A SCALE TO MEASURE SATISFACTION OF SARDAR SAROVAR PROJECT AFFECTED FARMERS AT REHABILITATED PLACE

U. R. Chinchmalatpure[1] and V. V. Mayani[2]

ABSTRACT

The present study was confined to develop a scale which can scientifically measure the satisfaction of Sardar Sarovar Project affected farmers at rehabilitated place. From the 36 statements, 30 statements were selected according to the fourteen criteria suggested by the different scientists. The final scale constitutes 14 statements. The calculated reliability co-efficient is 0.82.

INTRODUCTION

Sardar Sarovar Project is the important multipurpose river valley project and life line of Gujarat state. The rehabilitation and resettlement of the affected peoples of the project has become a sensitive issue and have been given the highest priority in its implementation. The primary objective of the policy is to significantly improve the economic condition of the Sardar Sarovar Project Affected Farmers (PAFs) after resettlement.

For the present study, the satisfaction was operationalized as the degree of PAF's judgment or feeling of satisfaction at rehabilitated place as a result of adoption of modern agricultural technology and desired changes in socio-techno-economic aspects. An individual who feel satisfied at any rehabilitated place, in turn helps in better rehabilitation and resettlement work for others. It is therefore crucial to recognize the satisfaction of PAFs at rehabilitated place. For the purpose of present study, an attempt was made by researcher to construct and standardize an instrument for measuring the satisfaction of PAFs who are concerned with rehabilitated place.

METHODOLOGY

Among the techniques available, 'scale product method' was selected, which combine the Thurstone's technique of equal appearing interval scale (1928) for selection of items and Likert's technique of summated rating (1932) for ascertaining the response on the scale as proposed by Eysenck and Crown (1949).

Collection of Statements

In the first step of constructing the scale, large number of statements covering the entire universe of content were collected from available literature on the subject, by consulting the experts in the area and also by discussion with resource persons. As such, 36 statements representing the satisfaction at rehabilitated place of PAFs were collected.

Editing the Statements

The statements were then edited according to the criterion laid down by Edwards (1957). Out of 36 statements 30 statements that were non ambiguous, non factual and comply with the criterion were selected.

[1] Ex. Ph.D. Scholar, BACA, GAU, Anand, Presently working as a Research Assistant in International Water Management Institute, Anand
[2] Extension Educationist (Retd.), EEI, Anand

Selection of Statements

The above thirty statements were handed over to judges consisting of the professional in the subject. The judges were requested to judge each statement in terms of their agreement or disagreement with each statement on five point continuum ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The response from the forty experts who have duly recorded their judgements were considered for the analysis. The response on a five point rating scale were analysed. Based on the judgement, scale (median) value and Q value for each of 30 statements were calculated by using following formula. (Edward, 1957).

$$S = L + (0.50 - Pb)/Pw \times I$$

Where,

S = The median or scale value of the statement
L = Lower limit of the interval in which median falls
Pb= Sum of the proportion below the interval in which median falls
Pw=Proportion within the interval in which median falls
i = Width of the interval and is assumed to be equal to (1.0)

The inter quartile range (Q = Q3 - Q1) for each statement was also worked out for determination of ambiguity involve in the statement. Based on the median and Q values, 14 statements were finally selected to constitute satisfaction scale.

Scoring Techniques

The selected 14 statements for the final format of the satisfaction scale were randomly arranged to avoid response biases which might contribute to low reliability and detraction from validity of the scale. Out of 14 selected statements, eight statements were positive and six statements were negative. Against each of these 14 statements, there were five columns representing a five point continuum of agreement and disagreement to the statements as followed by Likert (1932). The five points on continuum were strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree with the respective weights of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 for the favourable (positive) statements and with the respective weights of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 for the unfavourable (negative) statements. The weights of Likert's technique were combined in form of a product and the total scores for an individual was the sum of the products.

Reliability of the scale

A scale is considered to be reliable when it consistently produce the same results when applied to the same sample. The split-half technique was used to measure the reliability of the scale. The 14 statements were divided into two halves with 7 odd numbered in one half and the 7 even numbered statements in the other. These were administered to 20 respondents. Each of the two sets of statements were treated as a separate scale and then these two sub scales were correlated. The coefficient of reliability was calculated by the Rulon's formula (Guilford, 1954) which came to be 0.82, which indicated the stability of the instrument.

Final Format of the scale

The scale developed for the purpose carries a three point continuum with categories agree, undecided and disagree. The scores assigned to these categories were 3 to 1 for positive statements and 1 to 3 for negative statements. The final format of the scale is presented in Appendix – I.

REFERENCE

Edwards, A. L. (1957). Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. Vakils, Feffer and Simons Pvt. Ltd., Bombay -1.

Eysenck, H. J. and Crown, S. (1949). An Experimental Study on Opinion Attitude Methodology. *Inter. J. Opinion-Attitude Res.* **3** : 47-86.

Guilford, J. P. (1954). "Psychomatric Methods" TNH Ed., Tata Mc-Gow Hill Books Co. Ltd., New Delhi. pp. 597.

Likert, R. (1932). A Technique for Measurement of Attitude. Psychological Study, **5** (2) : 106-107.

Thurston, L. L. (1946). The Measurement of Attitude. *Ameriacan J. Soci.* Chicago Univ., Chicago Press, 39-50.

Appendix – I

Final format of the attitude scale

Sr. No.	Statements	A	UD	DA
1 *	Socioeconomic status was better at old place than new place. (2.5)			
2	Transport facilities are better at new place than old place. (3.8)			
3	Medical facilities are available at new place. (3.9)			
4	Religious facilities are good at new place. (2.9)			
5 *	Annual income was more at old place than new place. (2.8)			
6	There is chance for self development of at new place. (4.3)			
7 *	More discomfort at new place than old place. (3.2)			
8	Housing facilities are better at new place. (3.7)			
9	Agricultural production is increased at new place. (3.5)			
10	Children are more happy at new place than old place. (3.6)			
11 *	Women had better interaction at old place than new place. (2.2)			
12	Entertainment facilities are better at new place. (3.4)			
13 *	Neighbour farmers do not cooperate. (3.3)			
14 *	New crops do not suit with their requirement. (3.1)			

* Negative statements,
A- Agree, UD- Undecided and DA- Disagree