CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY
Methodology

In social sciences research attempts are made to find out some solutions pertaining to social problems of different nature. The basic idea behind conducting any scientific research is to evaluate the after effects of certain variables in search of some alternative courses of action to improve the decision-making ability and to add something in the existing body of knowledge. Research in any discipline is a ceaseless effort and is conducted for many reasons. Some researches are of exploratory nature in which attempts are made to probe something to add to the existing knowledge concerning to certain phenomenon.

According to Kothari (1985), “research design can be conducted as a blue print for the collection, analysis and interpretation of data”.

Edward (1968) pointed out that “in research we do not haphazardly make assumption of any kinds but rather our attention is directed towards those observations that we believe to be relevant to the question we formulated and the objective of research as recognized by all sciences, is to use observations as a basis of answering the question of one’s interest.

Main Objective of the Study

The main objective of the present study is to see the “impact of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on organizational role stress and job satisfaction of employees”.

In this study role efficacy and interpersonal trust are considered as independent variables and organizational role stress and job satisfaction as dependent variables. Role efficacy is the potential effectiveness of an individual occupying a particular role in an organization. It is the combination of the individual and the role. An efficient employee must have appropriate knowledge, technical competence, skills
required for the role and a good inter-personal trust with other employees in the organization. Role efficacy and interpersonal trust are important terms in the context of an organization.

In the present study an attempt is made to find out the impact of various dimensions of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on various dimensions of organizational role stress and job satisfaction.

In the light of available literature reviewed in the forgoing pages, related directly or indirectly with the proposed study, the following null hypotheses are formulated.

**Ho₁** Centrality- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

**Ho₂** Integration- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

**Ho₃** Proactivity- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

**Ho₄** Creativity- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

**Ho₅** Inter-role linkage- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

**Ho₆** Helping relationship- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

**Ho₇** Superordination- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

**Ho₈** Influence- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.
Ho_9 Growth- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho_10 Confrontation- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho_11 Role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho_12 Maintenance- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho_13 Security- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho_14 Intimacy- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho_15 Regard- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho_16 Success- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho_17 Interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho_18 Centrality- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho_19 Integration- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho_20 Proactivity- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.
$H_{021}$ Creativity- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{022}$ Inter-role linkage- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{023}$ Helping relationship- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{024}$ Superordination- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{025}$ Influence- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{026}$ Growth- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{027}$ Confrontation- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{028}$ Role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{029}$ Maintenance- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{030}$ Security- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{031}$ Intimacy- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{032}$ Regard- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.
Success- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

Interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

Hierarchy wise there is no significant difference within the group of employees of government insurance companies.

Hierarchy wise there is no significant difference within the group of employees of private insurance companies.

Sample:

To conduct the quantitative research a sample is needed. In quantitative research, it is believed that if this sample is chosen carefully using the correct procedure, it is then possible to generalize the results to the whole of the research population. Sampling is that part of statistical practice concerned with the selection of an unbiased or random subset of individual observations within a population of individuals intended to yield some knowledge about the population of concern, especially for the purposes of making predictions based on statistical inference. Sampling is an important aspect of data collection. The information gathered systematically is analyzed for the purpose of interpretation and drawing meaningful conclusions.

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

Thus, sample is a process of drawing a small portion of population representing the characteristics of the entire population.

The Purposive sampling technique was used to select the sample for the present study because it fulfilled the requirement of the investigation. The research topic of
present study warranted to select the samples from the population entrusted with certain work responsibilities directed to achieve the stipulated organizational goals. Therefore, sample of present study was taken from Government and Private Insurance Companies. The total sample was consisted of 400 employees selected from different insurance companies. 200 employees were selected from government sector whereas other 200 employees from private sector. The age range of the sample was 25 to 55 years. The sample was comprised of 4 categories of employees- Branch Managers, Administrative Officers, Assistants, and Clerical Staff from government sector whereas Branch Managers, Sales Managers, Operational Staff and Agents from private sector. The employees were selected from the government and private insurance companies of Aligarh district and near by cities of Aligarh.

Perhaps there is no single psychological test which can tell us about all the aspects of behaviours. Since human being is a composite of numerous behavioural patterns so, for measuring each behavioural aspect an independent psychological test is used. The questionnaire method is one of the important psychological test which has been used in the present investigation as it is most convenient to administer. A questionnaire contains numerous statements and respondents are required to answer each statement according to the instructions given to them. A comprehensive detail of the measures used in the present investigation is as follows-
Break-up of the sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Group (Government/ Private)</th>
<th>No. of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>50 / 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Officers/ Sales Managers</td>
<td>50 / 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistants/ Operational Staff</td>
<td>50 / 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical staff/ Agents</td>
<td>50 / 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200 / 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) - The Role Efficacy Scale (RE Scale):

Role efficacy scale developed by Udai Pareek is a structured instrument consisting of twenty triads of statements (appendix- I). A respondent marks the one statement in each triad that describes his role most accurately. The three alternatives are pre-weighted. There are two statements for each dimension of role efficacy and the scoring pattern followed is +2, +1 or -1. The scale consisted of 10 dimensions:

1. Centrality,
2. Integration,
3. Proactivity,
4. Creativity,
5. Inter-role linkage,
6. Helping relationship,
7. Superordination,
8. Influence,
9. Growth,
10. Confrontation.

Sen (1982) reported a retest reliability of 0.68 significant at 0.001 levels. This shows the high stability of the scale. Sen has also reported high internal consistency, indicated by significant correlation values among the items.

Sayeed (1985) reported item-total correlation for twenty RES items for a total sample of 658 managers, and for eleven organizations separately. For the total sample the total correlation for the entire sample was -0.36, with an alpha coefficient of 0.80. The alpha for the mean corrected item-total correlation of the eleven organizations ranged from 0.71 to 0.85. These results show internal homogeneity of the scale. This, however, is only one dimension of the validity of the scale.

(B)- The Inter-personal Trust Scale (IPT Scale):

Interpersonal trust scale is developed and standardized by S.C.Gupta and Vinita Mathur is designed to measure the inter-personal orientation. There are 20 items in the scale (Appendix-II). It consists of one item for each stage of Assumption-Perception- Behavior- Feedback cycle for five types of need-oriented human interactions. The items are so framed that agreement with them indicates low-trust orientation.

The IPT Scale is self-administering. No time limit is imposed but the entire questionnaire can be completed in about ten minutes. The response on each item is to be given on a 4-point scale, where:

1 stands for “Totally disagree”
2 stands for “Somewhat agree”
3 stands for “Agree to a large extent”,
4 stands for “Totally agree”.
Scoring is thus convenient and fast, require no special material. Scores (1, 2, 3 or 4) are summed up to find out the total score. The net score is then calculated by subtracting 20 from the total score. The net score can range from 0 to 60.

The total agreement with any item indicates low-trust orientation, while the total disagreement with any item indicates high-trust orientation. Thus, the lower the net score, the higher is the trust-orientation.

The split-half reliability of the scale was found to be 0.91 which is significant at 0.001 level.

(C)- Organizational Role Stress Scale (ORS Scale):

Organizational role stress scale is developed by Udai Pareek (1983a, 1983c) was used in the present study. It is a five-point scale indicating how true a particular statement is for the role. There are 50 items in this scale (Appendix- III). The score of each role stress may range between 0 to 20 and the total organizational role stress score may vary between 0 to 200. The rating of the respondents may be added row-wise to give the scores on the 10 role stress dimensions:

1. Self-role distance (SRD),
2. Inter-role distance (IRD),
3. Role stagnation (RS),
4. Role isolation (RI),
5. Role ambiguity (RA),
6. Role expectation conflict (REC),
7. Role overload (RO),
8. Role erosion (RE),
9. Resource inadequacy (RIn),
10. Personal inadequacy (PI).
(D)- Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ):

Job satisfaction questionnaire is developed by Shailendra Singh. It consisted 20 facets (Appendix- IV). The range of scores on JSQ is 20-100. The higher the total score the more will be the satisfaction of the employee. Its standardized alpha reliability is 0.96. It is a five point scale where,

1 stands for “very dissatisfied”,

2 stands for “dissatisfied”,

3 stands for “neutral”,

4 stands for “satisfied”,

5 stands for “very satisfied”.

Biographical Information Blank (BIB):

For recording background information of respondents BIB was prepared that includes information regarding age, sex, income, qualification, role of the employee, name of the organization, experience on the present job, total job experience.

Data Collection Procedures: The data was collected from 400 employees working in insurance companies. 200 employees were working in government sector whereas the remaining 200 were working in private sector. During the process of data collection the above mentioned scales were distributed among 470 employees, out of them 430 employees returned the questionnaires that were completed in every respect, 40 questionnaires were incomplete so these were rejected. Thus remaining 400 employees constituted as the sample of the present study. Proper instructions were given to the employees to obtain adequate responses. The researcher assured all the respondent that complete confidentiality of their responses be maintained and it will be used for research purpose only. The respondents were requested to read each
statement carefully and give response on each and every item. It was also mentioned that there is no right or wrong answer.

**Statistical Analysis:**

Data were analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0. The analysis was carried out in three phases.

In the first phase t-test was used to investigate the mean difference between various categories of employees of government and private insurance companies on different dimensions of role efficacy, interpersonal trust, organizational role stress and job satisfaction.

In the second phase stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to assess the relationship of both the independent variables (role efficacy and interpersonal trust) simultaneously with one dependent variable among four categories of government and private insurance companies. Since stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to find out how role efficacy and interpersonal trust affect the organizational role stress and job satisfaction of employees hence the correlational design was used.

Since there are more than two groups hence in the third phase one way ANOVA with Tukey Post Hoc was applied to see the hierarchy wise difference within the group of employees. The significance of difference was calculated to see whether the groups of employees are differing on all the variables i.e. role efficacy, interpersonal trust, organizational role stress and job satisfaction.