CHAPTER - IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The present study entitled 'Role Expectation of Physical Education Teachers in relation to Organizational Climate and Leadership Behaviour of Principals' was aimed at exploring the relationship that existed among role expectation of physical education teachers, organisational climate and leadership behaviour of principals in professional and non professional colleges of Chandigarh.

The data was statistically analysed from three different approaches:

i) Descriptive statistics where mean and standard deviation were computed;

ii) Correlational measurements where Pearson product moment correlation was computed; and

iii) Inferential statistics where 't' test was computed.

The results obtained are presented and discussed in the following pages under seven sections namely:

I - Relationship among role expectation, organisational climate and leadership behaviour variables, II - Perception of role expectation held for physical education teachers, III - Sex differences with respect to role expectation among physical education teachers, IV - Comparison of role expectation of
4.1 RELATIONSHIP AMONG ROLE EXPECTATION, ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR VARIABLES (Analysis and interpretation of data and discussion of results)

In this section the results of the correlational analysis between role expectation of physical education teachers and organisational climate, role expectation of physical education teachers and leadership behaviour of principals, and organisational climate and leadership behaviour of principals have been reported and discussed.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The 'a' part of the first hypothesis to be examined was 'Significant relationship exists between role expectation of physical education teachers and organisational climate.' It has been assessed in thirteen dimensions. Four dimensions are of role expectation namely teaching, administrative, other and total expectations and nine dimensions of organisational
climate, namely disengagement, hindrance, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production-emphasis, thrust, consideration and total of organisational climate. The scores of correlations between these dimensions have been discussed below vide Table 4.1.1. Only those values of correlations that were found to be significant at .05 or .01 level of significance have been considered.
Table 4.1.1
CORRELATION MATRIX : INTER CORRELATIONS AMONG SUB SCALES AND TOTAL SCORES OF PETRES AND OCDQ (N = 62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>EO</th>
<th>TRE</th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>HIN</th>
<th>EPS</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>ALO</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>THR</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>TCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>0.94**</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIN</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THR</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** df = 60
* SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .05 = .2500
** SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .01 = .3248
Discussion of Results

Teaching Expectations: Table 4.1.1 indicates positive correlation of teaching expectations with administrative expectations ($r = .69$), other expectations ($r = .67$) and with total expectations ($r = .83$), significant at .01 level. Teaching Expectations also had significant correlation with disengagement ($r = .53$) and total of organisational climate ($r = .34$) at .01 level and with intimacy ($r = .28$), thrust ($r = .28$), consideration ($r = .28$)

This shows that teaching expectations have positive and statistically significant relationship with eight out of twelve dimensions namely, administrative expectations, other expectations, total expectations, disengagement, total of organisational climate, intimacy, thrust and consideration as reported in Table 4.1.1.

The roles expected of a physical education teacher are wide and varied. This area of role expectation i.e. teaching expectations includes teaching, training, coaching, counselling, guidance and motivational roles. A physical education teacher is expected to take physical education classes, train and coach students for various inter college competitions, guide them to sort out their problems and motivate them toward better performance.

A healthy relationship among teaching expectations,
administrative expectations, other expectations and total expectations (vide Table 4.1.1) indicates that physical education teacher today is the focus of high degree of expectations. He / She is expected to carry out not only the routine jobs of taking theory and practical classes but is also expected to plan, implement, evaluate physical education programmers. It is the physical education teacher who scrutinises the admission applications of the students, prepares sports merit list, conducts skill tests, selects deserving students and helps them with their admissions. Physical education teacher is also expected to arrange informative and inspiring talks, film shows, and demonstrations to strengthen college sports activities, arrange coaches, plan and supervise practice schedules, select college teams, send entries to various inter college tournaments and accompany the college teams to these tournaments. Physical education teacher also looks after the purchase and maintenance of the sports equipment, supervises the maintenance of grounds and sports facilities, organises intra - murals, annual sports meet, outings, camps and annual prize distribution function. Hence, in order to reach up to the expectations of the authorities concerned a physical education teacher has to perform varied roles.

Physical education teacher is also expected to carry
out miscellaneous jobs like organising special exercise programmers for physically handicapped students, arrange leadership, conditioning, recreation and trekking camps during vacations and prepare students to be better citizens by increasing co-operation and interaction among them through his programmes.

A statistically significant relationship among the various dimensions of role expectation (vide Table 4.1.1) shows that the physical education teachers of the institutions under study are making all out efforts in discharging their roles. They are not only concentrating on the physical development of the students but are aiming at their all round development through their well-planned and integrated programmes so that they become better citizens and serve the nation.

Referring to Table 4.1.1, teaching expectations also show a significant relationship with disengagement, intimacy, thrust, consideration and total of organisational climate. This reveals that the organisational climate of an institution plays an important part in the determination of teaching expectations focussed on physical education teachers. Higher correlational scores among teaching expectations, intimacy, thrust and consideration indicate that friendly and co-operative attitude of the faculty, encouraging attitude of the principal and the
support and motivation provided by him results in higher expectations focussed on physical education teachers. A higher correlational score was also obtained between teaching expectations and disengagement which indicates that too high expectations may make the teachers disengaged and disinterested in their roles. Thus, it can be concluded, that the expectations focussed on physical education teachers should be in line with their capacities and capabilities, resources available at their disposable and co-operation provided by the other facility members because all these factors go a long way in the success and accomplishment of physical education programmes.

**Administrative Expectations**: A positive correlation of administrative expectations with other expectations \((r = .87)\) and total expectations \((r = .94)\) was found significant at .01 level \((\text{vide Table 4.1.1})\). Significant and positive relationship between administrative expectations and eight dimensions of organisational climate i.e. disengagement \((r = \text{emphasis} = .50), \text{thrust} = .56), \text{consideration} = .47)\) and total of organisational climate \((r = .68)\) also came out to be significant at .01 level and between administrative expectations and esprit \((r = .31)\), significant at .05 level.

Administrative expectations includes in its scope,
planning, organisational, administrative, supervisory and managerial roles. A physical education teacher is expected to discharge various planning and organisational roles like planning physical education department's time table for regular classes, coaching and practice schedules for the college teams, get sports budget approved and co-ordinate college physical education activities with academic, co-curricular and inter-college activities. Physical education teacher is also expected to implement decisions taken in sports committee meetings; prepare annual report of the physical education department, accompany students to inter-college competitions, conduct physical verification of sports store and take active interest in the development of sports activities.

In order to fulfil these administrative expectations, he needs full support from his colleagues, a sound backing and an encouraging attitude of the principal. Congenial working conditions and a morale-boosting attitude of the principal can help the physical education teacher in delivering the goods in a better way. Principal's respectful and cordial treatment of the faculty leads to higher morale of the group. Friendly and social relations provide opportunities to complete difficult tasks which leads to higher achievements.

The present study (vide Table 4.1.1) shows a positive
and significant relationship among administrative expectations, disengagement, esprit and intimacy. This indicates that in order to fulfil the administrative roles of planning, supervision and management a physical education teacher needs encouraging attitude of the principal as well as of the faculty. Friendly and personal relationships among faculty and principal will help physical education teacher to achieve higher goals.

Table 4.1.1 shows significant and positive relationship among administrative expectations, production-emphasis, thrust and consideration, which indicates that a principal who is sound in planning and implementation will expect higher administrative roles from his physical education teacher/s. Such an administrator will emphasise production through his set of standard rules and regulations and will see to it that the physical education teacher/s work up to their capacities. The higher the consideration he exhibits, the higher the roles he can expect from his teachers. A significant relationship was also observed between administrative expectations and aloofness. It signifies that in order to be more effective, an administrator has to keep distance from his faculty at times.

Other Expectations : It is evident from Table 4.1.1 that
positive and significant relationship exists between other expectations and total expectations ($r = .95$) and among other expectations and seven dimensions of organisational climate namely disengagement ($r = .63$), esprit ($r = .43$), intimacy ($r = .43$), production-emphasis ($r = .35$), thrust ($r = .54$) consideration ($r = .34$) and total of organisational climate ($r = .58$) significant at .01 level.

Other expectations as a dimension of role expectation have in their scope, roles concerned with social obligations, public relations, professional obligations and consultancy. A physical education teacher is expected to take active interest in the development of his profession, participate in sports seminars, clinics and workshops to update his knowledge, organise special exercise programmes for physically handicapped, take up research projects for the promotion of physical education and above all prepare students to be good citizens.

In addition to the above mentioned roles, a physical education teacher is also expected to encourage students to participate in sports activities, take active interest in student welfare programmes, persuade principal to purchase sports books for the library, maintain good relations with authorities to promote sport facilities, persuade principal and
colleagues to participate in sports activities during annual sports meet, encourage students to write articles on sports and take active interest in celebrating days of national importance. So the list of roles expected of a physical education teacher under this dimension is wide in range.

The present study shows a positive and significant relationship (vide Table 4.1.1) among other expectations, disengagement, esprit intimacy, production-emphasis, thrust, consideration, aloofness and total of organisational climate which indicates that in order to fulfil the expectations held from them a physical education teacher needs encouraging attitude of colleagues and principal.

**Total Expectations** : A positive correlation as per Table 4.1.1 among total expectations and seven dimensions of organisational climate namely disengagement (r = .70), esprit (r = .35), intimacy (r = .44), production-emphasis (r = .40), thrust (r = .52), consideration (r=.40), and total of organisational climate (r = .60), was found significant at .01 level. Total expectations is the sum of all the expectations held of a physical education teacher.

Higher scores on total expectations indicate (vide Table 4.1.1) that the physical education teachers of the institutions under study are a focus of high degree of
expectations. The roles expected of them are wide in range and varied in nature.

Table 4.1.1 indicates a significant and positive relationship among total expectations, disengagement, esprit, intimacy, production-emphasis, thrust, consideration and total of organisational climate. It shows that friendly, warm and cordial relationship between staff and principal and among the staff members, considerate and morale boosting attitude of the principal and adequate facilities available to the physical education teacher lead to higher expectations held of him/her.

The distinguishing feature of the Organisational Climate in the institutions under study is the almost complete freedom that the principals give to the faculty members to provide their own structures for interaction so that they can find ways within the group for satisfying their social needs. When they are together in a task-oriented situation, they achieve their goals easily and quickly. The principals provide thrust for the organisation by setting an example by working hard themselves. They have the flexibility to control and look for the personal welfare of the faculty members. They are rather considerate than impersonal in behaviour. They are friendly and motivate the faculty members. They initiate action
and boost the morale of their colleagues.

Thus, it can be concluded that in an institution with sound organisational climate, the level of expectations focussed on physical education teacher will be higher.

Disengagement: A significant and positive relationship (vide Table 4.1.1) among disengagement and seven dimensions of organisational climate namely esprit ($r = 0.44$), intimacy ($r = 0.56$) thrust ($r = 0.56$) consideration ($r = 0.59$), and total of organisational climate ($r = 0.87$) was found significant at .01 level.

The existence of positive and significant relationship (as per Table 4.1.1), of disengagement with seven dimensions i.e. esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production-emphasis, thrust, consideration and total of organisational climate depicts the situation in which the faculty members work well together without bickering. The principal does not burden them with routine reports and his policies facilitate the teachers’ accomplishment of their tasks. The faculty members enjoy friendly relations with the another. The behaviour of the principal represents an appropriate integration between his own personality and the role he is required to play as principal. Not only does he set an example by working hard himself but
depending upon the situation, he either criticizes the actions of teachers or goes out of his way to help a teacher. At times, he remains aloof to be more effective.

**Hindrance** : No correlation was found (vide Table 4.1.1) between hindrance and the dimensions of organisational climate namely esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production-emphasis, thrust, consideration and total of organisational climate. Hindrance refers to the teacher's feeling that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the teachers construe as unnecessary. The teachers perceive that the principal is hindering rather than facilitating their work.

**Esprit** : Table 4.1.1 indicates positive correlation between esprit and intimacy ($r = .37$), esprit and aloofness ($r = .78$), and esprit and consideration ($r = .30$), which were significant at .05 level.

Esprit refers to the faculty members morale and satisfaction of their social needs. The present study indicates a positive and significant relationship, as mentioned in Table 4.1.1 between esprit and six dimensions of organisational
climate namely intimacy, aloofness, thrust production-emphasis, consideration and total of organisational climate.

The main feature of this climate is the conspicuously friendly manner of both the principal and the teachers. Social needs satisfaction is extremely high and little is done to control or direct the group’s activities towards goal achievement. The teachers have established personal friendships among themselves. The principal is considerate. Teachers attribute thrust to the principal. He provides adequate leadership for the faculty whereby they enjoy their jobs and relations.

**Intimacy**: The present study indicates a positive and significant relationship as reported in Table 4.1.1 among intimacy and four dimensions of Organisational Climate namely production-emphasis \( (r = .41) \), thrust \( (r = .33) \), consideration \( (r = .45) \) and total of organisational climate \( (r = .66) \) significant at .01 level. Intimacy refers to the teachers’ enjoyment of friendly social relations with one another. It provides opportunities to develop close friendly social relations among the faculty which is not necessarily associated with task accomplishment.

A significant relationship (vide Table 4.1.1) among esprit, production - emphasis, thrust, consideration, and total
of organisational climate depicts the fact that the faculty members enjoy friendly social relations. The principal respects his colleagues' ideas. He prefers to discuss the institutional problems with them. He avoids close supervision of their activities but motivates them through an example he sets himself. His behaviour is task oriented but he treats faculty members as human beings and not as result-producing machines. This way, the working abilities of the faculty members are best utilized toward the achievement of the institutional goals.

**Aloofness**: Positive and significant relationships are revealed (vide table 4.1.1) between aloofness and production-emphasis \((r = .56)\), aloofness and thrust \((r = .50)\), aloofness and consideration \((r = .33)\), and aloofness and total of organisational climate \((r = .67)\) significant at .01 level.

Aloofness refers to the behaviour by the principal which is characterised as formal and impersonal. He is guided by rules and policies and does not deal with the faculty in an informal, face-to-face situation. To maintain his style, he keeps himself at a distance from his staff.

The relationship of aloofness in the present study as reported in Table 4.1.1 appears as positive and significant with production-emphasis, thrust, consideration and total of organisational climate which shows that the behaviour of the
principal represents an appropriate integration between his own personality and the role he is required to play as an administrator. In this regard, his behaviour can be seen as genuine. Not only does he set an example by working hard himself but also criticizes the action of the faculty on one hand and on the other, goes out of his way to help them, according to the situation.

**Production - Emphasis**: The values of correlation as entered in Table 4.1.1, between production-emphasis and thrust ($r = .44$), production - emphasis and consideration ($r = .57$) and production-emphasis and total of organisational climate ($r =$ emphasis refers to the behaviour by the principal which is characterised by close supervision of the staff. He is highly directive and plays the role of a 'straw boss'. His communication tends to go in one direction and he is not sensitive to feedback from the staff. The present study shows a significant relationship among production -emphasis, thrust, consideration and total or organisational climate which show that task -oriented approach of the principal and his humane treatment of the faculty gives direction to a higher production level.

**Thrust**: As is clear from Table 4.1.1, significant and positive correlation exists between thrust and consideration ($r = .33$)
and thrust and total of organisational climate (r = .69) at
which is characterised by his evident effort in trying to 'move
the organisation.' Thrust behaviour is marked not by close supervision but by the principal's attempt to motivate the teachers through personal example. He does not ask the teachers to give of themselves any more than he willingly gives of himself and that is the reason why his behaviour, though task-oriented, is viewed favourably by the teachers.

**Consideration**: The correlation values as entered in Table 4.1.1 between consideration and four dimensions of role expectation i.e. teaching expectations, administrative expectations, other expectations and total expectations and between consideration and seven dimensions of organisational climate namely disengagement, intimacy, aloofness, production-emphasis, thrust and total of organisational climate (r = .71) were significant at .01 level and between consideration and esprit which were significant at .05 level.

Consideration refers to the tendency of the administrator to treat the faculty members as human beings rather than result producing machines. This implies that humane treatment of the faculty brings in social needs-satisfaction, overall improvement in the working conditions, achievement of the institutional goals and the maintenance of good human
relations.

**Total of Organisational climate**: As reported in Table 4.1.1, the total of organisational climate had positive and significant correlation with all the dimensions of role expectation i.e. teaching, administrative, other and total of role expectations at .01 level. It also had significant relationship with all the dimensions of organisational climate except hindrance, at .01 level.

A positive and significant relationship between total organisational climate and the various dimensions of role expectation signifies that role expectations are determined by the organisational climate of the institutions. In an institution with a sound organisational climate, the roles expected of a physical education teacher will be wide in range and varied in nature.

Thus, the results of the present study indicate that the role expectation and the organisational climate are closely related to each other. In other words, the role expected of a physical education teacher has a close link with organisational climate of the institute in which he/she works.

Hence, the 'a' part of the first hypothesis 'Significant relationship exists between role expectation of physical education teachers and organisational climate,' stands
accepted in totality.

The 'b' part of the first hypothesis to be examined was 'Significant relationship exists between role expectation of physical education teachers and leadership behaviour of principals.'

**Analysis and Interpretation of Data**

The results pertaining to the 'b' part of the first hypothesis were assessed in seven dimensions. Role Expectation had four dimensions namely - teaching, administrative, other and total expectations. Leadership behaviour had three dimensions i.e. initiating-structure, consideration and total of leadership. The scores of correlations between these dimensions have been discussed below (vide Table 4.1.2). Only those values of correlations that are found to be significant at .05 or .01 level have been considered. The intercorrelations among various dimensions of role expectation i.e. teaching expectations, administrative expectations, other expectations and total expectations have already been discussed in the 'a' part.
### TABLE 4.1.2

**CORRELATION MATRIX : INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG SUBSCALES AND TOTAL SCORES OF PETRES AND LBDQ (N - 62)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>TRE</th>
<th>INI</th>
<th>CNS</th>
<th>TOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>0.94**</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**df = 60**

* SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .05 = .2500

** SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .01 = .3248

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TE</th>
<th>TEACHING EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>INI</th>
<th>INITIATING-STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>CONSIDERATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>OTHER EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>TOTAL OF LEADERSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRE</td>
<td>TOTAL EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of Results**

**Initiating-Structure** : In reference to Table 4.1.2 the correlations of initiating-structure with consideration (r =
significantly at .01 level. Initiating-structure also had significant correlation with three dimensions of role expectation, namely, administrative expectations (r = .28) and total expectations (r = .30) at .05 level, and with other expectations (r = .55) at .01 level.

This shows that initiating-structure has positive and statistically significant relationship with five out of six dimensions namely consideration, total of leadership, administrative expectations, other expectations and total expectations, (vide Table 4.1.2).

Initiating-structure is the degree to which the leader specifies the roles, responsibilities and relationships to be involved in getting the work of the group done. The leader has to motivate, initiate and inspire the group and get things done. Leadership is the initiation of acts which results in a consistent pattern of group interaction directed towards the solution of the mutual problems. The initiating-structure is the quality of a leader’s behaviour to develop rapport with the members of the group and to set standards of procedures and regulations for others to follow.

A positive relationship between initiating-structure and consideration as per Table 4.1.2, shows that the principals
of the institutions under study are exhibiting behaviours which result not only in task accomplishment but also help them to win the respect and trust of their faculty members. This opens new channels of communication between the principal and the faculty which leads to establishment of well-defined patterns of organisation and methods of procedure.

Initiating-structure also shows a significant relationship (vide Table 4.1.2) among administrative expectations, other expectations and total expectations. This reveals that the behaviour of the principals in the institutions under study is such that they create task-oriented situations to work which results in higher expectations focussed on the physical education teachers. They not only work hard themselves but also expect their teachers to work to their capacities and capabilities. In order to have a smooth functioning of the institution, they expect teachers to play administrative roles of planning and organisation and general duties in addition to teaching roles so that the institution can prosper.

Consideration: Table 4.1.2 exhibits positive correlation between consideration and total of leadership (r = .83) and among consideration and three dimensions of role expectations namely administrative expectations (r = .39), other
expectations \( r = .42 \) and total expectations \( r = .37 \) significant at .01 level.

Consideration deals with the degree and type of personal relationships between the leader and the group and the amount of socio-emotional support provided by the leader. It characterises the friendly, warm and healthy interpersonal relationship of the principal with the faculty. Such a leader can influence the activities of the group in its efforts toward goal-setting and its achievement.

A key factor in the success of an organisation is the working relationship between the principal and the faculty. The traditional administrative plans were established along a vertical plane with a boss and some subordinates working under him. But in today's world, a different type of hierarchy is needed, if each member of the staff is to be given chance to function in a creative manner. To meet this goal, a horizontal plane, in which subordinates work with the boss, is more suitable. A leadership plan founded on the basis of mutual trust, respect and admiration develops an attitude of love and concern for the successful accomplishment of organisational goals.

The existence of positive and significant relationship (vide Table 4.1.2) among consideration, total of
leadership, administrative expectations, other expectations and total expectations indicates that the behaviour of the principals in the institutions under study is one of friendship and mutual trust. Administrative, other and total expectations scored higher on consideration as compared to initiating-structure dimension of the leadership behaviour. This shows that when the behaviour of the principal is of considerate, the level of expectations focussed on physical education teachers is higher as compared to initiating-structure dimension. The scores on teaching expectations were similar and positive for both initiating-structure and consideration which indicates that leadership behaviour does effect the teaching expectations focussed on physical education teachers but cannot be regarded as a major factor.

**Total of Leadership**: Positive and significant correlations at dimensions of role expectations i.e. administrative expectation (\( r = .36 \)), other expectations (\( r = .43 \)) and total expectations (\( r = .37 \)), as per Table 4.1.2.

A high score on total of leadership, (vide Table 4.1.2), indicates higher initiating-structure and consideration. Such a leader is capable of initiating and carrying out co-operative group efforts which are efficient and effective. As a result his faculty will be more satisfied and
Table 4.1.2 shows significant and positive relationship among total of leadership, administrative, other and total expectations. It indicates that if the principal exhibits strong initiating ability as well as consideration, it is positively going to effect the level of expectations focussed on the physical education teachers. Comparing the correlational scores of total of leadership and role expectations, the scores on other expectations were highest and on administrative expectations the lowest. Score on teaching expectations were also positive though insignificant.

The results reported (vide Table 4.1.2) make it clear that the role expectations of physical education teachers and the leadership behaviour of the principals are closely related. In other words, the role expectations are determined by the principal’s behaviour.

Thus the ‘b’ part of the first hypothesis, ‘Significant relationship exists between role expectation of physical education teachers and leadership behaviour of principals,’ stands accepted in totality.

The ‘c’ part of the first hypothesis to be examined was ‘Significant relationship exists between organisational
Analysis and Interpretation of Data

To assess the results pertaining to the 'c' part of the first hypothesis, the dimensions of organisational climate namely disengagement, hindrance, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production-emphasis, thrust, consideration and total of organisational climate and the dimensions of leadership behaviour namely initiating-structure, consideration and total of leadership behaviour were analysed. The correlational scores on these dimensions were compared, to reach to a conclusion. Only those values as were significant at .01 or .05 level of significance (vide Table 4.1.3) have been considered for discussion.

The intercorrelations among the dimensions of leadership behaviour namely initiating-structure, consideration and total of leadership, and among the dimensions of organisational climate namely disengagement, hindrance, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production-emphasis thrust, consideration and total of organisational climate have already been presented and discussed earlier. In this part correlations among the dimensions of organisational climate and leadership behaviour, shall be discussed.
Table 4.1.3

Correlation Matrix: Intercorrelations Among Subscales and Total Scores of OCDQ and LBDQ (N - 62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>HIN</th>
<th>ESP</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>ALO</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>THR</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>TOC</th>
<th>INI</th>
<th>CNS</th>
<th>TOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIN</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THR</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 60
* Significant at level .05 = .2500
** Significant at level .01 = .3248

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>DISENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>THR</th>
<th>THRUST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIN</td>
<td>HINDRANCE</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>CONSIDERATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>ESPRIT</td>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>TOTAL ORG. CLIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>INTIMACY</td>
<td>INI</td>
<td>INITIATING-STRUCTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALO</td>
<td>ALOOFNESS</td>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>CONSIDERATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>PRODUCTION-EMPHASIS</td>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>TOTAL OF LEADERSHIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of results

Initiating-Structure: The results reported in Table 4.1.3 indicate a positive and significant relationship among initiating-structure and seven dimensions of organisational climate namely disengagement ($r = .27$), esprit ($r = .30$), intimacy ($r = .26$), aloofness ($r = .30$), thrust ($r = .27$) and consideration ($r = .25$), significant at .05 level and between consideration and total of organisational climate ($r =$

This shows that initiating-structure has a meaningful relationship, as per Table 4.1.3, with disengagement, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, thrust, consideration (CON) and total of organisational climate. It indicates that encouraging and initiating behaviour of the principal inspires the faculty to work hard with full vigour to achieve the institutional goal. It also results in improved communication which not only results in better social relations but also fosters growth and development of the organisation.

Consideration (CNS): A positive correlation, (vide Table 4.1.3), was found among consideration and six dimensions of organisational climate i.e. disengagement ($r = .40$), esprit ($r = .42$), aloofness ($r = .59$), thrust ($r = .44$) and total of organisational climate ($r = .46$) which were significant at .01
level and between consideration and production-emphasis (r =

The existence of positive and significant relationship of consideration (CNS) with disengagement, esprit, aloofness, thrust, production-emphasis and total of organisational climate depicts the situation in which the faculty members work well together. The principal makes it as easy as possible for the faculty to work. His behaviour is indicative of friendship, warmth and respect for the faculty. Such treatment of the faculty leads to higher morale of the group. Friendly and social relations provide opportunities to complete difficult tasks which leads to higher achievements. Higher correlational scores were obtained between consideration and six dimensions of organisational climate namely disengagement, esprit, aloofness, production-emphasis, thrust and total of organisational climate as compared to correlation of these dimensions with initiating-structure which indicates that considerate behaviour of principals is more favoured as compared to initiating-structure behaviour.

These results are in consonance with those of Milner (1976), who conducted a study on 29 heads of universities and colleges of physical education and 427 faculty members. The reports indicated among other things, that both department
heads and faculty members placed a higher value on the consideration dimension of leadership behaviour than initiating-structure dimension.

**Total of Leadership**: Table 4.1.3 exhibits positive and significant relationship between total of leadership and disengagement ($r = .36$), total of leadership and esprit ($r =$ leadership and thrust ($r = .38$) and total of leadership and total of organisational climate ($r = .44$) which were significant at .01 level and between total of leadership and intimacy ($r = .28$), total of leadership and production-emphasis ($r = .27$) and total of leadership and consideration (CON) ($r = .28$), significant at .05 level.

The results, as per Table 4.1.3, are indicative of the fact that an administrator, exhibiting a combination of initiating-structure and consideration, can provide better leadership and help the organisation to achieve higher and nobler goals.

He can mould ideas together like an imaginative artist to form an exciting sculpture of leadership systems that can meet the present and future needs of the organisation on the one hand and produce a group of happy and productive staff which can operate within the organisation with originality,
excitement and creativity, on the other.


Hence, the 'c' part of the first hypothesis 'Significant relationship exists between organisational climate and leadership behaviour of principals,' stands accepted in totality.

4.2 PERCEPTION OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS HELD FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

In this section, the findings on the role expectation held for physical education teachers as perceived by principals and physical education teachers themselves, have been analysed and discussed.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

To test the second hypothesis of this study which
states, 'Significant differences exist in the perception of role expectation held for physical education teachers as perceived by principals and physical education teachers themselves,' data was collected with the help of Physical Education Teacher's Role Expectation Scale (PETRES). Principals were asked to give their perceptions as to the roles they expect from the physical education teachers and the physical education teachers were asked to give their self perception as to the types of roles expected of them.

Role expectation variable has been assessed in four dimensions namely teaching expectations, administrative expectations, other expectations and total expectations. The means, standard deviations and t-ratios have been discussed below, (vide Table 4.2), for both principals and physical education teachers. Only those values which were found significant at .01 or .05 level of significance, have been considered for discussion.
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TABLE 4.2

COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS AMONG PRINCIPALS AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS (N = 62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE EXPECTATION</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>t-RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>918.68</td>
<td>35.35</td>
<td>894.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>976.74</td>
<td>53.46</td>
<td>944.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>964.94</td>
<td>62.83</td>
<td>908.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>2860.35</td>
<td>146.58</td>
<td>2747.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>2860.35</td>
<td>146.58</td>
<td>2747.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .05 = 2.000

** SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .01 = 2.660

df = 60

Discussion of Results

The results presented in Table 4.2 indicate that significant differences exist between the perceptions of the principals and physical education teachers on all the four dimensions of role expectation. The scores on teaching expectation (r = 2.541) and administrative expectations (r = 2.574) were found to be significant at .05 level whereas scores on other expectations (r = 4.053) and total expectations (r = 3.447) were significant at .01 level. The scores obtained on
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the three sub scales and total scores of PETRES reveal that principals of the institutions under study hold high expectations from physical education teachers.

The mean values (vide Table 4.2) obtained on sub scales and total scores of PETRES indicate that both principals and physical education teachers scored highest on administrative expectations and lowest on teaching expectations. These results are similar to those of Kelliher (1956), Bryson (1975), Webber (1975), Hruska (1976), Sutton (1976), Wallat (1976), Smith (1978) and Berg (1978). They all found 'administrative roles' to be of maximum importance.

The results interpreted in the light of Table 4.2 indicate that when mean scores of principals and lecturers were compared, it was seen that the principals scored high on all the three dimensions and total of role expectations which shows that principals have higher degree of expectations focussed on physical education teachers as compared to the perceptions of the physical education teachers themselves, about their roles. Thus, we can conclude that there are differences in the perceptions of role expectation of the physical education teachers.

In the light of above findings, the second hypothesis 'Significant differences exist in the perception of role
expectation held for physical education teachers as perceived by principals and the physical education teachers themselves, stands accepted in totality.

4.3 COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS AMONG MALE AND FEMALE PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

This section deals with the findings on the comparison of difference in the perception of role expectation of physical education teachers as perceived by male and female physical education teachers working in different colleges under study.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

In an attempt to test the third hypothesis, all physical education teachers working in the colleges under study were asked to give a self-perception of the roles expected from them. The data was analysed by separating the responses of male and female physical education teachers and then a comparison was done as regards their perceptions.

The results have been analysed and discussed (vide Table 4.3) for both male and female physical education teachers and only those values as were significant at .01 or .05 level of significance, have been considered.
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TABLE 4.3

COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS AMONG MALE AND FEMALE PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS (N - 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE EXPECTATION</th>
<th>MALE MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>FEMALE MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Expectations</td>
<td>896.00</td>
<td>46.92</td>
<td>892.29</td>
<td>28.95</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Expectations</td>
<td>955.06</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>930.93</td>
<td>39.77</td>
<td>1.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expectations</td>
<td>916.00</td>
<td>51.87</td>
<td>900.43</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expectations</td>
<td>2767.06</td>
<td>123.64</td>
<td>2723.64</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td>1.176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 29
SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .05 = 2.045
SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .01 = 2.756

Discussion of Results

The results presented in Table 4.3 reveal that male physical education teachers have scored higher on all the three dimensions and total of role expectations as compared to female physical education teachers. Both male and female physical education teachers scored highest on administrative expectations and lowest on teaching expectations. The mean values on the three sub scales and total scores of PETRES indicate that there is a difference in the perception of roles
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expected, as perceived by male and female education teachers.

The 't' values entered in Table 4.3 indicate that the scores on all the three sub scales and total of role expectations, for both male and female physical education teachers were neither significant at .05 level and nor at .01 level. Thus the differences though positive were found statistically insignificant for both the groups.

The results of the study are consistent with the findings of Berg (1978), who conducted a comparative study on the functions of male - female athletic administrators, among other things. The areas included in the study were planning, organising, staffing, scheduling, coordinating, directing, supervising, and budgeting. He concluded that there were no significant differences found.

In the light of above finding, it can be concluded that though differences were found in the perceptions of role expectation of physical education teachers among male and female physical education teachers yet the results were statistically insignificant as per Table 4.3, they cannot be accepted in favour of hypothesis under reference.

Thus, the third hypothesis, 'Significant differences exist in the perception of role expectation of physical
education teachers as perceived by male and female physical education teachers,' stands rejected.

4.4 COMPARISON OF THE ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS IN PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL COLLEGES

In this section the findings on the role expectations held for physical education teachers as perceived by themselves and by the principals of the professional and non-professional colleges have been analysed and discussed.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

In order to test the fourth hypothesis Physical Education Teacher's Role Expectation Scale (PETRES), were distributed among the principals and the physical education teachers to obtain their responses as to the expectations they perceived for the physical education teachers. The data was divided into two groups namely professional colleges and non-professional colleges.

Role expectation variable has been assessed in four dimensions namely teaching expectations, administrative expectations, other expectations and total expectations. The means, standard deviations and t-ratios have been discussed below, (vide Table 4.4) for both professional and non-professional colleges. Only those values as were significant at
FIG. 4.5
ROLE EXPECTATIONS PATTERN OF
P.E.T. IN PROF & NON-PROF COLLEGES

ROLE EXPECTATION SUBSCALES

- TEACHING
- ADMINISTRATIVE
- OTHER
- TOTAL

MEAN (PROF.)
S.D (PROF.)
MEAN (NON-PROF.)
S.D (NON-PROF.)
TABLE 4.4

COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS IN PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL COLLEGES (N = 62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE EXPECTATION</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL COLLEGES</th>
<th>NON-PROFESSIONAL COLLEGES</th>
<th>t-RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>921.25</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>901.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>972.44</td>
<td>51.26</td>
<td>956.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>943.75</td>
<td>55.45</td>
<td>934.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>2837.44</td>
<td>127.07</td>
<td>2792.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 60

* SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .05 = 2.000
** SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .01 = 2.660

Discussion of Results

Analysing the results presented in Table 4.4 higher mean scores were obtained on all the three dimensions and total of role expectation, in professional colleges as compared to non-professional colleges. Both professional and non-professional colleges scored highest on administrative expectations and lowest on teaching expectations. Thus, it can
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be concluded that higher expectations are focused on the administrative roles of physical education teachers and lowest on the teaching roles, in both professional and non-professional colleges. The mean values on the three sub scales and total of role expectation indicate that there is a difference in perception of role expectation of physical education teachers in professional and non-professional colleges.

The 't' values entered in Table 4.4 indicate that none of the values were significant at .01 or .05 level. So, it can be concluded that the results found were statistically insignificant.

Thus, it can be made out that there exist no significant differences in the perceptions of role expectation of physical education teachers in professional and non-professional college as perceived by themselves and by the principals of their institutions.

Hence, the fourth hypothesis, 'Significant differences exist in the role expectation of physical education teachers in professional and non-professional colleges as perceived by themselves and by the principals of their institutions,' stands rejected.
4.5 COMPARISON OF THE ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE IN PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL COLLEGES

In this section, the fifth hypothesis 'Significant differences exist between professional and non-professional colleges as regards organisational climate', as perceived by principals and physical education teachers of these institutions has been analysed and discussed.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

In an attempt to test the above stated hypothesis, Organisational Climate Description Questionnaires were distributed among principals and physical education teachers to obtain their views on organisational climate of their institutions. The data was divided into two groups namely, professional and non-professional colleges.

Organisational climate has been assessed in nine dimensions namely disengagement, hindrance, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production-emphasis, thrust, consideration and total of organisational climate. The responses of the principals and physical education teachers in professional colleges were compared to the responses of their counterparts in non-professional colleges. The means, standard deviations and t-ratios have been assessed below vide Table 4.5 for both
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professional and non-professional colleges. Only those values as were found significant at .01 or .05 level of significance, have been considered for discussion.

**TABLE 4.5**

**COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE IN PROFESSIONAL AND NON PROFESSIONAL COLLEGES (N - 62)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL COLLEGES</th>
<th>NON-PROFESSIONAL COLLEGES</th>
<th>t-RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDRANCE</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPRIT</td>
<td>26.94</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>27.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIMACY</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>19.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALOOPNESS</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>21.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROD-EMPH.</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>19.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THRUST</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>25.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSIDERATION</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>16.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>166.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>164.46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* df = 60

* SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .05 = 2.000

** SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .01 = 2.660

**Discussion of Results**

The mean values, as entered in Table 4.5 indicate
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that in both professional and non-professional colleges, esprit has got the highest ratings among the eight dimensions of organisational climate. Esprit refers to morale. When the social needs of the faculty are satisfied and at the same time they feel that they are enjoying a sense of accomplishment, it signifies that there morale is high. It shows that the principal in such an organisation is exhibiting behaviours that are leading to faculty satisfaction. This not only improves communication between the principal and the faculty but also leads to higher achievement levels within the organisation.

High scores on esprit also indicate that the principal is giving complete freedom to the faculty to provide their own structures for interaction so that they can find ways within the group for satisfying their social needs. The group members enjoy friendly relations with each other which results in a congenial working climate.

The studies conducted by Nanos (1991) and Dial (1992) are consistent with the results of the present study, that participative and collaborative organisational structures and an improved flow of communication between principal and faculty leads to better achievement of organisational goals.

Washington (1982) has also reported higher ratings on esprit in four of the five open education schools included in
his study.

Hindrance reported lowest scoring in both professional and non-professional colleges among the eight dimensions of organisational climate vide Table 4.5. The mean values were 14.75 and 13.04 respectively for both the groups. Hindrance refers to the feeling of the faculty that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands and other requirements which the faculty regard as unnecessary. Low scores on hindrance reported in this study indicate that the faculty is not burdened with work or routine reports. The principal's policies facilitate the teachers' accomplishment of their tasks. He sets up procedures and regulations to help the faculty to achieve their targets with ease. Teachers do not have to run to the principal, every time they need supplies, books, projectors and so on. Thus, all the procedural helps are available to facilitate their functioning.

The results as per Table 4.5 also indicated that non-professional colleges have lower level of hindrance (13.04) as compared to professional colleges (14.75). This shows that in non-professional colleges the faculty are not burdened with administrative duties and other committee requirements as compared to professional colleges.
Referring to Table 4.5, differences in mean values were also obtained on the remaining six dimensions and total of organisational climate in professional and non-professional colleges. Disengagement (22.00), aloofness (21.56), thrust (25.50) and consideration (17.88) had higher mean values in professional colleges whereas intimacy (19.59) and production-emphasis (19.07) had higher mean values in non-professional colleges. Total of organisational climate also had higher mean values (166.63) in professional colleges as compared to non-professional colleges (164.46).

Thus, the mean values entered in Table 4.5, though indicate differences among professional and non-professional colleges as regards organisational climate, yet none of the t-ratio scores were found to be significant either at .05 level or at .01 level.

Hence, the fifth hypothesis "Significant differences exist between professional and non-professional colleges as regards organisational climate," cannot be accepted.

4.6 PERCEPTION OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR HELD FOR PRINCIPALS

This section deals with the findings on the perception of leadership behaviour held for the principals as
perceived by principals themselves and by the physical education teachers of their institutions.

**Analysis and Interpretation of Data**

In an effort to test the sixth Hypothesis Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaires (LBDQ) were distributed among principals and physical education teachers. The principals were asked to self-analyse their behaviour whereas the physical education teachers were asked to fill in their responses as to how they felt about their principals' behaviour. Leadership behaviour variable has been assessed in three dimensions namely, initiating-structure, consideration and total of leadership.

The results have been analysed and discussed vide Table 4.6 for both principals and physical education teachers as regards leadership behaviour and only those values as were found significant at .01 or .05 level of significance have been considered.
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### Table 4.6

*COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR AMONG PRINCIPALS AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS (N - 62)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Behaviour</th>
<th>Principals MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Teachers MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>39.74</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>4.865**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>39.48</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>37.74</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85.06</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>77.48</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>4.589**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 60

* * SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .05 = 2.000
** SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .01 = 2.660

### Discussion of Results

The results presented in Table 4.6 indicate that significant differences exist between the perceptions of the principals and the physical education teachers as regards leadership behaviour. The mean values indicate that both principals and physical education teachers have scored high on initiating-structure as compared to consideration. Initiating-structure is a quality of a leader’s behaviour to develop rapport with the members of the working group to establish well-defined patterns of organisation, channels of communication and methods of procedure. He initiates action inspires and motivates the faculty to get things done. Higher
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scores on initiating-structure dimension indicate that the principals of the institutions under study are exhibiting behaviours which are more task-oriented. Similarly the physical education teachers of these institutions feel that the principals of their institutions lay more stress on goal accomplishment. Significant differences were found in the perceptions of principals (45.58) and physical education teachers (39.74) as regards mean values on initiating-structure.

The t-ratios as entered in Table 4.6 indicate statistically significant differences in the perceptions of principals and physical education teachers as regards initiating-structure dimensions of leadership behaviour. The t-values (r = 4.865), were significant at .01 level.

The mean values vide Table 4.6 on the consideration dimension of leadership behaviour also received differences in perception. The principals scored (39.48) while the physical education teachers scored (37.74) on this dimension. Consideration refers to the behaviour of the principal indicative of friendship between him and his faculty. The principal's behaviour generates warmth, friendship, mutual trust and respect which result in a healthy interpersonal relationships between him and his faculty. The scores of t-
ratios entered against consideration were not found significant either at .05 level or at .01 level. This indicates that both principals and physical education teachers do not differ in perception as regards consideration dimension of leadership behaviour.

The results presented in Table 4.6 indicate significant differences in mean values as regards perceptions of principals and physical education teachers on total of leadership. Principals scored (85.06) while physical education teachers scored (77.48). This indicates that the principals of the institutions under study feel that they are exhibiting higher initiating ability and consideration. They provide thrust for the organisation by setting an example by working hard themselves and have personal flexibility both to maintain control and to look for the personal welfare of the teachers. 't' values obtained in favour of total of leadership (r = 4.589) were also found significant at .01 level.

The results of the study are consistent with those of Lindemuth (1969), Sprandel (1974), Watkins (1984), Kleinsasser (1986) and Rice (1991) who reported significant differences in the perceptions of principals and teachers as regards leadership behaviour.

Thus, the sixth hypothesis, "Significant differences
exist between principals and physical education teachers as regards leadership behaviour is partially accepted.

4.7 ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

This section deals with the finding on the perception of organisational climate as perceived by principals and physical education teachers.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

In order to test the seventh hypothesis 'Significant differences exist between principals and physical education teachers as regards organisational climate,' t-ratios were worked out on the basis of the means and standard deviations of principals and physical education teachers to find out the differences in perceptions of both the groups.

Organisational climate variable has been assessed in nine dimensions namely disengagement, hindrance, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production-emphasis, thrust, consideration and total of organisational climate. The obtained t-ratios along with the values of means and standard deviations for both principals and physical education teachers, have been presented in Table 4.7 below, for analyses and discussion. Only those
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values as were found significant at .01 and .05 level of significance have been considered for discussion.

TABLE 4.7

COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE AMONG PRINCIPALS AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS (N - 62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>TEACHERS MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>2.731**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDRANCE</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPRIT</td>
<td>30.32</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>27.06</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>2.945**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIMACY</td>
<td>18.16</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALOOFNESS</td>
<td>21.84</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROD-EMPH.</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.353*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THRUST</td>
<td>26.52</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.458*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSIDERATION</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>158.71</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>158.26</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 60

* SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .05 = 2.000
** SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL .01 = 2.660

Discussion of Results

Statistically significant differences (Vide Table 4.7) were found between principals and physical education teachers in four out of nine dimensions of organisational
DIFF. IN PERCEPTION OF ORG. CLIMATE

AMONG PRINCIPALS & PHY. EDU. TEACHERS

- CONSIDERATION
- HINDRANCE
- INTIMACY
- PROD.-EMPH.
- THECLON OF ORG. CLIMA
- ROE

0.4  -
0.6  -
0.8  —
1
Z' 
1.4
1.6
.8
O
3.2
3
2.8
2 .6
2.4
2 2
D

DISENGAGEMENT
HINDRANCE
ESPRIT
INTIMACY
ALOOFNESS
PROD.-EMPH.
THRUST
CONSIDERATION
TOTAL

- ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE SUBSCALES

T - VALUE
climate.

**Disengagement**: The mean values as entered in Table 4.7 indicate that principals scored (17.87) whereas physical education teachers scored (21.10) on this dimension of organisational climate. The t-ratio value obtained for disengagement was 2.731 which was found to be significant at physical education teachers perceive more strongly about disengagement. The results of the study are in consonance with those of Brickner (1971) who revealed in his study that principals perceived lower disengagement as compared to their faculties.

**Esprit**: Table 4.7 indicates significant differences on mean values among principals (30.32) and physical education teachers (27.06) on esprit. The t-ratio (2.945) was significant at .01 level. This indicates that principals have higher perceptions as regards esprit. They feel that the morale of the staff is high and their social needs are being satisfied. The principals exhibit such behaviours that provide adequate opportunities to develop social relations among faculty members. The prevalence of congenial atmosphere helps them to perform their professional duties well.

The results of the study can be supported by the
findings of Brickner (1971) who reported higher scores on esprit as perceived by principals in comparison to their faculties.

**Production-emphasis** : As indicated in Table 4.7 production-emphasis, a dimension of organisational climate, received significant differences in perception from principals and physical education teachers. The mean value scores were (16.65) and (18.39) respectively for both the groups. The t-ratio (2.353) was significant at .05 level. The results are indicative of the fact that the physical education teachers perceive their principals as more goal conscious, than do the principals themselves feel about it. The principals in the institutions under study emphasise production and frequently tell the teachers to work hard. They set rules and regulations about how things should be done and see to it that their orders are being adhered to.

The results of the study are consistent with the findings of Muhm (1968) and Mariz (1980) who reported significant differences on production-emphasis.

**Thrust** : The t-ratio scores (Vide Table 4.7) were statistically significant for thrust (r = 2.458) at .05 level. The mean scores were (26.52) and (24.13) for principals and physical
education teachers respectively. Higher scores on thrust, by principals indicate behaviour of the principals characterized by their efforts in trying to move the organisation. The principals go out of their way to help the teachers to accomplish their tasks with ease. They do not go in for close supervision but encourage, support and endeavour to move the organisation in an efficient way. The principals provide thrust for the organisations by working hard themselves. They possess the personal flexibility to control and to look out for the personal welfare of the faculty.

The results obtained in the present study are similar to those of Berends (1969), Brickner (1971), Corpus (1971), Sisson (1980), Barton (1985), Sellars (1985), Vrable (1985), who reported significant differences on organisational climate.

In the light of the above discussion, the seventh hypothesis, 'Significant differences exist between principals and physical education teachers as regards organisational climate', stands partially accepted.