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METHODOLOGY

In the previous chapter, the researcher has presented the review of related literature concerning the researches done in the area of Job Satisfaction and performance in relation to number of independent variables. In this chapter, details of methodology, which includes discussion of variables, formulation of hypothesis, tools developed and used, mode of collection of data, statistical techniques employed for analysis the data are presented.

3.1 Design of the Study:

The study has attempted to:

i. examine the relationship between the independent variables viz. Locus of Control, Achievement Motivation and Job Involvement and dependent variables viz. Job Satisfaction

ii. assess the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variables

iii. determine the interaction effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables
Further, the study attempted to explore Secondary school teachers' knowledge, understanding, attitude and experience about the dependent variables and independent variables. Thus, the study is “correlational” in nature and descriptive design has been aptly used for the preset study.

3.2 Variables Used for the Study:

A “Variable’ is a symbol to which numerals or values are assigned. According to Fox (1969) variable is a characteristic, which is given research project, can have more than one value. Tuckman (1978) defined variable as that factor, which is measured, manipulated and observed by the investigator.

Dependent Variables

A variable, which is a cause of any consequence or result then the former can be, understood as independent variable whereas the later one as dependent variable. According to Kothari (1985) “If one variable is a consequence of the other variable it is termed as a ‘dependent variable’ and the variable that is antecedent to the dependent variable is termed as ‘an independent variable’ ”.

‘Job Satisfaction’ was considered as dependent variables in the present study because it depended upon the independent variables and they represent the consequence of a change in the person studied. Further, they were observed and
measured, by the researcher, to determine their effects of the independent variables. In other words, they were 'response' or 'output' variables because they were the observed aspects of behaviour of the teachers who have been stimulated.

**Independent Variables:**

Job Involvement, Locus of Control and Achievement Motivation were regarded as the independent variables, in the present study, because they are 'stimulus' or 'input' variables operated within a person or within this environment to affect behaviour. They were factors selected by the researcher to determine their relationship to the observed phenomena. These were variables that the investigator manipulated or changed to cause changes in other variables. The researcher considered them independent because researcher was interested only in finding out the influence of the other variables.

**3.3 Operational Definitions of the Terms Used:**

**Job Satisfaction:** According to Pramod Kumar and Mutha (1975) “Job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee towards his job. These attitudes are related with specific factors such as wages, conditions of work, advancement opportunities, prompt settlement of grievances, fair treatment by employers and other fringe benefits”. Job satisfaction may be defined as an
attitude, which a result from balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job.

**Job Involvement**: It is the extent to which an individual's self-esteem is affected by his performance at work (Lodhal and Kejner, 1965). It is the degree of which an individual identifies psychologically with his persons work holds a very important position in his life and is very much personally affected by the whole job situation.

**Locus of Control**: After the publication of Rotter's (1966) article dealing with the Locus of Control concept, there has been interest in examining the relationship between locus and performance. The dynamic and reciprocal relationship is such that Locus of Control orientation influences performance was reported by Anderson (1976). It is reported by Korman (1975) that the Locus of Control has impact on Job Satisfaction also.

**Achievement Motivation**: Achievement motivation is a concern for excellence, which involves planning, excitement and a specific set of action strategies. It involves a fundamental assumption that the desire to achieve something of excellence is inherent in all beings. Achievement motivation training encourages
each individual to find his own unique way of satisfying his concern for close relationship with others or for having influence as well as for meeting personal standards of excellence.

Achievement motivation can be considered an extended person-intrinsic motivation because its reinforcement is delayed and arises from an introduction within the person. Achievement motivation is also called need for achievement. Educationally, work in need for achievement and achievement has been sparse and only moderately successful. It was demonstrated that under some circumstances high need-for achievement people will pursue longer at a challenging task.

3.4 Hypotheses:

1. Male and Female teachers of Secondary Schools do not differ significantly with respect to their Job Involvement.

2. Male and Female teachers of Secondary Schools do not differ significantly with respect to Locus of Control and its dimensions i.e.

   1. Powerful Others,
   2. Chance Control,
   3. Individual Difference

3. Male and Female teachers of Secondary Schools do not differ significantly with respect to Achievement Motivation and its dimensions i.e.
1. Long term Involvement,
2. Unique Accomplishment,
3. Standard of Excellence,
4. Desire to Excel

4. Male and Female teachers of Secondary schools do not differ significantly with respect to Job Satisfaction and its dimensions i.e.
   1. Satisfaction with Work
   2. Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies
   3. Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies
   4. Satisfaction with Authority including Management

5. Urban and Rural School teachers of Secondary Schools do not differ significantly with respect to their Job Involvement.

6. Urban and Rural school teachers of Secondary Schools do not differ significantly with respect to Locus of Control and its dimensions i.e.
   1. Powerful Others,
   2. Chance Control,
   3. Individual Difference

7. Urban and Rural school teachers of Secondary schools do not differ significantly with respect to Achievement Motivation and its dimensions i.e.
   1. Long term Involvement,
2. Unique accomplishment,
3. Standard of Excellence,
4. Desire to Excel

8. Urban and Rural school teachers of Secondary schools do not differ significantly with respect to Job Satisfaction and its dimensions i.e.
1. Satisfaction with Work
2. Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies
3. Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies
4. Satisfaction with Authority including Management

9. Teachers of Secondary schools with high and low Job Involvement do not differ significantly with respect to Locus of Control and its dimensions i.e.
1. Powerful Others, 
2. Chance Control, 
3. Individual Difference

10. Teachers of Secondary schools with high and low Job Involvement do not differ significantly with respect to Achievement Motivation and its dimensions i.e.
1. Long term Involvement,
2. Unique accomplishment,
3. Standard of Excellence,
4. Desire to Excel

11. Teachers of Secondary schools with high and low Job Involvement do not differ significantly with respect to Job Satisfaction and its dimensions i.e.

1. Satisfaction with Work

2. Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies

3. Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies

4. Satisfaction with Authority including Management

12. Teachers of Secondary schools with internal and external Locus of Control do not differ significantly with respect to their Locus of Control.

13. Teachers of Secondary schools with internal and external Locus of Control do not differ significantly with respect to Achievement Motivation and its dimensions i.e.

1. Powerful Others,

2. Chance Control,

3. Individual Difference

14. Teachers of Secondary schools with internal and external Locus of Control do not differ significantly with respect to Job Satisfaction and its dimensions i.e.

1. Satisfaction with Work

2. Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies

3. Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies
4. Satisfaction with Authority including Management

15. Teachers of Secondary schools with high and low Achievement Motivation do not differ significantly with respect to their Job Involvement.

16. Teachers of Secondary schools with high and low Achievement Motivation do not differ significantly with respect to Locus of Control and its dimensions i.e.

1. Powerful Others,
2. Chance Control,
3. Individual Difference

17. Teachers of Secondary schools with high and low Achievement Motivation do not differ significantly with respect to Job Satisfaction and its dimensions i.e.

1. Satisfaction with Work
2. Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies
3. Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies
4. Satisfaction with Authority including Management

18. There is no significant interaction effect of Gender (Male and Female), Location (Urban and Rural) and Job Involvement (High and Low) on Job Satisfaction of Secondary school teachers
19. There is no significant interaction effect of Gender (Male and Female), Location (Urban and Rural) and Locus of Control (Internal and external) on Job Satisfaction of Secondary school teachers.

20. There is no significant interaction effect of Gender (Male and Female), Location (Urban and Rural) and Achievement Motivation (High and Low) on Job Satisfaction of Secondary school teachers.

21. There is no significant interaction effect of Location (Urban and Rural), Job Involvement (High and Low) and Locus of Control (Internal and external) on Job Satisfaction of Secondary school teachers.

22. There is no significant interaction effect of Location (Urban and Rural), Job Involvement (High and Low) and Achievement Motivation (High and Low) on Job Satisfaction of Secondary school teachers.

23. There is no significant interaction effect of Job Involvement (High and Low), Locus of Control (Internal and external) and Achievement Motivation (High and Low) on Job Satisfaction of Secondary school teachers.

24. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Job Involvement of Secondary school teachers.
25. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfactions and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Locus of Control and its dimensions (i.e. Powerful Others, Chance Control and Individual Difference) of Secondary school teachers.

26. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfactions and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Achievement Motivation and its dimensions (i.e. Long term Involvement, Unique accomplishment, Standard of Excellence and Desire to Excel) of Secondary school teachers.

27. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Job Involvement of Secondary school teachers.

28. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfactions and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security
and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Locus of Control and its dimensions (i.e. Powerful Others, Chance Control and Individual Difference) of Secondary school teachers.

29. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfactions and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Achievement Motivation and its dimensions (i.e. Long term Involvement, Unique accomplishment, Standard of Excellence and Desire to Excel) of Secondary school male teachers.

30. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Job Involvement of Secondary school female teachers.

31. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfactions and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Locus of Control
and its dimensions (i.e. Powerful Others, Chance Control and Individual Difference) of Secondary school female teachers

32. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfactions and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Achievement Motivation and its dimensions (i.e. Long term Involvement, Unique accomplishment, Standard of Excellence and Desire to Excel) of Secondary school female teachers.

33. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Job Involvement of urban Secondary school teachers.

34. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfactions and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Locus of Control and its dimensions (i.e. Powerful Others, Chance Control and Individual Difference) of urban Secondary school teachers
35. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfactions and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Achievement Motivation and its dimensions (i.e. Long term Involvement, Unique accomplishment, Standard of Excellence and Desire to Excel) of urban Secondary school teachers.

36. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Job Involvement of rural Secondary school teachers.

37. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfactions and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Locus of Control and its dimensions (i.e. Powerful Others, Chance Control and Individual Difference) of rural Secondary school teachers.

38. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfactions and its dimensions (i.e. Satisfaction with Work, Satisfaction with Salary, Security
and Promotion Policies, Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and Satisfaction with Authority including Management) and Achievement Motivation and its dimensions (i.e. Long term Involvement, Unique accomplishment, Standard of Excellence and Desire to Excel) of rural Secondary school teachers.

39. Job Involvement, Locus of Control and Achievement Motivation factors are would not be significant predictors of Job Satisfaction of Secondary school teachers.

40. Job Involvement, Locus of Control and Achievement Motivation factors are would not be significant predictors of Job Satisfaction of Secondary school male teachers.

41. Job Involvement, Locus of Control and Achievement Motivation factors are would not be significant predictors of Job Satisfaction of Secondary school female teachers.

42. Job Involvement, Locus of Control and Achievement Motivation factors are would not be significant predictors of Job Satisfaction of urban Secondary school teachers.

43. Job Involvement, Locus of Control and Achievement Motivation factors are would not be significant predictors of Job Satisfaction of rural Secondary school teachers.
3.5 Population and Sample

The population of the present study consisted of all the teachers those who have been working in Secondary schools.

The total sample selected for the study comprises of 600 Secondary school teachers (300 male and 300 female teachers) from different Secondary schools of Dharwad district. The researcher has used stratified random sampling technique to select schools for the study and these schools consisted of different types of management namely Government, Private Aided and Private Unaided, Rural and Urban Secondary schools. Simple random method of sampling was adopted to collect the data. The details of the teachers sample is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of the Area</th>
<th>Type of the School</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aided</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unaided</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aided</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unaided</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Tools used for Collection of Data:

The researcher has used the following tools for collection of relevant and required data for the study,

1. Job Satisfaction Inventory developed by Pramod Kumar and Mutha (1975)
2. Job Involvement Inventory constructed by Lodahl and Kejner (1965) revalidated by Kulsum (1985) to measure Job Involvement of teachers
3. Levenson's Locus of Control Scale developed by Hall and his associates (1980) revalidated by the researcher to measure Locus of Control of teachers
4. Achievement Motivation Scale developed by the researcher with the help of the research guide

The brief description of the tools is procured below:

(i) **Job Satisfaction Inventory**: To quantify the Job Satisfaction of teachers working in Secondary schools, Job Satisfaction scale was constructed and standardized by Pramod Kumar and Mutha (1975). This questionnaire consisted 29 'yes and no' type items. These items were classified into four different aspects of Job Satisfaction in teaching (i) Satisfaction with work (ii) Satisfaction with Salary, Security and Promotion Policies (iii)
Satisfaction with Institutional Plans and Policies and (iv) Satisfaction with Authority including School Management.

Scoring: The responses in the inventory were scored ‘1’ and ‘0’ depending on the direction of the items. The sum of these values gave the Job Satisfaction score for the subject. The total score varied from 0 to 29, showing lowest Job Satisfaction to highest Job Satisfaction for the subject.

Reliability: The Spilt Half reliability of the test applying Spearmen – Brown formula is 0.95 with an index of reliability of 0.97.

(ii) Job Involvement Inventory: This inventory was developed by Lodahl and Kejner (1965) with a purpose to assess the extent of Job Involvement of teachers. This inventory contain items which bear on: concern about one’s work, importance of work activities, concerned about their quality of work, preparing oneself for job activities, job activities as a source of gratification, lack of heightened time consciousness, working hard and doing extra work. Job Involvement Inventory consists of 20 items with five alternatives namely Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly disagree.
Reliability and Validity: The authors have reported that this inventory displayed validity of two kinds. Convergent and discriminate and the inventory had the test-retest reliability ranging between 0.72 and 0.89.

The 20-item Job Involvement Inventory developed by Lodahl and Kejner (1965) has been widely used in India and regarded as a ‘reliable and valid tool’ for assessing Job Involvement.

Kulsum (1985) adopted this Job Involvement Inventory and established the reliability and validity on a sample of 180 Secondary school teachers working in Bangalore City. Both the ‘test retest’ and ‘spilt half’ methods were used and reliability was found to be 0.75 and 0.82 respectively.

(iii) Locus of Control Scale: Researcher has used Levenson’s Locus of Control Scale, which was developed by Hall and his Associates (1980). The purpose of the scale was to study internal and external Locus of Control of teachers.

It consists of 24 items with five choices ranging from Strongly Agree (SA) to Strongly Disagree (SD). Twelve of the 24 items are oriented towards external Locus of Control and 12 towards internal Locus of Control.
In the five-point scale, the responses are given weight from 1 to 5 as shown below:

5. Strongly Agree
4. Agree
3. Undecided
2. Disagree
1. Strongly Disagree

The total score of the scale ranges from 24 (internal) to 120 (external). Higher scores indicate an External Locus of Control and the lower scores indicate an Internal Locus of Control.

Co-efficient alpha internal consistency of this scale as 0.85 as reported by Hall et. al. (1980) and co-efficient alpha internal consistency of reliability was 0.78 when the tool was used by ‘Glennelle Halpin and Associates (1985)’ in their study.

This tool is being extensively used in research. The researcher has used this tool in her study by establishing its validity and reliability. This was done by involving a small sample of 50 teachers working in the Secondary schools of Hubli-Dharwad district.

**Reliability:** The results were highly satisfactory and the reliability coefficient of this tool was found to be very high i.e. 0.76. The same tool was
tried on a small sample of 50 Secondary school teachers. It was finally administered. The result was satisfactory and almost the same.

(iv) **Achievement Motivation Scale:** The large incidence of failure in the Secondary school examination has been of great concerns to not only to teacher but also to the educator.

Behaviour is achievement oriented activity is stated as being based on need for achievement. The individual definition of “success” could well be different from another. The more successful someone perceives the more likely he or she enjoys the experience and therefore to strive to build on it or repeat it in the feature.

When testing his n-Ach theory McClelland found there were some managers who despite being very senior in their organization did not have high n-Ach. McClelland explained their motivation for achieving such success through the construct nPow. Thus a persons needs to have n impact on other people.

One of the concerns of the educators has been how to maximize the Achievement Motivation of Secondary school teachers. But there few studies related to the Achievement Motivation of teachers.
The first major report of the experimental work on measurement of human motivation, particularly the Achievement Motive appeared in 1953. McClelland and his associates (1953) adapted Murray’s TAT technique (1938) for the measurement of Achievement Motive. In this technique, certain pictures are used to obtain stories for the subjects on the basis of which achievement scores were derived.

The review of related literature reveals that it is only after 1966 that efforts were made to develop some techniques for the measurement of achievement motivation. Developed a sentence completion test with three alternatives for measuring Achievement Motivation of adult males. Singh (1974) developed a short scale consisting of six items for measuring the Achievement Motivation of former soldiers.

A review of Indian test materials indicates that practically less number of inventories was developed on Achievement Motivation. It was, therefore, decided to construct a new instrument in English on Achievement Motivation with the statements for the population of secondary school teachers.

**Pooling the Statements:** The items were constructed on the basis of description of the concept in the psychological literature discussion with psychologists and the existing scales. As the purpose was to develop the
Achievement Motivation Inventory, only such of the statements pertaining to Achievement Motivation of teachers were written. All the statements possessed one of the following criteria as enunciated by McClelland (1958, 1966).

All the statements were relevant to the situations close to the teachers while preparing the statements age, sex, salary teaching experience marital status were kept in mind. The statements were direct, simple and unambiguous and directly related to the Achievement Motivation.

The 24 pairs of statements were edited and scrutinized again and again with the help of experts in that field and according to their suggestions 4 pairs of statements were excluded from the list as those statements were not related. 19 statements were retained in the final list of the inventory.

Pre-study: The final list of inventory consists of 19 pairs of statements. These statements of pairs were administered to 50 male and 50 female Secondary school teachers randomly selected. All the male and female teachers were able to respond without any difficulty. Therefore, pairs of statements retained without any modification in the inventory and the pilot study was undertaken cleared instruction were given to the top of the inventory as to what the respondents have to do.
Pilot Study: The pilot inventory was administered on a random sample of 600 teachers of Secondary schools for a pilot study.

Reliability: The Spilt half reliability of the test was found to be 0.5147.

Scoring: The scoring key was prepared along with the inventory. The right statements were given credits of one because they were related to Achievement Motivation and wrong statements (answers) were given zero.

Item Selection: Numerous methods of expressing the discriminatory power of an item have been proposed in measurement literature. As far back as 1935, Long and Standford described 23 different methods of expressing item discrimination (Dosternof; 1976), Guilford (1966) listed 19 methods for calculating item discrimination. However, methods most commonly used by test constructors for assessing item discrimination is the correlation between each item and a criterion. If the co-efficient correlation is high one would expect correspondence between the trait as measured by the test and the items score. The most commonly used co-efficient correlations with dichotomously scored times are the point biserial.
3.7 Data Collection

To collect the data, required for the study, the researcher used booklet consisting of four scales namely Achievement Motivation, Locus of Control, Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction along with Information Blank.

The researcher obtained the permission from the management, Headmasters, Headmistresses, the teachers handed over the booklet to 600 Secondary teachers. The teachers were requested to respond freely and frankly and were cursed that the responses provided by them would be kept confidential and used only for research purposes.

Information about gender difference, age, qualifications, experience, marital status, monthly salaried income, nature of employment etc. was collected on the information blank, and data relating to teachers Job Satisfaction, Locus of Control, Achievement Motivation and Job Involvement were collected.

3.8 Analysis of Data

The investigator assigned scores to the responses from the teachers in respect of Locus of Control, Achievement Motivation, Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction. The Information about socio-demographic variables general information and the scores in respect of independent and dependent variable were centred in a “Master Sheet” of data in case of the entire 600 sample. Further these
entries were transferred on the data cards, which was printed by the researcher. Data thus collected were subjected to statistical treatment. Further, data collected were fed to the computer for statistical analysis and also with a view to retain data for further research.

Statistical tools and multiple classified Analysis of Variable (ANOVA) with unequal ns' were used to compare groups among independent variables and also to determine the interaction effects of all the independent variable on the dependent variable through 2x2x2 Factorial Design. All this was possible due to review of relevant literature, which provided enough background to utilize statistical techniques appropriately.

The succeeding chapter deals with analyses and interpretation of the data.