

**International Research Journal of Management
Science & Technology**
ISSN 2250 – 1959(Online)
2348 – 9367 (Print)

An Internationally Indexed Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal



**Shri Param Hans Education &
Research Foundation Trust**

www.IRJMST.com
www.SPHERT.org

Published by iSaRa Solutions

A study on perception of employees with regard to Leadership effectiveness in higher education

Dr. Patcha Bhujanga Rao

Professor of Commerce & Management Studies
Jain Deemed-To-Be University, Bengaluru

Mrs. Preethi Inampudi

Asst. Professor, Dept. of Management,
VET First Grade College, Bengaluru

Gowri Hebbar

HOD-Department of Commerce,
VET First Grade college, Bengaluru

ABSTRACT

ORIENTATION: The study reported here explores the perception of employees with regard to leadership effectiveness (LE) in higher education.

RESEARCH INITIATIVE: The study was initiated to investigate the prevalence of self-perception accuracy amongst the employees regarding their leadership effectiveness and transformational leadership behaviour.

MOTIVATION OF THE STUDY: Research has shown that leaders in different workplaces misjudge their own degree of competence and that this could affect on the viability of their leadership behaviour. However this phenomenon has not yet been researched in the context higher education institutions.

RESEARCH STRATEGY AND APPROACH: A quantitative cross-sectional study of the relationship between self-perception accuracy and leadership effectiveness was conducted amongst the total population ($N = 131$) of staff members in various positions. The response rate being 78.92% and the realised sample consisted of 131 employees from various higher education institutions. Leadership effectiveness was measured by means of behavioural ratings on the following five dimensions of the Leadership Practices Inventory : 'Challenging the process', 'Inspiring a shared vision', 'Enabling others to act', 'Modelling the way' and 'Encouraging the heart'.

MAIN FINDINGS: Statistically no major significant differences were found on leadership effectiveness on all five leadership dimensions as the results further provide evidence on the perceived leadership effectiveness.

PRACTICAL AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS: Leadership development practices should sensitise to what is essentially introspective and provide opportunities to reflect upon the leadership practices.

CONTRIBUTION: A challenge for higher education is to embark on feedback intensive leadership effectiveness processes that provides employees with comprehensive feedback in a supportive environment.

INTRODUCTION

It is by and large acknowledged that effective leadership is a essential component of positive social change in any institution. It appears to be evident that no institution can proceed to develop without leadership effectiveness and that none can flourish where it is unavailable.

This study investigates the issue by focussing on the effectiveness of leadership within a specific context, explicitly on higher education institutions that is in the agonies of an outrageous consolidating process and on the inescapability of self-acumen accuracy among the administrative authorities of that institutions.

FOUNDATION TO THE STUDY

Advanced education is confronting significant transformation challenges that require phenomenal leadership (Bosch, 2006; Brennan, 2005; Jansen, 2004; Hargreaves & Fink, 2003; Van Ameijde, Nelson, Billsberry & Meurs, 2009). This widespread acknowledgment of the requirement for viable leadership to shape institutional change in education and elsewhere has prompted a broad reconsidering of leadership practices in advanced education. Given the perspective on leadership as a process whereby individuals work together to encourage change, new emphasis is presently being put on abilities that are attached to relationships and interconnectedness (Martin, 2005). Therefore, to build the leadership capacity necessary for top-quality institutions of higher learning, administrators should have great administration and specialized abilities, as well as well evolved social and emotional abilities. In any case, ineffective and inefficient leadership has been recognized by different authors as one of the significant shortcomings of Higher Education, a reality that hinders the transformation agenda (Jansen, 2004; Kotecha, 2003; Seale, 2004).

The justification for this absence of leadership abilities may be on the grounds that leadership improvement has been offered little consideration by the greater part of the institutions of higher learning. Generally little attention is being given to the advancement of those characteristics that are probably going to be critical to compelling leadership (Astin and Astin, 2000): self-knowledge, self-awareness, integrity, interpersonal skills.

Obviously, the context of leadership is changing and that leadership with the ability to fabricate relationships, to team up and to lead change effectively will be basic to long haul accomplishment across domains of expertise and different institutional settings.

Martin (2005) agrees that basic abilities for successful leadership in future fall in the classification of relationships and joint effort. This view is upheld by Van Ameijde, Nelson, Billsberry and Van Meurs (2009) who express that leadership is a common impact process that 'emerges from the interactions of diverse individuals with diverse culture'. An essential for the successful administration of these interactions or relationships and fundamental to interpersonal skills is the concept of self-perception precision. This gives the leader self-information from different sources which needs to be incorporated into their self-assessment to improve self-discernment exactness (Randall, Ferguson and Patterson, 2000).

Self-perception accuracy is a basic element for legitimacy and in producing a common shared perspective for the leadership group by monitoring the capabilities and limits that could effect on the change exertion (Astin and Astin, 2000). As per Astin and Astin (2000, p. 73) one 'safe' strategy a leader could embrace in managing such an absence of self-perception precision is to avoid embarking on any endeavour to significant institutional change. Low self-perception precision could likewise prompt self-delusion where the leader briefly assuages supporters' need for change by promising seemingly fitting and sensible changes yet which are never followed up on due to the leader's absence of conviction or commitment. The main long-haul results of such a reaction are the disintegration of confidence in the leader as well as criticism among supporters (Astin and Astin, 2000).

Thus, for leaders to have the option to transform their organisations to turn out to be more viable, they first need to understand themselves (Souba, 2006). In this new perplexing and interdependent workplace, leaders don't just need new abilities yet in addition need to act diversely to lead employees ingeniously.

This will expect leaders to be dynamic, aggressive learners and to foster new leadership abilities quickly and transparently (McLagan, 2002). Along these lines, the process involved with improving as a leader is essentially grounded in individual transformation and self-revelation (Van Velsor and McCauley, 2004). Self-insight which could bring about a more precise self-perception has been perceived as a fundamental necessity for conscious, proactive change and progression, (Carlopio, Andrewartha and Armstrong, 2005). Understanding one's capabilities and shortcomings is regarded as essential for cognizant individual change and improvement. As such, we can't change what we are not intentionally aware of (Jokinen, 2005).

In outline, self-perception precision is by all accounts an essential for both individual development as well as powerful organisational change. Notwithstanding the significance of self-perception exactness, research has commonly seen that as, ordinarily, leaders tend to misjudge their own degree of skill and competence (for example Alicke, Klotz, Breitenbecher, Yurak and Vredenburg, 1995; Atkins and Wood, 2002; Herbst, Maree and Sibanda, 2006). Research studies (alluded to in Atwater, Brett and Waldman, 2003) observed that overraters were more unfortunate entertainers than under- and in-arrangement raters and that the most elevated performing administrators had self-and different appraisals that were generally comparative

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The motivation behind the study was to acquire new insights into effective leadership behaviour in higher education foundations that are going through a course of change. Expressed in more substantial terms, the general goal was to investigate the leadership effectiveness (LE) in high education. This was to be accomplished by tending the following three explicit exploration goals:

Objective 1: To investigate the leadership efficiency in higher education for optimal performance.

Objective 2: To investigate the pattern of significant correlations (if any) with regard to leadership effectiveness.

Objective 3: To study the association between different independent variables on Leadership effectiveness

It was trusted that this study would yield information that could be utilized as an instrument in turning into a more effective leaders in higher education and that this would uphold the emerging literature on the significance of further developing leadership effectiveness. The ultimate aim at this point of study was subsequently to acquire information as to leadership effectiveness inside the setting of a higher education institutions. Besides, it was trusted that the outcomes would furnish direction to the plan of the management development interventions

THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE STUDY

THE KOUZES AND POSNER MODEL OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Leadership is a process that is that is eventually concerned with fostering change. As a result, the literature on effective leaders suggest that they tend to be 'transformational' rather than 'transactional' (Harris, Day, Hopkins, Hadfield, Hargreaves & Chapman 2003, p. 29). Therefore, the current emphasis on leadership connects with the capacity of an administrator to oversee and deliver critical organisational change (Higgs, 2002). As per Astin and Astin (2000) leaders in higher education

should begin rehearsing the standards of transformational leadership. They view transformational leadership as empowering leadership 'since it is predicated on being self-aware, authentic, and empathic in light of the fact that it creates trust through listening, collaborating, and shaping a common purpose' (p.49).

Transformational leadership embraces four facets (Bass, 1985, 1998; Bass and Avolio, 1993): idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration. Transformational leadership predicts higher fulfilment and trust in leadership, apart from being interlinked with organisational performance, (Keller, 1995) as well as employees' emotional commitment to organisations (Barling, Slater and Kelloway, 2000). The transformational leader is additionally 'liable to be more favourable to dynamic than responsive, more resourceful in thoughts and less restrained in ideational quest for solutions'(Bass, 1985). Since the transformational leadership depends on collaboration the four facets are relational in nature.

Radical change has important ramifications for the practice of leadership. The consequences of a few investigations (in McCroskey, 2008) recommend that transformational leadership is one management practice that is probably going to bring about higher patterns for both emotional and authoritative responsibility during transformation. Therefore, the transformational leadership model of Kouzes and Posner (1987) constituted the conceptual framework for the investigation of the study, including five key transformational leadership practices. Kouzes and Posner (2001) recommend that successful transformational leaders demonstrate five particular practices of leadership accompanying the strategies, which exceptional leaders use to influence employees and organisational performance:

Practice 1 - Challenging the process: To seek innovative ways of transformation, develop and improve. Analyse and face challenges by continually generating little successes and learning from failures.

Practice 2 - Inspiring a shared vision: Imagining the future by ennobling possibilities and recognizing conceivable outcomes. Enrol others by engaging shared aspirations.

Practice 3 - Enabling others to act: Cultivate joint effort by advancing agreeable objectives and building trust. Reinforce others by sharing power and circumspection.

Practice 4 - Modelling the way: Find your voice by explaining your own qualities. Set an example by aligning actions to shared values.

Practice 5 - Encouraging the heart: Recognising contributions made by individuals and by appreciating individual excellence. Celebrate achievements by creating a spirit of community.

This model was used extensively to assess leadership behaviours across diverse organisations, disciplines and demographic backgrounds (Kouzes & Posner, 1987). We regard that the effective leaders as those who demonstrated these five practices of transformational leaders. However, we emphasise that this conception of effective leadership is one of many possible approaches.

This model has been utilized broadly to survey leadership practices across an assortment of associations, disciplines and segment foundations (Kouzes and Posner, 1987). In the current review we regarded leaders as the individuals who showed these five acts of transformational leaders. Notwithstanding, we need to stress that this origination of effective leadership is one of the numerous potential approaches.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND CORRESPONDING RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

As described in a previous section to the overall purpose of the study, the research question investigated was the leadership effectiveness (LE) in higher education context.

However, on the basis of the research certain hypotheses could tentatively be formulated for the context of this study. It was predicted that

1. There is no significant difference between Male and Female employees with respect to Factors of Leadership Effectiveness,
2. There is no significant difference between unmarried and married employees with respect to Factors of Leadership Effectiveness,
3. There is no significant difference among Age Group with respect to Factors of Leadership Effectiveness
4. There is no significant difference among different professions with respect to Factors of leadership effectiveness.
5. There is no significant difference among the different qualification of employees with regard to Factors of leadership effectiveness.
6. There is no significant difference among the experience with regard to Factors of leadership effectiveness.
7. Level of leadership effectiveness of employees are equally distributed.
8. There is no association between gender and level of leadership effectiveness of employees
9. There is no significant difference between Mean Rank of Experience in years with respect to Factors of leadership effectiveness.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Research approach

A cross-sectional study plan by which respondents is drawn from a populace at a given point (Shaughnessy and Zechmeister, 1991) was used to investigate accompanying hypothesis. The overall methodology of the study was, in the phrasing of Mouton and Marais (1989), primarily elucidating (focusing on the classification and interaction between factors) rather than explorative (researching an altogether new phenomenon) or logical (focusing in on circumstances and logical results).

RESEARCH METHOD

Sampling

In order to explore the leadership effectiveness in higher education institution, the whole population of staff in higher education institutions was approached to participate on a voluntary basis. To publish the research results and to incorporate the case studies in this article, a total of 131 employees participated and the response rate being 78.92%.

For every one of these 131 respondents were requested to give their ratings on Leadership effectiveness. It would have been a benefit to have the option to look at the ratings; however, to ensure the secrecy of the raters all information were incorporated into single 'rating' score for each employee.

RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

The total of 131 employees who agreed to participate in the study consisted of 64 men and 67 women, whilst 35 employees were un-married and 96 were married. Of these participants 19.1% (25 respondents) held a professor position, 21.4% (25 respondents) were Associate professors (heads of departments) and 50.4% (66 respondents) were assistant professors and 9.2% (12 respondents) were teaching assistants. The average age of the respondents was above 40 years and 56.5% had doctoral degree qualification. Anonymity in respect of their individual scores was guaranteed to all respondents.

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES OF THE RESPONDENTS
Personal Related Variables
Classification of Respondents by Personal Related Variables

Demographic Factors	Frequency	Percent	
Age	Above 20	27	20.6
	Above 30	37	28.2
	Above 40	49	37.4
	Above 50	18	13.7
Gender	Male	64	48.9
	Female	67	51.1
Marital Status	Un-married	35	26.7
	Married	96	73.3
Qualification	Post Graduate	45	34.4
	Professional	12	9.2
	Ph.D	74	56.5
Designation	Teaching Assistant	12	9.2
	Assistant Professor	66	50.4
	Associate Professor	28	21.4
	Professor	25	19.1
Experience	0-10	66	50.4
	10-20	28	21.4
	20 and above	37	28.2
Income	2,00,000-4,00,000	54	41.2
	4,00,000-6,00,000	34	26.0
	6,00,000-8,00,000	31	23.7
	8,00,000 and above	12	9.2

Source: Researchers Compilation

MEASURING INSTRUMENT

The Leadership Practices Inventory was administered to the sample of 131 employees in higher education.

The measure of self-perception accuracy for leadership effectiveness was derived from data collected on the Leadership Practices Inventory . There are 30-item leadership inventories with each item corresponding to one of 5 leadership practices or competency dimensions. Briefly, the dimensions were: challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modelling the way, encouraging the heart.

Each practice was measured by six behavioural descriptions, rated on a 5-point Likert scale anchored by 'Almost never' (1) up to 'Almost always' (5), therefore yielding a total score for each respondent that could range from 5 to 50 on each practice. Validation studies conducted have confirmed the reliability and validity (both face validity and predictive validity) of the Leadership Practices Inventory. The internal reliability for the Leadership Practices Inventory for the five factors of leadership effectiveness range from 0.81 to 0.92 whilst test-retest reliability was at 0.93 or higher (Kouzes & Posner, 1995).

**INFERENTIAL ANALYSIS OF LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS DATA
HYPOTHESIS**

There is no significant difference between Male and Female employees with respect to Factors of Leadership Effectiveness

t test for significant difference between Male and Female with respect to Factors of Leadership Effectiveness

Factors of Leadership Effectiveness	GENDER				T Value	P Value
	Male		Female			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Model the way	24.97	3.647	22.33	5.464	3.266	<0.001**
Inspire a Shared Vision	24.95	4.402	22.13	5.128	3.38	<0.001**
Challenge the Process	24.94	4.5	22.84	5.451	2.411	0.017*
Enable Others to Act	26.28	4.119	22.94	5.844	3.796	<0.000**
Encourage the Heart	26.25	4.619	22.88	6.299	3.502	<0.001**
Leadership Effectiveness	127.39	20.21	113.12	27.417	3.402	<0.001**

** denotes significant at 1% level,

* denotes significant at 5% level

Since P value is less than 0.001 the null hypothesis is rejected at 1 % level with regard to factors of leadership effectiveness towards model the way, inspire a shared vision, enable others to act , encourage the heart and overall leadership effectiveness. Hence, there is a significant difference between male and female of employees with regard to the factors of leadership effectiveness. Based on mean score, the male employees have better in overall leadership effectiveness than female employees.

All Since P value is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level with regard to the challenge the process on factors of leadership effectiveness. Hence there is significant difference between male and female employees with regard to the Factors of leadership on challenge the process.

HYPOTHESIS

There is no significant difference between unmarried and married employees with respect to factors of leadership effectiveness.

t test for significant difference between un-married and married with respect to Factors of Leadership Effectiveness

Factors of Leadership Effectiveness	MARITAL STATUS				T Value	P Value
	Un-married		Married			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Model the way	22.06	5.562	24.19	4.435	-2.042	0.046*
Inspire a Shared Vision	21.74	6.089	24.16	4.361	-2.152	0.037*
Challenge the Process	21.69	5.855	24.66	4.576	-2.714	0.009**
Enable Others to Act	22.8	6.028	25.22	4.923	-2.129	0.038*
Encourage the Heart	22.29	7.262	25.34	4.922	-2.306	0.026*
Leadership Effectiveness	110.57	29.802	123.56	22.357	-2.349	0.023*

** denotes significant at 1% level, * denotes significant at 5% level

Since P value is less than 0.001 the null hypothesis is rejected at 1 % level with regard to factors of

leadership effectiveness towards challenge the process on the factor of leadership effectiveness. Hence there is a significant difference between unmarried and married employees with regard to the Factors of leadership effectiveness. Based on mean score, the married employees have better in overall leadership effectiveness than unmarried employees.

All Since P value is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level with regard to the model the inspire a shared vision, enable others to act, encourage the heart, and overall leadership effectiveness on Factors of leadership effectiveness. Hence there is significant difference between unmarried and married employees with regard to the factors of leadership effectiveness.

HYPOTHESIS

There is no significant difference among different age group employees with respect to the factors of leadership

ANOVA for significant difference among the Age Group with respect to Factors of leadership effectiveness

Factors of Leadership Effectiveness	Age group in years				F Value	P Value
	Above 20	Above 30	Above 40	Above 50		
Model the way	20.67 (5.477)	24.95 (3.333)	24.22 (4.455)	23.67 (5.871)	4.96	0.003* *
Inspire a Shared Vision	20.78 (6.405)	25.08 (4.212)	23.65 (4.141)	24 (4.79)	4.326	0.006**
Challenge the Process	20.56 (5.925)	25.38 (3.825)	24.18 (5.199)	24.83 (3.777)	5.717	0.001**
Enable Others to Act	22 (6.777)	26 (3.055)	25 (4.886)	24.33 (6.633)	3.265	0.024*
Encourage the Heart	20.44 (7.175)	26.59 (3.5)	25.16 (5.425)	24.67 (5.499)	7.177	< 0.001**
Leadership Effectiveness	104.44 (30.968)	128 (16.653)	122.22 (23.473)	121.5 (25.982)	5.338	0.002**

** denotes significant at 1% level

*denotes significant at 5% level

() refers to SD,

Since P value is less than 0.01, null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level with regard to factors of model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, encourage others to act and overall leadership effectiveness. Hence there is significant difference among Age Group in years of employees with regard factors of model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, encourage others to act and overall leadership effectiveness. Based on mean score, the above 30 years have better in model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, encourage others to act and overall leadership effectiveness when compared to the other age group of employees.

All Since P value is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level with regard to the factor enable others to act on leadership effectiveness. Hence there is significant difference among the age group in years of employees with regard to the factor enable others to act on leadership effectiveness. Based on mean score, the above 30 years age group have better in the factor enable

other to act when compared to the other age group of employees.

HYPOTHESIS

There is no significant difference among different professions with respect to Factors of leadership effectiveness in employees

ANOVA for significant difference among profession with respect to Factors of leadership effectiveness of Employees

Factors of Leadership Effectiveness	Profession				F Value	P Value
	Teaching	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor		
Model the way	20.00	23.78	25.11	23.89		
	(5.099)	(5.000)	(3.790)	(5.326)		
Inspire a Shared Vision	22.00	23.30	25.67	23.22	0.671	0.575
	(8.206)	(4.884)	(4.031)	(4.994)		
Challenge the Process	20.00	23.91	25.33	24.11	1.008	0.399
	(6.481)	(4.728)	(4.330)	(6.254)		
Enable Others to Act	21.25	24.43	27.00	24.67	1.139	0.345
	(6.801)	(5.409)	(3.969)	(5.635)		
Encourage the Heart	20.00	24.43	26.78	24.89	1.324	0.280
	(6.976)	(5.639)	(4.410)	(6.392)		
Leadership Effectiveness	103.25	119.87	129.89	120.78	1.047	0.382
	(32.755)	(24.750)	19.522)	28.003)		

***denotes significant @5 % level of significance

** denotes significant a@ 1% level of significance

*The value within brackets is standard deviation,

There is no significant difference in employees with regard to profession on the factors of leadership effectiveness since P value is greater than 0.05. hence the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level with regard to the factors of leadership effectiveness. Based on mean score, professor and associate professor with regard to the profession have better in the factor when compared to the other profession of employees.

HYPOTHESIS

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the different qualification of employees with regard to Factors of leadership effectiveness.

ANOVA for significant difference among the different qualification of employees with respect to Factors of leadership effectiveness

Factors of Leadership Effectiveness	EDUCATION			F Value	P Value
	Post Graduate	Professional Qualification	Ph.D		
Model the way	22.6	23.5	24.26	1.665	0.193
	(6.11)	(0.905)	(4.233)		
Inspire a Shared Vision	23.53	22.5	23.66	0.279	0.757
	(6.511)	(1.168)	(4.256)		
Challenge the Process	23.33	23.25	24.28	0.577	0.563

	(6.019)	(2.261)	(4.827)		
Enable Others to Act	23.67	24	25.22	1.266	0.286
	(7.003)	(0)	(4.47)		
Encourage the Heart	23.73	22	25.42	2.514	0.085
	(7.222)	(1.954)	(5.012)		
Leadership Effectiveness	116.87	115.25	122.84	1.037	0.358
	(32.12)	(5.972)	(21.869)		

***denotes significant @5 % level of significance

** denotes significant a@ 1% level of significance

*the value within brackets is standard deviation

There is no significant difference in factors of leadership effectiveness with regard to education since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level with regard to the factors of leadership effectiveness. Based on mean score, those who have the doctoral degree with regard to education have better in the factor of leadership effectiveness when compared to the other education qualifications.

HYPOTHESIS

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the experience with regard to Factors of leadership effectiveness.

ANOVA for significant difference among different experienced employees with respect to Factors of leadership effectiveness

Factors of Leadership Effectiveness	EXPERIENCE			F Value	P Value
	0-10 year	10-20 years	20 & above		
Model the way	23.14	24.82	23.57	1.201	0.304
	4.739	2.262	6.198		
Inspire a Shared Vision	23.09	24.89	23.22	1.389	0.253
	5.426	2.644	5.391		
Challenge the Process	23.36	24.86	24	0.86	0.426
	5.267	2.772	6.069		
Enable Others to Act	24.27	26.43	23.7	2.345	0.100
	5.229	2.456	6.704		
Encourage the Heart	23.86	26.89	23.92	3.087	0.049*
	5.948	3.348	6.525		
Leadership Effectiveness	117.73	127.89	118.41	1.746	0.179
	25.714	11.666	30.358		

There is no significant difference in factors of leadership effectiveness with regard to experience since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level with regard to the factors of leadership effectiveness. Based on mean score, those who have 10-20 years of experience have better in the factor of leadership effectiveness when compared to the other education qualifications.

HYPOTHESIS

Level of leadership effectiveness of employees are equally distributed.

Chi-square test for goodness of fit of Equality level of leadership effectiveness if employees

Level of Leadership Effectiveness	Frequency	Percent	Chi-square value	P value
Low	11	24.4	6.4	0.41
Moderate	23	51.1		
High	11	24.4		
Total	45	100.0		

As the P value is greater than 0.05 there is no significant difference and hence concluded that level of leadership effectiveness are equally distributed. Hence concluded that level of leadership effectiveness of employees are equally distributed. Based on the percentage, majority of employees belong to Moderate level (51.1%).

HYPOTHESIS

There is no association between gender and level of leadership effectiveness of employees

Chi-square test for association between profession and of leadership effectiveness if employees

Designation	Level of leadership effectiveness			Total	Chi-square value	P Value
	Low	Moderate	High			
Teaching Assistant	2	2	0	4	3.092	0.797
	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%		
	18.2%	8.7%	0.0%	8.9%		
Assistant Professor	5	13	5	23		
	21.7%	56.5%	21.7%	100.0%		
	45.5%	56.5%	45.5%	51.1%		
Associate Professor	2	4	3	9		
	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	100.0%		
	18.2%	17.4%	27.3%	20.0%		
Professor	2	4	3	9		
	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	100.0%		
	18.2%	17.4%	27.3%	20.0%		
Total	11	23	11	45		
	24.4%	51.1%	24.4%	100.0%		
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Since P value is greater than 0.05, there the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance. Hence concluded that there is no association between profession and leadership effectiveness. Based in row percentage,

HYPOTHESIS:

There is no significant difference between Mean Rank of Experience in years with respect to Factors of leadership effectiveness.

Kruskal-Wallis test for significant difference among Mean Rank of Experience in years with

respect to Factors of leadership effectiveness

Factors of Leadership Effectiveness	EXPERIENCE IN YEARS			Chi-Square	P Value
	0-10 years	10-20 years	20 & above		
Model the way	61.3	70.48	71	2.063	0.357
Inspire a shared vision	64.07	73.2	64	1.29	0.525
Challenge the Process	62.5	69.41	69.66	1.145	0.564
Enable others to act	63.16	75.2	64.11	2.139	0.343
Encourage the heart	59.84	77.68	68.15	4.577	0.101
Leadership	62.34	71.66	68.24	1.367	0.505

** denotes significant at 1% level

All Since P value is more than 0.05, null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level with regard to Factors of leadership effectiveness. Hence, there is no significance difference between experience in years of employees with regard to the factors of leadership effectiveness and overall leadership effectiveness.

HYPOTHESIS

There is no association between Gender and Level of leadership effectiveness.

Chi-square test for association between Gender and Level leadership effectiveness

Gender	Level of Leadership Effectiveness			Chi Square Test	P Value
	Low	Moderate	High		
Male	9 (14.10%) {27.30%}	37 (57.80%) {57.80%}	18 (28.10%) {52.90%}	8.434	0.15
Female	24 (35.80%) {72.70%}	27 (40.30%) {42.20%}	16 (23.90%) {47.10%}		
Total	33 (25.20%) {100.00%}	64 (48.90%) {100.00%}	34 (26.00%) {100.00%}		

* Denotes significant at 5% level

The value within () refers to Row Percentage,

The value within { } refers to Column Percentage

Since P value is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance. Hence, it may be concluded that there is no association between gender and level of leadership effectiveness in employees. Based on row percentage, 14.10% of male have low level leadership effectiveness, 28.10% of male have high level of leadership effectiveness whereas for female employees 35.8 % belongs to low level of leadership effectiveness and 23.9% belongs to high level of leadership effectiveness. Hence, majority of male employees have high level of leadership effectiveness and majority of female employees have low level of leadership effectiveness

HYPOTHESIS

There is no relationship between Factors of Employee engagement of Employees

Karl Pearson Correlation Coefficient between Factors of employee engagement of Employees

Factors of Leadership Effectiveness	Model the way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart	Leadership Effectiveness
Model the way	1	.889**	.914**	.952**	.933**	.971**
Inspire a shared vision		1	.909**	.881**	.901**	.948**
Challenge the process			1	.907**	.922**	.963**
Enable others to act				1	.942**	.970**
Encourage the Heart					1	.975**
Leadership Effectiveness						1

**** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

Correlation Coefficient between the model the way and enable others to act is 0.952 which indicate $(0.952^2 = 0.906)$ 90.6 percentage positive relationships between the model the way and enable others to act and is significant at 1% level.

Correlation Coefficient between Inspire a Shared Vision and Challenge the Process is 0.907 which indicate $(0.907^2 = 0.863)$ 86.3 percentage positive relationships between the Inspire a Shared Vision and Challenge the Process and is significant at 1% level.

Correlation Coefficient between Challenge the Process and Enable Others to Act is 0.909 which indicate $(0.909^2 = 0.823)$ 82.3 percentage positive relationships between the Challenge the Process and Enable Others to Act and is significant at 1% level.

Correlation Coefficient between Enable Others to Act and Encourage the Heart is 0.942 which indicate $(0.942^2 = 0.887)$ 88.7 percentage positive relationships between the Enable Others to Act and Encourage the Heart and is significant at 1% level.

Results

In this study the Leadership Practices Inventory was utilized to obtain the self-appraisals of the sample of respondents, were obtained on each leadership aspect. To test the unwavering quality of these scales, Cronbach Alpha scores were determined. High Alpha scores were obtained for the self-appraisals (0.97) and from this it very well may be reasoned that the dependability of the evaluations acquired through the Leadership Practices Inventory can be considered as being great - normally an Alpha score of 0.7 is viewed as good (Garson, 2010).

The next step in data processing was to calculate and compare the numerical indicators of leadership effectiveness that were needed to address each research hypothesis with regard to the factors of leadership effectiveness.

In addition, the following detailed findings were made. It was found that leadership effectiveness:

1. Indicate significant difference between male and female of employees with regard to the factors of leadership effectiveness
2. Indicate significant difference between unmarried and married employees with regard to the factors of leadership effectiveness.

3. Indicate significant difference between unmarried and married employees with regard to the factors of leadership effectiveness.
4. Indicate significant difference among Age Group in years of employees with regard factors of model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, encourage others to act and overall leadership effectiveness.
5. Indicate significant difference among the age group in years of employees with regard to the factor enable others to act on leadership effectiveness.
6. Indicate no significant difference in employees with regard to profession on the factors of leadership effectiveness
7. Indicate no significant difference in factors of leadership effectiveness with regard to education
8. Indicate no significant difference in factors of leadership effectiveness with regard to experience
9. Indicate the factors of leadership effectiveness are equally distributed
10. Indicate **no association between profession and factors of leadership**
11. Indicate significant positive relationships between the model the way and enable others to act
12. Indicate significant positive relationships between the Inspire a Shared Vision and Challenge the Process
13. Indicate significant positive relationships between the Challenge the Process and Enable Others to Act
14. Indicate significant positive relationships between the Enable Others to Act and is Encourage the Heart

Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the leadership effectiveness in the context of higher educational institutions. More specifically, the research set out to explore the patterns of interaction regarding the leadership behaviour relating to various aspects of leadership effectiveness. **The findings confirmed that the highest leadership effectiveness ratings were found on the dimension 'Enabling others to act', but whilst the lowest on 'Inspiring a shared vision'.**

References

1. Alicke, M.D., Klotz, M.L., Breitenbecher, D.L., Yurak, T.J., & Vredenburg, D.S. (1995). Personal contact, individuation, and the better-than-average-effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 804-825.
2. Antonacopoulou, E.P. (2006). The relationship between individual and organizational learning: New evidence from managerial learning practices. *Management Learning*, 37(4), 455-473.
3. Astin, W.A., & Astin, H. S. (2000). Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change.
4. Atwater, L.E., & Yammarino, F.J. (1992). Does self-other agreement on leadership perceptions moderate the validity of leadership and performance predictions? *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 141-164.
5. Atwater, L.E., Brett, J.F., & Waldman, D. (2003). Understanding the benefits and risks of multisource feedback within the leadership development process. In S.E. Murphy & R.E. Riggio (Eds.), *The future of leadership development*, (pp. 89-106). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
6. Barling, J.F., Slater, F.J., & Kelloway, E.K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: an exploratory study. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 21(2), 157-161.
7. Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M.M. Chermers & R. Anyman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions*, New York: Free Press.

8. Bass, B.M., & Yammarino, F.I. (1991). Congruence of self and others' leadership rating of naval officers for understanding successful performance. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 40(4), 437-354.
9. Bateman, T.S., & Snell, S.A. (2002). *Management: Competing in the new era*: 5th edn. New York: Irwin McGraw Hill.
10. Baumeister, R.F., & Bushman, B.J. (2008). *Social Psychology and Human Nature*. Belmont, USA: Thomson Wadsworth.
11. Becker, L.R., Beukes, L.D., Botha, A., Botha, A.C., Botha, J.J., Botha, M., et al. (2004). The impact of university incorporation on college lecturers. *Higher Education*, 48, 153-172.
12. Bosch, A. (2006). The effect of a merger in higher education on staff members: the importance of change management. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg.
13. Boyatzis, R.E. (2007). Developing emotional intelligence through coaching for leadership, professional and occupational excellence. In R. Bar-On, J.G. Maree & M.J. Elias (Eds.), *Educating people to be emotionally intelligent* (pp. 155-168). Johannesburg: Heinemann Publishers (PTY).
14. Brennan, G. (2005). Developing a dynamic school culture: The role of the school principal. Masters thesis, University of Calgary.
15. Brutus, S., Fleenor, J., & Tisak, J. (1999). Exploring the link between rating congruence and managerial effectiveness, *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 16(4), 308-322.
16. Buono, A., & Bowditch, J. (1989). *The human side of mergers and acquisitions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
17. Carlopio, J., Andrewartha, G., & Armstrong, H. (2005). *Developing Management Skills: A comprehensive guide for leaders*, 3rd edn. Australia: Pearson Education.
18. Chambers, J.R., & Windschitl, P.D. (2004). Biases in social comparative judgements: The role of non-motivated factors in above-average and comparative-optimism effects. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 813-838.
19. Chen, X., Ender, P., Mitchell, M. and Wells, C. (2003). *Regression with SPSS*. Retrieved July 28, 2010, from <http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/spss/webbooks/reg/default.htm>
20. Church, A.H. (1997). Managerial self-awareness in high performing individuals in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 281-292.
21. Detweiler-Bedell, B., Detweiler-Bedell, J.B., & Salovey, P. (2006). Mood-congruent perceptions of success depend on self-other framing. *Cognition and Emotion*, 20(2), 196-216.
22. Dulewicz, V., & Higgs, M. (2005). Assessing leadership styles and organisational context. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(2), 105-123.
23. Duval, T.S., & Silvia, P.J. (2002). Self-awareness, probability of improvement, and the self-serving bias, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(1), 49-61.
24. Fleenor, J.W., McCauley, C.D., & Brutus, S. (1996). Self-other rating agreement and leader effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(4), 487-506.
25. Fletcher, C., & Bailey, C. (2003). Assessing self-awareness: some issues and methods. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(5), 395-404.
26. Garson, G.D. (2010). *Reliability Analysis* North Carolina State University. Public Administration Program. <http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/reliab.htm#alpha>
27. Godshalk, V.M., & Sosik, J.J. (2000). Does mentor-protégé agreement on mentor leadership behaviour influence the quality of a mentoring relationship? *Group & Organization management*, 25, 291-317.
28. Goleman, D. (1998). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 93-103.
29. Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2003). *The seven principles of sustainable leadership*. International Centre for Educational Change, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.
30. Harris, A., Day, C., Hopkins, D., Hadfield, M., Hargreaves, A., & Chapman, C. (2003). *Effective leadership for school improvement*. New York and London: Routledge.

31. Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (2001). *The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)*. Facilitator's Guide, 2nd edn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
32. Krishnan, V.R. (2003). Power and moral leadership: role of self-other agreement. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 24(6), 345-351.
33. London, M. (2002). *Leadership Development: Paths to self-insight and professional growth*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
34. Maree, J.G., & Eiselen, R.J. (2004). The emotional intelligence profile of academics in a merger setting. *Education and Urban Society*, 36(4), 482-504.
35. Martin, A. (2005). *The Changing Nature of Leadership*. Retrieved September 5, 2008, from <http://www.ccl.org>
36. Mayer, J.D., & Geher, G. (1996). Emotional intelligence and the identification of emotion, *Intelligence*, 22, 89-113.
37. McCarthy, A.M., & Garavan, T.N. (1999). Developing self-awareness in the managerial career development process: the value of 360-degree feedback and the MBTI. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 23(9), 437-445.
38. McCroskey, S. (2008). The Leadership Challenge - for educational administrators, *Academic Leadership*, 6(3). Retrieved May 23, 2010, from http://www.academicleadership.org/emperical_research/468.shtml
39. Mclagan, P. (2002). *Change is everybody's business*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
40. Nisbett, R., & Ross, L. (1980). *Human inference: Strategies and short comings of social judgement*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
41. Seale, O. (2004). Rooting for management capacity in South African higher education. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.hesda.org.uk/activities/vents/sdev2004/workshop7.doc>
42. Shaughnessy, J.J., & Zechmeister, E.B. (1997). *Research methods in psychology*. (4th edn.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
43. Sosik, J., & Megerian, L. (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance - the role of self-other agreement on transformational leadership perceptions, *Group and Organisation management*, 24(3), 367-390.
44. Sosik, J.J., (2001). Self-Other agreement on charismatic leadership. *Group and Organization Management*, 26(4), 484-511.
45. Strauss, J.P. (2005). Multi-source perspectives of self-esteem, performance ratings, and source agreement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(6), 462-482.
46. Tekleab, A.G., Sims, H.P., Yun, S., Tesluk, P.E., & Cox, J. (2008). Are we on the same page? Effects of self-awareness of empowering and transformational leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14(3), 185-201. Doi: 10.1177/1071791907311069.
47. Van Ameijde, J.D.J., Nelson, P.C., Billsberry, J., & Van Meurs, N. (2009). Improving leadership in Higher Education Institutions: a distributed perspective. *Higher Education*, doi: 10.1007/s10734-009-9224-y.
48. Van Velsor, E., Taylor, S., & Leslie, J.B. (2009). An examination of the relationships among self-perception accuracy, self-awareness, gender, and leadership effectiveness. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2-3), 249-263.
49. Yammarino, F.J., & Atwater, L.E. (1997). Do managers see themselves as others see them? Implications for self-other rating agreement for human resources management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 25(4), 35-44.
50. Zaccaro, S. J., Kemp, C., & Bader, P. (2004). Leader traits and attributes. In J. Antonakis, A.T. Cainciolo & R.J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 101-124), Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.



EARN YOUR MBA

WWW.IIMPS.IN



Accreditation & Ranking



UGC / NCTE Approved.

INFO@IIMPS.IN

☎ 011-41005174

R
S
E
A
R
C
H
G
A
T
E
W
A
Y

STOP PLAGIARISM



Arogyam Ayurveda
Holistic Healing through herbs



A
R
O
G
Y
A
M
O
N
L
I
N
E

PARIVARTAN PSYCHOLOGY CENTER



COLOR PSYCHOLOGY : HOW COLOR AFFECT YOUR CHILD



- BLUE** Calms your Child's Mind & Body
- YELLOW** Promotes Concentration, Stimulates the Memory
- PINK** Evokes Empathy, makes your Child Calm
- RED** Excites and energizes your Child's body
- GREEN** Improves Reading speed and Comprehension

www.parivartan4u.com



Confuse about your children's future?



Shri Param Hans Education & Research Foundation Trust
www.SPHERT.org

भारतीय भाषा, शिक्षा, साहित्य एवं शोध

ISSN 2321 – 9726

WWW.BHARTIYASHODH.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
MANAGEMENT SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY**

ISSN – 2250 – 1959 (O) 2348 – 9367 (P)

WWW.IRJMST.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
COMMERCE, ARTS AND SCIENCE**

ISSN 2319 – 9202

WWW.CASIRJ.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
MANAGEMENT SOCIOLOGY & HUMANITIES**

ISSN 2277 – 9809 (O) 2348 - 9359 (P)

WWW.IRJMSSH.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF SCIENCE
ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY**

ISSN 2454-3195 (online)

WWW.RJSET.COM



**INTEGRATED RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
MANAGEMENT, SCIENCE AND INNOVATION**

ISSN 2582-5445

WWW.IRJMSSI.COM

