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INTRODUCTION

Research methods are most important aspect in the process of research. It speaks about the various steps used in solving research problems. These steps are methods of study, sample taken, tools used to collect data, procedure adopted to collect data, quantification of data, analysis and interpretation of data. In the present chapter various aspects of the methodology have been discussed.

METHODS OF STUDY

In the present study the investigator has used descriptive method. According to Best (1978):

"A descriptive study describes and interprets what is. It is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident or trends that are developing" (Best, 1978, P-116)

Since data are collected through survey, this method is popularly known as survey method. In the field of social science most of researches adopt survey and case study method. In survey
extensive dealing with a large number of cases at a particular period of time are taken into account. In the present study survey method has been used and the findings would be of use for the progress of higher education in general and higher education in the state of Orissa in particular.

Sample:

In the present study the following samples of data were collected.

I. Political Elites:

50 political elites were interviewed through pre-prepared interview schedule to get data related to the present study. The political elites, selected for the purpose of sampling, were sitting M.Ps., Ex-M.Ps, sitting M.L.As and ex-M.L.As. of different constituencies of the State of Orissa.

II. Heads of the Colleges:

50 Principals of different Government and Private Colleges of the state were interviewed for the purpose of the present study. Where the principal post was lying vacant, the person who was functioning as principal of the Institute were interviewed. Pre-prepared interview schedules were used and data was collected.
III. President / Secretary of the College Union:

Either the President or the Secretary of the College Union was interviewed to collect data for the study. In total 50 Presidents/Secretary were interviewed from different colleges.

It is worthwhile to note that total 50 colleges (Government plus private) were randomly selected and data were collected. From the same college the principal, president / secretary were interviewed. Where the president / secretary were not in the chair due to completion of their session the vice-president/asst. secretary was interviewed to collect data.

TOOLS USED

The following tools were used to collect data for the present study.

A. Interview schedule for the Political Elites:

The interview schedule was developed in consultation with the experts. The interview schedule has two parts. The Section-A deals with the general information about the political elites and the Section-B deals with the different areas in which the political elites interfere in the college foundation, administration etc. The interview schedule was prepared in simple English language and has been given in Appendix 'A'.
B. Interview Schedule for the Principals:

The interview schedule for the principals of different colleges was also developed in consultation with the experts. The Section -A of the schedule intended to collect different information about the principal / principal – in – charge of the College. The section-B of the interview schedule was same as that of the political elites, but with different wordings to reply. The copy of the interview schedule has been given in Appendix –‘B’.

C. Interview Schedule for the presidents / secretaries of the college union.

The interview schedule used to collect data from the presidents and secretaries of the college union was also prepared in consultation with the experts. It has two parts. The Section –A collects the general bio-data of the president /secretary, whereas the Section-B, was just same as that, of the political elites with different wordings to answer. The interview schedule was prepared in simple English Language. The copy of the interview schedule has been given in Appendix-‘C’.
PROCEDURE FOR DATA COLLECTION

The investigator personally went to each respondent such as M.L.A.s, M.P.s, principals, vice-principals, presidents and secretaries of the college union. She explained them the purpose of the interview. She explained the questions contained in the interview schedule, explained the model of answer and marked the replies of the respondents on the interview schedule. It is worthwhile to note that almost all the respondents cordially accepted the investigator and responded freely.

The investigator was satisfied that the responses were genuine and correct. After collection of data the investigator tabulated data in different tables for analysis and interpretation.

VALIDITY OF THE DATA GATHERING TOOLS

Before the measuring device is used, its validity should be assessed; else all the efforts may go in vain.

Mursell (1948) says, “All measurement is subjected to constant errors ..........so any measuring device must be valid (P=228).

To validate questionnaires Mouley (1970) says, “At the most elementary level, it is necessary for all questionnaires to have
content validity i.e. each question must be related to the topic under investigation, there must be an adequate converge of the over all topic, the questions must be clear and unambiguous etc. A more adequate approach to validation consists of checking the agreement between the responses elicited by the questionnaire and criterion”.

The investigator read different thesis, journals, books, research reports etc. and prepared a draft interview schedules used to elicit responses from the political elites, principals, presidents and secretaries of the college union. Then, she showed the said schedules to a panel of experts (list given in Appendix-D). The investigator requested the experts to go through the schedules and suggest modifications, if any, with respect to adequate coverage of redundancy, ambiguity in the questions, difficulty to understand the words in the questions, poor phrasing, unrelated questions etc. The experts extended their helping hands and gave valuable comments for modification of the schedules. Accordingly the investigator made necessary correction in the interview schedules and prepared the final draft of the schedules. As all the interview schedules were prepared taking valuable suggestions of the esteemed experts in to consideration, the interview schedules claim to have content validity.
RELIABILITY OF THE DATA GATHERING TOOLS

The second important characteristic of a measuring device is its reliability. When validity speaks about the degrees to which the contents of the devices agree with the objectives, the reliability speaks about the agreement of the contents of the device with itself. According to Mursel (1948), "All measurement is subject to variable errors ........ so psychometric instruments must have a serviceable degree of reliability" (P-28-29). This indicates that the schedule used should have serviceable degree of reliability. According to Remmer et. al (1955), "A test may be reliable, but it may not be valid, but when it is valid, it must be reliable" (P-22).

Since all the interview schedules were prepared taking the valuable suggestions of the learned experts and claimed content validity, they do have also serviceable degree of reliability.

It is worth mentioning in this connection, that, the schedules so designed were first pre-tested, in one of the local colleges, to make sure that, the desired information is available and the respondents co-operation would be forthcoming without reservations. This pre-testing made us confident of gathering the right type of responses for subsequent tabulation and analysis.

METHODOS OF ANALYSIS OF DATA

Before analysis, the investigator quantified the data collected in the following way.
1. Quantification of Data:

The data collected in Section ‘A’ of the three interview schedules were analyzed adopting percentage techniques. The data collection in the section ‘B’ of the three interview schedules were quantified as follows:-

The Section ‘B’ of all three schedules contains questions related to role of political elites in the higher general education. The questions have been grouped under 8 different areas such as (1) foundation of the college (ii) admission of the student’s (iii) College election (iv) Curricular activities (v) co-curricular activities (vi) examination and evaluation (vii) finance and (viii) administration. Each area contains several questions. For each question there are five choice answers and the respondents were asked to choose one of the answers and reply for each question of each section. The quantification was made for each question as per the numbers of responses to each choice answer. For example consider the question No.1 of the foundation area. It has five choice answers, viz. “Always”, “Most of the times”, “Some times” “Rarely”, ‘Never”. As per the suggestion of the experts 4 points were given to “Always” 3 points were given to “Most of the times” 2 point were given to “Some times” 1 point was given to “Rarely”, and 0 point was given
to 'Never' responses. Suppose, out of the 50 respondents of political elites, 10 responded to "Always", 10 responded to "Most of the times", 5 responded to "sometimes", 15 responded to "rarely" and 10 responded to "Never", then the total score for that item would be:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Always} & \quad -10 \times 4 = 40 \\
\text{Most of the times} & \quad 10 \times 3 = 30 \\
\text{Sometimes} & \quad 5 \times 2 = 10 \\
\text{Rarely} & \quad 15 \times 1 = 15 \\
\text{Never} & \quad 10 \times 0 = 0 \\
\text{Total} & \quad = 95
\end{align*}
\]

For all the items of all these 8 areas, the points or scores were calculated following above procedure. Then the total scores for each of the area were calculated by adding scores of all the items in that area. The mean score for that area was calculated by dividing the total score of the area by the number of items contained in that area. For all the areas of the all the three schedules the mean scores were calculated in the similar way and tabulated in different tables for analysis and necessary interpretation. The analysis of data was made using percentage techniques.