Full Length Article

A Study of Emotional Intelligence Based Instructional Leadership Styles and related Indicators at University Level in Pakistan

Irfan Bashir[1], Usman Khalil[2], Uzma Perveen[3], Zainab Taiyyeba

[1] Head Dept. of Education, Lahore Institute of future Education
[2] Associate Professor, Dept. of Education, University of Management and Technology Lahore
[3] Research Officer, National Accreditation Council for Teacher Education (NACTE) Pakistan
[4] Ph.D. Scholar, Science Technology & Innovation Policy, MUISTD Jamshoro

A B S T R A C T

The paper aimed to explore the use of different indicators of Emotional Intelligence based six leadership styles by the Heads of the Departments (HoDs) of Higher Education Institutes of Pakistan. Furthermore, the purpose was to compare self-report of HoDs regarding leadership styles and opinion of the faculty about leadership styles used by HoDs. This descriptive research used a random sampling technique to select 120 HoDs and 240 faculty members from various faculties and departments of 5 public and 5 private Sector universities of Punjab. The study used 5 point Likert Scale questionnaires based on Goleman's leadership styles both for faculty and Heads of the Departments. Results of the study showed the difference between self-reported leadership styles of HoDs and opinion of the faculty. The study mainly suggested leadership courses and training for Heads of the Departments; strong and free communication between HoDs and the faculty; and reflective practices by Heads of the Departments.

Key Words: Instructional Leadership, Higher Education, University Academic Leadership, Emotional Intelligence

1. INTRODUCTION

Leadership is considered as the backbone of any organization that increases the effectiveness of setups. This effectiveness is manifold especially at the Universities which are the highest bodies of knowledge generation. Pakistan, a developing country, has 177 public and private sector universities and degree awarding institutes (HEC,

2016). The knowledge production, teaching-learning and research culture in the universities mainly depend on the university academic leadership, particularly the HoDs who are real instructional leaders.

Various leadership styles and theories have emerged during last 5 decades (Northouse, 2013). The most recent are the concept of Instructional Leadership (IL) and Emotional Intelligence (EI) based leadership. Leadership plays an important role in every sphere of life; and its importance is increased when it is about education, teaching, and learning, specifically in the higher education. Numerous leadership theories, styles, and models have been discussed in the literature; and the latest emergence is of Emotional Intelligence (EI) and leadership styles by Goleman (1998). In the survey of literature traces of work on higher educational leadership in Pakistan are found but no significant work has been carried out in the area of emotional intelligence (EI) based instructional leadership. There is a space for research based on Goleman's leadership styles at university instructional leadership level.

Statement of the Problem:

The study focuses on exploring the use of different indicators of Emotional Intelligence based leadership styles by the HoDs of Higher Education Institutes of Pakistan, and to compare self-report of HoDs regarding leadership styles and opinion of the faculty about leadership styles used by HoDs.

Objectives of the study are to:

1. Find out the most practiced and the least practiced indicators of various leadership styles by the Heads of the Departments of universities of Pakistan.
2. Find out the self-reported leadership styles of the Heads of the Departments and views of the faculty about leadership styles of their HoDs.

Hypotheses:

$H0_1$: There is no significant difference between the self-reported instructional leadership styles of the HoDs and opinion of their faculty in universities of Pakistan.

Delimitations of the Study:

The study was delimited only to the HoDs of the academic departments/ centers/

colleges of the universities in the Punjab province. Leadership styles investigated in this study were based on emotional intelligence based leadership styles of Goleman (1998).

Significance Study

The results of the study may be useful for the curriculum of educational leadership. It may also prove useful for educational leaders at University level in Pakistan

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Various definitions of leadership are available in the literature. The most common among them are the concepts with reference to the characteristics, traits, responsibilities, styles and roles of a leader. The early formation of the charismatic leadership theory is traced from the work of Max Weber (1947). Great Man Theory believes that the ability for leadership is an inherent, gifted and inbuilt quality of a leader. Trait Theory emerged during the 1930s, (Northouse, 2013) and is based on the idea that there are inborn attributes in the leaders that make them unchallenging suitable to leadership. Leadership Behaviors Theories stem from two streams: interpersonal relationships and task-oriented behaviors (Yukl, 2014).

Leader-Member-Exchange (LMX) theory sees leadership as linkages between leaders and workplace units (Northouse, 2013). Leadership Styles approach may be traced in the ideas of Kurt Lewin (1939); McGregor's (1960), Michigan State University Studies of Managerial Grid; and Ohio State University Studies, Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), (Northouse, 2013).

Goleman (2013), sees Emotional Intelligence as the most important factor in discriminating between the good and not so good leaders. In a general sense, Goleman's major work is based on the argumentation about the following six different leadership styles (Business Psychologist, 2012): 1) *The Visionary Leadership* 2) *The Coaching Leadership* creates 3) *The Affiliative Leadership* 4) *The Democratic Leadership* 5) *The Pacesetting Leadership* 6) *The Commanding/Coercive Leadership*

Instructional leadership theory emerged after the 1st half of the 20th century taking its roots from teacher leadership (Hallinger, 2009). Instructional Leadership may also be taken as an act of leading the teaching staff. They emphasize viewing the role of Heads of the Departments as vital to the improved instruction and smooth management.

Hallinger (2009) conceptualize Instructional Leadership includes defining the mission, managing program, promoting academic climate.

Emotional Intelligence is considered to be a combination of characteristics that are non-cognitive as well as of the competencies and skills enabling a person to succeed in meeting the demands made by him by the environment and also by the environmental pressures (Merkowitz & Earnest 2013).

Higher education contributes to the achievement of social tasks of increasing public responsibility, social harmony, and a more compassionate society. (National Education Policy, Pakistan (NEP, 2009). Rehman (2011) is the view that higher education receives a cold shoulder and mismanagement in the name of leadership that has resulted in the falling standards of academic excellence. Iqbal and Iqbal (2011) argue that a strong relationship exists between the leadership role and the quality of higher education. Mahmood (2007) using a three-dimensional model based on Blake and Mounton (1985) Managerial Grid identified 8 styles of the Heads.

The literature discussed above clearly indicates the current situation of instructional leadership styles globally; and points out a serious situation of educational leadership in Pakistan. The literature above also establishes the basis for the researcher's development of a "self-report" and "self-other report" instructional leadership style questionnaires. The absence of any significant researchers on university HoDs as instructional leaders is also established from the literature review.

Research Methodology: Population, Sampling and Research Tools:

The population of the study included all Academic HoDs of 177 universities and higher education institutes of Pakistan. The study was delimited to the province of the Punjab with a sampling frame of 24 universities. Using multistage sampling technique, a sample of 120 (60 public + 60 private sector) HoDs was selected from 5 public and 5 private sector universities. These universities included University of the Punjab, Govt. College University Lahore, Govt. College University Faisalabad, University of Sargodha, University of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, University of Management and Technology, University of Central Punjab, University of Lahore, Minhaj University and Forman Christian College University Lahore. Two faculty members (n=240), working

under each sample head of the department were also randomly selected.

A 5 point Likert scale questionnaire was used as a tool for the collection of data both from HoDs and Faculty. Both the questionnaires had 54 items in each and were based on Daniel Goleman's Emotional Intelligence based leadership styles. The alpha reliability values of both the tools were 0.86.

1. Data Analysis and Discussion

Table 1. *HoDs Practices and the Perceptions of the Faculty on the Coaching Leadership Style*

Sr.#	Indicator	Head of Department (n=120)		Faculty (n=240)	
		M	*(%)*	*M*	*(%)*
1.	Listening to the subordinates when they want	4.66	93.17	4.35	87.00
2.	Delegation of powers	2.61	52.17	2.95	59.08
3.	Compromising on quality of work	3.07	61.33	3.30	65.92
4.	Judging emotional condition	4.06	81.17	3.77	75.42
5.	Imparting of skills	1.94	38.83	2.30	46.00
6.	Clearly defining roles and tasks	4.43	88.67	4.10	82.08
7.	Involving staff in decision making	4.33	86.67	3.81	76.17
8.	Challenging assignments	2.59	51.83	2.85	57.00
9.	Trust leads to loyalty	4.30	86.00	3.95	79.08

Table 1 reveals that listening to the subordinate, judging emotional condition, clearly defining roles and task, involving staff in decision making and trusting staff to develop loyalty have >3.5 (>70%) mean scores. It means that these indicators are the most practiced by Heads of the Departments of universities in the Pakistani context. While other indicators have <3.5 mean scores.

Table 2. *HoDs Practices and Perceptions of the Faculty on Indicators of Affiliative Leadership Style*

Sr.#	Indicator	Head of Department (n=120)		Faculty (n=240)	
		M	*%*	*M*	*%*
1.	Creating harmony	4.47	89.33	3.91	78.25
2.	Staff is not important	2.13	42.50	2.41	48.17
3.	Communicating expectations	4.23	84.67	3.97	79.42
4.	Managing conflicts	4.26	85.17	3.93	78.67
5.	Building well-connected teams	4.23	84.67	3.95	79.08
6.	Ignoring poor performance	2.43	48.67	2.65	52.92
7.	Building relationships in the workplace	4.06	81.17	3.63	72.67
8.	Motivating staff for certain tasks	2.04	40.83	2.42	48.33
9.	Preferring emotional needs over work needs	2.72	54.50	2.89	57.75

Table 2 shows that creating harmony, communicating expectations, managing conflicts, building well-connected teams, and building relationships in the workplace are the most practiced indicators as all have more than 3.5 men and 70% scores both by the Heads of the Departments and the faculty. While other indicators have less than 3.5 mean and 70% scores.

Table 3. *Practices of HoDs and Perceptions of the Faculty on Democratic Leadership Style*

Sr.#	Indicator	Head of Department (n=120)		Faculty (n=240)	
		M	*%*	*M*	*%*
1.	Listening to the staff eagerly	4.27	85.33	3.83	76.58
2.	Working as a team member	4.41	88.17	4.10	82.08
3.	Believing in synergic approach	4.07	81.33	3.67	73.42
4.	Avoid learning from staff	2.02	40.33	2.46	49.25
5.	Neglecting low efficiency	3.18	63.67	3.15	63.00
6.	Hardly manage conflict by taking suggestions	2.64	52.83	2.88	57.50
7.	Valuing creativity	4.41	88.17	3.92	78.50
8.	Allowing staff to set priorities under guidance.	4.06	81.17	3.80	76.08
9.	Letting staff exercise self-direction committed to the departmental objectives	3.97	79.33	3.74	74.75

Table 3 shows that listening to subordinates eagerly, working as a team member, believing in a synergic approach, valuing creativity, allowing staff to set their priorities under the guidance and letting staff exercise self-direction committed to departmental objectives have more than 3.5 men and 70% scores; so these are the most practiced indicators. While other indicators have less than 3.5 mean and 70% scores both by the Heads of the Departments and the faculty members.

Table 4. *HoDs' Practices and Perceptions of the Faculty on Pace Setting Leadership Style*

Sr.#	Indicator	HoD (n=120)		Faculty (n=240)	
		M	*%*	*M*	*%*
1.	Being goal oriented	4.50	90.00	4.10	81.92
2.	Exemplifying high standards	4.23	84.50	4.02	80.33
3.	Give reward to staff for taking initiative	3.73	74.67	3.29	65.75
4.	Considering other persons' feelings	2.09	41.83	2.45	48.92
5.	Setting high standards of performance	4.32	86.50	3.84	76.75
6.	Take over when the staff seems to be in trouble	4.05	81.00	3.78	75.50
7.	Giving feedback	2.25	45.00	2.51	50.17
8.	Believe that staff is self-motivated	3.68	73.50	3.59	71.75

| 9. | Demanding more from poor performers | 3.68 | 73.67 | 3.52 | 70.33 |

Table 4 reveals that being goal oriented, exemplifying high standards, setting high standards of performance, taking control when staff is in trouble, believing that staff is self-motivated and demanding more from poor performers are the most practiced indicators($M >3.5$, % >70) according to the both the Heads of the Departments and the faculty. Other indicators are less practiced (M<3.5, % < 70). There is a conflict between Heads of the Departments and the faculty opinion on giving a reward to staff for taking initiative; Heads of the Departments report it as the most practiced indicator (M>3.5, %>70) and faculty considers it less practiced indicator(M<3.5, %<70).

Table 5.*HoDs' Practices and Perceptions of the Faculty on Commanding Leadership Style*

Sr.#	Indicator	HoD (n=120)		Faculty (n=240)	
		M	*%*	*M*	%
1.	Preferring tight control over staff	3.10	62.00	3.17	63.33
2.	Getting tasks done by clear directives	4.00	80.00	3.70	73.92
3.	Not using designation powers for certain jobs	3.15	63.00	3.11	62.17
4.	Resolving crisis by orders	2.79	55.83	3.08	61.58
5.	Not taking initiatives	2.14	42.83	2.56	51.17
6.	Retaining the final decision-making authority	3.58	71.67	3.60	72.08
7.	Liking leadership position over subordinates.	3.00	60.00	3.24	64.83
8.	Expecting full compliance of orders	3.76	75.17	3.68	73.67
9.	Behavior being cold with staff	2.60	52.00	3.07	61.50

Table 5 shows the most practiced and the least practiced indicators of commanding leadership style according to the self-reported data of the Heads of the Departments and opinions of the faculty. Data reveal that getting the task done by clear directives, retaining the final decision making authority with Heads of the Departments, and expecting full compliance of orders are most practiced indicators as these have (M>3.5, %>70) both by the Heads of the Departments and the faculty. While others are least practiced indicators according to the both Heads of the Departments and the faculty.

Table 6.*HoDs Practices and Perceptions of the Faculty on Indicators of the Visionary Leadership Style*

Sr.#	Indicator	HoD (n=120)		Faculty (n=240)	
		M	*%*	*M*	*%*
1.	Motivating staff towards departmental objectives	4.46	89.17	4.06	81.25
2.	Developing commitment to departmental goals	4.48	89.67	4.13	82.67
3.	Not liking to guide working as team member	2.32	46.50	2.50	50.00
4.	Guiding staff related to their duties and tasks	4.27	85.33	3.96	79.17
5.	Opportunity to choose duties	2.51	50.17	2.80	56.08
6.	Sharing vision with staff	4.48	89.67	3.95	79.08
7.	Providing information to staff as and when they need	4.43	88.67	4.03	80.67
8.	Planning keeping future in mind	4.55	91.00	4.16	83.25
9.	Asking staff to imagine the results of planning	3.84	76.83	3.88	77.67

Table 6 shows that there are only two less practiced indicators ($M < 3.5$, $\% < 70$): not liking to guide others when working as a team member, and not giving staff the opportunity to choose their duties on their own. While all other indicators have >3.5 mean and $>70\%$ scores.

Table 7. *Difference between the HoDs and the faculty members regarding leadership styles*

Leadership Style	HoD (n=120) *M(SD)*	Faculty (n=240) *M(SD)*	t	P
Coaching	31.99(3.40)	31.39(4.70)	1.253	.211
Affiliative	30.58(3.92)	29.76(4.59)	1.659	.098
Democratic	33.02(3.54)	31.56(5.12)	2.801	.005
Pace Setting	32.53(3.70)	31.07(5.02)	2.826	.005
Commanding	28.12(5.32)	29.21(5.61)	-1.762	.079
Visionary/Autocratic	35.35(4.01)	33.49(5.62)	3.232	.001

Table 7 shows that there is a significant difference between mean scores of the Heads of the Departments ($M=35.35$, $SD=4.01$,) and opinion of the faculty ($M=33.49$, $SD=5.621$) regarding the visionary leadership style, Democratic Style ($M=33.02$, $SD=3.54$, $M=31.56$, $SD=5.12$) and Pace Setting Style ($M=32.53$, $SD=3.70$, $M=31.07$, $SD=5.02$) as $p < .05$. Hence the researcher fails to accept the null hypothesis. HoDs tend to report higher scores than the faculty.

3.FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Most of the indicators of coaching, democratic, commanding and affiliative leadership styles have more than 3.5 mean score, hence these are more practiced by the HoDs.

2. In pace-setting style considering other persons' feelings, and giving feedback to the staff are less practiced indicators.

3. Among the visionary style indicators, guiding others and opportunity for choosing duties are less practiced indicators.

4. There is a significant difference between the mean scores of the Heads of the Departments' self-reported data and the opinion of the faculty regarding various instructional leadership styles but surprisingly ratio of the scores of the faculty is consistent with the scores of the Heads of the Departments.

These results are similar to studies of Seunghyun, Deborah, Feltz & Lee (2013). Results of the coaching style are consistent with the results of Khan (2011), while findings related to pace-setting leadership style are supported by Pashiardis and Savvides (2011), Less practiced indicators of other styles have also been explored by Iqbal and Iqbal (2011).

4. RECOMMENDATIONS:

In the light of the above-mentioned findings and discussion, the following recommendations are made:

1. Heads of the Departments should avoid being commanding all the times; rather they should use this style only when its use is unavoidable during some crisis.

2. Heads of the Departments using visionary leadership style should also share the strategies of reaching the goals; they should use this style when the department needs a new direction.

3. It is highly recommended that Heads of the Departments should reflect upon their frequency of various practices; and should portray themselves as what they really are, and there is a dire need to develop an understanding between the faculty and the Heads of the Departments.

4. Authorities of higher education should arrange leadership courses for the Heads of the Departments of both the public and private sector universities.

REFERENCES

Business Psychologist. (2012). *Daniel Goleman's 6 Leadership Styles,* retrieved on May 22, 2012, from www.psych-pcs.co.uk

Goleman, D. (1998) Harvard Business Review on What Makes a Leader? Harvard Business School Press

Goleman, D. (2013). Working With Emotional Intelligence. London: Bloomsbury.

Hallinger, P. (2009). Leadership for 21st Century Schools: From Instructional Leadership to Leadership for Learning; the Hong Kong Institute of Education

Iqbal, M., & Iqbal, M.Z. (2011). Educational Leadership for Managing Quality: Problems, Issues, and Ethical Behavior. Presentation at ICQI-Lahore, 2-3 May 2011. Retrieved from http://piqc.edu.pk/casestudies/Dr_Muhammad_Iqbal_Educational

Khan, K.M. (2011). Self-Perceptions of Leadership Role of the Secondary Schools Heads towards Improvement of Standards of Education. Retrieved August 15, 2010, from http://webcache.googleusercontent.co

Lewin, K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. Journal of Social Psychology, vol.10, pp. 271-301

Mahmood, K. (2007). Least common multiple of teacher leadership styles: Implication for the classroom. Quality in Education: Teaching and leadership in challenging times, pp. 306-331.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of the enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Merkowitz, R.F. & Earnest, G. W. (2013). Emotional Intelligence: a pathway to self-understanding and improved leadership capacities. Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2006august/iw3.shtml

Murphy, J. (1987). Barriers to implementing the instructional leadership role. Canadian Administrator, 27 (3), 1-9.

National Education Policy, NEP. (2009). Ministry of Education, Pakistan.

Northouse, P.G. (2013). Leadership: theory and practice. (6th Ed.) NewDehli: Sage Publication India Pvt. Ltd.

Pashiardis, P., & Savvides, V. (2011). The Interplay between Instructional and Entrepreneurial Leadership Styles in Cyprus Rural Primary Schools; Leadership and Policy in Schools, Paul Chapman Publishing.

Rehman, A. (2011). Higher Education in Pakistan stuck in a state of disarray. The Daily Nation, retrieved from http://www.interface.edu.pk/students/Nov-08/Higher-Education-in-Pakistan.asp

Seunghyun H., Deborah L., Feltz & Lee. (2013). Emotional intelligence in coaching: Mediation effect of coaching efficacy on the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership style; International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology,11:3, 292-306, DOI: 10.1080/1612197X.2013.763489

Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization. Talcott Parsons (Ed). New York: Free Press.

Yukl, G. A. (2014).Leadership in Organizations, (8th.ed.), State University of New York, Alban