Chapter – IV

Method

In this chapter attempts have been made to discuss the sample, the measures used, the design and the procedure of data collection. In the design section, the type of design and the statistics used to explain the relationship of dependent variable (LH) with independent variables (EI, Personality Type-A/B and Sex) has also been discussed.

SAMPLE

The sample of the study consists of male and female managers from various industries of Chhattisgarh. The industries were basically production units from both public and private sector organizations, production units include both iron and steel and cement production units. The total sample consisted of 500 managers and supervisors. Out of 500 employees, 250 employees were from public industrial sector (125 males and 125 females) and 250 employees were from private industrial sector (125 males and 125 females).
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MEASURES

Learned Helplessness Scale

In order to measure the LH of the subject LH (LH) scale was used. LH scale was originally developed by Seligman (1970). The scale was adapted and translated into Hindi by Srivastava and Patro (2006). Originally the scale consists of 48 items which measures both learned optimism and LH. To assess LH the scale was limited to 24 items. The LH was measured on the basis of attributions of the respondents on bad events which are indicators of LH.

The attributions of the respondents were assessed on three dimensions Learned Helplessness that is “Pmb” indicates “Permanence” (stability/instability) – Permanence means people who give up easily believe that the causes of bad events are permanent, that the bad events will persist. “Pvb” indicates “Pervasiveness” (globality/specificity) – People who make global or universal explanations for their failure give up on every thing when failure strikes in one area. “Psb” indicates “Personalization” (internality/externality) – People with internal pessimistic style personalize negative events. They consider themselves responsible for bad events. The items numbers, related to Pmb, Pvb and Psb are given below in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factorwise Items Serial Number</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pmb – Temporary vs Permanent.</td>
<td>5, 13, 20, 21, 29, 33, 42, 46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pvb – Globality vs Specificity.</td>
<td>8, 16, 17, 18, 22, 32, 44, 48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psb – Internality vs Externality</td>
<td>3, 9, 19, 25, 30, 27, 36, 45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reliability of the scale was determined by calculating split-half reliability on a sample of 500 managers. The split-half reliability coefficient was found to be 0.39. The validity of the scale is yet to be determined.

**Administration process of LH Scale**

The scale consists of situational items and subject has to respond on those items on the given options. For this purpose the subject was instructed to put himself into that situation and what is his attribution related to the event, he has to respond accordingly.

**Scoring**

The items of the scale has 2 categories of statements representing the two types of attributions of the dimensions of LH and the subjects have to choose any one option by putting a tick mark (✓) on any one of the 2 statements. The statements are related to the attributional dimensions of the factors i.e. (PmB, PvB and PsB). The total score obtained on each of the factors are summed up and that is the score for the LH scale (LHS). Subjects scoring high on the scale would be considered as showing more LH.

The tick mark (✓) on the responses indicating internality, globality and stability attributes would be scored “1”. For example, the statement for PmB dimension of LH is – “A friend says something that hurts your feelings”, the two responses are – (1)She always blurts things out without thinking of others, and (2)My friend was in a bad mood and she took it out on me. The subjects opting to the first (1) response, which indicates stability were scored “1”, and the subjects who tick (✓) the second (2) response, which indicates instability were scored “0”. Similarly, the statement for PvB dimension of LH is – “You ask someone to dance he/she says no”, the two responses are – (1)I am not a good enough dancer, and (2)He/She doesn’t like to dance. The subjects opting to the first (1) response,
which indicates globality were scored “1”, and the subjects who tick (✓) the second (2) response, which indicates specificity were scored “0”. Similarly, the statement for PsB dimension of LH is – “You fail an important examination”, the two responses are – (1) I wasn’t as smart as the other people taking the exam, and (2) I didn’t prepare for it well. The subjects opting to the first (1) response, which indicates internality were scored “1”, and the subjects who tick (✓) the second (2) response, which indicates externality were scored “0”. The higher the score on the LH scale, the higher will be the Learned Helplessness among the managers.

**Emotional Intelligence Scale**

To assess EI, EI Scale (EIS) by Hyde, Pethe and Dhar (2007) was used. The scale consists of 34 items and 10 factors. The factors are namely self awareness, empathy, self motivation, emotional stability, managing relations, integrity, self development, value orientation, commitment and altruistic behaviour.

The split half reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.88. The validity of the scale was found to be (0.93).

**Scoring**

The EIS is a 5 point scale. There are five categories of responses – strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 marks were given to each responses respectively. The EIS suggests ten factors of EI. Components of EI with total number of items in each category are given below:
The scores of all the ten factors were calculated separately to get total scores for each factor. Then, all these scores were added to get total EI score.

**Type-A/B Behaviour Pattern Scale**

To assess the personality type of the managers, the Type-A/B Behaviour Pattern Scale (ABBPS) by Dhar (2001) has been used. The scale is divided into two parts – Form ‘A’ and Form ‘B’. Form ‘A’ has six factors and 17 items and form ‘B’ has five factors and 16 items. Factors of form ‘A’ or Type-A Personality are tenseness, impatience, restlessness, achievement orientation, domineering and work alcoholic and factors of form ‘B’ or Type-B Personality are complacent, easy going, non assertive, relaxed and patience.

The reliability coefficient of form ‘A’ was found to be .54 and coincidently for form ‘B’ also it was found to be .54. The validity of the scale was found to be .73 for both the forms separately.

**Scoring**

The ABBPS is a 5 point scale. Responses were given under 5 categories. Strongly agree, Agree, Uncertain, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 marks were given to each response respectively for both the scales Type-A and
Type-B. The 6 factors and items which constitute Type-A Personality are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Item Serial No.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Tenseness</td>
<td>8, 10, 13, 15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Impatience</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Restlessness</td>
<td>4, 7, 17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>3, 9, 16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Domineering</td>
<td>1, 11, 14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Work Alcoholic</td>
<td>5, 12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five factors and items which constitute Type-B Personality are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Item Serial No.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Complacent</td>
<td>5, 14, 15, 16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Easy going</td>
<td>4, 7, 12, 13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Non Assertive</td>
<td>2, 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>1, 3, 8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>6, 9, 11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores were calculated for each of the 17 items of Type-A and 16 items of Type-B separately. Also, responses for each of the 6 and 5 factors of Type-A and Type-B Behaviour Pattern were scored separately to get the total score for each factor separately.

Then, a total of Form ‘A’ and Form ‘B’ was obtained by adding all the 17 items of Type-A and 16 items of Type-B separately.
In Form A, people whose score “61 and above” are high on Type-A Pattern and those who score “49 and below” are low on Type-A Pattern. In Form B those who score “59 and above” are high on Type-B and those who score “45 and below” are low on Type-B Pattern. “46-60” in Type-A, and “46-58” in Type-B is the average score.

**DESIGN**

The study by nature is a type ‘S’ research. The main objective of the study is to find out relationship of LH with EI, Personality Type-A/B of the male and female manager working in public and private industrial sector. Thus, the variables of the undertaken study are:

**Dependent Variable**

- LH
- Pmb (Permanence)
- Pvb (Pervasiveness)
- Psb (Personalization)

**Independent Variables**

- EI
- Self awareness
- Empathy
- Self Motivation
- Emotional Stability
- Managing Relations
- Integrity
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The study is divided in two parts: LH and EI; and LH and Personality Type-A/B.

In the first part of the study, LH is studied in relation to EI, Sex and Type of Organizations. More specifically, an attempt is made to find out whether or not male and female managers with high and low EI differ in their feeling of LH. For this purpose the subjects were divided into high and low EI on the basis of Quartile Deviation. The 25th percentile and the 75th percentile were considered as the cut points for selecting the sample from the two extreme groups. Thus, a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design (EI x Sex x Type of organizations) appears for analysis:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{EI} & \times & \text{Sex} & \times & \text{Type of Organization} \\
\text{High} & & \text{Male} & & \text{Public Sector} \\
\text{Low} & & \text{Female} & & \text{Private Sector}
\end{array}
\]

An attempt is also made to find out the best EI predictors of LH.

In the second part of the study an attempt is made to find out relationship of LH with Personality Type-A and Personality Type-B, Sex and Type of Organizations. More specifically, an attempt is made to find out, whether or not the male and female managers from public and private sector differ significantly in their feeling of LH. For this purpose male and female managers with Personality Type-A and Personality Type-B were detected with the help of scoring pattern given in the manual. Managers scoring high on Type-A scale and average or low on Type-B scale were considered as Type-A persons and managers scoring high on Type-B scale and average or low on Type-A scale were considered as Type-B persons.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Personality Type} & \times & \text{Sex} & \times & \text{Type of Organization} \\
\text{Type A} & & \text{Male} & & \text{Public Sector} \\
\text{Type B} & & \text{Female} & & \text{Private Sector}
\end{array}
\]
PROCEDURE

The managers of public and private sector industries constituted the sample for the study. The researcher approached managers through proper channel and contacted them personally. The managers were made clear about the purpose of the research and were requested to fill up the scales intended to measure the specific variables taken in study.

The instructions given on the scales were made clear to them and after they filled up the forms, the test materials were taken back. The scoring of each scale was done in accordance to the scoring pattern mentioned in the ‘Measure’ section of this chapter.

After scoring, the data was organized and put for the statistical analysis. The result and discussion are presented in the next chapter.