

A Study of Leadership Effectiveness of Principals of Secondary School

Mohammad Zahid

Assistant Professor, Shibli National P.G. College, Azamgarh, India

Abstract

Education is the basic foundation of Human Development . The Identity of a developed country does not belong to the building, big factories there but it is from the citizens there. If citizens are not developed that country will not progressed or developed . The development of citizens depends upon education. So the main duties of educational institutions is to provide the right type of education to make the right type of citizen. The progress of society and the country is dependent on the quality of the educational institutions . The most responsible person is the Principal who run the educational institutions effectively . It can be said that all the systems of formal education are employed and governed by the Principal. He plays a very significant role whether in primary schools, or secondary or higher . The success and effectiveness of all the Educational institutes depends upon Principals ,so they are the responsible person to handle all those responsibilities by their own capabilities . This paper is concerned with the study of leadership effectiveness of principals of secondary schools.

KEYWORDS. :- Leadership Effectiveness, Principals , Secondary Schools.

Introduction :- Education Commission had observed that destiny of our country is now being shaped in schools .The greatness of a country does not depend upon lofty buildings, gigantic projects and large armies. The ultimate test of a nation's greatness is the quality of her citizens . If a nation possesses young people of sterling character and unimpeachable patriotism, she bound to make rapid progress on all fronts. Educational institutions are entrusted the responsibility of developing attitudes, feelings, perceptions , insights, abilities and skills important for enrichment of personalities of individual students . In short the progress of society and country depends upon the quality of its educational institutions and educational programmed and the most responsible person to effectively run the educational institutions and to try to achieve the goals set before these institutions is principal .

It is universally recognized that the principal holds a very important position in the entire system of education and he is the principle means for the implementation of educational programs. The most potent single factor in education system is the principle and without taking cognizance of this vital factor all schemes of reforming education and raising the standard will prove an idle and deceptive as a dream. Successful leadership and adjustment is a function by both formal authority and earned esteem, and status position does not necessarily give leadership. The fact that a person holds a formal position does not assure his effectiveness as a leader. No one is even a leader, leave apart an effective participation in groups and people accept him as a person of worth.

Objectives :

1. To find out the leadership effectiveness of principals of boys and girls schools.
2. To find out the leadership effectiveness of principals of government and aided schools.

Hypotheses :

The following hypotheses were framed to study the problem meaning fully, and also to achieve the aforesaid objectives :

1. There is a significant difference between the leadership effectiveness of principals of boys and girls schools.
- 2- There is a significant difference between the leadership effectiveness of principals of government and aided schools.

Research Methodology :

The method used in this study was the 'Normative Survey Method' as the investigator had to collect relevant data from the Principal in the different schools of Azamgarh city. And statistical tool is taken Leadership Effectiveness- Dr. (Miss) Haseen Taj.

Testing of hypotheses :

Comparison of leadership effectiveness between Girls school principals and boys school principals.

H1>There is significant difference between the leadership effectiveness of principals of boys and girls schools. (H1) - There is no significant difference between the leadership effectiveness of principals of boys and girls schools.

To test, t-test was used and the results are shown in table-1

Table 1
Mean, S.D. & C.R. values of the scores on LES of girls and boys school principals

Dimension of leadership effectiveness	Girls School Principal			Boys School Principal			C.R.	Level of significance
	N ₁	Mean (M ₁)	S.D. (S ₁)					
I.R.	16	71.750	1.561	16	66.000	1.837	9.238	.01

I.O.	16	51.688	2.256	16	52.125	2.826	.0468	not significant
B.E.S.	16	51.313	1.157	16	42.250	11.750	16.731	.01
E.M.S	16	81.938	4.012	16	42.813	2021	7.411	.01
A.C	16	48.625	1.576	16	45.938	2.106	3.956	.01
O.AC.	16	37.500	1.541	16	37.750	1.750	.0415	NOT SIGNIFICANCE
Total	16	342.813	7.187	16	316.875	7.220	9.861	.01

Table 11 shows that there is a significant difference in the interpersonal relationship dimension of leadership effectiveness of boys and girls school principals because the C.R. value (9.238) is significant at 0.011 level. Since the means value of girls school principal is higher than the mean value of boys school principal so it is clear that girls school principals were more effective than boys school principals in the context of interpersonal relationship dimension of leadership effectiveness.

Table 1 also shows that there is no significant difference in the intellectual operations dimension of leadership effectiveness of boys and girls school principals because the C.R. value (0.468) is not significant.

Table 1 also shows that there is a significant difference in the behavioral and emotional stability dimension of leadership effectiveness of boys and girls school principals because the C.R. value (16.731) is significant at .01 level. Since the mean value of girls school principal is higher than the mean value of boys school principal so it is clear that girls school principals were more effective than boys school principals in the context of behavioral and emotional stability dimension of leadership effectiveness.

Table 1 also shows that there is a significant difference in the ethical and moral strength dimension of leadership effectiveness of boys and girls school principals because the C.R. value (7.522) is significant at .01 level. Since the mean value of girls school principal is higher than the mean value of boys school principal so it is clear that girls school principals were more effective than boys school principals in the context of ethical and moral strength dimension of leadership effectiveness.

Table 1 also shows that there is a significant difference in the adequacy of communication dimension of leadership effectiveness of boys and girls school principals because the C.R. value (3.956) is significant at .01 level. Since the mean value of girls school principal is higher than the mean value of boys school principal so it is clear that girls school principals were more effective than boys school

principals in the context of adequacy of communication dimension of leadership effectiveness.

Table 11 also shows that there is no significant difference in the operation as a citizen dimension of leadership effectiveness of boys and girls school principals because the C.R. value (0.415) is not significant.

Table 1 also shows that there is a significant difference in the leadership effectiveness of boys and girls school principals because the C.R. value (9.861) is significant at .01 level. So null hypothesis (H1) 0 is rejected and hypothesis (H1) is accepted. Since the mean value of boys school principal so it is clear that girls school principals were more effective than boys school principal in the context of leadership effectiveness.

Comparison of leadership effectiveness between government school principals and aided school principals .

H2 There is significant difference between the leadership effectiveness of principals of government and aided schools.

There is no significant difference between the leadership effectiveness of principals of government and aided schools.

To test, t-test was used and the results are shown in table 2

Table 2
Mean, S.D. & C.R. values of the scores on LES of government and aided school principals

Dimension of leadership effectiveness	Girls School Principal			Boys School Principal			C.R.	Level of significance
	N ₁	Mean (M ₁)	S.D. (S ₁)	N ₂	Mean (M ₂)	S.D. (S ₂)		
I.R.	16	66.000	1.837	16	57.313	2.493	10.865	.01
I.O.	16	52.125	2.826	16	47.688	1.488	5.381	.01
B.E.S.	16	42.250	1.750	16	39.938	1.919	3.448	.01
E.M.S	16	72.813	2.212	16	68.688	2.83	5.258	.01
A.C	16	45.938	2.106	16	40.125	1.654	8.407	.01
O.AC.	16	37.750	1.750	16	31.000	1.654	8.407	.01
Total	16	316.875	7.220	16	284.750	4.548	15.581	.01

Table 2 shows that there is a significant difference in the interpersonal relationship dimension of leadership effectiveness of government and aided school

principals because the C.R. value (10.865) is significant at 0.01 level. Since the mean value of government school principal is higher than government school principals were more effective than aided school principal so it is clear that government school principals were more effective than aided school principals in the context of interpersonal relationship dimension of leadership effectiveness.

Table. 2 also shows that there is a significant different in the intellectual operations dimension of leadership effectiveness of government and aided school principals because the C.R. value (5.381) is significant at 0.01 level. Since the mean value of government school principals is higher than the mean value of aided school principal so it is clear that government school principals were more effective than aided school principals in the context of intellectual operations dimension of leadership effectiveness.

Table 2 also shows that there is a significant difference in the behavioral and emotional stability dimension of leadership effectiveness of government and aided school principals because the C.R. value (3.448) is significant at 0.01 level. Since the mean value of government school principal so it is clear that government school principal is higher than the mean value of aided school principal so it is clear that government school principals were more effective than aided school principals in the context of behavioral and emotional stability dimension of leadership effectiveness.

Table 2 also shows that there is a significant difference in the ethical and moral strength dimension of leadership effectiveness of government and aided school principal because the C.R. value (5.258) is significant at .001 level. Since the mean value of government school principal is higher than the mane value of aided school principal so it is clear that government school principals were more effective than aided school principals in the context of ethical and moral strength dimension of leadership effectiveness.

Table 2 also shows that there is a significant difference in the adequacy of communication dimension of leadership effectiveness of government and aided school principals because the C.R. value (8.407) is significant at 0.01 level. Since the mean value of government school principal is higher than the mean value of aided school principals were more effective than aided school principals in the context of adequacy of communication dimension of leadership effectiveness .

Table. 2 also shows that there is a significant difference in the operation as a citizen dimension of leadership effectiveness of government and aided school principals because the C.R. value (10.407) is significant at 0.01 level. Since the mean value of government school principal is higher then the mean value of aided school principal so it is clear that government school principals were more effective.

Table 2 also shows that there is a significant difference in the leadership effectiveness of government and aided school principals because the C.R. value (14.581) is significant at .01 level. So null hypothesis (H₀) is rejected and hypothesis (H₁) is accepted. Since the mean value of government ornament school principals is higher than the mean value aided school principal so it is clear that government school principals in the context of leadership effectiveness.

Findings of the study :

The main findings of the present study may be enumerated as under :

1. Female principals proved superior in comparison the male principal in the conte44xt of leadership effectiveness.
2. Government school principals were more effectiveness than the aided school principals so far as leadership is concerned.

3. Government school principals proved superior comparison to the unaided school principals in context of leadership effectiveness .

BIBLIOGRAPHY :

- (1) Airan, J.W (1956). College Administration : A proposal, Asia Publishing House, Bombay,
- (2) Arnold, H-J- & Feldman, D.C. (1988)' Organization Behaviour, MC Graw Hill Book Co, New York, PP. 119-114.
- (3) Dall, Ronald C. (1969). Leadership to improve schools, Charles and John Pub. Co, Washington, Ohio.
- (4) Diwan, Rashmi (1993). A study of leadership behaviour and value patterns among school principals, Ph.D Edu.Jamia Millia Islamia.
- (5) Gupta, Y.K. & others (1985). A study of the administrative success as related to risk taking behaviour and experience of intermediate and high school principals of Moradabad District, The Progress of Education, Vol LIX, No. 19 PP. 203- 207.
- (6) Kaushik, S.P. (1979). A study of the dimensions of administrative leadership in relation to group acceptance and some other educational aspects in the colleges of Meerut University, Ph.D. Edu., Meerut University.
- (7) Kool, Reeta (1987). A study of the relationship between leadership style and organization climate, Ph.D. Psychology, C.S.J.M. University.
- (8) Krug, S.E. (1990). An experience sampling approach to the study of principal, instructional leadership I : Results from the principal activity sampling form (ED 3279111), Research report, www.eric.ed.gov