

A Study of Leadership Styles Adopted By School Principals in Relation to their Organisational Role Stress and Emotional Intelligence

Dr Umesh Kumari

Assistant Professor, L. L. R. M. College of Education, Dhudike, Moga

Abstract: The study examined the leadership styles adopted by school principals in relation to their organizational role stress and emotional intelligence. Data was collected by multistage random sampling technique from a sample of 250 principals of private senior secondary schools of five districts of Punjab (Moga, Ludhiana, Patiala, Ferozpur and Jalandhar). Standardized tools of Leadership style Scale by Sinha (1983), Emotional intelligence scale by Hyde et al (2002) and Organizational role stress scale by Pareek (1993) were used in this study. The data were analyzed by employing mean, SD, r and t ratio. Principals with high emotional intelligence preferred participative (34%) as the most dominating leadership style and Principals with high organizational role stress prefer Participative (38%) as the most dominating style further Results showed that there was a significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS1) Authoritarian as leadership style in principals with high and low emotional intelligence. Implications- Leadership style 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.

Keywords: Leadership Styles, Organisational Role Stress and Emotional Intelligence

1. Introduction

Education is the most important instrument for the progress of any nation. It is a 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 steam engine that moves the ship." (Warren, 2005) In an educational institution the principal should 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. Leadership does not just happen; it can be learned and developed 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 book. Leadership takes practice and hands-on experience, as well as intense personal exploration and development. Bennis (2004) is of the view that "Leadership is a function of knowing yourself, having a vision that is well communicated, building trust among colleagues, and taking effective action to realize your own leadership potential."

2. Different Styles of Leadership (Lewin, 1939)

1) **Authoritarian Leadership-** "Authoritarian leadership is, also known as *autocratic leadership*, provide clear expectations for what needs to be done, when it should be done, and how it should be done. Leadership is best applied to situations where there is little time for group decision-making or where the leader is the most knowledgeable member of the group." Lewin (1939)

- 2) **Participative Leadership (Democratic)-** Participative leadership, also known as *democratic leadership*, is generally the most effective leadership style. Democratic leaders offer guidance to group members, but they also participate in the group and allow input from other group members.
- 3) **Delegative Leadership (Laissez-Faire)** Delegative leadership is also known as *laissez-faire leadership*. Delegative leadership offers little or no guidance to group members and leave decision-making up to group members.
- 4) Emotionally intelligent leaders create and maintain relationships based on trust with their employees. They possess the skills to confront problems promptly, challenge others appropriately, remain optimistic, and constructively channel impulses. In addition, emotionally intelligent leaders know their values and emotions and use that knowledge to make decisions. The success of their actions often depends upon their ability to accurately read the emotions of others.

Role stress refers to the conflict and tension due to the roles being enacted by a person at any given point of time. (Pareek, 2003) Enacted in the context of organizations, such role stresses are called organizational role stress. Any organization may be perceived as a system of roles.

3. Statement of the Problem

A study of leadership styles adopted by school principals in relation to their organisational role stress and emotional intelligence.

Objectives of the Study

- 1) To study the leadership styles of principals.
- 2) To study the levels of organizational role stress of principals.
- 3) To study the levels of emotional intelligence of principals.

Volume 5 Issue 12, December 2016

www.ijsr.net

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

- 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 leadership styles among principals perceiving high and low organizational role stress.
- 7) To analyze the difference in the leadership preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

Hypotheses of the Study

- 1) There will be no significant relationship between dimensions of the organizational role stress and leadership styles of principals.
- 2) There will be no significant relationship between dimensions of the emotional intelligence and leadership styles of principals.
- 3) There will be no significant difference in (LS1) Authoritarian as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.
- 4) There will be no significant difference in (LS2) Bureaucratic as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.
- 5) There will be no significant difference in (LS3) Nurturant as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.
- 6) There will be no significant difference in (LS4) Task-oriented as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.
- 7) There will be no significant difference in (LS5) Participative as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.
- 8) There will be no significant difference in (LS1) Authoritarian as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.
- 9) There will be no significant difference in (LS2) Bureaucratic as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.
- 10) There will be no significant difference in (LS3) Nurturant as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.
- 11) There will be no significant difference in (LS4) Task-oriented as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.
- 12) There will be no significant difference in (LS5) Participative as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

4. Methodology

The present study was conducted on principals of five districts (Moga, Ludhiana, Jalandhar, Patiala, and Ferozepur) of Punjab state. 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 random sampling technique.

Tools of the Study

Leadership style Scale by Sinha (1983), emotional intelligence scale by Hyde et al (2002) and Organizational

role stress scale developed by Pareek (1993) were selected. Data was collected from the sample by administering the standardized tools.

Statistical Techniques

Mean, Median, Standard deviation, Skewness, Kurtosis and correlation.

Analysis and Interpretation

Objective no 1- To study the leadership styles of principals.

Table 1: Mostly Preferred Leadership Styles by School Principals

Leadership Styles	No. of Principals using the Styles	% of Principals using the Styles
Authoritarian (LS1)	11	4%
Bureaucratic (LS2)	32	13%
Nurturant (LS3)	47	19%
Task Oriented (LS4)	36	15%
Participative (LS5)	93	37%
Mixed	31	12%

Table.1-revealed that Participative (LS5) is the most frequently preferred style among principals with 37% of them reporting it as their mostly preferred style.

Objective no 2- To study the levels of organizational role stress of principals.

Table 2: Levels of Organizational Role Stress of School Principals

Levels of ORS	N	% of ORS
HIGH ORS	123	49%
LOW ORS	127	51%
N	250	

Table 2- shows that out of 250 school principals 123 school principals have high levels organizational role stress. It indicated that 49% of the school principals have high organizational role stress.

Objective no 3 - To study the levels of emotional intelligence of principals.

Table 3: Levels of Emotional Intelligence of School Principals

Levels of Emotional Intelligence	No. of principals	% of level of EI
High emotional intelligence	122	48%
Low emotional intelligence	128	52%
N	250	

Table 3-shows that out of 250 school principals 122 school principals have high level of emotional intelligence. It indicates that 48% principals' shows high levels and 52% principals shows low levels of emotional intelligence.

H1-There will be no significant difference in (LS1) Authoritarian as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.

Table 4: Showing values of mean, SD, SED, t-ratio for (LS1) Authoritarian as Leadership Style Preferred by Principals with High and Low Organizational Role Stress

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	SED	t-value	Level of significance
(LS1) Authoritarian	High ors	123	29.67	4.95	0.67	0.88	Not significant
	Low ors	127	30.26	5.62			

Table 4- shows the t-value is 0.88 which is not significant at 0.01 level. This implies that there is no significant difference in (LS1) Authoritarian leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress

H2- There will be no significant difference in (LS2) Bureaucratic as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.

Table 5: Showing values of mean, SD, SED, t-ratio for (LS2) Bureaucratic as Leadership Style Preferred by Principals with High and Low Organizational Role Stress

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	SED	t-value	Level of significance
(LS2) Bureaucratic	High ors	123	32.07	8.62	1.08	0.23	Not significant
	Low ors	127	31.82	8.58			

As shown is table 5 the t-value is 0.23 which is not significant at 0.01 level of significance indicating that statistically significant difference do not exist on the variable of leadership style i.e. (LS2) Bureaucratic with respect to high and low organizational role stress.

H3 -There will be no significant difference in (LS3) Nurturant as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.

Table 6: Showing values of mean, SD, SED, t-ratio for (LS3) Nurturant as Leadership style Preferred by Principals with High and Low Organizational Role Stress

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	SED	t-value	Level of significance
(LS3) Nurturant	High ors	123	35.20	7.87	0.98	0.44	Not significant
	Low ors	127	35.63	7.77			

As shown in table 6 the t-value is 0.44 which is not significant at 0.01 level of significance, indicating that statistically significant difference do not exist on the variable (LS3) Nurturant as leadership style with respect to high and low organizational role stress.

H4 -There will be no significant difference in (LS4) Task-oriented as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.

Table 7: Showing values of mean, SD, SED, t-ratio for (LS4) Task-oriented as Leadership Style Preferred by Principals with High and Low Organizational Role Stress

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	SED	t-value	Level of significance
(LS4) Task-oriented	High ors	123	32.99	8.36	1.06	0.27	Not significant
	Low ors	127	32.70	8.54			

As shown in table 7, the t-value is 0.27 which is not significant at 0.01 level of significance, indicating that, there

is no significant difference in (LS4) Task-oriented of principals with high and low organizational role stress.

H5 -There will be no significant difference in (LS5) Participative as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.

Table 8: Showing values of mean, SD, SED, t-ratio for (LS5) Participative as Leadership Style Preferred by Principals with High and Low Organizational Role Stress

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	SED	t-value	Level of significance
(LS5) Participative	High ors	123	38.0	6.4	0.8	0.62	Not significant
	Low ors	127	37.5	6.3			

Table 8 shows that the t-value is 0.62 which is not significant at 0.01 level. This implies that there is no significant difference on the variable of (LS5) Participative leadership with respect to with high and low organizational role stress.

H6-There will be no significant difference in (LS1) Authoritarian as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

Table 4.9: Showing values of mean, SD, SED, t-ratio for (LS1) Authoritarian as Leadership Style Preferred by Principals with High and Low Emotional Intelligence

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	SED	t-value	Level of significance
(LS1) Authoritarian	High EI	122	30.77	5.33	0.66	0.62	Significant at.01 level
	Low EI	128	29.0	5.13			

Table 9 shows that the t-value is 2.68 which is significant at 0.01 level. This implies that there is a significant difference on the variable of (LS1) Authoritarian with respect to high and low emotional intelligence,

H7-There will be no significant difference in (LS2) Bureaucratic as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

Table 4.10: Showing values of mean, SD, SED, t-ratio for (LS2) Bureaucratic as Leadership Style Preferred by Principals with High and Low Emotional Intelligence

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	SED	t-value	Level of significance
(LS2) Bureaucratic	High EI	122	32.12	8.66	1.08	0.29	Not significant
	Low EI	128	31.8	8.48			

Table 4.10 shows that the t-value is 0.29, which is not significant. This implies that there is not significant difference on the variable of (LS2) Bureaucratic with respect to high and low emotional intelligence.

H8-There will be no significant difference in (LS3) Nurturant as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

Table 4.11: Showing values of mean, SD, SED, t-ratio for (LS3) Nurturant as Leadership Style Preferred by Principals with High and Low Emotional Intelligence

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	SED	t-value	Level of significance
(LS3) Nurturant	High EI	122	35.22	7.97	0.97	0.23	Not significant
	Low EI	128	35.45	7.74			

Table 4.11 shows that the t-value is 0.23, which is not significant, this implies that there is no significant difference on the variable of (LS3) Nurturant style with high and low emotional intelligence.

H9-There will be no significant difference in (LS4) Task-oriented as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence

Table 4.12: Showing values of mean, SD, SED, t-ratio for (LS4) Task-oriented as Leadership Style Preferred by Principals with High and Low Emotional Intelligence

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	SED	t-value	Level of significance
(LS4) Task-oriented	High EI	122	32.97	8.31	1.14	0.35	Not significant
	Low EI	128	32.57	8.57			

Table 4.12 shows that the t-value is 0.35, which is not significant, this implies that there is no significant difference on variable of (LS4) Task-oriented with respect to with high and low emotional intelligence. The difference between the mean scores of high and low emotional intelligence is due to chance.

H10 -There will be no significant difference in (LS5) Participative as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

Table 4.13: Showing values of mean, SD, SED, t-ratio for (LS5) Participative as Leadership Style Preferred by Principals with High and Low Emotional Intelligence

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	SED	t-value	Level of significance
(LS5) Participative	High EI	122	32.97	6.41	0.81	0.68	Not significant
	Low EI	128	37.4	6.33			

Table 4.13 shows that the t-value is 0.68 which is not significant, this implies that there is no significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS5) Participative with high and low emotional intelligence.

5. Major Findings and Conclusions

- 1) Participative (LS5) was the most preferred leadership style among principals with i.e. (37%).
- 2) 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%).
- 3) 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%).
- 4) 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%).

- 5) 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%).
- 6) 52% school principals had low emotional intelligence.
- 7) 51% school principals had low organizational role stress.
- 8) 5 dimensions of emotional intelligence i.e. Self awareness (EIA) 0.21, Self motivation (EIC) 0.19, Managing relations (EIE) -0.19, Integrity (EIF) 0.18 and Self development (EIG) 0.20 were significantly correlated With (LS1) Authoritarian style of principals.
- 9) Self motivation (EIC) 0.17 was significantly correlated with (LS2) Bureaucratic style of principals.
- 10) Self motivation (EIC) 0.17, Self development (EIG) 0.17 were correlated significantly with (LS4) Task oriented style of principals.
- 11) Managing relations (EIE) -0.17 was significantly correlated with (LS5) Participative style of principals.
- 12) Dimensions of organizational role stress i.e. (ORS₁) inter- role distance 0.18, (ORS₂) role stagnation 0.18, (ORS₄) Role erosion 0.18, (ORS₅) role overload 0.19 were significantly correlated with (LS1) Authoritarian style of principals
- 13) Inter- role distance (ORS₁) 0.18 was significantly correlated with (LS2) Bureaucratic style of principals.
- 14) Inter- role distance (ORS₁) 0.23 was significantly correlated with (LS3) Nuturant style of principals.
- 15) Inter- role distance (ORS₁) 0.22, (ORS₄) Role erosion 0.17, (ORS₅) role overload 0.19 and (ORS₆) role isolation 0.19 were significantly correlated with (LS4) Task oriented style of principals.
- 16) No significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS1) Authoritarian, (LS2) Bureaucratic, (LS3) Nuturant, (LS4) Task oriented and (LS5) Participative as leadership style were found in principals with high and low organizational role stress.
- 17) Significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS1) Authoritarian as leadership style was found in principals with high and low emotional intelligence.
- 18) No significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS2) Bureaucratic, (LS3) Nutrant, (LS4) Task oriented and (LS5) Participative as leadership style were found in principals with high and low emotional intelligence.

6. Educational Implications

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. 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

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.

References

- [1] Alon, I & Higgins, J. M. (2005) Global Leadership Success through Emotional and Cultural Intelligence. *Business Horizons*, 48 (6) 501-512.
- [2] Bennis, W. (2004) The Seven Ages Of The Leader', *Harvard Business Review*, 82 (1) 46-53.
- [3] Lewin, K. (1939) Frontiers in Group Dynamics: Concept, Method and Reality in Social Science; Social Equilibria and Social Change. *Human Relations*, 1(5), 5-41.
- [4] Pareek, U. (2003) *Making Organizational Roles Effective*, Tata McGraw-Hill, New Delhi.