



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

Journal homepage: <http://www.journalijar.com>

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF ADVANCED RESEARCH

RESEARCH ARTICLE

A STUDY OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS AND ROLE PERFORMANCE OF HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS IN RELATION TO PERSONALITY

* Dr. L. Hemalatha Krishnaveni¹ and Dr. B. Yella Reddy²

1. Post Graduate Teacher, A. P. Model School. Rayachoti, Y.S.R. District, Plot No. 402 Satyasai Appartment near RTC Bus Stand, Kadapa, Y.S.R. District, – 516 004

2. Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Sree Rama College of Education, Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh, India.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History:

Received: 12 January 2014

Final Accepted: 22 February 2014

Published Online: March 2014

Key words:

Role expectations, Role performance and Personality.

*Corresponding Author

**Dr. L. Hemalatha
Krishnaveni**

Abstract

Teacher quality has been said to be the number one school-related influence on student achievement. Although research on what constitutes a quality teacher is often the subject of debate, there are some findings on teacher quality that are rarely contested. The main objective of the present study is to study the influence of personality on the role expectation and role performance of high school teachers. Role expectation and role performance of high school teachers' questionnaire developed by Mrs. L. Hemalatha Krishnaveni (2013) was adopted. To measure the personality traits of high school teachers, 16 PF Personality Questionnaire Form – C, developed by Cattell (1970) is adopted. A sample of 900 high school teachers representing all categories of high schools is selected in Andhra Pradesh by following the standardized procedures. 't' – test and ANOVA ('F' – test) were employed for analysis of the data. There is significant influence of personality factor – A, B, C, F, G, Q₃ and Q₄ at 0.01 level and personality factor – L, M and Q₂ at 0.05 level on the role expectation of high school teachers. There is significant influence of personality factor – A, B, C, F, G, L, Q₃ and Q₄ at 0.01 level and personality factor – M and Q₂ at 0.05 level on the role performance of high school teachers.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2013., All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

Teachers can improve student achievement when they communicate high expectations, avoid criticism, reward truly praise worthy behaviour, and provide abundant opportunities for success (academic learning time) on material over which students are tested. The role of the teacher involves two broad fields of research. On the one hand 'role' refers to behaviour, thus studies of teacher – role performance are those in which the actual behaviour of teachers is observed. On the other hand, 'role' refers to expectations of behaviour thus studies of teacher role expectations are those in which expectations maintained for teachers by teachers and others are investigated, in general, these are two distinct fields of research for investigation.

Role expectation of teachers

Teacher role expectations may be held by a variety of persons who are usually identified by the social positions which they hold. Thus expectations held by parents may be contrasted with those held by teachers themselves, principals, school board members and so on.

Role performance of teachers

Conventionally viewed as dispensers of knowledge, teachers are increasingly perceived as facilitators or managers of knowledge. They are often thought to be colearners with their students. Few modern teachers would try to claim intellectual hegemony in the classroom; such a claim would not stand the challenge of increasingly sophisticated students. There is too much to know and too many sources of knowledge outside the classroom that can easily be brought to bear within school walls by students themselves. Teachers teach, of course, but they do not simply dispense information to their students. Teachers are also intellectual leaders who create opportunities for students to demonstrate what they know and what they know how to do.

Review of Literature

Ioannis Paraskevopoulos (1965) identified several general and personality characteristics of teachers as intelligence, health, love of children, effective personality, broad interests, health, and love of children, effective personality, broad interests, enthusiasm and sound philosophy.

Judge, Timothy A.; Heller, Daniel; Mount, Michael K (2002) revealed that this study reports results of a meta-analysis linking traits from the 5-factor model of personality to overall job satisfaction. Using the model as an organizing framework, 334 correlations from 163 independent samples were classified according to the model. The estimated true score correlations with job satisfaction were -.29 for Neuroticism, .25 for Extraversion, .02 for Openness to Experience, .17 for Agreeableness, and .26 for Conscientiousness. Results further indicated that only the relations of Neuroticism and Extraversion with job satisfaction generalized across studies. As a set, the Big Five traits had a multiple correlation of .41 with job satisfaction, indicating support for the validity of the dispositional source of job satisfaction when traits are organized according to the 5-factor model.

Anit Somech (2010) investigated that the increasing emergence of Participation in Decision Making (PDM) in schools reflects the widely shared belief that flatter management and decentralized authority structures carry the potential for promoting school effectiveness. However, the literature indicates a discrepancy between the intuitive appeal of PDM and empirical evidence in respect of its sweeping advantages. The purpose of this theoretical article is to develop a comprehensive model for understanding the distinct impacts of PDM on school and teachers' outcomes. The proposed analytical framework is set within contingency theory and is aimed to predict the distinct impacts of PDM on school outcomes: innovation, organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB), and productivity; and on teacher outcomes: job satisfaction and strain. It contains mediator-moderator components, where the mediator factors explain the relationship between PDM and school and teacher outcomes and the moderator factors influence the strength and/or the direction of these relationships. Specifically, the framework suggests that two mechanisms, one motivational and one cognitive, serve as mediators in the PDM-outcomes relationship. Then, by taking a multilevel perspective, the author posits moderators that may facilitate or inhibit the PDM effect: teacher personality (the Big Five personality characteristics) at the individual level, principal-teacher exchange (leader-member exchange; LMX) at the dyadic level, structure (bureaucratic/ organic) at the school level, and culture (individualism/collectivism) at the environmental level.

Karatzias, A. K. G. Power, J. Flemming, F. Lennan & V. Swanson (2010) found that the importance in studying Quality of School Life (QSL) lies predominantly on research findings concerning its relationship with educational outcome. Although some studies have focused on factors affecting QSL, no study so far has assessed various factors of QSL simultaneously, with regard to secondary education, in order to construct a QSL model and establish its best predictors. The present research has attempted to study correlates of QSL including demographic, personality variables and school stress, and construct a consistent model of QSL, using data derived from pupils in two Scottish secondary pupils (n = 425). The model constructed was found able to account for 56% of the QSL variance. Overall results indicated that QSL is predominantly associated with personality factors, in particular school self-esteem. Results are discussed in relation to the 'trait' character of QSL and the educational implications of the model.

Scope of the Study:

The main intention of the study is to find the influence of personality on the role expectation and role performance of high school teachers.

Objective of the Study:

To study the influence of personality on the role expectation and role performance of high school teachers.

Hypothesis of the study:

Personality does not have significant influence on the role expectation and role performance of high school teachers.

Tools for the Study

1. The investigator has used the role expectation and role performance of high school teachers' questionnaire. It was developed by Mrs. L. Hemalatha Krishnaveni (2013) was adopted. It consists of 188 statements. For the purpose of scoring numerical values (weightages) were assigned to each of the five categories namely Most Important (MI), Important (I), Important to Some Extent (ISE), Little Important (LI) and Not at All (NA) for role expectations and To a Very Great Extent (TVGE), To More Extent (TME), To Some Extent (TSE), To a Very Little Extent (TVLE) and Not at All (NA) for role performance five point scale based on the Likert (1932) method.
2. To measure the personality traits of high school teachers, 16 PF Personality Questionnaire Form – C, developed by Cattell (1970) is adopted for the study. The scoring key prepared by the author is employed. The total scores in each factor and marked them on the right corner of the answer sheet.

Data Collection

The sample for the investigation consisted of 900 high school teachers. The stratified random sampling was applied in three stages. Geographically Andhra Pradesh state is divided into three regions namely Rayalaseema, Coastal Andhra and Telangana, and Three districts in each region was selected at random Chittoor, Kurnool and YSR districts are taken from Rayalaseema region, East Godavari, Krishna and Prakasam districts are taken from Coastal Andhra region and Karimnagar, Medak and Mahaboob Nagar districts are taken from Telangana region and in second stage management of the school i.e. Government, Private and Aided schools and third stage gender i.e. male and female. In total 450 male high school teachers and 450 female high school teachers are included in this study. It is a 3X3X2 factorial design with 900 sample subjects.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Impact of Personality Factors on Role expectation

On the basis of 16 personality factors scores, the high school teachers are divided into three groups using stenvales. The criterion in the division of the groups based on the stenvales, was used the stenvales 1 to 4 were grouped as Group – I, 5 and 6 as Group – II and 7 to 10 as Group – III. The influence of '16 personality factors' on the role expectation of High school teachers is investigated. The corresponding role expectation of High school teachers scores of three groups are analysed accordingly. The influence of '16 personality factors' on role expectation of High school teachers is investigated through one - way ANOVA technique. The following hypothesis is framed.

Hypothesis – 1

There would be no significant influence of 16 personality factors on role expectation scores.

Employing one – way analysis of variance technique, the above hypothesis was tested. The results are presented in **Table – 1**.

Table – 1 shows the impact of 16 Personality Factors on role expectation scores of High school teachers. It is observed from **Table – 1** that the computed value of 'F' for the personality factor – A, personality factor – B, personality factor – C, personality factor – F, personality factor – G, personality factor – Q₃ and personality factor – Q₄ is greater than critical value of 'F' (4.60) for 2 and 897 df at 0.01 level of significance. Hence Hypothesis – 1 is rejected at 0.01 level. The computed values of 'F' for the personality factors – L, personality factor – M and personality factor – Q₂ are greater than the critical value of 'F' (2.99) for 2 and 897 df at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore Hypothesis – 1 is rejected at 0.05 level. For the remaining personality factors, Hypothesis – 1 is accepted at 0.05 level.

From the above results it is concluded that the high school teachers with personality characteristics (1) Reserved, detached, critical, cool, (2) Less intelligent, concrete thinking (3) Affected by feeling, emotionally less stable (4) Sober, prudent, serious i.e., Desurgency (5) Expedient, evades rules i.e., weaker super-ego strength (6)

Trusting, adaptable, free of Jealousy i.e., Alaxia (7) Practical, careful, conventional i.e., Praxermia (8) Group – dependent, sound follower i.e., Group adherence (9) Undisciplined, self-conflict, careless i.e., Low integration and (10) Relaxed, tranquil, unfrustrated i.e., Low ergic tension are significantly better on role expectation than the high school teachers with personality characteristics (1) Outgoing, warmhearted, easy- going, participating (2) More intelligent, abstract thinking (3) Emotionally stable, calm, mature (4) Happy-go-lucky, Gay, enthusiastic i.e., Surgency (5) Conscientious, preserving, rule bound, i.e. stronger super ego strength (6) Suspicious, self-opinionated, hard to fool, i.e., Proteinson (7) Imaginative wrapped up in inner urgencies i.e., Autia (8) self – sufficient, resourceful, i.e., self-sufficiency (9) Controlled, socially precise, following self-image, i.e., High self-concept control and (10) Tense, Frustrated, driven, i.e., Ergic tension.

Table – 1: Impact of 16 Personality Factors on Role expectation

S. No.	Personality Factors	No. of Observations			Mean			SD Values			F - values
		I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	
1.	Personality Factor A	266	315	319	645.09	661.62	678.57	85.48	95.24	119.05	7.850**
2.	Personality Factor B	514	235	151	655.97	678.92	660.64	93.56	114.56	109.93	4.092**
3.	Personality Factor C	297	449	154	645.49	658.25	709.11	92.43	99.42	116.25	21.225**
4.	Personality Factor E	240	271	389	665.85	652.23	668.15	107.69	94.00	104.69	2.076@
5.	Personality Factor F	483	122	295	649.58	690.93	672.63	100.53	102.77	102.61	10.127**
6.	Personality Factor G	259	476	165	653.86	655.32	698.09	85.03	105.95	110.55	12.282**
7.	Personality Factor H	177	434	289	661.92	664.42	660.73	99.80	101.11	106.58	0.121@
8.	Personality Factor I	66	264	570	664.91	657.46	664.94	118.06	100.17	101.79	0.495@
9.	Personality Factor L	285	340	275	664.99	651.80	673.95	93.13	102.68	110.40	3.658*
10.	Personality Factor M	277	361	262	668.19	651.01	673.15	103.67	100.83	102.48	4.120*
11.	Personality Factor N	240	504	156	657.18	662.34	672.60	95.08	104.94	105.70	1.075@
12.	Personality Factor O	160	288	452	659.50	659.37	666.04	100.62	102.12	103.61	0.470@
13.	Personality Factor Q ₁	270	336	294	659.24	662.19	666.59	99.46	100.90	107.32	0.368@
14.	Personality Factor Q ₂	329	309	262	652.50	664.45	673.59	99.83	102.12	105.53	3.154*
15.	Personality Factor Q ₃	276	304	320	657.22	651.81	677.89	98.04	98.56	108.41	5.661**
16.	Personality Factor Q ₄	318	264	318	648.68	664.50	675.35	93.42	104.93	107.71	5.471**

** Indicates significant at 0.01 level * Indicates significant at 0.05 level

@ Indicates not significant at 0.05 level

2. Impact of Personality Factors on Role performance

On the basis of 16 personality factors scores, the high school teachers are divided into three groups using stenvvalues. The criterion in the division of the groups based on the stenvvalues, was used the stenvvalues 1 to 4 were grouped as Group – I, 5 and 6 as Group – II and 7 to 10 as Group – III. The influence of '16 personality factors' on the role performance of High school teachers is investigated. The corresponding role performance of High school teachers scores of three groups are analysed accordingly. The influence of '16 personality factors' on role performance of High school teachers is investigated through one - way ANOVA technique. The following hypothesis is framed

Hypothesis – 2

There would be no significant influence of 16 personality factors on role performance scores.

Employing one – way analysis of variance technique, the above hypothesis was tested. The results are presented in **Table – 2**.

Table – 2 shows the impact of 16 Personality Factors on role performance scores of High school teachers. It is observed from **Table – 2** that the computed value of 'F' for the personality factor – A, personality factor – B, personality factor – C, personality factor – F, personality factor – G, personality factors – L, personality factor – Q₃ and personality factor – Q₄ is greater than critical value of 'F' (4.60) for 2 and 897 df at 0.01 level of significance. Hence Hypothesis – 2 is rejected at 0.01 level. The computed values of 'F' for the personality factor – M and personality factor – Q₂ are greater than the critical value of 'F' (2.99) for 2 and 897 df at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore Hypothesis – 2 is rejected at 0.05 level. For the remaining personality factors, Hypothesis – 2 is accepted at 0.05 level.

From the above results it is concluded that the high school teachers with personality characteristics (1) Reserved, detached, critical, cool, (2) Less intelligent, concrete thinking (3) Affected by feeling, emotionally less stable (4) Sober, prudent, serious i.e., Desurgency (5) Expedient, evades rules i.e., weaker super-ego strength (6) Trusting, adaptable, free of Jealousy i.e., Alaxia (7) Practical, careful, conventional i.e., Praxermia (8) Group – dependent, sound follower i.e., Group adherence (9) Undisciplined, self-conflict, careless i.e., Low integration and (10) Relaxed, tranquil, unfrustrated i.e., Low ergic tension are significantly better on role performance than the high school teachers with personality characteristics (1) Outgoing, warmhearted, easy- going, participating (2) More intelligent, abstract thinking (3) Emotionally stable, calm, mature (4) Happy-go-lucky, Gay, enthusiastic i.e., Surgency (5) Conscientious, preserving, rule bound, i.e. stronger super ego strength (6) Suspicious, self-opinionated, hard to fool, i.e., Proteinson (7) Imaginative wrapped up in inner urgencies i.e., Autia (8) self – sufficient, resourceful, i.e., self-sufficiency (9) Controlled, socially precise, following self-image, i.e., High self-concept control and (10) Tense, Frustrated, driven, i.e., Ergic tension.

Table – 2: Impact of 16 Personality Factors on Role performance

S. No.	Personality Factors	No. of Observations			Mean			SD Values			F - values
		I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	
1.	Personality Factor A	266	315	319	624.53	647.02	668.46	76.24	98.06	114.41	14.369**
2.	Personality Factor B	514	235	151	636.99	668.68	653.13	87.64	113.24	112.26	8.434**
3.	Personality Factor C	297	449	154	622.53	649.05	693.93	86.84	96.71	116.05	27.289**
4.	Personality Factor E	240	271	389	643.87	638.83	656.88	102.37	92.48	103.17	2.877@
5.	Personality Factor F	483	122	295	636.74	661.98	660.58	93.52	100.89	107.88	6.643**
6.	Personality Factor G	259	476	165	632.39	642.89	687.11	79.73	101.58	114.04	16.899**
7.	Personality Factor H	177	434	289	646.72	652.28	642.28	99.08	98.72	102.68	0.882@

S. No.	Personality Factors	No. of Observations			Mean			SD Values			F - values
		I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	
8.	Personality Factor I	66	264	570	639.68	641.85	651.77	121.52	93.19	100.36	1.128@
9.	Personality Factor L	285	340	275	646.72	637.43	662.31	91.37	99.59	107.62	4.756**
10.	Personality Factor M	277	361	262	644.76	639.61	662.91	97.97	96.34	105.84	4.344*
11.	Personality Factor N	240	504	156	639.72	649.60	655.44	88.22	103.03	107.04	1.315@
12.	Personality Factor O	160	288	452	642.38	648.75	649.46	97.34	102.23	99.77	0.307@
13.	Personality Factor Q ₁	270	336	294	644.35	646.28	653.25	96.46	99.75	103.73	0.630@
14.	Personality Factor Q ₂	329	309	262	637.52	649.99	658.72	96.36	97.77	106.20	3.374*
15.	Personality Factor Q ₃	276	304	320	638.25	639.73	664.20	95.27	92.14	109.18	6.600**
16.	Personality Factor Q ₄	318	264	318	632.30	650.10	661.89	87.82	101.46	108.16	7.105**

** Indicates significant at 0.01 level * Indicates significant at 0.05 level @ Indicates not significant at 0.05 level

Findings: There is significant influence of personality factor – A, B, C, F, G, Q₃ and Q₄ at 0.01 level and personality factor – L, M and Q₂ at 0.05 level on the role expectation of high school teachers. There is significant influence of personality factor – A, B, C, F, G, L, Q₃ and Q₄ at 0.01 level and personality factor – M and Q₂ at 0.05 level on the role performance of high school teachers.

Conclusions: In the light of the findings, the following conclusions are drawn. Personality factor – A, B, C, F, G, L, M, Q₂, Q₃ and Q₄ have significant influence on the role expectation and role performance of high school teachers.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

On the basis of the results of the present investigation the following recommendations are suggested:

Personality has influence on the role expectation and role performance of high school teachers. At present the system of education forgot its main task in fostering the development of whole sum personality among teachers because of a sense of insecurity among the teachers. Hence in every school the guidance and counseling centers are opened to mould the teacher's personality within the current techniques to show that they can have a stable mind. The following personality characteristic may be developed in high school teachers through guidance and counseling for role expectation and role performance (1) Outgoing, warmhearted, easy-going, participating (2) More intelligent, abstract thinking (3) Emotionally stable, calm, mature (4) Happy-go-lucky, Gay, enthusiastic i.e., Surgency (5) Conscientious, preserving, rule bound, i.e. stronger super ego strength (6) Suspicious, self-opinionated, hard to fool, i.e., Proteinson (7) Imaginative wrapped up in inner urgencies i.e., Autia (8) self – sufficient, resourceful, i.e., self-sufficiency (9) Controlled, socially precise, following self-image, i.e., High self-concept control and (10) Tense, Frustrated, driven, i.e., Ergic tension.

The teaching methods which are practicable in nature should be included in the curriculum of school level.

Teacher's traditional and conservative attitude should be changed by involving then in social activities and arranging the citizenship training camp

REFERENCES

Anit Somech (2010). "Participative Decision Making in Schools. A Mediating-Moderating Analytical Framework for Understanding School and Teacher Outcomes", *Educational Administration Quarterly* April 1, 2010 46. 174-209.

Cattell (1970). "Theories of Personality", John Wiley & Sons, Inc (2nd ed.), p.386.

Hemalatha Krishnaveni, L. (2013). "Role expectation and role performance of high school teachers in relation to certain psycho – sociological factors". Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Education, S.V. University, Tirupati.

Ioannis Paraskevopoulos (1965) Quoted in Parandhama, A. (1992). "Role expectation and Role performance of Science teachers in relation to some personality traits", Ph.D. Thesis, S.V. University, Tirupati, A.P.

Judge, Timothy A.; Heller, Daniel; Mount, Michael K (2002). "Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction. A meta-analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87(3), Jun 2002, 530-541. doi. 10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.530.

Karatzias, A., Power, K. G., Flemming, J. Lennan, F. and Swanson, V. (2010). "The Role of Demographics, Personality Variables and School Stress on Predicting School Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction. Review of the literature and research findings", *Educational Psychology. An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology* Volume 22, Issue 1, pp. 33-50, DOI. 10.1080/01443410120101233.

Likert, R. (1932). "A Technique for the measurement of Attitudes", In *bragfield, A.H. and Rothis, H.F. 1951, An Index of Job satisfaction*, *Applied psychology*, 35(5) pp. 307-311.