



---

**A Comparison of Academicians of Different Age Groups in Management Education Sector of Saurashtra Region on Ten Dimensions of Role Efficacy**

**Dr. Bhumika Achhnani**

Assistant Professor

Christ Institute of Management, Rajkot

---

**Abstract**

We are living in a VUCA (Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous) world. The changes in the overall external environment of businesses have made the premises of education industry also very dynamic in nature. The academicians who were earlier only responsible for teaching and making themselves updated; have many new responsibilities like motivating students for taking admissions, universities related assignments, administrative work and managing the events to name a few. The major responsibility areas are mounting. As a result of these dynamics in the role the academicians may not find themselves efficient enough in all the roles they are supposed to play. Along with these altering roles in the organisation, changes in social life are also there to make academicians more distressed. The escalating growth and popularity of education of business management in India has given rise to MBA and BBA institutes all over the nation. However, due to the changing economic scenario and downturn in job market becoming a cause of distress, there are more and more hurdles for management education, many colleges have wrapped up or are at the verge of closing.

This scenario of management education has motivated the current research, to study the different dimensions of role-efficacy of academicians in Management Education Sector of in the Saurashtra Region of Gujarat State.

**Keywords:** Role Efficacy, Academicians, Management Education, Age Groups,

## **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.

When an employee joins any organisation, he confronts the various responsibilities and expectations related to his/her new role or job in the organisation. At the same time the employee also has a set of expectations from the new role which he is going to play in the organisation. So, the way one works in an organisation depends on the way roles are assigned and understood by an individual. If the person occupying a particular role is not technically efficient or lacks the necessary skills and knowledge needed for performing the tasks assigned to him, the person will not be effective while playing this role. Similarly, if the role assigned to the individual does not provides the individual with opportunities to use one's technical skills or knowledge, the success of the individual will be doubtful. Hence an integration of the person and the role occupied that person is needed in order to have an effective performance of an individual in any organisation. It is important for the person to understand the role well and try to fulfil the expectations with that role along with making optimum utilization of all the other opportunities and resources provided to him. The role played by an individual in any organisation is very significant in deciding the overall performance and satisfaction of that individual and thus a study of role efficacy is important in deciding the performance and satisfaction of employees.

According to Pareek the factors underlying the psychology of role effectiveness or the prospective effectiveness of a role is called as role efficacy. The author is of the opinion that role efficacy can be divided in 10 different aspects. These ten different aspects have been arranged under three dimensions in his book – Making Organisational Roles Effective.

Role-making; the first dimension of role-efficacy is the dynamic approach of an individual towards his role which intends to go beyond the description of role provided to him and works to make the role as one likes and faith in. This is different than role-taking where the individual approaches the role with a submissive attitude of acting as per the expectations of others. According to Pareek role-making is a function of four aspects: self-role integration, pro-activity, creativity and confrontation.

The second dimension- role centering is different than the first dimension which focused on individual. Role centering focuses on the way jobs are designed. Role centring is a function of three aspects: centrality, influence and personal growth.

The way a person's role assimilates into the roles played by others and the larger purpose of the organisation as a whole is known as role-linking; the third dimension of role-efficacy. Role linking is a function of three aspects: inter-role linkage, helping relationship and super-ordination.

This study is conducted in management education sector in Saurashtra Regions to know more about role efficacy of academicians belonging to different age groups.

## **Review of Literature**

Das and Padhy (2015) found that the performance of individuals and role efficacy are closely related. They found that out of seven, four measures of role performance were positively related with role efficacy. While studying the motivational effects of role efficacy Malik et. al (2016) found that motivation levels are positively related to role efficacy levels of employees. They suggested improving role efficacy of employees in order to boost the motivation of employees. By improving the role efficacy and other factors which affect role efficacy, organisations can indirectly improve the productivity of employees. The Role efficacy of women employees in Indian BPO Industry was studied by Diddi & Gujri (2014). In the study they found that an decrease in role efficacy of women employees resulted into an increase in their organisational role stress, especially role ambiguity and role overload dimensions of ORS were found to be increasing with decreased level of role efficacy. Waddar & Aminabhavi (2012) in their study on aircraft employees concluded that emotional labour is significantly correlated with role efficacy and role based performance. It was found that those with high centrality, growth, superordinate, confrontation and overall role efficacy were experiencing higher levels of emotional labour.

Emotional intelligence and internal locus of control are positively related to role efficacy (Mahadevi and Vijaylaxmi, 2012). It is also concluded that role efficacy is negatively correlated to external locus of control. People with higher levels of role efficacy experience less anxiety, role stress and tension related to their work (Bandura, 1986). They rely on their capabilities to encounter the problems their come in their path (Kofi and Josephine, 2012). People with higher role efficacy show higher perseverance in solving the problems on their own and sometimes with the help of other people (Kofi and Josephine, 2012).

## **Objectives**

- To assess the levels of various dimensions of role efficacy of academicians in Management Education Sector of Saurashtra Region.
- To compare the academicians of different age groups in management education sector of Saurashtra region on ten dimensions of role efficacy.

## **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 hypotheses to be tested to fulfil the objectives:

1. There is no significant difference among the role-efficacy levels of academicians of different age groups.
2. There is no significant difference among the Self-role Integration of academicians of different age groups.
3. There is no significant difference among the Influence of academicians of different age groups.
4. There is no significant difference among the Proactivity of academicians of different age groups.
5. There is no significant difference among the Creativity of academicians of different age groups.
6. There is no significant difference among the Confrontation of academicians of different age groups.
7. There is no significant difference among the Centrality of academicians of different age groups.
8. There is no significant difference among the Personal Growth of academicians of different age groups.
9. There is no significant difference among the Inter-role Linkage of academicians of different age groups.
10. There is no significant difference among the Helping Relationship of academicians of different age groups.
11. There is no significant difference among the Super Ordination of academicians of different age groups.

### **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:

H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant difference between the role-efficacy levels of academicians of different age groups (22-35, 35-45, >45 yrs.)

Table 1: ANOVA for Comparison of Mean Role Efficacy of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	27.819	2	13.909	.198	.820
Within Groups	21527.536	307	70.122		
Total	21555.355	309			

Table 1 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between mean role-efficacy of the groups as determined by one-way ANOVA (F (2,307) = 0.198, p = .820).

Anova table (Table 1) shows that role efficacy of faculties is not affected by the age groups in which they fall.

H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant difference among the Self-role Integration of academicians of different age groups.

Table 2: ANOVA for Comparison of Mean Integration of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6.355	2	3.177	1.383	.252
Within Groups	705.129	307	2.297		
Total	711.484	309			

Table 2 shows that is no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA (F (2,307) = 1.382, p = .252).

H<sub>03</sub>: There is no significant difference among the Influence of academicians of different age groups.

Table 3: ANOVA for Comparison of Mean Influence of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.009	2	2.004	.857	.425
Within Groups	717.591	307	2.337		
Total	721.600	309			

There is no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA (F (2,307) = 0.857, p = .425) as shown in Table 3.

H<sub>04</sub>: There is no significant difference among the Proactivity of academicians of different gender.

Table 4: ANOVA for Comparison of Mean Proactivity of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.199	2	.099	.031	.969
Within Groups	970.756	307	3.162		
Total	970.955	309			

Table 4 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(2,307) = 0.031, p = .969$ ).

$H_{05}$ : There is no significant difference among the Creativity of academicians of different age groups.

Table 5: ANOVA for Comparison of Mean Creativity of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.688	2	2.344	1.187	.307
Within Groups	606.283	307	1.975		
Total	610.971	309			

There was no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(2,307) = 1.187, p = .307$ ) as shown in Table 5.

$H_{06}$ : There is no significant difference among the Confrontation of academicians of different gender.

Table 6: ANOVA for Comparison of Mean Confrontation of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	17.919	2	8.960	4.162	.016
Within Groups	660.820	307	2.153		
Total	678.739	309			

Through analysis it is found that there is a significant difference between mean scores of confrontation of faculties belonging to different age groups. There is a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(2,307) = 4.162, p = 0.016$ ). It tends to be high in the age group of 22-35 and 35-45 yrs. of age but decreases significantly after this age.

$H_{07}$ : There is no significant difference among the Centrality of academicians of different age groups.

Table 7: ANOVA for Comparison of Mean Centrality of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.421	2	1.711	1.148	.319
Within Groups	457.421	307	1.490		
Total	460.842	309			

As shown in Table 7 there is no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(2,307) = 1.148, p = .319$ ). Thus we conclude that centrality is not affected by age group of the respondent.

$H_{08}$ : There is no significant difference among the Personal Growth of academicians of different age groups.

Table 8: ANOVA for Comparison of Mean Growth of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.647	2	.823	.431	.650
Within Groups	586.495	307	1.910		
Total	588.142	309			

There was no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(2,307) = .431, p = .650$ ) as shown in Table 8. Analysis of above table reveals that there is no significant difference between the perceived opportunities for growth scores for the faculties belonging to different age groups. So we can conclude that opportunities for growth and development in one's role are not affected by their age.

$H_{09}$ : There is no significant difference among the Inter-role Linkage of academicians of different age groups.

Table 9: ANOVA for Comparison of Mean Inter-role Linkage of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.488	2	.244	.134	.875
Within Groups	559.886	307	1.824		
Total	560.374	309			

There was no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(2,307) = 0.134, p = .875$ ) as shown in Table 9. So we can infer that age does not play any role in defining the inter-role linkages in roles played by faculties.

$H_{010}$ : There is no significant difference among the Helping Relationship of academicians of different gender.

Table 10: ANOVA for Comparison of Mean Helping Relationship of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.559	2	2.280	.302	.739
Within Groups	2316.615	307	7.546		
Total	2321.174	309			

As shown in Table 10 there is no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(2,307) = 0.302, p = .739$ ). Here again we can see that age does not effects the perception of helping relationships of faculties within their roles.

$H_{011}$ : There is no significant difference among the Super Ordination of academicians of different age groups.

Table 11: ANOVA for Comparison of Mean Superordination of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	9.753	2	4.876	1.703	.184
Within Groups	879.167	307	2.864		
Total	888.919	309			

Super-ordination means how one perceives himself to be helpful or making difference to the larger society. There is no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(2,307) = 1.703, p = .184$ ) as shown in Table 11.

### Findings & Conclusion

Analysis revealed that there is no significant difference between the role-efficacy levels of academicians of different age groups (22-35, 35-45, >45 yrs.). This finding is in contradiction with the findings of Vijayashree (2013) where test revealed that there was a significant variation in role centering experienced by women BPO Employees based on age. Only one dimension of role-efficacy i.e. confrontation was found to vary between the three age groups ( $F(2, 307) = 4.162, p = .016$ ). This revealed that academicians in the age-group of 35-45 have highest confrontation efficacy (Table 6). Respondents in more than 45 yrs. of age have least efficacy on confrontation. These findings can be used while selecting the faculty members in the institutes. As the findings suggest that the faculties who are less experienced (22-35 yrs) show less confrontation and those who are very much experienced (>45 yrs) show least confrontation; while bringing about any change in the organisation the middle aged group of faculties happen to be suitable as they can deal with the situations without avoiding or blaming others. Confronting the situation will help faculty members to have an overall higher role-efficacy which will ultimately result in better performance and lower stress for these faculties.

## References

- Bandura, A. 1986. *Social Foundations of Thought and Action*, Englewood Cliffs.
- 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. 65-70
- 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. 1-6.
- Didi, 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. 58-67
- 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.
- 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.
- Kofi, O. A and Josephine, B. 2012. Performance Appraisal and Human Resource Development in Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana. *IRJC International Journal of Social Science & Interdisciplinary Research*, Vol. 1, No. 10, October 2012. 52-69.
- Mahadevi, S.W and Vijaylaxmi A. A. (2012). Role Based Performance And Role Efficacy Of Aircraft Employees In Relation To Their Emotional Labour: A Study For Developing Employability Skills. *J.E.M.S*, Vol.3, No.1, 24-28.
- 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), 10-17.
- Mark, R. B, Steven, R., Bray and Mark A. E and Albert V. C. 2002. Role Ambiguity, Role Efficacy, and Role Performance: Multidimensional and Mediational Relationships within Interdependent Sport Teams. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 229-242 NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pareek, U. & Purohit, S. (2011). *Training Instruments in HRD and OD*. 3rd edition. Tata McGraw Hill.
- 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.
- Vijayashree, L. (2013). A Study of Demographic Factors on Role Stress and Role Efficacy. Paper presented at AIMS International Conference on Management on January 6-9, 2013.
- Waddar, M. & Aminabhavi, V. A. (2012). Role Based Performance And Role Efficacy Of Aircraft Employees In Relation To Their Emotional Labour: A Study For Developing Employability Skill. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Sciences* VOL.3 (1) 2012, 24-28