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METHOD AND PROCEDURE

4.1. DESIGN

In the present study survey method of investigation was employed. Sample comprised of male and female principals serving in government and private colleges of education situated in urban and rural areas of Jammu region. Difference in the personality characteristics, job-satisfaction, attitude towards administration and administrative styles due to different management strata, sex-differences, urban-rural differences were studied by employing statistical technique of t-test.

4.2. SAMPLE

43 Principals working in the Colleges of Education affiliated to University of Jammu, Jammu comprised the sample for the present study. Detail of sample has been presented in Table 4.1

TABLE 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Name of the Institution</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>U/R</th>
<th>Name of the Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kalra College of Education, Udhampur.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Sh. S.S. Raina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ranjit College of Education, Kunjwani, Jammu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Dr. Sheetal Gupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B.N. College of Education, Nawabad, Sunjwan, Jammu.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Dr. Janak Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shirdee College of Education, Bishnah, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Sh. S.S. Sahni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kawa College of Education, Patoli, Jammu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Mrs. Tarvinder Kaur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dogra College of Education, Bari Brahmana, Jammu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Dr. Kiran Luthra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S.M.S. College of Education, Digiana, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Dr. T.C. Sharma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thakur Dharam Singh College of Education, Kathua</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Prof. Darshan Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ashoka College of Education, Kathua</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Prof. R.K. Koul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Baba Farid College of Education, Hatli Morh, Kathua</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Dr. R.M. Sharma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>N.S.M. College of Education, Bohri, Jammu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Dr. Suman Thusoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Harward College of Education, Karan Bagh, Jammu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Dr. Usha Koul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Saraswati College of Education, Sainik Colony, Jammu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Prof. Nirmala Khajuria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>New Millennium College of Education, Sainik Colony, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Prof. P.L. Gupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sher-e- Kashmir College of Education, Ajit Nagar, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Sh. Ashwani Vaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>C.M.H. College of Education, Chowdi Top, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Dr. H.P. Magotra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NGM College of Education, Miran Sahib, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Dr. G.S. Gulshan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>K.C. Gurukul College of Education, B.C. Road, Jammu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Sh. Kiran Bakshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>College Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Luthra College of Education</td>
<td>Talab Tillo, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>J.K. College of Education</td>
<td>Kunjwani, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>K.C.S. College of Education</td>
<td>Roopnagar, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Surya College of Education</td>
<td>Kathua</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tagore College of Education</td>
<td>Near Railway Station, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chenab College of Education</td>
<td>Bari Brahmana, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Vivekanand College of Education</td>
<td>Lakhapnr.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Trikuta College of Education</td>
<td>Nardani, Kotbhaliwal, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sacred Heart College of Education</td>
<td>Paloura, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sai Shyam College of Education</td>
<td>Gho Manhasan, Jammu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Shivalik College of Education</td>
<td>Udhampur</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>K.C. College of Education</td>
<td>Akhnoor Road, Jammu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bhartiya College of Education</td>
<td>Udhampur</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Govt. College of Education</td>
<td>Canal Road, Jammu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Kalra College of Education</td>
<td>Kud, Udhampur</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Guru Nanak College of Education</td>
<td>Jallo Chak, Jammu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Rajiv Gandhi Memorial College of Education</td>
<td>Kathua</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38 Bhargava College of Education, Samba. M U Sh. P.D. Shastri
39 M.C.Khalsa College of Education, Chand Nagar, Jammu. F U Dr. Madhu Singh
40 National College of Education, Domana, Jammu. M U Sh. B.R. Moza
41 Islamia Firidia College of Education, Kishtwar. M R Sh. G.H. Shah
42 Atman College of Education, Greater Kailash, Jammu. F U Smt. Urmil Sharma
43 Vaishno Devi College of Education, Katra M U Sh. Joginder Khajuria

4.3. TOOLS

Following tools were used for data collection in the present study –

1. 16 Personality Factors Questionnaire (Kapoor & Tripathi, 1982).
2. Job Satisfaction Scale (Singh and Sharma, 1986).
3. Attitude Towards Educational Administration Scale (Sharma, 1992).
4. Leadership Preference Scale (Bhushan, 1995).

4.3.1 16 PF Questionnaire (Kapoor & Tripathi 1982)

The 16 PF is an objectively scorable test devised for basic research in the field of psychology to give the most complete coverage of the personality possible in brief time. This test was designed for use with adults.

Three alternative answers are provided for each of the questions, since the two alternatives ‘forced-choice’ situation forbidding any ‘middle of the road’ and may produce aversion to the test on the part of the individual.
Reliability

Co-efficient of the Test Form for each Trait

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity

The concept validity of the scale can be evaluated directly by correlating the scale with the pure factor it was designed to measure.

Scoring

Two card board stencil scoring keys are used. One covers Factors (Traits) A, C, F, H, I, N, Q1 and Q3 and other factors B, E, G, I, M, O, Q2 and Q4. By simply fitting the stencil over the answer sheet and the marks visible through the holes are counted for every factor through the stencil. In this way the scoring for every factor is done by adding these scores and the final score is indicated in the space given therein. For example for Factor A, allowing either 2 or 1 indicated by the number printed adjacent to the hole. Sum these scores and enter the total in the space indicated by the arrow on the stencil for Factor A (raw score). But the Factor B is peculiar where each correct mark visible in a hole gives a score of 1 only. For other factors the scoring is done in the same way to ultimately find out the score separately for each factor.

Interpretation of The Primary Factors

Each of the primary factors measured by the 16 PF has an alphabetic designation (A through Q4), a technical title (which is given in parentheses in the following descriptions), and a brief, less technical title (given here in boldface).

Detail of 16 PF Questionnaire has been presented below:
CAPSULE DESCRIPTIONS OF THE SIXTEEN PRIMARY PERSONALITY FACTORS

Low Score Direction High Score Direction

FACTOR

A


The person who scores low (sten of 1 to 3) on Factor A tends to be stiff, cool, skeptical and aloof. He likes things alone and avoiding compromises of viewpoints. He is likely to be precise and “rigid” in his way of doing things and in personal standards. He may tend, at times, to be critical, obstructive or hard.

The person who scores high on Factor A tends to be good-natured, easy-going, emotionally expressive, ready to cooperate, attentive to people, soft-hearted, kind and adaptable. He likes occupations dealing with people and socially impressive situations. He readily forms active groups. He is generous in personal relations, less afraid of criticism and better able to remember names of people.

FACTOR

B

Less Intelligent and Concrete Thinking (Lower Scholastic Mental Capacity) Vs. More Intelligent, Abstract Thinking, Bright (Higher Scholastic Mental Capacity)

The person scoring low on Factor B tends to be slow to learn and grasp dull, given to concrete and literal interpretation. His dullness may be simply a reflection of low intelligence or it may represent poor functioning.

The person who scores high on Factor B tends to be quick to grasp ideas, a fast learner and intelligent. There is some correlation level of culture with alertness. High scores contraindicate deterioration of mental functions in pathological conditions.
FACTOR C
Affected by Feelings, Emotionally Less Stable and Easily upset
(Lower ego strength)

The person who scores low on Factor C tends to be low in frustration tolerance for unsatisfactory condition, changeable and plastic, evading necessary reality demands, neurotically fatigued, easily emotional and annoyed, active in dissatisfaction, having neurotic symptoms (phobias, sleep disturbances, psychosomatic complaints, etc.). Low Factor C score is common to almost all forms of neurotic and some psychotic disorders.

FACTOR C
Emotionally Stable, Faces Reality, Calm and Mature
(Higher ego strength)

The person who scores high on Factor C tends to be emotionally mature, stable, realistic about life, untruffled possessing ego strength, better able to maintain solid group morale. Sometimes he may be a person making an resigned adjustment to unsolved emotional problems (Shrewd clinical observers have pointed out that a good C level sometimes enables a person to achieve effective adjustment despite an underlying psychotic potential)

FACTOR E
Humble, Mild, Accommodating and Conforming

The person who scores low on Factor E tends to give way to others, to be docile, and to conform. He is often dependent, confessing, anxious for obsessional correctness. This passivity is part of many neurotic syndromes.

FACTOR E
Assertive, Independent, Aggressive, Competitive and Stubborn

The person who scores high on Factor E is assertive, self-assured and independent-minded. He tends to be austere, a law to himself, hostile or introductive, authoritarian (managing others), and disregards authority.

FACTOR F
Sober, Prudent and Serious.

The person who scores low on factor F tends to be restrained, reticent and introspective. He sometimes dour, pessimistic and unduly deliberate. He tends to be sober and dependable person.

FACTOR F
Happy – Go – Lucky Impulsively lively and enthusiastic.

The person who scores high on this trait tends to be cheerful, active, talkative, frank, expressive, effervescent, carefree. He is frequently chosen as an elected leader. He may be impulsive and mercurial.
Expedient, Evades, Rules and Feels Few Obligations

The person who scores low on Factor G tends to be unsteady in purpose. He is often casual and lacking in effort for group undertakings and cultural demands. His freedom from group influence may lead to anti-social acts, but at times makes him more effective, while his refusal to be bound by rules causes him to have less somatic upset from stress.

Conscientious, Persevering, Staid, Rule-bound
(Strong superego strength)

The person who scores high on factor G tends to be exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty, persevering, responsible and planful. He is usually conscientious and moralistic and prefers hard working people to witty companions.

Shy, Restrained, Diffident and Timid

The person who scores low on this trait tends to be shy, withdrawing, cautious, retiring and a “wallflower”. He usually has inferiority feelings. He tends to be slow and impeded in speech and in expressing himself, dislikes occupations with personal contacts, prefers one or two close friends to large groups.

Venturesome, Socially-bold
Uninhibited and Spontaneous

The person who scores high on Factor H is sociable, bold, ready to try new things, spontaneous and abundant in emotional response. His “thick skinnedness” enables him to face wear and tear in dealing with people and emotional situations without fatigue. However, he can be careless of detail, ignore danger signals and consume much time in talking. He tends to be “pushy” and actively interested in the opposite sex.

Tough-minded and No Nonsense

The person who scores low on Factor I tends to be practical, realistic, masculine, independent, responsible, cultured. He is sometimes unmoved, hard cynical and smug. He tends to keep a group

Tender-Hearted, Protected and Sensitive

The person who scores high on Factor I tend to be tender minded, day-dreaming, artistic and feminine. He is sometimes demanding of attention and help, impatient, dependent, and impractical. He
operating on practical and realistic basis.

dislikes crude people and rough occupations. He tends to slow up group performance and to upset group morale by unrealistic fussiness.

FACTOR

L

Trusting, Adaptable, Free of Jealousy tendencies and Easy to get on with

The person who scores low on Factor L tend to be free of jealous tendencies, adaptable, cheerful, un-competitive, concerned about other people and a good team worker.

Vs.

Suspicious, Self-opinionated, Hard to Fool

The person who scores high on Factor L tend to be mistrusting and doubtful. He is usually deliberate in his actions, unconcerned about other people and a poor team member.

FACTOR

M

Practical, Careful, Conventional and Regulated by External Realities

The person who scores low on Factor M tends to be anxious to do the right things, attentive to practical matters, and subject to the direction of what is obviously possible. He is concerned over detail, able to keep his head in emergencies, but sometimes unimaginative.

Vs.

Imaginative, Wrapped up in inner Urgencies, Careless of Practical matters and Absent-minded

The person who scores high on Factor M tends to be unconventional, unconcerned over everyday matter, self-motivated, imaginatively creative, concerned with “essential”, particularly with people and physical realities. His inner-directed interests sometimes lead to unrealistic situations accompanied by expressive outbursts. His individuality tends to cause him to be rejected in group activity.

FACTOR

N

Natural, Artless and Sentimental

The person who scores low on Factor N tends to be unsophisticated, sentimental and simple. He is sometimes crude and awkward, but easily pleased and content with what comes and is natural and spontaneous.

Vs.

Calculating, Worldly, Penetrating and Shrewd

The person who scores high on Factor N tends to be polished, experienced, worldly, shrewd. He is often hardheaded and analytical. He has an intellectual and unsentimental approach to situations.
FACTOR

O

Placid, Self-assumed, Confident and Serene

The person who scores low on Factor O tends to be placid, with unshakable nerve. He has a mature, an anxious confidence in himself and his capacity to deal with things. He is resilient and secure, but to the point of being insensitive of when a group is not going along with him, so that he may evoke.

Vs.

Apprehensive, Worrying, Depressive and Troubled

The person who scores high on Factor O tends to be depressed, moody and a worrier. He has a child like tendency to anxiety in difficulties. He does not feel accepted in groups or free to participate. High Factor O score is very common in clinical groups of all types.

FACTOR

Q₁

Conservative, Respecting established ideas, Tolerant of traditional difficulties (Conservatism)

The person who scores low on Factor Q₁ is confident in what he has been taught to believe, and accepts the “tried and true”, despite inconsistencies, when something else might be better. He is cautious in regard to new ideas and tends to oppose and postpone any change.

Vs.

Experimenting, Critical, Liberal, Analytical, Free-thinking (Radicalism)

The person who scores high on Factor Q₁ tends to be interested in intellectual matters and has doubts on fundamental issues. He is skeptical and inquiring regarding ideas, either old or new. He tends to be more well informed, more inclined to experiment in life generally, and more tolerant of inconvenience and change.

FACTOR

Q₂

Group-depended, A “Joiner” and Sound Follower (Group Adherence)

The person who scores low on Factor Q₂ prefers to work and make decisions with other people, likes and depends on social approval and admiration. He tends to go along with the group. He is not necessarily gregarious by choice; rather he needs group support.

Vs.

Self-sufficient, Prefers Own decisions, Resourceful (Self-sufficiency)

The person who scores high on Factor Q₂ is temperamentally independent, accustomed to going his own way, making decisions and taking action on his own. He discounts public opinion, but is not necessarily dominant in this relation with others. He does not dislike people but simply does not need their agreement or support.
FACTOR
Q3
Undisciplined, Self-conflict, Careless of Protocol, Follows Own Urges (Low integration)

The person who scores low on Factor Q3 will not be bothered with control and regard for social demands. He is not overly considerate, careful or painstaking. He may feel maladjusted many times.

FACTOR
Q3
Vs. Controlled, Socially precise, Following Self-image (High Self-concept control)

The person who scores high on Factor Q3 tends to have strong control on his emotions and general behaviour, is inclined to be socially aware and careful and evidences what is commonly termed “self-respect” and regard for social regulations.

FACTOR
Q4
Relaxed, Torpid, Unfrustrated (Low tension)

The person who scores low on Factor Q4 tends to be relaxed, composed and satisfied (not frustrated). In some situations, his over satisfaction can lead to laziness and low performance, in the sense that low motivation produces little trial and error.

FACTOR
Q4
Vs. Tense, Frustrated, Driven and Overwrought

The person who scores high on Factor Q4 tends to be tense, excitable, restless, and impatient. He is often fatigued, but unable to remain inactive. In groups he takes a poor view of the degree of unity, orderliness and leadership. His frustration represents an excess of stimulated but un-discharged drive.

4.3.2. Job-Satisfaction Scale (Singh and Sharma, 1986)

Many researchers have tried to measure the quantum of job-satisfaction in the workers. But most of the measuring tools have been constructed and applied on industrial workers and not on different categories of employees in different walks of life. There was no such tool which could be used to find the job-satisfaction of any category of employees all at one time. This scale is comprehensive in nature. Hence this scale was chosen to find job-satisfaction of principals. This scale has only 30 statements. All the statements are clear, distinct and concept based. Each statement has five alternatives from which the respondent has to choose any one which expresses his response.
The instructions are printed on the cover page of the scale. These were read out before the subjects.

They were told not to give longer thought over any statement. They were requested to act spontaneously and to deal with all the statements.

The scale was administrated in full by establishing proper rapport with the subjects.

Scoring: The scale has both positive and negative statements. Items at Sr.no.4, 13, 20, 21, 27 and 28 are negative. Others are positive. The positive statements carry weightage of 4, 3, 2, 1 and 0 and the negative ones a weightage of 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4. The total score gives a quick measure of satisfaction.

The following table shows the degree of satisfaction among workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>DEGREE OF SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74 or above</td>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 – 73</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 – 62</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 – 55</td>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 or below</td>
<td>Extremely dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability: The test – retest reliability of the scale is 0.978 with N=52 and a gap of 25 days.

Validity: The scale compares favourably with Muthayya’s Job-Satisfaction Questionnaire giving a validity co-efficient of 0.743. Moreover, the satisfaction measures obtained from this scale have a close resemblance to the rating given to the employees on a 3-point scale: fully satisfied, average satisfied, dissatisfied by the employers. The coefficient of correlation was .812 (N=52).
4.33 Attitude Towards Educational Administration Scale (Sharma 1992)

In order to measure the attitude of the Principals towards educational administration, a scale was needed. Investigator used ATEA scale by Sharma, (1992). This scale was preferred due to availability of the scale and its good results.

Twenty statements constituted the scale. Statements at 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 16 are indicating favorable attitudes and the statement at Sr. no. 2, 7, 8, 9 14, 15, 17, 18, 19 and 20 are indicating non-favourable attitude.

**Reliability:** Reliability of the scores on the scale was calculated by product-moment method by correlating the scores obtained on 5-point scale for favourable and unfavourable statement.

Co-efficient of reliability correlation thus calculated was 0.91.

**Validity:** The validity of the scale was determined by finding the discriminating level which ranged between 1.76 to 11.1 between two groups of teachers, i.e.; the higher scores and the lower scores. Calculation of the C.R. showed that they differed significantly to defend the validity of the scale.

**Scoring:** Favourable and unfavourable statements are to be given weightage of 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 and 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 respectively. The total score will indicate the attitude of the respondents towards educational administration.

4.3.4 Leadership Preference Scale (Bhushan, 1995).

The L.P-scale aims at measuring one’s degree of preference for authoritarian or democratic leadership style. Of the various types of leadership described in industrial and social set up, the most common form of leadership classification is on the basis of the manner of exerting influence. From this viewpoint the two opposite poles are authoritarian and democratic leadership styles.
Final form of the scale has 30 statements including positive and negative statements.

Principals were instructed to underline only one of the five alternative responses. For a positive item (i.e.: an agreement with which indicated preference for democratic leadership) the scoring was done as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In case of negative items (i.e.; an agreement with which, indicated preference for authoritarian leadership) the scoring was reversed. The total score which an individual would get was the sum of the scores on all the statements. Higher score indicated greater preference for democratic leadership.

**Reliability**

In order to ascertain the reliability of the scale, both the internal consistency and temporal stability were determined. Using the responses from 100 students, the coefficient of internal consistency as corrected by spearman-Brown formula was found to be .74. The retest was done after four weeks on 50 subjects and the test-retest reliability coefficient was found to be .79.

**Validity**

To ascertain whether the LPS was a valid measuring tool, the content and construct validities were determined. The behavioural dimensions and characteristics on which the test items were constructed were quite explicitly mentioned. So, the entire list of statements along with the dimensions of the scale was given to five University teachers (as mentioned earlier) of psychology who had sufficient orientation in this area.
On the basis of the opinion expressed by them only 123 such item were subjected to item analysis which were according to them, definitely related to some criteria.

4.4. DATA COLLECTION

After preparing all the tools, the next step was to collect the data. For this the investigator prepared a list of Colleges of Education affiliated with the University of Jammu, Jammu.

Information of this was also collected from the office of the Director Colleges Development, University of Jammu.

Principals of various colleges were contacted on telephone and they were requested to co-operate the investigator in the process of data collection. The purpose of the research was also conveyed to them. After fixing timings with different principals of the colleges, they were contacted individually as per their convenience. All the research tools were given to them and they were requested to complete and handover to the investigator. All the queries and doubts were removed as and when raised by the principals. They were also told that their responses will be kept confidential and these will be used only for the purpose of research. In some cases, principals took 1-2 days for filling the research tools. In the beginning, tools were given to 47 principals but as 04 principals gave their incomplete responses, therefore, the final study was conducted on a sample of 43 principals of Colleges of Education affiliated with University of Jammu, Jammu.

4.5 STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED

The following statistical techniques were used in this study:

1. Computation of mean, Standard Deviation and t-value for measuring the significance of the difference between the mean scores of different groups.

2. Graphical representation.