SUMMARY

Introduction

The study of leadership phenomena has always been of interest to man from times immemorial. The literature on this subject is extensive and exhaustive. A leader always plays a major role in the growth, productivity, discipline and social climate of an organization.

The Principal of a school is the hub around which the whole educational process revolves. He plays a crucial role in determining the long range goals of education as well as in responding to the day-to-day events within the school building. The substance and philosophy of decisions made by the Principal are under close scrutiny by the public, the Education Department, students and the teaching staff. The development of the personality of the child, results of the students and the organizational climate of the school depend on the personality and leadership behaviour of the Principal.

Objectives of the Study

The present study, 'Personality Correlates of Leadership Behaviour of Principals at the Secondary School
Stage 1, aimed at finding out:-

1. Relationship between the personality of the school Principals and their leadership behaviour.

2. Principals' personality differentials of high achieving schools and low achieving schools.

3. Principals' leadership behaviour differences of high achieving schools and low achieving schools.

4. Relationship of the Principals' productivity emphasis with the high achievement on school results.

After screening the relevant research literature, the study was pivoted round the framework of the following hypotheses:

1. There are significant correlations between the variables of personality and the variables of leadership behaviour of school Principals.

2. The measures of personality factors cluster in specific combinations with the criterian measures of leadership behaviour of Principals to explain common factor variance.

3. There is no significant difference in the personality factors of the Principals of high achieving schools and low achieving schools.
4. Significant differences exist between the dimensions of leadership behaviour of Principals of high achieving schools and low achieving schools.

5. The higher the emphasis on productivity, the better are the school results.

**Design and Statistical Techniques**

To test the above hypotheses the study was designed and advanced to two phases: The first phase concerned the identification of leadership behaviour of Principals and the second phase related to establishing relationship between personality factors and the measures of leadership behaviour of Principals. The schools were divided into high achieving schools and low achieving schools. This was done to study the mean difference on personality and leadership behaviour of Principals of both type of schools. Schools showing good results for three years consecutively were termed as high achieving schools and those showing poor results for three years were termed as low achieving schools.

The method of investigation used to conduct this study was essentially descriptive in nature. Measures of central tendency and dispersion - mean, median, standard deviations were worked out to study the nature of sample
distribution in relation to personality and leadership behaviour of the Principals.

Numerical determinants of skewness and kurtosis were calculated for finding out the tendency of departure of the sample distribution from the normal probability curve.

Pearson's coefficients of correlations between the measures of leadership behaviour and personality factors were computed.

To test the linearity, \( \gamma \) (eta coefficients) and F values of the sample were also computed.

Principals - Axes method of factor analysis was employed to study the Principals' leadership behaviour in the light of personality traits.

The t-test of significance was applied to ensure whether the Principals of high achieving schools, and low achieving schools significantly differed on their means of personality traits and leadership behaviour measures.

Tools for Data Collection

Stogdill's Leadership Behaviour Descriptive Questionnaire-XII, popularly known as LBDQ - Form XII, Cattell's 16 PF Form A and the Background Information Card prepared by the investigator were employed.
The Sample

The overall sample involved the study of 102 Principals and 510 postgraduate teachers of high and higher secondary schools of Ludhiana district. The unit of randomization was the school. Initially 130 schools from urban and rural areas of the district were taken up for study. Out of these 102 schools were finally retained as the Principals of these schools had a minimum stay of three years.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were crystalized as evinced by the findings provided by the testing of the five hypotheses of the present study.

Results based on zero order correlations between the criterian and the independent variables showed that out of sixteen personality traits, which were considered to be related to leadership behaviour, four personality factors G (Conscientious); H (Venturesome); Q₂ (Group dependent); Q₄ (Free from nervous tension) were found to be correlates of the leadership behaviour measures 'Tolerance of Uncertainty' and 'Demands Reconciliation'.

Thus the hypothesis that there are significant correlations between the variables of personality and variables of leadership behaviour stands proved only with
limited number of variables showing significant correlations.

Sixteen different personality variables contributed differentially to the prediction of leadership behaviour of the total group. Differential factor structure of the total group simply confirmed the findings that certain personality traits combine in specific constellations to yield common factor/factors with leadership behaviour measures. Different personality factors contributed differentially in constellation to the four leadership behaviour measures: Tolerance of Uncertainty; Representation; Tolerance of Freedom; and Superior Orientation. This was the picture of the original factor matrix. But this trend did not turn up conspicuously in the rotated factor matrix where the variables of personality and variables of leadership behaviour cluster separately.

Summary of the results based on 't' values showed that Principals of the high achieving schools and low achieving schools did not deviate significantly on their sixteen personality traits. None of the factors out of the sixteen personality factors showed significant mean difference at any of the accepted levels of significance. Similarity of traits of the personality factors of the Principals of high achieving schools and low achieving schools suggested that although the schools differed in productivity yet the personality of the Principal had no relevance in showing better school results.
This confirmed the hypothesis that there is no significant difference in relationship between the personality factors of the Principals of high achieving schools and low achieving schools. This finding is confirmative with the findings of Walker (1971), Martin (1975) and Burtner (1973).

The Principals of the high achieving schools and the low achieving schools showed a significantly positive marked difference on their means on nine out of the twelve dimensions of leadership behaviour. It was found that schools which showed better results were manned by Principals who laid greater emphasis on productivity than the Principals of those schools who showed poor results. Besides this the other dimensions of leadership behaviour that contributed to productivity were: 'Tolerance of Freedom' followed by 'Superior Orientation'; 'Predictive Accuracy'; 'Initiation of Structure'; 'Representation'; 'Integration'; 'Persuasiveness'; and 'Role Assumption'. Thus, the Principals of high achieving schools were found to have these traits better than the Principals of low achieving schools. The study, therefore, confirmed the third and the fourth hypotheses that significant differences exist between the measures of leadership behaviour of Principals of high achieving schools and low achieving schools and higher the emphasis on productivity, the better are the school results.