
A Comparative Study on Dimensions of Role Efficacy between Male and Female Academicians in Management Education

Dr. Neeta Sinha

School of Liberal Studies, Pandit Deendayal Petroleum University,
Gandhi Nagar, Gujarat, India

Dr. Bhumika Achhnani

Christ School of Management, Rajkot

Abstract

The modifications in external environment of business have made the environment of education industry also very dynamic in nature. The professors who were earlier supposed to work for teaching and updating their knowledge are now responsible for many more tasks like attracting students, administrative work, work related to universities and event management to name a few. The key performance indicators are now expanding. Because of these dynamics in the role the faculties may not find themselves efficient enough in all the roles they are supposed to play. Along with these changing roles in the organisation, changes in social life are also there to make faculties more distressed. With the mushrooming growth of management education in India there has been a rise of management institutes all over the nation but due to the economic slowdown and placements becoming a cause of concern, now the scenario is not so bright, many colleges have closed down or are at the verge of closing. All these have caused a lot of pressure over faculties. Many have lost their jobs because of this downturn in the industry.

Keeping all these factors in mind, the present research strives to study the different dimensions of role-efficacy of academicians in Management Education Sector of Saurashtra Region. 310 responses were analysed to identify the average level of role-efficacy of faculties. An attempt has been made to compare the role-efficacy of male and female academicians in Management Education sector of Saurashtra Region. Comparison of means is done to test the hypotheses. Results and recommendations are discussed.

Keywords: *Role Efficacy, Academicians, Management Education*

Introduction

The world today is more turbulent and dynamic than ever before. So many changes in the society are making the life of individuals more challenging day by day. Gone are the days when all that organisations demanded from their employees was good performance in their specialized jobs. Now organizations demand a person to have multitasking capabilities. An employee with flexible working skills and capabilities is preferred over one who is specialized in one job. The business scenario has changed. The external environment is changing forcing the organisations to be more receptive to changes. No organisation can survive if it does not know how to adapt to changes. And the agent through whom organisations can change is its human resources only. Lately organisations have realised the importance of managing their human resources.

With these changes in the environment there is a constant up gradation and enlargement of roles played by employee of any organisation. If an employee is not confident in him / her while playing these different roles the performance of the employee may get compromised. One's beliefs about oneself can act as moderating variables in the stress-strain relationship. Results of many researches have supported the idea that stressors have a less negative effect when individuals have more positive self-perceptions (Mossholder, Bedein & Armenakis, 1982). Research shows that one's own beliefs of efficacy function as an important determinant of motivation, affect, thought and action (Bandura, 1992). People with low self-efficacy also harbor adverse thoughts about their performance and personal growth.

According to Udai Pareek (1980), “the performance of people working in an organization depends on their own potential effectiveness, technical competence, managerial experience etc. as well as on the design of the role that he performs in an organisation”. If a person does not have the required knowledge, skills and technical expertise which are required in a role, he cannot be effective. But that is not enough, with this, the role which he occupies in organisation should be designed in such a way that he likes. If the role design is not proper the person may feel that he is not able to utilise his competencies and as a result may feel frustrated, ultimately his effectiveness may get affected in a negative way. It is like a mutual relationship, when both the individual and the role fulfill the needs of each other then only both can be integrated. The nearer that role taking (reacting to the expectations of various other people) passages to role making (taking the initiative in planning the role innovatively so that the hopes of others as well as of the role occupant are integrated), the more the role is likely to be effective. Pareek calls this potential effectiveness “efficacy”. Pareek defined role efficacy in his book -Making Organisational Roles Effective. He defines role efficacy as the potential effectiveness of a role or the psychological factors underlying role effectiveness. He has outlined 10 aspects of role efficacy arranged under three dimensions.

Role-making is a role-holder's dynamic approach towards the role as shown by the strength and enterprise taken to go beyond the brief and make the role that one likes and have faith in. This happens to be different from role-taking which is a much more submissive attitude of merely reacting to others' expectations. According to Pareek role-making is a function of four aspects: self-role integration, pro-activity, creativity and confrontation.

While the first dimension focuses on the individual, the second dimension – role centring focuses on the job design aspects. Role centring is a function of three aspects: centrality, influence and personal growth. The concept of centrality is very interesting.

Role linking element of efficacy focuses on how the role assimilates into others' roles and with the larger purpose of the organisation. Role linking is a function of three aspects: inter-role linkage, helping relationship and super-ordination.

Review of Literature

Jyothi & Jyothi (2012) in his research *Assessing Work-Life Balance: From Emotional Intelligence and Role Efficacy of Career Women* hypothesised that there is a significant relationship between role efficacy and emotional intelligence and Career women are high on Emotional Intelligence and Role Efficacy aspects. The relationships between role efficacy and emotional intelligence variables predicted that an increase in the amount of emotional intelligence of the career women will cause corresponding increment in their potential role effectiveness. The analysis revealed that the career women are high in role effectiveness and emotional intelligence. Kaur & Kazi (2012) did an empirical study on impact of role efficacy of nursing community on Organizational effectiveness using multiple regression analysis. It was observed that the components of role efficacy like creativity and helping relationship played a dominating role over components of overall organizational effectiveness. Chaudhary & Jain (2014) in their study on Dimensions of Role Efficacy found that The Middle management of universities in Rajasthan performs better on Inter-role linkage, helping relationship, Coordination in comparison of Lower management. Malik et.al. (2016) studied the impact of role efficacy on the motivation levels of employees. They found a positive relation between role efficacy and motivation levels of an employee. They suggested that organisation can work to improve role efficacy among employees thereby improving the motivation levels. This would indirectly improve its productivity as a whole specifically, organisations must look for ways to improve role efficacy along with other factors which affect role efficacy. Das & Padhy (2015) conducted a study on role efficacy and engendering trust on performance indicators. They found that relationship exists between role efficacy and organizational effectiveness. Diddi & Gujri (2014) studied Organizational Role Efficacy in Indian BPO Industry w.r.t. women employees. Researchers found that when the role efficacy decreases amongst the women human resource of Indian BPOs, their organizational role stress level increases, in particular, the stress dimensions role overload and role ambiguity increase when these women employees experience less role efficacy.

Objectives

1. To study the various dimensions of role efficacy namely Centrality, Self-role integration, Proactively, Creativity, Inter-role linkage, Helping relationship, Super ordination, Influence, Personal growth and Coordination of academicians in Management Education Sector of Saurashtra Region.
2. To compare the various dimensions of role efficacy between male and female of academicians in Management Education Sector of Saurashtra Region.

Research Methodology

Sample

Saurashtra Region was selected for the study as in Gujarat this region is emerging as the education hub. Rajkot which belongs to this region has more management colleges than any other city in Gujarat. Questionnaires were distributed to 325 faculties of management studies teaching in different UG and PG management colleges. Out of these 310 questionnaires were found to be complete useable.

Data Collection

The required data on role efficacy of the faculties have been collected with the help of structured questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of two important parts. The first part covers the demographic details about the faculties whereas the second part of the questionnaire covers the Role-efficacy dimensions. The scale used is role-efficacy scale taken from Training Instruments in HRD and OD authored by Pareek & Purohit (2011), Tata McGraw Hill Publications. The scale consisted of 20 sets of statements. Each set has three statements, the respondents were asked to select one statement from each set.

Hypotheses

Following are the hypothesis to be tested to fulfil the objectives:

1. There is a significant difference among the role-efficacy levels of academicians of different gender.
2. There is a significant difference among the Self-role Integration of academicians of different gender.
3. There is a significant difference among the Influence of academicians of different gender.
4. There is a significant difference among the Proactivity of academicians of different gender.
5. There is a significant difference among the Creativity of academicians of different gender.
6. There is a significant difference among the Confrontation of academicians of different gender.
7. There is a significant difference among the Centrality of academicians of different gender.
8. There is a significant difference among the Personal Growth of academicians of different gender.
9. There is a significant difference among the Inter-role Linkage of academicians of different gender.
10. There is a significant difference among the Helping Relationship of academicians of different gender.
11. There is a significant difference among the Super Ordination of academicians of different gender.

Data Analysis

The data was analysed using comparison of means and one way ANOVA. The analysis was done by using SPSS version 17.

Demographic Details

Out of the total sample of 310 respondents, 148 were males and 162 females. Out of the total 310 respondents 265 (85.5%) belonged to age group of 22-35 yrs.; 33 (10.6%) respondent were from the age group of 35-45 yrs. and only 12 (3.9%) respondents were of more that of 45 yrs. of age. The data was collected from both faculties of BBA and MBA courses. 50.6% of total respondents were teaching in BBA colleges, 48.1% were teaching in MBA colleges and 1.3% faculties were working in both departments of the same college.

Testing of Hypotheses

To test all the hypotheses framed comparison of means has been done in SPSS with Anova table. The tables are as shown below:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference among the role-efficacy levels of academicians of different gender.

Table 1: Comparison of Mean Role-Efficacy w.r.t. Gender

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Total Role Efficacy * GENDER Between Groups (Combined)	174.562	1	174.562	2.515	.114
Within Groups	21380.793	308	69.418		
Total	21555.355	309			

As shown in Table 1 there is no statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 2.515, p = .114$). So we can infer that there is no difference between role efficacies of academicians which can be attributed to gender.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference among the Self-role Integration of academicians of different gender.

Table 2: Comparison of Mean Self-role Integration w.r.t. Gender

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Integration * GENDER Between Groups (Combined)	1.032	1	1.032	.448	.504
Within Groups	710.452	308	2.307		
Total	711.484	309			

There was no statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 0.448, p = .504$) as shown in Table 2.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference among the Influence of academicians of different gender.

Table 3: Comparison of Mean Influence w.r.t. Gender

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Influence * GENDER Between Groups (Combined)	.074	1	.074	.032	.859
Within Groups	721.526	308	2.343		
Total	721.600	309			

Table 3 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 0.032, p = .859$).

H₀₄: There is no significant difference among the Proactivity of academicians of different gender.

Table 4: Comparison of Mean Proactivity w.r.t. Gender

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Proactivity * GENDER Between Groups (Combined)	2.754	1	2.754	.876	.350
Within Groups	968.201	308	3.144		
Total	970.955	309			

There was no statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 0.876, p = .350$) as shown in Table 4.

H₀₅: There is a significant difference among the Creativity of academicians of different gender.

Table 5: Comparison of Mean Creativity w.r.t. Gender

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Creativity * GENDER Between Groups (Combined)	.005	1	.005	.003	.959
Within Groups	610.966	308	1.984		
Total	610.971	309			

Table 5 shows there was no statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 0.003, p = .959$).

H₀₆: There is a significant difference among the Confrontation of academicians of different gender.

Table 6: Comparison of Mean Confrontation w.r.t. Gender

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Confrontation * GENDER Between Groups (Combined)	9.634	1	9.634	4.435	.036
Within Groups	669.105	308	2.172		
Total	678.739	309			

Table 6 shows there is statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 4.435, p = .036$). That is we can conclude confrontation score is high for females; means females are more willing to confront with the problems associated with their role.

H₀₇: There is a significant difference among the Centrality of academicians of different gender.

Table 7: Comparison of Mean Centrality w.r.t. Gender

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Centrality * GENDER Between Groups (Combined)	.036	1	.036	.024	.878
Within Groups	460.806	308	1.496		
Total	460.842	309			

There was no statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 0.024, p = .878$) as shown in Table 7.

H₀₈: There is a significant difference among the Personal Growth of academicians of different gender.

Table 8: Comparison of Mean Growth w.r.t. Gender

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Growth * GENDER Between Groups (Combined)	.840	1	.840	.440	.507
Within Groups	587.302	308	1.907		
Total	588.142	309			

There was no statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 0.440, p = .507$) as shown in Table 8.

H₀₉: There is a significant difference among the Inter-role Linkage of academicians of different gender.

Table 9: Comparison of Mean Inter-role Linkage w.r.t. Gender

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Inter-role GENDER	Linkage	* Between Groups (Combined)	.293	1	.293	.161	.688
		Within Groups	560.081	308	1.818		
		Total	560.374	309			

Table 9 reveals that there was no statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 0.161, p = .688$).

H₀₁₀: There is a significant difference among the Helping Relationship of academicians of different gender.

Table 10: Comparison of Mean Helping Relationship w.r.t. Gender

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Helping GENDER	Relationship	* Between Groups (Combined)	72.804	1	72.804	9.973	.002
		Within Groups	2248.370	308	7.300		
		Total	2321.174	309			

There was statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 9.973, p = .002$) as shown in Table 10. A look at the means show that females score high on helping relationships.

H₀₁₁: There is a significant difference among the Super Ordination of academicians of different gender.

Table 11: Comparison of Mean Superordination w.r.t. Gender

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Superordination * GENDER		Between Groups (Combined)	1.677	1	1.677	.582	.446
		Within Groups	887.243	308	2.881		
		Total	888.919	309			

Table 11 shows there was no statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 0.582, p = .446$).

Findings & Conclusion

The study shows that there is no statistically significant difference between genders as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,308) = 2.515, p = .114$). This is in tune with the findings of study conducted by Rastogi, Rangnekar & Bamel (2012) on managers of public and private sector organisations. So we can infer that there is no difference between role efficacies of academicians which can be attributed to gender. However, individual comparisons of means score on different dimensions for two gender revealed that females were significantly ahead of males on two dimensions viz. helping relationship and confrontation of role efficacy.

References

- J Chaudhary A & Jain N (2014). A Comparative Study on Dimensions of Role Efficacy between Middle and Lower Management of Universities in Rajasthan. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology* | ISSN 2348-5396 Volume 2, Issue 1, Paper ID: B00209V2I12014. Pp. 65-70
- J Das, S. & Padhy, P.K. (2015). A study on role efficacy and engendering trust on performance indicators. *Journal of Management and Science* ISSN: 2249-1260 | e-ISSN: 2250-1819 | Vol.5. No.1. pp. 1-6.
- J Diddi, K. & Gujri, M. (2014). Organizational Role Efficacy in Indian BPO Industry with Reference to Women Human Resource. *International Journal of Modern Engineering & Management Research* | Vol 2 | Issue 2. pp. 58-67
- J Jyothi, S. & Jyothi, P. (2012). Assessing Work-Life Balance: From Emotional Intelligence and Role Efficacy of Career Women. *Advances In Management*, 5 (6), 35-43. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com> on 03-12-2013.
- J Kaur, R. & Kazi, R. (2012). An Empirical Study on impact of role efficacy of nursing community on Organizational effectiveness using multiple regression analysis. *Paripex - Indian Journal of Research*, 1 (9), 131-140. ISSN - 2250-1991.
- J Malik, R., Madappa, T. , Kaur, R. & Chitranshi, J. (2016). A Conceptual Study on the Impact of Role Efficacy on the Motivation Levels of Employees. *International Journal of Marketing and Human Resource Management*, 7(3), pp. 10–17.
- J Pareek, U. & Purohit, S. (2011). *Training Instruments in HRD and OD*. 3rd edition. Tata McGraw Hill.
- J Rastogi, R., Rangnekar, S. & Bamel, U. K. (2012). Gender, Organization(s) and Managerial Level(s) Differences in Perceiving Role Efficacy. *International Journal of Business and Management Tomorrow* 2 (2), 1-5. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com> on 16-03-2013.