CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Apart from the knowledge already provided in Chapter I about meaning, nature, objectives and hypotheses of the present study, it has become very necessary to the investigator to shed light upon the method and procedure adopted for investigation. The purpose of the present study was to know the effect of certain variables like personality factors, adjustment, job satisfaction, experience, and the risk taking behaviour and also their relationship with the administrative success or administrative effectiveness of the either sex principals of the different types of the secondary schools. BEST\(^1\), in his book has mentioned the methods of educational research under three heads, viz., Historical, Experimental, and Descriptive. In the historical research, the historical method is used which is based on the concept of WHAT WAS? There are many problems which are to be faced by the investigator in finding out
the correct data. This difficulty arises because the individuals who participated in the historical event have passed away and the person who reported these events have also died. In this condition, it is very difficult to have correct reports and the problem is how to get the correct informations? Anyhow one has to depend on the available sources. In the experimental method we have to take the problems where the future has to be decided under some imposed conditions. The main motive is WHAT WILL happen? It is to be answered through the experimentation by the investigators. In the descriptive method of research we are concerned with the present times, i.e., the method is based on the concept WHAT IS? This method covers the survey type of researches related to the current and emerging problems in the fields of education, public opinion surveys, market surveys, motivation research, case study, community research, casual comparative studies, activity analysis, time and motion study, content or document analysis, the follow-up studies, trend studies etc. The main difficulty in this method arises in the collecting of data. Sometimes the respondents give the responses which are conventional, i.e., to say that the respondents may conceal or colour the
actual facts in a manner not to affect his/her private or personal life. So in this type of research we take a large sample of study and we mainly depend on the responses received and the generalizations so made. Through the use of adequate and standardised psychological tests, questionnaires, inventories, observations, interviews etc. as the tools of research in a manner to restore the reliability and validity of the results thus obtained. Hence, this descriptive method is most commonly used in a large number of studies. The descriptive method is also referred to as the Normative Survey method. The word survey has been derived from the words 'Sur' or 'Sor' and 'Veeir' or 'Veior' which means 'over' and 'see' respectively. Normative Survey deals with 'WHAT IS'. Its scope is very vast. It describes and interprets what exists at present. In a Normative Survey we are concerned with conditions or relationship that exist; practices that prevail, beliefs, points of view or attitudes that are held, processes that are going on, influences that are being felt and trends that are developing. Writers have used various terms like 'Normative' 'Descriptive','Survey','Status' or 'Trend' to describe such type of investigations. JOHN W. BEST
has preferred to use the term 'Descriptive Research'; CARTER V. GOOD prefers the term 'Descriptive - Survey Studies'. According to WEBSTER'S NEW COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY, a survey is a 'Critical inspection, often official to provide exact information'. Here, in the present study the Normative Survey Method of research has been used.

3.1 METHODOLOGY:

The whole project was so organised that it could be carried out systematically. With this view, the following steps were taken:

(a) Suitable tools were selected.

(b) The collected data were arranged into different groups, i.e., Male/Female, Urban/Rural and also the schoolwise, i.e., the different types of schools, viz., Private Schools, Government Schools, Central School, and Missionary Schools.

(c) The collected data were treated statistically and the results so obtained were analysed.

(d) The evaluation of the obtained results were discussed and assessed in the light of the other related studies.
(e) Finally, to conclude the hypotheses were tested and the findings of the present study were listed along with its educational implications and suggestions.

3.2 POPULATION :

The population of the present study was both Male and Female Principals of the different types of the Secondary Schools of the Moradabad Division.

3.3 SAMPLE :

The sample was selected randomly. The investigator could select 84 Principals (60 Male and 24 Female) from the different types of the Secondary Schools and these Principals were rated by 504 teachers of the aforesaid schools of the Moradabad Division.

3.4 (A) TOOLS USED :

The following tools were used to collect the necessary data:

(i) CATTELL'S 16 PF Questionnaire (Hindi version
by KAPUR².

(i) Principal's Behaviour (Administrative Grounds) Questionnaire.
   - By Dr. Y.K. GUPTA AND INVESTIGATOR.

(iii) Principal's Adjustment Inventory.
      - By Dr. RAM LAKSHAN VISWAKARMA & INVESTIGATOR.

(iv) Principal's Job Satisfaction Questionnaire.
      - By Dr. Y.K. GUPTA AND INVESTIGATOR.

(v) Behaviour Prediction Scale (Measures of Risk Taking Behaviour).
    - By Dr. Y.K. GUPTA AND INVESTIGATOR.

(vi) Administrative Experience shall be determined with the help of the records available and/or the information given by the Principals themselves in this regard.

3.4 (B) DESCRIPTION OF THE TOOLS :

(i) CATTELL'S 16 PF QUESTIONNAIRE :

This test was prepared by RAYMOND B. CATTELL and HERBERT W. EBER. This is an objectively scorarable test devised by basic research in Psychology to give
the most complete coverage of personality possible. Coverage of personality is ensured by the sixteen functionally, independent and psychologically meaningful dimensions isolated by over 20 years of factor analytic research on normal and clinical groups. The authors gave the technical terms for these dimensions as A, B, C, E, F, G, H, I, L, M, N, O, O₁, O₂, O₃, & O₄. In addition to these sixteen primary factors, the test can be used as a measure of four (sometimes more) secondary dimensions which are separable from the component primary factors. These secondary dimensions of personality are: (i) Anxiety, (ii) Extraversion Alert (iii) Poise, and (iv) Independent.

Forms A and B included 137 items —— 10 to 13 items for each of the sixteen factors. The questions are arranged in a roughly cyclic order determined by a plan to give maximum convenience in scoring by stencil and to ensure variety and interest for the examinees.

The test is self-administering but it is good to establish rapport with the examinees. Answers are always made on separate answer sheets and not on
reusable test booklets. The test is untimed. The examinees have to answer all questions.

(a) TEST SCALE CONSISTENCIES:

The consistencies of the sixteen personality factors scales are given in all possible ways, namely as (i) reliabilities (dependability, that is short term test - retest correlation and also stability, that is retest after a longer interval); as (ii) homogeneities (internal); and as (iii) equivalence coefficients (between forms). The exact definitions of these coefficients are given along with that of stability and validity in the hand book.

(b) VALIDITY:

Items in the final forms are the survivors from several thousand of items originally tried and constitute only those which continued to have significant validity against the factors after three successive factor analyses on different samples. These analyses have verified the existence and natural structure of the sixteen factors and cross-validated the test item in their correlation with the factors on different adult population samples.
The validity of the test itself is meant to be a construct. That is to say, the test questions (or items) are chosen as being good measures of the personality factors. The mean correlation of all single items with the factors they represent is about +.37 and assuming a mean intercorrelation of the item of +.10, the mean correlation of each group of items with the factor it represents, that is the concept validity turns out to be about +.85, which is an acceptable performance for so brief a test.

**ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING:**

Simple and clear instructions were printed for the examinees on the coverpage of the test booklets. Although the test could be virtually Self - administered, it was considered important to establish good rapport with the examinees. Further, the instructions were reinforced by orally reiterating that the examinee will, in the long run, was doing good to himself by being frank and honest in his description of himself.

The respondents were asked to give their answers on a separate answer sheet. They were instru-
ected to enter their names, age etc., on the top of
the answer sheet and then to read the instructions on
the cover of the test booklet themselves. Initially
they had to work the four examples. About five minutes
were allowed for reading the instructions and working
the examples, or less if less time seemed sufficient.
Then the examinees were asked to turn the page and
begin.

Though, the test was untimed the examinees
were told not to tally but to give immediate answers
and move along. Educated readers usually took forty-
five to sixty minutes per form. A vigilant watch was
kept to look around and correct promptly any improper
ways of indicating answers that might later cause
difficulty in scoring. It was ascertained that the
names had been filled in before collecting the
answer sheet and that one, and only one, answer was
given for every question on the test.

Each answer scored 0, 1, or 2 points
except the factor B answers which scored 0 for inco-
rrect answers. The score of each single item contri-
buted to only one factor total.
(ii) **PRINCIPAL'S BEHAVIOUR (ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP)**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

This was prepared by the investigator and Dr. Y.K. Gupta (Lecturer, Deptt. of Education, Hindu College, Moradabad) for identifying the opinion of the teachers for their Principal's behaviour. P.B.C. (Principal's Behaviour Questionnaire) consists of 50 highly discriminating items. It is a self-administered scale. Assurance was given that replies would be kept confidential. The subject (teacher) is requested to read all instructions carefully and asked the teacher if there was any difficulty. No item would be omitted. No answer is right or wrong. There is also no time limit for the scale.

The 40 items are positively worded, and ten items (item Nos. 2, 4, 12, 20, 22, 25, 27, 31, 34, and 48) are negatively worded. Positive items are given a score of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 and negative items are given a score of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 for 'Strongly Agree', 'Agree', 'Undecided', 'Disagree', and 'Strongly Disagree' respectively. The sum of these values shows the administrative success score for the subject. The total score varies from 50
to 250 showing the least administrative success and the highest administrative success. Hence, by using this test the investigator has obtained the ratings by done by the teachers for their Principal.

**RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY**

The reliability of the scale was calculated by the test - retest method. Product moment correlation was computed and 0.85 correlation was found.

The validity of the scale was established through logical validity and criterion related validity.

(iii) **PRINCIPAL'S ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY**

This Inventory was prepared by the investigator and her supervisor Dr. Ram Lakhan Vishwakarma. Before preparing this inventory, efforts were made to find out any available and suitable tool for the present study. The investigator has gone through a number of adjustment scales but none of them was found to be suitable as no scale was available to measure the
Principal's adjustment in a college even the adult form of the "BELI ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY" was not thought to be a suitable one. Hence, the investigator has prepared this tool.

This inventory measures the Principal's adjustment in a college. Principal's adjustment has been defined as the adequacy with which the principal manages his interpersonal relations with teacher, students, community, ministerial staff (Non-teaching Staff), management and higher administrative authorities. Therefore, the investigator has taken into consideration of the above areas, viz., 1. Principal's adjustment with the students, 2. Principal's adjustment with the Staff (Teaching and Non-teaching), 3. Principal's adjustment with Management, 4. Principal's adjustment with higher administrative authorities, and 5. Principals adjustment with community.

The inventory consisted of 80 items in its first phase of pre-tryout but later the number of items were reduced and the final form of the inventory consisted only 50 items which were found to be effective and reliable. The inventory is based on a five
point scale having five response categories ranging from A to E which meant Strongly agree, Agree, Indifferent, Disagree, and Strongly disagree. It included both positive as well as negative items so that an agreement with an item would not indicate in all cases only one end of the dimension and also it was done to avoid halo effect. Then the inventory was given to the Principals to collect the response it was requested to the Principals that they should not to omit any item and were encouraged to respond honestly. They were assured that their responses would be kept confidential and will be used only for research purposes. No time limit was fixed but the Principals were asked to finish the task at their earliest. It was also disclosed to the Principals that nothing is right or wrong while answering to any of the statements (items).

The scoring was based on five-point Likert type scale designed as: Strongly agree (5), Agree (4), Indifferent (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly disagree (1) for positive items and the direction of item scores was reversed for negatively worded items and a response of Strongly agree was given score (1).
Agree (2) and so on. By using this scoring procedure, the overall adjustment score was, then, computed as the sum of the item scores. The theoretical range of scores was 50 to 250, the high score indicating greater adjustment.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY:

The reliability of the test was established through split-half method and the reliability coefficient came out to be .86.

The validity of the test was established through content validity since the purpose of the investigator was to measure the adjustment of the Principals in their institutions, the content validity was thought to be the most appropriate as stated by NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON TEST STANDARDS in USA that "Content Validity is especially important for achievement and proficiency measures and for measures of adjustment or social behaviour based observation in selected situations". Also, "all types of validity are based ultimately on the content validity of some measurement procedures". Hence, the test items
were given to some expert in the field of education and psychology to get their reactions about the suitability of each item included in the inventory. Perfect agreement was found to be existing among experts regarding the suitability of each item in the inventory.

The test, thus, can be said to possess content validity. Due to paucity of time the statistical validity of the test items could not, however, be measured.

(iv) **PRINCIPAL'S JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE**

This was prepared by the investigator and DR. Y.K. GUPTA (Lecturer, Deptt. of Education, Hindu College, Moradabad) for measuring the level of Job Satisfaction of Principals. This scale consists of 45 items. The scale can be self administered. Respondents were given due assurance that their replies would be kept confidential. The subject (Principal) was requested to read all the instructions carefully and the Principals were asked for any of the difficulty if they feel in this regard. If so, it was clarified by the investigator and so the difficulty, if arisen, was solved simultaneously. No items would be omitted and no answer was right or wrong for any of the items.
of the scale. there was no time limit for the scale.

**SCORING:**

There are 45 items out of which 35 items are positively worded and 10 items 3, 10, 11, 28, 35, 38, 39, 40, 42, 45 are negatively worded. Positive items are given a score 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 and negative items are given a score 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 for 'Strongly Agree', 'Agree', 'Undecided', 'Disagree' and 'Strongly Disagree', respectively. The sum of these values show the Job Satisfaction Score for the subject.

The total score varies from 45 to 225 showing the least satisfied to highly satisfied with their job.

**RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY:**

The test - retest reliability came out to be 0.96 with N=50. The Scale compares favourably with MUTHAYYA'S Job Satisfaction Questionnaire giving a validity coefficient of .743.
(v) **BEHAVIOUR PREDICTION SCALE (MEASURES OF RISK TAKING BEHAVIOUR)** :

This scale was prepared by the investigator and Dr. Y.K. GUPTA (Ref. given in Tool Nos. ii & iv).

It is a semi projective measure of risk-taking behaviour and is based on "Choice - Delimma Procedure" (KOGAN and "MALLACK") and a verbal measure of Risk Taking (DR. N.P. CHAUBEY), Indian Academy of Social Science, Allahabad. The tool was developed by DR. CHAUBEY specially for the problems of rural areas, while an attention has been paid here to prepare this tool to cover the problems of Urban and Rural areas. It consists of 8 items. Each item is a description of a situation involving risk. In each situation, a person is confronted with two alternative course of action - one safe but less rewarding and the other is much risky but more rewarding. The subject is asked whether he would advise the person to opt for safe or more risky alternative. In order to know minimum level of probability of success for which he would recommend him to choose more risky alternative, different probabilities of success of the risky course
of action are provided below each of the situations. The probabilities listed are 1 in 10, 3 in 10, 5 in 10, 7 in 10, and 9 in 10. There is an additional response category which the subject has option to refuse to recommend the risky alternative even if its success is almost certain. It is assumed that in recommending the risky alternative, the subject is actually expressing his own attitude towards the problem, the way he would act in similar circumstances.

In developing the risk measures, problem relating to different sphere of behavioural life were selected. Initially there were 12 items out of which 4 were dropped to reduce length of the measure and also to avoid repetition of similar contents. The items, selected were related to problems such as, fighting general election, medical treatment such as heart operation, growing high - yielding seeds, investing savings in new enterprise, accepting prestigious and highly paid job, education, family planning and litigation. An example of the item is being given below:

"Ramesh grows traditional variety of seeds in his farm. The yield is hardly enough for his annual
requirements. Recently the Government Officials visited his village and advised him to grow high variety of seeds. It is possible to raise the production up to four times of the present level through it. But, it requires timely irrigation and spraying of chemical fertilizers etc. Failure to provide adequate water and fertilizer can result in lowering of the production instead of increasing it.

Suppose, you are advising Ramesh on this subject about possible probabilities of raising production through the use of high yielding seeds as listed below. Please tell the minimum probability level for which you will advise him to grow high yielding seeds.

(A) The Chances are 1 in 10 that production will rise.
(B) The Chances are 3 in 10 that production will rise.
(C) The Chances are 5 in 10 that production will rise.
(D) The Chances are 7 in 10 that production will rise.
(E) The Chances are 9 in 10 that production will rise.
(F) Ramesh should not grow high yielding seeds even if there is certainty of rising his production.
ADMINISTRATION:

This test was administered on 200 subjects, out of which 120 (80 male and 40 female) belonged to Urban areas and 80 (58 Male and 22 Female) belonged to rural areas of Moradabad district. 50 Urban male arts teachers and 30 Urban male science teachers and 25 Urban female arts teachers and 15 Urban female science teachers were taken out of 120 Urban teachers. Similarly, 40 rural male arts teachers and 18 rural male science teachers, 12 rural female arts teachers and 10 rural female science teachers were taken out of 80 rural teachers.

SCORING:

The probability level is the unit of measurement. The subject's score on an item is the level of probability Chosen by him for the more risky alternative. For Example, if a subject chooses the risky alternative on the probability level of 1 in 10, then he gets score 1 and if he chooses for the probability 5 in 10, then his score would be 5. Thus, scores given for the probabilities 1 in 10, 3 in 10, 5 in 10, 7 in 10, and 9 in 10
are 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 respectively. For the final category in which the subject has option to refuse to recommend the more risky alternative no matter what the chances of success are, a score of 10 is given. The total score of the subject on the test is equal to the sum of scores on all items which could range from minimum 8 to maximum 80. The low scores imply high risk and high scores represent low risk.

**RELIABILITY OF THE TEST:**

**SPEARMAN - BROWN SPLIT - HALF METHOD** for odd even items has been followed for computing the reliability coefficients. In this method the test is first divided into two equivalent 'halves' and the correlation computed for these half tests. From the reliability of the half - test, the self correlation of the whole test is then estimated with the help of given formula:

\[
\hat{r}_{11} = \frac{2r_1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{11}}{1 + r_1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{11}} \quad \text{(Spearman Brown prophecy formula)}.
\]

where \( \hat{r}_{11} = \) reliability coefficient of the whole test.
\[ \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{11} = \text{reliability coefficient of the half test.} \]

In the following table the reliability coefficients are given for the different groups of teachers:

**TABLE 3.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( r_{11} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Teachers</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Teachers</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Male Teachers</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Female Teachers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Male Teachers</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Female Teachers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Male Arts Teachers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Male Science Teachers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Female Arts Teachers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Female Science Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Male Arts Teachers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Male Science Teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Female Arts Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Female Science Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROUP</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The range .67 to .75 of reliability coefficients clearly show that the test is fairly consistent and stable.

**INTER - ITEM CORRELATIONS** :

The inter-item correlations were computed on the groups of teachers belonging to urban areas and rural areas separately. Correlations for the two groups urban and rural areas are given in Table Nos. 3.2 & 3.3.

**TABLE - 3.2**

**INTER - ITEM COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATIONS ON THE POOLED SAMPLE OF URBAN AREAS (N=120).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Treat-</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment Agriculture</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE - 3.3

**INTER - ITEM COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION ON THE POOLED SAMPLE OF RURAL AREAS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Treatment</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE - 3.4

**COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ITEMS SCORES AND THE CRITERION MEASURE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>URBAN N=120</th>
<th>RURAL N=80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Election</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Medical Treatment</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Family Planning</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VALIDITY OF THE TEST:

Coefficient of Correlations were computed between item scores and criterion measures (i.e., a verbal measure of risk taking by M.P. CHAUHAN) for the urban and rural groups separately. It was found in most of the cases statistically significant, and in very few cases it was found not significant (TABLE-3.4).

(vi) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE:

The Administrative Experience was calculated from the information given by the Principals.

SCORING:

'1', '2', '3'--------- scores were given to the subject on '1', '2', '3'--------- years of experience respectively. Thus, the total score obtained by a subject will be equal to his experience in years.

3.5 STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES:

Mean, S.D., 't' - test, correlations are
the statistical techniques which have been used in the present investigation.

3.6 **COLLECTION OF DATA**

The collection of data is an important aspect of the investigation because the accuracy and reliability of the investigation depend on how the data were collected, i.e., the procedure adopted by the investigator to collect the desired data. Before the investigator collects the data, he/she has to choose a specific sample from which he has to collect it. SUKHIA\(^7\) says, "During the recent years sampling has been increasingly used in education to ascertain information necessary in answering certain questions about a specific population". The researcher wanted to study whether or not there exist a relationship with the Administrative Success in relation to the Personality, Adjustment, Job Satisfaction, Experience and Risk Taking Behaviour of the either sex Principals of different types of secondary schools in Moradabad Division. Hence, the important variables were:

(a) Administrative Success,
(b) Personality,
(c) Adjustment, 
(d) Job Satisfaction, 
(e) Administrative Experience, and 
(f) Risk Taking Behaviour.

First of all, the investigator has decided about the institutions from where the data were to be collected. For the sake of convenience, it was considered proper to select about 165 secondary schools of the Moradabad Division in the first instance. But the present study was confined only to 84 Principals rated by 504 Teachers of the secondary schools. The investigator with a letter of her supervisor addressed to the concerning Principals of such schools, met the Principals and subsequently with the teachers and requested them to help the investigator by filling up the desired response sheets of the different Questionnaires/tests (already mentioned previously). In administering the different questionnaires/tests, following precautions were taken:

(i) The Principals and Teachers were asked to be calm and congenial as testing environment is created.

(ii) The Principals and Teachers were asked to read carefully all instructions given in the questionnaires/tests.
(iii) The Principals and Teachers were assured that the informations rendered by them would be kept strictly confidential so that they may disclose the right informations and may furnish their opinions without any fear.

(iv) The subjects were not allowed to talk with each other and none was allowed to copy anybody's response.

(v) No other was allowed to interfere with the subject.

In this way, the data were collected and the investigator has checked such data and finally arranged it in order to get it ready for scoring and computation.
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