Chapter – II

Methodology
Research is a systematic investigation or inquiry directed towards discovery and establishments of new facts in any discipline/branch of knowledge. A research is called scientific if it is conducted in well planned manner.

The aim of a scientific endeavour is to ascertain facts and analyze them into objective manner, to work out a neat research design in order to make an investigation more systematic, to analyze data and interpret the obtained results in the light of whatever parallel findings are available (Mc Guigan, 1969; Edward 1956 Seigal and Castella 1988). A scientific research is carried out in a planned and objective manner so that the researcher should have to be utmost careful in selecting samples by means of applying appropriate sampling technique, selecting standardized tools to gather relevant information and employing adequate statistical tests for the analysis of data. In every scientific investigation all these vital steps are essentially needed to make a research study more scientific and objective, so as it will be greatly helpful in predictions and making out meaningful conclusions. The present investigators took all possible precautions to go through the steps that are needed to pursue a scientific investigations in order to complete this small piece of research work.

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the self concept, self-discrepancy and role effectiveness amongst senior and middle level executives working in different organizations such as Nationalized Banks, Construction company, Manufacturing units of
refrigeration and air conditioning, Manufactures of food materials and private financial companies and it was also aimed at to find out to what extent the self discrepancy influence in employees role effectiveness and infact this research is of exploratory nature.

2.1 Sample

A behavioral science researchers faces some difficulties in making decision regarding the sample size which depends upon its availability and the capability of the investigators. Infact it is not possible to cover all the individuals of a population, hence a sample is drawn from the population assuming as representing the characteristics of that entire population for the purpose of the study. However, an adequate sample size is essential for scientific investigation because it plays important role in statistical analysis and drawing inference about the population from which samples are drawn.

According to Kerlinger (1983) “The sample is a portion of population or universe as to be the representation of that population or universe”. Mohsin (1984) stated that “Sample is a small part of the total existing events, objects or the information”.

The sample size and its selection technique plays important role in behavioural science research for the purpose of statistical analysis of the data and generalization of the results. In fact sampling is a process of selecting a small part of a population representing the characteristics of entire population of which the sample is a part. The adequate sample size and the method of selecting sample from the population of interest, enables an investigator to draw meaningful conclusions and helpful in making generalization about the population from which the samples were
drawn. The sample of the present study consisting of senior and middle level executives drawn randomly from Nationalized Banks and 4 other companies. The sample break ups of Middle and Senior level executives selected from the various organization are as under.

**Table : Showing the representative sample category and size.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Senior level Executives</th>
<th>Middle level Executives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banks Employees</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.L.F Employees (A Construction Comp.)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.S. Group Employees (Food material)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assocham Employees (Finance Company)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punj Llyod Employees (Refrigeration &amp; Air Condition)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>210</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Tools Used

**The Self-Discrepancy Questionnaire** developed by Higgins et. al. (1985) was used to measure three self domain: actual, Ideal & ought from two standpoints own and others, combining these three self-domains with the two stand points yields six kinds of selves.

1) Actual-own  2) Actual-other  3) Ideal-own  
4) Ideal-other  5) Ought-own  6) Ought-other
Both the actual own and the actual other may combine to form what is called the "self-concept". The other 4 self-states are the self-guides of the individual. According to Higgins (1987) a person may possess one or more kinds of the self guides and thus may have one or more kinds of discrepancies, Higgins et al. (1986) only used the actual own represented the person's own views of himself. In his many studies Higgins too took only the actual-own self-state as a measure of self-concept of an individual. One modification was done by investigator in the self discrepancy scale to differentiate the questionnaire from that of Higgins et al. which was originally developed by Higgins, Klein and Strauman (1985) and later on this scale was revised by Strauman and Higgins (1987).

For this purpose a pilot study was conducted by the investigator and it was observed that in selves questionnaire it was not possible for the subjects to differentiate between possible attributes for the ought-own and the ought-other self-states. He clearly pointed out one of the possible reason for this may be due to relevance of different social norms in Indian society where an individuals, sense of moral obligations develops from childhood as per the expectations of the child's parent and family, parent and family members as well as society in general. This assumption was also verified and confirmed by the respondents themselves to them selves told that their ought selves attributes were mostly a reflection of their parents expectations of them rather than their own individual sense of duty. Keeping all these facts in mind it is possible to specify that the ought discrepancy was measured using the only ought other self-state.
The self discrepancy questionnaire finally developed at two parts, the part (1) measures the own self states i.e. the actual own of the self concept of the individual which he thinks he is having in himself.

The part (2) of this test measures the other self states i.e. the Ideal other that refers to the hopes ideals and aspirations that the significant others has for the individual and the ought others which is concerned to a sense of duty, moral obligations and responsibilities that a significant other expects the other to process.

**The Role Efficacy Scale** developed by Udai Pareek (1977) was used. It consist of 20 triads of statement and the subject is required to mark the one statement in each triad that describes his role more accurately.

There are 3 alternative in each triad that are preweigh, there are 10 dimensions and for each dimensions there are 3 statement of role efficacy and a scoring pattern followed is +2, +1 or -1. The dimensions of role efficacy are, Centrality, Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Inter-role linkage, Helping relationship, Super ordination, Influence, Growth, Confrontation.

The reliability of the test was reported by Sen (1982). He reported a re-test reliability of the test 0.68 which is significant at .001, level it clearly shows that there is high stability of the test. He also determined the internal consistency of the scale and found out significant correlation values among the items.

The validity of the test was determined on the items-total correlation for 20 statement for total sample of 658 managers and for 11 organizations separately. The alpha coefficient for the mean
item total correlations of the 11 organizations ranged from 0.71 to 0.85 this shows the internal homogeneity of the scale.

2.3 Procedure

The data for the present study was collected on an individual basis. Subjects were approached by the investigator and were explained about the purpose of investigation to clear their doubt and suspicion. The questionnaire was divided into 3 parts.

(a) **Actual Own**: Where he has to describe what he actually thinks about himself.

(b) **Qualities of Job-Incumbent**: In which he has to describe about the qualities required for doing the job well.

(c) **About the organizational Role**: In this set of trial statement, respondent has to mark only one which describes to his role in organization more accurately.

For the first two parts, respondent was provided with the list of 15 characteristics or qualities, and out of these they were asked to rate only 10 characteristics which they found in them selves and for the job, in the order of preference and rate them on the 4 point scale; but very few of them mentioned all the 10 qualities, so it was decided to select most frequently and most appropriate 6 qualities which were mentioned by all the respondents from the list of characteristics given to the respondent as given below.

(1) Submissive (2) Leadership (3) Enthusiasm
(4) Tenderness (5) Discipline (6) Bright
Third part of the questionnaire was to explain what type of role he is playing in the organization and how effectively he performs his duties in the organization. This part contain 20 questions which was further divided into three parts a, b, and c and the respondent was guided to tick only one, out these three statements which he feels is the most appropriate and suits his personality.

### 2.4 Data analysis

1) Senior Level Executives and Middle Level Executives were divided into the two groups in terms of Role Efficacy on the basics of median and then top 6 qualities characteristics were selected which were more frequently endorsed by Senior and Middle Level Executives who are high and low in efficacy. After this **Kendall – Coefficient of Concordance (w)** was applied to see the degree of agreement with the high and low efficacy group of Senior and Middle level executives.

Formula used \( w = \frac{s}{\frac{1}{2}K^2(N^3-N)} \)

Then (Chi-Squire was used to determine the significance of \( w \))

Formula used \( x^2 = K(N - 1)w \)
2) Discrepancy within the respondent was categorized into 3 parts.

   a) Positive discrepancy – indicates that quality is more important but person lacks (posses to a lesser degree)

   b) Negative discrepancy indicates that quality is not of much importance but the person has to a greater extent.

   c) Null discrepancy considers the quality to be important to certain degree and also posses the quality to certain extent.

Chi-square: - This was used to determine whether both the groups of high efficacy and low efficacy of senior level executive and middle level executives differ in respect to the three types of discrepancies or not.

3) Role efficacy was measured on the 10 dimension of Role efficacy Scale where item.

   Item No. 1 and 11 measures centrality

   Item No. 2 and 12 measures Integration

   Item No. 3 and 13 measures Proactivity

   Item No. 4 and 14 measures Creativity

   Item No. 5 and 15 measures Inter-role linkage

   Item No. 6 and 16 measures Helping relationship

   Item No. 7 and 17 measures Super-ordination
Item No. 8 and 18 measures Influence

Item No. 9 and 19 measures Growth

Item No. 10 and 20 measures Confrontation

To determine the significance of difference between the role-efficacy of senior and middle level executive the mean and S.D. were computed for each dimension and then t-test was applied to find out the mean difference if any between these two groups of executives on all the 10 dimensions of role efficacy.