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ABSTRACT

The study was carried out (i) to examine the leadership behaviour of secondary school principals, (ii) to compare leadership behaviour of government, aided, unaided, male and female secondary school principals. The study was conducted employing descriptive survey method of research. A sample of 35 male and female principals was selected from purposively selected 35 higher secondary schools including government, aided and unaided higher secondary schools of Dehradun city applying purposive sampling technique. Data were collected with the help of Leadership Behaviour Scale developed and standardized by Asha Hingar (1984). Data were analyzed using Mean, SD and t test. The study revealed that there was no significant difference in the leadership behaviour of government and aided secondary school principals, government and unaided secondary school principals, aided and unaided secondary school principals, male and female secondary school principals.
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INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that an effective leader is a prerequisite to attain the organizational effectiveness. To cope up with technological development and globalization of the market economy an insightful leader is essential for the furtherance of organizational growth. In the modern times any organization would need a person who combines technical competencies with human relations and knows how to manage risks and stresses so as to take organization to a new height.

Leadership effectiveness needs to address the means that a leader uses in trying to achieve organizational goals. Leadership could be considered as consistent ability to influence people in a desired way. It inevitably requires using power to influence the thoughts and actions of other people. The recent concept of transformational leadership elaborates on how great leaders transform large groups and nations from powerless groups into powerful constellations. Leadership in the new millennium which is characterized by unprecedented speed leading to valuable change, in convergence of technology and new paradigm of time and territory, world view, calls for a refreshing approach where thought and action, problem and solution, performance and accountability, unity and diversity are not distinct and opposites, but unalienable part of the same process. The most critical and conclusive role of the leader is to deliver results through the process of discovery, dreaming, designing and delivering results. Any mission has to be a part of a broader vision and vision has to be tempered by values, and values must guide the people engaged in the task. A key aspect of transformational leadership theories is that they attempt to operationalize effective leader behaviour. The recent trend in management theory and management practice is on leader’s role towards employee participation and empowerment. The accompanying management styles referred to by different authors is as
transformational, visionary, charismatic, or inspirational leadership (Bryman, 1992, Conger and Kanungo, 1994, Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1994). Transformational leaders articulate a vision, use lateral or non-traditional thinking, encourage individual development, give regular feedback, use participative decision-making and promote a cooperative and trusting work environment (Carless, 1998). Similarly, Javidan and House (2001) emphasized on global managers i.e. managers should be culturally sensitive in order to get desired results. Now the drive, vision and direction are being considered as essential components for development of an institution. Baheti (1994) in her study of leadership effectiveness has emphasized upon the vision aspect of leadership behaviour. Hingar and Sharma (1997) stressed upon the emotional stabilizer dimension of leadership effectiveness in the group of engineers and bank officers. Organizational characteristics such as organizational structure, culture and demography, and the corporate mission and vision propagated by the management, all shape leadership behaviour in organizations. In essence then, leadership is a dynamic process of making people more effective in increasing their competence and in achieving the desired and determined goals.

Like other organization, school organization’s performance depends much upon the ability, competence and vision of the principal as a leader. His leadership behaviour leads the school on the way he desires. The cooperation of the teachers and other staff in the development of the school depends upon the leadership behaviour of the principal. It is seen some schools continuously go ahead, while some others lag behind. It is because of the quality of principal’s leadership behaviour. In the present situation it become essential to investigate into the leadership behaviour of school principals working in different types of schools run and managed by different bodies to see as to what extent the performance of the schools depends upon the leadership behaviour of the principals. The present study is an attempt in this direction where male and female principals working in government, aided, unaided secondary schools were taken into consideration to examine their leadership behaviour in a comparative manner.

OBJECTIVES

The study was carried out with the following objectives:
   i. To examine the leadership behaviour of secondary school principals.
   ii. To compare leadership behaviour of government and aided secondary school principals.
   iii. To compare leadership behavior of aided and unaided secondary school principals.
   iv. To compare leadership behavior of male and female secondary school principals.

HYPOTHESES

The study was forwarded on the basis of the following hypotheses:
   i. There would be no significant difference in the leadership behaviour of government and aided secondary school principals.
   ii. There would be no significant difference in the leadership behaviour of aided and unaided secondary school principals.
   iii. There would be no significant difference in the leadership behaviour of male and female secondary school principals.

METHOD

The study was conducted employing descriptive survey method of research which was found suitable in the present case.
Sample and Sampling Technique
A sample of 35 male and female principals was selected from purposively selected 35 higher secondary schools including government, aided and unaided higher secondary schools of Dehradun city applying purposive sampling technique.

Tools of Data Collection
Data were collected with the help of Leadership Behaviour Scale developed and standardized by Asha Hingar (1984). This is a thirty items’ five - point Likert Scale developed on six dimensions of Leader’s Behaviour which are: Emotional Stabilizer Team Builder, Performance Orientor, Potential Extractor, Socially Intelligent, and Value Inculcator.

Statistical Analysis of Data
Data obtained from the respondent principals on Leadership Behaviour Scale were analyzed using Mean, SD and t test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Mean, S.D. and t value of the scores of Male and Female Principals on Leader Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behaviour &amp; its Dimensions</th>
<th>Male Principals</th>
<th>Female Principals</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stabilizer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Builder</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Orientor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Extractor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially Intelligent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Inculcator</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.52</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Leader Behaviour</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>129.78</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that there is no significant difference between male and female principals with regard to six dimensions of leader behaviour as well as overall leadership behaviour, because the calculated t value is not statistically significant. So it is clear that male as well as female principals were similar in their leadership behaviour.

Table 2: Mean, S.D. and t value of the scores of Government and Aided School Principals on Leader Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behaviour &amp; its Dimensions</th>
<th>Govt. School Principals</th>
<th>Aided School Principals</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stabilizer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Builder</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Orientor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Extractor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.52</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially Intelligent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.71</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Inculcator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Leader Behaviour</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>131.06</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that there is no significant difference between government and aided school principals with regard to six dimensions of leader behaviour as well as overall leadership behaviour, because the calculated t value is not statistically significant. So it is clear that government as well as aided school principals were similar in their leadership behaviour.
Table 3: Mean, S.D. and t value of the scores of Government and Unaided School Principals on Leader Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behaviour &amp; its Dimensions</th>
<th>Govt. School Principals</th>
<th>Unaided School Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Emotional Stabilizer             | 17 | 19.65| 2.68| 8  | 20.12| 2.58| 0.40
| Team Builder                     | 17 | 22.00| 1.46| 8  | 21.80| 1.70| 0.16
| Performance Orientor             | 17 | 22.00| 1.64| 8  | 22.50| 1.00| 0.89
| Potential Extractor              | 17 | 22.52| 1.75| 8  | 22.88| 1.61| 0.48
| Socially Intelligent             | 17 | 20.71| 1.84| 8  | 20.50| 1.66| 0.27
| Value Inculcator                 | 17 | 23.00| 1.57| 8  | 22.25| 2.78| 0.67
| Overall Leader Behaviour         | 17 | 131.06| 4.52| 8  | 130.12| 7.72| 0.34

Table 3 shows that there is no significant difference between government and aided school principals with regard to six dimensions of leader behaviour as well as overall leadership behaviour, because the calculated t value is not statistically significant. So it is clear that government as well as unaided school principals were similar in their leadership behaviour.

Table 4: Mean, S.D. and t value of the scores of Aided and Unaided School Principals on Leader Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behaviour &amp; its Dimensions</th>
<th>Aided School Principals</th>
<th>Unaided School Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Emotional Stabilizer             | 10 | 20.70| 2.19| 8  | 20.12| 2.58| 0.48
| Team Builder                     | 10 | 21.40| 1.96| 8  | 21.80| 1.70| 0.52
| Performance Orientor             | 10 | 21.70| 2.33| 8  | 22.50| 1.00| 0.18
| Potential Extractor              | 10 | 22.40| 1.90| 8  | 22.88| 1.61| 0.45
| Socially Intelligent             | 10 | 21.30| 1.62| 8  | 20.50| 1.66| 0.98
| Value Inculcator                 | 10 | 22.90| 1.92| 8  | 22.25| 2.78| 0.53
| Overall Leader Behaviour         | 10 | 130.40| 7076| 8  | 130.12| 7.72| 0.08

Table 4 shows that there is no significant difference between aided and unaided school principals with regard to six dimensions of leader behaviour as well as overall leadership behaviour, because the calculated t value is not statistically significant. So it is clear that aided as well as unaided school principals were similar in their leadership behaviour.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The study revealed the following results:

i. There was no significant difference in the leadership behaviour of male and female secondary school principals.

ii. There was no significant difference in the leadership behaviour of government and aided secondary school principals.

iii. There was no significant difference in the leadership behaviour of government and unaided secondary school principals.

iv. There was no significant difference in the leadership behaviour of aided and unaided secondary school principals.

The study reveals that the principals working in the schools managed by the government were not different in their leadership behavior from the principals working in aided as well as unaided secondary schools run by the private management. Similarly, the principals working in aided secondary schools were not different in their leadership behavior from the principals working in unaided secondary schools. The reason of it may be the high competition among the principals who
want that their schools should not lag behind in any way. So they learn from each other for better performance which requires effective leadership behaviour on the part of the principals.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the results of the study it is concluded that there was no effect of school management and sex on the leadership behaviour of secondary school principals. On making observation of the scores of the principals it was found that most of them were in the category leader. of highly effective
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