EUROPEAN
ACADEMIC
RESEARCH

Role clarity of Teachers of Government and Private Schools in relation to Leadership Style of the Principals

Dr. SUMITA VIG
Assistant Professor
IETVE, Panjab University, Chandigarh
India

Abstract:

Roles serve as the boundary between the individual and the organization. Roles represent the individual and the organization. Roles represent the expectation of the individual and the organization. Roles can thus serve to tie the individual to the organization and the organization to the individuals. When the roles are clear, when it is known what is expected, it is possible that an increased belief in self to perform the job results. According to Minda (2000), role clarity can be defined as the subjective feeling of having as much or not as much role relevant information as the person would like to have. The core values of an organization begin with its leadership, which will then evolve to a leadership style. The subordinates will be lead by these values and behaviors of leaders, such that the behavior of both employees and leaders become increasingly in line. In human organizations like schools, the principal holding the position of leader must concentrate his efforts on providing such an environment to his teachers so that each and every individual is having clarity about his roles and responsibilities being the part of school which in turn ensures the all round development and the professional growth of the staff. School principals can manipulate culture, climate and effectiveness of an organization, and those manipulations affect the role clarity of people within the organization. The present research was conducted to study the role clarity of teachers of government and private secondary schools in relation to leadership style of the principals. The study was conducted on a sample of 40 principals and 160 teachers thereby

making a final sample of 200 individuals. The results indicated that the teachers of private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) scored higher on role clarity as compared to the teachers of government secondary schools, whereas the teachers of government secondary schools working with principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) were higher on the dimension role clarity as compared to the teachers of private secondary schools working with principals of leadership style 2(consideration) . The teachers of private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) scored higher on role clarity as compared to the teachers of government secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 2(consideration), whereas, the teachers of private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 2(consideration) scored higher on role clarity as compared to the teachers of government secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 2(consideration).

Key words: Government school teachers, private school teachers, principal, leadership style, India

The first thing a person needs to know before starting on a job is the purpose of the job. The individual needs to know the objective of the job, the results expected out of job and the responsibilities that the job entails. This basic information can increase the individual's confidence in his or her self-ability to perform on the job by enabling the person to chart out an action plan towards achieving the clearly known results expected. Roles serve as the boundary between the individual and the organization. Roles represent the individual and the organization. Roles represent the expectation of the individual and the organization. Roles can thus serve to tie the individual to the organization and the organization to the individuals. When the roles are clear, when it is known what is expected, it is possible that an increased belief in self to perform the job results. According to Minda (2000), role clarity can be defined as the subjective feeling of having as much or not as much role relevant information as the person would like to have.

Each organisation has leaders and purposes. The leader of an organization ensures that associated efforts are productive. It demands the capacity to coordinate many different and conflicting types of human personalities. The core values of an organization begin with its leadership, which will then evolve to a leadership style. The subordinates will be led by these values and behaviors of leaders, such that the behavior of both employees and leaders become increasingly in line.

A leader's ability to demonstrate these behaviours will influence how employees perceive the tasks presented to them by their leader (Wilson *et al.*, 2004). According to Greco, Laschinger and Wong (2006), employees will be empowered if a leader enhances the meaningfulness of work, allows participation in decision-making, facilitates the accomplishment of tasks, communicates confidence in high performance and provides autonomy. A leader that utilises empowerment creates benefits for both the organisation and the employees, as empowerment improves the economic performance of an organisation and reduces role conflict and role ambiguity amongst employees (Greasley *et al.*, 2008). According to Mardanov, Heischmidt and Henson (2008), employee behaviour depends on the relationship between an employee and the leader, as experienced by the employee. Every employee within an organisation should have a specified set of roles and these allow the leaders of an organisation to hold the employee accountable for performance (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970). Mukherjee and Malhotra (2006) found that when a leader offers clarity in terms of these roles, a positive relationship results. Leader empowering behaviours influence employees' perceived role clarity in a positive way (Hong, Nahm & Doll, 2004; Nielsen, Randall, Yarker & Brenner, 2008). Leaders who provide guidance in terms of the tasks presented to employees create less uncertainty (Hong *et al.,* 2004). Nielsen *et al.* (2008) support this in their findings that a positive relationship exists between supervisory consideration and

perceived role clarity. Klidas, Van den Berg and Wilderom (2006) found that employees who indicated disempowerment due to leadership behaviours were experiencing low role clarity. Role clarity consists of two concepts, namely role conflict and role ambiguity (Rizzo *et al.,* 1970), Role conflict occurs when two or more conflicting job requirements arise, so that complying with one would make doing the other more difficult (Rizzo *et al.*, 1970; Teh, Ooi & Yong, 2008). Role ambiguity refers to the lack of clarity and predictability of the outcomes of one's behaviour (Rizzo *et al.*, 1970; Slatten, 2008). Employees who feel empowered report low levels of role conflict and ambiguity (therefore higher levels of role clarity) in their roles because they are able to control their own environment (Greasley *et al.*, 2008).

In human organizations like schools, number of individuals mainly teachers work towards a common goal. Each of these teachers brings to the work situation a different background of personal and social experiences. The teachers differ in their demands on the job. These demands depend on an individual's physical and social needs. These socio-physical needs and the sentiments associated with the teachers vary in accordance with the social conditioning as well as with the needs and sentiments of people closely associated with them, both inside and outside the organization. The principal holding the position of leader in the school organization must concentrate his efforts on providing such an environment to his teachers so that each and every individual is having clarity about his roles and responsibilities being the part of school which in turn ensures the all round development and the professional growth of the staff . School principals can manipulate culture, climate and effectiveness of an organization, and those manipulations affect the role clarity of people within the organization.

Methodology and Procedure

To conduct the study, 40 principals were randomly selected from government schools and equal number was selected from private schools. Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire was administered to all the 40 principals of government schools and on the basis of scoring, the investigator was able to identify a sample of 10 principals of leadership style1 i.e initiating structure and 10 principals of leadership style 2 i,e.consideration, thereby making a final sample of 20 principals from government schools (10 principals of leadership style initiating structure and 10 principals of leadership style consideration). Same procedure was followed for private schools. Thus, the final sample consisted of 40 principals. For each leadership style, a total sample of 40 teachers was randomly selected. Same procedure was followed for private secondary schools, thereby, making overall sample of 40 principals and 160 teachers. The teachers were administered the role clarity scale.

Tools Used
- To study the leadership style, Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire developed by Halpin (1966) and modified and adapted by the investigator was used.
- To study the Role Clarity, Role Clarity Scale developed by Bala, N. (1998) modified, and validated by the investigator was used.

Statistical Techniques Employed
- Descriptive statistics i.e., mean and standard deviation were employed.
- t-ratio was employed to examine the difference in the mean values.

Objectives of the Study

- To study the difference in the mean scores of role clarity of teachers of government and private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) .
- To study the difference in the mean scores of role clarity of teachers of government secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) and teachers of private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 2(consideration).
- To study the difference in the mean scores of role clarity of teachers of government secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 2(consideration) and teachers of private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure).
- To study the difference in the mean scores of role clarity of teachers of government and private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 2(consideration)

Hypotheses of the Study

- **Ho1:** There is no significant difference mean scores of role clarity of teachers of government and private secondary schools working with principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure).
- **Ho2:** There is no significant difference in the mean scores of role clarity of teachers of government secondary schools working with principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) and teachers of private secondary schools working with principals of leadership style 2(consideration).
- **Ho3:** There is no significant difference in the mean scores of role clarity of teachers of government secondary schools working with principals of leadership

style 2(consideration) and teachers of private secondary schools working with principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure).

- **Ho4:** there is no significant difference on the mean scores of role clarity of teachers of government and private secondary schools working with principals of leadership style 2(consideration).

Results

Table 1: Mean differentials in the role clarity of teachers of government and private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure).

Variable	Mean scores		Standard Deviation		t-value
Role clarity	Govt.	Pvt.	Govt.	Pvt.	
	38.15	43.15	3.15	2.815	7.485**

Table 1 shows that the t-value for the difference in the mean scores of role clarity of teachers of government and private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) was found to be significant at 0.01 level of confidence. Therefore, **the hypothesis Ho.1 stands rejected at the specified level of confidence.** The comparison of mean scores of two groups suggested that the teachers of private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) scored higher on role clarity as compared to the teachers of government secondary schools.

Table2: Mean differentials in the role clarity of teachers of government secondary schools in relation to leadership style 1 (initiating structure) and teachers of private secondary schools in relation to leadership style 2 (consideration) of the principal.

Variable	Mean scores		Standard Deviation		t-value
Role clarity	Govt. LS (I)	Pvt. LS (II)	Govt. LS I	Pvt. LS II	
	38.15	35.78	3.15	6.040	2.205*

Table 2 shows that the t-ratio for difference in the mean scores of the dimension role clarity of teachers of government secondary schools working with principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) and teachers of private secondary schools working with principals of leadership style 2(consideration) was significant at 0.05 level of confidence. This suggested that the two groups were different beyond chance factors. Therefore, **the hypothesis 2** stands rejected at the specified level of confidence. A comparison of the mean scores of two groups indicated that the teachers of government secondary schools working with principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) were higher on the dimension role clarity as compared to the teachers of private secondary schools working with principals of leadership style 2(consideration) .

Table 3: Mean differentials in the role clarity of teachers of government secondary schools in relation to leadership style 2 (consideration) of the principal and private secondary schools in relation to leadership style 1 (initiating structure) of the principal.

Variable	Mean scores		Standard Deviation		t-value
Role clarity	Govt. LS (II)	Pvt. LS (I)	Govt. LS (II)	Pvt. LS(I)	
	29.40	43.15	3.296	2.815	20.063**

Table 3 shows that the t-value for the difference in the mean scores of the role clarity of teachers of government secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 2(consideration) and teachers of private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) was found to be significant at 0.01 level of confidence. **Therefore, the hypothesis Ho.3 was rejected at the specified level of confidence**. The comparison of the mean scores of two groups revealed that the teachers of private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) scored higher on role clarity as compared to the teachers of government secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 2(consideration).

Table 4: Mean differentials in the role clarity of teachers of government and private secondary schools in relation to leadership style 2 (consideration) of the principal.

Variable	Mean scores		Standard Deviation		t-value
Role clarity	Govt.	Pvt.	Govt.	Pvt.	
	29.40	35.78	3.296	6.040	5.859**

Table 4 shows that the t-value for the difference in the mean scores of role clarity of teachers of government and private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 2(consideration) was found to be significant at 0.01 level of confidence. **Therefore, the hypothesis Ho.4 was rejected at the specified level of confidence.** The comparison of the mean scores of two groups on role clarity indicated that the teachers of private secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 2(consideration) scored higher on role clarity as compared to the teachers of government secondary schools working with the principals of leadership style 2(consideration).

Discussion of the Results

In the light of the findings of the study, it was concluded that there was significant difference in the role clarity of teachers of government and private schools. The teachers of private schools were found to be significantly higher on the role clarity. This difference can be attributed to the fact that government institutes have more open and autonomous organizational climate. This type of climate portrays an atmosphere where teachers are given a good measure of freedom to operate in the institution. Government schools have loose structure, lack cohesive forces, though higher democratic spirit. In contrast, the private schools have higher goal orientation and tend to construct the environment of organizational innovation, stable and intimate system, harmonization and better performance. In private schools, diligence and hard work are overemphasized. Teachers are committed to their work. This difference can also

be attributed to the fact that in private schools, teachers are carefully supervised to ensure that they just do what they are employed to do. Salaries are relatively paid as and when to motivate them to do their work as expected. This leads to greater clarity about role and responsibilities among teachers and hence better organizational climate and work culture.

It is also evident from the results that the teachers of government and private schools working with principals of leadership style 1(initiating structure) and leadership style 2 (consideration) also differ on role clarity. This difference can be attributed to the fact that leadership style 2 (consideration) is indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between principal and staff members. The leadership style consideration is characterized by low concern for structure and high emphasis on interpersonal relations. The needs and feelings of individuals are of overriding importance to the leader. Task requirements are clearly subordinate to the need dispositions of the individuals. The leader is friendly and supportive in interactions with subordinates, hence, generating greater job satisfaction among staff members. On the other hand, leadership style 1 i.e. initiating structure refers to Principal's behavior in delineating the relationship between him and her and staff members. Principals apply pressure for productive output and maintain performance standards. Rules and regulations are enforced in the pursuit of assignment tasks. This accounts for the greater role clarity, better organizational climate and better work culture.

REFERENCES

Greasley, K., Bryman, A., Dainty, A., Price, A., Naismith, N., & Soetanto, R. (2008). Understanding empowerment from an employee perspective. *Team Performance Management, 14*, 39−55.

Greco, P., Laschinger, H.K.S., & Wong, C. (2006). Leader empowering behaviours, staff nurse empowerment and work engagement/burnout. *Nursing Leadership, 19*, 41−56.

Hong, P., Nahm, A.Y. & Doll, W.J. (2004). The role of project target clarity in an uncertain environment. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management, 24*, 1269−1291.

Klidas, A., van den Berg, P.T., & Wilderom, C.P.M. (2006). Managing employee empowerment in luxury hotels in Europe. *International Journal of Service Industry Management, 18*, 70−88.

Mardanov, I.S., Heischmidt, K., & Henson, A. (2008). Leader-member exchange and job satisfaction bond and predicted employee turnover. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies, 15*(2), 159−175.

Minda G 2000. Opportunistic downsizing of aging workers:The 1990's version of age and pension discrimination in employment. *Hast Law J,* 4: 23- 26.

Mukherjee, A., & Malhotra, N. (2006). Does role clarity explain employee-perceived service quality? *International Journal of Service Industry Management, 17*, 444−473.

Nielsen, K., Randall, R., Yarker, J., & Brenner, S. (2008). The effects of transformational leadership on followers' perceived work characteristics and psychological well-being: A longitudinal study. *Work and Stress, 22*, 16−32.

Rizzo, J.R., House, R.J., & Lirtzman, S.I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organisations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 15,* 150−163.

Slatten, T. (2008). Antecedents and effects of emotional satisfaction on employee-perceived service quality. *Managing Service Quality, 18*, 370−386.

Wilson, M.G., DeJoy, D.M., Vandenberg, R.J., Richardson, H.A., & McGrath, A.L. (2004). Work characteristics and employee health and well-being: Test of a model of

healthy work organisation. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology, 77,* 565–588.