

## Leadership styles of principals in relation to organizational role stress, emotional intelligence and gender

Dr. Umesh Kumari

Assistant Professor, L.L.R.M. College of education, Dhudike, Moga, Punjab, India

### Abstract

The study examined the leadership styles of principals in relation to organizational role stress, emotional intelligence and gender. 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. It was found that male and female principals use Participative style (LS5) i.e. 35% and 39% respectively as the most dominating style. 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. Self-awareness ( $EI_A$ ) was a positive predictor and managing relations ( $EI_E$ ) was a negative predictor of the Authoritarian (LS1) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of emotional intelligence in case of male principals. Implications- The principals can guide their teachers in a proper way and can provide facilities to his followers. In changing times, principals 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 principal to provide congenial and attractive work conditions both for the students and teachers.

**Keywords:** stress, emotional intelligence and gender

### Introduction

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. 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) Sai Baba's Mahavakya on Leadership (Chibber, 2005) [5]. To be-To do-To see-To tell

- *To be* is source of leadership which is dependent on universal inner structure of the leader. The universal inner structure of the leader is based upon the foundation of selflessness based on ideal/vision which consists of courage to decide, will power to persist, initiative to be a self-starter, knowledge of the self, ability to deal with people and knowledge of the job for us to decide.
- *To do* is the study of leadership by personal examples. For examples-"If the king plucks one apple from the public garden, the public will take away even the roots." Thus do no evil, do what is good.

To see -Tools to manage situation. See no evil, do what is good.

To tell-lovingly, humanly.

A true leader should practice and then preach to transform his

followers, and then only we can drive our education system on the right path.

Buildings and machines can be owned; people cannot. 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 cannot 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.

### Statement of the problem

Leadership styles of principals in relation to organizational role stress, emotional intelligence and gender

### Delimitations of the study

1. The study has been confined to a sample of 250 senior secondary schools principals.
2. The study has been delimited to private unaided schools located in the five districts (Moga, Ludhiana, Jalandhar, Patiala and Ferozpure) of Punjab state only.

### Objectives of the study

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.

### Hypotheses of the study

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)Task-oriented leadership and (LS5) Participative leadership.
 

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

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

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

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

**H 5(e)-** There will be no significant difference in (LS5) Participative,as 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) Task-oriented as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low organizational role stress.
  10. There will be no significant difference in (LS5) Participative 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) Task-oriented as leadership style preferred by principals with high and low emotional intelligence.
  15. There will be no significant difference in (LS5) Participative 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.

### 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

1. Leadership style Scale by Sinha (1983)
2. Organizational role stress scale developed by Pareek (1993)
3. Emotional Intelligence scale by Hyde *et al.* (2002)

### Statistical Techniques

1. Descriptive Analysis such as Mean, Median, Standard deviation, Skewness and Kurtosis.
2. Bi-variate correlation, Differential Analysis and Multi-variate regression Analysis were employed.

### Major findings and conclusions

1. Participative (LS5) 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 (LS5) i.e. 35% and 39% respectively as the most dominating style. But female

- principals use participative style (LS5) more as compare to male principals
3. Principals with high emotional intelligence preferred participative (34%) and low emotional intelligence also preferred Participative LS5) (38%) as the most dominating leadership styles
  4. Principals with high organizational role stress prefer Participative (38%) and low organizational role stress prefer Participative (37%) as the most dominating style.
  5. 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 male principals.
  6. Self-motivation (EIC) 0.17 was significantly correlated with (LS2) Bureaucratic style of male principals.
  7. Self-motivation (EIC) 0.17, Self-development (EIG) 0.17 was correlated significantly with (LS4) Task oriented style of male principals.
  8. Managing relations (EIE) -0.17 was significantly correlated with (LS5) Participative style of male principals.
  9. Three dimensions of emotional intelligence i.e. 0.25, Empathy (EIB) 0.26, Emotional stability (EID) 0.25 and Altruistic behavior (EIJ) 0.25 were significantly correlated with (LS1) Authoritarian style of female principals.
  10. Emotional stability (EID) 0.19 was significantly correlated with (LS4) Task oriented style of female principals.
  11. Self-awareness (EIA) 0.17 was significantly correlated with (LS5) Participative style of female principals.
  12. Dimensions of organizational role stress i.e. (ORS<sub>1</sub>) inter-role distance -0.18, (ORS<sub>2</sub>) role stagnation-0.19, (ORS<sub>3</sub>) role expectation conflict -0.18, (ORS<sub>4</sub>) Role erosion -0.19, (ORS<sub>5</sub>) role overload-0.19, (ORS<sub>7</sub>) personal inadequacy-0.20 and (ORS<sub>9</sub>) role ambiguity 0.21 were significantly correlated with (LS1) Authoritarian style of male principals.
  13. Inter- role distance (ORS<sub>1</sub>) 0.18 was significantly correlated with (LS2) Bureaucratic style of male principals.
  14. Inter- role distance (ORS<sub>1</sub>) 0.23 was significantly correlated with (LS3) Nuturant style of male principals.
  15. Role stagnation (ORS<sub>2</sub>) -0.18 and (ORS<sub>10</sub>) resources inadequacy -0.17 were significantly correlated with (LS4) Task oriented style of male principals.
  16. Inter- role distance (ORS<sub>1</sub>) -0.22, (ORS<sub>3</sub>) role expectation conflict -0.19, (ORS<sub>9</sub>) role ambiguity -0.24 and (ORS<sub>10</sub>) resources inadequacy -0.24 were significantly correlated with (LS5) Participative style of male principals.
  17. Dimensions of organizational role stress i.e. (ORS<sub>1</sub>) inter-role distance 0.18, (ORS<sub>2</sub>) role stagnation 0.18, (ORS<sub>4</sub>) Role erosion 0.18, (ORS<sub>5</sub>) role overload 0.19 were significantly correlated with (LS1) Authoritarian style of female principals.
  18. Inter- role distance (ORS<sub>1</sub>) 0.18 was significantly correlated with (LS2) Bureaucratic style of female principals.
  19. Inter- role distance (ORS<sub>1</sub>) 0.23 was significantly correlated with (LS3) Nuturant style of female principals.
  20. Inter- role distance (ORS<sub>1</sub>) 0.22, (ORS<sub>4</sub>) Role erosion 0.17, (ORS<sub>5</sub>) role overload 0.19 and (ORS<sub>6</sub>) role isolation 0.19 were significantly correlated with (LS4) Task oriented style of female principals.
  21. Significant difference in the tendency to adopt (LS1) Authoritarian as leadership style was found in principals with high and low emotional intelligence.
  22. Self-awareness (EI<sub>A</sub>) was a positive predictor and managing relations (EI<sub>E</sub>) was a negative predictor of the Authoritarian (LS1) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of emotional intelligence in case of male principals.
  23. Inter- Role Distance (ORS<sub>1</sub>) was the only dimension of organizational role stress which was found to be a positive predictor of the Bureaucratic (LS<sub>2</sub>) leadership style in case of male principals.
  24. Inter- Role Distance (ORS<sub>1</sub>) was a positive predictor and Role Stagnation (ORS<sub>2</sub>) was a negative predictor of the Nuturant (LS<sub>3</sub>) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of organizational role stress in case of male principals.
  25. Role Stagnation (ORS<sub>2</sub>) was the only dimension of organizational role stress which was found to be a negative predictor of the Task- oriented (LS<sub>4</sub>) leadership style in case of male principals.
  26. Self-Role Distance (ORS<sub>9</sub>) was a negative predictor of the Participative (LS<sub>5</sub>) 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.
27. Empathy (EI<sub>B</sub>), Altruistic behavior (EI<sub>I</sub>) and Self-awareness (EI<sub>A</sub>) were positive predictors and Self-motivation (EI<sub>C</sub>) 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 (ORS<sub>1</sub>) was a positive predictor of Authoritarian (LS1) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of organizational role stress in case of female principals.
  28. Inter- Role Distance (ORS<sub>1</sub>) was a positive predictor of the Bureaucratic (LS<sub>2</sub>) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of organizational role stress in case of female principals.
  29. Inter- Role Distance (ORS<sub>1</sub>) was a positive predictor and Role Expectation Conflict (ORS<sub>3</sub>) was a negative predictor of the Nuturant (LS<sub>3</sub>) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of organizational role stress in case of female principals.
  30. Inter- Role Distance (ORS<sub>1</sub>) was a positive predictor of the Task- oriented (LS<sub>4</sub>) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of organizational role stress in case of female principals. Further Emotional stability (EID) was a positive predictor of the Task- oriented (LS<sub>4</sub>) leadership style from among the 10 dimensions of emotional intelligence in case of female principals.
- Besides predictors of leadership styles i.e Authoritarian (LS1), Bureaucratic (LS<sub>2</sub>), Nuturant (LS3) and Task-oriented (LS<sub>4</sub>) no predictors for Participative (LS<sub>5</sub>) from 10 dimensions of emotional intelligence (EI<sub>A</sub>, EI<sub>B</sub>, EI<sub>C</sub>, EI<sub>D</sub>, EI<sub>E</sub>, EI<sub>F</sub>, EI<sub>G</sub>, EI<sub>H</sub>, EI<sub>I</sub>, EI<sub>J</sub>) and 10 dimensions of organizational role stress (ORS<sub>1</sub>, ORS<sub>2</sub>, ORS<sub>3</sub>, ORS<sub>4</sub>, ORS<sub>5</sub>, ORS<sub>6</sub>,

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.

### **Educational Implications**

The principals can guide their teachers in a proper way and can provide facilities to his followers. In changing times, principals 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 school principals to provide congenial and attractive work conditions both for the students and teachers. Principals should encourage their teachers to attend different seminars/workshops/conference 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.

### **References**

1. Bennis W. The seven ages of the leader, Harvard business review. 2004; 82(1):46-53.
2. Lewin K. Frontiers in Group Dynamics: Concept, Method and Reality in Social Science; Social Equilibria and Social Change. Human Relations. 1939; 1(5):5-41.
3. Bar-On R. Emotional quotient inventory: a measure of emotional intelligence technical manual. Ontario: Multi-Health Systems. Toronto, Canada, 2004.
4. Carless SA. Gender differences in transformational leadership: an examination of superior, leader and subordinate perspectives. Sex Roles. 1998; 38:225-228.
5. Chibber ML. Mahavakya on leadership, new age leadership- A Viable Means For Quality Development, Edutrack Journal, 2005; 9(5):16-19.
6. Druskat VU. Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the roman catholic church. Leadership Quarterly. 1994; 5(2):99-119.
7. Eagly AH. Gender and Leadership Style among School Principals: A Meta-Analysis. Educational administration quarterly. 1992; 28(1):76-102.
8. Goleman D. Working with Emotional Intelligence. Bantam Books, New York, 1998.
9. Lehal R, Singh. Organizational role stress among college teachers of Patiala district Journal of Indian management studies. 2005; 11:67-80.
10. Mandell B, Pherwani S. Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and transformational leadership style: A gender comparison. Journal of business and psychology. 2003; 17(3):387-404.
11. Pareek U. Making organizational roles effective, Tata McGraw-Hill, New Delhi, 2003.
12. Pareek U. Definition of Role Stress. Manual for organizational role stress Scale, Naveen Publication, Ahmadabad, 2004.
13. Sinha JBP. The Cultural Context of Leadership and Power. California: Sage Publications, 1995.