Development of leadership potential amongst higher education students in Kashmir – An evaluative study

Dr. Shaheena Akhter

Lecturer, Department of Education, Kashmir, Jammu and Kashmir, India.

Abstract
The present study was carried out to evaluate the leadership potential of undergraduate, post-graduate and professional students. A sample of 780 students from three higher levels of learning viz., under-G, Post-Graduate and professionals (Medicine, Engineering, Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences) constituted the sample. The age of the subjects was 18-25 years. The data was collected with the help of self-constructed leadership potential scale. Mean, S.D. and test of significance were calculated to find out the differences between the mean scores of Under-graduate, Post-Graduate and Professional students on leadership potential. The results reveal significant mean difference between the groups under investigation.

Keywords: Leadership Potential, Under-graduate, Post-graduate, Professional students, Higher education

1. Introduction
Education is the most powerful agency in moulding the character and determining the future of individuals and of nations. It is an integral part and basis of human life, an essential human virtue that develops human intellect and body, fashions and models him for society and cultural being. In its most comprehensive sense it aims at storing the mind of its receipt with useful knowledge and training his powers of mind and body to healthful and harmonious action. Researches have revealed that education is the most single factor in achieving rapid economic development and technological progress in creating a social order founded on the values of freedom, social justice and equal opportunity.

Thus, in the area of knowledge and development, the university education (higher education) occupies a centre stage position. It influences the social changes through opinion building, economic development through human resource development which is caused by education training and socio economic development through Research and Development. The Commissions have formulated the training of character, development of qualities for character, citizenship in democratic social order, training for leadership and improvement of vocation efficiency.

According to Secondary Education Commission (1952-53) development of qualities of leadership is important for successful functioning of democracy. Leadership involves a group process with the leader as the main directive element. A transactional view of leadership effectiveness emphasizes the leader follower relationship in two major respects. First, it deals with the responsiveness of the group in gaining specified goals and second it means securing those goals with the greatest possible consideration for the individual comprising the group. Leadership means achieving a productive use of human and material resources at or beyond potential. It contributes to organizational effectiveness. Qualities of leadership are not so much attributes of the leader as they are requirements of the leader's role. Leader's regularity and practicability of behaviour is important in smoothing ongoing interaction. Quality of behavioural stability alone does not judge the leader's effectiveness. In addition, he should possess the emotional stability. The leader who has ethical and moral strength is fully committed to the goals of the organization and his role in accomplishing these goals. The higher education must impart education for leadership. Students should also be trained to be able to own the responsibilities or leadership in various fields of life, namely social, cultural or industrial, political etc.

The student is attracted by the protest movements, riots and demonstrations. To some students these represent real commitment and leadership. Many are eager to take an active part in social reforms and revolution. As a higher level student, he is exposed to crowded schools and then moves into a crowded labour market. At the same time, less and less independence of choice and activity confronts him. He seeks and desires a feeling of value in the scheme of things, a sense of achieving and belonging which brings identification with these movements, activities and individuals. The higher education student has the opportunity to provide the positive leadership and guidance so critically needed at this period.

2. Objectives of the study
1. To measure the leadership qualities of higher education students
2. To compare Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on Leadership Qualities.
3. To compare Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on various dimensions of Leadership Qualities.

3. Methodology and Procedure
Sample
A sample of 780 students from three higher levels of learning viz. Under-graduates, Post-graduates and Professionals (Medicine, Engineering, Agriculture & Veterinary sciences) constituted the sample. The sample included 120 respondents from U.G. level, 360 from P.G. level and 300 from various professional Institutions. The sample institutions were identified on the basis of random sampling from the list of institutions/colleges falling under the jurisdiction of Kashmir University (KU), Sher-i-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology (SKUAST) and National Institute of Technology (NIT) deemed University. The entire sample

was selected from the Kashmir Division of Jammu and Kashmir State. The students were in the age group of 18-25 years.

4. Description of Tools
The tool for the present study was selected and prepared in a manner to ensure the accomplishment of objective of the study. The investigator constructed & used the following tool for the collection of the data.
1. Leadership Potential Scale (LPS) by Prof. N.A. Nadeem and Shaheena Akhter
It consists of six major areas like, Interpersonal Relations, Understanding of People, Behavioral and Emotional Stability, Values and Ethical Inculcator, Adequacy of Communication and Operation as a Citizen. The reliability of the leadership potential scale were calculated by upper and lower and split– half reliability. The validity coefficient of leadership potential was obtained through intrinsic validity and item validity.

5. Analysis and Interpretation

The Data on the basis of objectives set forth were analyzed through various statistical techniques found suitable for drawing inferences and presented with the help of tables. The 't' test was employed in order to measure the significance.

6. Qualities of Leadership
The analysis and the interpretation of qualities of leadership have been done along the flowing lines:
1. Area-wise percentage comparison of Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on Leadership Potential Scale.
2. Comparison of Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on dimensions of Leadership Potential Scale (i.e. Interpersonal Relations, Understanding of People, Behavioral and Emotional Stability, Ethical and Moral Inculcator, Adequacy of Communication and Operation as a Citizen).
3. Significance of Mean Difference between Under-graduate, Post-graduate & Professional students on Leadership Potential Scale & Dimensions of Leadership Potential Scale.

Table 1: Significance Comparison of Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on Leadership Potential Scale

S. No.	Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
1	U. G.	120	84.78	14.16	0.29	Not Significant
	P.G.	360	85.25	17.07		
2	U. G.	120	84.78	14.16	1.50	Not Significant
	Professionals	300	87.06	14.13		
3	Professionals	300	87.06	14.13	1.50	Not Significant.
	P. G	360	85.25	17.07		

Table 1 shows the comparison of Under-graduate students V/s Post-graduate, Under-graduate students V/s Professional students and Professional students V/s Post-graduate students on 'Leadership Potential Scale'. The results reveal that all the three comparisons turned out to be insignificant at both (0.01) and (0.05) levels. Table clearly indicates that the mean value of Post-graduate students (85.25) is higher in comparison to Under-graduate students with mean score (84.78). This means Post-graduate students show higher leadership potential in comparison to Under-graduate students. Likewise, the mean value of Professional students is higher (87.06) in comparison to Under-graduate students with mean value (84.78). This means that Professional students show higher leadership potential in comparison to Under-graduate and Post-graduate students.

Table 2: Significance Comparison of Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on 'Interpersonal Relations' Dimension of Leadership Potential Scale

S. No.	Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	level of significance
1	U. G.	120	10.60	3.26	1.69	Not Significant
	P.G.	360	11.16	3.55		
2	U. G.	120	10.60	3.26	3.17	Significant at 0.01 level
	Professionals	300	11.68	3.58		
3	Professionals	300	11.68	3.58	2.00	Significant at 0.05 level
	P. G	360	11.16	3.55		

Table 2 gives an account of means, 'S.D's and 't'-values of the three groups (i.e.) Under-graduate students V/s Post-graduate students, Under-graduate students V/s Professional students and Professional students V/s Post-graduate students on 'Interpersonal Relations' the dimension of Leadership Potential Scale. A quick look at the table reveals that there is no significant difference between boys and girls of Under-graduate and Post-graduate students on interpersonal relations dimension of Leadership Potential Scale. The results show that boys and girls turned out to be significant at 0.01 level. Similarly, the Professional and Post-graduate comparison of boys and girls turned out to be significant at 0.05 level. The results reveal that Post-graduate and Professional students show higher mean value (11.16 and 11.68 respectively) in comparison to Under-graduate students with mean value 10.60. This implies that Post-graduate and Professional students show higher knowledge of interpersonal relations on Leadership Potential Scale in comparison to Under-graduate students.

Table 3: Significance Comparison of Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on 'Understanding of People' Dimension of Leadership Potential Scale

S. No.	Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
1	U. G.	120	22.48	4.20	3.80	Significant at 0.01 level
	P.G.	360	24.19	5.14		
2	U. G.	120	22.48	4.20	0.39	Not Significant
	Professionals	300	22.69	679		
3	Professionals	300	22.69	6.79	3.26	Significant at 0.01 level
	P. G	360	24.19	5.14		

Table 3 shows the comparison of Under-graduate students V/s Post-graduate students, Under-graduate students v/s Professional students and Professional students V/s Post-graduate-graduate students, on 'Understanding of People' the dimension of Leadership Potential Scale. The results reveal that out of the three comparisons, the comparison between Undergraduate and Post-graduate students and Professional students and Post-graduate students turned out to be significant at (0.01) level. It has been found that Post-graduate students show higher mean value (24.19) in comparison to Under-graduate students with mean value (22.48). This implies Post-graduate students show higher understanding of people in comparison to Under-graduate students. The table further shows that there is no significant difference between Under-graduate and Professional students on understanding of people dimension of Leadership Potential Scale. The mean value of Under-graduate students (22.48) and Professional students (22.69) has been found lower in comparison to Professional students with mean value (24.19). This implies that Under-graduate and Professional students show lower knowledge of understanding of people on Leadership Potential Scale in comparison to Post-graduate students.

Table 4: Significance Comparison of Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on 'Behavioral and Emotional Stability' Dimension of Leadership Potential Scale

S. No.	Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
1	U. G.	120	13.88	3.56	1.94	Not Significant
	P.G.	360	13.18	3.46		
2	U. G.	120	13.88	3.56	1.18	Not Significant
	Professionals	300	14.32	3.81		
3	Professionals	300	14.32	3.81	4.38	Significant at 0.01 level
	P.G	360	13.18	3.81		

The table 4 shows the significance of difference between three groups (i.e.) Under-graduate V/s Post-graduate students, Under-graduate students V/s Professional students and Professional students v/s Post-graduate students, on 'Behavioral and Emotional Stability' the Dimension of Leadership Potential Scale. The results show that there is no significant difference between Under-graduate and Post-graduate and Under-graduate and Professional students on behavioral and emotional stability dimension of Leadership Potential Scale. The results reveal that Professional students score higher mean value (14.32) in comparison to Post-graduate students in comparison to Post-graduate students with mean value (13.18). This shows Professional students in comparison to Post-graduate students show higher behavioral and emotional stability. Likewise, the mean value of Professional students is higher (14.32) in comparison to Under-graduate students with mean value (13.88). This shows that Professional students in comparison to Under-graduate students show higher behavioral and emotional stability. The results further reveal that both Under-graduate and Post-graduate students have shown similar behavioral and emotional stability.

Table 5: Significance Comparison of Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on 'Value and Ethical Inculcator' Dimension of Leadership Potential Scale

S. No.	Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
1	U. G.	120	9.03	3.45	2.96	Significant at 0.01 level
	P.G.	360	8.05	2.90		
2	U. G.	120	9.03	3.45	0.41	Not Significant
	Professionals	300	8.89	3.21		
3	Professionals	300	8.89	3.21	3.81	Significant at 0.01 level
	P. G	360	8.05	2.90		

Table 5 gives the significance of difference between the Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on 'Value and Ethical Inculcator' the dimension of Leadership Potential Scale. The results reveal that there is a significant difference between Undergraduate and Post-graduate students and Professional and Post-graduate students on value and ethical dimension of Leadership Potential Scale. The calculated value of 2.96 and 3.81 are significant at 0.01 level of significance. Since the mean of Under-graduate students is decidedly better than that of Post-graduate group, so the students from Under-graduate group have shown better performance than the Post-graduate students. The table also shows that the Under-graduate and Professional groups do not differ significantly on value and ethical inculcator dimension of Leadership Potential Scale.

Table 6: Significance Comparison of Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on 'Adequacy of Communication' Dimension of Leadership Potential Scale

S. No.	Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
1	U. G.	120	13.78	3.60	0.22	Not Significant
	P.G.	360	13.70	3.73		
2	U. G.	120	13.78	3.60	0.72	Not Significant
	Professionals	300	14.05	3.67		
3	Professionals	300	14.05	3.67	1.34	Not Significant
	P. G	360	13.70	3.73		

The above table No. 6 indicates that there is no significant difference between the three groups (i.e. Under-graduate v/s Post-graduate, Under-graduate v/s Professional and Professional v/s Post-graduate on 'Adequacy of Communication' the dimension of Leadership Potential Scale. On the basis of mean scores it has been found that Under-graduate- students in comparison to Post-graduate students show higher adequacy of communication. On the other hand, Under-graduate students in comparison to Professional students show lower adequacy of communication as per mean scores. The results also reveal that Professional students in comparison to Post-graduate students as per mean scores show higher adequacy of communication.

Table 7: Significance Comparison of Under-graduate, Post-graduate and Professional students on 'Operation as a Citizen' Dimension of Leadership Potential Scale

S. No.	Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
1	U. G.	120	15.05	3.84	0.21	Not Significant
	P.G.	360	14.96	4.70		
2	U. G.	120	15.05	3.84	1.80	Not Significant
	Professionals	300	15.81	4.57		
3	Professionals	300	15.81	4.57	2.50	Significant at 0.05 level
	P. G	360	14.96	4.70		

The above table shows the comparison of Under-graduate students V/s Post-graduate students, Under-graduate students V/s Professional students and Professional students V/s Post-graduate students, on 'Operation as a Citizen' the dimension of Leadership Potential Scale. The results show that there is no significant difference between Under-graduate and Post-graduate and Under-graduate & Professional students on operation as a citizen dimension of Leadership Potential Scale. The results show that Professional students score higher mean value (15.81) in comparison to Post-graduate students with mean value (14.96). This indicates Professional students in comparison to Post-graduate students show higher quality on operation as a citizen. The results further show a significant difference between Professional and Post-graduate students at 0.05 level of significance. The perusal of the mean scores of Under-graduate students with a mean value of 15.05 and that of Professional students with a mean value of 15.81 shows that Under-graduate and Professional students are almost same on operation as a citizen.

7. Findings
On the basis of empirical evidence discussed above, the following conclusions have been drawn:
1. The area-wise mean difference on leadership potential has shown that all the three groups i.e. under-graduate, and post-graduate, under-graduate and professional and professional and post-graduate are same on leadership potential.
2. During dimension-wise significance of mean difference, the results reveal the out of six dimensions of leadership potential, under-graduate students do not differ significantly from post-graduate students on four dimensions excluding understanding of people and value and ethical inculcator. Also under-graduate students do not differ significantly from professional students on five dimensions of leadership potential excluding interpersonal relations. However, professional students differ significantly from post-graduate students on five dimensions of leadership potential excluding adequacy of communication.

8. Educational Implications
There is a need to encourage students to involve in voluntary programme. This will develop social, social interpersonal and leadership qualities in students. Encouraging students in voluntary programme students in voluntary programmes like, scouting, girl-guiding, N.S.S., N.C.C. clubs, games and sports will enable them to solve the problems they face through their own efforts. Through these activities, the students acquire the virtues of clear thinking, resourcefulness, good judgment, tolerance, patience etc. which are essential features of a leader.

9. References
1. A.K. Rao. Leadership and its variants (I.O.T.D.) International Journal of Educational and Reviews, 2006, XXXV.
2. Anand, Trend report on secondary education. Fifth Survey of Educational research. Trend reports 1988-1992, 1: NCERT, New Delhi.
3. Anil Kumar AK. Perceived stress of teachers in relation to job satisfaction and certain personality characteristics. (Indian Educational Abstract, 2004, 2.
4. Ashok Pachauri. Principles of Education, Pragun Publications, 2006.
5. Satija BR. Trent's in education, Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi-110002 (India).

6. Balon, Daniello, Garma. Racial, ethenic and gender differences among entering college students attitudes towards leadership, culture and leader self-identification. A focus on Asian-pacific Americans.) Dissertation Abstracts International, 2004; 65(07):2509.

7. Cavins, Bryan Jeremy. The relationship between emotional, social intelligence and leadership practices among college student leaders. (Dissertation Abstracts International, 2005. 66:10.

8. Mehta DD. Development of education system in India. Tandon Publications, Book Market Ludhiana.

9. Dr. Walia JS. Development of Educational System in India. Ahim Paul Publishers NN. 11, Gopal Nagar, Jalandhar City (Punjab), 2010.

10. Dr. Chaube SP. Leadership and education. (Journal of Edutracks, 2007. 02:03.

11. Elizabeth DL. Gender distinctions in the moral and cognitive development of adults. The interaction of ways of knowing, decision making, communication and leadership behavior of women. (Dissertation Abstracts International, 1996, 57-07.

12. Erwin, Lise Ann. Women's leadership practices in student's government. Dissertation Abstracts International, 2005; 67(61):111.

13. Friedrich, Brain L. The role of leadership in building endowment at Lutheran colleges and universities: A case study comparison of three Lutheran colleges and universities in the United States. (Dissertation Abstracts International, 2006; 67(61):111.

14. Goldsmith, Carole Suzanne. Leadership for creating a learning college. A study of perceived leadership styles. (Dissertation Abstracts International, 2005; 66(07):2450.

15. Gomez, Doris. Leadership development: student specific characteristics as predictors of retention and attrition in an online doctoral leadership program. (Dissertation Abstracts International, 2005; 67(08):2899.

16. Iken, Stace L. Student leadership in higher education: Exploring educator's perceptions of and staff employed in a university setting. Dissertation Abstracts International, 66(12):4317.

17. Agarwal JC. Agarwal SP. Documentation encyclopedia of UNESCO and education (Part – I) Concept publishing Company, New Delhi-110059, 2003.

18. Rajput JS. Encyclopaedia of Indian Education 2004, 2.

19. Kampel, Donne G. Learning leadership: Women presidents of colleges and universities. (Dissertation Abstracts International, 2006; 66(12):3417.

20. Parrington Coral A. Multiple intelligences and leadership: A theoretical perspective. (Dissertation Abstracts International, 2005; 66(07):2493.

21. Paula Young. Leadership and gender is higher education. A case study. Journal of further and higher education, 2004, 28-01.

22. Vari. An exploration of factor associated with college students attitudes and beliefs about leadership. Dissertation Abstracts International, 2005; 66(02):520.