CHAPTER-4

METHODOLOGY

Study design and venue of the study

It is a cross sectional and correlation study, which was conducted at different rural as well as urban area. The study tapes age, experience and organizational status as the independent variables. The group of dependent variables cover organizational commitment and personal efficacy.

Sample:

A group of 200 female working teachers of Intermediate and Degree College level were randomly selected for the present purpose. Following inclusion and exclusion criteria were taken in consideration for the selection of sample:

Inclusion criteria for working women:
Subjects must be involved in teaching job in Intermediate or Graduation level of teaching institution

Subjects must be of female sex

Subjects residing in urban or rural area of habitat

Subject educated up to minimum graduation level

**Exclusion criteria for working women:**

- Subjects who were not cooperative for study
- Subjects who were involved in more than one occupation

**Hypotheses:**

In order to find out the aims of the present study the following major hypotheses were formulated:

- **Ha**$_1$- Age would exert differential effects on organizational commitment of working women.
- **Ha**$_2$- Experience would exert differential effects on organizational commitment of working women.
- **Ha**$_3$- Organizational status would exert differential effects on personal efficacy of working women.
- **Ha**$_4$- Organizational status would exert differential effects on organizational commitment of working women.
- **Ha**$_5$- Age would exert differential effects on personal efficacy of working women.
Ha₆ - Experience would exert differential effects on personal efficacy of working women.

Ha₇ - There would be significant correlation between organizational commitment and personal efficacy

Tools:

The Following tools were used for the study:

- **Socio demographic and personal data sheet**

- **The Organizational Commitment scale of O’Reily and Chatman (1986)(Hindi Version)**

- **General Self efficacy scale Hindi version by Shonali Sud (2002)**

Description of the tests:

1. **Socio Demographic and Personal Data Sheet**

   It is especially designed for the study. It measures different aspects of socio demographic and teaching aspects of the sample. It is consisted of name, age, sex, habitat, education, teaching experience, monthly income and teaching designation.

2. **The Organizational Commitment scale of O’Reily and Chatman Hindi Version).**

   The study variable is organizational commitment which is measured by Hindi Version of O’Reilley and Chatman’s (1986) Organizational
commitment questionnaire. Organizational commitment Questionnaire was developed with the aim of measuring organizational commitment as a tri-dimensional construct. The scale is intended to measure three components of organizational commitment: affective, continuance and normative commitment.

Hindi version of O’Reilley and Chatman’s organizational commitment scale (1986) was developed by Singh and Singh (1997). This scale consists of 12 items and each item is accompanied with five alternative response categories. Although the original organizational commitment scale consists of seven alternative responses but in Hindi version response categories were reduced to five from convenience point of view. The response categories are completely agree, agree, undecided, disagree and completely disagree and are scored as 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 for positive items and 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 for negative items. This scale provides the scores for three components of organizational commitment namely, affective, continuance and normative:

**Affective Commitment dimension:**

This dimension measures organizational member’s emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in the organization. The affective dimension means that members stay in the organization because they want to do so.
**Continuance commitment dimensions:**

The continuance dimension measures organizational commitment to the organization based on the costs are associated with leaving the organization. In other words, members whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so.

**Normative commitment dimension:**

This dimension measures organizational member’s feeling of obligation to remain with the organization. Normative commitment implies that members remain in the organization because they ought to.

**Administration**

The organizational commitment questionnaire is self-explanatory and is completed individually by respondents. Supervision is not necessary. The questionnaire was loaded on the organization’s intranet site, and employees could complete it during their own spare time. The response categories are completely agree, agree, undecided, disagree and completely disagree and are scored as 5,4,3,2, and 1 for positive items and 1,2,3,4, and 5 for negative items. This scale provides the scores for three components of organizational commitment namely, affective, continuance and normative. Higher the score on the scale show higher the organizational commitment and vice versa. Out
of 12 items 9 items are positively worded and the remaining three are negatively worded. The negatively worded items are item number 3, 4 and 9.

**Reliability and validity**

The reliability estimates of this scale are found by Meyer and Allen (1997) to be internal consistencies of the dimensions varying between .85 for affective, .79 for continuance and .73 for normative. The overall reliability estimates exceed .79.

Construct validity of the dimensions of the organizational commitment questionnaire is based on the fact that they correlate as predicted with the proposed antecedents variables (Meyer and Allen, 1997). This provides preliminary evidence that this questionnaire is a valid measure for organizational commitment. According to Meyer and Allen (1997) the median reliability estimates for the affective commitment scale from more than 40 samples representing more than 16000 employees from various employment group was .85. The Hindi version of the organizational commitment scale possesses good psychometric properties. Its reliability and validity coefficient of correlation have been found to be .79 and .85.
respectively. Its suitability has been evaluated for many occupation and is reported to be quite comfortable.

**Motivation for using the OCQ**

The contents of the OCQ are applicable to this study. According to RIAZ and Tayeeb (2004), to date much of the organizational commitment research has been largely restricted to samples in the USA and India. Relatively few studies have been conducted elsewhere in the world. Hofstede (2001) clearly demonstrated the need to consider the cross cultural validity and applicability of the constructs.

**3. General Self efficacy scale (Hindi version) by Sonali Sud (2002)**

The self-efficacy scale aims at a broad and stable sense of personal competence to deal efficiently with a variety of stressful situations. The scale was designed to assess self-efficacy. This scale consists of 10 items. It comprise statements about how one assesses one’s self efficacy in different situations. The General Self Efficacy Scale is a 4 point scale, the score could range from a minimum score of 10 to a maximum score of 40.

**Administration:**

The GSE is a self-completion questionnaire and takes 2-5 minutes to complete. No time limit is set but respondents are requested to work quickly and give their first impressions. Respondents are required to indicate the
extent to which each statement applies to them. The GSE can be administered individually or in groups. The corresponding score on the four point scale is selected and recorded. Each item has a four choice response pattern ranging for “not at all true” which scores 1 to “exactly scores” 4. The scores of each of the ten items are summed to give a total score. Thus the range of possible scores for this instrument could vary from a minimum of 10 to a maximum score of 40.

**Interpretations:**

The score on this scale reflects the strength of an individuals generalised self-efficacy belief. Thus the higher the score, the greater is the individuals generalised sense of self efficacy. According to Bandura (1989) the stronger the sense of self efficacy, the bolder the behaviour of the individuals will be. An individual who is strong in self-efficacy is more likely than someone with weak perceptions of self-efficacy to:

- Be motivated to do things competently
- Be spurred on to great efforts in the face of adversity
- Withstand failures by viewing tasks as challenges
- Deploy attention and effort to the demands of the situation
Being a un-dimensional scale, the overall score reflects the general level of self-efficacy.

**Reliability:**

Rimm and Jersulam (1999) and Lord et al (2005) reported Cronbach Alpha ranges varying between .75 and .94 across a number of different language versions. High reliability and stability was found. The Maddux and Sherer measurement obtain Cronbach alpha of between .71 and .86 which compare favourable to an alpha value of .7 recommended by Nunnally (1978) for scales used in basic research (Sherer and Maddux, 1982).

**Validity:** Studies have shown that the GSE has high construct validity (Leganger et al, 2000; Schwartz et al, 1999). The scale was found to be configurally equivalent across 28 nations and it forms only one global dimension (Leganger et al, 2000). Relations between the GSE and other social cognitive variables are high and confirm the validity of the scale. This scale showed good construct validity, with six personality measures, and good criterion validity with measures of vocational, education and military career success (Sherer and Maddux, 1982).

**Procedure for data collection:** First of all, the subjects were selected according to inclusion and exclusion criteria. After that they were contacted. Then, prior permission was sought to undertake the study in their respective homes. They were
made acquainted with the aims and objective of the study. All relevant information was filled in the socio demographic and personal data sheet. After that all questionnaires was administered and raw data were compared. Questionnaires were administered in session according to convenience of subjects.

**Statistical Analysis** : Statistical package for social science for win version 13.0 was used. Data of the present study is described using number and percentage for category variable. Group comparison was done by $X^2$ test for category variable. Pearson’s method of correlation is used for evaluating correlation between variables.