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CHAPTER - III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

3.0 Introduction

The present study connected itself with an explanation and description of job satisfaction and administrative behaviour of principals of B.Ed. Colleges. The study also attempts to measure the nature and the degree of relationships that exists, if any, between job satisfaction and administrative behaviour of principals of B.Ed. Colleges.

A careful review of the related literature in the earlier chapter, clearly established the comprehensiveness and magnitude of the problem of job satisfaction which is extremely essential in any profession, more so, in the teacher education. It is seen from the review of the previous literature that a large number of factors such as; management, colleagues, students, job security, rewards, recognition, emoluments, academic preparation, experience, professional attitudes, quality of teacher education, sex, age and a number of personal aspects influences on job satisfaction and administrative behaviour of the principals.

It may be clearly seen from the previous chapter that, much of research works were not done in the area of teacher education involving teacher educators and principals. While researchers concentrated very much on general and main stream of college teachers. Perhaps, for this
reason that the teacher education colleges are less in number, adequate attention has not been paid to the phenomenon of job satisfaction and administrative behaviour of the principals in this specialized professional area. Hence, the present research work proceeded out of the dire necessity of the specific problem under study.

This chapter deals with the methodology and design of the study, sample and sampling procedure, tools used for the study and description of the same. The statistical techniques used in the study are discussed.

3.1 Design of the Study

The present study intends to investigate the job satisfaction and administrative behaviour of principals of B.Ed. Colleges in Karnataka State. The nature of present study is of descriptive survey. In fact most of the earlier researchers who have worked on the related concerns have, invariably followed this popular method of survey research to meet their research questions effectively. Therefore, in the present research work the investigator used the descriptive survey research method with convenience in fulfillment of the research questions raised.

3.2 Research Tools used in the Study.

Tools and techniques become most essential for any research work to probe into the various aspects of the problem under the study. The present study intending to find out the relationship between job satisfaction and administrative behaviour on effectiveness of the
principals of B.Ed Colleges. Hence, following aspects are taken into
consideration. While determining the tools for the present study.

1) Job satisfaction of the principals of B.Ed. Colleges.

2) Factors directly related to the job satisfaction are;
   a) General information including man and material
      resources of the institutions.
   b) Organisational climate of the institution
   c) Personality characteristics of the principal

3) Administrative behaviour of the principals of the B.Ed.
   Colleges.

4) Factors related to the administrative behaviour of the
   principals are;
   a) Self rating of the principal.
   b) Morale of the principal.

Keeping in view the above factors the investigator planned to adopt
some of the related tools. The available tools are;

1) Job Satisfaction Scale constructed and standardized by Prof.
   K. Ramatulasamma of Andhra University.

2) Organisational Climate Description Questionnaire by Halpin
   and Croft adopted by Prof. K. Ramatulasamma of Andhra
   University.

3) Personality Characteristics Inventory by Campaign and
   Illinonis adopted by Prof. K. Ramatulasamma of Andhra
   University.

4) Self Rating Scale developed by Structure and Wetzler and
   adopted by Sri. B.C. Patil.

5) Principals' Morale Inventory developed by Dr. P. Dekhtawala
   and adopted by Sri. B.C.Patil.
6) Administrative Behaviour Description Scale, developed and standardized by Department of Educational Administration of M.S. University, Baroda.

Though research along the lines described was meager in teacher education area, the vast research, found in India and elsewhere on other sample subjects and contexts, demonstrate a liberal use of suitable effective tools that reliably and validity measured the research elements, i.e. job satisfaction and administrative behaviour. The present research derived a great deal of insight into the procedures of measurement and the tools of measurement from the earlier researches to meet the exclusive needs of the study related to teacher education. The tools were suitably modified with terms and references from the field and discipline of teacher education. It is acknowledged, here, that the standardized tools used in different purposes in earlier researches as reviewed were used in the present study, with suitable, appropriate and permissible modifications to meet the needs of the present research. To study job satisfaction and administrative behaviour of principals of colleges of education the investigator used following tools.

1. General Data Sheet of the B.Ed. College.
2. Job Satisfaction Scale for the principals.
4. Principals' Morale Inventory.
5. 'Administrative Behaviour Description Scale' (ABDS) for teacher-educators and office staff.

3.3 Description of Tools

3.3.1 General Data Sheet of the B.Ed. College:

This is one of the important tool constructed and used by the investigator. As the name itself indicates that it is containing general information about a particular B.Ed. College. This tool contains following main aspects.

This tool is important because the above information is necessary for estimating the job satisfaction and effective administrative behaviour of the principals. Hence, the investigator planned to construct the general data sheet. Initially, the investigator constructed totally 130 items distributed in 11 sub headings as shown below.

1. General information of the B.Ed. College. 10
2. Infrastructure and physical facilities of the B.Ed. College. 20
3. Library facilities. 18
4. Laboratory facilities. 18
5. Audio-visual facilities. 16
6. Computer facilities. 10
7. Teaching-aids room facilities. 10
8. Teaching-staff of the college. 10
9. Non-teaching staff. 10
10. The enrolment of the students. 04
11. The academic achievement of the students. 04

Total = 130
The tool was shown to experts, senior principals and teacher educators of the B.Ed. Colleges. According to the suggestions some of the items were deleted and some were reframed. After the first screening 100 items were remained. Then the general data sheet was subjected to pilot test, the same was administered to 10 principals, 30 teacher educators and 10 office bearers of the B.Ed. Colleges. After the careful analysis of the impressions of the above persons some of the items were deleted and some others were reconstructed. Finally following form was emerged:

1. General information of the B.Ed. College. 06  
2. Infrastructure and physical facilities of the B.Ed. College. 16  
3. Library facilities. 14  
4. Laboratory facilities. 14  
5. Audio-visual facilities. 12  
6. Computer facilities. 06  
7. Teaching-aids room facilities. 05  
8. Teaching-staff of the college. 06  
9. Non-teaching staff. 05  
10. The enrolment of the students. 02  
11. The academic achievement of the students. 01

Total = 87

All the items are an open ended in nature, that is Yes or No type. The same tool is retained for final data collection and is given in Appendix-B.

Validity

Since the tool is constructed to know the general information, infrastructure, physical and material facilities of B.Ed. Colleges. Hence, it
is having content validity. The tool is constructed only to know the essential features of the B.Ed. Colleges. Hence, it has construct validity.

3.3.2 Job Satisfaction Scale:

One of the major component of the present study is job satisfaction of the principals of B.Ed. Colleges. As earlier noted that, the job satisfaction of the principals in turn depends upon the organizational climate and personality characteristics of the principals. Hence, the investigator looked into many tools related to job satisfaction. But the most suitable tool was found in Andhra Pradesh University, where Dr. Ramatusulamma K. used in her research work on the topic “Job Satisfaction of Teacher Educators.” Since the tool was meant for teacher educators of B.Ed. Colleges, the same was used after due contact of the author for the present study. The tool contains mainly 3 parts they are:

- **Part -A**  Job Satisfaction
- **Part -B**  Organisational Climate
- **Part—C**  Personality Characteristics.

**Part – A  Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes that, the employee holds towards his job. One of the important variable of this study is to know the job satisfaction of the principals working in different organizations of colleges of education. Hence, the investigator has approached following Job satisfaction scales.
The Teacher Job satisfaction Questionnaire standardized by Pramod Kumar and Mutha D.N(1976) at the department of Psychology, Jodhpur University and published by Agra Psychological Research cell along with the Job satisfaction Inventory standardized by Indiresan(1973) at the Indian Institute of Technology, New Delhi for engineering profession have formed the basic ground for the present tool on the job satisfaction in teacher education. By and large, professional challenges and demands are more or less of the same nature and scope in any profession. But the context of functioning and content of the professional education differ from one another. Having understood this distinction, the present study made a judicious and liberal use of the items of the said tools to gather information.

The bipolar check list of Pramod Kumar and Muthe and three point rating scale of Indiresan(1973) were not used verbatim. An intermediary rating structure was constructed for the present purpose in Job satisfaction. Mention of few tools used by earlier researchers in the area would further indicate the selection of tools of the present study. Gupta(1980) used Teachers Job Satisfaction Scale, Attitude towards career scale and Meenakshi Personality Inventory. Porwal (1980) used, meaningfully, Teacher Satisfaction Questionnaire and 16PF scale and established interrelationships. Srivastava and Shobha(1980) used Job Satisfaction Inventory. Abdual Samad (1986), used the Halpin and Croft Organisational Climate Description Questionnaire which was used partly in the present study.
Several references could be cited where in scales and questionnaires were used seeking information from respondents on their job satisfaction. This comprehensive and solid compilation of previous research led to the application of the same techniques and procedures to the area of interest.

Having assured of the sources for research tool construction, both from their suitability to the present problem from their effective use in earlier researches, the study procedures were finalized adopting the test items keeping in view the responding principals, their experiences, their expectations and their roles and responsibilities in the field of teacher education.

The 3-point rating scale thus developed in the present study was subjected to curricular validity through an intensive discussion by experts and research guides, who have suggested certain appropriate changes in the formation of the rating item and its structured response.

The Job Satisfaction Scale constructed and standardized by Prof. K. Ramatulasamma has following dimensions:

- Personal data sheet containing academic, socio-economic status and administrative aspects. The main scale has three parts. Part 'A' of the rating scale containing fifty items regarding infrastructure facilities, college condition, professional attitude, personal involvement, students relations and community relations that matter a great deal in ensuring job satisfaction.
Area-wise distribution of items Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No.of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Infrastructure facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>College condition</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professional attitude</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Personal relations</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student relations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructural facilities and college conditions are found to be influential hence five and eight items were allotted respectively to these two areas, professional attitude and personal involvement play a major role in producing job satisfaction as revealed from the related literature hence twelve items were allotted to each area to elicit the required information. Similarly student relations and community relations are also found to be contributing significantly to job satisfaction hence eight and five items were allotted for each area respectively.

Part-B : Organisational Climate ;

Part-B of the rating scale meant for measuring the organizational climate of college of education. To measure Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (O.C.D.Q) adopted from Halpin and Croft (1963) standardized for Indian conditions by Bayti J. Z (1970) was used again with suitable modifications. Indiresan's (1973) Organisational Atmosphere Questionnaire was also used with facility and convenience.
Part ‘B’ of the rating scale consists of thirty items on organizational climate which were further subdivided into the following categories.

**Area-wise distribution of items organizational climate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No.of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The O.C.D.Q. of Halpin and Croft and Organisational Questionnaire of Indirsan also identified the same aspects Management, Superior and colleagues with almost equal proportion and weightages. Hence in the present study the influencing aspects of organizational climate were considered and given each aspect ten items to elicit the required information.

**Part-C : Personality Characteristics ;**

Part-C of the rating scale is meant to measure the personality characteristics of the principals in order to find out their personality styles and to relate the same to job satisfaction, Gattell’s 16 PF (Form A-1967-68 Edition) standardized at the institute of personality and Ability Testing, Campaign Illinois was used. The present test which consists of a rating scale with three responses, adequately reflected the personality dimensions of a person, here a principal, in important aspects like
persistence, emotional balance, logical thinking, domination, self concept, honesty, interaction, sociability and so on.

Part 'C' of the rating scale consists of thirty items on personality characteristics. The personality dispositions of the principals play a very crucial role in their attitudes, commitment, involvement and interaction in discharging the duties and responsibilities on the job. This has been highlighted as an important factor for ensuring job satisfaction in several previous studies. The same stress is given here in the present study with specific focus on the principals. Items that call for responses on aspects like embarrassment, dejection, feelings, problem solving attitudes and so on were included in the rating scale in the emotional domain.

**Area-wise distribution of items personality characteristics.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No.of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description making, extensive reading, descriptions, a high proficiency are some of the aspects included in the intellectual and mental activity domain. The principal as a person will have to constantly interact with groups of students, colleagues and management personnel. Hence this area becomes a field of applications of their intellectual and emotional powers, and hence in the social aspect a large number of scale
items are included that involves various instances of the principal social concerns, reactions and behaviours in general.

**Validity.**

The validity of the tool was established with the help of (1) observation and (2) Taking the opinion of experts. When the tool was observed critically it was found that the items are meant for exploring the job satisfaction of the principals of the B.Ed. Colleges. Hence, it has content validity. The same tool shown to experts they went deep into the each item of the tool and concluded that it is appropriate to estimate the job satisfaction of the principals of B.Ed. Colleges. Hence the tool has contract validity. Since the tool is constructed recently and it has concurrent validity.

**Reliability:**

Rating scale was administered to the sample of B.Ed.College principals was given and responses were scored out. The Mean and Standard Deviation were calculated.

The same tool was administered to the same set of principals after one month. The Mean and Standard Deviation were calculated. Then ‘t’-value was calculated. The result showed that the ‘t’ value was not significant. Hence both results are considered as consistent. Hence the tools have reliability.

**Scoring:** Summated ratings and weighted means were conveniently used to measure and describe the job satisfaction. The three responses for
each of the test items constitute situations vary according to the requirements of the rating items in terms of intensity, degree and frequency of occurrence a high positive situation to a low negative situation passing through an average or moderate situation. A few examples were given here to further elucidate the composition of the test item responses. Examples of response pattern to rating scale items.

1. (a) Always, (b) Occasionally (c) Never

2. (a) To full extent, (b) To some extent, (c) Not at all

3. a) Very much b) Moderately c) Not adequate

4. a) Most adequate b) Adequate c) Not adequate

5. a) Satisfactory b) Moderately Satisfactory
c) Least satisfactory

6) a) More b) Moderate c) Least

For positive endorsement of the rating item indicating very ‘highs’ the first response (a) for each item was to be chosen and for a negative endorsement at very ‘lows’ the third response (c) for each item was to be chosen, with an intermediate response for neither ‘very high’ nor ‘very low’ of a given phenomenon. In the present study the procedures were followed with the weightages of 3, 2 and 1 for the responses starting with ‘very high’ and down to ‘very low’. The same tool is retained for final data collection and is given Appendix-D.
3.3.3 Self-Rating Scale

Self-Rating scale is developed by Structure and Wetzler (1958). It is assumed that besides developing skill of a good manager of the college, the principal must have ability to evaluate his own administrative behaviour. Such evaluation can be diagnostic as well as 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 can be correlated. 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 college executive.

The Self–rating scale have 21 items with four components as shown below.

**Area-wise distribution of items self-rating scale;**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>No.of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>As a teacher-educator</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>As an administrator</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>As an personnel administrator</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>As a public relation administrator</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each statement under each component has five alternative – ABCDE—and different values as shown below;
The 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 assist in the mapping of future programmes of self-advancement.

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's behaviour. The principal evaluates himself against the two components; as an administrator and as a personnel administrator. The same tool is used for final data collection and is given in Appendix-E.
3.3.4 Principals' Morale Inventory.

There are three standardized instruments available for the measurement of teacher morale, each of which have different sets of dimensions namely;

a) Purdue Teacher opinionnaire by Bently and Rampel(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 Dekhtawala. Hence the investigator has selected the instrument devised by Dr. P. Dekhtawala.

This inventory consists 95 items with five components as shown below;

Area-wise distribution of items principals' morale inventory;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>No.of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual characteristics</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Behavioural characteristics</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Group spirit</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Attitude towards the job</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the statements are descriptive in nature. Principals' Morale Inventory, therefore, measures the following characteristics of the principals.
1. Individual characteristics consisting of mental stage of the principals, like Confidence, Zeal, Cheerfulness, hope etc.

2. Behavioural characteristics refers to the behaviour of the principals regarding adjustment, efficient working willingness, discipline etc.

3. Group spirit: It refers to the attitude of the principal's towards fellow workers or teacher educators and relations with others.

4. Attitude towards the job: It refers to the principal's attitude towards different aspects like salary, job satisfaction, work load, environment, 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 some up to its expectations.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity:

The instrument is validated by Dr. P. Dakhtawala using the following methods. Content validity, the various definitions of morale the basis of deriving the components and all the items were based on the components of morale. The same tool is retained for final data collection and is given in Appendix-F.
Reliability:

Reliability of the instrument was established by test and retest method. 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 is indicating the instrument's high reliability.

Scoring of the rating responses was done along the usual lines followed in most of the rating scales in educational research. The score for a chosen alternative and for the negative item, the score was in reverse order. The total score was determined by adding the weightages of each response.

3.3.5 Administrative Behaviour of the Principals

Another important component of the present study is administrative behaviour of the principals of the B.Ed. Colleges. Following factors are important for the administrative behaviour of the principals. They are:

1) Self rating

2) Principals' morale

Keeping in view the above factors the investigator used the administrative behaviour tool prepared and standardized by Department of Educational Administration of M.S. University, Baroda.
**Administrative Behaviour Description Scale (ABDS).**

The Administrative Behaviour Description Scale is an instrument for measuring administrative behaviour of principals. Initially it was designed as a Leader Behaviour Description Scale, but its dimensions are also administrative in nature, and it had six components. They 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 the Department of Educational Administration of M.S. University, Baroda has modified the scale devising it into four components instead of six. The experts felt that the 5th and 6th components could be omitted. Since these two components are subsumed under the first four components.

The dimensions of Administrative Behaviour Description Scale are administrative in nature. It consists of 96 items with four components as shown in the following table.
Area-wise distribution of items administrative behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the items of the scale are Likert type statements. They simply describe the administrator behaviour and objectively of what administrator actually do. The same tool is used for final data collection and is given in Appendix-G.

**Reliability:** The reliability of the Administrative Behaviour Description Scale scale is established by the result of the previous study. The test-retest correlation is obtained. All the test retest correlations and most of the odd even reliabilities are about as high as can be expected for score. Hence, the scale has reliability.

**Validity:** The author 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 principal's administrative behaviour in present study is derived from the teacher educator's perceptions and office staff member's perceptions. Hence the scale used in the present study has content validity.
Scoring

The administrative behaviour of the principals is measured by using Administrative Behaviour Descriptive Scale carrying five alternative responses with different values as given below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oftenly</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure.

The present study is concerned with the job satisfaction and administrative behaviour of principals of B.Ed. Colleges. Hence, the investigator has to consider following factors for choosing the appropriate sample for the study.

1) Colleges of Education -- B.Ed. Colleges of Karnataka State.
2) Principals of B.Ed. Colleges.
3) Teacher Educators.
4) Office Staff.

1) Selection of B.Ed. Colleges

It is well noted fact that up to 2004 there were 70 B.Ed. Colleges established in Karnataka State. As it was mentioned that, the 70 B.Ed. Colleges started earlier to 2004 are having well balanced administrative
and academic atmosphere. Hence, the investigator found it appropriate to choose all the 70 B.Ed. Colleges for the present study.

Among the 70 B.Ed. Colleges chosen for the study following sub categories are made:

1) Government colleges of Teacher Education - 08
   (Consisting University College of Education, Dharwad, RIE Mysore and Six CTEs).
2) Private Aided colleges of Education - 22
3) Private Un-aided colleges of Education - 40

Total - 70

The details of the B.Ed. Colleges chosen is enclosed in the Appendix-A.

2) Principals of the B.Ed. Colleges.

Principals of the 70 B.Ed. Colleges chosen for the study are included.

1x 70 = 70 Principals

3) Teacher Educators of B.Ed. Colleges.

Three teacher educators from each 70 B.Ed. Colleges chosen for the study have been randomly selected.

3 x 70 = 210 teacher educators

4) Office Staff

One office staff (Preferably, O.S) from each college were also selected.

1 x 70 = 70 Office Staff
3.5 Procedure of Data Collection.

In the first phase the investigator given the General Data Sheet to the principals of B.Ed. Colleges and collected the general information required from each college.

During second phase the Job Satisfaction Scale, Self Rating Scale and Principals’ Morale Inventory were given to all the principals. During third stage Administrative Behaviour Description Scale was given to teacher educators and to the office staff with whom the principals are having regular contact for administrative matter.

3.6 Statistical Techniques used in the study:

To know the attainability of formulated objectives of the study the data was analysed by using the following statistical techniques;

1. Descriptive Statistics
2. Mean
3. Standard Deviation
4. ANOVA
5. ‘t’ test
6. Differential Statistics
7. Correlation

The statistical operations resulted in findings that satisfactorily, answered the research questions leading to insightful generalizations.