CHAPTER -IV

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

In order to find out the relationship between the criterion measure of job satisfaction and the predictor measures of values, attitude towards teaching and teacher effectiveness for teachers educators, bi-variate correlation analysis was employed and significance of difference between the correlations was found out.

With a view to ascertain the relative contribution of values, attitude towards teaching and teacher effectiveness towards the prediction of job satisfaction and also to examine the conjoint effect of predictor variable towards the prediction of job satisfaction, different models of setup regression equations were worked out and the predictor measures, which had significant relationship with the criterion measures were taken one by one. Then the conjoint prediction for teacher educators was worked out.

SAMPLE:- Randomization technique of sampling was used in the present study. As it was not possible to cover the entire teacher educator population of Punjab, the sample was drawn from colleges of education of three Universities of Punjab i.e. Punjab University Chandigarh, Punjabi University Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University Amritsar. 17 Colleges of education were selected from these three universities. In this way, 250 teacher educators (100 male and 150 female teacher educators) formed the sample of the study. Colleges from which the sample was drawn has been shown in Appendix -I.

TOOLS USED :- Besides the personal data form to obtain information about Age, experience, sex, qualification of the teacher educators, the following standardized tools of job satisfaction, values, attitude towards teaching and teacher effectiveness were used.

(A) Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) by Amar Singh and T.R. Sharma (1999):
The revised version (1999) of Job Satisfaction Scale by Amar Singh and T.R Sharma was used because this scale has been standardized, widely and satisfactorily used (Singh, 1990; Sharma, 1990; Das, 1995; Panda, 1995). It takes a little time to administer it. It has been standardized on college teachers. It meets the accepted standards for reliability and validity.

There are 30 statements and each statement has 5 alternatives from which a respondent has to choose any one. The following chart shows the connection of different items with different areas constituting the scale.

1. Job-intrinsic statements (factors inherent in job)
   (a) Job-concrete statements such as excursions place of posting, working conditions- 6, 11, 13, 19, 23 and 25
   (b) Job-abstracts statement such as cooperation democratic functioning - 8, 15, 16, 17, 21 and 27.

2. Job-extrinsic statements (factors residing out side the job)
   (a) Psycho-social such as intelligence, social circle- 1, 3, 4, 7, 10, 12, 26 and 30
   (b) Economic such as salary allowance-2, 5, 9, 18
   (C) Community/National growth such as quality of life, national economy - 14, 22, 24, 28 and 29

The scale has both positive and negative statements. Items at Sr. No. 4, 13, 20, 21, 27 and 28 are negative, others are all positive. The positive statements carry a weight age of 4,3,2,1 and 0 and the negative one a weight age of 0, 1, 2,3 and 4.

The test-retest reliability works out to be 0.978 with N=52 and a gap of 25 days.
The scale compares favorably with Muthayya’s Job Satisfaction questionnaire giving a validity coefficient of 0.743. The coefficient of correlation was 0.812 (N=52).

B Personal values Questionnaire (PVQ) by G.P. Sherry and R.P. Verma (1994)

The revised (1994) version of Personal values Questionnaire by G.P. Sherry and R.P. Verma was used because this has been widely used [(Katiyar (1975), Nirmal (1977), Sinha (1978), Kaur (1978), Padhan (1992), Grewal (1995), Singh Gurmit (1997), Kaur (1999)]

It measures the following values in Indian context:

1 Religious Value: This value is defined in terms of faith in God, attempts to understand him, fear of divine wrath, and acting according to the ethical codes prescribed in the religious books.

2 Social Value: This value is defined in terms of charity, kindness, love and sympathy for the people, effort to serve God through the service of mankind.

3 Democratic Value: This value is characterized by respect for individuality, absence of discrimination among persons on basis of sex, language, religion, caste, race and family status, ensuring equal rights.

4 Aesthetic Value: This value is characterized by appreciation of beauty.

5 Economic Value: This value stands for desire for money and material gain.

6 Knowledge Value: This value stands for love of knowledge of theoretical principles of any activity and love of discovery of truth.
7. **Hedonistic Value**: It is defined as the conception of desirability of loving pleasure and avoiding pain.

8. **Power Value**: It is defined as the conception of desirability of ruling over others and also of leading others.

9. **Family Prestige Value**: It is conception of the desirability of such items of behaviour, roles, functions and relationships as would become one’s family status.

10. **Health Value**: It is the consideration for keeping the boy in a fit state for carrying out one’s normal duties and functions.

    Personal values Questionnaire (PVQ) contain total of 40 questions. Each question is provided with three alternative answers. The subject has to marks (✔) on the correct answer and (x) on the wrong answer. One bracket is left blank.

    Check mark (✔) showing the most preferred answer should be given weightage of 2, cross mark (x) showing least preferred answer should be given weightage of zero and blank ( ) showing intermediate preferred answer should be given weightage of 1.

    Reliability of Personal Value Questionnaire (PVQ) is shown by following table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.No.</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Test-Retest</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Standard Error of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Months</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
<td>N=48</td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Religious Value</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social Value</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Democratic Value</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aesthetic Value</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economic Value</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Knowledge Value</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hedonistic Value</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Power Value</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Family Prestige Value</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Health Value</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ahluwalia’s Teacher Attitude Inventory (1998):

Ahluwalia’s Teacher Attitude Inventory revised version (1998) is a 90 item instrument consisting of six sub-scales. These sub-scales were developed by the likest summated rating procedure. The six aspects dealt within the Inventory are:

(a) Attitude towards profession.
(b) Attitude towards classroom teaching.
(c) Attitude towards child centered practices.
(d) Attitude towards educational process.
(e) Attitude towards pupils, and
(f) Attitude towards teacher

Each sub-scale has 15 statements which pertain to a particular aspect of prospective and practicing teacher’s professional attitude out of 90 items, 56 are in positive form and 34 in negative form. In favorable attitude items, a score of four is given to ‘strongly agree’ response; three to ‘agree’; two to ‘undecided’; one to ‘disagree’; zero to ‘strongly disagree’. On the other hand in ‘unfavorable attitude’ items, a score of zero is given ‘strongly agree’ response; one to ‘agree’; two to ‘undecided’; three to ‘disagree’; four to ‘strongly agree’.

There is no time limit to respond to various items on the scale.
Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Reliability Obtained r11</th>
<th>Correlated r</th>
<th>Index of Reliability</th>
<th>Standard Error of Measurement r100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Split half (odd even)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>11.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Test-retest (3 months)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>16.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Test-retest (9 months)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>15.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rational Equivalence (KR 21)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>20.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D Teacher Effectiveness Scale by P.Kumar and Mutha (1985):**

The revised version (1985) of Teacher Effectiveness scale by P.Kumar and Mutha was used because this scale has been standardized and widely and satisfactorily used on Punjab School population (Mutha, 1979; Veena, 1985; Swami, 1988; Suthar 1989; Singh, 1990; Kaur, Harsimran, 1996; Kumar, Khushwinder, (1999). The scale consists of 69 test items which were finally selected from 93 items belonging to 11 different teaching aspects; (i) information source, (ii) motivator, (iii) disciplinarian, (iv) advisor and guide, (v) relationship with pupils, fellow teachers, principals and parents, (iv) teaching skill, (vii) co-curricular activities, (viii) professional knowledge, (ix) general appearance and habits in relation to class room and (x) class room management and (xi) personality characteristics.
All the 69 items of scale are positively worded. It was emphasized that no item should be omitted and there was nothing right or wrong about these questions. The subjects were to answer each item according to their personal agreement or disagreement. Items are given a score of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 from ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’, ‘undecided’, ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ respectively and the sum of those scores give the teacher effectiveness scores for the subject. Total scores varies from 69 to 345, showing least teacher effectiveness to highest teacher effectiveness.

The split half reliability works out to be 0.67 and the test retest reliability 0.75. Validating against principal’s rating, the correlation between principal’s rating and self rating was found to be 0.77.

Collection of Data:

A good rapport was established with the subject before the actual administration. They were asked to respond truthfully as possible to the test items and assured of the confidentiality of their responses. Instructions for the tools were read out before it was actually administered.

All the four tools were hand scored by consulting their respective manuals.

Statistical Techniques Used:

The following statistical techniques were used for analyzing the data:

- Descriptive statistics, i.e. mean, median, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis to examine the nature of distribution of scores.
- Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation techniques to find out the relationship between job satisfaction and values, attitude towards teaching and teacher effectiveness.
- F-values to determine the linearity of correlations between job satisfaction and the variables of values, attitude towards teaching and teacher effectiveness.
- Critical ratio to find out the significance of difference between means and coefficient of correlation.
Step up regression technique, multiple R’s along with $R^2$ and F-ratio to examine the relative weightage contributed by values, attitude towards teaching and teacher effectiveness to the prediction of job satisfaction.

Table 4.3

**Codes used in the Analysis of Data for Various Variables used in the Study:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Description of data</th>
<th>code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>JSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High job satisfaction</td>
<td>HJSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average job satisfaction</td>
<td>AJSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low job satisfaction</td>
<td>LJSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Religious value</td>
<td>value (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social value</td>
<td>value (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Democratic value</td>
<td>value (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aesthetic value</td>
<td>value (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Economic value</td>
<td>value (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Knowledge value</td>
<td>value (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hedonistic value</td>
<td>value (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Power value</td>
<td>value (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Family Prestige value</td>
<td>value (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Health value</td>
<td>value (J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Attitude towards teaching</td>
<td>ATT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Teacher Effectiveness</td>
<td>T.Eff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>