

CHAPTER - V

DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENTS

THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

5-0 Introduction

In the previous chapter, the detailed plan and procedure of the present study were architected and also discussed.

This chapter is mainly devoted to the research instruments which are used to collect the data that would facilitate to fulfilment of the objective of the study and also to investigate the administrator behaviour towards ~~in~~ the organisational personnel and his relevant factors.

4.0.1 Description of the Tool

The ABDS (Baroda Version III) : The ABDS is an instrument for measuring of administrator behaviour. It is originally devised by the staff members of Ohio States leader studies. Initially it was designed as a leader behaviour description scale, but its dimensions are also administrative in nature and it has six components. That is why, it is used for measuring the administrator leadership behaviour. The components are :

1. Communication
2. Representation
3. Organisation
4. Integration
5. Relations with subordinates
6. Relations with superiors

Modifications: Considering the Indian context and to ascertain the behaviour of ABDS, the Department of Educational Administration of M.S.U. has modified the scale dividing it into four components instead of six. The experts in the Department of Educational Administration felt that the 5th and 6th components could be omitted. Since these two components are subsumed under the first four components.

These four components are collapsed into the two dimensions of initiating structure (communication and organisation) and consideration (representation and integration).

The two dimensions of initiating structure and consideration are similar to the dimensions in LBDO of Halpin and Winter (1952).

4.0.2 Description of the Component

(a) Nature and Type: The dimensions of ABDS are

administrative in nature. It consists of 22 items with four components. All items are likert type statements. They simply describe the administrator behaviour and objectively of what administrators actually do. They do not judge whether the behaviour is desirable or undesirable. They are not to be considered as a test either of the ability of the persons answering them.

The 4 components of administrator leadership measured by the ABDS are :

1. Communication (Items 5,9 and 20)
2. Representation (Items 2, 10 and 14)
3. Organisation (Items 3 and 11)
4. Integration (Items 4 and 12)

Rest 12 items describe the general aspects of administrator behaviour of school heads. Items 4, 11,12,14 and 20 are negative.

5.03. Scoring

Each item carries five alternative responses out of which one is to be chosen by encircling it by the respondent. The score for choiced alternative and for the negative item, the score is in reverse order.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>code</u>	<u>Value</u>
1. Always	A	4
2. Often	B	3
3. Occasionally	C	2
4. Seldom	D	1
5. Never	E	0

Maximym Possible Score :

<u>Total No. of Items</u>	<u>Max. Possible Score</u>	<u>Components</u>	<u>No. of Items</u>	<u>Max. Possible Score</u>
22	88	1. Communication	3	12
		2. Representation	3	12
		3. Organisation	2	8
		4. Integration	10	40

5.0.4 Reliability

The reliability of the ABDS Scale or LBDQ is established by the results of the study conducted in a Noval District command staff on two separate occasions as stated by the staff members of the Ohio State leader studies. The test-retest correlations obtained from this organisation are as under: -

Administrative Dimensions	Odd / Even Correlations		Test Retest Observations		Two Observers Research
	Noval Offi- cers staff	Others	Dist. Dist Self	Staff Self	Staff Others (N=32)
1.Communication	.76	.85	.34	.70	.37
2.Representation	.67	.66	.57	.60	.33
3.Organisation	.31	.75	.45	.67	.34
4.Integration	.56	.53	.66	.70	.44

The correlations between the odd items and even items for each of the components are shown by the above mentioned table. All test-retest correlations and most of the odd even reliabilities are about as high as can be expected for score based upon to three items.

5.0.5 Validity

The authors of the instrument make no claim for the validity of the administrative behaviour descriptions. They observe 'when an individual is described by an observer, their description is the most accurate'. The correlations between self description and by others are shown below:

Self Vs Superior

Dimensions	Air Station	Submarine	Research	Staff
1. Communication	.34	.21		.09
2. Organisation	- .07	.38		.11
3. Representation	- .03	.17		.24
4. Subordinates	.16	.15		.05
5. Superiors	.15	.39		.40
	45	69		47

The Headmaster's administrator behaviour in present study is derived from the teachers' perceptions of their headmaster as measured by the ABDS. The Headmaster's perceptions about his own behaviour is also measured by this scale.

Instrument No. 2 :

5.0.6 Self - Rating Scale (SRS)

Self - Rating Scale is developed by structure and Wetzler (1958).

It is assumed that besides developing skill of a good manager of the school organisation the secondary school

principal must have ability to evaluate his own administrative behaviour. Such evaluation can be diagnostic and remedial. The results of the self-rating scale might be used by him to identify where his weakness lies in regard to his administrative behaviour and they are identified. He can do some heart searching himself and apply his efforts to modify those aspects of his administrative behaviour which have been found to be weak in the self appraisal process. The self analysis approach is really a difficult job wherein a principal may not know how to be objective about his operational role as a school executive. The Self - Rating Scale has five components, viz.

	<u>No of Items</u>
1. As an Educator	5
2. As an Administrator	6
3. As a Personnel Administrator	6
4. As a Public Relation Administrator	4
5. As a Business Administrator	4

Each statement under each component has five alternative ABCD

	<u>Value</u>
A Means strong in a given area	4
B Alternative means very strong	3
C Indicates moderately strong	2
D Means weak	1
E Very weak or not present	0

In placing check marks under the appropriate column or alternative column, a person is to rate himself on what he is actually doing or has done. The authors observe that 'the user of the scale should be able to document his rating mark. If he has never been in the position of a principal, he can rate himself in terms of comparable activities as the Departmental level or even at the business executive level. The prospective administrator may also rate his perception and training to discover strengths and weakness and thereby assists in the mapping of future programmes of self-advancement. Scoring and interpretation 4 points for a check in the A Column, 3 point for a check in the B column, 2 point for C, 1 point for D and zero for E. The maximum score for any respondent will be 104.

But in the present study two components of the scale, viz. two and three, that is, 'as an administrator and 'as a personnel administrator' were selected to represent the 'initiating structure' and 'consideration' dimensions of the administrator behaviour. Each of these components has six items and the maximum score for each respondent will be 48. The school principal evaluates himself against the two components : as an administrator and as a personnel administrator. These ratings were compared with his perceptions of his administrator behaviour on the ABDS -

(Administrator Behaviour Description Scale). It is assumed that self evaluation in regard to school administration helps the principals towards educational state-manship and assists him in analysing his educational programmes and achieving educational goals.

Instrument No.3 :

5.0.7 Teacher Morale Inventory

It presents three standardised instruments are available for the measurement of teacher morale, each of which have different sets of dimensions namely, (a) Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire by Bently and Rampel (P.T.O.), (1970) (b) the School Survey (S.S.) by Coughler (1970), (c) Teacher Morale Inventory by Dr. P. Dekhtawala (1977).

Out of them, the instrument which is useful for measurement under Indian conditions was devised by Dekhtawals (1977).

The investigator has selected the instrument devised by Dekhtawala to use in the context of Bangladesh because there is no such an instrument to serve the needs of Karnataka school system.

5.0.8. Dekhtawala'S T.M.I. : This Inventory consists

of 100 items with five components, namely

- (a) Individual characteristics
- (b) Behavioural characteristics
- (c) Group Spirit
- (d) Attitude Towards the Job
- (e) Community Involvement

All statements are descriptive nature.

T.M.I., Therefore, measures the following characteristics of the teacher.

1. Individual Characteristics consisting of mental state of teachers, like confidence, zeal, cheeffulness, hope etc.
2. Behavioural Characteristics refers to the behaviour of the teacher regarding adjustment, efficient working, willingness, discipline etc.
3. Group Spirit : It refers to the attitude of the teachers towards fellow workers, teachers and relations with others.
4. Attitude Towards The Job : It refers to the teacher attitude towards different aspects like salary, job satisfaction, work-load, envøronment, facilities etc.
5. Community Involvement : It refers to the extent to which the community is involved with the education system by

way of supporting the system acceptable to and exerting sufficient pressure to make it come up to its expectations.

The main purpose of measuring the morale components is to get a global picture of morale of teacher which is a complex whole of various socio-economic and psychological influences impinging on the person of the teacher.

5.0.9 Administration of the Instrument

The respondents will ask to indicate their responses to each item on a five - point scale as show below :

		<u>Scoring</u>
1. Fully agree	(A)	5
2. Agree	(B)	4
3. Undecided	(C)	3
4. Disagree	(D)	2
5. Fully Disagree	(E)	1

Scoring is reversed in the case of negative items. The items underlined are negative items.

Dimensions:

1. Individual Characteristics	1, 2, 12, 15, 18, 25, 33, 37, 59, 67, 75, 79, 83, <u>87</u> , 92.
2. Behavioural Characteristics	3, <u>6</u> , 10, 16, 20, <u>24</u> , 29, <u>34</u> , <u>38</u> , <u>41</u> , 44, <u>47</u> , 50, 52, <u>55</u> , <u>58</u> , 61, <u>64</u> .

	68, 73, 76, 80, <u>86</u> , 93, 95, <u>100</u>
3. Group Spirit	5, 8, 11, 13, 17, 21, 23, 27, 30, 36, 39, 43, 46, <u>49</u> , 53, 57, 60, <u>63</u> , <u>70</u> , 74, <u>77</u> , 82, 84, 88, <u>90</u> , 97
4. Attitude Towards the Job	2, 7, 14, <u>19</u> , <u>22</u> , <u>28</u> , 31, 35, <u>40</u> , 42, 48, 51, <u>54</u> , <u>56</u> , 62, <u>66</u> , <u>69</u> , 72, 78, 81, 85, 91
5. Community Involvement	94, <u>96</u> , <u>98</u> , 99, <u>4</u> , 26, 32, <u>45</u> , <u>65</u> , 71, 89

5.10. Validity

The instrument is validated by Dekhtawala using the following methods.

- (1) Content Validity, the various definitions of morale the basis of deriving the components and all the items were based on the components of morale.
- (2) Teacher's and principal's rating : The validity of the questionnaire was further tested by correlating, the scores of the teachers with the principals rating.

The product moment coefficient of correlation between the two sets of scores was .77 which is quite high.

5.11 Reliability

Reliability of the instrument was established by test retest method. The correlation coefficient obtained is .86. Split half method was also used to further test its reliability. Scores on the odd items of the inventory were correlated with the even items and the correlation was found to be .99 indicating the instrument's high reliability.

Instrument No. 4:

5.12. The Dogmatism Scale

It was developed by Rokeach (1960) to measure individual differences in openness or closedness of organisation of belief-disbelief system and was employed to measure open and closed minded-ness of teachers.

The dogmatism scale is a self-administered instrument consisting of 40 items covering three main areas.

- (a) The belief-disbelief dimension.
- (b) The Central - Peripheral dimension
- (c) The time Peripheral

On the instrument, subjects are directed to respond to each of the forty items by writing + 1, + 2, + 3, -1, -2, -3, corresponding respectively, agree, a little, I disagree on the whole, I agree very much, I disagree on the whole, or I disagree very much.

The instrument is scored by adding the constant + 4 to the algebraic value of each item and summing the forty converted item scores. The theoretical range on the test is from 40 to 280. The interpretation will be the higher the score, the more dogmatic or closed minded the respondent.

5.13. The Validity and Reliability of the Dogmatism

The validity of the dogmatism Scale in Indian educational situation has been tested earlier by Qumar Hussain (1965).

Data on the validity of the dogmatism scale have been provided through the use of the Method of Known Groups, psychology students in a graduate seminar conducted by Rokeach selected high and low dogmatic persons from among their personal friends and acquaintances. In this was, a total of 20 subjects was obtained 10 judged to extremely high and 10 extremely low in dogmatism. A t - test of the difference of the means of the two independent samples was applied to the test prediction that individuals

selected as high dogmatic persons would differ in mean dogmatism Scale scores from individuals judged to be low in dogmatism. Using a one tailed test, the calculated t - value was 4.08 indicating a difference in the expected direction, significant at the .01 level. Relevant data in this regard are presented below.

Comparison between high and low dogmatic groups on Dogmatism.

Persons judged as	N	Dogmatism score mean
High dogmatic	10	157.2
Low dogmatic	10	101.1

t = 4.08 df = 18 P is greater than .01

The scales reported reliabilities range from .68 to .93 using both the split-half and Test - Retest t - techniques with samples of English workers, students at several universities and individuals at a veteran's administration domiciliary. Shelat (1975) also reported using this method that the t calculated was equal to 2.96 indicating a difference in the expected direction. So, the instrument is valid and reliable.

Instrument No. 5 :

5.14. OCDQ - Baroda Version Form A

Halpin and Croft (1963) were the pioneers of the study in this field. This questionnaire is the most popular and widely used questionnaires for assessing the organisational climate of the schools. But there are three models so far used by the investigators in U.S.A. to study the organisational climate.

- (a) Halpin and Croft OCDQ (1963)
- (b) Stern and Stenhops (1963) Organisational Climate Index
- (c) Taylor and Bowers OCDQ (1972)

But among of them, Halpin's model of organisational climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) used to identify and measure the organisational climate of schools.

The instrument as a matter of regular practice, had been used as the main instrument by many researchers in India and abroad to identify and determine whether certain types of climates were found in schools with principals showing certain characteristics.

However, the Department of Educational Administration of the M.S. University of Baroda has developed a variation of the OCDQ with 12 dimensions to suit India conditions. Besides the traditional eight dimensions of (1) Disengagement (2) Hindrance (3) Espirit (4) Intimacy (5) Aloofness (6) Production Emphasis (7) Thrust (8) Consideration, four more dimensions were added they are (9) organisational structure (10) Communication (11) Human Relations (12) Freedom and Democratisation.

This modification is done as a result of belief that the institutional climate does not depend entirely on the behaviour patterns of teachers and school principals but also on factors like managerial committee which plays an important role in shaping the organisational climate of Indian schools.

The hierarchical structure of administration, the communication system adopted by the principal group spirit and cooperation, consultations and decision making have a significant impact on the organisational climate of an institution. Kirit Gandhi (1977), Seema Sahasrabudhe (1977) and Anjani Mehta (1977) have used the OCDQ with twelve dimensions in their studies.

1.1.5 Description:

OCDQ (Baroda Version - I consists of 200 items, all

are Likert type statements. The respondents indicate to what extent each statement characterises their school. The scale on which the respondents register their answers is a five points one (In Halpin Crofts OCDQ it is, four point scale).

5.1.6 Dimensions : (a) Teacher Behaviour

- (1) Disengagement : 22, 27, 41, 54, 76, 92, 110, 121, 130,
137, 139, 142, 146, 155, 165, 178 200 = 17
- (2) Hindrance : 15, 38, 48, 62, 69, 78, 83, 101, 126, =14
144, 157, 163, 188, 197
- (3) Intimacy : 11, 13, 32, 35, 46, 58, 68, 79, 82, 95,
107, 164, 180, 190. =14
- (4) Espirit : 2, 20, 25, 28, 37, 56, 64, 80, 89, 98
103, 119, 127, 147, 160, 169, 177 = 17

Principal Behaviour :

- (5) Aloofness : 7, 12, 36, 45, 59, 72, 84, 94, 99, 106,
144, 117, 125, 158, 168, 174, 175, 184 = 18
- (6) Production Emphasis : 4, 23, 26, 34, 42, 53, 63, 70, 86,
96, 102, 109, 115, 120, 128, 134, 141,
161, 179, 192. = 30
- (7) Thrust : 3, 10, 21, 40, 55, 71, 75, 97, 111, 151,
157, 191, 193. = 15

(8) Consideration : 1, 9, 19, 51, 57, 65, 90, 108, 112, 122
 129, 132, 140, 166, 194 = 15

Administrative Behaviour :

(9) Organisational Structure : 5, 14, 24, 31, 49, 61, 73, 77
 81, 104, 124, 143, 148, 153, 162, 171,
 183, 195 = 18

(10) Human Relations : 6, 16, 33, 44, 47, 60, 85, 88, 93,
 100, 105, 118, 133, 138, 149, 152, 159
 172, 189, 199 = 20

(11) Communication : 18, 30, 39, 43, 52, 66, 87, 135, 145
 150, 154, 156, 182, 185, 198 = 15

(12) Freedom and Democratisation: 8, 17, 29, 50, 67, 74,
 91, 113, 116, 12 , 131, 136, 167, 170
 173, 176, 181, 186, 196 = 19

Total = 200

4.1.7 Score

A	=	Never occurs	-	5
B	=	Rarely occurs	-	4
C	=	Sometimes occurs	-	3
D	=	Often occurs	-	2
E	=	Very frequently occurs	-	1

The scale adopted for scoring the responses registered on the items of the OCDQ - Baroda Version I wise distribution of the selected 200 items, it is already given above.

5.1.8 Reliability

T test - Retest reliability was calculated using an interval of 15 days. The number of cases used was 50. The Rest - Retest Method yielded a reliability coefficient of .717 which is significantly high to provide, to use the words of Garrett and Woodworth (1971), a close - estimate of the stability of the test scores. Thus, the stability, coefficient of the OCDQ is sufficiently high to make it a satisfactory instrument of measuring organisational climate.

5.1.9 Validity

The validity was found out by the interviewing principals and teachers about the perception of their schools. Again item analysis was done to establish internal consistency of the tool. The coefficient of correlation between individual item and dimension total score was higher than .50. Only items having such correlations were retained in the final form. The test-retest technique was applied to find out the reliability of the questionnaire. It was highly correlated at 0.92.

The range of Pearson product moment Coefficient of Correlation between Dimension, Total Score and Individual items selected for the OCDQ Baroda I is shown below :

Range of R between the Dimension, Total score and Individual items included in the Dimension

<u>Dimension</u>		
1. Disengagement	0.51	- 0.69
2. Hindrance	0.47	- 0.55
3. Esprit	0.46	- 0.62
4. Intimacy	0.46	- 0.63
5. Aloofness	0.43	- 0.68
6. Production Emphasis	0.45	- 0.55
7. Thrust	0.55	- 0.78
8. Consideration	0.49	- 0.77
9. Organisational Structure	0.44	- 0.55
10. Communication	0.55	- 0.62
11. Human Relations	0.51	- 0.70
12. Freedom and Democratisation	0.52	- 0.70

The instrument is used by the present researcher i.e. OCDQ which is new to the field. As there are no standardized scales to determine the organisational climate of school in Karnataka, the investigator has, therefore, used a research instrument of M.S. University

of Baroda that could appropriate to the objectives formulated by her for the study.

Instrument No. 6 :

5.2.0 Personal Data Sheet (Information Sheet) :

Personal data sheet was prepared by the investigator for the collection of basic information related to the administrator, and schools. The questionnaire has been analysed descriptively (see Appendix).

The next chapter will present the analysis and interpretation of the data.
