

University of Rajshahi

Rajshahi-6205

Bangladesh.

RUCL Institutional Repository

<http://rulrepository.ru.ac.bd>

---

Department of Psychology

MPhil Thesis

---

2009

# Leadership Styles, Gender Roles and Institutional Effectiveness: A Comparative Study

Elias, Md. Shamsuddin

University of Rajshahi

---

<http://rulrepository.ru.ac.bd/handle/123456789/487>

*Copyright to the University of Rajshahi. All rights reserved. Downloaded from RUCL Institutional Repository.*

# **Leadership Styles, Gender Roles and Institutional Effectiveness: A Comparative Study**



**Md. Shamsuddin Elias**

**Department of Psychology  
University of Rajshahi**

**June 2009**

# **Leadership Styles, Gender Roles and Institutional Effectiveness: A Comparative Study**



**Dissertation Submitted for the Degree of  
Master of Philosophy in Psychology**

**By**

**Md. Shamsuddin Elias**

**Department of Psychology  
University of Rajshahi  
June 2009**

# **Dedication**

**To my Beloved Parents –**

**Mother Mrs. Halima Begum  
&  
Father Mr. Mohammad Hossain**

## DECLARATION

The research work embodied in the thesis entitled “ Leadership Styles, Gender Roles and Institutional Effectiveness : A Comparative Study” has been carried out by me under the supervision of Dr. A.B.M.Zahirul Haque, Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh. I do hereby declare that the work is original and no part of it has been submitted by any body , any where for any degree.



21 June 2009

**Md. Shamsuddin Elias**

মনোবিজ্ঞান বিভাগ  
রাজশাহী বিশ্ববিদ্যালয়  
রাজশাহী-৬২০৫  
বাংলাদেশ



**Department of Psychology**  
University of Rajshahi  
Rajshahi-6205  
Bangladesh

## CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the research work entitled “Leadership Styles, Gender Roles and Institutional Effectiveness : A Comparative Study” is a piece of original work of **Md. Shamsuddin Elias** done under my supervision in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of ‘Master of Philosophy’ in Psychology.

I recommend the thesis for examination for the degree of M.Phil. in Psychology.

21 June 2009

**Dr. A.B.M. Zahirul Haque**  
Professor  
Department of Psychology  
University of Rajshahi  
Rajshahi – 6205  
Bangladesh

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research work involves dozens of people, not just the author whose name appears on the front cover. So, it is a privilege as well as an obligation to express my indebtedness to a number of individuals and institutions who helped me in many ways in the process of completing the research work..

I express my whole hearted indebtedness and gratitude to my respected supervisor Dr. A.B.M.Zahirul Haque, Professor, Department of Psychology, University Rajshahi, not only for the unstinting allocation of his valuable time in formulating the research design, correcting and revising the write-up of the thesis, but also for the extraordinary love and affection I have received from him. Without his active help and sincere cooperation it would not have been possible to complete this thesis in time.

My colleagues provided valuable suggestions as participants in the seminar. I was energized by their positive feedback, and very grateful for their numerous suggestions for improvements. My sincerest thanks go to all of them.

To Mr. Provash Kumar Karmokar, Assistant Professor, Department of Statistics, University of Rajshahi, my debt are unlimited. Without his generous assistance in analyzing the data through computer it would have been difficult for me to complete this thesis.

I am deeply grateful to Dr. Nitai Kumar Saha, Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Rajshahi Govt. College, for his sincere help and cooperation whenever necessary.

I am grateful and express my indebtedness to the teachers and students of the schools, where the study was conducted, for their kind help and cooperation in collecting the data.

I wish to acknowledge my sincere appreciation and special thanks to Mr. Nitay Kumar Mondal, who typed and composed the whole manuscript with special care and attention.

Finally, I would not have been able to succeed in this research work without the patient support and encouragement of my wife, Rummaana, and of my beloved daughter Reeti and son Reevu, who unconditionally sacrificed their valuable time for this research work. I am forever indebted to them.

**Md. Shamsuddin Elias**



# CONTENTS

|                                |      |
|--------------------------------|------|
| <b>Dedication</b> .....        | i    |
| <b>Declaration</b> .....       | ii   |
| <b>Certificate</b> .....       | iii  |
| <b>Acknowledgement</b> .....   | iv   |
| <b>Table of Contents</b> ..... | vi   |
| <b>List of Tables</b> .....    | viii |
| <b>SUMMARY</b> .....           | xi   |

## **CHAPTER – 1 : INTRODUCTION.....1-33**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Perspectives of Leadership .....  | 2  |
| Competency Perspective of leadership.....                                       | 2  |
| Behavioral Perspective of Leadership .....                                      | 6  |
| The ‘Hi-Hi’ Leadership Hypothesis .....   | 7  |
| Contingency Perspective of Leadership .....                                     | 8  |
| Path-Goal Theory of Leadership .....  | 8  |
| Transformational Perspective of Leadership.....                                 | 9  |
| Elements of Transformational Leadership .....                                   | 10 |
| Leadership Styles .....   | 11 |
| Theoretical Rationale for Sex Differences and Similarities in Leadership Styles | 14 |
| Leadership Styles and Gender .....  | 21 |
| Leadership and Effectiveness .....  | 26 |
| Variables.....  | 31 |
| Objectives .....  | 32 |
| Hypotheses .....  | 32 |
| Significance of the Study .....   | 33 |

## **CHAPTER – 2 : METHODS.....34-41**

|                            |    |
|----------------------------|----|
| Population and Sample..... | 34 |
|----------------------------|----|

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| Measuring Approaches.....                   | 39           |
| Leadership Style Questionnaire.....         | 39           |
| Head Teachers Opinion Survey Questions..... | 40           |
| Documents Survey .....                      | 40           |
| Process of Data Collection .....            | 41           |
| Statistical Treatment.....                  | 41           |
| <br>  |              |
| <b>CHAPTER – 3 : RESULTS.....</b>           | <b>42-57</b> |
| <br>  |              |
| <b>CHAPTER – 4 : DISCUSSION.....</b>        | <b>58-66</b> |
| Conclusion and Recommendation.....          | 65           |
| <br>  |              |
| <b>CHAPTER – 5 : REFERENCES .....</b>       | <b>67-83</b> |

#### **APPENDICES**

- Appendix – A : Original English Version of Leadership Style Questionnaire.
- Appendix – B : Bangla Version of Leadership Style Questionnaire
- Appendix – C : English Version of Head Teachers Opinion Survey Questions
- Appendix – D : Bangla Version of Head Teachers Opinion Survey questions

## LIST OF TABLES

|            |  |    |
|------------|--|----|
| Table-1 :  | The break-up of schools run by head teachers having different leadership styles.   | 34 |
| Table-2 :  | Distribution of Head Teachers by gender and school type.   | 34 |
| Table-3 :  | Distribution of head teachers by school type , gender and styles of leadership.  | 35 |
| Table-4 :  | Distribution of students by gender and school type.  | 35 |
| Table-5 :  | List of primary schools and distribution of students.  | 36 |
| Table-6:   | List of secondary schools and distribution of students.  | 37 |
| Table-7 :  | Distribution of students of class-v in Primary Schools under different styles of leadership and gender of leaders.         | 38 |
| Table-8 :  | Distribution of students of class-x in Secondary Schools under different styles of leadership and gender of leaders.       | 38 |
| Table-9 :  | Distribution of students (Primary and Secondary combined) under different styles of leadership and gender of leaders.      | 39 |
| Table-10 : | Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary schools under different styles of male leadership.     | 42 |
| Table-11 : | Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary schools under different styles of female leadership.   | 42 |
| Table-12 : | Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary schools under different styles of leadership.          | 43 |
| Table-13 : | Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Secondary schools under different styles of male leadership.   | 43 |
| Table-14 : | Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Secondary schools under different styles of female leadership. | 44 |
| Table-15 : | Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Secondary schools under different styles of leadership.        | 44 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table-16 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary and Secondary schools combined under different styles of male leadership.                    | 45 |
| Table-17 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary and Secondary schools combined under different styles of female leadership.                  | 45 |
| Table-18 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary and Secondary schools altogether under different styles of leadership.                       | 46 |
| Table-19 : Means of GPAs of the students of primary and secondary schools under different styles of leadership.   | 46 |
| Table-20 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary schools, run under the leadership of male and female autocratic head teachers         | 47 |
| Table-21 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary schools, run under the leadership of male and female democratic head teachers.        | 47 |
| Table-22 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary schools, run under the leadership of male and female laissez – faire head teachers.   | 48 |
| Table-23 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary schools, run under the leadership of male and female head teachers.                   | 48 |
| Table-24 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of secondary schools, run under the leadership of male and female autocratic head teachers       | 49 |
| Table-25 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of secondary schools, run under the leadership of male and female democratic head teachers.      | 49 |
| Table-26 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of secondary schools, run under the leadership of male and female laissez – faire head teachers. | 50 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table-27 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of secondary schools, run under the leadership of male and female head teachers.  | 50 |
| Table-28 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary and secondary schools combined, run under the leadership of male and female autocratic head teachers.        | 51 |
| Table-29 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary and secondary schools altogether, run under the leadership of male and female democratic head teachers.      | 51 |
| Table-30 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary and secondary schools altogether, run under the leadership of male and female laissez - faire head teachers. | 52 |
| Table-31 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary and secondary schools combined run under the leadership of male and female head teachers.                    | 52 |
| Table-32 : Pass, fail, drop-out, and classroom attendance rate of the students of class –v under different styles of leadership.   | 53 |
| Table-33 : Pass, fail, drop-out, and classroom attendance rate of the students of class–v under male and female leadership.  | 53 |
| Table-34 : Pass, fail, drop-out, and classroom attendance rate of the students of class –x under different styles of leadership.   | 54 |
| Table-35 : Pass, fail, drop-out, and classroom attendance rate of the students of class–x under male and female leadership.  | 54 |
| Table-36 : Pass, fail, drop-out, and classroom attendance rate of the students (Primary and Secondary combined) under different styles of leadership and gender of the leaders.                    | 55 |
| Table-37 : Percentages of head teachers’ opinion regarding some academic and administrative issues.  | 56 |

## SUMMARY

The present research work was aimed at investigating the effects of leadership styles and gender of the head teachers of the primary and secondary schools. On the basis of leadership styles and similarity in some control variables a total of 60 schools – 30 government primary schools and 30 main stream secondary schools, were selected as study schools. The study requires two categories of sample. Head teachers of the 60 selected schools comprises one category, and a total of 3776 students of class-v and class-x of the selected schools were treated as the second category of sample. Leadership Style Questionnaire (Bhogle, 1969), Head Teachers Opinion Survey Questions (Haque and Elias, 2008), and Documents Survey techniques were used to collect the data. The study was conducted with the following objectives in mind:

- i) To see the difference between the students of different schools in terms of their academic success under different styles of leadership
- ii) To compare the academic success of the students of different schools run under the leadership of male and female head teachers
- iii) To compare the relative effectiveness of different styles of leadership of the school head teachers in terms of students' success and failure.
- iv) To compare the relative effectiveness of different leadership styles in terms of drop-out rate and rate of classroom attendance.
- v) To compare the views of the head teachers of primary and secondary schools regarding teachers' duties and responsibilities, school climate, reward and punishment, qualities of teaching, extra curricular activities, community participation, and classroom environment.

On the basis of the available literature, personal observation of the researcher, and the objectives of the present investigation following hypotheses were framed:

- i) Leadership styles of head teachers will have significant effect on the academic success of the students.

- ii) Gender of the head teachers will have no effect on the academic success of the students.
- iii) Attendance rate of the students will be much higher under democratic and autocratic leadership than that of under laissez-faire leadership.
- iv) Drop-out rate of the students will be lower under democratic and autocratic leadership than that of under laissez-faire leadership.
- v) Opinion of the primary school head teachers regarding some academic and administrative issues would be different from that of secondary school head teachers.

Major findings of the present study were as follows :

- i) Significant effects of different styles of leadership were found on the academic successes of the students of primary schools ( $p < .05$ ), secondary schools ( $p < .001$ ), and two types of schools taken together ( $p < .001$ ).
- ii) Significant effect of gender of the head teachers were also found on the academic success of the students of primary schools ( $p < .05$ ), secondary schools ( $p < .001$ ), and the two types of schools taken together ( $p < .05$ ).
- iii) Classroom attendance rates of the students under autocratic and democratic leadership were found to be higher for primary schools (80% & 76%), for secondary schools (69% & 72%), and for two types of schools taken together (74.5% & 74%) than that of under laissez-faire leadership, where attendance rates were found to be 69% for primary schools, 57% for secondary schools, and 63% for two types of schools taken together respectively. Attendance rates of the students were also found higher under male head teachers (74.5%) than under female head teachers (66.5%).
- iv) Drop-out rates of the students under democratic and laissez-faire leadership were found to be minimum for primary (15% & 12%) and secondary (13% & 14%) schools than that of under autocratic leadership, where drop-out rates were 21% and 18% for primary and secondary schools respectively.

- v) Head teachers of the primary and secondary schools expressed almost similar views on some issues like school and classroom environment, arrangement of co-curricular activities, teaching abilities, performing duties and responsibilities, and seeking community assistance in running schools. But differences of opinion between the head teachers of primary and secondary schools were also found in case of giving reward and punishment to the teachers and students, particularly provision for physical punishment for the students.

The findings of the present investigation offer support to the hypotheses in most of the cases, but in some points opposite results were found. Finally, it may be concluded that the authorities should take head teachers' styles of leadership into serious consideration while appointing them. Necessary measures should also be taken in developing the quality of the teaching-learning activities by increasing the professional and physical facilities of the schools.



*Chapter-1*

---

---

**INTRODUCTION**

## INTRODUCTION

Leadership is one of the most hotly debated topics in management studies, social psychology and organizational psychology (Pfeffer, 1993). Despite the depth and breadth of debate concerning leadership effectiveness, it remains an elusive construct. As a result, researchers and practitioners have not reached a consensus on a true and concise definition that represents an accurate depiction of effective leadership in all situations and possibilities. Bennis and Nanus (1985) maintain that 'neither in common parlance nor in the literature on the subject, is there consensus about the essence of leadership, or the means by which it can be identified, achieved or measured'. So how can these ambiguities be overcome, and how do we answer the ever-elusive question, what distinguishes a manager from an exceptional leader?

Some people say that we can't define leadership, but we know it when we see it. Others argue that leadership can only be defined as someone who has followers. Leaders are not people in specific positions. Rather, leaders are defined by the people they serve. Recent commentaries note that scholars do not sufficiently agree on the definition of leadership (Barker, 1997). As one respected scholar acknowledged, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (Burns, 1978).

With these caveats in mind, we will cautiously define leadership as the process of influencing people and providing an environment for them to achieve team or organizational objectives. Effective leaders help groups of people define their goals and find ways to achieve them (Miller, Vries, & Toulouse, 1982). They use power and persuasion to ensure that followers have the motivation and role clarity to achieve specified goals. Leaders also arrange the work environment – such as allocating resources and altering communication patterns – so that employees can achieve corporate objectives more easily.

Research has covered a broad spectrum from trait models (based on the traits and other characteristics of leaders) to behavioural perspectives to contingency theories (House 1971; Vroom & Yetton 1973; Vroom & Jago 1988). More recently, the transactional versus transformational leadership models have been at the forefront of leadership research (Bass & Avolio, 1995).

Although no one perspective is entirely accurate, nor entirely irrelevant, the answer to exceptional leadership remains relatively unclear. For example, does the early 21<sup>st</sup> century environment demand a different kind of leadership from earlier times? Certainly there has been a move away from 'command and control' models of leadership towards more flexible, collaborative and nurturing styles (Bennis 1999). The ability to cope with new and challenging imperatives such as increasing global competition demands the use of new leadership skills (Conger 1993). While the technical skills of leaders are not unimportant, there appears to be a case for emphasizing general management expertise, entrepreneurship, an ability to look into the future and the acceptance of responsibility (Savery et al. 1996). In addition, others have identified a need for interpersonal competence (Cooper & Argyris 1998; Karpin 1995) as it assists in learning new things about oneself and one's company in order to leverage intellectual capital. A prerequisite of interpersonal competence is self-awareness, as this influences effectiveness and what the individual is able to 'see in the environment, how evaluates it, and how deals with it' (Cooper & Argyris, 1998).

### **Perspectives of leadership**

Leadership has been contemplated since the days of Greek philosophers and it is one of the most popular research topics among organizational behavior scholars. As we describe the leadership, it becomes apparent that there are many ways to understand leadership in organizational settings. Although some leadership perspectives are currently more popular than others, each helps us to more fully understand this complex issue.

### **Competency (Trait) Perspective of Leadership**

Competencies are the underlying characteristics of people that lead to superior performance (Kochanski, 1997). These include the person's knowledge, natural and learned abilities, values, and personality traits. Since the beginning of recorded civilization, people have been interested in personal characteristics that distinguish great leaders from the rest of us. Early interest focused on personality traits and physical appearance. The ancient Egyptians demanded authority, discrimination, and justice from their leaders. The Greek philosopher Plato called for prudence, courage, temperance, and justice (Takala, 1998).

For the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, organizational behavior scholars used scientific methods to determine whether certain personality traits and physical characteristics actually distinguish leaders from lesser souls. A major review in the late 1940s concluded that no consistent list of traits could be distilled from the hundreds of studies conducted up to that time. Review suggested that a few traits are consistently associated with effective leaders, but most are unrelated to effective leadership (Stogdill, 1974).

A focus on individual characteristics of early leadership research whereby leaders were initially considered successful due to their attractive appearance. When it became apparent that there was a lack of consistency in this approach, personality characteristics, known as traits, began to take over. As a result, particular traits and competencies associated with leadership have emerged. These include: integrity, confidence, extraversion, determination, resilience, the relentless pursuit of goals, the ability to take risks, inventiveness, conscientiousness, the readiness to face uncertainty, innovativeness, adaptability, knowledge of the market and the ability to learn from adversity (Busenitz, 1999; Thomas, Dickson & Bliese, 2001; Wooten, Timmerman & Folger, 1999). Carlopio, Andrewartha and Armstrong (1997) propose that “leadership has been equated with dynamism, vibrancy and charisma; management with hierarchy, equilibrium and control”. Subsequently Mumford & Doorn (2001) maintain that charisma has been referred to as the characteristic or trait that points to exceptional following from employees. According to Offermann, Hanges and Day (2001) much of the discourse on the internal characteristics of leadership over recent years has focused on values and ethics. They argue that disillusionment and a lack of confidence in political leadership has been generated by the particular values that political leaders use to motivate their actions. As a result, Offermann, Hanges and Day (2001) claim that the world is more aware of the importance that values play in leadership effectiveness and success. In addition, it has been shown that particular types of leaders, attract different followers depending on their value types (Ehrhart & Klein 2001). McShane (2001) argues that in order to motivate, influence, be liked and respected, a leader’s values need to align themselves with those of their employees and to reflect integrity, honesty, compassion and assertiveness. Values influencing leadership are also subject to external factors, such as culture (Szabo, Reber, Weibler, Brodbeck & Wunderer, 2001) although there is debate concerning the reciprocity of leadership and corporate culture. Bryman (1986)

maintains that harmonious cultures, which may have “nothing at all to do with the style of each leader”, have a tendency to produce particular styles of leadership and subordinate response, whereas Schein (1985) is clear that leaders do influence corporate culture. Leadership competencies tend to be at the forefront of interest in leadership. Research has centred on gender differences and leader competence (Connell, 2000; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992; McGlashan, Wright & McCormick, 1995), the legitimacy associated with a leader’s appointment (Johnson & Ford 1996) and various traits and skills associated with leader competencies. Bennis (1999) identified five aspects of leader competence: technical competence; interpersonal skills; judgement; conceptual skills and character. Bennis believes that character is the vital element that determines leader efficacy as he claims that he has never found a person to be rejected due to technical incompetence but has seen people rejected because of a lack of character.

The ability to work well with people has always been universally understood as a gift for some, and a competency that others do not possess. These ‘soft’ skills have been identified as important contributors to workplace efficiency for both leaders and employees as market pressures create the need for more competitive organizational cultures skills. However, soft skills have been identified as lacking in Australia (Connell, 1998; Karpin, 1995), the United Kingdom (Green et al. 1998), the United States (Broschew & Kleiner 1991; Moss & Tilly 1996; Stasz, 1996) and Canada (McKague 1991). This may be, as Richardson (1998) reports, because the acquisition of soft skills is problematic. For example, some social scientists believe that interpersonal skills are personality traits that are deeply entrenched and not amenable to change (Fiedler 1967). To date, the leadership literature has been dominated by trait and cognitive theory, whilst emotions have been previously documented as blocking and interfering with the cognitive processes of leadership (George, 2000). Although there has been an impressive increase in the research on emotions as a stand-alone subject, the role they play in the success of leadership remains somewhat of an enigma. Mayer & Salovey (1990) addressed emotion as a competency and developed the seminal emotional intelligence (EQ) model. They defined EQ as the ability to understand, control and utilize the emotions of the self and others.

Since the 1980s, management consultants and a few organizational behavior scholars have popularized competency based selection and reward practices. Competencies

encompass a broader range of personal characteristics – such as knowledge, abilities, and values – that were not considered by earlier studies on leadership traits. This new generation of leadership experts argues that the earlier studies focused too much on the abstract personality traits and physical appearance of leaders. The recent literature on leadership identifies seven competencies that are characteristics of effective leaders (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991).

*Drive*– This refers to the inner motivation that leaders possess to pursue their goals. Leaders have a high need for achievement. This inspires an unbridled inquisitiveness and a need for constant learning.

*Leadership motivation*– Leaders have a strong need for power because they want to influence others. However, they tend to have a need for “socialized power” because their motivation is constrained by a strong sense of altruism and social responsibility (House & Aditya). In other words, effective leaders try to gain power so that they can influence others to accomplish goals that benefit the team or organization.

*Integrity*– This refers to the leader’s truthfulness and tendency to translate words into deeds. Several studies have reported that followers consistently identify integrity as the most important leadership characteristic. Leaders will only have followers when trust is maintained through the leader’s integrity (Kouzes & Posner, 1993).

*Self confidence*– Leaders believe in their leadership skills and ability to achieve objectives. They also use impression management tactics to convince followers of their confidence.

*Intelligence*– Leaders have above average cognitive ability to process enormous amounts of information. Leaders aren’t necessarily geniuses; rather, they have a superior ability to analyze alternative scenarios and identify potential opportunities.

*Knowledge of the Business*– Leaders need to know the business environment in which they operate. This knowledge gives them an intuitive understanding of which decisions to make and whose ideas make sense for the organizations survival and success. This enables leaders to recognize opportunities and understand their organization’s capacity to capture those opportunities.

*Emotional intelligence*– Effective leaders have a high level of emotional intelligence. People with high emotional intelligence monitor their own and others’ emotions, discriminate among them and use the information to guide their thoughts and actions

(Goleman, 1998). Emotional intelligence requires a strong self-monitoring personality because leaders must be sensitive to situational cues and readily adapt their own behavior appropriately. It also requires the ability to empathize with others and process the social skills necessary to build rapport as well as network with others.

The competency perspective offers practical implications for organizations. It recognizes that some people possess personal characteristics that offer them a higher potential to be great leaders. The most obvious implication of this is that organizations are relying increasingly on competency based methods to hire people for future leadership positions (Byham, 1999). Leadership talents are important throughout the organization, so this recommendation should extend to all levels of hiring, not just senior executives. Companies also need to determine which behaviors represent these competencies so that employees with leadership talents are identified early for promotion.

The competency perspective of leadership does not necessarily imply that great leaders are born. On the contrary competencies only indicate leadership potential. People with these characteristics become effective leaders only after they have developed and mastered the necessary leadership behaviors.

### **Behavioral Perspective of Leadership**

In the 1940s and 1950s, scholars from Ohio State University launched an intensive research investigation to answer the question: What behaviors make leaders effective? Questionnaires were administered to subordinates, asking them to rate their supervisors on a large number of behaviors. These studies, along with similar research at the University of Michigan and Harvard University, distilled two clusters of leadership behaviors from more than 1,800 leadership behavior items (Yukl, 1994).

One cluster represented people-oriented behaviors. This included showing mutual trust and respect for subordinates, demonstrating a genuine concern for their needs, and having a desire to look out for their welfare. Leaders with a strong people oriented style listen to employee suggestions, do personal favors for employees, support their interests when required and treat employees as equals (Deogun, 1997).

The other cluster represented a task-oriented leadership style and included behaviors that define and structure work roles. Task-oriented leaders assign employees to

specific tasks, clarify their work duties and procedures, ensure that they follow company rules, and push them to reach their performance capacity.

After identifying the two clusters of leader behavior, researchers associated them with specific measures of leadership effectiveness. The early studies concluded that people oriented leadership is associated with higher job satisfaction among subordinates, as well as lower absenteeism, grievances, and turnover. However, job performance was lower than it was for employees with task-oriented leaders (Korman, 1966). Task-oriented leadership, on the other hand, was associated with lower job satisfaction as well as higher absenteeism and turnover among subordinates. But this leadership style also seems to increase productivity and team unity. College students apparently value task-oriented instructors because they want clear course objectives and well prepared lectures that abide by the course objectives (Baba, 1989).

### **The 'Hi-Hi' Leadership Hypothesis**

Behavioral leadership scholars initially thought that people oriented and task-oriented leadership were at opposite ends of a behavior spectrum. In other words, they believed that a strong task oriented leader was necessarily a weak people oriented leader. But researchers later concluded that these styles are independent of each other. Some people are high or low on both styles, others are high on one style and low on the other, and most are somewhere in between.

With the revised assumption that leaders could be both people oriented and task-oriented, behavioral leadership scholars hypothesized that the most effective leaders exhibit high levels of both types of behavior. This became known as the 'hi-hi' leadership hypothesis (Kahn, 1956). Effective leaders, it was thought, should have a high people oriented style and a high task-oriented style.

A popular leadership program that grew out of the 'hi-hi' leadership hypothesis is the leadership Grid (formerly known as the Managerial Grid) (Blake & McCauley, 1991). Participants begin by assessing their own leadership style on the grid then develop skills to move toward the best leadership style. According to the model, the best leadership style is team management having high levels of concern for people and production. People with high scores on the grid tend to rely on commitment, participation and conflict resolution to get results.



The leadership Grid also labels people with less than perfect scores. Authority compliance managers to maximize productivity through power and authority. Country club managers focus on developing good feelings among employees even when production suffers. Middle-of-the-road managers, in the center of the grid, try to maintain the status quo by adopting a middle of the road approach. Impoverished managers do the minimum required to fulfill their leadership role and keep their job.

### **Contingency Perspective of Leadership**

The contingency perspective of leadership is based on the idea that the most appropriate leadership style depends on the situation (Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1973). They must be able to adapt their behaviors and styles to the immediate situation. It takes considerable effort to learn when and how to alter one's style to match the situation. As we noted earlier, leaders must have a high emotional intelligence, particularly a self-monitoring personality so they can diagnose the circumstances and match their behaviors accordingly.

### **Path-Goal Theory of Leadership**

Several contingency theories have been proposed over the years, but path-goal leadership theory has withstood scientific critique better than the others. The theory has its roots in the expectancy theory of motivation. Early research by Martin Evans incorporated expectancy theory into the study of how leader behaviors influence employee perceptions of expectancies (paths) between employee effort and performance (goals). Based on this perspective, Robert House and other scholars developed and refined path-goal theory as a contingency leadership model (Evans, 1970).

Path-goal theory states that effective leaders influence employee satisfaction and performance by making their need satisfaction contingent on effective job performance. Thus, leaders strengthen the performance-to-outcome expectancy and the value of those outcomes by ensuring that employees who perform their jobs well have a higher degree of need fulfillment than employees who perform poorly. Second, path-goal theory states that effective leaders strengthen the effort-to-performance expectancy by providing the information, support, and other resources necessary to help employees complete their tasks (House and Mitchell, 1974).

Path-goal theory suggests that leaders motivate and satisfy employees in a particular situation by adopting one or more of the four leadership styles described below (House, 1996).

- 1. Directive or task-oriented style:** These are clarifying behaviors that provide a psychological structure for subordinates. The leader clarifies performance goals, the means to reach those goals, and the standards against which performance will be judged. It also includes judicious use of rewards and disciplinary actions.
- 2. Supportive or people-oriented style:** These behaviors provide psychological support for subordinates. The leader is friendly and approachable, makes the work more pleasant, treats employees with equal respect, and shows concern for the status, needs, and well-being of employees.
- 3. Participative:** These behaviors encourage and facilitate subordinate involvement in decisions beyond their normal work activities. The leader consults with employees, asks for their suggestions, and takes these ideas into serious consideration before making a decision.
- 4. Achievement-oriented:** These behaviors encourage employees to reach their peak performance. The leader sets challenging goals, expects employees to perform at their highest level, continuously seeks improvement in employee performance, and shows a high degree of confidence that employees will assume responsibility and accomplish challenging goals.

The path-goal model contends that effective leaders are capable of selecting the most appropriate behavioral style (or styles) for that situation. Leaders might simultaneously use more than one style at a time. For example, they might be both supportive and participative in a specific situation.

### **Transformational Perspective of Leadership**

Transformational leadership is different from transactional leadership. Transactional leadership is 'managing' – helping organizations achieve their current objectives more efficiently, such as linking job performance to valued rewards and ensuring that employees have the resources needed to get the job done (Avolio and Bass, 1988).

In contrast, transformational leadership is about 'leading' – changing the organization's strategies and culture so that they have a better fit with the surrounding environment

(Kotter, 1990). Transactional leadership improves organizational efficiency, whereas transformational leadership steers organizations onto a better course of action.

### **Elements of Transformational Leadership**

There are several descriptions of transformational leadership, but most include the four elements. These are creating a strategic vision, communicating the vision, modeling the vision, and building commitment toward the vision.

**Creating a strategic vision :** Transformational leaders are the brokers of dreams (Sooklal,1991). They shape a strategic vision of a realistic and attractive future that bonds employees together and focuses their energy toward a super ordinate organizational goal (Stewart, 1993). Visions represent the substance of transformational leadership. They reflect a future for the company or work unit that is ultimately accepted and valued by organizational members.

There is some evidence that visions are the most important part of transformational leadership (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1996).

**Communicating the vision :** If vision is the substance of transformational leadership, then communicating that vision is the process. Effective leaders are able to communicate meaning and elevate the importance of the visionary goal to employees (Conger,1991). They frame messages around a grand purpose with an emotional appeal that captivates employees and other corporate stakeholders. Framing helps transformational leaders establish a common mental model so that the group or organization will act collectively toward the desirable goal (Fairhurst and Sarr, 1996).

**Modeling the vision :** Transformational leaders not only talk about a vision, they enact it. They `walk the talk' by stepping outside the executive suite and doing things that symbolize the vision (McGill and Slocum, 1998). Moreover, transformational leaders are reliable and persistent in their actions. They stay on course, thereby legitimizing the vision and providing further evidence that they can be trusted.

**Building commitment toward the vision :** Transforming a vision into reality requires employee commitment. Transformational leaders build this commitment in several ways. Their words, symbols, and stories build a contagious enthusiasm that energizes people to adopt the vision as their own. Leaders demonstrate a 'can do' attitude by enacting their vision and staying on course. Their persistence and

consistency reflect an image of honesty, trust, and integrity. Finally, leaders build commitment by involving employees in the process of shaping the organization's vision.

### Leadership Styles

The main styles on which classic research has focused are autocratic versus democratic, task-oriented versus relationship-oriented, and laissez – faire leadership (Cuadrado, 2001; Eagly & Johnson, 1990). *Autocratic* leadership is characterized by the leader's making decisions unilaterally, not allowing the group members to participate. *Democratic* leadership is participative, consultative, and involves the group, and the leader allows and encourages group members' participation in the decisions (Cuadrado, 2001). Leaders who use a *task-oriented* style are mainly concerned with achieving the group goals—emphasis on achieving the task—whereas *relationship-oriented* leaders are basically concerned with their followers' wellbeing and satisfaction— emphasizing the quality of relations with others—(Cuadrado, 2001).

Badford and Lippitt (1945) saw laissez-faire leadership as being descriptive of leaders who avoid attempting to influence their subordinates and who shirk their supervisory duties. Such leaders instill no confidence in their ability to supervise. They bury themselves in paper work, avoid situations that precludes any possibility of confrontation. They leave too much responsibility with subordinates, set no clear goals, and do not help their group to make decisions. They tend to let things drift, since their main aim is stay on good terms with everyone.

Laissez-faire leadership, however, is a common, but unrealistic and immature way to encounter rapidly growing quality, innovation and effectiveness demands. Those leaders are inclined to delegate responsibility and authority, not in order to empower but to escape their own responsibility. This abdication from leadership is disempowering, effecting leadership behavior of change, relation and production negatively.

Democratic and authoritarian leadership was compared with laissez-faire leadership by adults who were instructed how to lead boys' clubs (Lewin, Lippitt & White, 1939). Laissez-faire leaders gave group members complete freedom of action, provided them with materials, refrained from participating except to answer questions

when asked, and did not make evaluative remarks. This behavior was in contrast to that of autocratic leaders, who displayed a much greater frequency of order giving, disrupting commands, praise and approval, and non constructive criticism. It also contrasted with the behavior of democratic leaders, who gave suggestions and stimulated subordinates to guide themselves. Under laissez-faire conditions, the groups were less well organized, less efficient, and less satisfying to members than under democratic conditions. The work was of poorer quality and fewer assignments completed, and, there was more play, frustration, disorganization, discouragement, and aggression under laissez-faire than under democratic leadership. When groups of boys were required to carry out various projects under a high degree of laissez-faire leadership, they felt a lack of organization to get things done and did not know where they stood. When an autocratic leader was followed by a laissez-faire leader, the group exhibited an initial outburst of aggressive, uncontrolled behavior. This form of behavior subsided during the second and third meetings. Similar outbursts were not observed after the transition from laissez-faire to other forms of leadership. Although it did not stimulate as much aggression as did the autocratic condition, laissez-faire leadership was disliked because it was accompanied by less sense of accomplishment, less clarity about what to do, and less sense of group unity. The investigators (Lippitt & White, 1943; White & Lippitt, 1960) concluded that laissez-faire leadership resulted in less concentration on work and a poorer quality of work than did democratic and autocratic leadership. There was less general satisfaction than from the democratic style, but still somewhat more satisfaction than from the autocratic style that was employed in their study. Laissez-faire leadership has been consistently found to be the least satisfying and effective management style.

In a study of railroad-section groups, Katz, Maccoby, Gurin, and Floor (1951) found that the groups were unproductive if their supervisors avoided exercising the leadership role and relinquished it to members of the work group. These supervisors also did not differentiate their own role from the role of worker. Like their subordinates, they engaged in production work rather than spend their time in supervisory functions. Berrien (1961) studied groups that differed in their adaptation to changes in work. Poorly adapted groups felt little pressure from their superiors and appeared to attribute their poor performance to lax discipline. In the same way, Murnighan and Leung's (1976) experiment found that undergraduate participants who were led by uninvolved leaders were less productive in the quality and quantity of the

problems they solved and lower in satisfaction in comparison to participants who were led by involved leaders. Argyris (1954) conducted a case study in a bank in which the management recruited supervisors who disliked conflicts, hostility and aggression, and wanted to be left alone. The bank's recruitment policy fostered in employees a norm of low work standards and unexpressed dissatisfaction.

Maier and Solem (1962) experimented with discussions under free and more systematic styles of leadership, they found that free discussion produced decisions of lower quality than did systematic, controlled, step-by-step discussion. They also noted that the more free approaches to problem solving were less effective and less satisfying and yielded less commitment from participants than did systematic problem solving.

Pelz (1956) reported that the laissez-faire pattern of leadership was negatively related to productivity in a research organization. Similarly, Farris (1972) demonstrated that the less innovative of 21 scientific groups at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had less peer and managerial leadership. In addition, the leadership of these groups was less task- or relations-oriented as well as less empowering.

Baumgartel (1957) studied authoritarian, laissez-faire, and empowering patterns of leadership behavior. Group members under laissez-faire leadership reported more isolation from the leader and less empowerment in decision making than did those under directive leadership. The results suggested that laissez-faire leadership contributed to low cohesiveness of the group. Aspegren (1963) compared laissez-faire, and empowering patterns of leadership and showed that laissez-faire leadership was associated with lower task motivation and lower satisfaction with superiors. Similarly, MacDonald's (1967) study of three styles of leadership (laissez-faire, autocratic, and democratic) in the Job Corps found that laissez-faire leadership was associated with the highest rates of truancy and delinquency and with the slowest modifications in performance. Wehman, Goldstein, and Williams (1977) reported results from an experiment in which four leadership styles were varied to study their effects on 80 undergraduates' individual risk-taking behavior in group settings and the shift in risk-taking behavior when the responsibility for making decisions moved from the individuals to groups. They found that the shift in such behavior was more likely to occur in laissez-faire-led groups than in groups led by a democratic or autocratic leader. The consensus seems to state a disassociation of laissez-faire leadership with

leadership in general since it enhances unproductive attitudes and disempowerment of subordinates.

### **Theoretical Rationale for Sex Differences and Similarities in Leadership Style**

The relation between leadership styles and gender has recently become an important topic of research (Barberá & Ramos, 2004; Cuadrado, 2003; Cuadrado & Molero, 2002; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; Van Engen & Willemsen, 2004), generating interesting debates in the literature, (Ayestarán, 2003; Cuadrado, 2003; Moya, 2003; Munduate, 2003; Eagly & Carli, 2003a, 2003b; Vecchio, 2002, 2003). As noted by Eagly and Carli (2003b), these studies are sometimes carried out to investigate whether the scarcity of women in managerial positions can be explained on the basis of the fact that they use less effective leadership styles than men, and sometimes, to investigate whether women use “superior” leadership styles than men’s styles, which has recently been called the female leadership advantage (Eagly & Carli, 2003a, 2003b; Helgesen, 1990; Vecchio, 2002, 2003).

Analysis of the situation that women and men face as leaders provides a rationale for expecting differences and similarities. From the perspective of social role theory of sex differences and similarities (Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann, 2000), this analysis begins with the principle that leadership roles, like other organizational roles, are but one influence on leaders’ behavior.

Aspects of gender roles that are especially relevant to understanding leadership pertain to agentic and communal attributes (Eagly et al., 2000). Agentic characteristics, which are ascribed more strongly to men than women, describe primarily an assertive, controlling, and confident tendency—for example, aggressive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, independent, daring, self-confident, and competitive. In employment settings, agentic behaviors might include speaking assertively, competing for attention, influencing others, initiating activity directed to assigned tasks, and making problem-focused suggestions.

Communal characteristics, which are ascribed more strongly to women than men, describe primarily a concern with the welfare of other people—for example, affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic, interpersonally sensitive, nurturant, and gentle. In employment settings, communal behaviors might include speaking

tentatively, not drawing attention to oneself, accepting others' direction, supporting and soothing others, and contributing to the solution of relational and interpersonal problems.

As indicated by Eagly and Johnson when referring to these styles, "leadership research provides an excellent opportunity to determine whether the behavior of leaders is gender stereotypic." Men are generally considered more autocratic and task-oriented because of their relationship with the components of the "instrumental" dimension of gender stereotypes (e.g., aggressive, enterprising, independent, self-sufficient, dominant, competent, rational). In contrast, women tend to be considered more democratic and relationship-oriented, because the "communal" dimension is characterized by aspects such as being concerned with others, being generous, sensitive, understanding, affectionate, or compassionate (Cuadrado, Navas, & Molero, 2006). Studies carried out by Cann and Siegfried (1990) offer empirical support to this relation between gender stereotypes and leadership styles.

Therefore, in view of the above, the autocratic and task-oriented leadership styles are stereotypically male, whereas the democratic and relationship-oriented styles, with individualized consideration of team members are considered stereotypically female (Cuadrado, 2003; Cuadrado et al., 2006).

Most research in the area of leadership and gender role stereotyping in the workplace has focused on either self-perceptions or subordinates' perceptions of male and female leaders' behaviors (Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

In some cases, past research has shown that gender differences in leadership behaviors are reported more frequently by subordinates than by the leaders themselves (Field & Caldwell, 1979; Millard, 1981). Yet meta-analysis of leadership styles found leaders' self-ratings of their task and interpersonal styles to be significantly more gender role stereotypic than subordinates' ratings (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). These discrepant findings suggest the importance of studying different perceptual sources of leaders' behavior and may provide further insight into the nature of gender role stereotyping in organizations.

The study by Lewis (1998) explores the factors that are associated with leaders' and their supervisors' reports of leaders' leadership behaviors. Four hypotheses were tested utilizing Fagenson's four models and are also based on the meta-analysis by



Eagly and Johnson (1990). Each model is discussed in the context of its relevant research.

According to the gender-centred perspective, individual attributes vary according to their gender (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987; Henning & Jardin, 1977; Loden, 1985; Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992).

**The Gender-Centered Model.** The gender-centered model attributes individual differences in organizational behavior to gender (Fagenson, 1990b; Riger and Galligan, 1980). It posits that there are definite behavioral and psychological differences between men and women that lead them to attain distinct and unique managerial and leadership styles. Men have traditionally been perceived to possess characteristics such as aggressiveness, high self-confidence and low emotionality, termed initiating structure behavior, while women have been assigned characteristics such as emotionality, kindness and nurturance, termed consideration behavior (Powell, 1988; Schein, 1973, Stogdill & Coons, 1973, Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). Similarly, the social-role theory (Eagly, 1987) proposes that individuals behave in accordance with societal expectations about their gender role. Through the socialization process, people learn to conform to cultural expectations about their gender role. The feminine model of leadership includes typical transformational leadership behaviors, for example, participatory decision-making, collaboration and quality interpersonal relationships between leader and subordinate (Eagly, Karau, Miner & Johnson, 1994; Helgesen, 1990; Loden, 1985). Thus, women are predicted to engage in more consideration and democratic leadership behaviors than are men, while men are predicted to engage in more task-oriented and autocratic leadership behaviors than are women. While gender differences may be biologically based, most current research focuses on the effects of socialization (Powell, 1988). Henning & Jardin (1977) purport that men possess stronger leadership skills because of their early socialization experiences, particularly their involvement in team sports. Others maintain the existence of similar differences, yet argue that these differences (e.g., women having higher interpersonal sensitivity and human relations skills) enable women to become more effective leaders (Hay, 1980; Helgesen, 1990; Loden, 1985; Rosener, 1990). These findings, however, deviate from more empirically-based research (Eagly & Johnson, 1990), and therefore have been questioned and are

surrounded by controversy (Bradford, Cohen, Epstein, Goldberg, Graham, Lloyd, Mansbridge, Olivares, Schwartz, Siegel, Sonnenfeld & Wyskocil, 1991).

Research that has relied on more empirically-based methodologies has pointed to a lack of significant differences in the leadership styles of men and women (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Gordon & Strober, 1975; Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974; Riger & Galligan, 1980). Furthermore, it has been argued that studying men and women in general rather than men and women who attain formal leadership positions may not provide a valid test of gender differences because the former group has not elected to be leaders, and thus has not acquired distinctive leadership styles. However, research that has compared the behavior of male and female leaders has generally found a lack of significant differences in initiating structure and consideration behaviors between male and female managers (Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Day and Stogdill, 1972; Dobbins and Platz, 1986; Donnell and Hall, 1980).

Despite the very mixed results from psychological and management research, strong and widely held perceptions of the existence of gender differences in leadership style continue (Mednick, 1989). For instance, the standards for an effective manager have been perceived to be more associated with descriptions of men than with descriptions of women (Heilman, Block, Martell & Simon, 1989; Brenner, Tomkiewicz & Schein, 1989; Schein, 1973, 1975). These characteristics include task orientation, need for power, assertiveness and risk taking. These stereotypes were found to somewhat diminish when male and female managers were described as 'successful'. However, stereotypes of men, women, and managers are still prevalent and remain quite strong.

**Organization-Structure Model.** In contrast to the gender-centered model, the organization-structure model suggests that the behavior of individuals is related to their positions in organizational hierarchies (Fagenson, 1986; Kanter, 1977). Kanter (1977) found that the behavior of an individual was due to three structural factors: (1) the individual's perceived opportunity to advance in the organization, (2) the individual's perceived power in the company, and (3) the numerical representation of the individual's gender within that organization. Fagenson (1990b) extended this theory by suggesting that other aspects of organizations, such as their histories, culture and policies, also influences individual behavior.

Kanter (1977) suggests that those who are at the top of the management hierarchy perceive themselves to be powerful, have a lot of opportunity to advance, and often belong to the majority group. They act accordingly, by being aggressive, instrumental, and risk oriented. Since men have held the majority of top managerial positions, they have acted in this fashion. For instance, Kanter (1977) found that workers who perceived themselves to have an opportunity to advance were more interested in and had a higher commitment to their work than workers who did not have such opportunities. The former were more likely to engage in initiating structure leadership behavior than the latter. Conversely, those lower in the hierarchy felt more subservient to those with power, perceived themselves to have less opportunity to advance, and often belonged to the minority group. They also acted accordingly, by being nurturing, helpful and attentive to others' needs. These behaviors are consonant with a consideration type leadership style. The majority of women in management have been in lower level positions (Fagenson, 1993).

Support for the organization-structure model was recently evidenced in a study by Eagly, Karau & Makhijani (1995). In this study, male and female leaders were found to be equally effective, however, men were found to be more effective than women in roles that were defined in more masculine terms, and also in situations in which both leader and subordinate roles were numerically dominated by men.

A number of other studies provide additional support for the organization-structure model (Ragins, 1991; Snodgrass, 1985, 1992). For example, in two studies conducted by Snodgrass, it was shown that in both same and mixed-gender dyads consisting of a supervisor and a subordinate pair, individuals in the subordinate role, regardless of gender, were more sensitive to leaders than leaders were to subordinates (Snodgrass, 1985, 1992). Another study which examined subordinates' evaluations of their leaders' effectiveness found that subordinates were more responsive to their leaders' power than to their leaders' gender (Ragins, 1991). These results suggest that sensitivity to others might be a characteristic of people who are in subordinate roles rather than a characteristic that is innate to women. Since women commonly occupy lower level positions, they are attributed, perhaps mistakenly, with having a greater amount of consideration behavior than are men.

**Gender-Organization Model.** The gender-organization model proposes that both gender and position in the organization influence individual differences in

organizational behavior, although independently, in a linear fashion (Fagenson, 1990a). For example, a female manager may be very sensitive to other workers' needs because she has become socialized to be nurturing, but also because she is in an entry level managerial job which requires her to be responsive to upper level management. According to this model, both gender and organization structure variables individually contribute to an individual's leadership style.

**Gender-Organization-System Model.** The gender-organization-system model, while also suggesting that both gender and position in the organization are factors influencing individual differences in organizational behavior, posits that these two factors make non-independent, nonlinear contributions. In other words, this model recognizes that these two variables can interact (Fagenson, 1990b). It therefore proposes that the same type of leadership style should not necessarily be expected for both men and women because they are likely to experience different organizational conditions. Under the gender-organization-system model, the influence of gender on leadership style depends on the structural nature of organizations and the systems in which they exist. For example, this model predicts that the leadership styles of women managers who attain high level managerial positions may differ from that of men in similar positions, and also from women in lower level positions. Women in high level positions have experienced different treatment by society than have men in these positions, and have traveled a different professional path than women in lower level jobs. Being one of the very few to achieve the highest level managerial jobs, these women may over compensate by acting more stereotypically masculine than men in comparable jobs, and less stereotypically feminine than women in lower level jobs (Fagenson, 1990a; Powell, Posner & Schmidt, 1984).

Despite the stereotypical attitudes, women are increasingly being given heightened managerial responsibility at all corporate levels (Daily, Certo, & Dalton, 1999; Daley & Naff, 1998; Owen & Todor, 1993). According to Kent and Moss (1994), changing stereotypical attitudes and societal acceptance of females in leadership roles are mitigating many of the barriers that have traditionally prevented women from being promoted. Indeed, women exhibit many of the people-oriented and transformational characteristics that companies value (Andorka, 1998; Maronglu & Ekehammar, 1999; Rozier & Hersh-Cochran, 1996), they perform well in key managerial skill areas (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995; McShulskis, 1996; Moskal, 1997) and they

emerge as effective leaders in many situations (Kent & Moss, 1994; Marongiu & Ekehammar, 1999).

Women's responses to negative employment experiences have not been adequately addressed in the organizational sciences (Guttek et al., 1996), and additional inquiry that focuses on their job perceptions, attitudes, and performance is needed. In particular, any lower job responsibility experienced by women compared to that experienced by men may be one source of perceived inequity, and previous research confirms that women are commonly employed in jobs that have little potential (Reskin & Padavic, 1994) and frequently deal with skepticism from their coworkers and employees (Cann & Siegfried, 1987; Cooper, 1997; Jeanquart-Barone & Sekaran, 1994). Even more important to organizations is the reality that such negative experiences may adversely affect women's job attitudes and work performance.

Despite their managerial competencies, women must unfortunately deal with negative stereotypes that can impair their job mobility and advancement (Chang & McBride-Change, 1997; Cooper, 1997; Reskin & Padavic, 1994). As leaders, women are sometimes characterized as quiet, passive, overly relationship-oriented, and emotionally unstable (Heilman, 1997; McGlashan, Wright, McCormick, 1995; Owen & Todor, 1993), and the masculine task-oriented styles of leadership that are highly favored by management are not always utilized by female managers (Rozier, 1996; Rozier & Herch-Cochran, 1996). Brady (1998) using a sample of business students recently found that negative stereotypes about women's lack of talent and career interest were cited as major determinants of workplace inequalities between men and women. Sutton and Moore (1985) concluded that nearly 60% of males sampled believed that only exceptional women could attain noteworthy success. Furthermore, Ibarra (1992) found that women formed professional relationships with both men and women in organizations whereas men formed multiple networks with only other men, which could further impede women's access to employment opportunities. Men also appeared to be better rewarded by their individual and positional resources and homophilous relationships than were women.

Many of the negative ideas about women in management may affect how they are treated and accepted at work (Daley & Naff, 1998; McGlashan et al., 1995). Despite representing almost half of the workforce, women's presence is much less noticeable in positions with executive responsibility (Whelan-Berry & Gordon, 2000). Even

worse, women are frequently given assignments that are excluded from social and professional networking (Ohlott, Ruderman, McCauley, 1994, Snively, 1993). Lyness and Thompson (2000) concluded that women reported greater career barriers and greater importance of performing well on the job than did men using matched samples of male and female executives.

With regard to ratings, men tend to evaluate their abilities, contributions, and successes higher than they rate women's characteristics (Deaux, 1979; Deaux & Farris, 1977; Rosenthal, 1995). Some managers even believe that women's desires to marry and raise children make them less career-oriented than men (Korabik & Rosin, 1995; Lewis & Park, 1989), which sometimes prevents them from being hired and promoted (Stuart, 1992). These negative ideas unfortunately lead some women to question their own supervisory abilities, to evaluate themselves harshly on performance appraisals, and to set low performance expectations (Hammick & Acker, 1998; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Talmud and Izraeli (1999) recently concluded that women's concerns about lacking skills might cause them to try to prove themselves to others.

Disparate treatment generally results in negative job outcomes such as pessimism, wage dissatisfaction, and turnover (Sicherman, 1996). Gutek et al. (1996) concluded that women's perceptions of sex discrimination were associated with increased work conflict, lower prestige and power on the job, and lower willingness to make the same career choice. Additionally, Ackah et al. (1999) concluded that women experience more motivational problems and career uncertainties compared to men, and this could be attributed to their negative work experiences.

### **Leadership Styles and Gender**

Whether men and women behave differently in leadership roles is a much-debated question. Although there is general agreement that women face more barriers to becoming leaders than men do, especially for leader roles that are male-dominated (Eagly & Karau, 2001), there is much less agreement about the behavior of women and men once they attain such roles.

It is not surprising that women are the usual focus of discussions of the impact of gender on leadership. Because social perceivers generally concentrate on the non-

prototypical members of categories (Miller, Taylor, & Buck, 1991), people direct their attention to the adequacy of women's leadership styles.

For many years, researchers wanting to explore gender differences in leadership were hampered by a lack of women in leadership positions (Bass, 1990). Slowly the situation changed and by 1990, Eagly and Johnson were able to locate 171 studies which reported leadership style for females and males. The review by Eagly and Johnson was the first systematic and comprehensive analysis of gender differences in leadership. Eagly and Johnson's (1990) meta-analysis of gender differences in leadership revealed mixed findings. An analysis of task-oriented style and interpersonal oriented style showed that women and men did not differ on these dimensions in organizational studies. Differences were noted for studies in which the sample did not formally hold a leadership position (experimental and assessment studies). On the other hand, significant gender differences were reported in the use of democratic leadership in organizational, experimental and assessment studies. Women used a more participative and inclusive style of leadership and men were more likely to use a directive, controlling style.

Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani (1995) reviewed 86 studies of gender and leadership effectiveness. Since these reviews, interest in gender differences in both leadership behavior and effectiveness has remained high (Brewer, Socha & Potter, 1996; Berdahl, 1996; Forsyth, Heiney, & Wright, 1997, Kabacoff, 1998a; Kolb, 1997; Lauterbach & Weiner, 1996; Maher, 1997; Payne & Cangemi, 1997; Moss & Kent, 1996; Pratch, 1996; Sakata, 1996).

Kabacoff (1998) conducted a large sample study of 900 male and 900 female managers matched for organization, management level, job function, and management experience. Using 360-degree data (N=17,491 completed assessments), extensive differences were obtained. These differences were stable across observer groups (self, boss, peer, direct report) and had significant implications for development.

Three primary questions were addressed. First, do male and female senior executives differ in their perceived leadership behaviors? Second, do male and female senior executives differ in their perceived effectiveness? Finally, is the relationship between perceptions of leadership behaviors and effectiveness the same for both men and women?

A diverse sample of male and female CEOs and Senior Vice Presidents (n=172) were compared on 22 leadership behaviors and leadership effectiveness using a 360-degree strategy. Gender differences in leadership behaviors were obtained from self, boss, peer, and direct report rater groups. Correlations between leadership behaviors and leadership effectiveness were found to vary by the gender of the executive being evaluated when bosses provided ratings. However, differential correlations were not found for ratings provided by direct reports.

Previous research indicates that employees often treat men and women supervisors differently. Some studies have shown that subordinates show a preference for male leadership (Cann & Siegfried, 1987), some have concluded that female subordinates trust male supervisors more than they trust female supervisors (Jeanquart-Barone & Sekaran, 1994), and others show that subordinates are more likely to blame female managers for negative work outcomes (Cooper, 1997). Evidence also suggests that gender attitudes may affect the evaluation of and preference for women's leadership (McGlashan et al., 1995).

Thompson (2000) conducted a study to the differences in gender between orientation of leadership, leadership characteristics, and the perceived effectiveness of educational leaders through subordinate responses. This study analyzed the ratings of 57 leaders (males=31; females= 26) by 472 subordinate participants (males= 234; females= 238) from lower, middle, and upper management levels in secondary and postsecondary institutions. The findings suggest that any differences in the perceived effectiveness of educational leaders in the three leadership type groups are equally true for male and female leaders, and that male and female educational leaders were perceived to be equally effective in their respective organizations despite the stereotypical connotations asserted in previous research. In addition, no significant differences were found between men and women in their leadership characteristics, which stands in contrast to extant research-supported evidence.

In an experimental study of leadership styles and gender Cuadrado, Morales and Recio (2008) found that, regardless of sex, the leaders were considered more competent and efficient, and were evaluated more favorably, when they adopted stereotypically feminine leadership styles.

To sum up, the above results show that female leaders are at a disadvantage with regard to males when they adopt male-stereotypical styles and when the evaluators



(their subordinates) are men. Therefore, differences in leadership between men and women are not so much due to the fact that they act differently but to differential reactions to the behavior of both sexes. Taking these and other results as a starting point, Eagly and Karau (2002) formulated the role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders (Morales & Cuadrado, 2004). The central theme of the theory is that the perceived incongruity between the female stereotype and leadership roles is responsible for the existence of two kinds of prejudice towards female leaders and potential leaders, which results in a poorer appraisal of women's leadership behavior in comparison to that of men. The first kind of prejudice, proceeding from the descriptive component of the gender stereotypes—beliefs about men's and women's characteristics—is due to the mismatch between leadership roles and typically female characteristics. The second, derived from the prescriptive gender stereotypes—beliefs about the desirable characteristics of the members of each sex—is due to the fact that stereotypically male behavior is perceived as less desirable in women than in men. Thus, according to Eagly and Karau, female leaders or potential leaders receive fewer favorable evaluations than their males counterparts when they adopt male-stereotypical leadership styles—for example, autocratic and task-oriented styles—(Eagly et al., 2003).

Lastly, congruity between leadership style and the leader's sex has been investigated, but separately, to be precise, either with the autocratic versus democratic styles (Luthar, 1996), or with task-oriented and relationship oriented styles (Rojhan & Willemsen, 1994). In the first study, in contrast to the theory defended by Eagly and Karau (2002), it was experimentally shown that female leaders who adopted an autocratic style were evaluated more positively than male leaders who used this style. In the second study, the congruity between leadership style and the leader's sex did not produce effects in men's and women's general evaluations of leadership. It was merely found that male evaluators devalued men and women who used styles that were incongruent with their gender.

Relationships of gender, age, and education to leadership styles and leaders' influence tactics were examined by Barbuto Jr, Fritz, Matkin, and Marx (2007) with 56 leaders and 234 followers from a variety of organizations. They found that gender produced a small direct effect on leadership behaviors. The interaction of gender and education produced consistent differences in leadership behaviors.

Demographic variables such as gender, age, and educational level have been used to predict many behaviors, including effectiveness (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995; Thompson, 2000), communication style (Kirtley & Weaver, 1999), decision making (Ganzel, 1999; Radecki & Jaccard, 1996), productivity (Kovar & Overdorf, 1995; Wilson & Hossain, 1999), participation (Itzhaky & York, 2000; O'Connor, 1996; Williamson, 2000), conflict style (Chusmir & Mills, 1989; Duane, 1989; Sorenson, Hawkins, & Sorenson, 1995), success (Blank & Levesque, 1993; Chusmir & Parker, 1992; Sutherland, 1999), and power (Jenkins, 2000; Lips, 2000).

Research examining whether there are different stereotypes for male and female leaders exhibiting more traditional styles of leadership such as initiating structure and consideration. In general, studies “have continued to show that the ‘agentic’ stereotypic male qualities (e.g., competitiveness, daring, assertiveness) are more aligned with stereotypic views of managerial roles, versus ‘communal’ stereotypic female qualities (of kindness, supportiveness, and affection)” (Vecchio, 2002). A specific study in a military context found men were believed to possess the motivation and leadership qualities necessary for effective performance more than women, and women were believed to possess more feminine attributes that impair effective military performance (Boldry, Wood, & Kashy, 2001).

Russell et al. (1988) also researched the stereotypes of consideration and initiating structure styles for men and women who are leaders. They found that when female subjects were asked to describe characteristics of effective male and effective female leaders, female leaders were rated higher in consideration and structure.

Eagly and Karau (2002) suggest that there is a perceived incongruity between the female gender role and typical leader role. They posit that this incongruity creates prejudice towards female leaders. Eagly (1987) discusses social role theory as a means to better understand how gender roles (consensual beliefs about the attributes of women and men) and social roles (socially shared expectations that apply to persons who occupy a certain social position or are members of a particular social category) interact to produce sex differences in social behavior. Applied to leadership, this theory says that leaders occupy roles defined by their specific positions in a hierarchy and simultaneously function under the constraints of their gender roles (Eagly, et al., 2003).

## **Leadership and effectiveness**

Contemporary approaches to leadership research, however, have concentrated on a blend of variables to explain effectiveness. Not only does this research emphasize the cognitive effects of leaders on their followers, but also their influence on the organization itself through structural, cultural, and performance measures ( Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; House, 1977; Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1988; Sashkin, 1988). These approaches combined to form a new genre of theory that emphasized a leader's motivational skills, symbolic behavior, vision, and morality in what was termed transformational effects of leadership or outstanding leadership (House & Podsakoff, 1994).

Although not extensive, there has been research showing variations in leadership style and effectiveness within the context of Bolman and 'Deal's (1991, 1997) four-frame leadership theory. In a study of leadership orientations, Bensimon (1989) found significant variation between new college and university presidents and experienced presidents. For example, new presidents were more likely to have a single-frame leadership orientation (generally structural or human resource), while the more experienced presidents were more likely to have a paired or multi-frame leadership orientation. This evidence suggests that the more experienced presidents had acquired greater cognitive complexity and were able to utilize multiple frames in their managerial and leadership experiences, while the new presidents were more likely to utilize frames emphasizing managerial effectiveness, but not leadership effectiveness (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Hence, more job experience may allow one to see an organization through multiple lenses or leadership orientations, and thus become a more effective manager and leader. Two additional studies of educational administrators and middle managers of a multinational corporation showed strong relationships between leadership orientation and effectiveness within each respective job description (Bolman & Deal, 1991, 1992). This evidence suggests that all four frames are related to effectiveness, and that the ability to use multiple frames are related to effectiveness, and that the ability to use multiple frames is critical to an individual's effectiveness as both a manager and a leader. However, the sampled groups differentiated on which frames were dominant in relation to effective leadership and effective management, revealing the importance of the respective situational contexts.

These patterns of similarity in the use of multiple leadership orientations reported by Bensimon (1989) and Bolman and Deal (1991, 1992) relate directly to Bolman and Deal's assertion that 'managers often use only one or two frames, but need to rely on all four to be fully effective as managers and leaders' (Bolman & Deal, 1991). If effective management is associated with an individual's structural and human resource orientation, and effective leadership is associated with an individual's symbolic and political orientation, one would expect that utilizing the leadership orientations in a multi-frame view would yield the most effective leadership style. These expectations were confirmed in the findings of Bensimon (1989) and Bolman and Deal (1991, 1992). Unfortunately, however, the vast majority of these studies did not consider gender differences as the primary focus in their research, either because there were not enough women in leadership positions at the time, and / or because women were not considered to have the same leadership or managerial abilities and characteristics as men.

Quinn and his colleagues (Quinn, Faerman, & Dixit, 1987; Quinn et al., 1991; Hart & Quinn, 1993; Denison, Hooijberg, & Quinn, 1995) conducted four studies analyzing the perceived effectiveness of managers, chief executive officers, middle managers, and midlevel executives. All of the studies yielded significant variations in the roles leaders play, forming clusters of those high-performing leaders who had the ability to integrate the competing tensions between stability and change and between task and person. These leaders could assume all roles, balancing the conflicting demands from all four domains of action, thus providing a high degree of effectiveness. Those leaders clustering in the low performance category revealed less complexity than the high-performing leaders, and were more likely to adopt a single role of leadership. Hence, the low-performance leaders were unable to balance the conflicting demands of the organization, and were perceived as less effective than those who had adopted more cognitive complexity or balance in their leadership style.

Another recent study testing the relationship between behavioral differentiation and repertoire and the managerial effectiveness of automotive and public utility managers found that behavioral repertoire had a strong positive effect on subordinate, peer, and superior perceptions of effectiveness (Hooijberg, 1996). For example, effective managers must have the ability to use multiple leadership functions to increase the likelihood of meeting all of the demands of organizational members. Thus, the

perceived differentiation of a manager's behavioral repertoire is directly related to the perceived effectiveness of the respective manager.

In two Bolman and Deal (1991, 1992) studies, the evidence indicated that there were no significant differences on any of the variables between men and women, and that in comparable leadership positions, men and women were more alike than different. Stereotypically, it might be expected that women would have rated higher on the human resource frame, which emphasizes interpersonal relationships and feelings, and lower on the political frame, which emphasizes conflict and competition. This, however, was not the case. For example, in the 1991 study, women rated significantly higher than men on the structural, political, and symbolic leadership frames, and in the 1992 study, women were, on average, rated higher than men on every frame. Consistent with these findings, Gibson (1995), in a study of gender differences in leadership across four countries, found that many of the leadership behaviors and styles did not vary across gender. Although men placed greater emphasis on goal setting, while women placed greater emphasis on interaction facilitation, neither differentiated significantly on any other dimensional aspect of leadership. Both men and women performed a variety of leadership functions that overlapped stereotypic gender usage, forming a balance of leadership traits used to achieve organizational goals.

In contrast to the above research, there have been studies supporting gender differences in leadership style. Statham (1987), in a study of two sex-differentiated management styles, found that women were more likely to use styles involving the completion of tasks and interpersonal competencies with subordinates, while men were more likely to utilize a 'hands-off' approach, keeping a distance from subordinates and using their power as authority. In a meta-analysis of literature on leadership and gender, Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that leadership style tended to be gender-stereotypic. For example, women were more likely to adopt a democratic or participative leadership style, while men were more likely to adopt a more autocratic or directive style. This was attributed to women having more skills in interpersonal behavior, which would facilitate a democratic style of leadership. In a study of gender and managerial styles of public administrators, Kelly, Hale, and Burgess (1991) found notable differences in male and female behavioral styles. For example, men clustered in behavioral categories that included traits such as dominant, competitive, assertive,

opportunistic, and manipulative; while women clustered in behavioral categories that included traits such as interpersonal, ambitious, creative, affectionate, and trusting. In another meta-analysis of gender and leadership style among school principals (Eagly, Karau, & Johnson, 1992), results indicated that female principals were more likely to adopt a more democratic style of leadership, while males adopted a more autocratic style of leadership, again gender-stereotypic.

In a further meta-analytic study, Eagly, Karau, and Makhijani (1995) reviewed studies that tested whether student demographics (age, education level, and gender) correlated with perceptions of professors' leadership styles. Aggregated data found no evidence of a sex effect for effectiveness, yet men were perceived as more effective than women in roles that were defined in masculine terms and women were more effective than men in roles that were defined in less masculine terms. The recent meta-analysis conducted by Eagly et al. (2003) shows small differences between men and women in leadership effectiveness. They concluded that, 'the data attest to the ability of women to perform well in leadership roles in contemporary organizations' (Eagly et al., 2003).

The above studies are also supported by the work of Rosener (1990). Through **interviews with female respondents from an International Women's Forum survey**, Rosener noted the efforts of female leaders to 'encourage participation, share power and information, enhance other people's self-worth, and get others excited about their work', which are all what Rosener defines as 'interactive leadership'. Rosener attributes these characteristics to differences in role expectations between men and women. For example, 'women are supposed to be cooperative, supportive, and democratic' while men are to be 'competitive, strong and tough' of autocratic leadership. Furthermore, career opportunities for women traditionally differed from **those of men. For example, women were often given positions that were** comparatively similar to their role expectations in the home, generally as support staff with little or no authority in the decision-making process. The above characteristic differences between men and women parallel the gender-stereotypic traits described in the work of Eagly and her associates (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly et al., 1992), Kelly et al. (1991), and Statham (1987). However, it should be noted that although Rosener states that 'women are more likely than men to be interactive leaders', she

Leadership is a determining factor in the efficiency and effectiveness of a school. It may be said that, “as is the head teacher so is the school.” The head teacher defines the nature and character of a school – how it is run, how significant it is to the students, and how it is perceived in the community.

A brief description of variables studied in the present investigation are given below :

(a) **Independent Variables :** i) Leadership styles - autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire

ii) Gender – male and female

(b) **Dependent Variables :** Institutional effectiveness, in terms of

i) Academic success of the students in class-v and in S.S.C. examination

ii) Classroom attendance of the students in class-v and class-x

iii) Drop-out rate of the students

(c) **Controlled Variables :** Besides the variables we have studied, there are some other variables which may influence the effects of independent variable as well. Considering this possible effect we have tried to select the study schools keeping the following confounding variables almost similar for every school:

- Physical facilities
- Availability of educational materials
- Parent and community support
- Capable teaching force
- Attendance and punctuality of teachers
- School curriculum
- Hours of schooling
- Classroom environment
- Use of teaching aids

- School visits by concerned officials
- Financial position of the school, and
- Geographic area

### **Objectives of the study**

The specific objectives of the study were as follows :

- i) To see the difference between the students of different schools in terms of their academic success under different styles of leadership
- ii) To compare the academic success of the students of different schools run under the leadership of male and female head teachers
- iii) To compare the relative effectiveness of different styles of leadership of the school head teachers in terms of students' success and failure.
- iv) To compare the relative effectiveness of different leadership styles in terms of drop-out rate and rate of classroom attendance.
- v) To compare the views of the head teachers of primary and secondary schools regarding teachers' duties and responsibilities, school climate, reward and punishment, qualities of teaching, Extra curricular activities, community participation, and classroom environment.

### **Hypotheses**

On the basis of the available literature and personal observation of the researcher following hypotheses were framed:

- i) Leadership styles of head teachers will have significant effect on the academic success of the students.
- ii) Gender of the head teachers will have no effect on the academic success of the students.
- iii) Attendance rate of the students will be much higher under democratic and autocratic leadership than that of under laissez-faire leadership.



- iv) Drop-out rate of the students will be lower under democratic and autocratic leadership than that of under laissez-faire leadership.
- v) Opinion of the primary school head teachers regarding some academic and administrative issues would be different from that of secondary school head teachers.

### **Significance of the study**

Effective leadership of the head teachers can bring about changes in the academic atmosphere of the schools. It can help improving the overall position of the school. Since leadership styles play a significant role in running an institution properly and lack of effective leadership interferes with the functioning and quality of education in school. So, it is necessary to know which leadership style is more effective for academic and administrative success of the school. It will ultimately help the concerned authority to hire effective head teachers for effective learning.

*Chapter-2*

---

---

**METHODS**

## METHODS

### Population and Sample

All the 63 government primary schools and the 67 main stream secondary schools, located within the Rajshahi City Corporation area, were treated as the study schools of the present investigation. Head teachers of these schools and the students in class-v of the primary schools and students in class-x of the secondary schools respectively were treated as population. Leadership Style Questionnaire was administered on the head teachers of all the 63 government primary schools and 47 secondary schools to assess their styles of leadership. On the basis of the leadership styles and similarity in some control variables 30 government primary schools and 30 main stream secondary schools were finally selected as study schools. Present study requires two categories of sample. Head teachers of the selected 60 (primary and secondary) schools, 10 for each leadership styles in each category of schools, comprises one category, and the students of class-v and class-x of the selected schools, a total of 3776, were treated as the second category of sample. Of these 3776 students, 1742 students were from primary schools and the remaining 2034 students were from the secondary schools. Primary school students were the ones who appeared at the final examination of class-v. And the secondary school students were the ones who appeared at the SSC examination. Thus, the sample of the present study was consisted of 60 head teachers and 3776 students. The distribution of sample is given in the following tables:

Table-I : The break-up of schools run by head teachers having different leadership styles.

| Type of schools | Leadership styles |            |               |       |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------|---------------|-------|
|                 | Autocratic        | Democratic | Laissez-faire | Total |
| Primary         | 10                | 10         | 10            | 30    |
| Secondary       | 10                | 10         | 10            | 30    |
| Total           | 20                | 20         | 20            | 60    |

Table-2 : Distribution of Head Teachers by gender and school type.

| Types of school | Gender of head teachers |        | Total |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--------|-------|
|                 | Male                    | Female |       |
| Primary         | 17                      | 13     | 30    |
| Secondary       | 20                      | 10     | 30    |
| Total           | 37                      | 23     | 60    |

Table-3 : Distribution of head teachers by school type, gender and styles of leadership.

| School types | Gender of head teachers | Leadership Styles |            |               | Sub-total | Total |
|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------|---------------|-----------|-------|
|              |                         | Autocratic        | Democratic | Laissez-faire |           |       |
| Primary      | Male                    | 8                 | 3          | 6             | 17        | 30    |
|              | Female                  | 2                 | 7          | 4             | 13        |       |
| Secondary    | Male                    | 9                 | 5          | 6             | 20        | 30    |
|              | Female                  | 1                 | 5          | 4             | 10        |       |
| Total        |                         | 20                | 20         | 20            | 60        |       |

Table-4 : Distribution of students by gender and school type.

| Types of Schools | Gender of students |      |        |      | Total Pass | Total Fail | Grand total |
|------------------|--------------------|------|--------|------|------------|------------|-------------|
|                  | Male               |      | Female |      |            |            |             |
|                  | Pass               | Fail | Pass   | Fail |            |            |             |
| Primary          | 907                | 78   | 701    | 56   | 1608       | 704        | 3776        |
| Secondary        | 778                | 379  | 686    | 191  | 1464       |            |             |
| Total            | 1685               | 457  | 1387   | 247  | 3072       |            |             |

Table-5 : List of primary schools and distribution of students.

| Name of schools                   | Number of students passed class-v Exam |        |            | Fail Total | School total |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------|------------|------------|--------------|
|                                   | Male                                   | Female | Pass total |            |              |
| K.I. Primary School               | 40                                     | 23     | 63         | 4          | 67           |
| Khorbona Primary School           | 24                                     | 18     | 42         | 3          | 45           |
| Railway Primary School            | 25                                     | 21     | 46         | 5          | 51           |
| Kadirgonj Primary School          | 45                                     | 31     | 76         | 6          | 81           |
| DoriKhorbona Primary School       | 25                                     | 21     | 46         | 2          | 48           |
| Hetem Kha Primary School          | 31                                     | 29     | 60         | 6          | 66           |
| Hosenigonj Primary School - Boys  | 65                                     |        | 65         | 5          | 70           |
| Hosenigonj Primary School - Girls |  | 48     | 48         | 4          | 52           |
| Dorgapara Primary School          | 33                                     | 22     | 55         | 3          | 58           |
| Helenabad Primary School          | 32                                     | 26     | 58         | 5          | 63           |
| Gourhanga Primary School          | 37                                     | 28     | 65         | 6          | 71           |
| Patanpara K Primary School        | 31                                     | 25     | 56         | 5          | 51           |
| Mohisbathan Primary School        | 35                                     | 30     | 65         | 5          | 70           |
| Sabitri Primary School            | 16                                     | 10     | 26         | 3          | 29           |
| Talaimari Primary School          | 25                                     | 20     | 45         | 5          | 50           |
| M.College Primary School          | 40                                     | 25     | 65         | 4          | 69           |
| Upashahar Primary School          | 36                                     | 22     | 58         | 4          | 62           |
| Sopura Annada S Primary School    | 31                                     | 23     | 54         | 5          | 59           |
| Nowdapara Primary School          | 40                                     | 24     | 64         | 6          | 70           |
| Siroil colony Primary School      | 42                                     | 27     | 69         | 3          | 72           |
| Namovodra Primary School          | 31                                     | 25     | 56         | 3          | 59           |
| Vodra Primary School              | 34                                     | 23     | 57         | 5          | 62           |
| Raninagar Primary School          | 26                                     | 21     | 47         | 5          | 52           |
| Dasmari Primary School            | 36                                     | 26     | 62         | 6          | 72           |
| Mirzapur Primary School           | 24                                     | 20     | 44         | 3          | 47           |
| Budhpara Primary school           | 34                                     | 24     | 58         | 3          | 61           |
| Simla Primary School              | 25                                     | 21     | 46         | 7          | 53           |
| Horogram Primary School           | 21                                     | 12     | 33         | 2          | 35           |
| Baro Banogram Primary School      | 26                                     | 13     | 39         | 3          | 42           |
| LoxmipurVatpara Primary School    | 24                                     | 16     | 40         | 2          | 42           |
| Grand Total                       | 907                                    | 701    | 1608       | 134        | 1742         |

Table-6: List of secondary schools and distribution of students.

| Name of schools                 | Number of students passed<br>SSC Exam |        |            | Fail<br>total | School<br>total |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|------------|---------------|-----------------|
|                                 | Male                                  | Female | Pass total |               |                 |
| Masjid Mision Academy           | 148                                   | 70     | 218        | 14            | 232             |
| Rajshahi Muslim High School     | 13                                    | 5      | 18         | 34            | 52              |
| Riverview High School           | 40                                    | 12     | 52         | 01            | 53              |
| Rajshahi Court Academy          | 14                                    |        | 14         | 22            | 36              |
| Hamidpur Nawadapara High School | 31                                    |        | 31         | 11            | 42              |
| Loxmipur Girls' High School     |                                       | 61     | 61         | 52            | 113             |
| B B Hindu Academy               | 48                                    | 35     | 83         | 21            | 102             |
| Sabitri Girls' High School      |                                       | 19     | 19         | 17            | 36              |
| Shaheed Nazmul Girls' School    |                                       | 115    | 115        | 48            | 163             |
| BCSIR Lab High School           | 6                                     | 11     | 17         | 9             | 26              |
| Dasmari High School             | 34                                    | 27     | 61         | 25            | 86              |
| Nowdapara Girls High School     |                                       | 36     | 36         | 15            | 51              |
| Ranibazar Girls' High School    |                                       | 7      | 7          | 14            | 21              |
| Mirzapur High School            | 8                                     | 17     | 25         | 11            | 36              |
| Court Model High School         | 13                                    |        | 13         | 15            | 28              |
| Shah Mokhdum High School        | 28                                    | 22     | 50         | 18            | 68              |
| Housing Estate Girls' School    |                                       | 4      | 4          | 15            | 19              |
| Satelite town High School       | 22                                    | 13     | 35         | 11            | 46              |
| Agrani School                   | 37                                    | 25     | 62         | 06            | 72              |
| Raj Cant Board High School      | 31                                    | 19     | 50         | 05            | 55              |
| Siroil Colony High School       | 19                                    | 14     | 33         | 15            | 48              |
| Raj Bohumukhi Girl High School  |                                       | 34     | 34         | 18            | 52              |
| Khademul Islam Girls High Schol |                                       | 34     | 34         | 27            | 61              |
| Meherchandi High School         | 22                                    | 15     | 37         | 22            | 59              |
| Raj Loknath High school         | 69                                    |        | 69         | 17            | 86              |
| Govt Lab High School, Rajshahi  | 58                                    |        | 58         | 13            | 71              |
| Rajshahi Collegiate School      | 78                                    |        | 78         | 31            | 109             |
| Siroil Govt High School         | 49                                    |        | 49         | 19            | 68              |
| PN Girls' School                |                                       | 82     | 82         | 12            | 94              |
| Grand Total                     | 778                                   | 686    | 1464       | 570           | 2034            |

Table-7 : Distribution of students of class-v in Primary Schools under different styles of leadership and gender of leaders.

| Types of Leadership | No. of students appeared | No. of students passed | No. of students failed | Drop-out rate | Rate of class attendance |
|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Autocratic          | 560                      | 541                    | 19                     | 21            | 80                       |
| Democratic          | 575                      | 539                    | 36                     | 15            | 76                       |
| Laissez-faire       | 607                      | 528                    | 79                     | 12            | 69                       |
| <b>Grand Total</b>  | <b>1742</b>              | <b>1608</b>            | <b>134</b>             | <b>16</b>     | <b>75</b>                |
| Male                | 985                      | 907                    | 78                     | 20            | 79                       |
| Female              | 757                      | 701                    | 56                     | 12            | 71                       |
| <b>Grand Total</b>  | <b>1742</b>              | <b>1608</b>            | <b>134</b>             | <b>16</b>     | <b>75</b>                |

Table-8 : Distribution of students of class-x in Secondary Schools under different styles of leadership and gender of leaders.

| Types of Leadership | No. of students appeared | No. of students passed | No. of students failed | Rate of drop-out | Rate of class attendance |
|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Autocratic          | 799                      | 579                    | 220                    | 18               | 69                       |
| Democratic          | 568                      | 407                    | 161                    | 13               | 72                       |
| Laissez-faire       | 667                      | 478                    | 189                    | 14               | 57                       |
| <b>Grand Total</b>  | <b>2034</b>              | <b>1464</b>            | <b>570</b>             | <b>15</b>        | <b>66</b>                |
| Male                | 1392                     | 1052                   | 340                    | 17               | 70                       |
| Female              | 642                      | 412                    | 230                    | 13               | 62                       |
| <b>Grand Total</b>  | <b>2034</b>              | <b>1464</b>            | <b>570</b>             | <b>15</b>        | <b>66</b>                |

Table-9 : Distribution of students (Primary and Secondary combined) under different styles of leadership and gender of leaders.

| Types of Leadership | No. of students appeared | No. of students passed | No. of students failed | Rate of drop-out | Rate of class attendance |
|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Autocratic          | 1359                     | 1120                   | 239                    | 19.5             | 74.5                     |
| Democratic          | 1143                     | 946                    | 197                    | 14               | 74                       |
| Laissez-faire       | 1274                     | 1006                   | 268                    | 13               | 63                       |
| <b>Grand Total</b>  | <b>3776</b>              | <b>3072</b>            | <b>704</b>             | <b>15.5</b>      | <b>70.5</b>              |
| Male                | 2377                     | 1959                   | 418                    | 18.5             | 74.5                     |
| Female              | 1399                     | 1113                   | 286                    | 12.5             | 66.5                     |
| <b>Grand Total</b>  | <b>3776</b>              | <b>3072</b>            | <b>704</b>             | <b>15.5</b>      | <b>70.5</b>              |

### Measuring approaches

Both subjective and objective measures were taken to collect the data. Leadership Style Questionnaire (Bhogle, 1969) was administered to assess the style of leadership of the head teachers. Head teachers opinion regarding some academic and administrative issues were sought with the help of a structured set of questions. Academic success and failure records of the students in their Primary School Final Examination and SSC Examination were collected from the published result sheets of the primary schools and the results published by the Rajshahi Education Board respectively. Students' class attendance rates, and drop-out rates were collected from the attendance registers, and the enrolment records of the schools respectively.

**Leadership Style Questionnaire (LSQ):** Leadership Styles Questionnaire was introduced by Shalini Bhogle in 1969 to measure styles of leadership of school Head Teachers. LSQ is used particularly to measure three styles of leadership – Authoritarian, Democratic, and Laissez-faire. The scale contains 13 items, describing 13 different work situations. Each work situation was described in three different ways by three alternative styles of leadership behaviour. The Head Teachers were required to express their preferences in each situation by giving a tick mark on any one of the three alternative approaches placed under each situation. One unit score is



given for a response in each situation. Respondents can earn a maximum score of 13 and a minimum of zero (0) on the whole scale for a particular style of leadership. They may have a combination of three scores on three different styles. A score of 7 or more (above median) on a style is regarded as the particular style of leadership of the respondent. Bhogle found the scale highly reliable and valid, with reliability coefficient ranges from .52 to .74. The criterion for validation was face validity and content validity. The adopted Bangla version of the LSQ was administered in the present study. For which the present investigator determined its reliability and validity. For ascertaining face validity, both Bangla and English version of the questionnaire were given to seven teachers of the Department of Psychology, University of Rajshahi, who served as judges to assess the quality of translation and re-translation. Inter-judge agreement of the questionnaire ranged from .76 to 1.00. Based on their well considered and careful opinion, a few corrections were made to the translated version of the questionnaire. The reliability of the Bangla version of the questionnaire was determined by test-retest method where 20 school head teachers were given the questionnaire two times at an interval of two weeks. The test-retest reliability of the questionnaire was found to be 0.78 ( $p < 0.01$ ).

**Head Teachers Opinion Survey Questions:** 'Head Teachers Opinion Survey Questions' was a set of questions intended to measure the head teachers' opinion regarding some academic and administrative issues. Opinion survey questions were prepared by Haque and Elias (2008). It is a structured set of questions containing eight different questions, each describing a unique administrative or academic condition of the schools. The respondents' response to each question was treated separately. Respondents are required to express their opinion by rating one of the three alternatives (yes, no, or not always) given just right to each question.

**Documents survey:** For collecting the information regarding academic success and failure of the huge number of students, who were included in the sample, documents survey technique was applied. The researcher went through the final examination result sheets for class-v, which were preserved in each primary school, and collected the success record in terms of Grade Point Average (GPA). The number of students who have failed to achieve minimum GPA was also recorded from the result sheets. Academic success and failure records of the secondary school students were collected

from the gazette published by the 'Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education, Rajshahi'. Drop-out rate and classroom attendance rate of the students were collected from the records of the respective schools.

### **Process of data collection**

Leadership Style Questionnaire was administered on all the primary and secondary school head teachers to assess their styles of leadership. After assessing their leadership style, the head teachers, who were included in the sample, were interviewed with the help of a set of structured questions related to seven academic and administrative issues. The head teachers responded to the questions by expressing their opinion through tick mark or by writing few words. All the 60 head teachers were interviewed in the same way. Information regarding students' success and failure in the examination, classroom attendance rate, and drop-out rate were collected accordingly from the office records of the respective schools.

### **Statistical treatment**

To see the effect of gender of the head teachers under each style of leadership separately, and the effect of gender as a whole on the academic success of the students of the primary and secondary schools separately and the students altogether, tests of difference between means were computed through t-tests. Side by side analysis of variance was applied to see the effects of different styles of leadership on the academic success of the students for primary schools and secondary schools separately, and for the student altogether. Analysis of variance was also applied to determine the effects of gender of the leaders on the academic success of the students for the primary and secondary schools separately and two types of schools taken together. To determine the rate of pass, rate of fail, drop-out rate, and classroom attendance rate of the students, percentages were computed. Percentages were also computed to see the differences in opinion between the head teachers of the primary and secondary schools regarding some academic and administrative issues.

*Chapter-3*

---

---

**RESULTS**

## RESULTS

This chapter deals with the results and analyses of data. Results of statistical analyses of the data are presented in the following tables.

Table-10 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary schools under different styles of male leadership.

| Sources of Variation | Sum of Square | df  | Mean Square | F   | Sig. |
|----------------------|---------------|-----|-------------|-----|------|
| Between Groups       | .95           | 2   | .47         | .93 | .39  |
| Within Groups        | 494.11        | 955 | .51         |     |      |
| Total                | 495.09        | 957 |             |     |      |

The result in the above table indicates that the styles of leadership of male primary head teachers didn't have any effect on the academic success of the students.

Table-11 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary schools under different styles of female leadership.

| Sources of Variation | Sum of Squares | df. | Mean Square | F    | P   |
|----------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|-----|
| Between group        | 36.12          | 2   | 18.11       | 2.91 | .05 |
| Within group         | 4034.59        | 647 | 6.24        |      |     |
| Total                | 4070.71        | 649 |             |      |     |

Summary of ANOVA in table-23 reveals that the styles of leadership of the female head teachers have a significant effect on the academic success of the primary school students.

Table-12 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary schools under different styles of leadership.

| Sources of Variation | Sum of Squares | df   | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|----------------------|----------------|------|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups       | 1.93           | 2    | .96         | 2.95 | .05  |
| Within Groups        | 522.31         | 1605 | .33         |      |      |
| Total                | 524.24         | 1607 |             |      |      |

The result in the above table shows that the styles of leadership of the primary school head teachers, regardless of their gender, have significant effect on the academic achievement of the students.

Table-13 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Secondary schools under different styles of male leadership.

| Sources of Variation | Sum of Squares | df   | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|----------------------|----------------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups       | 22.07          | 2    | 11.03       | 17.12 | .001 |
| Within Groups        | 715.64         | 1110 | .64         |       |      |
| Total                | 737.71         | 1112 |             |       |      |

Summary of ANOVA in the above table indicates that there is highly significant effect of the styles of leadership of the male head teachers on the academic success of the students of the secondary schools.

Table-14 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Secondary schools under different styles of female leadership.

| Sources of Variation | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|----------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups       | 7.25           | 2   | 3.62        |      |      |
| Within Groups        | 259.92         | 349 | .74         | 4.86 | .008 |
| Total                | 267.17         | 351 |             |      |      |

Significant effect of the styles of leadership of the female head teachers on the academic success of the students of secondary schools is found from the result in the above table.

Table-15 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Secondary schools under different styles of leadership.

| Sources of Variation | Sum of Squares | df   | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|----------------------|----------------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups       | 18.82          | 2    | 9.41        |       |      |
| Within Groups        | 1004.49        | 1461 | .68         | 13.69 | .001 |
| Total                | 1023.31        | 1463 |             |       |      |

The result in the above table indicates that there is significant effect of the styles of leadership of the secondary schools head teachers, regardless of their gender, on the academic success of the students.

Table -16 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary and Secondary schools combined under different styles of male leadership.

| Sources of Variation | Sum of Squares | df   | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|----------------------|----------------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups       | 16.04          | 2    | 8.02        |       |      |
| Within Groups        | 1214.91        | 2067 | .58         | 13.65 | .001 |
| Total                | 1230.96        | 2069 |             |       |      |

Summary of ANOVA in the above table shows that styles of leadership of the male head teachers, regardless of the type of schools, have a significant effect on the academic success of the students.

Table-17 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary and Secondary schools combined under different styles of female leadership.

| Sources of Variation | Sum of Squares | df   | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|----------------------|----------------|------|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups       | 11.51          | 2    | 5.75        |      |      |
| Within Groups        | 2477.52        | 999  | 2.48        | 2.32 | .05  |
| Total                | 2489.03        | 1001 |             |      |      |

The result in the above table reveals that the styles of leadership of the female head teachers, regardless of the type of schools, have significant effect of the academic success of the students.

Table-18 : Summary of ANOVA for the Grades obtained by the students of Primary and Secondary schools altogether under different styles of leadership.

| Sources of Variation | Sum of Squares | df   | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|----------------------|----------------|------|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups       | 27.93          | 2    | 13.96       |      |      |
| Within Groups        | 5568.07        | 3069 | 1.81        | 7.69 | .001 |
| Total                | 5596.00        | 3071 |             |      |      |

The summary of ANOVA in the above table indicates that the styles of leadership of the school head teachers (Primary and Secondary combined), regardless of their gender, have significant effect on the academic success of the students.

Table-19 : Means of GPAs of the students of primary and secondary schools under different styles of leadership.

| Type of schools              | Gender of head teachers | Styles of leadership |            |               |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------|---------------|
|                              |                         | Autocratic           | Democratic | Laissez-faire |
| Primary                      | Male                    | 3.66                 | 3.58       | 3.59          |
|                              | Female                  | 4.19                 | 3.56       | 3.55          |
| Secondary                    | Male                    | 3.74                 | 3.62       | 3.43          |
|                              | Female                  | 3.05                 | 3.44       | 3.31          |
| Primary+Secondary (combined) | Male                    | 3.70                 | 3.61       | 3.5           |
|                              | Female                  | 3.78                 | 3.52       | 3.45          |

The means of GPA in the above table shows that the students' academic success under democratic leadership of the head teachers is relatively better than under laissez-faire leadership. And academic success of the students under autocratic head teachers is relatively better than under democratic leadership. The only exceptional result was found in case of female head teachers of secondary schools, where students' performance was better under democratic rather than autocratic leadership.



Table-20 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary schools, run under the leadership of male and female autocratic head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df  | t-value | P   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|
| Male                    | 453                | 3.66                 | .26 | 557 | .92     | .82 |
| Female                  | 106                | 4.19                 | .48 |     |         |     |

The above information indicates no difference between the grades achieved by the students of primary schools run under the leadership of male and female autocratic head teachers. Though, students under female autocratic head teachers obtained relatively higher scores than the students under male autocratic head teachers.

Table-21 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary schools, run under the leadership of male and female democratic head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df  | t-value | P   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|
| Male                    | 186                | 3.58                 | .31 | 575 | .48     | .31 |
| Female                  | 391                | 3.56                 | .43 |     |         |     |

The result in the above table indicates that no difference exists between the grades of the students of the primary schools run under the leadership of male and female democratic head teachers.

Table-22 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary schools, run under the leadership of male and female laissez – faire head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df  | t-value | P   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|
| Male                    | 319                | 3.59                 | .56 | 470 | 1.07    | .14 |
| Female                  | 153                | 3.51                 | .19 |     |         |     |

The result in table-22 indicates no significant difference between the scores obtained by the students of primary schools led by male and female laissez-faire head teachers. Students under male head teachers obtained relatively higher grades than the students under female head teachers.

Table-23 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary schools, run under the leadership of male and female head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df   | t-value | P   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|------|---------|-----|
| Male                    | 958                | 3.62                 | .27 | 1606 | 1.67    | .05 |
| Female                  | 650                | 3.66                 | .42 |      |         |     |

The result in the above table revealed that the students in primary schools under the leadership of female head teachers performed significantly better in the examination than those led under male leadership.

Table-24 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of secondary schools, run under the leadership of male and female autocratic head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df  | t-value | P   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|
| Male                    | 533                | 3.74                 | .29 | 592 | 5.99    | .01 |
| Female                  | 61                 | 3.05                 | .51 |     |         |     |

Above information showed that the students in secondary schools led by male autocratic head teachers achieved significantly better grades than the students led by female autocratic head teachers.

Table-25 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of secondary schools, run under the leadership of male and female democratic head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df  | t-value | P   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|
| Male                    | 225                | 3.62                 | .32 | 426 | 2.23    | .01 |
| Female                  | 203                | 3.44                 | .25 |     |         |     |

The above result indicates that the students of secondary schools under the leadership of male democratic head teachers performed significantly better in the examination than the students led by female democratic head teachers.

Table-26 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of secondary schools, run under the leadership of male and female laissez – faire head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df  | t-value | P   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|
| Male                    | 354                | 3.43                 | .62 | 440 | 1.21    | .11 |
| Female                  | 88                 | 3.31                 | .46 |     |         |     |

The result in the above table doesn't indicate any significant effect of gender of the head teachers on the academic success of the students led by laissez-faire leadership. But the result reveals that the students under the leadership of male laissez-faire head teachers performed relatively better.

Table-27 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of secondary schools, run under the leadership of male and female head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df   | t-value | P    |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|------|---------|------|
| Male                    | 1112               | 3.61                 | .71 | 1462 | 5.25    | .001 |
| Female                  | 352                | 3.34                 | .31 |      |         |      |

The result in table-27 revealed that significant difference exists between the achievement scores of the secondary school students under the leadership of male and female head teachers. Result indicates that the students led by male head teachers obtained better grades than the students led by female head teachers.

Table-28 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary and secondary schools combined, run under the leadership of male and female autocratic head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df   | t-value | P   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|------|---------|-----|
| Male                    | 986                | 3.70                 | .58 | 1151 | .45     | .32 |
| Female                  | 167                | 3.78                 | .36 |      |         |     |

The information in the above table reveals that no difference exists between the achievement scores of the students of primary and secondary schools altogether under the leadership of male and female autocratic head teachers.

Table-29 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary and secondary schools altogether, run under the leadership of male and female democratic head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df   | t-value | P   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|------|---------|-----|
| Male                    | 411                | 3.61                 | .48 | 1003 | 1.73    | .04 |
| Female                  | 594                | 3.52                 | .53 |      |         |     |

The result in the above table shows that the students led by male democratic head teachers performed significantly better in the examination than the students led by democratic female head teachers.

Table-30 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary and secondary schools altogether, run under the leadership of male and female laissez - faire head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df  | t-value | P   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|
| Male                    | 673                | 3.5                  | .61 | 912 | 1.01    | .15 |
| Female                  | 241                | 3.45                 | .35 |     |         |     |

The above result indicates that no significant difference exists between the academic success of the students led by male and female laissez-faire leadership.

Table-31 : Difference between the scores (grades) obtained by the students of primary and secondary schools combined run under the leadership of male and female head teachers.

| Gender of head teachers | Number of students | Mean score of Grades | SD  | df   | t-value | P   |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|------|---------|-----|
| Male                    | 2070               | 3.72                 | .68 | 3070 | 1.57    | .05 |
| Female                  | 1002               | 3.55                 | .59 |      |         |     |

The result in the above table shows that the students under the leadership of male head teachers obtained significantly higher grades than the students under the leadership of female head teachers.

Table-32 : Pass, fail, drop-out, and classroom attendance rate of the students of class – v under different styles of leadership.

| Styles of Leadership | No. of students appeared | Rate of Pass | Rate of Fail | Drop-out rate | Attendance rate |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Autocratic           | 560                      | 96.6%        | 3.4%         | 21%           | 80%             |
| Democratic           | 575                      | 93.73%       | 6.27%        | 15%           | 76%             |
| Laissez-faire        | 607                      | 86.98%       | 13.02%       | 12%           | 69%             |

Information in the above table reveals that percentages of students passed in the class-v final examination and students' attendance rate in the classroom were higher under the leadership of autocratic head teachers than under democratic and laissez-faire leadership. But in case of drop-out rate inverse result was found, where drop-out rate was minimum under laissez-faire leadership, then slightly higher for democratic leadership, and highest for autocratic leadership.

Table-33 : Pass, fail, drop-out, and classroom attendance rate of the students of class– v under male and female leadership.

| Gender of Leaders | No. of students appeared | Rate of Pass | Rate of Fail | Drop-out rate | Attendance rate |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Male              | 985                      | 92.08%       | 7.92%        | 20%           | 79%             |
| Female            | 757                      | 92.60%       | 7.40%        | 12%           | 71%             |

The information in the above table indicates that the percentages of pass and fail in the class-v examination are almost similar under both the male and female leadership. Result reveals that attendance rate of the students was higher under male leadership than under female leadership. But drop-out rates of the students were higher for male head teachers than for their female counter parts.

Table-34 : Pass, fail, drop-out, and classroom attendance rate of the students of class – x under different styles of leadership.

| Styles of Leadership | No. of students appeared | Rate of Pass | Rate of Fail | Drop-out rate | Attendance rate |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Autocratic           | 799                      | 72.47%       | 27.53%       | 18%           | 69%             |
| Democratic           | 568                      | 75.65%       | 24.35%       | 13%           | 72%             |
| Laissez-faire        | 667                      | 65.66%       | 34.34%       | 14%           | 57%             |

It was found from the above result that the rate of pass in the SSC examination is higher, rate of fail and drop-out rate are lower and rate of classroom attendance is higher for the students under democratic leadership than for the students under autocratic and laissez-faire leadership.

Table-35 : Pass, fail, drop-out, and classroom attendance rate of the students of class– x under male and female leadership.

| Gender of Leaders | No. of students appeared | Rate of Pass | Rate of Fail | Drop-out rate | Attendance rate |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Male              | 1392                     | 75.57%       | 24.43%       | 17%           | 70%             |
| Female            | 642                      | 67.17%       | 32.83%       | 13%           | 62%             |

The information in the above table indicates that the percentage of pass in the SSC examination under male head teachers was higher than that of under female head teachers. Attendance rate of the students in the classroom was also higher under the leadership of male head teachers than under the females. But the drop-out rate of the students from the schools was lower under female head teachers and higher under male head teachers.



Table-36 : Pass, fail, drop-out, and classroom attendance rate of the students (Primary and Secondary combined) under different styles of leadership and gender of the leaders.

| Types of Leadership | No. of students appeared | Rate of pass  | Rate of fail  | Rate of drop-out | Rate of class attendance |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Autocratic          | 1359                     | 82.41%        | 17.59%        | 19.5%            | 74.5%                    |
| Democratic          | 1143                     | 82.76%        | 17.24%        | 14%              | 74%                      |
| Laissez-faire       | 1274                     | 78.96%        | 21.02%        | 13%              | 63%                      |
| <b>Grand Total</b>  | <b>3776</b>              | <b>81.35%</b> | <b>18.65%</b> | <b>15.5%</b>     | <b>70.5%</b>             |
| Male                | 2377                     | 82.41%        | 17.59%        | 18.5%            | 74.5%                    |
| Female              | 1399                     | 79.55%        | 20.45%        | 12.5%            | 66.5%                    |
| <b>Grand Total</b>  | <b>3776</b>              | <b>81.35%</b> | <b>18.65%</b> | <b>15.5%</b>     | <b>70.5%</b>             |

The information containing in the above table reveals that pass rate and fail rate of the students in their final examinations under the leadership of the autocratic and democratic head teachers were almost similar. Rates of students' attendance in the classroom were also almost the same. But the drop-out rate of the students under autocratic head teachers was higher than that of under democratic head teachers. Pass rate, rate of fail, and rate of classroom attendance of the students under laissez-faire leadership were relatively lower than under autocratic and democratic leadership. The result also shows that the pass rate and attendance rate of the students were relatively better under male head teachers than that of under female head teachers. But the drop-out rate of the students under female leadership was much lower than that of under male leadership.

Table-37 : Percentages of head teachers' opinion regarding some academic and administrative issues.

| Type of information   | Yes     |           | No      |           | Not always |           |
|---|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|   | Primary | Secondary | Primary | Secondary | Primary    | Secondary |
| Do you think, your colleagues perform their duties properly?                | 73.33%  | 63.33%    | 10%     | 16.67%    | 16.67%     | 20%       |
| Do you think your school atmosphere congenial for learning?                 | 53.33%  | 50%       | 36.66%  | 30%       | 10%        | 20%       |
| Do you have any provision for reward & punishment in your school?           | 76.66%  | 43.33%    | 13.33%  | 36.66%    | 10%        | 20%       |
| Do you think physical punishment necessary for maintaining discipline?      | 90%     | 40%       | 6.66%   | 33.33%    | 3.33%      | 26.66%    |
| Do you think your colleagues capable of maintaining teaching standard?      | 90%     | 73.33%    | 3.33%   | 10%       | 6.67%      | 16.67%    |
| Does your school arranges co-curricular activities regularly?               | 26.66%  | 36.67%    | 50%     | 30%       | 23.33%     | 33.33%    |
| Do you let local people involved & get their cooperation in running school? | 60%     | 50%       | 10%     | 30%       | 30%        | 20%       |
| Do you think classroom environment congenial for learning and teaching?     | 50%     | 40%       | 26.67%  | 33.33%    | 23.33%     | 26.67%    |

The information in the above table shows that most of the head teachers think their colleagues in the schools are sincere in performing their duties. But the percentage of primary school head teachers in this regard was higher than the high school head teachers. Both the primary and secondary school head teachers expressed almost similar views that classroom environment and overall school atmosphere is not so

congenial for conducting teaching-learning activities. Primary school head teachers were found to be in favour of physical punishment and they have provision for reward and punishment more than the secondary school head teachers. Most of the primary and secondary school head teachers consider their colleagues capable of maintaining standard of teaching. Majority of the head teachers of both primary and secondary schools opined that co-curricular activities can't be performed in most of the time for some environmental reasons. Most of the primary school head teachers sought cooperation from and let local people involved in running the schools, where only 50 % of the secondary school head teachers expressed their willingness to get local people involved in school activities.

*Chapter-4*

---

---

**DISCUSSION**

## DISCUSSION

In this chapter the findings of the present investigation will be discussed in the light of the objectives and the hypotheses formulated for the study. It's worth mentioning here that all the hypotheses were formulated in accordance with the objectives of the study. So, discussion of results would be attempted following each of those hypotheses.

### **Hypothesis -1: Leadership styles of head teachers will have significant effect on the academic success of the students.**

Results of the present investigation reveal that styles of leadership of the school head teachers have tremendous effect on the academic success of the students of primary and secondary schools. Significant effects (table 10 through 19,  $p < .05 - .001$ ) of styles of leadership of the head teachers were found for all cases - i) taken male and female head teachers separately for each category of schools, ii) male and female head teachers jointly for each type of schools, iii) male and female head teachers separately regardless of type of schools, and iv) male and female head teachers jointly regardless of type of schools. But, in case of male head teachers of the primary schools, effect of leadership styles was not found significant. It is evident from the means of GPA that the students under autocratic leadership, regardless of the gender of the leader, performed better than under democratic and laissez-faire leadership, and the students under democratic leadership performed better than under laissez-faire leadership. It is believed that the task oriented autocratic head teachers assign teachers to specific tasks, clarify their work duties, procedures and goals, ensure that they follow rules, the standard against which performance will be judged, and push them to reach their performance capacity (House, 1996). This leadership style seems to increase school performance. Students apparently value task-oriented autocratic instructors because they want clear course objectives and well prepared lectures that abide by the course objectives (Baba, 1989). It is evident from the results that the students under democratic style of leadership performed better than under laissez-faire leadership, though the level of the students' attainment was not as good as under autocratic leadership. The democratic head teachers with their strong people oriented style do personal favors for fellow teachers, support their interests and treat them as

equals (Deogun, 1997), makes the work more pleasant, shows concern for the status, needs, and well-being of the teachers and students, consults with other teachers, asks for their suggestions, and takes these ideas into serious consideration before making a decision (House, 1997). As a result, teachers and students under democratic leadership feel encouraged to attain the performance goals that may lead the students perform better than the students under laissez-faire leadership. The performance level of the students under laissez-faire leadership was lowest among the three styles of leadership. Since the laissez-faire leadership, as being descriptive of leaders who avoid attempting to influence their subordinates and who shirk their supervisory duties, lacks confidence in their ability to supervise they avoid situations that preclude any possibility of confrontation. They leave too much responsibility with subordinates, set no clear goals, and do not help others to make decisions. They tend to let things drift, since their main aim is stay on good terms with every one (Badford and Lippitt, 1945). The findings of the previous researches suggest that the students under laissez-faire conditions were less organized, and less efficient than under democratic conditions. The work was of poorer quality and fewer assignments completed, and there was more frustration, disorganization, discouragement, and aggression under laissez-faire than under democratic leadership. The investigators (Lippitt and White, 19943; White and Lippitt, 1960) concluded that laissez-faire leadership resulted in less concentration on work and a poorer quality of work than did democratic and autocratic leadership. Laissez-faire leadership has been consistently found to be the least effective management style. The findings of the present investigation are in line with the findings of the previous researchers who found autocratic and democratic leadership more effective than the laissez-faire leadership (Lippitt and White, 1960; Katz et al., 1951; Berrien, 1961; Murnighan and Leung, 1976; Petz, 1956; Farris, 1977; Baumgartel, 1957; Aspegren, 19963; MacDonald, 19967; Wehman et al., 1977).

**Hypothesis–2 : Gender of the head teachers will have no significant effect on the academic success of the students.**

The results, regarding the effect of gender on the academic success and failure of the students of primary schools, revealed that there is no significant difference between the grades obtained by the students under the leadership of male and female

autocratic, male and female democratic, and male and female laissez-faire head teachers. But, regardless of leadership styles, female head teachers of the primary schools exert significant positive effect ( $p < 0.05$ ) on the academic success of the students than that of the male head teachers. In case of secondary schools, it was found from the results that the students' achievement scores, under male autocratic and male democratic head teacher, were significantly higher than the achievement scores under female autocratic and female democratic head teachers. Though, gender differences in the laissez-faire leadership in terms of their effect on the achievement scores of the students was not found significant. Students under male head teachers of the secondary schools, regardless of the styles of leadership of the head teachers, performed significantly ( $p < .001$ ) better in their final examinations than the students under female head teachers. As a whole, regardless of school types taken all the schools together, achievement scores of the students did not differ significantly under male and female autocratic and laissez-faire head teachers. But the difference was found significant in case of male and female democratic head teachers of the secondary schools, where students performed significantly ( $p < .04$ ) better under male leadership than they did under female leadership. Significant ( $p < .05$ ) effect of gender on the academic success of the students was also observed taken all the schools together regardless of the school type and the styles of leadership of the head teachers, where students under male head teachers performed significantly ( $p < .05$ ) better than they did under female head teachers. From the analyses of results one thing is clear that gender of the head teachers, whether the head teachers are working in the primary schools or in the secondary schools and whatever their leadership styles might be, have distinctive significant effect on the academic achievement of the students. Here, male head teachers are predominantly playing the vital role in influencing the students achieve their goals.

Results of the present investigation revealed mixed findings and consistent with the results of the previous researchers. In some cases differences between the males and females were noted but in some other cases differences were not found. The gender-centered model (Fagenson, 1990; Riger and Galligan, 1980) posits that there are definite behavioral and psychological differences between men and women that lead them to attain distinct and unique leadership styles. Men have traditionally being perceived to possess characteristics such as aggressiveness, high self-confidence and low emotionality, while women have been assigned characteristics such as

emotionality, kindness and nurturance (Powell, 1988; Eagly, Makhijani, and Klonsky, 1992). Similarly, the social role theory (Eagly, 1987) proposes that individuals behave in accordance with the social expectations about their gender role. Thus, women are predicted to engage in more consideration and democratic behaviors than men, while men are predicted to have more task-oriented and autocratic leadership behaviors than are women (Miner and Johnson, 1994; Helgesen, 1990; Loden, 1985). Researches on gender differences purport that men possess stronger leadership skills because of their early socialization experiences and involvement in team works, which leads them to become effective leaders (Henning and Jardin, 1977; Hay, 1980; Rosener, 1990). In some cases, male and female leaders were found to be equally effective. However, men were found to be more effective than women in roles that were defined in more masculine terms, and also in situations in which both leader and subordinate roles were numerically dominated by men (Eagly, Karau, and Makhijani, 1995). The results of the present investigation are also consistent with the findings of the study by Thompson (2000), who suggested that any differences in the perceived effectiveness of educational leaders in three styles of leadership are equally true for male and female leaders and male and female educational leaders were perceived to be equally effective in their respective organizations. The recent meta-analysis conducted by Eagly et al. (2003) shows small differences between men and women in leadership effectiveness. Eagly emphasized that in some positions, particularly elementary education and nursing, leadership is defined in more feminine ways and could be described as congenial to women. Eagly's view is in line with the result of the present study, particularly it is true for primary schools, where students under female leadership performed significantly ( $p < .05$ ) better than they did under male leadership. Therefore, differences in leadership between men and women are not so much due to the fact that they act differently but to differential reactions to the behavior of both the sexes. Female leaders who adopted an autocratic style were evaluated more positively than male leaders who used this style (Eagly and Karau, 2002; Luthar, 1996; Rojhan and Willemsen, 1994; Barbuto et al., 2007). Though the result revealed mixed findings, but it did not support the hypothesis and gave a clear indication of the effect of gender on the academic success of the students of both primary and secondary schools.



**Hypothesis-3 : Attendance rate of the students will be much higher under democratic and autocratic leadership than that of under laissez-faire leadership.**

It was observed from the results (tables 31 through 35) of the present investigation that the attendance rates of the students vary as a function of the styles of leadership of the head teachers. The results indicated that the attendance rates of the students of class-v under autocratic and democratic leadership were higher than that of under laissez-faire leadership. In case of secondary schools, attendance rates of students of class-x under autocratic and democratic leadership were also found higher than that of under laissez-faire leadership. On the average, taken all the primary and secondary schools together, percentages of students' classroom attendance were found to be 74.5%, 74%, and 63% under the head teachers of autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership respectively. It's worth mentioning here that classroom attendance rates of the students regardless of type of schools were also found higher under male head teachers (74.5%) than under female head teachers (66.5%). The results indicate that the head teachers who possessing autocratic and democratic leadership styles were more effective in motivating the students to attend their classes regularly than the head teachers possessing laissez-faire style of leadership. It may be mentioned here that the achievement-oriented autocratic and democratic head teachers encourage teachers and students to reach their peak performance, sets challenging goals, expects teachers and students perform at their highest level, and show high degree of confidence that teachers will assume responsibility and accomplish challenging goals. That is why students feel encouraged and interested to attend their classes regularly. The results of the present investigation are in line with the hypothesis framed.

**Hypothesis – 4 : Drop-out rate of the students will be lower under democratic and autocratic leadership than that of under laissez-faire leadership.**

The results (table 31 through 36) indicated that the drop-out rate of the students of class-v in the primary schools was lowest (12%) under laissez-faire leadership, relatively lower (15%) under democratic leadership, and higher (21%) under autocratic leadership. In case of the students of class-x in the secondary schools, it was observed from the results that the drop-out rate of the students under democratic

leadership was lowest (13%), relatively lower (14%) under laissez-faire leadership, and higher (18%) under autocratic leadership. On the average, taken all the primary and secondary schools together regardless of gender of the head teachers, it was found from the results that drop-out rate of the students was lowest (13%) under laissez-faire leadership, relatively lower (14%) under democratic leadership, and higher (19.5%) under autocratic leadership. It was surprisingly found that the drop-out rate of the students in the secondary schools under female head teachers, as in the primary schools, was lower (12.5%) than that of under male head teachers (18.5%). Since the autocratic leadership is characterized by the leader's making decisions unilaterally, not allowing the group members to participate, it may be argued that the teachers and the students of the schools under autocratic leadership feel discouraged and lack enthusiasm to achieve goals at a higher level (Cuadrado,2001; Eagly and Johnson,1990). On the other hand, democratic leadership is participative, consultative, and involves the group, and the leaders allow and encourage group members' participation in the decision making. So, the teachers and students under democratic head teachers enjoy satisfaction and get involved in the process of achieving institutional goals (Cuadrado,2001). As a result, teachers may cordially encourage students to attend the class regularly. That is why attendance rate of the students under democratic head teachers may be lower than that of under autocratic head teachers. In regard to laissez-faire leadership, it may be said that laissez-faire leaders gave teachers and students complete freedom of action, provided them with materials, refrained from participating except to answer questions when asked, and did not make evaluative remarks (Lewin, Lippitt, and White, 1939). Because of lack of monitoring from the side of the laissez-faire head teachers, the case of students' attendance and drop-out was not maintained strictly. That might be the cause of lower rate of drop-out of the students from the schools run under the leadership of laissez-faire head teachers. The results in this regard offer partial support to the hypothesis.

**Hypothesis-5 : Opinion of the primary school head teachers regarding some academic and administrative issues would be different from that of secondary school head teachers.**

The results (table-37) regarding the opinion of the head teachers on some academic and administrative issues stated that more than 73% of the primary school head

teachers think their colleagues perform their duties properly in comparison to only 63% of the secondary school head teachers. 90% of the primary school head teachers think their colleagues capable of maintaining teaching standard in comparison to only 73% of the secondary school head teachers. It may be mentioned here that all the primary schools are owned by the government and the teachers of the primary schools are government employees and their service is regulated by government rules. On the other hand, most of the secondary schools are privatized and the teachers are not regulated directly by government rules. So, the views expressed by two groups of head teachers regarding performing their duties and maintaining teaching standard may be some what different. Head teachers of both primary and secondary schools opined that the classroom environment and the overall school atmosphere are not so congenial for conducting teaching-learning activities. It is true for the schools, whether primary or secondary, public or private, that the location of the schools, physical facilities, classroom facilities and overall internal environment in most of the schools are not so favorable for effective teaching and sound learning. It was found from the results that most of the head teachers of the primary schools are in favor of physical punishment (90%) in comparison to only 40% of the secondary school head teachers, and in more than 76% of the primary schools have provision for reward and punishment in comparison to 43% of the secondary schools. The investigator, while collecting data, had discussions with the head teachers on the issue. The head teachers opined that some sort of physical punishment, at least at a lesser degree, should be used for easy controlling of the students and smooth running of the schools. But only 40% of the head teachers of secondary schools hold this view. It is to be noted that system of punishment, particularly physical punishment, in the schools is strictly prohibited as per law of the land. Nevertheless this system is still in effect in the schools. In regard to extra curricular activities, head teachers of the primary and secondary schools expressed almost similar views. Only 26% of the primary school head teachers and 36% of the secondary school head teachers expressed that they arrange extra curricular activities in their schools regularly, though it was expected that all the schools would arrange co-curricular activities in a regular basis. Two types of schools did not differ remarkably on this issue. 60% of the primary school head teachers, in comparison to 50% of the secondary school head teachers, expressed positive opinion that they try to get local people involved in the process of running the schools. Though all the schools are expected to let local people involved and get their

assistance, within the purview of the law, for smooth running of the schools. It is clear from the discussion that there are differences in opinion between the primary and secondary school head teachers on some administrative and academic issues. So, the results related to some common issues are in line with the hypothesis framed for the present investigation.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

The results of the study gave clear indication that the styles of leadership of the head teachers in primary and secondary schools play a vital role in motivating the students to achieve better grades in their final examinations. Autocratic task-oriented and democratic relationship-oriented head teachers are in the forefront in achieving better school success, and the laissez-faire leadership style has been proved as an ineffective or less effective leadership approach in achieving institutional goals. It has now become evident that leadership style of head teachers is a determining factor in the schools as to how the schools will be run and how do the teachers and students of the schools behave in academic and extra academic matters. Gender of the head teachers also plays a significant role both for smooth running of the school and in motivating the teachers and students to achieve institutional goals.

On the basis of the findings of the present study following recommendations were made:

- ▶ Head teachers' styles of leadership should be considered as one of the most important and essential criteria while recruiting and appointing them. Teachers' having laissez-faire leadership style should not be appointed as head teachers at any schools. School authority should take this point into serious consideration when selection and placement of head teachers are made.
- ▶ Female head teachers are found to be more effective in primary schools than in the secondary schools. So, female teachers should be given preference in appointing head teachers in the primary schools.
- ▶ Head teachers of all the schools should be instructed properly for arranging co-curricular activities in their schools on a regular basis.

- ▶ Government should give proper attention to increase physical facilities of the schools for attaining better as well as similar achievement scores by the students irrespective of location and nature of the schools.
- ▶ An effective and intensive academic monitoring and supervision system should be developed so that schools can perform teaching-learning activities at the highest level.
- ▶ Measures should be taken by the concerned authority to stop giving physical punishment to the students.

*Chapter-5*

---

---

**REFERENCES**

## REFERENCES

- Ackah, C., Heaton, N., & McWhinney, G. 1999. Women in management: The case of MBA graduates. *Women in Management Review*, 14, 136-145.
- Andorka, F.N., Jr. 1998. Women gaining leadership roles. *Hotel and Motel Management*, 213, 54, 63.
- Argyris, C. 1954. Human relations in a bank. *Harvard Business Review*, 32, 64-72.
- Aspegren, R.E. 1963. A study of leadership behavior and its effects on morale and attitudes in selected elementary schools. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 23, 3708.
- Avolio, A.J. and Bass, B.M. 1988. "Transformational Leadership, Charisma, and Beyond." In J.G. Hunt, H.P. Dachler, B.R. Baliga, and C.A. Schriesheim, eds. *Emerging Leadership Vistas* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books), pp. 29-49.
- Ayestarán, S. 2003. Dirigen las mujeres igual que los hombres?
- Baba, V.V. 1989. "Serendipity in Leadership: Initiating Structure and Consideration in the Classroom", *Human Relations*, 42, pp. 509-525.
- Badford, L.P., & Lippitt, R. 1945. Building a democratic work group. *Personnel*, 22(3), 142-148.
- Barberá, E., & Ramos, A. 2004. Liderazgo y discriminación de género. *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada*, 57, 147-160. Monographic issue: La psicología y el acceso de la mujer a la función directiva. (Coords.: J.F. Morales & I. Cuadrado).
- Barbuto Jr, J.E., Fritz, S.M., Matkin G.S. & Marx D.B. 2007. Effects of Gender, Education, and Age upon Leaders' Use of Influence Tactics and Full Range Leadership Behaviors. *Sex Roles*, 56, 71-83.
- Barker, R.A. 1997. "How Can We Train Leaders If We Do Not Know What Leadership Is?" *Human Relations* 50, pp. 343-362.
- Bass, B. M. 1990. Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Stogdill R. M. 1990. Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership theory, research, and managerial applications (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B. 1995, *The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*, Mind Garden, Palo Alto, CA.
- Bass, B.M. 1985. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. N.Y.: Free Press.
- Baumgartel, H. 1957. Leadership style as a variable in research administration. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, 344-360.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. 1985, *Leaders: The strategies for Taking Change*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Bennis, W. 1999, 'Five Competencies of New Leaders', *Executive Excellence*, 16(7), pp. 4-5.
- Bensimon, E. M. 1989. The meaning of "good presidential leadership": A frame analysis. *Review of Higher Education*, 12, 107-123.
- Berdahl, J. 1996. Gender and Leadership in work groups: Sex alternative models. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21-40.
- Berrien, F.K. 1961. Homeostasis theory of groups – implications for leadership. In L. Petrullo & B. Bass (Eds.) *Leadership and interpersonal behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Betz, N.E., & Fitzgerald, L. I. 1987. *The career psychology of women*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Bhogle, S. 1969. Development of a test to measure the leadership style of headmaster. *Indian Educational Review*, Vol.4(2), Pp 73-83.
- Blake, R.R. and McCause, A.A. 1991. *Leadership Dilemmas – Grid Solutions* (Houston: Gulf Publishing Company).
- Blank, T.O. & Levesque, M.J. 1993. Constructing success and failure. Age differences in perceptions and explanations of success and failure. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 37, 105-119.
- Boldry, J., Wood, W., & Kashy, D.A. 2001. Gender stereotypes and the evaluation of men and women in military training. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 689-705.
- Bolman, L. C., & Deal, T. E. 1997. *Reframing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. 1991. Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 30, 509-534.



- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. 1992. Leading and managing: Effects of context, culture, and gender. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 314-329.
- Bradford, D. L., Cohen, A. R., Epstein, C. E., Graham, P., Lloyd, K. R., Mansbridge, J., Olivares, F., Schwartz, F. N., Siegel, M., Sonnenfeld, J. A., & Wyskocil. 1991. Ways women and men lead. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 158-159.
- Brady, T. 1998. How equal is equal pay? *Management Review*, 87, 59-61.
- Brenner, O. C., Tomkiewicz, J., & Schein, V. E. 1989. The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics revisited. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 662-669.
- Brewer, N., Socha, L., & Potter, R. 1996. Gender differences in supervisors' use of performance feedback. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 786-803.
- Brosow, D.A. & Kleiner, B.H. 1991, 'Skill Training Needed by Tomorrow's Executive', *Journal of Industrial and Commercial Training*, 23, pp. 26-31.
- Bryman, A. 1986, *Leadership and Organizations*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Burns, J.M. 1978. *Leadership*. N.Y.: Harper & Row.
- Busenitz, L.W. 1999, 'Entrepreneurial risk and strategic decision-making: It's a matter of perspective', *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 35(3), pp. 325-340.
- Byham, W.C. 1999. "Grooming Next-Millennium Leaders," *HR Magazine*, 44, pp. 46-50.
- Cann, A., & Siegfried, W.D. 1987. Sex stereotypes and the leadership role. *Sex Roles*, 17, 401-408.
- Cann, A., & Siegfried, W.D. 1990. Gender stereotypes and dimensions of effective leader behavior. *Sex Roles*, 23, 413-419.
- Carpolio, J., Andrewartha, G. & Armstrong, H. 1997, *Developing Management Skills in Australia*, Longman, Melbourne.
- Chang, L., & Chang-McBride, C. 1997. Self-and peer-ratings of female and male roles and attributes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 137, 527-529.
- Chusmir, I. H., & Mills, J. 1989. Gender differences in conflict resolution styles of managers: At work and at home. *Sex Roles*, 20, 149-163.

- Chusmir, I. H., & Parker, B. 1992. Success strivings and their relationship to affective work behaviors. Gender differences. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 132, 87-100.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. 5. 1988. Behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger and R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 78-97). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. A. 1987. Towards a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-647.
- Conger, J.A. 1991. "Inspiring Others: The Language of Leadership", *Academy of Management Executive* 5, pp. 31-45.
- Conger, J.A. 1993. 'The brave new world of leadership training', *Organizational Dynamics*, 21(3), pp. 46-58.
- Connell, J. 1998. 'Soft skills: The Neglected Factor in Workplace Participation?', *Journal of Labour and Industry*, 9(1) pp. 69-89.
- Connell, J. 2000. 'Management Style: Does the Feminine Touch Make a Difference?' *Journal of Interdisciplinary Gender Studies*, 5(1), pp. 23 - 40.
- Cooper, C.L. & Argyris, C. 1998. *The Concise Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Management*, Blackwell, Massachusetts.
- Cooper, V.W. 1997. Homophily or the Queen Bee Syndrome: Female evaluation of female leadership. *Small Group Research*, 28, 483-499.
- Cuadrado, I. & Molero, F. 2002. Liderazgo transformacional y género: autoevaluaciones de directivos y directivas españoles. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 18, 39-55.
- Cuadrado, I. & Navas, M. 2000. La técnica del meta-análisis aplicada al estudio del liderazgo y el género: resultados e implicaciones. *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada*, 53, 303-317.
- Cuadrado, I. 2001. Cuestiones teóricas y datos preliminares sobre tres estilos de liderazgo. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 16, 131-155.
- Cuadrado, I. Navas, M. & Molero, F. 2004. El acceso de las mujeres a puestos directivos: género, contexto organizacional y estilos de liderazgo. *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada*, 57, 181-192. Monographic issue: La

- psicología y el acceso de la mujer a la función directiva. (Coords.: J.F. Morales & I. Cuadrado).
- Cuadrado, I., Morales, F., & Recio, P. 2008. Women's Access to Managerial Positions: An Experimental Study of Leadership Styles and Gender. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 11. No. 1, 55-65.
- Cuadrado, I., Navas, M. & Molero, F. 2006. *Mujeres y liderazgo: claves psicosociales del techo de cristal*. Madrid: Sanz y Torres.
- Cuadrado, I. 2003. Emplean hombres y mujeres diferentes estilos de liderazgo? Análisis de la influencia de los estilos de liderazgo en el acceso a los puestos de dirección. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 18, 283-307.
- Daily, C.M., Certo, S.T., & Dalton, D.R. 1999. Entrepreneurial ventures as an avenue to the top? Assessing the advancement of female CEOs and directors in the Inc. 100. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 4, 19-32.
- Daley, D.M., & Naff, K.C. 1998. Gender differences and managerial competencies: Federal supervisor perceptions of the job of management. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 18, 41-56.
- Day, D. R., & Stogdill, R. M. 1972. Leader behavior of male and female supervisors: A comparative study. *Personnel Psychology*, 25, 353-360.
- Deaux, K. 1979. Self-evaluation of male and female managers. *Journal of Sex Roles*, 5, 571-580.
- Deaux, K., & Farris, E. 1977. Attributing causes for one's own performance: The effects of sex, norms, and outcomes. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 11, 59-72.
- Denison, D. R., Hooijberg, R., & Quinn, R. E. 1995. Paradox and performance: Toward a theory of behavioral complexity in managerial leadership. *Organizational Science*, 6(5), 524-540.
- Deogun, N. 1997. "Is Craig Weatherup Too Nice for Pepsi-Cola's Own Good?" *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Dobbins, G. H., & Platz, S. J. 1986. Sex differences in leadership: How real are they? *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 118-127.
- Donnell, S. M., & Hall, J. 1980, Spring. Men and women as managers: A significant case of no significant difference. *Organizational Dynamics*, pp. 60-77.

- Duane, M.J. 1989. Sex differences in styles of conflict management *Psychological Reports*, 65, 1033-1034.
- Eagly, Alice H., Steven J. Karau, and Mona G. Makhijani, 1995. "Gender and the Effectiveness of Leaders: A Meta-Analysis," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol.117, no.1, 125-145.
- Eagly A.H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C., & van Engen, M.L. 2003. Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 569-591.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Johnson, B. T. 1992. Gender and leadership style among school principals: A meta-analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 76-102.
- Eagly, A.H. & Johnson, B.T. 1990, 'Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis', *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, pp. 233-256.
- Eagly, A.H. 1987. Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social-Role Interpretation, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Eagly, A.H. and Johannesen-Schmidt, M. 2001, "The leadership styles of men and women", *Journal of Social Issues*, No. 57, pp. 781-97.
- Eagly, A.H. Karau, S.J., Miner, J.B., & Johnson, B. 1994. Gender and motivation to manage: A meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 135-159.
- Eagly, A.H., & Carli, L.L. 2003a. Finding gender advantage and disadvantage: Systematic research integration is the solution. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 851-859.
- Eagly, A.H., & Carli, L.L. 2003b. The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 807-834.
- Eagly, A.H., & Karau, S.J. 2001. Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. Manuscript under review.
- Eagly, A.H., & Karau, S.J. 2002. Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573-598.
- Eagly, A.H., Makhijani, M.G. & Klonsky, B.G. 1992, 'Gender and the Evaluation of Leaders: A meta-analysis', *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, pp. 3-22.
- Eagly, A.H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. 2000. Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes & H.M. Trautner (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender*, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 123-174.

- Ehrhart & Klein. 2001, 'Predicting follower's preferences for charismatic leadership: The influence of follower values and personality', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12(2), pp. 153-179
- Evans, M.G. 1970. "The Effects of Supervisory Behavior on the Path-Goal Relationship". *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 5, pp. 277-298.
- Fagenson, E. A. 1986. Women's work orientations: Something old, something new. *Group and Organization Studies*, 11, 75-100.
- Fagenson, E. A. 1990a. Perceived masculine and feminine attributes examined as a function of individuals' sex and level in the organizational power hierarchy: A test of four theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 204-211.
- Fagenson, E. A. 1990b. At the heart of women in management research: Theoretical and methodological approaches and their biases. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, 267-274.
- Fagenson, E. A., (Ed.). 1993. Women in management--trends, issues and challenges in managerial diversity. Sage: Newbury Park, CA
- Fairhurst, G.T. and Sarr, R.A. 1996. *The Art of Framing: Managing the Language of Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass).
- Farris, G.F. 1972. The effect of individual roles on performance in innovation groups. *R&D Management*, No. 3.
- Fiedler, F.E. 1967, *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*, McGraw Hill, New York.
- Field, H.S., & Caldwell, B.E. 1979. Sex of supervisor, sex of subordinate, and subordinate job satisfaction. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 3, 391-399.
- Forsyth, D. Heiney, M. & Wright, S. 1997. Biases in appraisals of women leaders. *Group Dynamics : Theory, Research and Practices*, 1, 98-103.
- Ganzel, A.K. 1999. Adolescent decision making: The influence of mood, age, and gender on the consideration of information. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 14, 289-319.
- George, J.M. 2000, 'Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence', *Human Relations*, 53(8), pp. 1027-1055.
- Gibson, C.B. 1995. An investigation of gender differences in leadership across four countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26, 255-275.

- Goleman, D. 1998, *Working with emotional intelligence*, Bloomsbury Publishing; London.
- Gordon, F.E., & Strober, M.H. 1975. Bringing women into management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Green, F., Machin, S. & Wilkinson, D. 1998, 'The Meaning and Determinants of Skill Shortages', *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 60(n2), pp. 165–188.
- Gutek, B.A. Cohen, G., & Tsui, A. 1996. Reactions to perceived sex discrimination. *Human Relations*, 49, 791-813.
- Hammick, M., & Acker, S. 1998. Undergraduate research supervision: A gender analysis. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23, 335-347.
- Haque, A. B. M. Z. and Elias, M.S. 2008. Head Teachers Opinion Survey Questions. Department of Psychology, University of Rajshahi.
- Hart, S.L., & Quinn, R.E. 1993. Roles executives play: CEOs, behavioral complexity, and firm performance. *Human Relations*, 46, 543-574.
- Hay, C. D. (1980). Women in management: The obstacles and opportunities they face. *Personnel Administrator*, 25, 31-39.
- Heilman, M.E. 1997. Sex discrimination and the affirmative action remedy: The role of sex stereotypes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, 877-889.
- Heilman, M.E., Block, C.J., Martell, R.F., & Simon, M.C. 1989. Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 935-942.
- Helgeson, Sally. *The Female Advantage—Women's Ways of Leadership*, New York: Bantam Doubleday Publishing Group, 1990.
- Hennig, M., & Jardin, A. 1977. The managerial woman. Garden City: Anchor Press, Doubleday.
- Hooijberg, R. 1996. A multidirectional approach toward leadership: An extension of the concept of behavioral complexity. *Human Relations*, 49(7), 917-946
- House and Aditya. "The Social Scientific Study of Leadership".
- House, R. J. 1996. "Path – Goal Theory of Leadership : Lessons, Legacy, and a Reformulated Theory". *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, pp. 323-352.
- House, R.J. 1977. Theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

- House, R.J. and Mitchell, T.R. 1974. "Path Goal Theory of Leadership Lessons, Legacy, and a Reformulated Theory", *Leadership Quarterly* 7, pp. 323-352.
- House, R.J., & Podsakoff, P.M. 1994. Leadership effectiveness: Past perspectives and future directions for research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior* (pp. 45-82). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- House, R.J.K. 1971, 'A Path-Goal Theory of Leadership Effectiveness', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16 (September), pp. 321-38.
- Ibarra, H. 1992. Homophily and differential returns: Sex differences in network structure and access in an advertising firm.
- Itzhaky, H., & York, A.S. 2000. Empowerment and community participation: Does gender make a difference? *Social Work Research*, 24, 225-235.
- Jeanquart-Barone, S., & Sekaran, U. 1994. Effects of supervisor's gender on American women's trust. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 134, 253-254.
- Jenkins, S.R. 2000. Defining gender, relationships, and power (Introduction to the special issue). *Sex Roles*, 42, 467-494.
- Johnson, M. 1996. "Taking the Lid off Leadership," *Management Review*, 11, pp. 56-61.
- Kabacoff, R. 1998. Leadership effectiveness analysis: Technical consideration. *Management Research Group*, 14-26, York Street, Portland, ME.
- Kabacoff, R. 1998(a). Gender differences in Organizational Leadership: A Large Sample Study. Paper presented at the 106<sup>th</sup> annual conference of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, California.
- Kahn, R.I. 1956, "The Prediction of Productivity", *Journal of Social Issues* 12, no. 2, pp. 41-49.
- Kanter, R.M. 1977. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- Karpin, D. 1995, 'Enterprising Nation: Renewing Australia's Managers to Meet the Challenges of the Asia-Pacific Century', Report of the Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Katz, D., Maccoby, N., Gurin, G., & Floor, L. 1951. *Productivity, supervision, and morale among railroad workers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. Institute for Social Research.

- Kelly, R. M., Hale, M. M., & Burgess, J. 1991. Gender and managerial/leadership styles: A comparison of Arizona public administrators. *Women and Politics*, 11, 19-39.
- Kent, R. L., & Moss, S. E. 1994. Self-monitoring as a predictor of leader emergence. *Psychological Reports*, 66, 875-881.
- Kirkpatrick, S.A. and Locke, E.A. 1991. "Leadership: Do Traits Matter?", *Academy of Management Executive* 5, pp. 48-60.
- Kirkpatrick, S.A. and Locke, E.A. 1996. "Direct and Indirect Effects of Three Core Charismatic Leadership Components on Performance and Attitudes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, pp. 36-51.
- Kirtley, M. D. & Weaver, J. B. 1999. Exploring the impact of gender role self-perception on communication style. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 22, 190-210.
- Kochanski, J. 1997. "Competency-Based Management", *Training & Development*, Vol. 10, pp. 44.
- Kolb, Judith A. 1997. Are We Still Stereotyping Leadership? *Small Group Research*, Vol.28, No. 3, .
- Korabik, K., & Rosin, H.M. 1995. The impact of children on women managers' career behavior and organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management*, 34, 513-528.
- Korman, A.K. 1966. "Consideration Initiating Structure, and Organizational Criteria – A Review", *Personal Psychology*, pp. 349-362.
- Kotter, J. P. 1990 *A Force for Change*, London: The Free Press.
- Kouzes, J.M. and Posner, B.Z. 1993. *Credibility: How Leaders Gain and Lose It, Why People Demand It* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass).
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. 1995. *The Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kovar, S.K., & Overdorf, V. 1995. Scholarly productivity as a function of graduate training, workplace, and gender, *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 4(2), 1-21.
- Kushell, E., & Newton, R. 1986. Gender, leadership style, and subordinate satisfaction: An experiment. *Sex Roles*, 14, 203-209.



- Lauterbach, K. & Weiner, B. 1996. Dynamics of upward influence : How male and female managers get their way. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 87-107.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R.K. 1939. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-301.
- Lewis, A.E. 1998, The influence of gender and organization level of perception of leader behaviors: A self and supervisor comparison. *Sex Roles*, 39, 479-502.
- Lewis, G.B., & Park, K. 1989. Turnover rates in federal white-collar employment: Are women more likely to quit than men? *American Review of Public Administration*, 19, 13-48.
- Lippitt, R., & White, R.K. 1943. The social climate of children's groups. In R.G. Baker, J.S. Kounin, & H.F. Wright (Eds.), *Child behavior and development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lips, H.M. 2000. College students' visions of power and possibility as moderated by gender. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 39-44.
- Loden, M. 1985. *Feminine leadership or how to succeed in business without being one of the boys*. New York: Times Books.
- Luthar, H.K. 1996. Gender differences in evaluation of performance and leadership ability: Autocratic vs. democratic managers. *Sex Roles*, 35, 337-361.
- Lyness, K.S., & Thompson, D.E. 2000. Climbing the corporate ladder: Do female and male executives follow the same route? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 86-101.
- Maccoby E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. 1974. *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- MacDonald, W.S. 1967. Responsibility and goal establishment: Critical elements in Job Corps programs. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 24, 104.
- Maher, K.J. 1997. Gender-Related Stereotypes of Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Sex Roles*, Vol. 37, Nos. 3/4.
- Maier, N.R.F., & Solem, A.R. 1962. Improving solutions by turning choice situations into problems. *Personnel Psychology*, 15, 151-158.
- Marongiu, S., & Ekehammar, B 1999. Internal and external influences on women's and men's entry into management. *Journal of managerial Psychology*, 14, 421-433.

- Mayer, J. & Salovey, P. 1990, 'Emotional Intelligence', *Imagination, Cognition & Personality*, 9(3), pp. 185-211.
- McGill, M.E. and Slocum, J.W. 1998. Jr., "A Little Leadership, Please?" *Organizational Dynamics*, 39, pp. 39-49.
- McGlashan, K.E., Wright, M. & McCormick, B. 1995, 'Preferential selection and stereotypes: effects on evaluation of female leader performance, subordinate goal commitment, and task performance', *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 33(9-10), pp. 669- 685.
- McKague, A. 1991, 'IS Now Forced to Develop "Soft Skills"', *Computing Canada*, 17, p. 19.
- McShane, S. 2001, *Organisational Behaviour*, McGraw-Hill, Toronto
- McShulskis, E. 1996, Women outscore men in management and leadership skills, *H.R. Magazine*, 41, 14-15.
- Mednick, M. T. 1989. On the politics of psychological contracts. *American Psychologist*, 44, 1118-1123.
- Millard, R. J. 1981. A comparative analysis of male and female management style and perceive behavior patterns. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 1219.
- Miller, D., Ket de Vries, M.F.R. and Toulouse, J.M. 1982. "Top Executive Locus of Control and Its Relationship to Strategy-Making. Structure, and Environment". *Academy of Management Journal* 25, pp. 237-253.
- Miller, D.T., Taylor, B., & Buck, M.L. 1991. Gender gaps: Who needs to be explained? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 5-12.
- Morales, J.F., & Cuadrado, I. 2004. Introducción: Teoría de congruencia de rol del prejuicio hacia líderes femeninos. *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada*, 57, 135-146. Monographic issue: La psicología y el acceso de la mujer a la function directiva (Coords.: J.F. Morales & I. Cuadrado).
- Moskal, B.S. 1997. Women make better managers. *Industry Week*, 246, 17-19.
- Moss, P. & Tilly, C. 1996a, "'Soft' Skills and Race: An Investigation of Black Men's Employment Problems', *Work and Occupations*, 23(3), August, pp. 252-276.
- Moss, S. & Kent, R. 1996. Gender and gender-role categorization of emergent leaders: A critical review and comprehensive analysis. *Sex Roles*, 35, 79-96.

- Moya, M. 2003. Sobre la existencia y el origen de las diferencias en el liderazgo entre hombres y mujeres. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 18, 321-325.
- Mumford, M.D. & Doorn, J.R. 2001, 'The leadership of pragmatism: Reconsidering Franklin in the age of charisma', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12(3), pp. 279-309.
- Munduate, L. 2003. Género y liderazgo: diferencias entre hombres y mujeres en el acceso a los puestos directivos. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 18, 309-314.
- Murnighan, K., & Leung, T.K. 1976. The effects of leadership involvement and the importance of the task on subordinates performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 17, 299-310.
- O'Connor, J.S. 1996. Labour market participation, gender, and citizenship. *Current Sociology*. 44, 78-101.
- Offerman, L.R., Hanges, P.J. & Day, D.V. 2001, 'Leaders, followers, and values: progress and prospects for theory and research', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, pp. 129-131.
- Ohlott, P., Ruderman, M., & McCauley, C. 1994. Gender differences in managers' development job experiences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 46-67.
- Owen, C.L., & Todor, W.D. 1993. Attitudes toward women as managers: Still the same. *Business Horizons*, 36, 12-16.
- Payne, K. & Cangemi, J. 1997. Gender differences in leadership. *IFE Psychologia: An International Journal*, 5, 22-43.
- Pelz, D.C. 1956. Some social factors related to performance in a research organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1, 310-325.
- Pfeffer, J. 1993, 'The Ambiguity of Leadership', in M. Matteson & J.M. Ivancevich (eds.), *Management and Organizational Behavior Classics*, Irwin, Homewood.
- Powell, G. N. 1988. Women and men in management. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Powell, G. N., Posner, B. Z., & Schmidt, W. H. 1984. Sex effects in managerial value systems. *Human Relations*, 37, 909-921.
- Pratch, L. 1996. Gender, motivation and coping in the evaluation of leadership effectiveness. *Consulting Psychology Journal : Practice and Research*, 48, 203-220.

- Quinn, R. E., Faerman, S. R., & Dixit, N. 1987. Perceived performance: Some archetypes of managerial effectiveness and ineffectiveness. Working Paper, Institute for Government and Policy Studies, Department of Public Administration, State University of New York at Albany.
- Quinn, R. E., Spreitzer, G. M., & Hart, S. L. 1991. Challenging the assumptions of bipolarity: Interpenetration and managerial effectiveness. In R. Fry (Ed.), *Executive and organizational continuity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Radeeki, C.M., & Jaccard, J. 1996. Gender-role differences in decision-making orientations and decision-making skills. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 76-95.
- Ragins, B. R. 1991. Gender effects in subordinate evaluations of leaders: Real or artifact? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 259-268.
- Reskin, B., & Padavic, I. 1994. Women and men at work. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 18, 315-319.
- Richardson, D. 1998, *US Labour Market Issues*, BLS Daily Report: Richardson\_D@BLS.GOV.
- Riger, S., & Galligan, P. 1980. Women in management. An exploration of competing paradigms. *American Psychologist*, 35, 902-910.
- Rojahn, K., & Willemsen, T.M. 1994. The evaluation of effectiveness and likeability of gender-role congruent and gender-role incongruent leaders. *Sex Roles*, 30, 109-119.
- Rosener, J. B. 1990. Ways women lead: The command-and-control leadership style association with men is not the only way to succeed. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 119-125.
- Rosenthal, P. 1995. Gender differences in managers' attributions for successful work performance. *Women in Management Review*, 10, 26-31.
- Rozier, C. 1996. Gender differences in managerial characteristics in a female-dominated health profession. *Health Care Supervisor*, 14, 57-70.
- Rozier, C., & Hersh-Cochran, M. 1996. Gender differences in managerial characteristics in a female-dominated health profession. *Health Care Supervisor*, 14, 57-70.
- Russell, J. E. A., Rush, M. C., & Herd, A. M. 1988. An exploration of women's expectations of effective male and female leadership. *Sex Roles*, 18, 279-287.

- Sakata, K. 1996. Sex differences on leadership processes: A Review. *Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 114-130.
- Sashkin, M. 1988. 'The visionary leader'. In Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R.N. (Eds), *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Savery, L., Mazzarol, T. & Dawkins, P. 1996, 'The Quality of British Management: Asia-Pacific Perceptions', *Warwick Business School Research Bureau Paper* No. 228.
- Schein, V. E. 1973. The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 95-100.
- Schein, V. E. 1975. Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 340-344.
- Schien, E.H. 1985, *Organizational Culture and Leadership: A Dynamic View*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco
- Sicherman, N. 1996. Gender differences in departures from a large firm. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 49, 484-505.
- Snavey, B.K. 1993. Managing conflict over the perceived progress of working women. *Business Horizons*, 36, 17-22.
- Snodgrass, S. E. 1985. Women's intuition: The effect of subordinate role on interpersonal sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 146-155.
- Snodgrass, S. E. 1992. Further effects of role versus gender on interpersonal sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 154-158.
- Sooklal, L. 1991. "The Leader as a Broker of Dreams," *Human Relations*, 44, pp. 833-855.
- Sorenson, P.S. Hawkins, K., & Sorenson, R.L. 1995, Gender, Psychological type, and conflict preference. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 9, 115-126.
- Stasz, C. 1996, 'Workplace Skills in Practice: Understanding the New Basic Skills', *4<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Post-Compulsory Education and Training*, Griffith University, Gold Coast.

- Statham, A. 1987. The gender model revisited: Differences in the management styles of men and women. *Sex Roles*, 16, 409-429.
- Stewart, J.M. 1993. "Future State Visioning – A Powerful Leadership Process", *Long Range Planning*, 26, pp. 89-98.
- Stodgill, R. M. 1974. *A Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: Free Press.
- Stogdill, R.M., & Coons, A.E. 1973. Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.
- Stuart, P. 1992. What does the glass ceiling cost you? *Personnel Journal*, 71, 70-78.
- Sutherland, M.B. 1999. Gender equity in success at school. *International Review of Education*, 45, 431-444.
- Sutton, C.D., & Moore, K.K. 1985. Executive women: Twenty years later. *Harvard Business Review*, 85, 42-66.
- Szabo, S., Reber, E., Weibler, G., Brodbeck, J. & Wunderer, F.C. 2001, 'Values and behaviour orientation in leadership studies: Reflections based on findings in three German-speaking countries', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12(2), pp. 219-244.
- Takala, T. 1998. "Plato on Leadership", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17 pp. 785-798.
- Talmud, I., & Izraeli, D.N. 1999. The relationship between gender and performance issues of concern to directors: Correlates or institution? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 459-474.
- Tannenbaum, R. and Schmidt, W.H. 1973. "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern", *Harvard Business Review* 51, pp. 162-180.
- Thomas, J.L., Dickson, M.W. & Bliese, P.D. 2001, 'Values predicting leader performance in the U.S. Army Reserve Officer Training Corps Assessment Center: Evidence for Personality-mediated model', *The Leadership Quarterly, Special Issue: Leaders, followers and values*, 12(2), pp. 181-196.
- Thompson, M. D. 2000. Gender, leadership orientation, and effectiveness: Testing the theoretical model of Bolman & Deal and Quinn. *Sex Roles*, 42(11/12), 969-992.
- Van Engen, M.L., & Willemsen, T.M. 2004. Sex and leadership styles: A meta-analysis of research published in the 1990s. *Psychological Reports*, 94, 3-18.

- Vecchio, R.P. 2002. Leadership and gender advantage. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 643-671.
- Vecchio, R.P. 2003. In search of gender advantage. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 835-850.
- Vroom, V. & Yetton, P. 1973, *Leadership and Decision-Making*, University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh.
- Vroom, V.H. & Jago, A. G. 1988, *The New Leadership*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Wehman, R., Goldstein, M.A., & Williams, J.R. 1977. Effects of different leadership styles on individual risk-taking in groups, *Human Relations*, 30, 249-259.
- Whelan-Berry, K.S., & Gordon, J.R. 2000. Strengthening human resource strategies: Insights from the experiences of midcareer professional women. *Human Resource Planning*, 23, 26-37.
- White, R.K., & Lippitt, R. 1960. *Autocracy and democracy: An experimental inquiry*. New York: Harper.
- Williamson, A. 2000. Gender issues in older adults' participation in learning Viewpoints and experiences of learners in the university of the third age. *Educational Gerontology*, 26, 49-67.
- Wilson, C.D., & Hossain, M.A. 1999. Gender and scholarly productivity in administration in social work, 1977-1995. *Administration in Social Work*, 23, 67-84.
- Wooten, K.C., Timmerman, T.A. & Folger, R. 1999, 'The use of personality and the five-factor model to predict new business ventures: from outplacement to start-up', *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 54, pp. 82-101.
- Yukl, G.A. 1994. *Leadership in Organizations*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall), pp. 53-75.

# **APPENDICES**



## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX- A

#### Original English Version of the Leadership Style Questionnaire

(One response alternative has to be chosen from the three given after each of the following situational descriptions)

1. In order to attend a workshop meant for headmasters, you are to be away from the school for four months. The annual examination of the school and new admissions would be conducted during this period. It is not compulsory for you to attend the workshop.
  - A. I shall ask the school management to make suitable arrangements in my absence and attend the workshop.
  - B. I shall attend the workshop. Our teachers are well experienced. They can run the school quite efficiently even in my absence. I shall distribute the charges amongst the teachers and the assistant headmaster will be in over all charge.
  - C. An headmaster worth his salt cannot be away from the school for a long period of four months especially at the time of examination and admissions. If it were shorter period, the assistant headmaster would have managed it. In this case I will not attend it.
  
2. The Director of Public Instruction has written to you, to undertake responsibility of housing and organizing a camp with participants from 10 schools during the December vacation. Your teachers are very reluctant to have it in your school. You are expected to reply to the D.P.I.
  - A. I shall write to the D.P.I. that the School will undertake the responsibility, and shall tell the teachers that they have to organize the camp whether they like it or not.
  - B. If the teachers are not willing then headmaster cannot do any thing. I shall have to write to the D.P.I. that the school cannot organist the camp because the teachers are not wanting it.

- C. The organization of a camp is a creative activity. The school and the staff are likely to get some opportunity to learn how to organize a camp. So, I shall discuss with the teachers to make it possible as good as they can.
3. One of the assistant teachers has suggested a new way of scheduling the work-load of teachers through a committee of teachers.
- A. If the teachers come forward to manage their own work through a joint cooperative system, I shall join them in the enterprise and shall welcome such an initiative as it provides sharing of experience and ideas.
- B. I consider, it will make things difficult for me to maintain discipline amongst the teachers. After all scheduling the work-load is headmaster's duty and, I do not want others to do it for me. I cannot accept such a proposal.
- C. Scheduling is not so important as to require my attention. If the teachers want to decide what should be done let them decide. I shall approve the plan.
4. The governing body of the school is of the opinion that you as a headmaster did not use sufficient tact in handling students strike, and consequently the school was put to considerable loss and damage. They have asked you to send your explanation if any.
- A. I will explain that in meeting the situation I have been continuously in touch with my colleagues for adopting a suitable course of action. And I think it was the best under the circumstances of which I assume the full responsibility.
- B. I considered it was futile to meet the agitated students; they were in a violent mood. Nothing better was possible in the situation.
- C. With all the power that I have as a headmaster, I tried to suppress the students, but apparently the students were out of control. Of course I feel that deterrent punishment should have been given.

5. You receive a request from some brilliant students of the final year class that they want some extra coaching for the coming Public Examination in order to secure higher ranks.
  - A. It is difficult to arrange such classes, as I cannot impose additional burden on the teachers under the existing rules. So let the students make their own arrangements.
  - B. I shall encourage the students for this initiative, but tell them I like to discuss the matter with the other teachers and possibly the teachers' committee may find a way out.
  - C. Since, rank holders are a matter of prestige to the school I shall send a circular to the teachers assigning some of them for the extra coaching class.
  
6. A lady teacher had a delivery early in the summer vacation. She has applied for maternity leave from the date of re-opening of the school after the summer vacation. The rule governing the maternity leave is rather vague. (as to when this period of two months should commence) and much depends on your discretion.
  - A. The teacher has had enough rest when she needed it, and she should join the school on completion of two months from the date of delivery.
  - B. I have to find out from her how many days of leave she thinks she would need, after the reopening, and if it is reasonable shall help her to have it.
  - C. I do not think I have much to do in this case. I shall simply recommend the application for two months of maternity leave.
  
7. A very influential member of the school management asks you to admit his below normal child in your school. His admission is to affect the discipline of the class and so the class teacher has advised you against this admission. You know the admission would help the school in getting more grants.
  - A. I think it would be in the interest of the school to admit the child; one dull child in the class will not effect the class materially. But the grants will surely be helpful for the school and could even be used to improve many such children.

- B. I shall circulate the letter among other teachers for their opinion and shall ask the Assistant Head Master to decide in the matter.
  - C. I shall ask a competent teacher to study the child carefully. On the merit of report the class teacher and I shall jointly take the decision, if the child should be admitted or not.
8. You get a letter from a parent that his son was beaten up by bigger and stronger classmate for refusing to do the home-work for him. On inquiries you find that the complaint was valid.
- A. Quarrels among the students are numerous and so often that a single headmaster of such a big institution cannot afford to waste time in investigating them. However, I shall try to speak to the miscreant and inform the father accordingly.
  - B. I shall mete out severe punishment to the bigger boy and warn him that in case he misbehaves again, he would be rusticated.
  - C. I shall discuss the incident with the class as a whole and also discuss with the teacher for finding ways such that the two boys are able to do their home work themselves.
9. You receive an application from your assistant teacher requesting you to relieve him of his job as he has secured a better one elsewhere. You did not know that the teacher had applied elsewhere. Rules require that application for any job should be sent through you. If the teacher is relieved now, teaching would greatly suffer.
- A. I shall call for the explanation of the teacher and tell him that he cannot be relieved, as he did not apply through proper channel. I do not want the school work to suffer and shall warn him, that in future applications should be sent through the Headmaster.
  - B. The teacher is to be relieved as it is a better job. I cannot ask him to continue when he is not willing. I shall explore what alternative arrangements could be made to relieve him.
  - C. The teacher should see the Secretary of the Managing Committee and get his clearance. Personally I do not have any objection after all, no one is indispensable.

10. You have received a note from the Students' Union of your School (obviously under outside inspiration) that they would go on strike if the evaluation of the examination papers is not made more leniently.
  - A. I shall sit with the students to discuss with them about the suitable action regarding evaluation. To me strike is not the problem; problem is their dissatisfaction about evaluation.
  - B. I shall inform the Students' Union that if they went on strike or cause any disturbance severe disciplinary action will be taken against them.
  - C. I shall send the note to the governing body of the school and the Parent Teacher Association as, I consider the decision of what is to be done in such situation is up to them.
11. The governing body of the school considers that some weak students need extra coaching in some subjects beyond the school hours and you should make arrangements for it. You apprehend some resistance to this idea from some teachers.
  - A. I shall also share the extra work with my teachers, shall find out if they can volunteer to do the work by rotation. I shall also try to impress them that, the teachers credit lies in pulling a backward student up and here is an opportunity for them.
  - B. Teachers are full time employees of the school and it is a part of their duty to teach the subject well, it affects the school performance. They should attend to these backward children.
  - C. Shall forward the letter to the assistant headmaster to make suitable arrangements for these children. If there is something that I can do, I shall do so.
12. You heard a rumor that a certain teacher is very communal in his approach towards pupils. On preliminary inquiries, you understand that although there is exaggeration yet there was some truth in it. You also discover that communal tendencies were present in some other teachers also.
  - A. I think, as a free citizen every person has his own ways of thinking and I cannot go on correcting individual opinions or modes of thinking.

- B. I shall convene a meeting of the teachers to discuss about communalism. Shall firmly point out that communalism is not conducive in a school situation. It is an unhealthy feature.
  - C. I shall call each of the teachers and tell him that there is absolutely no place for communal feeling in my school. If I find anybody communal I can become ruthless to outcast such a person.
13. The assistant headmaster of the school who happens to be your colleague and friend over a long period of time suggests you in writing that the school teachers and students would show remarkable progress in their achievements if you reduce your check on them.
- A. I can never trust my assistants and students. The assistant headmaster is too good to be a leader. I think he does not know that school would be a big mess if I do not check constantly.
  - B. As a headmaster as I think I was expected to take rounds. I used to go round but if that is a problem I may stop going around.
  - C. I have always been thinking for the progress of my school. I think I should try out this suggestion for a fortnight to see the results. If there is a worthwhile progress I shall willingly follow this suggestion.

## APPENDIX- B

### Bangla Version of the Leadership Style Questionnaire

#### নেতৃত্বের ধরণ প্রশ্নমালা

নিচে নেতৃত্ব সম্পর্কিত কতকগুলি কর্মপরিস্থিতি বর্ণনা করা হয়েছে। প্রত্যেকটি কর্ম পরিস্থিতির জন্য তিনটি বিকল্প প্রতিক্রিয়া (ক, খ ও গ) দেয়া আছে আপনার পছন্দমত যে কোন একটিতে টিক (✓) চিহ্ন দিন।

১. প্রধান শিক্ষকদের জন্য আয়োজিত একটি ওয়ার্কশপে আপনার উপস্থিত থাকতে হবে। এজন্য আপনি চার মাস স্কুলে উপস্থিত থাকতে পারবেন না। এই সময়ে স্কুলের বার্ষিক পরীক্ষা এবং ভর্তি পরীক্ষা অনুষ্ঠিত হবে। যদিও ওয়ার্কশপে উপস্থিত থাকা আপনার জন্য বাধ্যতামূলক নয়। আপনি কি করবেন-

ক. আমার অনুপস্থিতিতে স্কুল পরিচালনা পরিষদকে যথোপযুক্ত ব্যবস্থা গ্রহণের জন্য অনুরোধ করবো এবং ওয়ার্কশপে উপস্থিত হবো।

খ. আমি ওয়ার্কশপে উপস্থিত থাকবো। আমাদের শিক্ষকমণ্ডলী যথেষ্ট অভিজ্ঞ। আমার অনুপস্থিতিতে তারা সুষ্ঠুভাবে স্কুল পরিচালনা করতে পারবেন। আমি শিক্ষকদের মধ্যে কিছু দায়িত্ব ভাগ করে দিব এবং সহকারী প্রধান শিক্ষক সব কিছুর দায়িত্বে থাকবেন।

গ. একজন প্রধান শিক্ষক কখনো চার মাস দীর্ঘ সময়ব্যাপী স্কুলে অনুপস্থিত থাকতে পারে না। বিশেষ করে যখন পরীক্ষা এবং ভর্তি পরীক্ষা অনুষ্ঠিত হয়। যদি এটা স্বল্প মেয়াদী ওয়ার্কশপ হতো তাহলে সহকারী প্রধান শিক্ষক স্কুলের যাবতীয় কর্মকাণ্ড পরিচালনা করতে পারতেন। এই ক্ষেত্রে আমি ওয়ার্কশপে অংশগ্রহণ করবো না।

২. শিক্ষা অধিদপ্তরের পরিচালক ডিসেম্বরের ছুটিতে দশটি স্কুলের অংশগ্রহণকারীদের নিয়ে একটি ক্যাম্পের আয়োজন করা এবং তাদের থাকার সুব্যবস্থা করার জন্য লিখেছেন। আপনার শিক্ষকরা এ ব্যাপারে মোটেও সম্মত নয়। আপনাকে শিক্ষা অধিদপ্তরের পরিচালককে এ ব্যাপারে অবহিত করতে হবে, আপনি কি করবেন-

- ক. শিক্ষা অধিদপ্তরের পরিচালককে জানানো যে আমার স্কুল এই ক্যাম্প আয়োজনের দায়িত্ব নিবে এবং স্কুলের শিক্ষকদেরকে তারা এটা পছন্দ করুক বা না করুক ক্যাম্প আয়োজনের ব্যবস্থা করতে নির্দেশ দিব।
- খ. শিক্ষকরা না চাইলে প্রধান শিক্ষকের কিছুই করার থাকে না। আমি শিক্ষা অধিদপ্তরের পরিচালককে জানানো স্কুল এই ক্যাম্পের ব্যবস্থা করতে পারবে না কারণ স্কুলের শিক্ষকরা এটা চান না।
- গ. ক্যাম্পের সুবন্দোবস্ত করা একটি সৃজনশীল কাজ। ক্যাম্প কিভাবে করতে হয় স্কুল তথা শিক্ষকবৃন্দ তা শেখার সুযোগ পায়। তাই আমি শিক্ষকদের সাথে আলোচনা করবো যাতে তারা যতটা সুন্দরভাবে পারেন ক্যাম্পের আয়োজন করেন।
৩. একজন সহকারী শিক্ষক, শিক্ষকদের একটি কমিটির মাধ্যমে শিক্ষকদের কাজের নতুন সময়সূচী প্রণয়নের জন্য একটি প্রস্তাব করেছেন, আপনি কি করবেন-
- ক. পারস্পরিক সহযোগিতার মাধ্যমে শিক্ষক যদি কাজের নতুন সময়সূচী প্রণয়ন করেন তাহলে আমি তাদের এ উদ্যোগকে স্বাগত জানাবো এবং তাদের সাথে থাকবো।
- খ. আমার মনে হয় এ ধরনের উদ্যোগ শিক্ষকদের শৃঙ্খলা রক্ষার ক্ষেত্রে সমস্যা সৃষ্টি করবে। তাছাড়া শিক্ষকদের কর্মবণ্টন ও কাজের সূচী প্রণয়ন প্রধান শিক্ষকের কাজ। আমার পক্ষে অন্য কেউ এ কাজ করুক আমি তা চাই না। এজন্য এধরনের প্রস্তাব আমি সমর্থন করবো না।
- গ. শিক্ষকদের কাজের সূচী প্রণয়ন আমার দৃষ্টিতে তেমন গুরুত্বপূর্ণ কোন কাজ নয়। তাই শিক্ষকরা যদি মনে করেন যে তাদের কি করা উচিত তা তারাই ঠিক করবে তাহলে আমি তাদেরকে তা করতে দেব এবং তাদের পরিকল্পনা অনুমোদন করবো।
৪. স্কুল পরিচালনা পরিষদ যদি মনে করে যে প্রধান শিক্ষক ছাত্রদের ধর্মঘট মোকাবেলায় যথাযথ কৌশল অবলম্বন করেননি ফলে স্কুলের অপূর্ণীয় ক্ষতি হয়েছে এবং পরিচালনা পরিষদ যদি এ ব্যাপারে আপনাকে ব্যাখ্যা দিতে বলেন, তাহলে আপনি কি করবেন-
- ক. আমি ব্যাখ্যা দিব যে পরিস্থিতি মোকাবেলায় যথাযথ পদক্ষেপ নিতে সার্বক্ষণিকভাবে আমি আমার সহকর্মীদের সাথে যোগাযোগ রক্ষা করছি। আমার মনে হয় উদ্ভূত পরিস্থিতি মোকাবেলায় এটাই সবচেয়ে ভাল পন্থা।



- খ. আমার মনে হয় আক্রমণাত্মক মনোভাব সম্পন্ন উত্তেজিত শিক্ষার্থীদের সাথে দেখা করা বৃথা তাছাড়া এ পরিস্থিতিতে ভাল কিছু হওয়াও সম্ভব নয়।
- গ. যদিও আপাত দৃষ্টিতে শিক্ষার্থীরা নিয়ন্ত্রণের বাইরে তথাপি প্রধান শিক্ষকের ক্ষমতা বলে আমি শিক্ষার্থীদেরকে দমন করার চেষ্টা করবো। আমি মনে করি তাদেরকে অবশ্যই ভীতিমূলক শাস্তি প্রদান করতে হবে।
৫. দশম শ্রেণীর মেধাবী শিক্ষার্থীরা এস.এস.সি পরীক্ষায় ভাল ফলাফলের জন্য বিশেষ কোচিং-এর ব্যবস্থা করতে আপনাকে অনুরোধ করলো, তাহলে আপনি কি করবেন-
- ক. প্রচলিত নিয়ম অনুসারে শিক্ষকদের উপর অতিরিক্ত দায়িত্ব চাপানো যায় না, তাই এ জাতীয় ক্লাসের ব্যবস্থা করা কঠিন। তবে শিক্ষার্থীরা নিজেদের উদ্যোগে এরকম ক্লাসের ব্যবস্থা করতে পারে।
- খ. শিক্ষার্থীদের এ ধরনের উদ্যোগকে আমি উৎসাহিত করবো এবং অন্য সহকর্মীদের সাথে আলাপ করে কোচিং ক্লাসের ব্যবস্থা করার একটা উপায় বের করবো।
- গ. প্রধান শিক্ষকের মর্যাদা রক্ষার্থে আমি কোচিং ক্লাস নেয়ার জন্য শিক্ষকদের দায়িত্ব দিয়ে একটি নোটিশ জারি করবো।
৬. গ্রীষ্মের ছুটির শুরুতে একজন শিক্ষিকা সন্তান প্রসব করেছেন। ছুটি শেষে স্কুল খোলার দিন থেকে তিনি মাতৃত্ব ছুটির জন্য আবেদন করেছেন। মাতৃত্ব ছুটি শুরু করার তারিখের বিষয়ে সুনির্দিষ্ট কোন নিয়ম নেই। প্রধান শিক্ষক তার ক্ষমতায় এ ব্যাপারে সিদ্ধান্ত নিতে পারেন, আপনি কি করবেন-
- ক. যখন বিশ্রামের প্রয়োজন ছিল তখন তিনি যথেষ্ট সময় পেয়েছেন। সুতরাং সন্তান প্রসবের দিন থেকে ধরে মাতৃত্বকালীন ছুটির মেয়াদ শেষ হলেই তার স্কুলে যোগদান করতে বলবো।
- খ. গ্রীষ্মকালীন ছুটির পর স্কুল আরম্ভ হলে তার কত দিনের ছুটি প্রয়োজন হবে তা জেনে নিবো এবং আমার কাছে যুক্তিযুক্ত মনে হলে তাকে ছুটির ব্যাপারে সাহায্য করবো।
- গ. আমি মনে করি এ ব্যাপারে আমার তেমন কিছুই করার নেই। আমি তার মাতৃত্ব ছুটির আবেদন স্বাভাবিকভাবেই সুপারিশ করবো।

৭. স্কুল পরিচালনা কমিটির একজন প্রভাবশালী সদস্য স্কুলের মানের চেয়ে নিম্নমানের একটি শিশুকে স্কুলে ভর্তি করতে বলেন। এ ধরনের শিক্ষার্থী ভর্তি হলে শ্রেণী কক্ষের শৃঙ্খলা নষ্ট হতে পারে। বিধায় শ্রেণী শিক্ষক এর বিরোধিতা করেন। আপনি জানেন উক্ত শিক্ষার্থীকে ভর্তি করলে স্কুলের জন্য আরো অনুদান পেতে সুবিধা হবে। আপনি কি করবেন-
- ক. প্রধান শিক্ষক স্কুলের স্বার্থে ছাত্রটিকে ভর্তি করে নিতে পারেন। মাত্র কয়েকজন নিম্নমানের ছাত্র ক্লাশে কোন খারাপ প্রভাব ফেলতে পারে না। কিন্তু স্কুলের অনুদান বৃদ্ধি পেলে তা ব্যবহার করে স্কুলের এবং এ ধরনের শিক্ষার্থীদের মান উন্নয়ন করা যাবে।
- খ. অন্য শিক্ষকদের মতামত চেয়ে আমি একটি নোটিশ জারি করবো এবং সহকারী প্রধান শিক্ষককে এ ব্যাপারে সিদ্ধান্ত নিতে বলবো।
- গ. শিশুটির সার্বিক অবস্থা মূল্যায়ন করে রিপোর্ট দিতে আমি একজন দক্ষ শিক্ষককে দায়িত্ব দিবো। রিপোর্ট পর্যালোচনা করে শ্রেণী শিক্ষক ও আমি যৌথভাবে শিশুটির ভর্তির ব্যাপারে সিদ্ধান্ত নিবো।
৮. একজন অভিভাবক অভিযোগ দায়ের করেছেন যে, তার ছেলেকে ক্লাশের অন্য একজন শক্তিশালী সহপাঠী বাড়ির কাজ করে না দেয়ার জন্য মারধর করেছে। তদন্তে ঘটনার সত্যতা পাওয়া গেছে, আপনি কি করবেন-
- ক. ছাত্রদের ঝগড়ার ঘটনা প্রায়ই ঘটে থাকে। একটি বৃহৎ স্কুলে এইসব ঘটনা অনুসন্ধান করে সময় নষ্ট করা প্রধান শিক্ষকের জন্য কষ্টকর। তা সত্ত্বেও তিনি এ ব্যাপারে দোষী ছাত্রের সাথে কথা বলবেন এবং ঘটনাটি তার পিতাকে জানাবেন।
- খ. আমি দোষী ছাত্রকে কঠিন শাস্তি প্রদান করবো এবং ভবিষ্যতে কারো সাথে খারাপ আচরণ করলে স্কুল থেকে বিতাড়িত করা হবে বলে সতর্ক করে দেব।
- গ. আমি ঐ ক্লাশের সকল ছাত্রদের সাথে ঘটনাটি নিয়ে আলোচনা করবো এবং শিক্ষকদের সাথে আলোচনা করে শিক্ষার্থীরা যেন তাদের হোমওয়ার্ক নিজে নিজে করতে পারে সে ব্যাপারে পদক্ষেপ নেব।
৯. একজন সহকারী শিক্ষক অন্য ভাল চাকুরী পাওয়ায় স্কুল থেকে অব্যাহতি চেয়ে আবেদন করেছেন। তার অন্য চাকুরীর জন্য আবেদন করার বিষয়ে আপনি প্রধান শিক্ষক হিসেবে জানতেন না। যদিও নিয়ম অনুসারে আপনার মাধ্যমেই দরখাস্ত করার কথা ছিল। তাকে রিলিজ দিলে স্কুলের ক্লাশ পরিচালনার সমস্যা সৃষ্টি হবে, তাহলে আপনি কি করবেন-

- ক. যথাযথ কর্তৃপক্ষের মাধ্যমে দরখাস্ত না পাঠানোয় তার কাছে ব্যাখ্যা চাইবো এবং জানিয়ে দিব যে তাকে রিলিজ দেয়া সম্ভব নয়। স্কুলের ক্লাস ক্ষতিগ্রস্থ হোক তা আমি চাই না, তাই তাকে ভবিষ্যতের জন্য সতর্ক করে দেব।
- খ. যেহেতু সহকারী শিক্ষক স্কুলে চাকুরী করতে ইচ্ছুক নন এবং একটি ভাল চাকুরী পেয়েছেন তাই তাকে রিলিজ দেয়ার জন্য বিকল্প কি ব্যবস্থা গ্রহণ করা যায় তা খতিয়ে দেখবো।
- গ. যেহেতু কোন ব্যক্তিই কোন কাজের জন্য অপরিহার্য নয়, তাই তাকে রিলিজ দেয়ার ব্যাপারে আপত্তি করবো না এবং তাকে স্কুল পরিচালনা পরিষদের সভাপতির অনুমতি নিতে বলবো।
১০. স্কুলের ছাত্র-সংসদ আপনাকে চিঠি দিয়ে জানালো যে শিক্ষার্থীদের পরীক্ষার খাতা শিথিলভাবে দেখতে হবে তা না হলে ছাত্র-সংসদ ধর্মঘট আহ্বান করবে, আপনি কি করবেন-
- ক. যথাযথভাবে খাতা মূল্যায়ন করণীয় সম্পর্কে আমি শিক্ষার্থীদের সাথে আলোচনা করবো। আমার কাছে ধর্মঘট কোন সমস্যা নয় বরং মূল্যায়নের ব্যাপারে শিক্ষার্থীদের অসন্তুষ্টিই বড় সমস্যা।
- খ. আমি ছাত্র-সংসদকে জানিয়ে দেব যে, শিক্ষার্থীরা যদি ধর্মঘট আহ্বান করে বা বিশৃঙ্খলার সৃষ্টি করে তাহলে তাদের বিরুদ্ধে শাস্তিমূলক ব্যবস্থা গ্রহণ করা হবে।
- গ. আমি চিঠিটা স্কুলের পরিচালনা পরিষদ এবং অভিভাবক-শিক্ষক সমিতির নিকট পাঠিয়ে দেব। আমি মনে করি এই পরিস্থিতিতে কি সিদ্ধান্ত নেয়া উচিত সে ব্যাপারে তারা সিদ্ধান্ত নিবেন।
১১. স্কুল পরিচালনা কমিটি মনে করে দুর্বল শিক্ষার্থীদের জন্য কিছু বিষয়ে অতিরিক্ত কোচিং ক্লাসের ব্যবস্থা করা প্রয়োজন এবং এ ব্যাপারে আপনি উদ্যোগ নিবেন। আপনি জানেন এই ক্ষেত্রে শিক্ষকগণ বাধা প্রদান করবেন, আপনি কি করবেন-
- ক. আমি শিক্ষকদের বোঝাতে চেষ্টা করবো যে পিছিয়ে পড়া শিক্ষার্থীদের এগিয়ে নিতে পারা শিক্ষকের জন্য মর্যাদাকর এবং এটা আমাদের জন্য একটি সুযোগ। শিক্ষকরা এ কাজে স্বেচ্ছায় পালানক্রমে অংশ নিলে আমিও তাদের সাথে থাকবো।
- খ. স্কুলের শিক্ষকগণ পূর্ণকালীন কর্মচারী। নিজ নিজ বিষয় ভালভাবে পড়ানো তাদের দায়িত্ব। কারণ ইহা স্কুলের ফলাফলকে প্রভাবিত করে। তাদের উচিত স্কুলের দুর্বল ছাত্রদের প্রতি অতিরিক্ত যত্নশীল হওয়া।

গ. সহকারী প্রধান শিক্ষককে এ ব্যাপারে যথাযথ পদক্ষেপ নেয়ার জন্য বলবো। সে ক্ষেত্রে আমার কিছু করার প্রয়োজন হলে তা আমি করবো।

১২. আপনি শুনেছেন যে স্কুলের একজন শিক্ষক শিক্ষার্থীদের সাথে সাম্প্রদায়িক আচরণ করে থাকে। প্রাথমিক তদন্তে বিষয়টি অতিরঞ্জিত মনে হলেও এর কিছু সত্যতা পাওয়া যায়। আপনি আরো আবিষ্কার করেন যে স্কুলের কিছু শিক্ষক শিক্ষার্থীদের প্রতি সাম্প্রদায়িক মনোভাব পোষণ করে, আপনি কি করবেন-

ক. আমি মনে করি স্বাধীন নাগরিক হিসাবে প্রত্যেক ব্যক্তিই নিজের মত করে চিন্তা করতে পারে এবং আমি অপরের মতামতকে বা চিন্তার ধরণকে সংশোধন করতে পারি না।

খ. সাম্প্রদায়িকতা বিষয়ে আলোচনার জন্য শিক্ষকদের একটি সভা আহ্বান করবো এবং সেখানে সাম্প্রদায়িকতার ক্ষতিকর দিকগুলো তুলে ধরবো।

গ. প্রত্যেক শিক্ষককে ডেকে বলে দেবো যে এই স্কুলে সাম্প্রদায়িকতার কোন স্থান নেই। সাম্প্রদায়িক মনোভাব সম্পন্ন কাউকে পাওয়া গেলে তাকে স্কুল থেকে বিতাড়িত করা হবে।

১৩. আপনি নজরদারি কমিয়ে দিলে স্কুলের শিক্ষক ও শিক্ষার্থীরা উল্লেখযোগ্য অগ্রগতি সাধন করবে বলে আপনার দীর্ঘদিনের বন্ধু ও সহকর্মী সহকারী প্রধান শিক্ষক আপনাকে পরামর্শ দিলেন, আপনি কি করবেন-

ক. আমি আমার সহকারী ও শিক্ষার্থীদেরকে কখনও বিশ্বাস করতে পারি না। নেতা হওয়ার জন্য সহকারী প্রধান শিক্ষক খুব ভাল। কিন্তু সে জানে না যে সার্বক্ষণিক নজরদারী উঠিয়ে নিলে স্কুলে বড় ধরনের বিশৃঙ্খল পরিবেশের সৃষ্টি হবে।

খ. প্রধান শিক্ষক হিসাবে আমি মনে করি যে মাঝে মাঝে পরিদর্শনে যাওয়া আমার দায়িত্ব। তবে পরিদর্শনে গেলে যদি অসুবিধার সৃষ্টি হয় তাহলে আমি পরিদর্শন বন্ধ করে দেব।

গ. আমি সবসময় স্কুলের অগ্রগতি নিয়ে চিন্তা করি। আমার মনে হয় সহকারী প্রধান শিক্ষকের পরামর্শ আমি পরীক্ষামূলকভাবে ১৫ দিন অনুসরণ করতে পারি। যদি উল্লেখযোগ্য ফল পাওয়া যায় তাহলে তার পরামর্শ অনুসরণ করা যেতে পারে।

## APPENDIX- C

### English Version of the Head Teachers' Opinion Survey Questions

ID No. :  
Name of School :  
Type of School : Primary / Secondary / Govt. / Non-Govt.  
Gender of Head Teacher : Male / Female  
Age :

(Please read the following questions carefully and give a tick mark on appropriate place for each question)

1. Do you think, your colleagues perform their duties properly?  
Yes  No  Not always
2. Do you think your school atmosphere congenial for learning?  
Yes  No  Not always
3. Do you have any provision for reward & punishment in your school?  
Yes  No  Not always
4. Do you think physical punishment necessary for maintaining discipline?  
Yes  No  Not always
5. Do you think your colleagues capable of maintaining teaching standard?  
Yes  No  Not always
6. Does your school arranges co-curricular activities regularly?  
Yes  No  Not always
7. Do you let local people involved & get their cooperation in running school?  
Yes  No  Not always
8. Do you think classroom environment congenial for learning and teaching?  
Yes  No  Not always