RESULTS
The aim of the present investigation was to study Self-Rated Effectiveness amongst Judicial Officers in relation to their Personality, Motives, Need Satisfaction, Job attitudes, Stress & Strain, Ways of Coping and Perception of Quality of Working Life.

Self-Rated Effectiveness was studied in relation to various personal and organisational variables. The measures of personal variables included Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire-Revised (Eysenck et al., 1985) which was used to study the personality dimensions of Extraversion/Introversion, Psychoticism, Neuroticism and Social Desirability. Type A behaviour was studied through Type A scale by (Cooper et al., 1988). The Mach IV Scale developed by Christie and Geis (1970) was used to assess the personality dimension of Machiavellianism. The dimensions of Impulsiveness, Venturesomeness and Empathy were studied through Eysenck’s Impulsiveness Questionnaire (1978). Optimism, Irritability and Self-Esteem were measured through the tests by Scheier and Carver (1985), Buss and Durkee (1957) and Cheek and Buss (1981) respectively. Rotter’s Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (1966) was used to measure the personality dimension of Externality. Manifest Hostility scale developed by Kool (1980) was used as a measure of hostility.

Misra and Tripathy’s (1980) Motives scale was used to study the four motives of need for Achievement, need for Affiliation, need for Approval and need for Power.

Need Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Porter and Lawler (1968) was used to gauge subject’s deficiency of satisfaction in the areas of Self-Esteem, Self Actualization, Autonomy, Social and Security needs along with a measure of importance that the subject attached to each of these need areas.

Study of various Job Attitudes used Job Involvement Questionnaire by Kanungo (1981) for the measurement of the extent of Job Involvement and Job Descriptive Index (Smith et al., 1969) as a measure of Total Job Satisfaction and its dimensions viz., Work Satisfaction, Supervisory Satisfaction, Co-Worker Satisfaction, Pay Satisfaction and Promotion Satisfaction.

Daily Hassles and Uplifts Scale (Kanner et al., 1981) was used as a measure of minor events. Occupational Stress was studied through Occupational Stress Index (Srivastava and Singh, 1984). Maslach’s Burnout Inventory (Maslach and Jackson, -153-
1981) was used to study the dimensions of Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, Personal Accomplishment and Total Burnout. General Health Questionnaire (Marshall and Cooper, 1972) was used as a measure of strain on the whole.

Ways of Coping Questionnaire (Folkman and Lazarus, 1988) was used as a measure of the eight dimensions of coping viz., Confrontive Coping, Distancing, Self-Controlling, Seeking Social Support, Accepting Responsibility, Escape Avoidance, Planful Problem Solving and Positive Reappraisal.

The perception of Quality of Working Life was studied through the Quality of Working Life Inventory by Sinha and Sayeed (1980). It comprised seventeen dimensions viz., Economic Benefits, Physical Working Conditions, Mental State, Career Orientation, Advancement on Merit, Effect on Personal Life, Union-Management Relations, Self-Respect, Supervisory Relations, Intra-Group Relations, Sense of Achievement versus Apathy, Confidence in Management, Meaningful Development, Control, Influence and Participation, Employee Commitment, General Life Satisfaction and Organizational Climate.

Self-Rated Effectiveness was studied through Self-Rating Effectiveness scale by Valecha (1987).

The raw data consisted of scores on all the above-mentioned sixty-nine variables. Means and Standard Deviations were computed for the total sample (Table 1).

The total sample in the study was further differentiated into two groups on the basis of the mode of selection of the Judicial Officers in the total group. Group I comprised the Judicial Officers selected directly from the bar (Direct Recruits) while Group II consisted of Judicial Officers selected through competition and thereafter promoted (Promotee Officers).

_t-RATIOS_

The expectation was that these groups would show differences on all the measures of personal and organizational correlates of Effectiveness. To verify this hypothesis, _t_ratios_ were calculated comparing the above-mentioned two groups on the various variables under study. The same is shown in Table 2.
The results, as revealed by this table, showed that t-ratios between the two groups were significantly different on Promotion Satisfaction (2.48), Work Satisfaction (2.33), Total Job Satisfaction (2.23), Self-Rated Effectiveness (2.00), Positive Reappraisal (1.93) and Intra-Group Relations (1.72) favouring Group I.

Significant differences were also found between the two groups on Occupational Stress (2.34), Social Need Deficiency (2.08), need for Approval (1.68), Career Orientation (1.65) and Neuroticism (1.64) favouring Group II.

The fact that there was a significant difference in the two groups on a number of variables justified (a) the formation of the two groups and (b) the expectation that these two groups would differ on various correlates of Effectiveness.

As some of the t-ratios among the Groups I and II emerged significant, Inter-Correlational Analysis, Factors Analysis and Regression Analysis were run for the total sample as well as for Group I and Group II.

CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS

Correlational Analysis was done to study the relationship of Self-Rated Effectiveness with various dimensions of Personality, different Motives, Need Satisfaction, Job Attitudes, Stress and Strain measures, Burnout, various Ways of Coping and perception of Quality of Working life.

As t-ratios revealed differences among the groups on some variables, Correlation Analysis was conducted for the total sample (Table 3), as well as Group I (Table 4) comprising Judicial Officers selected directly from bar and Group II (Table 5) consisting of Judicial Officers selected initially through competition and thereafter promoted.

Table 3, presenting the inter-correlational matrix for the total sample revealed Effectiveness to be negatively correlated with Job Involvement (-.19) and positively correlated with Impulsiveness (.22).

For Group I (Table 4), Effectiveness was positively correlated with Self-Esteem Need Importance (.35) and General Life Satisfaction (.37).

For Group II (Table 5), Effectiveness was found to be positively correlated with Impulsiveness (.24) and negatively correlated with Job Involvement (-.20).
Accepting Responsibility (-.20), Planful Problem Solving (-.19) and Union-Management Relations (-.23).

A detailed discussion of Effectiveness and its correlates has been presented in a separate chapter on discussions.

FACTOR ANALYSIS

Factor Analysis was conducted to identify structure of Effectiveness as related with personal and organizational variables. This was done for the total sample, Group I and Group II. The related factor matrices of the variables with their communalities for total sample, as well as Groups I and II are presented in Tables 6-11.

Table 6 showed Unrotated Factor Matrix for total sample while Table 7 presented the Rotated Factor Matrix for the total sample. For Group I, the Unrotated Factor Matrix is shown in Table 8 whereas Rotated Factor Matrix is presented in Table 9. The Unrotated Factor Matrix for Group II is presented in Table 10 while the Rotated Factor Matrix is presented in Table 11.

For interpretation and discussion, only rotated factors have been considered. Correlational Matrices were transformed into factor matrices using Principal Component Method (Hoteling, 1935). Following Kaiser (1960), the extraction of factors was stopped when the value of latent root came to be less than 1.0. By this method, 28 factors could be extracted for the total sample while the number of factors extracted was 23 for Group I and 27 for Group II.

For total sample and Group II (n being 100+), loadings of (+-).30 or above have been considered for the interpretation and identification of factors (Guilford, 1956; Nunnally, 1978). The loadings of .3 to .5 are treated as moderate whereas loadings of .5 to .7 are considered high (vide Fruchter, 1954).

Since for Group I the sample was only 32, loadings from .4 to .6 were considered moderate while loadings of .6 and above were considered high.

A detailed discussion of only those factors which are relevant to the study is being done in the discussion chapter.
REGRESSION ANALYSIS

One of the objectives of the present study was to derive regression equations to know about the optimum contribution of various personal and organizational predictors for the criterion variable of Self-Rated Effectiveness. Regression Analysis was also conducted to identify significant predictors of Self-Rated Effectiveness among Judicial Officers. For this purpose the initial plan was to enter all the 69 measures of personal and organizational variables as Independent variables (predictors). However, after surveying the inter-correlational matrices, the variables showing low or near zero relationship with Effectiveness were not entered as predictors of Self-Rated Effectiveness.

Regression equations with Self-Rated effectiveness as the criterion variable were computed for the total sample (Table 12), Group I (Table 13) and Group II (Table 14). The results revealed significant association of Self-Rated effectiveness with Occupational Stress and Job Attitudes too. Additional Equations for aiding in interpretation and discussion, were also worked out for all the three groups, with Occupational Stress, Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction as criterion variables respectively.

Tables 15, 16 and 17 showed the regression equations for all the three groups, with Occupational Stress as the criterion variable. Tables 18,19 and 20 showed the regression equations for all the three groups, with Job Involvement as the criterion variable. Tables 21,22 & 23 indicated the regression equations for all the three groups, with Job Satisfaction as the criterion variable.

For the regression equation computed with Self-Rated Effectiveness as the criterion for total sample (Table 12), the following variables were taken as predictors: Type A, Hassles, Uplifts, Neuroticism, Social Desirability, Seeking Social Support, Accepting Responsibility, Escape Avoidance, Planful Problem Solving, Job Involvement, Work Satisfaction, Promotion Satisfaction, Total Job Satisfaction, Depersonalization, need for Achievement, need for Approval, need for Power, Deficiency of Self Actualizaiton need Satisfaction, Deficiency of Autonomy need Satisfaction, Deficiency of Social need Satisfaction, Self-Esteem need Importance, Autonomy need Importance, Security need Importance, Impulsiveness, Empathy.
Machiavellianism, Career Orientation, Union-Management Relations, Meaningful Development, Employee Commitment and General Life Satisfaction.

Table 12 showed $R^2$ for this set to be 0.27. A glance at the predictors revealed Impulsiveness ($β = .21$) to be contributing the most, followed by Job Involvement ($β = -.23$); Type A ($β = .23$); Machiavellianism ($β = .11$); Work Satisfaction ($β = .17$); Importance of need for Self Actualization ($β = -.17$); Uplifts ($β = .18$); Planful Problem solving ($β = -.17$); Need for Approval ($β = -.20$); Empathy ($β = -.14$) and need for Achievement ($β = .14$).

For the regression equation with Self-Rated Effectiveness as the criterion variable for Group I (Table 13), the following variables were taken as predictors: Optimism, Self-Esteem, Extraversion, Social Desirability, Distancing, Locus of Control, Work Satisfaction, Promotion Satisfaction, Total Job Satisfaction, need for Power, Occupational Stress, Deficiency of Autonomy Need Satisfaction, Deficiency of Social Need Satisfaction, Deficiency of Self-Esteem Need Satisfaction, Security Need Importance, Venturesomeness, Machiavellianism, Mental State, Career Orientation, Advancement on Merit, Union-Management Relations, Self Respect, Intragroup Relations, Meaningful Development, Control, Influence and Participation, Employee Commitment and General Life Satisfaction.

Table 13 showing this regression equation revealed the $R^2$ for Self-Rated Effectiveness to be .79.

The significant predictors for Effectiveness in Group I were: Quality of Working life dimension of General Life Satisfaction ($β = -.01$), Importance of need for Autonomy ($β = .23$); Machiavellianism ($β = .42$); Union-Management Relations ($β = .02$); Venturesomeness ($β = .09$); Intragroup Relations ($β = -.42$); Occupational Stress ($β = .16$); Control, Influence and Participation ($β = -.35$); Advancement on Merit ($β = .41$); Locus of Control ($β = -.47$); WOC dimension of Distancing ($β = .34$); Employee Commitment ($β = -.27$) and Self Actualization need Deficiency ($β = .25$).

For the regression equation for Group II (Table 14) with criterion variable Self-Rated Effectiveness, the following variables were taken as predictors: Type A, Hassles, Uplifts, Irritability, Psychoticism, Neuroticism, Seeking Social Support, Accepting Responsibility, Planful Problem Solving, Job Involvement,
Depersonalization, need for Achievement, need for Approval, Deficiency of Self Actualization need Satisfaction, Deficiency of Autonomy need Satisfaction, Deficiency of Social need Satisfaction, Social need Importance, Impulsiveness, Empathy, Venturesomeness, Machiavellianism, Economic Benefits, Union Management Relations, Relations with Supervisor and Meaningful Development.

Table 14 shows $R^2$ for Self-Rated Effectiveness in Group II to be .31. The predictor which contributed most was Impulsiveness ($\beta = .22$) followed by Union Management Relations ($\beta = -.16$); Job Involvement ($\beta = -.22$); Planful Problem Solving ($\beta = -.24$); Empathy ($\beta = -.21$); Type A ($\beta = .17$); Need for Approval ($\beta = -.18$); Uplifts ($\beta = .15$); need for Achievement ($\beta = .14$); Importance of need for Self Actualization ($\beta = -.15$); and Psychoticism ($\beta = .10$).