Chapter - VII

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS
DISCUSSION

The aim of the present investigation was to study Role Efficacy of polytechnic teachers in relation to various personal and organisational variables. The two personality variables included were the Eysenckian personality dimensions of Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and Lie Scale (Social Desirability); Personality Stress Questionnaire (PSQ) behaviour types viz., Type-I (Cancer Proneness), Type-II (Coronary Heart Disease Proneness), Type-III (Psychopathic Behaviour Proneness), Type-IV (Healthy Orientation), Type-V (Depression Proneness), and Type-VI (Drug Addiction).

The various types of Motivation in Role (MAO-R) were Achievement in Role, Power in Role, Control in Role, Affiliation in Role and Extension in Role. Role satisfaction was studied in respect of Role Satisfaction Achievement, Role Satisfaction Power, Role Satisfaction Control, Role Satisfaction Affiliation and Role Satisfaction Extension.

Role Efficacy was also studied in relation to various types of Motivational Climate (MAO-C) viz., Achievement Climate, Expert Influence Climate, Extension Climate, Control Climate, Dependency Climate and Affiliation Climate present in the organisation of Polytechnics.
All the seventeen dimensions of Quality of Working Life (QWL) were related with Role Efficacy of teachers of polytechnics.

The various dimensions of Organisational Role Stress (ORS) i.e. Self Role Distance, Inter Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Erosion, Role Overload, Role Isolation, Personal Inadequacy, Role Expectation conflict, Role Ambiguity and Resource Inadequacy and Occupational Stress (OS) were related with Role Efficacy. For this purpose, raw data was analysed and mean, standard deviations (SDs), t-ratios (Tables 1 & 2) and correlation (Tables 3, 4, 5) were computed. In addition, regression analysis (Tables 6, 7, 8) was also computed.

The total marks of teacher in the sample was divided in two groups – one of age ranging from 20 to 38 years and the other ranging from 39 to 57 years. It was done with a view that these groups would show differences on all the measures of personal and organisational correlates of Role Efficacy.

The expectation was that these two groups would show differences on all the measures of personal and organisational correlates of Role Efficacy of polytechnic teachers.

To verify this hypotheses, t-ratios were computed to study the significance of difference between the means of the two groups on all the measured variables (Table 2).
From Table-2, a separate Table-A was prepared. This table shows the t-ratios of the variables where Group-I, II were found to have a significant difference.

A glance at the table A showing significant t-ratios between Group I and Group II revealed that as expected, these two groups did emerge different on a number of personal and organizational correlates of Role Efficacy. Table 2 and Table 9 revealed that Group II scores higher than Group 1 on Role Efficacy and dimensions of Role Efficacy viz.; Self Role Integration, Personal Growth and Helping Relations. Thus older teachers Role Efficacy is higher than younger teachers.

The two groups also emerged significantly different on the variables of Lie Scale, Resource Inadequacy, Role Satisfaction Extension, Extraversion, Role Stagnation, Extension in Role, Role Satisfaction Control and Control in Role. This is evident from the list of significant t-ratios among Group I and II, as given in Table 9.

The Lie Scale, Control in Role and Extension in Role for Group II were more than Group I while Extraversion, Role Satisfaction Extension and Role Satisfaction Control and Organisational Role Stress relating to Role Stagnation and Resource Inadequacy were more for Group I compared to Group II. Thus younger polytechnic teachers(
Group I) were of higher value of Extraversion, Role Satisfaction control, Role Satisfaction Extension, Role Stagnation and Resource Inadequacy than older polytechnic teachers (Group II).

Thus the results revealed that the t-ratios between two groups emerged significant and different on the variables of Role Efficacy, Personality (EPQ-R), Motivation in role (MAO-R) and Organisational Role Stress (ORS).

**TABLE - 9**

**Showing the significant t-Ratios Between Group I and II.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t-ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Role Efficacy Index (Role Efficacy)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Self Role Integration</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Helping Relations</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Lie Scale</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Control in Role</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Extension in Role</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Role Satisfaction Control</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Role Satisfaction Extension</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Role Stagnation</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Resource Inadequacy</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus the two groups i.e. teachers in the age group 20 to 38 and 39 to 57 were different from each other on account of personal and organisational factors correlates of Role Efficacy. It upholds partially the hypotheses. Multiple Regression Analysis results for TotalSample, Group I and II is given in Table 10. Some of the studies supporting the above finding are:

**Role Efficacy and Age**

Group II Polytechnic Teaches perceived greater Role Efficacy than Group I teachers(Table2 and 9). Glean, et.al (1977) reported that as the workers grow older, they tend to be slightly more satisfied with their jobs. There are number of reasons, such as lowered expectations and better adjustment to their work situation because of experience with it. Younger workers, on the other hand, tend to be less satisfied because of higher expectations, less adjustment and other causes. There are exceptions but the general trend is for higher job satisfaction with advancing age. The trend applies to managers as well as workers.

Sen (1982) in the study of bank employees and Surti (1983) in study of working women found positive and highly significant correlation of Role Efficacy with age. This appeared in several forms, like positive correlation of Role Efficacy with length of service. Surti (1983) found that length of service (and age) explained almost 7% of the total variance.
TABLE - 10: Significant Predictors contributing to the Criterion (Dependent) Variable Role Efficacy in Multiple Regression Equations for the Total Sample, Group-I and Group-II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>PREDICTOR VARIABLES (INDEPENDENT VARIABLES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROLE EFFICACY</td>
<td>Total Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Name</td>
<td>Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement in Role</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in Role</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Role Distance</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Expectation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Life</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moran (1986) in a study of 131 Superintendents of Police in Ireland found relation between length of service and Role Efficacy. Highest Inter Role Linkage was reported by those who had more than 30 years service.

**Role Stress and Age**

- Young polytechnic teachers Group I experienced greater ORS than Group II. It was also true for Role Stagnation and Resource Inadequacy dimensions of organisational role stress.

Sen (1982) studied relationship of Role Efficacy with variables such as age, sex, education etc. He found that Role Stagnation decreases as people advance in age, and age is negatively related with role stress. Pestonjee (1987) studied the relationship between role stresses and personality variables with age of different job categories and management personnel. It was found that the younger age, scored significantly higher on role stagnation, role erosion, self role distance, role ambiguity, overall roles stress as compared to the older age group. Further, Role Ambiguity were the least dominant contributors of role stress in all categories of management personnel.

Jha et al. (1994) in a study of 40 upper level (UL), 40 middle level (ML), and 40 lower level (LL) technocrats of a large organisation
found lower levels subjects experienced more role stress as compared to middle level and upper level subjects.

**Motivation in Role with Age**

Sen (1982) in a study of 500 employees of several bank in India reported under “norms” for MAO-R, the relationship between psychological need satisfaction in role and age of employee. According to this, a person usually advances in career with age, and the higher the position he holds, the more opportunities he gets for satisfying his role needs. The mean value of motivation in role-control and motivation in role –extension was found higher for higher levels. It was also reported that the length of total service and length of present job were positively related with all dimensions, except affiliation.

**ROLE EFFICACY AND ITS CORRELATES**

Role Efficacy of polytechnic teachers is a function of various personal and organizational variables. For this purpose, inter-correlation analysis was carried out to find out the personal and organizational correlates of Role Efficacy for the total sample (Table 3). Earlier the t-ratios between the two groups had emerged significant on a number of variables. Therefore, separate correlational analysis were also run for Group I (Table 4) and Group II (Table 5).
Besides this, regression analysis was conducted to identify the significant predictors of Role Efficacy the criterion (Dependent) variable for the total sample (Table 6) as well as Group I (Table 7) and Group II(8).

To draw meaningful inference from inter-correlation and regression analysis, all the variables have been categorised into five blocks of predictors:

1. Personality (EPQ)
2. Personality Stress Questionnaire (PSQ)
3. Motivation in Role and Role Satisfaction
4. Quality of Working Life (QWL)
5. Organisational Role Stress (ORS)
6. Occupational Stress (OS)

**Role Efficacy & Personality (EPQ – R)**

Two personality variables considered for this study were the Eysenckian Personality dimensions and Personality Stress Questionnaire(PSQ) behaviour types.

I. **Role Efficacy & Personality**

The dimensions of Eysenckian Personality considered for this study were Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and Lie Scale(Social Desirability).
It was hypothesised that Role Efficacy of polytechnic teachers is expected to be positively related to Extraversion and negatively related with Psychoticism and Neuroticism dimensions of Eysenckian personality. The inter-correlation analysis (Tables 3, 4, 5) and regression analysis (Tables 6, 7, 8) of Role Efficacy and dimensions of Eysenckian personality for total sample, Group I and Group II revealed:

**Extraversion**

Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Extraversion for total sample of polytechnic teachers.

For Group I, Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Extraversion while for Group II Role Efficacy was not related.

In Regression analysis Extraversion did not emerge significant predictor of Role Efficacy. A glance at the Tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Extraversion for total sample & Group I only. Extraversion did not emerge as a significant predictor of Role Efficacy in any of the groups (Tables 6, 7, 8).

The above upheld the hypotheses partially for total sample and Group I i.e. Role Efficacy of polytechnic teachers was expected to be significantly positively related with Extraversion. It has not been found valid for Group II.
Psychoticism

Role Efficacy was negatively correlated with Psychoticism for total sample. For Group I Role Efficacy was negatively correlated with Psychoticism. It was not significantly correlated with Psychoticism for Group II. Regression Analysis revealed Psychoticism as significant positive predictor of Role Efficacy for Group I.

A glance at the tables(3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Psychoticism for total Sample and Group I only, Psychoticism emerged as a significant positive predictor of Role Efficacy for Group I. Thus the above result upheld the hypotheses partially for total sample and Group I.

Lie Scale

Role Efficacy was negatively correlated with Lie Scale of total sample. For Group I, Role Efficacy was positively correlated with Lie Scale. For Group II Role Efficacy was positively correlated with Lie Scale. Regression Analysis revealed Lie Scale significantly negatively predictor of Role Efficacy for Group II.

A glance at the tables(3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Lie Scale for Total sample and significantly positively correlated for Group I and II. Lie Scale emerged
significantly negatively predictor of Role Efficacy for Group II. The above result upheld the hypotheses partially.

**Neuroticism**

For total sample Role Efficacy was negatively correlated with Neuroticism. For Group I Role Efficacy was negatively correlated with Neuroticism. For Group II Role Efficacy was negatively correlated with Neuroticism. Regression analysis did not reveal Neuroticism significant predictor of Role Efficacy for Group I, II and total.

A glance at Tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly and negatively correlated with Neuroticism for total Sample, Group I and Group II. Neuroticism did not emerged as a significant predictor of Role Efficacy. The above result upheld the hypotheses.

Some of the studies supporting results of Role Efficacy of polytechnic teachers with dimensions of Eysenckian personality are:

**Studies relating to Extraversion**

Solomon(1965) indicated a relationship between extraverted qualities and success in a study. Chhaya (1974) found effective teachers to be more extraverted than ineffective teachers.
Sharma & Rai (1976) reported that subjects who were high on alienation score lower on extraversion. Diwedi (1978) found Extraversion were positively related with job satisfaction. Kahn (1982) found extrovert teachers to be more satisfied than that of introverts. Extroverts gave importance to helping students, whereas introverts to salary, policies and working conditions.

Sen (1982) and Surti(1983) found positive and significant correlation between Role Efficacy and “contact” personality dimensions : people orientation, extraversion and outgoing tendency.

Furnham(1986) reported that for computer employees Extraversion correlated positively with all aspects of Job satisfaction. Wangoo(1986) in a research study on teacher personality corelates to teachers effectiveness found that the teachers with outgoing attitudes were less aggressive, more trusting, open forthright, relaxed and group dependent. They are highly successful as compared to teachers who are reserve. Bhagoliwal (1988) found that more effective teachers are expressive, socialized and expressed behavior in a socially approved way.

Pareek(1993) reported that persons with high Role Efficacy seem to rely on their own strengths to cope with problems, they are active and interact with people and the environment, and persist in
solving problem mostly by themselves, and sometimes by taking help of other people. They show positive and approach behaviour, and feel satisfied with life and with their jobs and roles in their organisation. Such a profile is that of effective managers.

Shah (1995) reported that there is a considerable variation in the personality characteristic of effective and ineffective teachers. The effective teacher have shown more extrovert behaviour as compared to their in effective counterparts. Furnham & Medhurst(1995) found that extraverts (as measured by EPQ) were more likely to participate in seminar activities and perform well.

Sehgal & Kaur(2000) in a study of global measures of teacher effectiveness, through stepwise regression analysis found that only Psychoticism, Extraversion, and Empathy emerged as significant predictors of global teacher effectiveness. Extraversion emerged as a positive predictors of teacher effectiveness.

Studies relating to Psychoticism

Furnham(1986) reported that for computer employees, Psychoticism correlated negatively with job satisfaction. Furnham & Zacherl(1986) examined the relationship between personality and job satisfaction as measured by multidimensional scale. Psychoticism scale
correlated negatively with all of the subscale score. Individuals with high Psychoticism scores (tough-minded) tended to be significantly less satisfied with their supervisors, the nature of work and their co-workers than people with low psychoticism scores i.e. tender minded.

Kaur (1993) in study of teacher effectiveness of teachers with 5 to 10 years experience, 15 to 20 years experience and 25 to 30 years experience found I negatively related with Psychoticism. Psychoticism emerged as negative predictors of various measures of teacher effectiveness.

Sehgal and Kaur (2000) reported Psychoticism as a negative predictor of global teacher effectiveness.

**Studies relating to Neuroticism**

Sehgal & Kaur (2000) found Neuroticism as negative predictors of various measures of teacher effectiveness. Earlier findings of (Bhatia, 1977; Rushton et al., 1987; Mohan, 1995; Sehgal and Kaur, 1995) also revealed that highly anxious, neurotic teacher transfer their conflicts to pupils via disturbed interactions patterns & not effective.

Furnham (1986) reported that for computer employees Neuroticism correlated negatively with all aspects of job satisfaction.
Diwedi (1978) found Neuroticism negatively associated with job satisfaction.

Eysenck (1964) opined that persons high on neuroticism are characterized by very strong emotional reactions to all classes of stimuli. A high scoring individual on neuroticism tends to be anxious, worrying, over responsive and depressed. His strong emotional reactions interfere with his proper adjustment, making him react in irrational ways (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975).

**Studies Relating to Lie Scale**

Furnham (1986) reported that for computer employees Lie scale correlated positively with all aspects of job satisfaction. Sehgal and Kaur (2000) in a study of global measure of teacher effectiveness found, Lie scale emerged as a negative predictor for principal rated and student rated teacher effectiveness.

**Role Efficacy and Personality Stress Questionnaire (PSQ)**

**Behaviour Types**

The types of behaviours relating to PSQ considered were Type 1, Type 2, Type 3, Type 4, Type 5 and Type 6.

It was hypothesized that Role Efficacy is expected to be positively related to Type(4) Behaviour and negative with the
remaining. The inter-correlation analysis (Tables 3, 4, 5) and regression analysis (Tables 6, 7, 8) of Role Efficacy and Types of PSQ for total sample, Group I and Group II revealed:

**Type I**

For Total Sample Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Type I. For Group I, Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Type I. For Group II, Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Type I. In Regression analysis Type I did not emerge as a significant predictor of Role Efficacy.

A glance at the Tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Type I for Total Sample, Group I & Group II. Type I did not emerge as a significant predictor of Role Efficacy in any of the group (Tables, 6, 7, 8). The above result upheld the hypotheses.

**Type 2**

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Type 2. For Group I, Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Type 2. For Group II, Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Type 2. Regression analysis revealed that for Group I, Type 2 was significant negative contributor
to Role Efficacy. Type 2 was significant and positive contributor to Role Efficacy for Group II and it has no contribution to Role Efficacy for total sample.

A glance at the Tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Type 2 for Total Sample, Group I and Group II. Type 2 emerged as significant negative contributor to Role Efficacy for Group I & significant positive contributor for Group II (Tables 6, 7, 8). The above result upheld the hypotheses.

Type 3

Type 3 did not correlate with Role Efficacy for total sample, Group I and Group II. The Regression analysis revealed that it did not contribute to Role Efficacy. The above result resulted the hypotheses.

Type 4 (Healthy Orientation)

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Type 4. For Group I Role Efficacy was found significantly negatively correlated with Type 4. For Group II Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Type 4. In Regression analysis Type 4 did not emerged as significant predictor of Role Efficacy.
A glance at the Tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Type 4 for Total sample and Group II. Type 4 did not emerge as a significant predictor of Role Efficacy in any of the group.

The above upheld the hypotheses partially that Role Efficacy of polytechnic teachers is expected to be positively correlated with Type 4 (Healthy Orientation).

**Type 5**

A glance at Tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Type 5 was not significantly correlated with Role Efficacy for total Sample, Group I and Group II polytechnic teachers, Type 5 did not emerge as a significant predictor of Role Efficacy in any of the groups (Table 6, 7, 8) Thus the result rejected the hypotheses.

**Type 6**

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Type 6 (Drug Addiction Proneness). For Group I Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Type 6. For Group II Role Efficacy was not correlated with Type 6. In Regression analysis Type 6 did not emerge significant predictor of Role Efficacy for Total Sample, Group I and Group II polytechnic teachers.
A glance at Tables(3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Type 6 for Group I and Group II. Type 6 did not emerge as a significant predictor of Role Efficacy in any of the groups. The above result upheld the hypotheses partially.

The above results upheld the hypotheses partially, the role efficacy of polytechnic would be positively correlated with type 4 (Health Orientation). It is supported by following studies:

Sen (1982) reported that persons with high role efficacy seem to experience less role stress, anxiety and work related tension. Joshi (1995) in a study of two groups of managers – the “effective” and the “not so effective” found that on the whole, a large number of personality traits than organisational factors were found to be discriminating between the two groups.

The relationship between Personality and health problems disease have been emphasised by Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985). It is widely held that Personality disposition is linked to health status. Indeed many academic definitions of health recognise this fact and view health not simply as an absence of illness but also as involving body, mind(personality) and social factors(Taylor, 1991). Even among lay people, it seems to be generally recognised that emotional factors may predict one’s health status at any given time(Furnham, 1994).
Thus, individual put in stressful situation shows behaviour which is one of the type of disease based on their personality structure.

Ryff & Keyes (1995) have recently proposed an alternative model of well being, suggesting that it consists of distinct dimensions including autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relationship with others, purpose in life and self acceptance.

Role Efficacy and Motivation in Role

Motivation in role considered were: Achievement in Role, Affiliation in Role, Extension in Role, Control in Role & Power in Role. It was hypothesised that Role Efficacy is expected to be positively related with the Achievement in Role, Affiliation in Role, Extension in Role and positively related with Control in role and Power in role.

The Inter-correlation analysis and Regression Analysis of Role Efficacy and dimensions of Motivational in Role for Total sample, Group I & Group II revealed:

Achievement in Role

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Achievement in Role. For Group I Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Achievement in Role. For Group II also Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with
Achievement in Role. Multiple Regression Analysis revealed Achievement in Role as significant & positive predictor of Role Efficacy for Total Sample & Group I. It was not predictor of Role Efficacy for Group II.

A glance at the Tables(3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Achievement in Role for Total Sample, Group I and Group II. Achievement in Role was positive predictor of Role Efficacy for Total sample & Group I(Tables 6, 7, 8). The above upheld the hypothesis partially that Role Efficacy is expected to be positively correlated with Achievement in Role. It is supported by earlier studies.

Power in Role

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Power in Role. For Group I Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Power in Role. For Group II Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Power in Role.

Regression Analysis(6, 7, 8) revealed that Power in Role was a significant and positive predictor of Role Efficacy for Total Sample and Group I. It was not significant predictor of Role Efficacy for Group II.
A glance at the Tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Power in Role for Total Sample, Group I and Group II. Power in Role was positive predictor of Role Efficacy for Total Sample & Group I (Tables 6, 7, 8). The above upheld the hypothesis partially. It is supported by earlier studies.

**Extension in Role**

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly and positively correlated with Extension in Role. For Group I Role Efficacy was significantly and positively correlated with Extension in Role. Group II Role Efficacy was not correlated with Extension in Role. Regression Analysis tables (6, 7, 8) revealed that Extension in Role was a significant & positive predictor of Role Efficacy for Group I and not a predictor of Role Efficacy for Group II & Total Sample.

A glance at the tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlate with Extension in Role for Total Sample, Group I and Group II. Extension in Role was a significant & positive predictor of Role Efficacy for Group I (Tables 6, 7, 8). The above upheld the hypothesis partially that Role Efficacy is expected to be positively correlated with Extension in Role. It is supported by earlier studies.
Affiliation in Role

For total sample Role Efficacy was not related with Affiliation in Role. For Group I Role Efficacy was positively significantly related with Affiliation in Role. For Group II Role Efficacy was not related with Affiliation in Role. Regression Analysis Tables(6, 7, 8) revealed that Affiliation in Role was not a predictor of Role Efficacy for Total Sample, Group I & Group II.

A glance at the Tables(3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Affiliation in Role for Group I & Total Sample. It was not correlated with Group II. Affiliation in Role did not emerge as a significant predictor of Role Efficacy in any of the Group. The above upheld the hypothesis partially that Role Efficacy was expected to be positively correlated with Affiliation in Role. It is supported by earlier studies.

Control in Role

For Total sample Role Efficacy was not correlated with control in Role. For Group I Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with control in Role. For Group II Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Control in Role. Regression Analysis revealed
Control in Role as significant & negative predictor of Role Efficacy for Group II polytechnic teacher only.

A glance at the Tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly positively correlated with Control in Role for Group I and Group II. The Control in Role was significant and negative predictor of Role Efficacy for Group II (Table 6, 7, 8). The result upheld the hypotheses partially.

The results of studies revealed significant and positive relationship between Achievement in Role for Group I and II and Extension in Role for Group I and negative relationship for Control in Role for Group II. The hypotheses was partially upheld for these. Similar results have been reported by earlier studies in this field.

In (Pareek, 1993) it is reported that three needs (Achievement, Power and Extension) make a positive contribution to managerial effectiveness, the needs for personal control and affiliation have been found to be negatively related to effectiveness. Aditi (1999) found Need for Achievement positive contribution to Self Rated Effectiveness in regression equation. Mohan and Rattan (1987) were of view that the need for achieving is a striving to increase or keep as high as possible, one's own capabilities in all activities in which a standard of excellence is thought to apply in executives. Ramaumma (1991) described effective
manager as one who is high in power motivation, low in affiliation motivation and high inhibition.

**Role Efficacy and Role Satisfaction**

It was hypothesised that Role Efficacy is expected to be positively related with Role Satisfaction Achievement, Role Satisfaction-Power, Role Satisfaction-Affiliation, Role Satisfaction Extension, and Role satisfaction Control. The Inter correlation analysis and regression analysis of Role Efficacy and Role Satisfaction for Total Sample. Group I and Group II revealed.

**Role Satisfaction – Achievement**

For total sample Role Efficacy was not related with Role satisfaction Achievement. For Group I Role Efficacy was not related with Role Satisfaction Achievement. For Group II Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role satisfaction Achievement. Regression analysis revealed that Role satisfaction Achievement for Total sample and Group I was significantly negative predictors of Role Efficacy.

A glance at Tables (3,4,5,) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role satisfaction Achievement for
Group II. Role satisfaction Achievement contributed significantly negatively to Role Efficacy for Total sample & Group I. (Table 6,7,8)

The above is against the hypotheses that Role Efficacy is expected to be positively significantly related to Role satisfaction-Achievement. It is supported by earlier studies.

**Role satisfaction Control**

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role satisfaction-Control. For Group I Role Efficacy was not related with Role satisfaction-Control. For Group II Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role satisfaction-Control. Regression analysis revealed Role Satisfaction Control not significant predictor of Role Efficacy of Total Sample, Group I and Group II.

A glance at the Tables (3,4,5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly negatively correlated with Role Satisfaction Control for Total sample & Group II. Role satisfaction control did not contribute to Role Efficacy (Table 6,7,8). The above result reject the hypotheses.

**Role Satisfaction Power**

For total sample Role Efficacy was not related with Role satisfaction – Power. For Group I Role Efficacy was not related with
Role satisfaction - Power. For Group II Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role Satisfaction - Power. Multiple Regression analysis revealed that Role Satisfaction Power for Group I is significant positive predictor of Role efficacy.

A glance at Table (3,4,5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role Satisfaction-Power for Group II. Role Satisfaction Power contributed positively to Role Efficacy for Group I (Table 6,7,8). The above result upheld the hypotheses partially.

Role Satisfaction – Extension

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role Satisfaction – Extension. For Group I Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role satisfaction-Extension. For Group II Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role satisfaction – Extension

Multiple Regression analysis revealed Role Satisfaction- Extension not significant predictor of Role Efficacy of Total Sample, Group I and Group II.

A glance at Tables (3,4,5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role Satisfaction –Extension for Total sample, Group I and Group II. Role Satisfaction-Extension did not
contribute to Role Efficacy (Tables 6,7). The above result rejected the hypotheses.

**Role Satisfaction-Affiliation**

For Total sample, Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role Satisfaction-Affiliation. For Group I, Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with Role Satisfaction-Affiliation. For Group II, Role Efficacy was not related with Role Satisfaction Affiliation. Multiple Regression analysis revealed that Role Satisfaction-Affiliation was not a significant predictor of Role Efficacy of Total sample, Group I and Group II.

A glance at Tables (3,4,5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Role satisfaction-Affiliation for Total sample. Role satisfaction-Affiliation did not contribute to Role Efficacy (Tables 6,7,8). The above result rejected the hypotheses. The above results did not uphold the hypotheses. It has been supported by earlier studies given below:

Sen (1982) studied role satisfaction for about 500 employees of several banks in India. Role efficacy was found to have a positive correlation with all Role Satisfaction (Role Satisfaction was determined by subtracting Desired from Present psychological needs in role). In
contrast to expectation, he found employee with high role efficacy less satisfied with their role. It is probably due to higher expectation from their role and lack of career advancement in middle age.

For Group I faculty, Role Efficacy in negatively related to Role Satisfaction. Young faculty having low role efficacy gave opinion that they get sufficient role satisfaction in extension.

In the present study Role Satisfaction was found by subtracting Present Motivation in Role from Desired Motivation in Role instead of Desired Motivation in Role from Present Motivation in Role. Due to this the result were found Negative instead of positive, indicating sufficient Motivation in Role dimensions present in the Role and positive relation ship between Role Efficacy and Role Satisfaction as reported in Sen(1982).

ROLE EFFICACY AND MOTIVATIONAL CLIMATE

It was hypothesized that Role Efficacy is expected to be positively related with Motivational Climate-Achievement, Motivational Climate -Extension, Motivational Climate-Power , Motivational Climate – Power , Motivational Climate -Affiliation and negatively related with Motivational Climate – Control.
The inter correlation analysis and regression analysis of Role Efficacy and Motivational Climate for Total Sample, Group I and Group II revealed.

**Motivational Climate – Achievement**

For total sample Role Efficacy was not related with Motivational Climate – Achievement. For Group I and Group II Role Efficacy was not related with Motivational Climate – Achievement. Multiple Regression analysis revealed that Motivational Climate-Achievement did not contribute to Role Efficacy.

The above did not upheld the hypotheses that Role Efficacy is expected to be positively related with Motivational Climate-Achievement.

**Motivational Climate Expert Influence (Power)**

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with Motivational Climate – Expert Influence. For Group I Role Efficacy was not related with Motivational Climate – Expert Influence. For Group II Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with Motivational Climate – Expert Influence. Multiple Regression analysis revealed Motivational Climate – Expert Influence not significant predictor of Role Efficacy for Total Sample, Group I and Group II.
The above clearly shows that Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with Motivational Climate – Expert Influence for Total Sample & Group II. Motivational Climate – Expert Influence was not a significant predictor of Role Efficacy for Total Sample, Group I and Group II (Tables 6, 7, 8).

The above upheld the hypotheses partially that Role Efficacy was expected to be positively significantly related with Motivational Climate – Expert Influence. It is supported by earlier studies.

**Motivational Climate – Extension**

For total Sample Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with Motivational Climate – Extension. For Group I Role Efficacy was not related with Motivational Climate-Extension. For Group II Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with Motivational Climate – Extension. Multiple Regression analysis revealed Motivational Climate – Extension and significant predictor of Role Efficacy for total Sample, Group I and Group II.

A glance at tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with Motivational Climate – Extension for Total Sample & Group II. Motivational Climate – Extension was not a significant predictor of Role Efficacy for Total Sample, Group I and
Group II (Tables 6, 7, 8). The above upheld the hypothesis partially that Role Efficacy was expected to be positively significantly correlated with Motivational Climate – Extension. It is supported by earlier studies.

**Motivational Climate – Control**

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly not related with Motivational Climate – Control. For Group II Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with Motivational Climate – Control. Multiple Regression analysis revealed Motivational Climate Control not significant predictor of Role Efficacy for Total Sample, Group I & Group II.

A glance at the tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with Motivational Climate – Control for Group II. Motivational Climate – Control did not contribute to Role Efficacy for Total Sample, Group I and Group II (Tables 6, 7, 8). The above is against the hypotheses that Role Efficacy is expected to be negatively significantly related with Motivational Climate – Control. It is supported by earlier studies.

**Motivational Climate – Affiliation**

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with Motivational Climate – Affiliation. For Group I Role Efficacy was not
related with Motivational Climate – Affiliation. For Group II Role Efficacy was not related with Motivational Climate – Affiliation. Multiple Regression Analysis revealed Motivational Climate – Affiliation not significant predictor of Role Efficacy for Total Sample, Group I and Group II.

A glance at the tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with Motivational Climate – Affiliation for total sample. Motivational Climate – Affiliation did not contribute to Role Efficacy for Total Sample, Group I and Group II (Tables 6, 7, 8). The above upheld the hypotheses partially that Role Efficacy is expected to be positively significantly related with Motivational Climate – Affiliation. It is supported by earlier studies. The results of Regression Analysis (Table 7 for Group I) revealed that Motivational Climate did not contribute to Role Efficacy.

For Group II (Table 4) Role Efficacy was found significantly & positively correlated with Expert Influence and Extension Motivational Climate. It was found significantly & negatively correlated with control climate. The Regression Analysis (Table 8) revealed that motivational climate did not contributed to Role Efficacy.

Some of the studied supporting the above finding are:
Litwin and Stringer (1966) found influence of organisational climate on human motivation. According to him a distinct organisational climate can be created by varying leadership style. Their characteristics are quite stable. Once created, these climate seems to have a significant often dramatic effects on motivation and correspondently on performance & job motivation. Conducive work environment was found to make leadership work which ultimately influence role efficacy of organisational members and productivity of organisation (Sayeed, 1992).

Sen (1982) found positive correlation between Role Efficacy and Extension Climate and Expert Influence Climate (Power). In the former the organisational policies promote concern for the employees and the organisation whereas in the latter the practice promote expertise (utilising and rewarding etc.)

Litwin and Stringer (1968) found that an authoritarian climate (referred as Control Climate) produce low job satisfaction and low performance. A climate characterised by achievement, extension, and expert influence might be assumed to be related to higher job satisfaction & performance.

Kedar Nath (1988) studied the effect of organizational climates, role stresses and locus control on job involvement among banking
professionals. The study revealed that high scoring group on four dimensions of organizational climate-Achievement, Expert Influence, Affiliation and Dependency-scored significantly high on job involvement as compared to the groups which scored low on these dimensions of organizational climate. On the contrary groups, scoring high on Control & Extension climates scored significantly low on job involvement as compared to the groups which scored low on these organisational climate.

ROLE EFFICACY AND QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE

It was hypothesised that Role Efficacy of polytechnic teachers’ is expected to be positively related with a positive perception of Quality of Working Life.

Inter-correlation analysis and regression analysis of Role Efficacy and Quality of Working Life for total sample, Group I and Group II revealed:

For total sample Role Efficacy was positively related with all dimensions of QWL. Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with dimensions of QWL viz. Physical Working Conditions, Economic Benefits, Career Orientations, Advancement on Merit, Effect on Personal Life, Union Management Relations, Self Respect, Sense of
Achievement vs. Apathy, Confidence in Management, Meaningful Development, Control, Influence and Participation, Employee Commitment, General Life Satisfaction and Organisational Climate.

For Group I Role Efficacy was positively related with all dimensions of QWL. Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with dimensions of QWL viz., Intra Group Relations, Sense of Achievement vs. Apathy, Self Respect, Effect on Personal Life, Supervisory Relations, General Life Satisfaction, Control Influence & Participation, Meaningful Development and Organisational Climate, Employee Commitment. Physical Working Conditions, Confidence in Management, Economic Benefits, Advancement on Merit, Mental State, Union Management Relations.

For Group II Role Efficacy was positively related with all dimensions of QWL. Role Efficacy was significantly positively related with dimensions of QWL viz. Self Respect, Control, Influence and Participation, Supervisory Relations, Advancement on Merit, Meaningful Development, Union Management Relations, Organizational Climate, Confidence in Management, Intra-group Relations.

Multiple regression revealed that General Life Satisfaction for total sample; Self Respect, Physical Working Conditions and Meaningful Development for Group I; Union Management Relations for
Group II dimensions of QWL are significant positive contributors to Role Efficacy. For Group I, Confidence in Management & Advancement on Merit and Supervisory Relations for Group II are significant negative contributors to Role Efficacy. A glance at tables (3, 4, 5) revealed that Role Efficacy was positively related with most dimensions of QWL for total sample, Group I and Group II. It is significantly positively related with specific dimensions of QWL for total sample, Group I and Group II (table 6,7,8).

The above upheld the hypotheses particularly that Role Efficacy is expected to be positively related with dimensions of QWL. It is significantly positively related with most of the dimensions of QWL for Total Sample, Group I and Group II. This is consistent with the earlier finding of Hoque(1991;1992), Hoque and Rahman(1999), Hossain(1999) and Sayeed and Sinha(1981),Sehal(1997),Sehgal and Kaur(1995); Sehgal and Singh(1997).

Hoque (1992) found Quality of Working Life positively related to performance and negatively correlated to absenteeism. Sehgal and Kaur(1995) reported that teacher effectiveness was significantly related with the positive perception of quality of working life and job satisfaction. Sehgal and Singh (1997) reported positive perception of Quality of Working Life and Job Satisfaction. Hoque and Rehman(1999)
found Quality of Working Life positively related with performance for public and private sector workers. There are few studies supporting the relations of Quality of Working Life dimensions with the Role Efficacy of polytechnic teachers. These are:

As was in the case of Group II of the present study, a similar positive relationship of effectiveness and UMR was also been found by Savneet(1990) regarding Effectiveness (self rated) in male and female government college teachers.

General Life Satisfaction (GLS) contributed negatively to Role Efficacy for total sample. Savneet (1990) found Effectiveness in Teacher (Self-rated) to be significantly and negatively correlated to GLS both for male and female subjects. Kaur (1993) found the Effectiveness in Teachers (pupil-rated) to be negatively correlated to General Life Satisfaction in a Group with teaching experience of 5-10 years.

ROLE EFFICAY AND ORGANISATIONAL ROLE STRESS

It was hypothesised that Role Efficacy is expected to be negatively related with Organisational Roles Stress and its dimensions. The inter-correlation analysis and regression analysis of Role Efficacy and Organisational Role Stress for total Sample, Group I and Group II revealed:
For total sample Role Efficacy was negatively related with all dimensions of ORS. Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Total Organisational Role Stress, Self Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Ambiguity, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Isolation, Resource Inadequacy, Inter Role Distance, Role Erosion, Persona I Inadequacy. For Group I Role Efficacy was negatively related with all dimensions of ORS. Role Efficacy was negatively related with Total Role Stress, Self Role Distance, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Ambiguity, Role Isolation, Resource Inadequacy, Role Stagnation, Role Erosion, Inter Role Distance. For Group II Role Efficacy was negatively related with all dimensions of ORS. Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Total Organisational Role Stress, Role Stagnation, Self Role Distance, Role Expectation Distance, Role Ambiguity and Role Expectation Conflict. Multiple regression revealed that Role Expectation Conflict and Self Role Distance for total sample; Role Expectation Conflict and Role Erosion for Group I; and Self Role Distance and Role Ambiguity for Group II dimensions of QWL are significant negative predictors of Role Efficacy.

A glance at Tables (3,4,5) revealed that Role Efficacy was negatively related with dimensions of ORS for Total sample, Group I
and Group II. It is significantly negatively related with specific dimensions of ORS for Total sample, Group I and Group II (Table 6, 7, 8). The above upheld the hypotheses that Role Efficacy is expected to be negatively related with dimensions of ORS. Some earlier studies which lend support to the present results are:

Singh (1986) in an exploratory study of structure and dynamics of 250 middle and lower level executives found: Personal and organizational factors were related to the dimensions of stress in specific way. “For example relatively younger executives who lacked preference for certainty and autonomy experienced high stress.

Sen(1982) reported negative and significant correlation between Role Efficacy and eight role stress (as well as total stress). However, he did not find any correlation between Role Efficacy and Inter Role distance. Pandey(1997) examined the relationship between Role Stress and Role Efficacy using a sample of 61 personnel of India Railways(aged 28-58 years). According to the findings of study, Role Efficacy was found to have negative correlation with dimensions of Role Stress except creativity for which it is positive.

Surti(1983) found Role Efficacy and all dimensions of Role Stress correlation negative and significant to working women.
Mathur (1997) studied the Psychological and organizational correlates of role stress in 400 working women belonging to different professional groups such as doctors, school teachers, college teachers and bank employees. Role Efficacy was found to be inversely associated with most of the dimensions of role stress. Mukherjee (1997) studied the relationship between organisational role stress, role efficacy and organisational climate among banking professionals. The study revealed Role stress variables inversely associated with Role Efficacy. Role efficacy was found to be reducer of role stress (Pestonjee, 1992).

ROLE EFFICACY AND OCCUPATIONAL STRESS

It was hypothesised that Role Efficacy is expected to be negatively correlated with Occupational Stress. The inter-correlation analysis and regression analysis of Role Efficacy and Occupational Stress for total sample, Group I and Group II revealed:

For total sample Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Occupational Stress. For Group I Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Occupational Stress. For Group II Role Efficacy was not related with Occupational Stress. Multiple regression analysis revealed Occupation Stress not significant predictor of Role Efficacy for Total sample, Group I and Group II.
A glance at the tables (3,4,5) revealed that Role Efficacy was significantly negatively related with Occupational Stress for total sample and Group I. Occupational Stress was not a significant predictor of Role Efficacy for total sample and Group 2 (Table 6,7,8).

The above upheld the hypotheses partially that Role Efficacy is expected to be negatively significantly related with Occupational Stress. It is supported by few studies. Sayeed (1985) has reported negative correlation between work related tension and the overall role efficacy measure. Mohan, et.al(1988) found relationship between Occupational Stress and managerial effectiveness in managers belonging to Public and Private Sector. The result revealed inverse correlation between occupational stress and managerial effectiveness thereby indicating that increase of occupational stress leads to decrease or lesser managerial effectiveness. Mohan(2000) reported findings of Charles D. Spielberger & Eric.C. Reheiser: It is well known that stress in work place adversely affects productivity, absenteeism, worker turnover, and employee health and well being(e.g.) copper and Payne; 1988; Kahn et.al., 1964; Karasek & Therorell, 1990, Keita & Sauter 1992; Levi, 1981; Matterson & Irvanceivich 1982.
Conclusions

Based on results of study and discussion, several conclusions are derived. Some of the important are:

i) The predictors of Role Efficacy relating to personal and organisational variables for Group I and Group II polytechnic teachers revealed a significant difference. Thus, there is a significant difference of Role Efficacy of Group I and Group II. Group II perceive greater value of Role Efficacy compared to Group I.

ii) For total sample, Group I and Group II polytechnic teachers Role Efficacy has five blocks of common predictors namely; Personality, Personality Stress Questionnaire (PSQ) – Behaviour Types, Motivation in Role and Role Satisfaction, Quality of Working Life and Organisational Role Stress. These five blocks of predictors contribute either positively or negatively to Role Efficacy.

iii) For the total sample, Group I and Group II, Achievement in Role contributed positively to Role Efficacy. Similarly Power in Role contributed positively to Role Efficacy of Total Sample and Group II. The Role Satisfaction relating to Achievement
contributed negatively for Group II and negatively to Role Efficacy to Total sample. For Group I polytechnic teachers, the Extension in role contributed positively to Role Efficacy. However, the Control in Role contributed negatively to Role Efficacy for Group II. For Group II, the Role Satisfaction relating to Power contributed positively to Role Efficacy.

iv) Personality Stress Questionnaire (PSQ) – Behaviour type of Coronary Heart Proneness (T₂) contributed negatively to Role Efficacy for Group I and positively to Role Efficacy for Group II.

v) Personality dimension of Psychoticism contributed negatively to Role Efficacy in Group I. While, Lie scale Personality dimension contributed negatively to Role Efficacy for Group II of polytechnic teachers.

vi) For Group I, the Quality of Working Life dimensions viz. physical working conditions, meaningful development, self-respect contributed positively to Role Efficacy, while confidence in management contributed negatively to Role Efficacy.

For Group II, the Quality of Working Life dimension of union Management Relation contributed positively. While Advancement on Merit, Supervisory Relationship contributed negatively to Role Efficacy. For Total sample, general life
satisfaction of Quality of Working Life was negatively related to Role Efficacy.

vii) As regards Organisational Role Stress dimension of Role Erosion contributed negatively to Role Efficacy for Group I. Self Role Distance and Role Ambiguity contributed negatively to Role Efficacy. Self Role Distance contributed negatively to Role Efficacy for Total sample and Group I.

On the basis of this investigation, it could be, generally concluded that the personality, efficiency, efficacy, quality of working life and organisational role stress have an important linkage with polytechnic teachers performance and general well being.