

A Comparative Study of Role Efficacy among Public, Deemed and Private Universities of Rajasthan

**- A. K. Chaudhary &
- N. Jain**

Role efficacy is potential effectiveness of an individual occupying a particular role in an organization. In this study the researchers have compared the level of role efficacy among public, private and deemed universities Higher Education.

Key words: - Role Efficacy, Private University, Public University, Deemed University

Role efficacy would mean potential effectiveness of an individual occupying a particular role in an organization. The performance of a person working in an organization depends on his own potential effectiveness, technical competence, managerial experience as well as the design of the role that he performs in the organization. It is the integration of the two that ensures a person's effectiveness in the organization. The word "university" is derived from the Latin universitas magistrorum et scholarium, which roughly means "community of teachers and scholars." The University Grants Commission (UGC) of India is a statutory organisation set up by Union public in 1956, for the coordination, determination and maintenance of standards of university education. The status of Deemed University is granted only after fulfilling certain criteria laid down by the UGC. The Deemed University status allows the institutions to develop their own syllabus and course work. They also get the autonomy to set its own guidelines regarding admission and fees. Private Universities established by Entrepreneur with self financed. The Public Universities establish by public.

Review of Literature-

Y.N.Sridhar, Hamid Reza Badii (2008) conducted research on the topic "Teacher Efficacy Beliefs: A Comparison of Teachers in India and Iran" This study examined and compared the teacher efficacy of higher primary school teachers in India and Iran by surveying 225 Indian teachers (60 male and 165 female) and 222 Iranian teachers (97 male and 125 female). Therefore, the sample groups were composed of 447 subjects. Teachers' sense of efficacy was measured through the Woolfolk and Hoy standard Teacher- Efficacy Scale (1990). Overall participant teacher efficacy scores were almost high. Statistically no significant difference in general teaching efficacy scores were found between two countries. A statistically difference was found between male teachers in two countries in terms of personal teaching efficacy. Iranian male teachers had high personal efficacy than counterparts in India. However, female teachers were not reported statistically difference in both the dimensions of teacher efficacy. In addition, an ANOVA results revealed no significant differences regarding efficacy beliefs on both dimensions for number of years of teaching experience even when compared as a function of country. According to the literature and findings of this study it is necessary to take into consideration the efficacy beliefs in the teacher training environment or professional development courses to promote and fostering sense of teaching efficacy beliefs among teachers in two these countries. Mitchell, Hopper, Daniels, George-Falvy, & James (1994) as cited in Redmond, 2010 High Role-efficacy individuals succeed often and better than individuals with low Role-efficacy.

Objective of the Study: The significance of the study is based on the challenges facing higher education and to improve their academic standard through Role Efficacy by the public, private and deemed universities.

1. To study the Role Efficacy of employees of Public, Deemed and Private Universities,
2. To study the various dimensions of role efficacy such as Centrality, Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Inter-role linkage, Helping Relationship, Superordination, Influence, Personal Growth, Confrontation of employees of public, deemed and private universities.
3. To compare the various dimensions of role efficacy among employees of Public, Deemed and Private Universities.

Participant-

The sample consisted of a total number of 90 academic and non academic staff, 30 employees from public universities namely Mohan Lal Sukhadia University, University of Rajasthan, 30 employees from private universities namely Pacific University, Mewar university, and 30 employees from Deemed universities namely Rajasthan Vidyapeeth, Bansthathali Vidhyapeeth.

Methodology-

First of all the head of the institutions were contacted and after taking permission for data collection, respondents were contacted at their comfort zone of time. Then the Role Efficacy Scale tool was distributed and collected after 45 minutes. Thereafter scoring was done with the help of manual and interpretation was done. F-test and t-test was applied for the comparison of employees of selected universities in the context of various dimensions of Role Efficacy.

Tool-

RES (Role Efficacy Scale) developed by Uday Pareek is used. The scale consists of 3 dimensions: Role making dimensions (Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, and Confrontation), Role Centering dimensions (Centrality, Influence and Personal Growth), Role linking dimensions (Inter-role linkage, Helping relationship, Superordination). It has reliability of 0.68 significant at .001 as per reported by Sen and validity ranged from 0.71 to 0.85.

Tools Used for Data Collection-

Questionnaire method was used to collect data from the respondents. The questionnaire was developed to measure Role Efficacy practices followed in different Universities. An RES index was computed by adding the score of all the twenty items. Each item or Statement is rated with a Role Efficacy Index.

Research Design-

Data were collected from 90 employees drawn from Public, Private and Deemed Universities. For testing the differences on present Role Efficacy practices among Public, Private and Deemed Universities, the distribution of sample is as follows: Public Universities = 30; Private Universities = 30; Deemed Universities = 30

Hypothesis-

H1: There will be no significant difference among Public, Deemed and Private Universities regarding dimensions of Role Efficacy like Centrality, Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Inter-role linkage, Helping Relationship, Superordination, Influence, Personal Growth, Confrontation dimensions.

H2: There will be no significant difference between employees of Public and Deemed universities regarding Role Efficacy like Centrality, Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Inter-role linkage, Helping Relationship, Super ordination, Influence, Personal Growth, Confrontation dimensions.

H3: There will be no significant difference between employees of Public and Private universities regarding Role Efficacy like Centrality, Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Inter-role linkage, Helping Relationship, Super ordination, Influence, Personal Growth, Confrontation dimensions.

H4: There will be no significant difference between employees of Deemed and Private universities regarding Role Efficacy like Centrality, Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Inter-role linkage, Helping Relationship, Super ordination, Influence, Personal Growth, Confrontation dimensions.

ANALYSIS AND DATA INTERPRETATION-

H1: There will be no significant difference among Public, Deemed and Private Universities regarding dimensions of Role Efficacy like Centrality, Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Inter-role linkage, Helping Relationship, Superordination, Influence, Personal Growth, Confrontation

dimensions.

Table
**Comparison of Role Efficacy of employees of Public, Private and Deemed
University**

Dimension of Role Efficacy	Source of Variation	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F	Significant
Centrality	Between Groups	3.089	2	1.544	1.374	NS
	Within groups	97.800	87	1.124		
	Total	100.889	89			
Self-role Integration	Between Groups	1.356	2	0.678	0.414	NS
	Within groups	142.300	87	1.636		
	Total	143.656	89			
Proactivity	Between Groups	5.956	2	2.978	1.614	NS
	Within groups	160.500	87	1.845		
	Total	166.456	89			
Creativity	Between Groups	5.489	2	2.744	2.330	NS
	Within groups	102.467	87	1.178		
	Total	107.956	89			
Inter-role linkage	Between Groups	13.089	2	6.544	4.795	0.050
	Within groups	118.733	87	1.365		
	Total	131.822	89			
Helping Relationship	Between Groups	2.756	2	1.378	0.462	NS
	Within groups	259.300	87	2.980		
	Total	262.056	89			
Superordination	Between Groups	3.800	2	1.900	0.814	NS
	Within groups	203.100	87	2.334		
	Total	206.900	89			
Influence	Between Groups	9.489	2	4.744	2.556	NS
	Within groups	161.500	87	1.856		
	Total	170.989	89			
Personal Growth	Between Groups	2.467	2	1.233	0.764	NS
	Within groups	140.433	87	1.614		
	Total	142.900	89			
Confrontation	Between Groups	2.222	2	1.111	0.833	NS
	Within groups	116.100	87	1.334		
	Total	118.322	89			

The F-ratio for Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy was 1.374 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference among Public, Private and Deemed universities on Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy. The F-ratio for Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy was 0.414 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference among Public, Private and Deemed universities on Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy. The F-ratio for Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy was 1.614 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference among Public, Private and Deemed universities on Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy. The F-ratio for Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy was 2.330 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference among Public, Private and

Deemed universities on Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy. The F-ratio for Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy was 4.795 which is significant at 0.05 level. It infers that there is significant difference among Public, Private and Deemed universities on Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy. The F-ratio for Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy was 0.462 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference among Public, Private and Deemed universities on Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy. The F-ratio for Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy was 0.814 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference among Public, Private and Deemed universities on Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy. The F-ratio for Influence dimension of Role Efficacy was 2.556 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference among Public, Private and Deemed universities on Influence dimension of Role Efficacy. The F-ratio for Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy was 0.764 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference among Public, Private and Deemed universities on Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy. The F-ratio for Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy was 0.833 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference among Public, Private and Deemed universities on Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy.

H2: There will be no significant difference between employees of Public and Deemed universities regarding Role Efficacy like Centrality, Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Inter-role linkage, Helping Relationship, Super ordination, Influence, Personal Growth, Confrontation dimensions.

The mean score for Public Universities on Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.37 and the mean score for Deemed Universities on Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.03. The mean difference was 0.333 and the 't' value was 1.211 which is insignificant. It infers that there

Table 2
Comparison of Public and Deemed University regarding Role Efficacy

Dimension of Role Efficacy	Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t	Significance
Centrality	Public	30	2.37	0.964	0.333	1.211	NS
	Deemed	30	2.03	1.159			
Self-role Integration	Public	30	3.27	0.944	0.133	0.459	NS
	Deemed	30	3.13	1.279			
Proactivity	Public	30	2.43	1.501	0.467	1.348	NS
	Deemed	30	1.97	1.159			
Creativity	Public	30	3.37	1.273	0.467	1.562	NS
	Deemed	30	2.90	1.029			
Inter-role linkage	Public	30	3.43	0.817	0.500	1.885	NS
	Deemed	30	2.93	1.202			
Helping Relationship	Public	30	2.57	1.736	-0.067	-0.142	NS
	Deemed	30	2.63	1.903			
Superordination	Public	30	1.87	1.456	0.200	0.517	NS
	Deemed	30	1.67	1.539			
Influence	Public	30	2.67	1.155	0.633	2.068	0.050
	Deemed	30	2.03	1.217			
Personal Growth	Public	30	2.60	1.037	0.333	1.092	NS
	Deemed	30	2.27	1.311			
Confrontation	Public	30	3.77	0.774	0.333	1.262	NS
	Deemed	30	2.27	1.311			

	Deemed	30	3.43	1.223			
--	--------	----	------	-------	--	--	--

sities feel that their role is not important and resulting therefore low Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.27 and the mean score for Deemed Universities on Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.13. The mean difference was 0.133 and the 't' value was 0.459 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Deemed University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees cannot integrate his personal skills (strength, experience, technical training and special skills) and their role hence low Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.43 and the mean score for Deemed Universities on Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.97. The mean difference was 0.467 and the 't' value was 1.348 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Deemed University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees cannot take initiative in their present role, resulting low Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.37 and the mean score for Deemed Universities on Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.90. The mean difference was 0.467 and the 't' value was 1.562 which is insignificant at 0.01 level. It infers that there is no significant difference in Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Deemed University. The mean scores represent that both universities employees did not find creative opportunity to do the assign job and solve problems therefore low Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.43 and the mean score for Deemed Universities on Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.93. The mean difference was 0.500 and the 't' value was 1.885 which is insignificant at 0.01 level. It infers that there is no significant difference in Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Deemed University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees do not link their role with others so low Inter-role Linkage dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.57 and the mean score for Deemed Universities on Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.63. The mean difference was -0.067 and the 't' value was -0.142 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Deemed University. The mean scores represent that poor Helping Relationship among employees of both Universities however low Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.87 and the mean score for Deemed Universities on Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.67. The mean difference was 0.200 and the 't' value was 0.517 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Deemed University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees establishes weak role linkage with the systems, groups, and entities resulting low Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Influence dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.67 and the mean score for Deemed Universities on Influence dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.03. The mean difference was 0.633 and the 't' value was 2.068 which is significant at 0.05 level. It infers that there is significant difference in Influence dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Deemed University. The mean scores represent that Public University employees enjoy more Power to Influence other people in comparison to Deemed University, it means higher degree of influence dimension of Public University in comparison to Deemed University. The mean score for Public Universities on Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.60 and the mean score for Deemed Universities on Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.27. The mean difference was 0.333 and the 't' value was 1.092 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Personal Growth

dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Deemed University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees find similar opportunity to grow and develop their role however low Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.77 and the mean score for Deemed Universities on Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.43. The mean difference was 0.333 and the 't' value was 1.262 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Deemed University. The mean scores represent that both universities employees think that organization avoid the problems and shift to others, therefore low Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy.

H3 There will be no significant difference between employees of Public and Private universities regarding Role Efficacy like Centrality, Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Inter-role linkage, Helping Relationship, Super ordination, Influence, Personal Growth, Confrontation dimensions.

The mean score for Public Universities on Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.37 and the mean score for Private Universities on Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.93. The mean difference was 0.433 and the 't' value was 1.666 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Private University. The mean scores represent that employees of both universities feel that their role is not important and resulting therefore low Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy was

Table 3
Comparison of Public and Private University regarding Role Efficacy

Dimension of Role Efficacy	Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t	Significance
Centrality	Public	30	2.37	0.964	0.433	1.666	NS
	Private	30	1.93	1.048			
Self-role Integration	Public	30	3.27	0.944	0.300	0.909	NS
	Private	30	2.97	1.542			
Proactivity	Public	30	2.43	1.501	0.600	1.605	NS
	Private	30	1.83	1.392			
Creativity	Public	30	3.37	1.273	0.567	1.973	NS
	Private	30	2.80	0.925			
Inter-role linkage	Public	30	3.43	0.817	0.933	3.140	0.010
	Private	30	2.50	1.408			
Helping Relationship	Public	30	2.57	1.736	-0.400	-0.950	NS
	Private	30	2.97	1.520			
Superordination	Public	30	1.87	1.456	0.500	1.272	NS
	Private	30	1.37	1.586			
Influence	Public	30	2.67	1.155	0.733	1.987	NS
	Private	30	1.93	1.660			
Personal Growth	Public	30	2.60	1.037	0.367	1.136	NS
	Private	30	2.23	1.431			
Confrontation	Public	30	3.77	0.774	0.333	1.153	NS
	Private	30	3.43	1.382			

Universities on Self-role integration dimension of role Efficacy was found to be 2.97. The mean difference was 0.300 and the 't' value was 0.909 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees cannot integrate their personal skills (strength, experience, technical training and special skills) and their role hence low Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Proactivity

dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.43 and the mean score for Private Universities on Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.83. The mean difference was 0.600 and the 't' value was 1.605 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees cannot take initiative in their present role, resulting low Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.37 and the mean score for Private Universities on Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.80. The mean difference was 0.567 and the 't' value was 1.973 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Private University. The mean scores represent that both universities employees did not find creative opportunity to do the assign job and solve problems therefore low Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.43 and the mean score for Private Universities on Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.50. The mean difference was 0.933 and the 't' value was 3.140 which is significant at 0.010 level. It infers that there is significant difference in Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Private University. The mean scores represent that Public University employees establishes better link with their role in comparison to Private University, it means higher Inter-role Linkage dimension of Public University in comparison to Private University. The mean score for Public Universities on Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.57 and the mean score for Private Universities on Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.97. The mean difference was -0.400 and the 't' value was -0.950 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Private University. The mean scores represent that poor Helping Relationship within employees of both Universities however low Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.87 and the mean score for Private Universities on Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.37. The mean difference was 0.500 and the 't' value was 1.272 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees establishes weak role linkage with the systems, groups, and entities resulting low Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Influence dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.67 and the mean score for Private Universities on Influence dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.93. The mean difference was 0.733 and the 't' value was 1.987 which is insignificant at. It infers that there is significant difference in Influence dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees enjoy same power Influence to other peoples therefore low Influence dimension of role efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.60 and the mean score for Private Universities on Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.23. The mean difference was 0.367 and the 't' value was 1.136 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees find similar opportunity to grow and develop their role however low Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Public Universities on Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.77 and the mean score for Private Universities on Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.43. The mean difference was 0.333 and the 't' value was 1.153 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy of Public and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees think that organization avoid the problems and shift to others, therefore low Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy.

H4 There will be no significant difference between employees of Deemed and Private universities regarding Role Efficacy like Centrality, Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Inter-role linkage, Helping Relationship, Super ordination, Influence, Personal Growth, Confrontation dimensions.

The mean score for Deemed Universities on Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.03 and the mean score for Private Universities on Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.93. The mean difference was 0.100 and the 't' value was 0.350 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy of Deemed and Private University. The mean scores represent that employees of both universities feel that their role is not important and resulting therefore low Centrality dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Deemed Universities on Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.13 and the mean score for Private Universities on Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.97. The mean difference was 0.167 and the 't' value was 0.456 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Self-role Integration dimension of Role

Table 4
Comparison of Public and Deemed University regarding Role Efficacy

Dimension of Role Efficacy	Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t	Significance
Centrality	Deemed	30	2.03	1.159	0.100	0.350	NS
	Private	30	1.93	1.048			
Self-role Integration	Deemed	30	3.13	1.279	0.167	0.456	NS
	Private	30	2.97	1.542			
Proactivity	Deemed	30	1.97	1.159	0.133	0.403	NS
	Private	30	1.83	1.392			
Creativity	Deemed	30	2.90	1.029	0.100	0.396	NS
	Private	30	2.80	0.925			
Inter-role Linkage	Deemed	30	2.93	1.202	0.433	1.282	NS
	Private	30	2.50	1.408			
Helping Relationship	Deemed	30	2.63	1.903	-0.333	0.750	NS
	Private	30	2.97	1.520			
Superordination	Deemed	30	1.67	1.539	0.300	0.744	NS
	Private	30	1.37	1.586			
Influence	Deemed	30	2.03	1.217	0.100	0.266	NS
	Private	30	1.93	1.660			
Personal Growth	Deemed	30	2.27	1.311	0.033	0.094	NS
	Private	30	2.23	1.431			
Confrontation	Deemed	30	3.43	1.223	0.000	0.000	NS
	Private	30	3.43	1.382			

Efficacy of Deemed and Private University, the mean scores represents that both universities employees cannot integrate his personal skills (strength, experience, technical training and special skills) and their role hence low Self-role Integration dimension of Role Efficacy.

The mean score for Deemed Universities on Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.97 and the mean score for Private Universities on Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.83. The mean difference was 0.133 and the 't' value was 0.403 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy of Deemed and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees cannot take initiative in their present role, resulting low Proactivity dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Deemed Universities on Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.90 and the mean score for Private Universities on Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.80. The mean difference was 0.100 and the 't' value was 0.396 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy of Deemed and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees not found creative opportunity for do the assign job and solve problems therefore low Creativity dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for

Deemed Universities on Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.93 and the mean score for Private Universities on Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.50. The mean difference was 0.433 and the 't' value was 1.282 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy of Deemed and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees do not link their role with others so low Inter-role Linkage dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Deemed Universities on Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.63 and the mean score for Private Universities on Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.97. The mean difference was -0.333 and the 't' value was -0.750 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy of Deemed and Private University. The mean scores represent that poor Helping Relationship among employees of both Universities however low Helping Relationship dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Deemed Universities on Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.67 and the mean score for Private Universities on Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.37. The mean difference was 0.300 and the 't' value was 0.744 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy of Deemed and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees establishes weak role linkage with the systems, groups, and entities resulting low Superordination dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Deemed Universities on Influence dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.03 and the mean score for Private Universities on Influence dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 1.93. The mean difference was 0.100 and the 't' value was 0.266 which is insignificant. It infers that there is significant difference in Influence dimension of Role Efficacy of Deemed and Private University. The mean scores represent that both Universities employees enjoyed same power of Influence to other people therefore low Influence dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Deemed Universities on Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.27 and the mean score for Private Universities on Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 2.23. The mean difference was 0.033 and the 't' value was 0.094 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy of Deemed and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees find similar opportunity to grow and develop their role however low Personal Growth dimension of Role Efficacy. The mean score for Deemed Universities on Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.43 and the mean score for Private Universities on Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy was found to be 3.43. The mean difference was 0.000 and the 't' value was 0.000 which is insignificant. It infers that there is no significant difference in Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy of Deemed and Private University. The mean scores represents that both universities employees think that organization avoid the problems and shift to others, therefore low Confrontation dimension of Role Efficacy.

Findings-

It infers that there is no significant difference among Public, Private and Deemed universities on Centrality, Self-role Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Helping Relationship, Superordination, Influence, Personal Growth, Confrontation dimensions of Role Efficacy. While there is significant difference among Public, Private and Deemed Universities on Inter-role linkage dimension of Role Efficacy.

Suggestions-

1. Government and UGC should conduct various Programs to improve role efficacy of employees of Public, Private and Deemed Universities.
2. Public, Deemed and Private Universities distribute award and reward for their work, employees understand he or she is important for the organization.
3. Public, Deemed and Private Universities should to assign jobs their employees according to their qualification and interest. So that employees integrate with their role, hence personal skills will be developed of the employees and achieve higher role efficacy.
4. Every University should encourage to their employees that they take initiative and use creativity within assigned work.

Continued on Page no. 77

Continued from Page No. 63

5. In the Public, Deemed and Private Universities administrative department cannot assign routine task repeatedly to their employees. If it is needed, administrator should rotate their roles.
6. Every University should celebrate formal and informal get-together program for develop better understanding among employees and resulting organization achieve higher role efficacy.
7. Some programs organize for employees assimilate with the system, group and entities.
8. Deemed and Private Universities also hand over decision powers to their employees, for execution of assigned job.
9. Every University introduce career path when employees join the organization.
10. Public, Deemed and Private University should establish a grievance cell, for solve the problems of the employees and not shift to others.

References:-

- 1- Mitchell, T. R., Hopper, H., Daniels, D., George-Falvy, J., & James, L. R. (1994). "Predicting self-efficacy and performance during skill-acquisition" Journal of Applied Psychology, 79(4), 506-517.
- 2- Y.N.Sridhar, Hamid Reza Badiie (2008) 'Teacher Efficacy Beliefs: A Comparison of Teachers in India and Iran' Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, April 2008, Vol. 34, Special Issue, 81-89.