CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES
chosen keeping in view the backward and advanced area. Kapurthala and Ropar stood for backward area and Jalandhar for advanced area.

Punjab (330)

Kapurthala (84) Jalandhar (149) Ropar (97)

- Sex
  - Males (219)
  - Females (111)
- Marital Status
  - Married (284)
  - Unmarried (46)
- Location of the School
  - Urban teachers (257)
  - Rural teachers (73)
- Type of the School
  - Govt. School teacher (209)
  - Pvt. School teacher (121)
- Teachers' training
  - Trained teachers (275)
  - Untrained teachers (28)
  - Vocational trainees (27)
- Category of School
  - Day School teachers (277)
  - Day-Boarding School teachers (26)
  - Residential School teachers (27)
- Stream
  - Humanities (195)
  - Science (98)
  - Commerce (10)
  - Vocational trainees (27)

Fig. 4: SPLIT OF SAMPLE
3.3 Tools:

The following tools were employed by the investigator for the study:

2. 16 PF Questionnaire by Cattell & Eber (1967).

Description of Tools

3.3.1 Job-Satisfaction Scale by Singh & Sharma (1986):

Introduction: Many researchers have tried to measure the quantum of Job-Satisfaction in the workers. But most of the measuring tools have been constructed and applied on industrial workers and not on different categories of employees in different walks of life. There was no such tool which could be used to find the Job-Satisfaction of any category of employees all at one time. This scale is comprehensive and omnibus in nature. Hence this scale was chosen to find Job-Satisfaction of teachers. This scale has only 30 statements. All the statements are clear, distinct & concept based. Each statement has five alternatives from which the respondent has to choose any one which candidly expresses his response.
Instructions: The instructions are printed on the cover page of the scale. These were read out before the subjects. They were told not to give a longer thought over any statement. They were requested to act spontaneously and to deal with all the statements.

Administration: The scale was administered in full by establishing proper rapport with the subjects.

Scoring: The scale has both positive and negative statements. Items at sr. No. 4, 13, 20, 21, 27 and 28 are negative. Others are positive. The positive statements carry a weightage of 4, 3, 2, 1 and 0 and the negative ones a weightage of 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4. The total score gives a quick measure of satisfaction/dissatisfaction of a worker towards his job. As indicated earlier by adding the score on particular statements, satisfaction/dissatisfaction can also be found in particular areas say financial or job inherent and so on.

The following table shows the degree of satisfaction among workers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Degree of Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74 or above</td>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-73</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-62</td>
<td>Moderately satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-55</td>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 or below</td>
<td>Extremely Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability: The test-retest reliability works out to be 0.978 with N=52 and a gap of 25 days.

Validity: The scale compares favourably with Muthayya's Job-Satisfaction Questionnaire giving a validity coefficient of 0.743. Moreover, the satisfaction measures obtained from this scale have a close resemblance to the ratings given to the employees on a 3-point scale: fully satisfied, average satisfied, dissatisfied by the employers. The coefficient of correlation was .812 (N=52).

3.3.2 16 PF Questionnaire by Cattell & Eber, (1967):

The sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 PF) is an objectively scorable test devised to give the most complete coverage of personality possible in a brief time. Each of the Primary factors measured by the 16 PF has alphabetical designation (A through Q4). In addition to the sixteen factors, the test can be used as measure of eight secondary dimensions which are broader traits scorable from the component factors. The questions numbering 187 are arranged in roughly cyclic order determined by a plan to give maximum convenience in scoring by stencil and to ensure variety and interest for the examinees. Three alternative answers are provided for each of the questions, since the two alternatives "forced choice" situations, forbidding any "middle of the road" Compromise tends to force a distorted
distribution and may produce aversion to the best on part of
the examinee.

**Capsule description of 16 PFs:**

**Factor A:** Reserved (Sizothymia, Previously Schizothymia) Vs Outgoing (Affectothymia, Previously Cyclothymia).

'Reserved' has been described as detached, critical and cool whereas, 'outgoing' has been described as warm-hearted, easy-going and participating. A person scoring low on Factor A tends to be stiff, cool, skeptical and aloof, liking things rather than people, working alone and avoiding compromises of viewpoints, likes to be precise and "rigid" in his ways of doing things. He may at times be critical, obstructive and hard.

A person scoring high a Factor A is good-natured, easy-going, emotionally expressive, ready to cooperate, attentive to people, soft-hearted, kind, adaptable, likes occupations dealing with people and socially-impressive situations, readily forms active groups, generous in personal relations, less afraid of criticism, and better able to remember names of people.

**Factor B:** Less Intelligent (Lower scholastic mental capacity) Vs More Intelligent (higher scholastic mental capacity).
'Less Intelligent' is described as having concrete thinking, and 'More Intelligent' as given to abstract thinking and bright. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be slow to learn and grasp, dull, given to concrete and literal interpretation. His dullness may be a reflection of his low intelligence or poor functioning due to psychopathology.

A person scoring high on this factor tends to be quick to grasp ideas, a fast learner and intelligent. High scores contraindicate deterioration of mental functions in pathological conditions.

Factor C: Affected by feelings (lower ego strength) Vs Emotionally Stable (Higher ego strength).

Factor C has been described as indicating emotionally less stable, easily upset Vs facing reality, calm and mature. A person scoring low on this factor is in frustration, tolerance for unsatisfactory conditions, changeable and plastic, evading necessary reality demands, neurotically fatigued, fretful, emotional and annoyed, active in dissatisfaction, having neurotic symptoms (phobias, sleep disturbances, psychosomatic complaints etc.).

A person scoring high on this factor is emotionally mature, stable, realistic about life, unruffled, possessing ego strength, and better able to maintain solid group morale.
Factor E: Humble (submissiveness) Vs Assertive (dominance).

'Humble' is described as being mild, accommodating and conforming, whereas, 'Assertive' is described as independent, aggressive and stubborn. A person scoring low on Factor E tends to give way to others, to be docile, and to conform, is often dependent, confessing and anxious for obsessional correctness.

A person scoring high on Factor E is assertive, self-assured, independent-minded, austere, a law to himself, hostile or extra-punitive, authoritarian (managing others), and disregards authority.

Factor F: Sober (desurgency) vs Happy-go-lucky (Surgency).

This factor has been indicative of being prudent, serious, and taciturn Vs impulsively lively, gay and enthusiastic. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be restrained, reticent, introspective, pessimistic, unduly deliberate; is considered smug, sober and dependable.

A person who scores high on this trait is cheerful, active, talkative, frank, expressive, effervescent, carefree, frequently chosen as an elected leader, impulsive and mercurial.

Factor G: Expedient (Weaker superego strength) Vs Conscientious (stronger superego strength).
This personality dimension is described as evading rules, feels few obligations Vs persevering, staid and rule bound. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be unsteady in purpose, is often casual, lacks effort for group undertakings and cultural demands. His freedom from group influence may lead to anti-social acts. But at times makes him more effective, while his refusal to be bound by rules causes him to have less somatic upsets from stress.

A person scoring high on this factor tends to be exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty persevering, responsible planful, usually conscientious and moralistic, prefers company of hard-working people than the witty.

Factor H: Shy (threctia) Vs Venturesome (Parmia).

'Shy' is described as being restrained, diffident and timid, whereas, 'Venturesome' is described as socially bold, uninhibited and spontaneous. A person scoring low on this factor is Shy, withdrawing, cautious, retiring, a "Wall flower", usually has inferiority feelings, is slow, dislikes occupations with personal contacts, prefers one or two close friends to large group, not given to keeping in contact with all that is going around him.

A person scoring high on this factor is sociable, bold, ready to try things, spontaneous, abundant in emotional
response. His 'thick-skinnedness' enables him to face wear and tear in dealing with people and gruelling emotional situations without fatigue; he is 'pushy' and actively interested in the opposite sex.

Factor I: Tough-minded (harria) Vs Tender-minded (premsia) i.e. self-reliant, realistic, no-nonsense Vs dependent, over-protected, sensitive.

A person scoring low on Factor I, tends to be practical, realistic, masculine, independent, responsible, but skeptical of subjective and cultural elaborations, unmoved, hard, cynical and smug. He often keeps a group operating on a practical and realistic "no-nonsense" basis.

A person scoring high on Factor I tends to be tender-minded, day-dreaming, artistic, fastidious, feminine, sometimes demanding help and attention, impatient, impractical, dislikes crude people and rough occupations, slows up group performance, and upsets group morale by unrealistic fussiness.

Factor L: Trusting (alaxia) Vs Suspicious (protension) i.e. adaptable, free of jealousy, easy to get along with vs Self-opinionated and hard to fool.

A person scoring low on this factor tends to be free of jealous tendencies, adaptable, cheerful, uncompetitive, concerned about other people, and a good team worker.
A person scoring high on this factor tends to be mistrustful and doubtful, involved in his own ego, self-opinionated, interested in internal and mental life, deliberate in his actions, unconcerned about other people, and a team member.

Factor M: Practical (praxernia) vs Imaginative (autia).

'Practical' is described as careful, conventional, regulated by external realities whereas 'Imaginative' is described as wrapped up in inner urgencies, careless of practical matters, and bohemian. A person scoring low on this factor is anxious to do the right things, attentive to practical matters, and subject to the dictation of what is obviously possible, concerned about details, able to keep his head in emergencies, but sometimes unimaginative.

A person scoring high on this factor is unconventional, unconcerned over everyday matters, bohemian, self-motivated, imaginatively-creative, concerned with "essentials", oblivious of particular people, and physical realities. His inner-directed interests sometimes lead to unrealistic situations accompanied by expressive outburst, his individuality causes him to be rejected in group activities.

Factor N: Forthright (artlessness) Vs. Shrewd (Shrewdness)

'Forthright' is described as natural, artless, and sentimental Vs. Calculating, worldly, and penetrating. A
person scoring low on this factor is unsophisticated, sentimental, simple, sometimes crude, awkward, easily pleased, content with what comes, is natural and spontaneous.

A person scoring high on this factor tends to be polished, experienced, worldly, shrewd, hardheaded, analytical, intellectual and has unsentimental approach to situations.

Factor 0: Placid (untroubled adequacy) Vs. Apprehensive (guilt proneness).

This factor indicates self-assured, confident, and serene Vs. worrying, depressive, and troubled personality dimension. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be placid with unshakeable nerve, mature, unanxious, has confidence in himself and his capacity to deal with him, resilient, secure, insensitive when a group is not going along with him, which evokes in him antipathies and distrust.

A person scoring high on this factor tends to be depressed, moody, worrier, full of foreboding, brooding, having childlike tendency to anxiety in difficulties, and does not feel accepted in groups or free to participate.

Factor $Q_1$: Conservative (conservatism) Vs. Experimenting (radicalism).

Further $Q_1$ relates to respecting established ideas,
tolerant of traditional difficulties Vs. Critical, liberal, analytical, and given to free thinking dimension of personality. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be confident, accepts the "tried and true" despite inconsistencies when something else might be better, cautious, compromising regarding new ideas, tends to oppose and postpone change, goes along with tradition, more conservative in religion and politics, not interested in analytical "intellectual" thought.

A person scoring high on Factor Q₁ tends to be interested in intellectual matters and has doubts on fundamental issues. He is skeptical and inquiring regarding ideas either old or new, is more well informed, less inclined to moralize, more inclined to experiment in life, and more tolerant of inconvenience and change.

Factor Q₂: Group Dependent (Group Adherence) Vs. Self-Sufficient (Self-sufficiency) i.e. A 'Joiner' and sound follower Vs. prefers own decisions, and resourceful.

A person scoring low on Factor Q₂ prefers to work, makes decisions with other people, likes and depends on social approval and admiration, goes along with the group, not necessarily gregarious by choice and needs group support.

A person scoring high on Factor Q₂ is temperamentally
independent, accustomed to going his own way, making decisions and taking action on his own, discounts public opinion, not dominant in his relations with others, does not dislike people but simply does not need their agreement or support.

Factor Q₃ : Undisciplined Self-conflict (low integration) Vs. Controlled (high self-concept control). i.e. careless or protocol, follows own urges Vs. Socially precise and following self-image.

A person scoring low on this factor is not bothered with will-control and regard for social demands, not overly considerate, careful, or painstaking, and feels maladjusted.

A person scoring high on this factor has strong control of his emotions and general behaviour, is socially aware, careful and self-respecting. However, he tends sometimes to be obstinate.

Factor Q₄ : Relaxed (low ergic tension) Vs. Tense (high ergic tension).

'Relaxed' is described as tranquil, torpid and unfrustrated Vs. frustrated, driven and over-wrought. A person scoring low on this factor tends to be sedate, relaxed, composed, satisfied (not frustrated). Sometimes, over-satisfaction can lead to laziness and low performance, as also low motivation which leads to little trial and error.
A person scoring high on this factor tends to be tense, excitable, restless, fretful, impatient, often fatigued, is unable to remain inactive, takes a poor view of the degree of unity, orderliness, leadership, his frustration represents an excess of stimulated but undischarged drive.

Instructions: Simple and clear instructions are printed for the examinees on the cover page of the test booklet. The instructions were reinforced by orally reiterating that the examinee will, in the long run, be doing himself most good by being frank and honest in describing himself. Answers were asked to be given on a separate answersheet.

Administration: The time given for the administration of the test was 45-60 minutes. Although the test is virtually self-administering, but it was done by establishing good "rapport" with the examinees.

Scoring: Hand scoring was accomplished by Key, easily, rapidly and in a standard manner. The answers appeared as pencil marks in the boxes on the given answer-sheets. Two cardboard stencil scoring keys were used: one covering factors (traits) A,C,F,H,L, N,Q₁ and Q₃ and other factors B,E,G,I,M,O,Q₂ and Q₄. Simply stencil-1 was fitted over the answer sheet and marks counted visible through the holes for Factor A, allowing either 2 or 1, as indicated by the number printed adjacent to the hole. The score was summed and the
total entered in the space indicated by the arrow on the stencil for Factor A (raw score). It is to be noted here that Factor B (intelligence) is peculiar in that each correct mark visible in a hole gives a score of 1 only.

Reliability: The test-retest reliability of this test (after 6 days) as reported in the manual, on 146 adults (25-45 years) was found to range from .82 to .93 and on 132 students (after a gap of 2 months) it was found to range from .63 to .88.

Validity: The concept or construct validity of the questionnaire is +.85 which is an acceptable level for the purpose for which it was constructed.

3.3.3 Sinha’s Comprehensive Anxiety Test by Sinha & Sinha (1990):

On the examination of the tests of anxiety in existence (both Indian and Foreign), the present authors (Sinha and Sinha, 1990) found that these were not covering certain facets of anxiety. Further existed a good deal of disagreements and confusion concerning the concept of anxiety. Several aspects of anxiety appeared to be ignored. All these considerations led to the development of this comprehensive test of anxiety incorporating a variety of anxiety indices proposed by different investigators from time to time, keeping in view the conditions available in the country.
Instructions: The instructions about the test were made clear by the test administrator to the testee. No time limit was fixed for completing the test. However, usually an individual takes 15 to 20 minutes in completing the test form. It was emphasized that there is no right or wrong response to the statements. They are designed to study individual’s reactions to different situations. It was pointed out that each item has Yes or No, and that no statement should be left out.

Scoring: The inventory was scored accurately by hand and no scoring key or stencil is provided so far. For any response indicated as 'Yes', the testee was awarded the score of one, and Zero for 'No'. The sum of all the positive or Yes responses was the total anxiety score of the individual. Norms for the test have been prepared on a sample of 400 college students of BA classes consisting of both the sexes - 200 Boys and 200 Girls. Percentile norms are provided as shown below for boys and girls separately. These were considered as a reference point for interpreting the test scores.

Percentile equivalents of Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentiles</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Extremely High Anxiety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentiles</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 (Q3)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27 High Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 (Md)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23 Normal Anxiety Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 (Q1)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15 Low Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>09 Extremely Low Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N          | 200    | 200            |
| Mean       | 22.33  | 23.05          |
| Median     | 19.94  | 22.86          |
| S.D.       | 12.40  | 10.90          |

Reliability: The coefficient of reliability was determined by using the following two methods:

1. The test-retest method (N=100) was employed to determine the temporal stability of test. The product moment correlation between the test and retest scores was 0.85.
2. The internal consistancy reliability was ascertained by adopting odd-even procedure (N=100). Using the Spearman Brown formula, the reliability coefficient of the test was found to be 0.92. Both the values ensure a high reliability of the test.

Validity: The coefficient of validity was determined by computing the coefficient of correlations between scores on Comprehensive Anxiety Tests and on Taylor's Manifest Anxiety Scale. It was 0.62, which is significant beyond .001 level of confidence.

3.3.4 PGI General Well-Being Measure by Verma, (1989):

This scale has 20 items and suits Indian conditions. Items have been tested through "thinking aloud method" for their suitability. Its difficulty value judged by "underlining test" and was found to be quite low and highly satisfactory. It was well accepted and took very little time to administer. The scoring was easy-just counting the number of ticks (/) with scores ranging from 0 to 20. People were found to be all score range levels.

Instructions: How do you feel these days (past one month)? kindly tick (/) the items applicable to you.

Administration: This scale was administered after establishing rapport with the subjects, and ensuring privacy (Free from distraction of any kind) although the nature of
the items are such as are not likely to cause any embarrassment to the subjects in the presence of others.

Scoring: Number of ticks are counted and constitutes Well-Being score of that particular individual at that time.

The administration and scoring takes hardly 5-6 minutes per subjects.

Reliability: It was measured by K.R. 20 formula and was found to be 0.98 \((p<.01)\) (Verma, Dube and Gupta, 1983), while test-retest reliability was 0.91 \((p<.01)\) (Moudgil et al., 1986) for the English Version and 0.96 \((p<.01)\) for the Hindi Version (Moudgil et al., 1986).

Validity: The test was correlated with a number of tests in different studies. These are summarised as below:

**Correlations with other tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Other tests</th>
<th>Test Variable</th>
<th>Correlations Reported by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td>of the two scales</td>
<td><strong>Mahajan &amp; Verma</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>a) Positive Score +.53</td>
<td><strong>Verma</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Negative Score -.15</td>
<td><strong>(1989)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Modified Score +.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Hindi PEN</td>
<td>Psychoticism</td>
<td>.02 Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.17 Dube &amp; Gupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.No.</td>
<td>Other tests</td>
<td>Test Variable</td>
<td>Correlations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lie</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>PGI Quality of Life</td>
<td>Quality of Life Scale score</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p<.05 ** p<.01
3.4 Different abbreviations used during the study:

1. JS : Job Satisfaction
2. AX : Anxiety
3. WB : Well-Being
4. 16PFs : 16 Personality factors
5. Factor A : Reserved Vs Outgoing
6. Factor B : Less intelligent Vs More intelligent
7. Factor C : Affected by feelings Vs Emotionally stable
8. Factor E : Humble Vs Assertive
9. Factor F : Sober Vs Happy-go-lucky
10. Factor G : Expedient Vs conscientious
11. Factor H : Shy Vs Venturesome
12. Factor I : Tough-minded Vs Tender-minded
13. Factor L : Trusting Vs Suspicious
14. Factor M : Practical Vs Imaginative
15. Factor N : Forthright Vs Shrewd
16. Factor O : Placid Vs Apprehensive
17. Factor Q1 : Conservative Vs Experimenting
18. Factor Q2 : Group-dependent Vs Self-sufficient
19. Factor Q3 : Undisciplined self-conflict Vs Controlled
20. Factor Q4 : Relaxed Vs Tense
21. SCAT : Sinha’s Comprehensive Anxiety Test
22. JSS : Job Satisfaction Scale
23. TRD : Trained
24. UTRD : Untrained
25. VOC : Vocational
26. DS : Day School
27. DBS : Day Boarding School
28. RS : Residential School
29. H : Humanities
30. S : Science
31. C : Commerce
32. V : Vocational
### 3.5 Different Codes used for the variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>V_1</td>
<td>JS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>V_2</td>
<td>AX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>V_3</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>V_4</td>
<td>Factor A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>V_5</td>
<td>Factor B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>V_6</td>
<td>Factor C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>V_7</td>
<td>Factor E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>V_8</td>
<td>Factor F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>V_9</td>
<td>Factor G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>V_{10}</td>
<td>Factor H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>V_{11}</td>
<td>Factor I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>V_{12}</td>
<td>Factor L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>V_{13}</td>
<td>Factor M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>V_{14}</td>
<td>Factor N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>V_{15}</td>
<td>Factor O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>V_{16}</td>
<td>Factor Q_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>V_{17}</td>
<td>Factor Q_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>V_{18}</td>
<td>Factor Q_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>V_{19}</td>
<td>Factor Q_4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>