



12-1-2005

Leadership Role Expectations and Relationships of Principals and Pastors in Catholic Parochial Elementary Schools: Part 2

Duane F. Schafer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/ce>

Recommended Citation

Schafer, D. F. (2005). Leadership Role Expectations and Relationships of Principals and Pastors in Catholic Parochial Elementary Schools: Part 2. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 9 (2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.15365/joce.0902092013>

This Review of Research is brought to you for free with open access by the School of Education at Digital Commons at Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. It has been accepted for publication in *Journal of Catholic Education* by the journal's editorial board and has been published on the web by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons at Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. For more information about Digital Commons, please contact digitalcommons@lmu.edu. To contact the editorial board of *Journal of Catholic Education*, please email JCE@nd.edu.

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

LEADERSHIP ROLE EXPECTATIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS OF PRINCIPALS AND PASTORS IN CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: PART 2

DUANE F. SCHAFER

Diocese of Spokane, Washington

This review examines several topics that inform many struggles currently experienced in the relationship between a canonical pastor and the principal of the parochial elementary school. Drawing on current research, this review examines various leadership theories, including the popular servant leadership model, and proceeds to a discussion of role expectations, role conflict, and role ambiguity.

The school principal is generally identified as a primary decision maker in both public and private schools. However, since the Catholic parochial school is a ministry of the parish, the pastor, along with the principal, is also designated as a primary decision maker within the school. If the principal and pastor do not have a clear understanding of their own role and the role of the other in the school, then a positive working relationship between these two leaders may be affected.

This is the second of four articles that focus on research designed to identify leadership expectations that may be perceived differently by pastors and principals. The first article focused on basic background information regarding Catholic elementary schools in the United States, their place within the Catholic Church, the role of the pastor, and the role of the principal. This article addresses several understandings of the term leadership in order to establish a basis for determining the roles of a leader; the concepts of power and authority and how they are perceived as relating to leadership; the concepts of role expectations, role conflict, and role ambiguity and how each of these affects the leader; and team building and collaboration and how they affect organizational effectiveness. The third and fourth articles will focus on previous research on pastor and principal relationships, a recent study and findings, and possible recommendations for pastors and principals.

THE VARIOUS MEANINGS OF LEADERSHIP

There are numerous leadership theories that have emerged throughout the years. Some of the primary theories include a traits approach to leadership, a style approach, a situational approach, contingency theory, path-goal theory, leader-member exchange theory, and transformational theory. Dobbs, Gordon, Lee, and Stamps (1999) have taken a more informal approach to leadership theory and have delineated 10 general leadership theory categories:

- Biology is destiny. The leader is the alpha male with the most testosterone.
- It's all about power. Might makes right.
- Paternalism. The leader should be the brightest and most virtuous.
- Contingency. It all depends on the situation. (p. 26)
- Charisma. Leadership is embedded in the personalities of Great Men.
- Historical determinism. The times create the leader.
- Transaction-based. Followers act in their own self-interest.
- Reason-based. Leaders lead by ideas.
- Census-based. Leaders encourage followers to buy into a common program.
- Values-based. Leaders are moral agents and enablers of followers. (p. 27)

These authors divide the 10 theories into two major categories: leaders who get their followers to serve them for selfish purposes and those who help their followers fulfill their needs and achieve their goals.

Clearly there are many understandings of leadership, but primarily leadership is about relationships. Leadership is management by persuasion and inspiration, rather than direct or implied coercion. It is the ability to impress the will of the leader on those led in order to solicit obedience, respect, loyalty, and cooperation. It is a non-coercive relationship between leader and followers.

Therefore, leadership is an influence process. It influences people toward shared goals. Leadership is "the ability to mobilize others in a positive way" (Daloz, Keen, Keen, & Daloz Parks, 1996, p. 42). "Leadership means that one individual has a better than average sense of what should be done now, and is willing to take the risk to say: Let us do this now" (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 244). "Leadership is a process in which an individual takes initiative to assist a group to move toward goals that are acceptable, to maintain the group, and to dispose of the needs of the group" (Boles & Davenport, 1975, p. 117). Bennis and Nanus (1985) attributed the following strategies to leaders: attention through vision, meaning through communication, trust through positioning, and the deployment of self. Kouzes and Posner (1995) delineated five behaviors common to successful leaders: (a) "challenge the process"; (b) "inspire a shared vision"; (c) "enable others to

act”; (d) “model the way”; and (e) “encourage the heart” (p. 9). Kouzes and Posner also spoke of the 10 commitments of leadership:

- Search out challenging opportunities to change, grow, innovate, and improve.
- Experiment, take risks, and learn from the accompanying mistakes.
- Envision an uplifting and ennobling future.
- Enlist others in a common vision by appealing to their values, interests, hopes, and dreams.
- Foster collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust.
- Strengthen people by giving power away, providing choice, developing competence, assigning critical tasks, and offering visible support.
- Set the example by behaving in ways that are consistent with shared values.
- Achieve small wins that promote consistent progress and build commitment.
- Recognize individual contributions to the success of every project.
- Celebrate team accomplishments regularly. (p. 18)

SERVANT LEADERSHIP

Since the word leadership has been used only for approximately the last hundred years, it seems that we have not come to any firm understanding of this term. For this study, a brief overview of one of the more predominant leadership theories that seems to be appropriate for Church and Catholic schools – servant leadership – is provided. Greenleaf’s (1991) servant leadership approach to leadership closely reflects the kind of leadership that one may expect to find in both Church and Catholic schools. Characteristics of servant leadership as delineated by Spears (1994) include: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. This is the language of both Church and Catholic school leaders, as delineated in three Church documents pertaining to Catholic schools.

The United States Catholic bishops stated in a document entitled, *To Teach As Jesus Did*:

As God’s plan unfolds in the life of an individual Christian, he grows in awareness that, as a child of God, he does not live in isolation from others. From the moment of Baptism he becomes a member of a new and larger family, the Christian community. Reborn in Baptism, he is joined to others in common faith, hope, and love. This community is based not on force or accident of geographic location or even on deeper ties of ethnic origin, but on the life of the

Spirit which unites its members in a unique fellowship so intimate that Paul likens it to a body of which each individual is a part and Jesus Himself is the Head. In this community one person's problem is everyone's problem and one person's victory is everyone's victory. Never before and never since the coming of Jesus Christ has anyone proposed such a community. (National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1972, §22)

In another Church document entitled, *The Catholic School*, the Vatican embraced the idea that Catholic schools are Christian communities:

From the outset the Catholic school declares its program and its determination to uphold it. It is a genuine community bent on imparting, over and above an academic education, all the help it can to its members to adopt a Christian way of life. For the Catholic school mutual respect means service to the Person of Christ. Cooperation is between brothers and sisters in Christ. A policy of working for the common good is undertaken seriously as working for the building up of the kingdom. (Congregation for Catholic Education [CCE], 1977, §60)

In another document entitled, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, the Vatican stated, "A Catholic school is not simply a place where lessons are taught; it is a centre that has an operative educational philosophy, attentive to the needs of today's youth and illumined by the Gospel message" (CCE, 1988, §22).

Greenleaf (1991) saw the leader as a servant first. Servant leadership "emphasizes increased service to others, a holistic approach to work promoting a sense of community, and the sharing of power in decision making" (p. 337). Greenleaf stated,

Servants, by definition, are fully human. Servant-leaders are functionally superior because they are closer to the ground – they hear things, see things, know things, and their intuitive insight is exceptional. Because of this they are dependable and trusted, they know the meaning of that line from Shakespeare's sonnet: "They that have power to hurt and will do none." (p. 42)

Greenleaf described the need for institutions to become servants, as well:

If a better society is to be built, one that is more just and more loving, one that provides greater creative opportunity for its people, then the most open course is to raise both the capacity to serve and the very performance as servant of existing major institutions by new regenerative forces operating within them. (p. 49)

Greenleaf suggested that an institution is a servant because it is

a gathering of persons who have accepted a common purpose, and a common discipline to guide the pursuit of that purpose, to the end that each involved person reaches higher fulfillment as a person, through serving and being served by the common venture, than would be achieved alone or in a less committed relationship. (p. 237)

Greenleaf (1991) clearly identified the Church as an institution and urged the Church to also consider its role as servant, stating

Most charitable institutions, of which the church is one, have tended to view the problems of society as “out there,” and it was assumed that service to the “out there” was the sole justification for their existence. Now the view is emerging that one begins “in here,” inside the serving institution, and makes of it a model institution. This model, because it is a thing of beauty, in itself, becomes a powerful serving force. (p. 239)

Greenleaf (1991) identified four general strategies for developing these model institutions, and encouraged institutional leaders to act on these recommendations. The first strategy involves goal setting:

There must be a goal, a concept of a distinguished serving institution in which all who accept its discipline are lifted up to a nobler stature and great effectiveness than they are likely to achieve on their own or with a less demanding discipline. (p. 240)

The second general strategy of institution building is

an understanding of leadership and followership that is essential for movement toward a goal such as this. Everyone in an institution is part leader and part follower. If an institution is to achieve distinction as servant, then only those who are natural servants should be empowered to lead....The servant operates by a theory of justice in which the least favored in society always benefits, or, at least, is not further deprived. (Greenleaf, 1991, pp. 240-241)

A third major element is “organization-structure-modus operandi” (p. 241). Greenleaf stated,

The key question is how power and authority are handled. The major conclusion I have reached after much searching is that we have at long last come to grips with the liabilities in the obsolete idea of a single chief atop a pyramidal structure, and that henceforth the ultimate authority should be placed in a balanced team of equals under the leadership of a true servant who serves as *primus inter pares*, first among equals. (1991, p. 241)

The fourth part of Greenleaf's (1991) strategy of institution building is the need for trustees. "Trustees are persons in whom ultimate trust is placed and who stand outside the institution, apart from the administration and with more detachment and objectivity than insiders can summon" (p. 241). The trustees' role is to closely monitor the institution as it moves toward its goals. Greenleaf stated, "Such an arrangement is essential, I believe, if the internal leadership, the administration, is to be placed with a council of equals rather than a single chief" (p. 241).

The institutional Church tends to fall back on the law: the moral law, the law of Moses, the law of the elders, Canon Law, and so forth. Greenleaf (1991) repudiated,

Then, by stating the law as uniform for all persons, regardless of their capacities, rather than placing the greater obligation on the more able, the better endowed persons are relieved of the obligation to measure up to their opportunities and their potentials. This permits many to be seen as law abiding when, in fact, their performance is far below what it might be. In the shadow of this view of the shortcomings of the traditional moral law, I have tried to delineate the servant as one who meets the test of a higher law whose requirements of both persons and institutions are proportional to their opportunity to serve. While I would like to see more non-servants converted to servanthood, my greater hope is that more of those who are natural servants, who get joy out of serving, will become aggressive builders of serving institutions. Within these institutions the opportunity may seem larger for those in higher status positions, but as more and more people, regardless of their status, are asserting their autonomy and articulating their beliefs, literally everyone who is inside and who has some force as a person can be an institution builder. (p. 248)

Because of its thematic unity with the Christian Gospels and its congruence with the life of Jesus, servant leadership merits the attention, consideration, and reflection of leaders in every aspect of Catholic life – parishes, schools, hospitals, social service agencies, and diocesan central offices.

POWER AND AUTHORITY

In addressing servant leadership, Greenleaf (1991) defined power and authority, and how they relate to servant leadership in the educational setting: "Power has many meanings, but in this discussion let us take it to be coercive force – either overtly to compel, or covertly to manipulate. And let us take authority to mean a sanction bestowed to legitimate the use of power" (p. 167). Greenleaf further stated,

A generalization is offered: the institution is strongest when all parties have adequate power for their role; it is weakest where one or more of the elements

has too little power, because then somebody has too much and the corrupting influence of power is moving toward the absolute. (p. 170)

Heifetz (1994) also spoke of power and authority, defining authority “as a conferred power to perform a service” (p. 57) and consisting of two major components: “First, authority is given and can be taken away. Second, authority is conferred as part of an exchange” (p. 57). Heifetz further explained,

The exchange of power for a service between principal and agent takes a characteristic form. The authorizing principal says to the authorized agent: Given your know-how, I give you the power to make decisions to accomplish a service, and I’ll follow those decisions as long as it appears to me that they serve my purposes. (p. 57)

Heifetz did, however, see that “not all conscious exchanges involving power are acts of authorization” (p. 58), offering the example of a mugger. “The victim does not authorize the gunmen. The victim does not confer power for a service” (p. 58).

Heifetz (1994) clearly believed that “authority relationships are enormously productive” (p. 69) but also recognized that people have mixed feelings regarding authority:

Perhaps because we know from experience that authority relationships consist essentially of dependencies, some of us are ambivalent about giving power, and others are ambivalent about taking it. Having been disappointed or abused in these relationships, some of which may strongly resemble dominance, many of us do not like to be dependent, or depended upon. Dependency makes us feel vulnerable, controlled, or overwhelmed by the expectations other people place upon us. (pp. 69-70)

Heifetz (1994) divided authority into two basic classifications: formal authority and informal authority. “With formal authority comes the various powers of the office, and with informal authority comes the power to influence attitude and behavior beyond compliance” (p. 101). One who possesses formal authority is limited by the powers of his or her office, and the authority ends when he or she leaves that office; while one who possesses informal authority can influence others well beyond the limits of his or her job description, and this authority becomes greater or lesser depending on the individual’s popularity and reputation.

Heifetz (1994) also addressed the negative side of leadership and authority. “Constituents confer resources in exchange for services. Power is received in the promise of fulfilling expectations – people in authority, we

insist, must provide direction, protection, and order” (p. 125). When those in authority do not meet expectations, Heifetz emphasized, “we bring them down. Sometimes, we kill them” (p. 125).

Rausch (1989) also addressed power and authority in leadership, and as did Heifetz (1994), made a distinction between the two concepts. Rausch explained,

The English word authority is derived from the Latin *auctor*, author; just as an author brings something into being, so a person possessing authority can bring about some effect, whether of persuasion, definition, or compliance. Thus authority conveys the idea of an ability or power to persuade, determine, command, or even exact obedience.... Though authority frequently implies power, authority is not the same thing as power. Power describes the ability to compel others to do something, whether legitimately or not. People who exercise authority *de jure* generally have the power to enforce their authority. (p. 38)

Lindgren (1982) associated power with leaders: “One rather basic concept of a leader is that of a person who possesses power – more power, that is than those who are not leaders” (p. 57). Lindgren defined power as “the faculty of getting others to do things, willingly or unwillingly” (p. 57) and acknowledged that different leaders use power in different ways at different times:

Sometimes the anxiety felt by a leader about unfinished tasks and the work to be accomplished leads him to use power as a way of achieving the goals of the group. This means, in effect, that he compels group members and subordinates to do the tasks assigned them. Many a leader has turned to power in times of emergency and has found it impossible to turn away. For such leaders, one emergency begets another, and life becomes a series of emergencies that can be met only with the use of power. (p. 79)

Lindgren (1982) declared that those who are actually in formal leadership roles are more concerned with power and power issues than those who are not in formal leadership roles. Lindgren reasoned that “because of the nature of their work, they must continually be concerned about whether they have enough power, whether they are using it wisely, or whether it should be shared more widely” (p. 80). Nonetheless, Lindgren assured, “as a group, leaders enjoy using power and having the responsibility for groups and organizations” (p. 80). On the other hand, “when the leader is no longer meeting the expectations of the group, the leader may come under attack. At this point they may try to get rid of the leader” (p. 80). Finally, Lindgren believed that effective leaders will use power conservatively and will seek to find ways to share their power with other group members.

Sergiovanni and Elliott (1975) spoke of two kinds of authority in

schools: formal authority and functional authority. These two kinds of authority can create conflict, tension, frustration, and confusion in elementary schools:

Formal authority is that authority associated with the role or position one occupies in any organization and is sometimes referred to as hierarchical, legal, position, or office authority. This authority is defined by the schools, the bureaucratic structure, and the legal system rather than by the person who occupies a given role. Principals rely on formal authority by using school rules, regulations, and policies or by “pulling rank.” Functional authority refers to the authority which an individual who occupies a given role or position brings to the position. His competence, ability, or expertise in functioning on the job and his interpersonal skills in working with others within the job context (expert and referent authority) are examples of functional authority. One important difference between formal authority and functional authority is that the superordinate always has the former, while often the subordinate has the latter. (pp. 110-111)

Sergiovanni and Elliott (1975) stressed that when those who possess formal authority become “anxious about authority relationships, protocol, and status systems” they “might be inclined to override the functional authority” of their subordinates “in order to preserve formal authority relationships and assume the major leadership role” (p. 111). They continued,

Substantial evidence exists to show that workers in educational and noneducational settings are more satisfied and seem to work harder and more willingly when exposed to functional authority. Response to legal uses of formal authority by workers is often one of indifference. Position or hierarchical forms of authority, particularly when expressed in terms of sanctions, paternalism, rewards, and punishments evoke negative responses and seem to result in poorer performance in the long run. (p. 111)

ROLE EXPECTATIONS

Vroom (1964) defined the term, expectancy, as “a momentary belief concerning the likelihood that a particular act will be followed by a particular outcome” (p. 17). Similarly, Lawler (1973) defined the concept of expectancy as “the likelihood that an action will lead to a certain outcome or goal” (p. 45). A number of theorists have developed their own versions of expectancy theory. Lawler stated, “All of the theorists maintain that the strength of a tendency to act in a certain way depends on the strength of an expectancy that the act will be followed by a given consequence (or outcome) and on the value or attractiveness of that consequence (or outcome) to the actor” (p. 45). Thus, role expectation addresses behavior-outcome expectancy. Lawler wrote,

Managers often ask why their subordinates are not more productive. They seem to feel that people should be productive almost as if it is a question of morality or of instinct. The expectancy approach suggests asking a rather different question: Why should people be productive in a given situation? People are not naturally productive (or nonproductive). Thus, managers who wonder why their people are not more productive should start by comparing the rewards given to good performers with the rewards given to poor performers. Time after time, no real difference is found when the comparison is made. Thus, the workers' perception of the situation is that the good and the poor performers receive the same treatment, and this view is crucial in determining motivation. (p. 53)

Lawler (1973) presented an expectancy model to help readers better understand motivation in an organization. He based his model on four basic beliefs established by researchers who preceded him:

- People have preferences among various outcomes that are potentially available to them.
- People have expectancies about the likelihood that an action (effort) on their part will lead to the intended behavior or performance.
- People have expectancies (instrumentalities) about the likelihood that certain outcomes will follow their behavior.
- In any situation, the actions a person chooses to take are determined by the expectancies and the preferences that person has at the time. (p. 49)

In summary, the expectancy model “argues that both the attractiveness of the outcomes and the person’s expectancies influence which outcomes a person will try to obtain and how these outcomes will be sought” (p. 53).

Sergiovanni and Elliott (1975) indicated that it is important for the leader and his or her superiors to have common expectations in order for him or her to be effective in his or her leadership role. Cole (1999) confirmed that one skill of a good and effective leader is the leader’s sensitization to follower expectations: “When a person assumes a leadership role, followers have certain expectations regarding a leader’s performance toward achieving team goals” (p. 9). Kouzes and Posner (1995) stated,

Successful leaders have high expectations, both of themselves and of their constituents. These expectations are powerful, because they’re the frames into which people fit reality: we often wind up seeing what we expect rather than what’s actually occurring. (p. 271)

They go on to emphasize the power of the leader’s expectations, “adults in the workplace and children in school tend to perform to the level of the authority figure’s expectations” (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 323).

Moore (1985) wrote, "We hold expectations for each other's behavior and we apply positive and negative sanctions in accord with the degree to which behavior approximates or deviates from these shared standards" (p. 263). In addition to responding to the expectations of others, Moore also argued that we act in response to our own expectations for self and stated, "Role expectations may become incorporated as self-identities" (p. 264). In other words, we become the role that we play.

The term, role, was defined by Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) as: "Associated with each office is a set of activities, which are defined as potential behaviors. These activities constitute the role to be performed, at least approximately, by any person who occupies that office" (p. 13). They further explained, "To understand and describe the means by which organizations attain such predictable and dependable behavior, a number of role-related concepts will be utilized: role set or cluster, role expectations, role pressure, role force, and role behavior office" (p. 13). They described role set as all those who work in close proximity with a particular office, physically and according to workflow, technology, and the hierarchy of authority; and role expectations are the beliefs and attitudes by an individual's role set about what that individual should and should not do as part of his role. "The prescriptions and proscriptions held by members of a role set are designated as role expectations" (p. 14).

The role expectations held for a certain person by some member of his or her role set will reflect that member's conception of the person's office and his or her abilities. The content of these expectations may include preferences with respect to specific acts and personal characteristics or styles; they may deal with what the person should do, what kind of person she should be, what he should think or believe, and how she should relate to others (Kahn et al., 1964). When referring to "role set," the authors speak of the fact that members of the role set communicate their understanding of specific role expectations:

They tend to be communicated in many ways: sometimes directly, as when a supervisor instructs a subordinate in the requirements of his job; sometimes indirectly, as when a colleague expresses admiration or disappointment in some behavior. The crucial point for our theoretical view is that the activities (potential behaviors) which define a role consist of the expectations of members of the role set, and that these expectations are communicated or "sent" to the focal person. (p. 15)

Role pressures are attempts on the part of the role senders to get the individual to conform to the role expectations. Some of these pressures (e.g., those from superiors) may be directed toward the accomplishment of formal-

ly specified responsibilities and objectives of office. Others (perhaps from peers or subordinates) may be directed toward making life easier or more pleasant for the senders themselves. The pressures may come from formal or informal sources; they may or may not be legitimate; in combination, they may not conform to anyone's ideal view of the job. They may be prescriptive or proscriptive, punitive or benevolent, subtle and indirect, or direct and blatant. They are, in short, whatever requirements and demands are actually communicated to the focal person (Kahn et al., 1964).

Each person receives a sent role and pressures from his or her role set. In addition, he or she also has a received role or his or her perception of what was sent. It is this received role that, in fact, has immediate influence on this individual's behavior:

Each sent pressure can be regarded as arousing in the focal person a psychological force of some magnitude and direction. Such forces will be called role forces. This is not to say that these motivational role forces are identical in magnitude and direction with the role pressures which evoked them. Especially when role pressures are seen as illegitimate or coercive, they may arouse strong resistance forces which lead to outcomes different from or even opposite to the expected behavior. Pressures to increase production rates sometimes result in slowdowns. Moreover, every person is subject to a variety of psychological forces in addition to those stimulated by pressures from his role set in the work situation. Role pressures are thus only a partial determinant of behavior on the job. In addition, to the motivational forces aroused by role pressures, there are important internal sources of motivation for role performance. One of these stems from the intrinsic satisfaction derived from the content of the role. (Kahn et al., 1964, pp. 16-17)

The authors define role behavior as "behavior which is system relevant (not necessarily congruent with the expectations and requirements of others), and which is performed by a person who is accepted by others as a member of the system" (p. 18). However, it is clear as one looks more closely at organizations, that different members of the role set may actually have different expectations for the focal person which are even different from the expectations held by the system for the focal person. With all of these different expectations and role pressures upon him or her, the focal person may experience psychological conflict. This conflict is referred to by the authors as "sent role conflict."

Sent role conflict is defined as the simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other. In the extreme case, compliance with one set of pressures excludes completely the possibility of compliance with another set; the two sets of pressures are mutually contradictory. (p. 19)

ROLE CONFLICT

Kahn et al. (1964) indicated that there are several kinds of role conflict: intra-sender conflict, inter-sender conflict, inter-role conflict, and person-role conflict. They define each of these types of role conflict in the following manner:

- Inter-sender conflict: different prescriptions and proscriptions from a single member of the role set may be incompatible. (p. 19)
- Inter-sender conflict: pressures from one role sender oppose pressures from one or more other senders.
- Inter-role conflict: role pressures associated with membership in one organization are in conflict with role pressures stemming from membership in other groups.
- Person-role conflict: role requirements violate moral values. (p. 20)

Kahn et al. also indicated that even more complex forms of role conflict can flow from these four basic forms. One of these forms is referred to as role overload:

Overload could be regarded as a kind of inter-sender conflict in which various role senders may hold quite legitimate expectations that a person perform a wide variety of tasks, all of which are mutually compatible in the abstract. But it may be virtually impossible for the focal person to complete all of them within given time limits. He [sic] is likely to experience overload as a conflict of priorities; he must decide which pressures to comply with and which to hold off. If it is impossible to deny any of the pressures, he may be taxed beyond the limits of his abilities. Thus overload involves a kind of person-role conflict and is perhaps best regarded as a complex, emergent type combining aspects of inter-sender and person-role conflicts. (p. 20)

Role conflicts take their toll on the person and even the organization. "Various forms of emotional turmoil – anxiety, tension, frustration, and a sense of futility – have long been associated with psychological conflict" (Kahn et al., 1964, p. 65). In addition, those who experience role conflicts tend to worry more about conditions at work than those who do not experience role conflict. They also experience less satisfaction with their jobs and less confidence in their superiors and the organization, as a whole:

The attitudes reflected are important components of employee morale and have been shown under certain conditions to have significant effects on work performance, absenteeism, and staff turnover. It is clear that chronic conditions of conflict in one's work role tend to be demoralizing as well as tension provoking. (pp. 66-67)

Furthermore, there is evidence that those experiencing role conflict may also exhibit a marked sense of futility and a loss of self-esteem, as well as show symptoms of acute anxiety, confusion and indecision, and even hysteria and psychosomatic disorders.

Kahn et al. (1964) also indicated that role conflict not only affects the person's emotional well-being, but also affects one's interpersonal life. They stated:

Social relations with one's work associates tend to deteriorate under the stress of conflict. In part, this reaction reflects the person's general dissatisfaction with the work situation. Attitudes toward those role senders who create the conflict become worse, just as do those toward the job and the organization in general. (p. 67)

In addition, they stated, "The presence of conflict in one's role tends to undermine his relations with his role senders, to produce weaker bonds of trust, respect, and attraction" (p. 71). They believed that role conflicts are harmful to both the individual and the organization.

In addition to role conflict, individuals can also experience role ambiguity which can also negatively affect both the individual and the organization. Kahn et al. (1964) stated, "Certain information is required for adequate role performance, that is, in order for a person to conform to the role expectations held by members of his role set" (pp. 22-23). The individual wants to know the rights, duties, and responsibilities of the office; the individual wants to know what he or she must do to fulfill the responsibilities of the office; and finally, the individual wants to know the consequences of his or her role performance.

Role ambiguity occurs when there is a lack of clear and consistent information. It is "a direct function of the discrepancy between the information available to the person and that which is required for adequate performance of his role" (Kahn et al., 1964, p. 73). The authors distinguished between two types of ambiguity: ambiguity that "results from lack of information concerning the proper definition of the job, its goals and the permissible means for implementing them," and ambiguity that relates to "the socio-emotional aspects of role performance.... This second kind of ambiguity manifests itself in a person's concern about his standing in the eyes of others and about the consequences of his actions for the attainment of his personal goals" (p. 94).

Despite the type of ambiguity, there is research that indicates that ambiguity "is a source of stress for a substantial number of people" (Kahn et al., 1964, p. 74). Kahn et al. emphasized,

both kinds of ambiguity are associated with increased tension and reduced trust

in associates. But whereas task ambiguity tends to create dissatisfaction with the job and feelings of futility, ambiguity about one's evaluation by others appears to undermine both the individual's relations with them and his self-confidence. (pp. 94-95)

It is clear that the effects of role ambiguity resemble those of role conflict, although they are, in fact, separate from each other.

Nevertheless, whether an individual is suffering from role conflict, role ambiguity, or both, the final outcome is that the organization can also suffer. Tubre and Collins (2000) explained,

In today's complex work environments, boundaries between occupations, departments, and organizations are often unidentifiable and blurred roles are especially likely to occur in jobs where the responsibility and performance of job tasks is distributed among teams and team members. Since organizations are role-systems that depend on the interaction of system members, both role ambiguity and role conflict could be expected to have negative consequences on organizational outcomes. (p. 157)

WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

In this section, team building and collaboration and how they positively affect organizational effectiveness are described. It is through working together as one that the various entities of an organization can discover creative solutions to complex problems. Developing positive relationships is an important part of leadership. "In fact, if leadership is about anything, it is about relationships" (Dyer, 2001 p. 28). "Relational leadership involves being attuned to and in touch with the intricate web of inter- and intra-relationships that influence the organization. It is about the meaning and identity that are created when people work together" (p. 28).

Webster's Dictionary (1967) defines the word collaborate as "to work jointly with others esp. in an intellectual endeavor" (p. 162). Bennis and Biederman (1996) spoke of collaboration in this manner:

Great groups have shaped the world, from the gathering of young geniuses at Los Alamos who unleashed the atom, to the youthful scientists and hackers who invented a computer that was personal as well as powerful.

We must turn to great groups if we hope to begin to understand how the rarest of precious resources – genius – can be successfully combined with great effort to achieve results that enhance all our lives. It is in such groups that we may also discover why some organizations seem to breed greatness, freeing members to be better than anyone imagined they could be. (p. 97)

Coben, Thomas, Sattler, and Morsink (1997) cited several definitions of collaboration:

Collaboration as an endpoint on a continuum, with cooperation and coexistence in the middle and conflict at the opposite end....Collaboration as...[an] interplay of talents and knowledge that come together...to produce a commonly valued end result which no single party could ever have produced alone...and...as a style for direct interaction between at least two co-equal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making...toward a common goal. (p. 428)

Muronaga and Harada (1999) believed that “collaborative interactions enable people with diverse expertise to generate creative solutions to mutually defined problems” (p. 9). Saltiel (1998) stated, “There is magic in a collaborative partnership. It provides the power to transform ordinary learning experiences into dynamic relationships, resulting in a synergistic process of accomplishment” (p. 5).

Marshall (1995) echoed others, speaking of collaboration in the workplace in the following manner:

Collaboration is the premier candidate to replace hierarchy as the organizing principle for leading and managing the 21st century workplace. It is a way of life, a value-based framework that enables us to meet our fundamental needs for self-esteem, respect, trust and integrity in the workplace. More specifically, collaboration is a principle-based process of working together that produces trust, integrity and breakthrough results by building true consensus, ownership and alignment in all aspects of the organization. (p. 15)

In addition, Mintzberg, Dougherty, Jorgensen, and Westley (1996) spoke of collaborations as complex relationships: “Collaborations are complicated relationships that can be nuanced, intense, glorious, illicit, imbalanced, unrecognized, unrecognizable, titillating, and tiresome” (p. 68). Ratliff and Brackner (1998) addressed successful workplace relationships:

After more than 250 observations and interviews, we found that only two criteria must be met for any workplace relationship to be successful: (a) all parties must benefit from the relationship – in other words, their purposes for the relationship must be achieved; and (b) the relationship must be mutually pleasant. (p. 37)

They went on to state, “Four basic conditions must be present to meet those two goals: an intersection of purposes or interests; mutual trust; mutual respect; and adequate means for conducting the relationship” (p. 37).

Coben et al. (1997) also identified several guiding principles regarding

collaborative interactive teams. These are:

- Participation and leadership: All team members are viewed as equals and their participation is encouraged and supported.
- Development of goals: Goals must be developed in a cooperative manner with attention focused on meeting the needs of the student. Secondary focus should be placed on meeting the needs of all team members.
- Communication: Open communication among team members should be fostered and encouraged, with each member feeling comfortable expressing opinions and thoughts on any and all issues.
- Decision making: Important decisions should be the joint responsibility of all team members. This should be accomplished through consensus.
- Conflict resolution: Conflict must be dealt with openly in a productive manner, respectful of all viewpoints. Steps to resolve conflict should be designed when the team is first formed. (p. 430)

In a similar manner, Longenecker and Neubert (2000) suggested six gateways to management cooperation and improved teamwork.

- Develop consensus around a common vision and superordinate goals that focus on organizational outcomes.
- Implement team-based performance measurement, feedback, and reward systems.
- Ensure that top management demonstrates and fosters cooperation in word and deed.
- Promote the use of team building, skill development, and team training as common practices in organizational life.
- Facilitate front-line management team involvement in and ownership of decision processes and outcomes. (p. 40)
- [Select and promote] managers who have a cooperative disposition (and an ego that is in check). (p. 42)

It appears that many of these principles of collaboration and teamwork even extend beyond culture. In an article entitled, "High-Performance Teams: Lessons from the Pygmies," Kets De Vries (1999) identified seven lessons for effective teamwork as found in pygmy society. These seven lessons are (a) "members respect and trust each other" (p. 69); (b) "members protect and support each other" (p. 70); (c) "members engage in open dialogue and communication"; (d) "members share a strong common goal" (p. 71); (e) members have strong shared values and beliefs" (p. 72); (f) "members subordinate their own objectives to those of the team" (p. 73); and (g)

“members subscribe to ‘distributed’ leadership” (p. 74).

Finally, in regard to schools, Stump and Wilson (1996) suggested 12 basic guidelines for developing collaborative educational teams: (a) “Set a clear team purpose and identify what each individual brings to the team”; (b) “establish schedules” (p. 310); (c) “conduct meetings”; (d) “set expectations for student work and assignments”; (e) “set expectations for student behavior”; (f) “develop systems for monitoring student performance and determining grades”; (g) “determine team members’ classroom roles” (p. 311); (h) “share workload and responsibilities”; (i) “share expertise”; (j) “follow through”; (k) “celebrate successes and shoulder failures together”; and (l) “keep lines of communication open” (p. 312).

On the other hand, Longenecker and Neubert (2000) also identified 10 primary factors that inhibit frontline management from cooperating with each other. These are (a) “personality conflicts/egos,” (b) “conflicting goals,” (c) “rewards are based on individual performance,” (d) “lack of unifying goals/direction/focus,” (e) “ineffective leadership from above,” (f) “lack of teaming skills,” (g) “system and structural barriers to cooperation,” (h) “teamwork/cooperation is not a management priority/no accountability to cooperate,” (i) “personal agendas/politics/turf wars,” and (j) “no perceived benefits to cooperating” (p. 39).

SUMMARY

In summary, this article focused on literature that addressed leadership, role expectations, and working relationships. Leadership has been defined in many ways throughout history, and this article addressed several definitions. However, a significant portion of the discussion on leadership focused on Greenleaf’s (1991) understanding of servant leadership because his concept of servant leader seems to most appropriately define the type of leadership one would expect to find in the Church. Greenleaf even spoke of the Church as servant leader. The servant leader is a servant first; and as a result, the servant leader must come to grips with power and authority.

Different understandings of power and authority were also addressed. Heifetz (1994) divided authority into two categories: formal and informal. In a like manner, Sergiovanni and Elliott (1975) spoke of formal and functional authority. Greenleaf (1991) believed that the institution is best served when all parties have adequate power to fulfill their role.

In addition, Sergiovanni and Elliott (1975) also believed that it is important for the leader and his or her superiors to have common expectations in order for him or her to be effective in his or her role. When there are not clear expectations regarding role, role conflict and role ambiguity could occur. In either case both the individual and the institution could be negatively impacted.

On the other hand, developing positive working relationships is an important part of leadership. Collaboration and team building can positively affect organizational effectiveness. Saltiel (1998) states, "There is magic in a collaborative partnership" (p. 5). Numerous characteristics and guidelines for developing collaborative relationships were reviewed.

The third and fourth articles in this series will focus on previous research on pastor and principal role expectations and relationships within Catholic parochial elementary schools, current research and findings regarding pastor and principal role expectations and relationships, and several recommendations to help pastors and principals in elementary parochial schools work together more effectively to further the mission of Catholic education in their parishes.

REFERENCES

- Bennis, W., & Biederman, P. W. (1996). The secrets of creative collaboration. *Inc.*, 18(18), 97.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Boles, H. W., & Davenport, J. A. (1975). *Introduction to educational leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Coben, S. S., Thomas, C. C., Sattler, R. O., & Morsink, C. V. (1997). Meeting the challenge of consultation and collaboration: Developing interactive teams. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 30(4), 427-432.
- Cole, M. (1999, December). Become the leader followers want to follow. *Supervision*, 60, 9-11.
- Congregation for Catholic Education. (1977). *The Catholic school*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.
- Congregation for Catholic Education. (1988). *The religious dimension of education in a Catholic school*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.
- Daloz, L., Keen, C., Keen, J., & Daloz Parks, S. (1996). *Common fire*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dobbs, K., Gordon, J., Lee, C., & Stamps, D. (1999). Leadership theories: A top-10 list. *Training*, 36(10), 26.
- Dyer, K. M. (2001). Relational leadership. *School Administrator*, 58(10), 28-30.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1991). *Servant leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kets De Vries, M. F. R. (1999). High-performance teams: Lessons from the pygmies. *Organizational Dynamics*, 27(3), 66-77.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. (1995). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E., III. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Lindgren, H. C. (1982). *Leadership, authority, and power sharing*. Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger.
- Longenecker, C. O., & Neubert, M. (2000). Barriers and gateways to management cooperation and teamwork. *Business Horizons*, 43(5), 37-44.
- Marshall, E. M. (1995). The collaborative workplace. *Management Review*, 84(6), 13-17.
- Mintzberg, H., Dougherty, D., Jorgensen, J., & Westley, F. (1996). Some surprising things about collaboration – Knowing how people connect makes it work better. *Organizational Dynamics*, 25(1), 60-71.
- Moore, J. C., Jr. (1985). Role enactment and self-identity. In J. Berger (Ed.), *Status, rewards, and influence* (pp. 262-316). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Muronaga, K., & Harada, V. (1999). Building teaching partnerships: The art of collaboration. *Teacher Librarian*, 27(1), 9-14.

- National Conference of Catholic Bishops (1972). *To teach as Jesus did*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.
- Ratliff, R. L., & Brackner, J. W. (1998). Relationships. *The Internal Auditor* 55(1), 37-41.
- Rausch, T. P. (1989). *Authority and leadership in the church*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier.
- Saltiel, I. (1998). Defining collaborative partnerships. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 79, 5-11.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Elliott, D. L. (1975). *Educational and organizational leadership in elementary schools*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Spears, L. C. (1994). Servant leadership: Quest for caring leadership. *Inner Quest*, 2, 9-13.
- Stump, C. S., & Wilson, C. (1996). Collaboration: Making it happen. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 31(5), 310-312.
- Tubre, T. C., & Collins, J. M. (2000). Jackson and Schuler (1985) revisited: A meta-analysis of the relationships between role ambiguity, role conflict, and job performance. *Journal of Management*, 26, 155-169.
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary*. (1967). Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam.

Duane F. Schafer is the secretary/superintendent of Catholic schools in the Diocese of Spokane, Washington. Correspondence concerning this article may be sent to Dr. Duane F. Schafer, Secretary/Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Spokane, P.O. Box 1453, Spokane, WA 99210-1453.