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3.1 Introduction

Any research starts with curiosities and questions about a given phenomenon or a set of phenomena. Systematic attempts are made to explore, analyze and understand the issues under question through suitable conceptual and methodological tools. The process of inquiry and the analytical tools are to a great extent relative to the specific domain of concern, and the conceptual, methodological, heuristic and pragmatic goals of the research.

In the world we see that there are each and every human are different from each other because environment, heredity, society, education, area of living, training, economy, development etc. factors are effecting to the human life. So, it we want to know about human life and create meaningful our life then it is necessary to do a research study. This research is related to the problems of school teachers. Now days school teachers facing so many problems. There for this research will help to the school teachers.

The present chapter is intended for the presentation of the plan and the procedure adopted to study the Emotional Maturity, Life Style, Insecurity and Psychological Well-Being: A Comparative Study of Government and Non-Government School Teachers. In this chapter the plan and procedure of the present study including the statement of the problem, objective of the study, hypothesis tested in the study, methodology, tools used for data collection, procedure of sample selection and statistical treatment of data have been describe in detail.

3.2 Problem of the study

The main problem of the present research is as under:


3.3 Objectives Of The Study

The objectives of research are centered an the research problem. The objectives decided for the present research are as follow.

The main objectives of the present research were as under:

2. To study of the Emotional maturity, Lifestyle, Insecurity, Psychological well-being and Factor of Psychological well-being among male and female school teachers.

3. To study of the Emotional maturity, Lifestyle, Insecurity, Psychological well-being and Factor of Psychological well-being among urban and rural area school teachers.

4. To study of the Emotional maturity, Lifestyle, Insecurity and Psychological well-being among low and high income of school teachers.

5. To study of the Emotional maturity, Lifestyle, Insecurity and Psychological well-being among married and unmarried school teachers.

6. To study of the Emotional maturity, Lifestyle, Insecurity and Psychological well-being among joint and nuclear family school teachers.

7. To study of the Emotional maturity, Lifestyle, Insecurity and Psychological well-being among less and more family members of school teachers.

8. To study of the Emotional maturity, Lifestyle, Insecurity and Psychological well-being among Gujarati and English Medium school teachers.


10. To study of the relation between the Emotional maturity, Lifestyle, Insecurity and Psychological well-being of school teachers.

11. To study of the relation between Emotional Maturity, Lifestyle, Insecurity, Types of School, Gender, Types of Area, Marital Status, Types of Family, Monthly Income and Medium on Psychological Well-Being of Predict effect.

### 3.4 Hypothesis

The major hypotheses of the present research were as under:

1. There is no difference between Emotional maturity of government and non-government school teachers.
2. There is no difference between Emotional maturity of male and female school teachers.

3. There is no difference between Emotional maturity of urban and rural areas school teachers.

4. There is no interaction effect of Emotional maturity on types of school and Gender of school teachers.

5. There is no interaction effect of Emotional maturity on types of school and types of areas school teachers.

6. There is no interaction effect of Emotional maturity on Gender and types of areas school teachers.

7. There is no interaction effect of Emotional maturity on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.

8. There is no difference between Lifestyle of government and non-government school teachers.

9. There is no difference between Lifestyle of male and female school teachers.

10. There is no difference between Lifestyle of urban and rural areas school teachers.

11. There is no interaction effect of Lifestyle on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.

12. There is no interaction effect of Lifestyle on types of school and types of areas school teachers.

13. There is no interaction effect of Lifestyle on Gender and types of areas school teachers.

14. There is no interaction effect of Lifestyle on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.

15. There is no different between Insecurity of government and non-government school teachers.

16. There is no difference between Insecurity of male and female school teachers.

17. There is no difference between Insecurity of urban and rural areas school teachers.

18. There is no interaction effect of Insecurity on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
19. There is no interaction effect of Insecurity on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
20. There is no interaction effect of Insecurity on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
21. There is no interaction effect of Insecurity on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.
22. There is no difference between Psychological well-being of government and non-government school teachers.
23. There is no difference between Psychological well-being of male and female school teachers.
24. There is no difference between Psychological well-being of urban and rural areas school teachers.
25. There is no interaction effect of Psychological well-being on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
26. There is no interaction effect of Psychological well-being on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
27. There is no interaction effect of Psychological well-being on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
28. There is no interaction effect of Psychological well-being on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.
29. There is no difference between Meaninglessness of government and non-government school teachers.
30. There is no difference between Meaninglessness of male and female school teachers.
31. There is no difference between Meaninglessness of urban and rural areas school teachers.
32. There is no interaction effect of Meaninglessness on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
33. There is no interaction effect of Meaninglessness on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
34. There is no interaction effect of Meaninglessness on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
35. There is no interaction effect of Meaninglessness on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.

36. There is no difference between Somatic symptoms of government and non-government school teachers.

37. There is no difference between Somatic symptoms of male and female school teachers.

38. There is no difference between Somatic symptoms of urban and rural areas school teachers.

39. There is no interaction effect of Somatic symptoms on types of school and Gender of school teachers.

40. There is no interaction effect of Somatic symptoms on types of school and types of areas school teachers.

41. There is no interaction effect of Somatic symptoms on Gender and types of areas school teachers.

42. There is no interaction effect of Somatic symptoms on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.

43. There is no difference between Self esteem of government and non-government school teachers.

44. There is no difference between Self esteem of male and female school teachers.

45. There is no difference between Self esteem of urban and rural areas school teachers.

46. There is no interaction effect of Self esteem on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.

47. There is no interaction effect of Self esteem on types of school and types of areas school teachers.

48. There is no interaction effect of Self esteem on Gender and types of areas school teachers.

49. There is no interaction effect of Self esteem on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.

50. There is no difference between Positive effect of government and non-government school teachers.
51. There is no difference between Positive effect of male and female school teachers.
52. There is no difference between Positive effect of urban and rural areas school teachers.
53. There is no interaction effect of Positive effect on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
54. There is no interaction effect of Positive effect on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
55. There is no interaction effect of Positive effect on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
56. There is no interaction effect of Positive effect on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.
57. There is no different between Daily activities of government and non-government school teachers.
58. There is no difference between Daily activities of male and female school teachers.
59. There is no difference between Daily activities of urban and rural areas school teachers.
60. There is no interaction effect of Daily activities on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
61. There is no interaction effect of Daily activities on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
62. There is no interaction effect of Daily activities on Gender and Types of areas school teachers.
63. There is no interaction effect of Daily activities on types of school, Gender and Types of areas school teachers.
64. There is no difference between Life satisfaction of government and non-government school teachers.
65. There is no difference between Life satisfaction of male and female school teachers.
66. There is no difference between Life satisfaction of urban and rural areas school teachers.
67. There is no interaction effect of Life satisfaction on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
68. There is no interaction effect of Life satisfaction on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
69. There is no interaction effect of Life satisfaction on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
70. There is no interaction effect of Life satisfaction on types of school, Gender and areas school teachers.
71. There is no interaction effect of Life satisfaction on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
72. There is no interaction effect of Suicidal ideas on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
73. There is no interaction effect of Suicidal ideas on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
74. There is no interaction effect of Suicidal ideas on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
75. There is no interaction effect of Suicidal ideas on types of school, Gender and areas school teachers.
76. There is no interaction effect of Suicidal ideas on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
77. There is no interaction effect of Suicidal ideas on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.
78. There is no difference between Personal control of government and non-government school teachers.
79. There is no difference between Personal control of male and female school teachers.
80. There is no difference between Personal control of urban and rural areas school teachers.
81. There is no interaction effect of Personal control on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
82. There is no interaction effect of Personal control on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
83. There is no interaction effect of Personal control on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
84. There is no interaction effect of Personal control on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.
85. There is no difference between Social support of government and non-government school teachers.
86. There is no difference between Social support of male and female school teachers.
87. There is no difference between Social support of urban and rural areas school teachers.
88. There is no interaction effect of Social support on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
89. There is no interaction effect of Social support on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
90. There is no interaction effect of Social support on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
91. There is no interaction effect of Social support on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.
92. There is no difference between Tension of government and non-government school teachers.
93. There is no difference between Tension of male and female school teachers.
94. There is no difference between Tension of urban and rural areas school teachers.
95. There is no interaction effect of Tension on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
96. There is no interaction effect of Tension on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
97. There is no interaction effect of Tension on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
98. There is no interaction effect of Tension on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.
99. There is no difference between Wellness of government and non-government school teachers.
100. There is no difference between Wellness of male and female school teachers.
101. There is no difference between Wellness of urban and rural areas school teachers.
102. There is no interaction effect of Wellness on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
103. There is no interaction effect of Wellness on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
104. There is no interaction effect of Wellness on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
105. There is no interaction effect of Wellness on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.
106. There is no difference between General efficiency of government and non-government school teachers.
107. There is no difference between General efficiency of male and female school teachers.
108. There is no difference between General efficiency of urban and rural areas school teachers.
109. There is no interaction effect of General efficiency on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
110. There is no interaction effect of General efficiency on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
111. There is no interaction effect of General efficiency on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
112. There is no interaction effect of general efficiency on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.
113. There is no difference between Satisfaction of government and non-government school teachers.
114. There is no difference between Satisfaction of male and female school teachers.
115. There is no difference between Satisfaction of urban and rural areas school teachers.
116. There is no interaction effect of Satisfaction on types of school and Gender of the school teachers.
117. There is no interaction effect of Satisfaction on types of school and types of areas school teachers.
118. There is no interaction effect of Satisfaction on Gender and types of areas school teachers.
119. There is no interaction effect of Satisfaction on types of school, Gender and types of areas school teachers.
120. There is no difference between Emotional maturity of low and high income of school teachers.
121. There is no different between Emotional maturity of married and unmarried school teachers.
122. There is no difference between Emotional maturity of joint and nuclear family school teachers.
123. There is no difference between Emotional maturity of less or more family member school teachers.
124. There is no difference between Emotional maturity of Gujarati and English Medium School teachers.
125. There is no difference between Emotional maturity of secondary and higher secondary school teachers.
126. There is no difference between Life style of low and high income of school teachers.
127. There is no difference between Life style of married and unmarried school teachers.
128. There is no difference between Life style of joint and nuclear family school teachers.
129. There is no difference between Life style of less or more family members school teachers.
130. There is no difference between Life style of Gujarati Medium and English Medium School Teachers.
131. There is no difference between Life style of secondary and higher secondary school teachers.
132. There is no difference between Insecurity of low and high income of school teachers.
133. There is no difference between Insecurity of married and unmarried school teachers.
134. There is no difference between Insecurity of joint and nuclear family school teachers.
135. There is no difference between Insecurity of less or more family members school teachers.
136. There is no difference between Insecurity of Gujarati and English Medium School Teachers.
137. There is no difference between Insecurity of secondary and higher secondary school teachers.
138. There is no difference between Psychological well-being of low and high income school teachers.
139. There is no difference between Psychological well-being of married and unmarried school teachers.
140. There is no difference between Psychological well-being of joint and nuclear family school teachers.
141. There is no difference between Psychological well-being of less and more family members school teachers.
142. There is no difference between Psychological well-being of Gujarati and English Medium School Teachers.
143. There is no difference between Psychological well-being of secondary and higher secondary school teachers.
144. There is no relation between the Emotional maturity and Life style of school teachers.
145. There is no relation between the Emotional maturity and Insecurity of school teachers.
146. There is no relation between the Emotional maturity and Psychological well-being of school teachers.
There is no relation between the Life style and Insecurity of school teachers.

There is no relation between the Life style and Psychological well-being of school teachers.

There is no relation between the Insecurity and Psychological well-being of school teachers.

There is no predictor relation between Emotional maturity, Life style, Insecurity, Types of school, Gender, Types of area, marital status, monthly income, Types of family and Medium of Psychological well-being on school teachers.

There is no predictor relation between Emotional maturity, Life style, Insecurity, Gender, Types of area, marital status, Monthly incomes, Type of family and Medium of Psychological well-being on government school teachers.

There is no predictor relation between Emotional maturity, Life style, Insecurity, Gender, Types of area, marital status, Monthly incomes, Type of family and Medium of Psychological well-being on non-government school teachers.

3.5 VARIABLE

(A) Independent Variables:

1. Types of School – Government / Non-Government
2. Gender : Male/ Female
3. Area – Urban / Rural
4. Monthly Income –Low (1 to 15,000) / High (More than 15,000 )
5. Marital Status – Married / Unmarried
6. Types of family – Joint / Nuclear
7. Family member – Less (1 to 5 Family Members) / More ( 6 or up to 6 Family Members)
8. Medium – Gujarati / English
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Predictor Factor  :
1.  Emotional maturity
2.  Life Style
3.   Insecurity
4.  Types of school
5.  Gender
6.  Types of area
7.  Monthly income
8.  Marital Status
9.  Types of family
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(B)  Dependent Variables:
1.  Emotional Maturity
2.  Life Style
3.   Insecurity
4.  Psychological well-being and factor of psychological well-being
Factor of  Psychological well-being
   1.  Meaninglessness
   2.  Somatic Symptoms
   3.  Self-esteem
   4.  Positive affect
   5.  Daily activities
   6.  Life Satisfaction
   7.  Suicidal ideas
   8.  Personal control
   9.  Social support
  10.  Tension
  11.  Wellness
  12.  General efficiency
  13.  Satisfaction
(C) Controlled variables:
1. In this study government and non-government school teacher will be including from only Ahmadabad city and its surrounding villages.
2. In this study government (purely government and grant in aid) and non-government (self – finance) school teacher will be including in this study.
3. The sample size is restricted to only 400 school teachehrs.
4. Sample was taken from only 48 schools situated in rural and urban areas of Ahmadabad city.
5. The study is limited to only secondary and higher secondary school teachers.
6. The study is limited to only studying the four dependent variable Emotional maturity, Life style, Insecurity and Psychological well-being.
7. The study is limited to collect information about independent variable like types of school, gender, area, monthly income, marital status, types of family, family member, medium and teaching level.
8. The sample was selected by random system.

3.6 Research Design
Main aim of this study is to get information about the government and non-government school teachers, emotional maturity, life style, insecurity and psychological well being other important variable like Types of school, Gender, Types of area, Monthly income, Marital status, Types of family, Family member, Medium, Teaching level. The whole procedure of this study was divided into two section

Section : 1
In this research 2x2x2 factorial design was used for to study, variable like emotional maturity, life style, insecurity, psychological well-being and factors of psychological well-being of government and non-government school teachers reference of Gender and Types of area do they contained difference in which matter or not? It will be decided to take samples in equal number generated from this research method in eight groups above three independent variables under this research method of main and interactive.
This research was adopted 2x2x2 factorial design will 2 types of school (government and non-government school), 2 Gender (male and female) and 2 types of areas (urban and rural)

Table No. 3.1

2x2x2 Factorial Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Government School Teachers (A₁)</th>
<th>Non-government school Teachers (A₂)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male B₁</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female B₂</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section : 2

‘t’ test was used for to get information about emotional maturity, life style, insecurity and psychological well-being with reference to monthly income, marital status, types of family, family member, school medium and teaching level in this section. ‘r’ Karl – Pearson’s method was used for to get information about emotional maturity, life style, insecurity, psychological well- being to know do they have only relation between them or not.

Multiple regression analysis was used to know about psychological well-being and predictor relation by emotional maturity, life style, insecurity, types of school, Gender, types of area, monthly income, marital status, types of family and medium.

3.7. Sample

The aim and object of this research is to study of Emotional maturity, Life style, Insecurity and Psychological well-being among government and non-government school teachers. In this research study of government and non-government school teachers shall be selected from Ahmadabad city and there rural areas. This sample was selected by random sampling method. A total of 400 school teachers shall be selected. Out of which 200 would be government school teachers and 200 non-government school teachers. Out of which 100 would be Male and 100
Female. From each of this 100 teacher’s 50 urban area school teacher and 50 rural area school teacher would taken.

3.8. Tools

For this study to collect the required information the following tools shall be used.

**Personal Data Sheet :**

Certain personal information about respondents included in the sample of research is useful and important for research. Here also, for collecting such important information, personal data sheet was prepared. With the help of this personal datasheet, the information about types of school, Gender, types of area, monthly income, marital status, types of family, family member, medium and teaching level etc. were collected.

(1) **Emotion maturity scale**

Emotional maturity scale developed by Pal, (1988) was used to measure emotional maturity the scale contains 40 items with totally agree, agree, generally, disagree and totally disagree. Response alternative the responses were marked 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively and from the responses we had to select only one response in every sentence. 5 for tick mark totally agree, 4 for tick mark agree, 3 for tick mark neutral, 2 for tick mark disagree and 1 for tick mark totally disagree. The maximum possible score is 200 and minimum is 40. Scoring pattern shows that more score indicates less emotional maturity. The less score in the scale indicates good (more) emotional maturity.

The reliability score of emotional maturity scale comes to 0.84, derived by the split half method, obtained from the sample of 200 students. The researcher of the present research has found out the reliability score as 0.81, by using split-half technique on the sample of 50 students.

2) **Life style scale :**

This scale is developed by Bawa and Kaur (2012) this scale consists 60 items into 6 dimensions like.
1. Health conscious Life Style
2. Academic oriented Lifestyle
3. Career oriented Lifestyle
4. Socially oriented Lifestyle
5. Trend seeking Lifestyle
6. Family oriented Lifestyle

It is a standardized on students of higher education (adult)

Life style scale contains 60 items each item has five option responses i.e. strongly agree, agree, indifferent, disagree and strongly disagree. The respondent has to select one option out of the given five responses. There are 43 positive item and 17 negative items. The positive item scored as 4,3,2,1,0 and negative item scored as 0,1,2,3,4 for the responses strongly agree, agree, indifferent, disagree, and strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type of item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this test the reliability coefficient has been found to be 0.93 the reliability index is 0.98 the author has reported satisfactory validity of the questionnaire.

3) Insecurity feeling scale:

Indian Adaption of Maslow’ insecurity feeling inventory constructed and standardized Nagvi, (1986) There is 47 sentences in the scale. All at the sentence had a two options “yes” or “no” belong two options can choose one option and marked by symbol (√) in sentences 1 score for yes and 0 score for no.

The test retest reliability coefficient is 0.83. It is standardized on 100 students of higher education. His known has very good Hindi and Gujarati languages and the test retest validity is 0.74.
4) **Psychological well-being scale**

Psychological Well-being Index formed by Bhogle and Prakash (1995). Psychological well-being scale is used in this research. There are total 28 statements who measures Psychological well-being factor in which you have to answer by considering right tick. In this scale there are 28 statements accessible. There are two types of answer given to you that is ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ in this scale positive and negative statements are putted. For positive answer give one marks and for negative will be awarded one marks but in case if the answer given in opposite side than give zero mark of each false statement. There are following number of sentence is positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this psychological well-being scale we can get “28” Maximum score and minimum “0” score. Through test-retest reliability found 0.72, and correlation found for this scale is 0.84, so this scale is very right way to obtain the well-being of any person. After the translation in Guajarati language even if the test retests reliability found 0.91, in this scale if the right answer more than the person is very happy and he/she are well-being in their life.

3.9. **Procedure**

The first step for the present study was taken by selecting the sample. To select the sample, randomized sample techniques were used on government and non-government school teachers belong to urban and rural areas of Ahmadabad districts. First all of list of government and non-government school of urban and rural areas of Ahmadabad districts by District Education Office (DEO) and out of those list 48 schools were randomly selected on the basis of urban and rural background. For this
research 400 government and non-government school teachers. Out of which 200 would be government school teachers and 200 non-government school teachers. Out of which 100 would be male school teachers and 100 female school teachers. From each of this 100 teacher’s 50 urban area school teachers and 50 rural area school teachers would taken.

After constitute the sample Emotional maturity scale, Lifestyle scale, Insecurity scale and Psychological well-being scale were administered on the selected sample. To avoid the fatigue and warm –up effect both test were taken separately. All the instruction were strictly followed as per describe in manual of the correspondence test. Later on, the responses of the subjects on the each test was scored as per scoring procedure describe in the particular test and their scores on Emotional maturity scale, life style scale, Insecurity scale and Psychological well-being scale (dependent variable) were obtained. These score were further statistically analyzed under four techniques F test, ‘t’ test, Correlation and Multiple regression to study the Emotional maturity, life style, Insecurity and psychological well-being among government non-government school teachers of urban and rural area and to find relation between them.

3.9. Statistical Analysis

Researchers use various statistical methods to convert qualitative information in to numerical data. Various statistical methods were used in the present study also. Statistics is connected in various forms of science. Statistics is useful in getting clear let alls in deriving meaningful results section of sample from, in generalization of sample, and in interpreting results as well as casual variation in data.

In the present study, several statistical methods were used considering objectives of study and null hypothesis mainly four methods were used in the present study.

ANOVA was used to get information about emotional maturity, life style insecurity and psychological well-being and factor of psychological well-being with reference to types of school, gender and types of area in this section.
‘t’ test was used for to get information about emotional maturity, life style, insecurity and psychological well-being with reference to monthly income, marital status, types of family, family member, school medium and teaching level.

‘r’ karl-pearson’s correlation method was used to know relation between emotional maturity, life style, insecurity and psychological well-being to know do they have only relation between them or not.

Multiple regression analysis was used to know about Psychological well-being and predictor relation by emotional maturity, life style, insecurity, types of school, gender, types of area, monthly income, marital status, types of family, and medium of school teachers.