

Role Perception and Role Performance of Formal Leaders

B. B. Patel¹ and V. D. Suryavanshi²

INTRODUCTION

The key leadership at the grass-root level is the chief agency through which most of the rural development works are carried out. Generally the formal leadership in rural areas could transmit the message, mobilize people's support and intensify their participation. Leaders of different areas vary in performing the leadership roles. Role performance of an individual depends upon how he perceives his role, whether he considers his role correctly or not. Thus, role perception of an individual has an influence in role performance.

OBJECTIVES

- (1) To determine and describe the leaders' perception of different leadership roles to be played by formal leaders.
- (2) To study the extent of leadership roles actually performed by the formal leaders.

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted in Anand Taluka of Kheda District in Gujarat State. Out of 76 villages in a taluka, 17 villages

having population upto 3,000 were selected randomly. From these villages, 105 village panchayat members have been interviewed through personal interview. The study mainly focused on role perception and role performance in different village development activities in relation to the eight role-segments viz. Planner, Executor, Communicator, Representative, Helper, Harmonizer, Group-maintainer and Initiator. A five-point and three-point rating scale were used for determining the perception and performance of leadership roles played by the village panchayat leaders respectively. For each role, three statements reflecting that particular role were developed.

The total score and mean score for each statement and for each respondent was then calculated separately. The respondents who got score value below the mean were considered to have low perception and low performance of the role and those who got score value above the mean were considered to have high perception and high performance of the role.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

(A) LEADERS' PERCEPTION

Number and percentage of leaders

1. Asso. Prof. (Extn.), B.A.C.A., GAU, Anand.
2. Asso. Extn. Educationist (Agril. Comm.), EEI, GAU, Anand.

having high and low perception of each role has been presented in Table 1.

Data presented in Table 1 reveals that 70.48 per cent of the leaders had high perception of their role as a planner followed by 63.81 and 61.90 per cent of leaders as harmonizer and communicator,

village development programmes.

Respondents also had high perception of the role of harmonizer. This may be due to the fact that they are the leading person of the village and they might have felt that maintaining harmony is the basic thing for the success of the village development activities and they

Table 1 : Distribution of the leaders according to perception of different leadership roles (N = 105)

Sr. No.	Name of role	Level of role perceived			
		High		Low	
		No.	Per cent	No	Per cent
1.	Planner	74	70.48	31	29.52
2.	Executor	54	51.43	51	48.57
3.	Communicator	65	61.90	40	38.10
4.	Representative	58	55.24	47	44.76
5.	Helper	42	40.00	63	60.00
6.	Harmonizer	67	63.81	38	36.19
7.	Group maintainer	41	39.05	64	60.95
8.	Initiator	63	60.00	42	40.00

respectively. While majority of the respondents (60.95 and 60.00 per cent) had low perception of their role as a group maintainer and helper respectively.

A perusal of data conclude that all the village panchayat members are the elected local leaders of their concerned villages and therefore, the responsibility to plan different activities rest with them. These are the villagers' needs, interests and problems and resources available locally. Thus, they might have thought that they should play an important role in planning

might have tried to deal with villages tactfully and they might have motivated the villagers to remain together in working towards the goal.

Similarly, nearly about two-third (63.81 per cent) of the local leaders had perception of the role of communicator. This might be due to the prestige and status of the village panchayat members, extension workers might have used them as communicator for diffusing innovations.

As far as low perception is concerned, majority of the leaders (60.95

and 60.00 per cent) had low perception of their role as group maintainer and helper, respectively.

The probable reasons might be that, they are elected for a definite period of time and as a leader they have not to worry much for maintaining the group and being the leaders they might be busy enough not to spare time to help the villagers individually or might find it below dignity.

(B) LEADER'S ROLE PERFORMANCE

Number and percentage of leaders having high and low performance of role has been presented in Table 2.

This might be due to the fact that the members of the village panchayats were elected as local leaders and therefore, their responsibility to plan different activities in agricultural and other development work of the village rest with them. While the roles of representative and harmonizer were performed high by about equal number of formal leaders. Only two roles viz. executor and helper were performed low by equal number (54) respectively.

CONCLUSION

From the above study, it can be concluded that the roles as planner,

Table 2 : Distribution of the leaders according to perception of different leadership roles (N = 105)

Sr. No.	Name of role	Level of role performed			
		High		Low	
		No.	Per cent	No	Per cent
1.	Planner	75	75.24	26	24.76
2.	Executor	51	48.57	54	51.43
3.	Communicator	61	58.10	44	41.90
4.	Representative	64	60.65	41	39.05
5.	Helper	51	48.57	54	51.43
6.	Harmonizer	63	60.00	42	40.00
7.	Group maintainer	57	54.29	48	45.71
8.	Initiator	60	57.14	45	42.86

In case of role performance of formal leaders, out of 105, as many as 75.24 per cent of leaders had high performance in the role as planner while equally 51.43 per cent of leaders had low performance for both roles namely executor and helper.

harmonizer and communicator were perceived high while the roles as helper and group maintainer were perceived low by the formal leaders.

The roles as planner, representative and harmonizer were given top most

importance means they performed their roles very well while they given less importance to the roles executor and 'helper'. So village panchayat members should be trained in under-standing the need for working as helper and group maintainer and they should be given some definite units while performing their roles on definite lines of rural development programmes. They know the resources, situations, needs, alternatives and planned accordingly with possible souldtions. This findings was similar to those of Dwivedi (1956) and Bachenheimer (1959).

Equal number of respondents had low performance of both the roles as

executor and helper. They might have assumed that the responsibility to execute the programme does not rest with them and they might be getting less time to care individually.

IMPALICATIONS

Formal leadas viz village Panchayat members should be trained in understanding the inportance of roles which were perceived low by them as helper and group-maintain. Likewise they should also encourage to perform the role as executor and helper so that they perform leadership role very effectively in different rural development programmes.

REFERENCES

Bachenheimer, R. (1959). Elements of Leadership in an Andhra village in "Leadership and Political Institutions in India" (Park and Tinkers, Ed.) Princeto U. Press, Princetion. p. 452

Dwivedi, R. C. (1956). Local Leadership in the Pilot Project Etawal. Kurukshetra. IV : 1. pp. 45-47.

Morality is simply the attitude we adopt toward
people whom we personally dislike

- OSCAR WILDE