

## Research Articles

# Life Satisfaction and Role Efficacy as Predictors of Transactional Styles

KamalJeet Sandhu<sup>a</sup>, Nidhi Gurbaxani<sup>\*a</sup>

[a] Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Agra, India.

## Abstract

The study examines the relationship of perceived Life Satisfaction (LS) and Role Efficacy (REI) with transactional styles (TS). The sample comprised of 200 managerial level employees from different units of Infosys at Bangalore and NOIDA, India, and HCL at Delhi, India. Stratified random sampling technique was used to generate data. The results for the overall transactional styles reveal that there was no significant relationship between Life satisfaction and transactional styles. It is observed that there was a significant but negative correlation between role efficacy and transactional styles. About 5.19% of total contribution in determining transactional styles was jointly accounted for by the predictor variables, i.e., perceived Life Satisfaction (X1) and Role Efficacy (X2). Role Efficacy accounted for more contribution than Life Satisfaction in determining transactional styles. Relationship of the predictor variables with different transactional styles is also analyzed.

**Keywords:** life satisfaction, role-efficacy, transactional styles, managerial level employees

Psychological Thought, 2013, Vol. 6(2), 326–338, doi:10.5964/psyct.v6i2.79

Received: 2013-06-09. Accepted: 2013-09-03. Published (VoR): 2013-10-25.

\*Corresponding author at: Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Dayalbagh, Agra 282005, Uttar Pradesh, India. E-mail: nidhigurbaxani@gmail.com



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## Introduction

Life satisfaction is a measure of an individual's perceived level of wellbeing and happiness. In essence, life satisfaction is a subjective assessment of the quality of one's life. Satisfaction is a concept that can mean many different things to different individuals. Life satisfaction usually refers to as "happiness" coming from the fulfillment of a need, wishes and as such is the cause or means of enjoyment. As [Alston and Dudley \(1973\)](#) have explained, "life satisfaction is the ability to enjoy ones experiences, accompanied by a degree of excitement". [Hofer, Chasiotis, and Campos \(2006\)](#) revealed that an alignment of implicit motives and self-attributed values is associated with an enhanced life satisfaction across cultures. [Steger and Kashdan \(2007\)](#) found moderate stability for presence of meaning in life, search for meaning in life, and life satisfaction.

Life satisfaction acts as an important variable that relates to the transactional style of individuals.

One of the popular theories of personality and human development is Transactional Analysis originated by [Berne \(1961\)](#). Departing from classical psychoanalysis, Berne used simple day-to-day language to explain the dynamics of personality and its application for human development. The habitual way of a person's interaction with others can be called his/her transactional style. A useful conceptual framework to describe an individual's style is Transactional Analysis (TA). Exchange of words, ideas, viewpoints, commands, comments etc., all require com-

munication in organizations. This means the employees get involved in transaction of words in order to communicate with each other. Without transaction, it will not be possible to function in organizations. Wrong transactions hamper work and growth of the organizations constantly. So, an analysis of the transactions is important to know what will promote good transactions in the organizations.

Transactional Analysis explains the dynamics of interpersonal communication in terms of transactions between ego states of individuals A and B. A transaction is the act of communication or interaction between two people. A transaction starts with a stimulus and ends with a response to the stimulus. Since each individual involved in the transaction has three ego states, the transactions are between the various ego states. When 'A' sends a message, 'B' receives it; 'B' then responds and this response is received by 'A'. This is one transaction. A person can send a prescriptive message (from what is called the Parent ego-state), an information message (from the Adult), or a feeling message (from the Child). Any of these messages may be sent to (and received by) one of the three ego-states of the other person (Parent, Adult, or Child). If the response is by the expected ego-state to the one which sent the message, it is called a complementary or parallel transaction. Such transactions are very satisfying (Schultz & Media, 2013; *Transactional Analysis for Leadership development - Part 2*, 2009). The employees who indulge in complementary transactions will always work better and smoothly in contrast to employees whose transactions go wrong. It is assumed that to indulge in complementary transactions one must have more of role efficacy and life satisfaction. Whether as individuals or in social organizational roles, humans interact with others. There are three main areas of their interpersonal interactions. Human beings interact in relation to the tasks being performed or to be performed. They also interact in relation to values and norms which are or should be followed or are violated. They also adopt certain life positions over a life span. The life positions suggest the position an individual adopts in their transaction with outer world that focus on the deeply ingrained convictions about the worth of the self and others. Four life positions may be obtained I'm OK, You're OK (healthy position); I'm OK, You're not OK (paranoid position); I'm not OK, You're OK (depressive position) and I'm not OK, You're not OK (schizoid position). Humans also interact with emotions: affection, fear, anger etc. (Harris, 2004; James, 1975; Pareek, 2002b).

Avary (1980) has suggested 12 styles after combining the six ego states with the two life positions 'OK' and 'Not OK'. *Rescuing Style* indicates a dependency relationship in which the manager, trainer or consultant perceives his main role as rescuing the subordinate, participant trainee or client, who is seen as being incapable of taking care of him/her. The managers using *Supportive Style* encourage their subordinates and provide the necessary conditions for continuous improvement. The managers who use *Prescriptive Style* are critical of the behaviors of others; they develop rules and regulations and impose them on others. The managers who use *Normative Style* are interested in developing proper norms of behavior for their subordinates and in helping them understand why some norms are more important than others. The managers who make use of *Task-Obsessive Style* are more concerned with the task. Matters not directly related to the task are ignored. They are not concerned with feelings and, in fact, fail to recognize them since they do not perceive them as related to the task. In *Problem-Solving Style*, a manager is concerned with solving problems but does not see them as merely confined to the task. The focus of the managers is on dealing with and finding out solutions to problems. In this process they solicit the help of and involve subordinates, client trainees and participants (Pareek, 2002b).

The managers that make use of the *Bohemian Style* have lots of ideas and are impatient with current practices. Here the manager is less concerned with how the ideas work than with the ideas themselves. In *Innovative Style*, the managers are enthusiastic about new ideas and approaches and move to enthusiasm the others, too. The

managers with *Aggressive Style* are fighters. They may fight for their subordinates, clients, or for their own ideas and suggestions, hoping that this will help them to achieve their desired results. Their aggressiveness however makes people avoid them and not take them seriously. In *Assertive Style*, the person is concerned with the exploration of a problem. They are more concerned with confronting problems than with confronting other person for the sake of confrontation. The managers who make use of *Sulking Style* keep their negative feelings to themselves, find it difficult to share them, avoid meeting people if they have-not been able to fulfill their part of the contract. Instead of confronting problems, a person with this style avoids them and feels bad about the situation, but does not express these feelings openly. In *Resilient Style*, persons show creative adaptability – learning from others, accepting others' ideas, and changing their approach when required (Pareek, 2002b).

The Table 1 below gives a description about the styles, among these some styles are 'OK' and some 'Not OK' depending on the circumstances and the life position an individual is in.

Table 1

"OK" and "Not OK" Transactional Styles

Style No.	Transactional Styles	OK Style / Not OK Style
1	Rescuing Style	Not OK Style
2	Supportive Style	OK Style
3	Prescriptive Style	Not OK Style
4	Normative Style	OK Style
5	Task-Obsessive Style	Not OK Style
6	Problem-Solving Style	OK Style
7	Bohemian Style	Not OK Style
8	Innovative Style	OK Style
9	Aggressive Style	Not OK Style
10	Assertive Style	OK Style
11	Sulking Style	Not OK Style
12	Resilient Style	OK Style

Another important predictor variable assumed to show relation with transactional styles is role-efficacy that refers to an individuals' belief that he or she is capable of performing a task. In addition, individuals high in self-efficacy seem to respond to negative feedback with increased effort and motivation, those low in self-efficacy are likely to lessen their effort when given negative feedback this will also affect their transactions (Pareek, 2002a). Role efficacy can be seen as the psychological factor underlying role effectiveness. Persons with high role efficacy seem to experience less role stress, anxiety and work related tension. They rely on their own strengths to cope with problems, use more purposeful behavior, are active and interactive with people and the environment, persistent in solving problems (mostly by themselves), show growth orientation, attitudinal commitment and positive approach in behavior. Such persons feel satisfied with life and with their jobs and roles in the organization. Role efficacy is related to age, type of role, and the location of work place, social acceptance and length of employment. Apart from this an employee would have high role efficacy if his interpersonal relations were smooth. Moreover, role-efficacy and interpersonal relations that prevails in the organization depends on the type of transactions that the managers make with their employees (Pareek, 2002a). Various studies indicate important association of role efficacy with other equally important variables. Rusch (2009) examined leadership behaviors of U.S. Army Sergeants Major.

Leadership behaviour creates a pervasive social context that positively affects employees' attitudes and behaviour. Such leader's behavior provides situational cues from which followers' interpret and understand their environment (Takeuchi, Chen, & Lepak, 2009). Thus, it is observed that there would be predominant and well defined combination of life satisfaction, role efficacy in an organization and the way in which the employees transact with each other using different styles and find themselves in one or the other life positions which also determine their effectiveness.

There has been increasing interest in the concept of Life Satisfaction and Role-Efficacy. The major part of role efficacy will be sorted out by the types of transactions that are carried out in the organizations. If the transactional styles are 'OK' then he/she would get help readily and feel that the task could be performed with confidence. On the other hand, more the employee feels that the task could be performed, more he/she will be positive with his transactions as it will also boost his satisfaction in life. Therefore a clear and interesting relationship is predicted in these three variables that need to be explored. Considering these issues the following *hypotheses* were formulated: Life Satisfaction and Role Efficacy will show a positive relationship with the 'OK' transactional styles; Role Efficacy, i.e., the degree to which one believes that he/she is capable of performing a task, will be the main predictor variable (out of the two), in determining transactional styles as Life Satisfaction also depends on many other aspects and is situational. Yet, the association of Life Satisfaction cannot be denied in determining transactions, more the employee feels that the task could be performed, more he/she will be positive with his transactions as it will also boost his satisfaction in life. It can also be the other way that an employee who is satisfied with his life will be smooth in his transactions, interactions and will use appropriate transactional styles.

## Method

### Variables

Predictor variables: (1) Life Satisfaction; (2) Role Efficacy

Criterion variable: Transactional Styles:

- a. Rescuing Style
- b. Supportive Style
- c. Prescriptive Style
- d. Normative Style
- e. Task-Obsessive Style
- f. Problem-Solving Style
- g. Bohemian Style
- h. Innovative Style
- i. Aggressive Style
- j. Assertive Style
- k. Sulking Style
- l. Resilient Style

## Sample

The sample comprised of 200 managerial level employees who were included from different units at Infosys in Bangalore and NOIDA (New Okhla Industrial Development Area), India and HCL in Delhi, India. 100 managerial level employees were from Infosys and 100 from HCL. Their age ranged between 30-60 years. They were at least post graduates and had an experience of more than three years in that organization. Their salary was above Rs 25 000 per month. They were all full time employees. Stratified Random sampling technique was used for the present study. Strata were formed on the basis of units, age group, experience and income. Both male and female employees were included in the sample.

## Tools

*Life Satisfaction Scale* (L-S Scale) constructed by Singh and Joseph (1996) intends to measure the life satisfaction of employees which include all round activities of an employee. The scale is based on the following dimensions: Taking pleasure in everyday activities, considering life meaningful, holding a positive self-image, having a happy and optimistic outlook, and Feeling success in achieving goals. This scale consists of 35 items; each item is to be rated on the 5-point scale- Always, often, sometime, seldom, and never. The respondent are ask to express their view on each item depending on their importance to them. The test-retest reliability computed (after a lapse of 8 weeks) turned out to be 0.91 and the scale possesses face and content validity.

*Role Efficacy Scale* (RES) is a structured instrument constructed by Pareek (2002b) consisting of 20 pre-weighted items. There are 2 statements for each dimension of Role Efficacy and the scoring pattern followed is +2, +1 or -1. A retest reliability of .68 significant at .01 level is reported, this shows the high stability of the scale. High internal consistency indicated by significant correlation values among the items. Item total correlation for twenty RES items for a total sample of 658 managers, and for 11 organizations separately is reported. For the total sample the lowest correlation for the entire sample was -0.36, with an alpha coefficient of 0.80. The alpha coefficients for the mean corrected item total correlations of the 11 organizations ranged from 0.71 to 0.85. These results show internal homogeneity of the scale.

*Transactional Style Inventory* constructed by Pareek (2002b) is used for the present study. The retest reliability coefficients with several groups have been found to range between 0.51 and 0.74 for the different styles. All of these were significant at 0.01 levels. Guttman split-half, for a sample of health administrators was found to be 0.89. The validity of the instrument was tested by correlations of the five ego state scores on the egogram with the style score. Four correlations were in the predicted direction. However, the Nurturing Parent ego state was found correlated not with the Supportive Style but with the Rescuing Style.

## Research Design

Correlational design is used for the present study.

## Results and Interpretation

In order to test the proposed hypotheses, analysis of the raw scores was done to obtain coefficients of correlation.

Table 2 shows correlations among the variables which indicate a positive and significant relationship between Life Satisfaction and **Rescuing Transactional Style** ( $r = 0.27, p < .01$ ). This means that more the Life Satisfaction, more the manager develops a dependency relationship and realizes that subordinate is incapable of doing any

work alone. The manager perceives his main role more as rescuing the subordinate when he has more of Life Satisfaction.

Table 2

*Correlation Coefficients Between Transactional Styles, Life Satisfaction and Role Efficacy*

Transactional Styles (Criterion Variable)	Life Satisfaction	Role Efficacy
Rescuing Style (S1)	0.27**	0.14*
Supportive Style (S2)	0.148*	0.159*
Prescriptive Style (S3)	0.06	0.12
Normative Style (S4)	-0.08	-0.18**
Task-Obsessive Style (S5)	0.188**	-0.016
Problem-Solving Style (S6)	-0.087	-0.07
Bohemian Style (S7)	0.09	-0.07
Innovative Style (S8)	-0.02	-0.198**
Aggressive Style (S9)	-0.109	-0.226**
Assertive Style (S10)	-0.02	-0.17*
Sulking Style (S11)	-0.147*	-0.266**
Resilient Style (S12)	-0.138*	-0.248**
Total of Transactional Styles (TS)	-0.01	-0.225**

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

There is a positive relationship between Role Efficacy and Rescuing Style ( $r = 0.14$ ,  $p < .05$ ) indicating that more the employees perceive that they are capable of doing the task more will be their **Transactional Style Rescuing-Style-1**. This means more the employee understands his role more he rescues the subordinates whom consider as being unable to take care of themselves. But this is a not OK style of transaction. For the **Supportive Transactional Style-Style-2**, the coefficient of correlation ( $r = 0.148$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) indicates a significant positive relationship between Life Satisfaction and Supportive Style (S2), which means with increase in Life Satisfaction, Supportive Transactional Style will be more and employees will encourage their subordinates and provide necessary conditions for improvement. Also there is a positive and significant correlation between Role Efficacy and Supportive Style,  $r = 0.159$  ( $p < 0.05$ ), which means higher the Role Efficacy more the Supportive Transactional Style used which is OK transactional style. But the relationship between Life Satisfaction and **Prescriptive Transactional Style-Style 3** is not significant ( $r = 0.06$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), indicating that increase in Life Satisfaction does not necessarily bring about an increase in Prescriptive Style. Role Efficacy and Prescriptive Style also show no significant correlation ( $r = 0.12$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). Prescriptive Style is Not OK style where managers are critical of other's behavior and impose rules and regulations on them. Further, the coefficient of correlation indicate a negative relationship between Life Satisfaction and **Normative Style-Style 4**, which is not significant ( $r = -0.08$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). But there is a significant correlation ( $r = -0.18$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) between Role Efficacy and Normative Style, which means that with the increase in Role Efficacy there is a decrease in Normative Transactional Style. This is OK style where managers are interested in developing proper norms for the subordinates and helping them understand why norms are important. But higher the Role Efficacy lesser will be the Normative Transactional Style used. Relationship between Life Satisfaction and **Task-Obsessive Style-Style 5** ( $r = 0.188$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) is positive and significant, which indicates more the Life Satisfaction more the Task-Obsessive Transaction Style used. It means with increase in Life Satisfaction managers are more concerned with task. But the correlation is not significant in between Role Efficacy and Task-Obsessive Style ( $r = -0.016$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) which is a Not OK style. Further, no significant relationship (Table 2) between Life Satisfaction and **Problem-Solving Style-Style 6** ( $r = -0.087$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) was found, meaning that

with increase in Life Satisfaction Problem-Solving Style would not change significantly. Also relationship between Role Efficacy and Problem-Solving Style ( $r = -0.07$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) is negative and not significant. Problem-Solving Style is an OK transactional style but the relationship with Life Satisfaction and Role Efficacy is not significant here. This indicates focus of the managers is not on finding solutions to the problems in the organization.

As shown in Table 2, Life Satisfaction and **Bohemian Style**-Style 7 has no significant relationship ( $r = 0.09$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). Also, there is a negative correlation between Role Efficacy and Bohemian Style ( $r = -0.07$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), this indicates that with increase in Role Efficacy there is very negligible but not significant decrease in Bohemian Style. This is a Not OK style and the results indicate that increase in Life Satisfaction and managers impatient with the current practices in organization show no significant relationship. Also Role Efficacy does not show significant relationship with the concern managers have with the ideas no matter it works or not. Life Satisfaction and **Innovative Style**-Style 8 ( $r = -0.02$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) show a relationship that is a negative and not significant. Yet, Role Efficacy and Innovative Style have a negative but significant correlation ( $r = -0.198$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). When there is increase in Role Efficacy the Innovative Transaction Style decreases. Innovative Style is OK style but when managers feel they are capable of doing a task they do not cater to new ideas and approaches which is surprising. Probably they like to work without any risk involved as innovations invite risk. The coefficient of correlation for Life Satisfaction and **Aggressive Style**-Style 9 ( $r = -0.109$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) is negative and not significant indicating no significant relationship. This is a Not OK style and there is a slight but not significant indication that higher Life Satisfaction decrease the possibility that managers will fight for simple things hoping to achieve desired results. But the relationship between Role Efficacy and Aggressive Style is negative and significant ( $r = -0.226$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), indicating higher the Role Efficacy i.e. capability to perform the task, lesser will be the Aggressive Transactional Style used to achieve desired results. The correlation value  $r = -0.02$  ( $p > 0.05$ ) suggest a negative and not significant relationship between Life Satisfaction and **Assertive Style**-Style-10 whereas Role Efficacy and Assertive Style have a negative and significant correlation ( $r = -0.17$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). This means that higher the Role Efficacy lesser the Assertive Transaction Style (OK style) used. This also indicates that with increase in Role Efficacy they are less concerned with confronting problems that is an alarming situation. In addition to this, there is a positive and significant negative relationship between Life Satisfaction and **Sulking Style**-Style 11 ( $r = -0.147$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) as shown in Table 1 indicating higher the Life Satisfaction lesser the Sulking Transactional Style (Not OK style) used. With increased Life Satisfaction managers do not keep their negative feelings to themselves, perhaps they share it. A significant but negative correlation between Role Efficacy and Sulking Style ( $r = -0.266$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) indicates more the Role Efficacy lesser the transactions in Sulking Style by the employees which is a positive situation to a certain extent if the outlet to negative feelings is not aggressive or violent. Further, a negative but significant relationship between Life Satisfaction and **Resilient Style**-Style 12 ( $r = -0.138$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) is found. This is an OK style and if with increased Life Satisfaction the managers do not show creative adaptability it generates a difficult situation. It can be stated that higher the Life Satisfaction lesser the Resilient Style used. Correlation ( $r = -0.248$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) between Role Efficacy and Resilient Style indicates that it is negative and significant, meaning more the Role Efficacy lesser the employee shows creative adaptability-learning from others, accepting others ideas and changing their approach when required. Therefore higher the Role Efficacy lesser the Resilient Style used. Finally, the results for the **overall transactional styles** reveal no significant relationship between Life Satisfaction and Total Transactional Styles ( $r = -0.011$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). In contrast to this, there is a significant but negative correlation between Role Efficacy and Total Transactional Styles ( $r = -0.225$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Preferred use of types of transactional styles (OK or Not OK) does not give a clear cut positive picture of the work culture from where the data is generated.

## Multiple Regression Analysis

The multiple regression analysis was done to examine the extent to which predictor variables i.e., Life Satisfaction (X1) and Role Efficacy (X2) independently predict criterion variable i.e., Transactional Styles.

Table 3 shows the value of  $R^2$  equal to 0.0816, which means that about 8.16% of contribution, is jointly accounted for by the predictor variables perceived Life Satisfaction (X1) and Role Efficacy (X2) in bringing variation in the criterion variable, i.e. **Rescuing Transactional Style**. Further, regarding the individual contribution of the predictor variables, Table 4 reveals that Life Satisfaction (X1) accounted more than Role Efficacy (X2) in determining Rescuing Transactional Style.

Table 3

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis ( $n = 200$ )

Styles	Multiple R	$R^2$	Adjusted $R^2$	Standard Error
Rescuing Style	0.2857	0.0816	0.0723	1.7288
Supportive Style	0.1987	0.0395	0.0297	2.6547
Prescriptive Style	0.1289	0.0166	0.0066	1.7450
Normative Style	0.1878	0.0352	0.0254	2.8885
Task-Obsessive Style	0.1963	0.0385	0.0287	2.4678
Problem-Solving Style	0.1050	0.0110	0.0009	3.7664
Bohemian Style	0.1311	0.0171	0.0072	2.0124
Innovative Style	0.1992	0.0396	0.0299	2.4032
Aggressive Style	0.2354	0.0554	0.0458	3.4831
Assertive Style	0.1731	0.0299	0.0201	2.8191
Sulking Style	0.2836	0.0804	0.0711	4.0464
Resilient Style	0.2646	0.0700	0.0606	2.2257
Total of Transactional Styles (TS)	0.2278	0.0519	0.0422	16.3742

The value of  $R^2$  is 0.0395 (Table 3) which means that about 3.95% of the contribution is accounted for by the predictor variables perceived Life Satisfaction (X1) and Role Efficacy (X2) in determining the criterion variable **Supportive Transactional Style**. Role Efficacy (X2) accounted more than Life Satisfaction (X1) in determination of Supportive Transactional Style (Table 4).

The value of  $R^2 = 0.016$  (Table 3) shows about 1.66% of contribution jointly accounted for by the predictor variables in determining **Prescriptive Transactional Style**. Role Efficacy (X2) accounted more than Life Satisfaction (X1) in determination of Prescriptive Transactional Style as revealed in Table 4, but both accounted non-significantly in determination of Prescriptive Transactional Style.

The value of  $R^2$  is 0.0352 (Table 3), which means that about 3.52% of contribution is jointly accounted for by the predictor variables. Role Efficacy (X2) accounted more than Life Satisfaction (X1) in determination of **Normative Transactional Style** (Table 4).

Further, Table 3 shows the value of  $R^2 = 0.0385$ , indicating about 3.85% of the contribution jointly accounted for by the predictor variables in determination of **Task-Obsessive Transactional Style**. Life Satisfaction (X1) accounted more than Role Efficacy (X2) in determination of Task-Obsessive Transactional Style (Table 4).

Table 4

*Multiple Regression Analysis Outcomes*

Transactional Styles (Criterion Variable)	Variables	B	$\beta$	t	p
Rescuing Style (S1)	Life Satisfaction	0.0413	0.2522	3.6206	0.001
	Role Efficacy	0.0172	0.0930	1.336	0.18
Supportive Style (S2)	Life Satisfaction	0.0297	0.1211	1.699	0.09
	Role Efficacy	0.0377	0.1998	1.899	0.05
Prescriptive Style (S3)	Life Satisfaction	0.0062	0.0390	0.541	0.58
	Role Efficacy	0.0208	0.1153	1.60	0.11
Normative Style (S4)	Life Satisfaction	-0.0128	-0.0480	0.67	0.50
	Role Efficacy	-0.0521	-0.06	-2.413	0.01
Task-Obsessive Style (S5)	Life Satisfaction	0.0456	0.1996	2.80	0.00
	Role Efficacy	-0.0144	-0.0559	-0.78	0.43
Problem-Solving Style (S6)	Life Satisfaction	-0.02611	-0.0759	-1.049	0.29
	Role Efficacy	-0.0230	-0.0590	-0.817	0.41
Bohemian Style (S7)	Life Satisfaction	0.0204	0.1107	1.536	0.12
	Role Efficacy	-0.0199	-0.0956	-1.327	0.18
Innovative Style (S8)	Life Satisfaction	0.0036	0.0161	0.227	0.82
	Role Efficacy	-0.0509	-0.2018	-2.832	0.00
Aggressive Style (S9)	Life Satisfaction	-0.0217	-0.0666	-0.94	0.34
	Role Efficacy	-0.0785	-0.2129	-3.0135	0.00
Assertive Style (S10)	Life Satisfaction	0.0030	0.0116	0.163	0.87
	Role Efficacy	-0.0515	-0.1750	-2.4448	0.01
Sulking Style (S11)	Life Satisfaction	-0.0375	-0.0978	-1.4037	0.16
	Role Efficacy	-0.1074	-0.2475	-3.55	0.00
Resilient Style (S12)	Life Satisfaction	-0.0193	-0.0921	-1.3147	0.19
	Role Efficacy	-0.0547	-0.2304	-3.28	0.00
Total of Transactional Styles (TS)	Life Satisfaction	0.0534	0.0350	0.49	0.62
	Role Efficacy	-0.4018	-0.2322	-3.28	0.00

The value of  $R^2$  in Table 3 shows that only 1.10% of contribution is jointly accounted for by the predictor variables in determining **Problem-Solving Transactional Style**. Life Satisfaction (X1) accounted more than Role Efficacy (X2) in determination of Problem-Solving Transactional Style, but both accounted non-significantly in determination of Problem-Solving Transactional Style (Table 4).

Further, Table 3 shows that the value of  $R^2$  is 0.0171, indicating about 1.71% of contribution jointly accounted for by the predictor variables in determining **Bohemian Style**. In addition to this, Life Satisfaction (X1) accounted more than Role Efficacy (X2) in determining Bohemian Transactional Style, but both accounted non-significantly in determination of Bohemian Transactional Style (Table 4).

The value of  $R^2$  (Table 3) for transactional styles (criterion) is 0.0396, which shows that in determining the **Innovative Transactional Style** about 3.96% of contribution is jointly accounted for by the predictor variables. Role Efficacy (X2) accounted more than Life Satisfaction (X1) in Innovative Transactional Style (Table 4).

About 5.54% of contribution is jointly accounted for by Life Satisfaction (X1) and Role Efficacy (X2) in determining **Aggressive Style** (Table 3). The remaining 94.46% still needs to be explored. Role Efficacy (X2) accounted more than Life Satisfaction (X1) in determination of Aggressive Transactional Style (Table 4).

The  $R^2$  value equal to 0.0299 (Table 3) shows about 2.99% of contribution is jointly accounted by Life Satisfaction (X1) and Role Efficacy (X2). The remaining 97.01% is accounted by other variables. Role Efficacy (X2) accounted more than Life Satisfaction (X1) in determination of **Assertive Transactional Style** (Table 4).

Table 3 shows about 8.04% of the contribution jointly accounted for by the predictor variables in determining **Sulking Transactional Style** and remaining 91.96% contribution by other variables not taken in the present study. Table 4 shows that Role Efficacy (X2) accounted more than Life Satisfaction (X1) in determining Sulking Transactional Style.

About 7% of the contribution is jointly accounted for by the predictor variables (Table 3) showing the value of  $R^2 = 0.0700$ , which also means that remaining 93% contribution in determining **Resilient Transactional Style** is yet to be explored that is accounted by variables other than in the study. Role Efficacy (X2) accounted more than Life Satisfaction (X1) in determining Resilient Transactional Style (Table 4).

About 5.19% of total contribution is accounted for by the predictor variables, i.e. perceived Life Satisfaction (X1) and Role Efficacy (X2), the rest 94.81% of the contribution is accounted by some other variables not under consideration for this study. However a significant F value ( $F_{|2, 197|} = 4.05, p < 0.05$ ) specifies the variables in the study are important to be considered. Role Efficacy (X2) accounted more than Life Satisfaction (X1) in determination of transactional styles (Table 4).

Thus, the results obtained direct us towards Role Efficacy as the main and important predictor variable; Life Satisfaction has a negligible role in predicting transactional styles except for a few specific styles like Rescuing and Task-Obsessive Transactional Styles.

## Discussion

There is no significant relationship between Life Satisfaction and Total Transactional Styles however, a significant but negative correlation is found between Role Efficacy and transactional styles. Thus, the hypothesis that states Life Satisfaction and Role Efficacy will show a positive relationship with transactional styles is rejected. This can be interpreted as Life Satisfaction which is the ability to enjoy ones experiences, a state of well-being and contentment does not relate with the transaction styles that the managers use while executing their transactions. Life Satisfaction is not stable as it changes over time. People may respond evenly no matter what is their level of satisfaction, therefore it may not determine the transactions. Moreover, individuals tend to show similar level of satisfaction across time and across many life domains. According to Fujita and Diener (2005) there is a set point for Life Satisfaction (LS)—stability across time. Height, weight, body mass index, systolic and diastolic blood pressure, and personality traits were all more stable than Life Satisfaction. Moreover, it can be stated that no satisfaction and no dissatisfaction phase may always be there in an individual's life, so transactions may not always relate to the level of satisfaction that the individual is experiencing. Further, regarding Role Efficacy, Yeo and Neal (2006) found task-specific self-efficacy negatively associated with task performance at the within-person level and that self-efficacy effects were dynamic and could change over time. Considering this, it is quite possible that Role Efficacy shows negative relations with transaction styles.

A detailed analysis of the various transactional styles reveal that Life Satisfaction has accounted more in determining Rescuing and Task-Obsessive Transactional Styles which means that Life Satisfaction can bring variation in these styles. Life Satisfaction is found to have significant positive correlations with Rescuing, Supportive and Task-Obsessive Transactional Styles which mean that with high Life Satisfaction employees use transactional styles that allow them dependency relationship, rescuing the subordinate, and see them as being incapable of taking care of them. They may support and encourage their subordinates and provide the necessary conditions for continuous improvement yet, be more concerned with the task and matters not directly related to the task will be ignored. This is a combination of OK and Not OK transactional styles (Berne, 1961) and emphasizes professionalism. Whereas significant negative correlations with Sulking and Resilient Transactional Styles means more the Life Satisfaction lesser the employees keep their negative feelings to themselves, find it difficult to share them, avoid meeting people and instead of confronting problems avoid them and feel bad about the situation, perhaps they express their feelings openly. However they do not show creative adaptability – learning from others, accepting others ideas readily. The companies from where data is generated definitely expect their employees to show more of professionalism and task obsession so the dynamics of Life Satisfaction and transactional styles emphasizes the same. They would confront any problem or decision with logic, so they may not like to accept other's ideas readily or creatively adapt to situations anytime. Out of this, Supportive and Resilient Styles are OK-styles whereas Rescuing, Task-Obsessive and Sulking Styles are Not OK transactional styles.

Role Efficacy is found to have significant positive correlations with Rescuing and Supportive Transactional Styles whereas significant negative correlations with Normative, Innovative, Aggressive, Sulking and Resilient Transactional Styles. Out of this, Supportive, Normative, Innovative and Resilient Styles are OK styles whereas Rescuing, Aggressive and Sulking Styles are Not OK styles. This means that an employee with high Role Efficacy believes that he or she is capable and has potential effectiveness of performing a task. They will also observe more dependency relationship, rescuing the subordinate, and see them as being incapable of taking care of them. They may support and encourage their subordinates and provide the necessary conditions for continuous improvement. As Todd and Kent (2006) point, self-efficacy was positively associated with an employee's propensity to engage in organizational citizenship behavior, which means they will show less of Aggressive Transactional Style. Politis (2001) investigated the relationship between different leadership style dimensions and a number of knowledge acquisition attributes. The results indicate that the leadership styles that involve human interaction and encourage participative decision-making processes are positively related to the skills and traits that are essential for knowledge management.

Among the two predictor variables, Role Efficacy has accounted for more contribution in determining the transactional styles than Life Satisfaction. This enables us to accept the hypothesis that states 'role efficacy will be the main predictor variable in determining transactional styles.

Role Efficacy has emerged as the main contributor as if an employee feels that he is potentially effective in performing the task that will also determine the type of transactions he carries out. The employees with high self-efficacy indulge in transactions that are definitely more positive and constructive. In support to this, Pilus and Saadan (2009) found that training and instruction coaching behavior, and positive feedback were the key elements to influence athletes' performance.

Role Efficacy has accounted for more of contribution in determining Sulking, Resilient, Aggressive, Assertive and Innovative Transactional Styles. This indicates that Role Efficacy can bring about a variation in these transaction

styles. To sum up implications to the leadership qualities, it can be stated with conviction that employees must try and put forward more of OK styles in contrast to Not OK transactional styles if they want to successfully deal with others in the organization. But this will be possible only if they are high on self-efficacy.

## Conclusion

Thus on the basis of above findings and discussions it can be concluded that Role Efficacy emerged as the main predictor variable in determining transactional styles in the present research. There is a mixed combination of OK and Not OK transactional styles that shows relation with the two predictor variables. This combination is also evident in the relative contribution that the predictor variables have made in determining the different transactional styles.

*Limitations* of the present study that have come into light are as follows: The study has not been done on all the branches, so the results cannot be generalized to Infosys and HCL as a whole. Comparison between units, gender, age groups etc. of different organizations was not done, because the sample of the research is small.

*Implications* of the investigation bring into focus the various transactional styles and which predictor variable accounts for in determining these transactional styles. The study can be utilized by the manager to understand the relation and magnitude of the Life Satisfaction and Role Efficacy with transactional styles. This will bring more effectiveness in their leadership and provide good working climate to the employees. In other words if the employees get supervisors who always understand their problems (personal and professional) and provide them a comfortable environment to work in, the idea of leaving the organization at an early phase, will never come in their mind. The employees can use transactional styles according to their potential and mix-match with the OK and Not OK transactional styles as time allows them to do so. This study is very crucial especially in these days of economic crisis where majority of organizations are facing severe setback due to communication flaws in the organizations by the rein holders.

## References

- Alston, J. P., & Dudley, C. J. (1973). Age, occupation and life satisfaction. *The Gerontologist*, *13*(1), 58-61. doi:10.1093/geront/13.1.58
- Avary, B. (1980). Ego states: Manifestation of psychic organs. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, *10*(4), 291-294.
- Berne, E. (1961). *Transactional analysis in psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Grove.
- Fujita, F., & Diener, E. (2005). Life satisfaction set point: Stability and change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*(1), 158-164. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.158
- Harris, T. (2004). *I'm ok, you're ok*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Hofer, J., Chasiotis, A., & Campos, D. (2006). Congruence between social values and implicit motives: Effects on life satisfaction across three cultures. *European Journal of Personality*, *20*(4), 305-324. doi:10.1002/per.590
- James, M. (1975). *The OK boss*. Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.
- Pareek, U. (2002a). *Making organizational roles effective*. New Delhi, India: TMH.

- Pareek, U. (2002b). *Training instruments in HRD and OD*. New Delhi, India: TMH.
- Pilus, A. H. M., & Saadan, R. (2009). Coaching leadership styles and athlete satisfactions among hockey team. *Journal of Human Capital Development*, 2(1), 77-87.
- Politis, J. D. (2001). The Relationship of various leadership styles to knowledge management. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Development*, 22(8), 354-364. doi:10.1108/01437730110410071
- Rusch, R. J. (2009). An assessment of transactional and transformational characteristics of U.S. Army Sergeant Majors: A case study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 70(9, Section A), 3614-3729.
- Schieltz, M., & Media, D. (2013). *Examples of transactional analysis in the workplace*. Retrieved from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/examples-transactional-analysis-workplace-12560.html>
- Singh, P., & Joseph, G. (1996). *Manual for Life Satisfaction Scale*. Agra, India: National Psychological Corporation.
- Steger, M. F., & Kashdan, T. B. (2007). Stability and specificity of meaning in life satisfaction over one year. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 8(2), 161-179. doi:10.1007/s10902-006-9011-8
- Takeuchi, R., Chen, G., & Lepak, D. P. (2009). Through the looking glass of social system: Cross-level effects of high-performance work systems on employees' attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(1), 1-29. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.01127.x
- Todd, S. Y., & Kent, A. (2006). Direct and indirect effects of task characteristics on organizational citizenship behavior. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 8(2), 253-268.
- Transactional analysis for leadership development - Part 2. (2009, December 2) [Web log blost]. Retrieved from <http://leadershipdevelopmentlessons.blogspot.com/2009/12/transactional-analysis-for-leadership.html>
- Yeo, G. B., & Neal, A. (2006). An examination of dynamic relationship between self-efficacy and performance across levels of analysis and levels of specificity. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1088-1101. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1088

## About the Authors

Assoc. Prof. **KamalJeet Sandhu** works at Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Dayalbagh Educational Institute (Deemed University), Dayalbagh, Agra. Postal address: Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Dayalbagh, Agra 282005, Uttar Pradesh, India. E-mail: [kpaula2471@rediffmail.com](mailto:kpaula2471@rediffmail.com)

**Nidhi Gurbaxani** is a Research Scholar at Department of Psychology, Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Agra, India.