19 was significantly correlated with (LS4) Task oriented style of female principals.

15. Self-awareness (EI\text{a}) 0.17 was significantly correlated with (LSi) Participative style of female principals.

16. Dimensions of organizational role stress i.e. (ORS\text{i}) inter-role distance -0.18, (ORS\text{c}) role stagnation -0.19, (ORS\text{s}) role expectation conflict -0.18, (ORS4) Role erosion -0.19, (ORSi) role overload -0.19, (ORS7) personal inadequacy -0.20 and (ORS\text{a}) role ambiguity 0.21 were significantly correlated with (LSi) Authoritarian style of male principals.

17. Inter-role distance (ORS\text{i}) 0.18 was significantly correlated with (LS2) Bureaucratic style of male principals.

18. Inter-role distance (ORS\text{i}) 0.23 was significantly correlated with (LS\text{s}) Nuturant style of male principals.

19. Role stagnation (ORS\text{i}) -0.18 and (ORS\text{w}) resources inadequacy -0.17 were significantly correlated with (LS\text{s}) Task oriented style of male principals.

20. Inter-role distance (ORS\text{i}) -0.22, (ORS\text{s}) role expectation conflict -0.19, (ORS\text{a}) role ambiguity -0.24 and (ORS\text{m}) resources inadequacy -0.24 were significantly correlated with (LS\text{a}) Participative style of male principals.

21. Dimensions of organizational role stress i.e. (ORS\text{i}) inter-role distance 0.18, (ORS\text{c}) role stagnation 0.18, (ORS\text{s}) Role erosion 0.18, (ORS\text{i}) role overload 0.19 were significantly correlated with (LS\text{i}) Authoritarian style of female principals.

22. Inter-role distance (ORS\text{i}) 0.18 was significantly correlated with (LS\text{c}) Bureaucratic style of female principals.

23. Inter-role distance (ORS\text{i}) 0.23 was significantly correlated with (LS\text{i}) Nuturant style of female principals.

24. Inter-role distance (ORS\text{i}) 0.22, (ORS\text{s}) Role erosion 0.17, (ORS\text{i}) role overload 0.19 and (ORS\text{a}) role isolation 0.19 were significantly correlated with (LS\text{i}) Task oriented style of female principals.

(3) The findings related to hypotheses no 5 to 15 concerning significance of difference between means are listed from 25 to 39

25. No significant difference was found in preference for (LS\text{i}) Authoritarian, as
leadership style preferred by male and female principals.

26. No significant difference was found in preference for, (LS2) Bureaucratic, as leadership style preferred by male and female principals.

27. No significant difference was found in preference for (LS3) Nuturant, as leadership style preferred by male and female principals.

28. No significant difference was found in preference for (LS4) Task oriented, as leadership style preferred by male and female principals.

29. No significant difference was found in preference for (LS5) Participative, as leadership style preferred by male and female principals.

30. No significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS1) Authoritarian as leadership style was found in principals with high and low organizational role stress.

31. No significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS2) Bureaucratic as leadership style was found in principals with high and low organizational role stress.

32. No significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS3) Nuturant as leadership style was found in principals with high and low organizational role stress.

33. No significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS4) Task oriented as leadership style was found in principals with high and low organizational role stress.

34. No significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS5) Participative as leadership style was found in principals with high and low organizational role stress.

35. Significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS1) Authoritarian as leadership style was found in principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

36. No significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS2) Bureaucratic as leadership style was found in principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

37. No significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS3) Nuturant as leadership style was found in principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

38. No significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS4) Task oriented as leadership style was found in principals with high and low emotional intelligence.
39. No significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS) Participative as leadership style was found in principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

(4) The findings related to hypotheses no 16 and 17 to locate predictors of Leadership Styles have been listed from 40 to 48

40. Self-awareness (EIA) was a positive predictor and Managing relations (EIE) was a negative predictor of the Authoritarian (LSI) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of emotional intelligence in case of male principals.

41. Inter- Role Distance (ORSi) was the only dimension of organizational role stress which was found to be a positive predictor of the Bureaucratic (LS2) leadership style in case of male principals.

42. Inter- Role Distance (ORSi) was a positive predictor and Role Stagnation (ORS2) was a negative predictor of the Nurturant (LS3) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of organizational role stress in case of male principals.

43. Role Stagnation (ORS2) was the only dimension of organizational role stress which was found to be a negative predictor of the Task- oriented (LS4) leadership style in case of male principals.

44. Self-Role Distance (ORS9) was a negative predictor of the Participative (LS5) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of organizational role stress in case of male principals.

So hypothesis no 16 stated that None of the independent variables of organizational role stress and emotional intelligence would contribute significantly in predicting the leadership styles of principals independently or conjointly in case of male sample was partially accepted.

45. Empathy (EIB), Altruistic behavior (EJ) and Self-awareness (ELA) were positive predictors and Self motivation (ELC) was a negative predictor of Authoritarian (LS1) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of emotional intelligence in case of female principals. Further Inter- Role Distance (ORS1) was a positive predictor of Authoritarian (LS1) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of organizational role stress in case of female principals.
46. Inter-Role Distance (ORSi) was a positive predictor of the Bureaucratic (LS2) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of organizational role stress in case of female principals.

47. Inter-Role Distance (ORSi) was a positive predictor and Role Expectation Conflict (ORS3) was a negative predictor of the Nurturant (LS3) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of organizational role stress in case of female principals.

48. Inter-Role Distance (ORSi) was a positive predictor of the Task-oriented (LS4) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of organizational role stress in case of female principals. Further Emotional stability (EI0) was a positive predictor of the Task-oriented (LS4) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of emotional intelligence in case of female principals.

Besides predictors of leadership styles i.e Authoritarian (LSi), Bureaucratic (LS2), Nurturant (LS3) and Task-oriented (LS4) no predictors for Participative (LS5) from 10 dimensions of emotional intelligence (EIa, EIb, EIc, EI0, EIe, EI0, EIg, EIh, EIi, EJ) and 10 dimensions of organizational role stress (ORS1, ORS2, ORS3, ORS4, ORS5, ORS6, ORS7, ORS8, ORS9, ORS10) were found in case of female principals hence no discussion is being presented.

So hypothesis no 17 stated that None of the independent variables of organizational role stress and emotional intelligence would contribute significantly in predicting the leadership styles of principals independently or conjointly in case of female sample was partially accepted.

5.12 EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The question remains, how do we prepare and mentor future administrators for success in leading transformational change in our school system? In order for collaboration, response and mobilization to occur, self-reflection on the part of the leader is the starting point for successful relationships within the school community. To promote success for all students, leaders must become acquainted with the areas related to emotional intelligence and the competencies necessary to be successful. On the basis of enhanced emotional intelligence, Principals can provide stress free atmosphere in schools. Principals should not be rigid in their thinking and in ways of dealing with staff, students and their parents. Educational leadership programs should
include emotional intelligence theory as a component for reform. Programs have been focusing on the development of course content. Leadership is helpful in policy making and curriculum framing. It also helps the principal to solve day to day problems of the schools. The principals can guide their teachers in a proper way and can provide facilities to his followers. In changing times, they expect from school teachers, to bring high academic results and to display exemplary character traits. Healthy work environment is also expected from teachers. It is the one of the foremost duty of a school principals to provide congenial and attractive work conditions both for the students and for their colleagues.

A principal should remember that the effectiveness of school programs lies in establishing proper immediate objectives whose realization will assure the fulfillment of ultimate aim of education, resulting building of a nation.

Role stress implies universally and is not confined mere to a part of human life. It usually applies to the relationship with the family, friends, and colleagues in working conditions. Healthy organizational role stress can help the principal to solve day to day problems very easily. Stress free environment can help the principal in more gainful way. He/she can handle the relation with the staff, students and their parents effectively. He/she can maintain discipline in a very effective manner.

Principals should encourage their teachers to attend different functions and different co-curricular activities and to allow them to express their views on various issues. Educational institutions should organize such type of activities that can reduce organizational role stress among teachers.

5.13 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Researches are never complete. One research opens various new directions for further research and it continues towards new perspectives as a chain reaction. The present investigation also abides by the same rule and opens up certain avenues for further researches. The present study was conducted with certain limitations. It is, therefore, suggested that further investigation, in this direction may be taken up with the suggestions:
1. Effectiveness of intervention program on appropriate use for leadership style for principals.

2. To find predictors of conflict resolution strategies from variables of organizational role stress, leadership styles, intelligence and self concept among principals.

3. Comparative study on use of leadership style by principals with high and low life satisfaction.

4. Comparative study on use of leadership style by male and female principals with respect to self esteem and organizational climate.

5. This study can be replicated to include more antecedents of leadership style as age, marital status, number of years of teaching experience and locus of control.