Measurement of value orientation of rural farm women

P.M. Parekh[1] and D.N. Pandya[2]

INTRODUCTION

Values are related to the beliefs of an individual, but unlike belief, they involve an element of approval or disapproval.

Nelson et al (1965) considered values as systems specifying a code of conduct including means and goals.

According to Parsons and Shils (1965), value orientation refer to those aspects of the actor orientation which commit him to the observance of certain norms, standards criteria for selection whenever he is in a contingent situation which allows him to make a choice.

Among the value orientations selected for this investigation were localite-cosmopolite and conservation-liberalism orientations.

1. Localite-Cosmopolite Orientation:

Rogers et al. (1969) defind "Localitness is degree to which individuals are oriented within, rather than external to their social system and Cosmopolitness is the degree to which an individual is oriented outside his social system".

2. Conservation-Liberalism Orientation:

Chattopadhyay et al. (1963) defind "Conservation is a positive attitude towards traditional institutions and practices and maintaining of the `Status quo", producing a tendency to resist change, whereas liberalism is a positive attitude towards search for new ways and new ideas and modifications or change in the `status quo".

Past studies suggest that in value orientation, the directive aspect was of primary importance. A farm women's response to the environmental forces, while she was transacting with them were influenced, conditioned and directed by the pattern of her value-orientation, Adoption of a farm practice and participation in farm operations by rural women were an expression of her transactional acts and were, therefore, dependent to a great extent on her value-orientation.

Thus, it was assumed that the localite-cosmopolite and conservation-liberalism value orientations of rural women might have influence on their role behaviour, and hence, an attempt was made in this study to construct a scale to measure value orientation of rural farm women.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in six villages namely, Aat, Chhapra, Ethan, Matwad, Moagar and Wada of Navsari taluka, Valsad District, Gujarat State.

1. Professor of Extension Education, N.M. College of Agriculture, GAU, Navsari.
2. Ex-Director of Extension Education, GAU, Ahmedabad.

Two types of measures, namely, attitudinal and behavioural indicators were involved to operationalise the concept of value orientation. In the case of attitudinal type, the respondent was asked to indicate her degree of agreement or disagreement with statements which would indicate the value dimensions. In the case of behavioural indicator type, the respondent reflects her communication contact with sources external to her social system. In this study, a Likert type of summated rating-scale with modifications was developed to use the attitudinal type of indicators to operationalise the value dimensions.

CONSTRUCTION AND STANDARDISATION OF THE SCALE

1. Item Collection : The important source of collection of item was making use of the items from available scales. The available scales were consulted for this purpose. Besides, 10 farm women interviewed separated from the study area. They were first explained the concept of different values. During the conversation, they started reacting and got involved in the discussion expressing their opinions and narrating their experiences. The provided opportunity to note their reactions and collect some items.

Eleven and eighteen statements which were suppose to indicate localite cosmopolite and conservatism-liberalism dimensions respectively were selected from the scales of Murthy (1969), Udai Pareek and Venkateswara Rao (1974) and from rural women. In editing, these statements were rewritten to represent a single idea, unambigously, precisely, and in a language familiar to the respondents. Then they

were got passed by the judges from the field of extension education regarding appropriateness of the items with respect to thre adequate coverage of the universe and representativeness of the value dimensions. Changes suggested by the judges were effected.

2. Item Analysis : The statements were put into a form of Likert scale with four-point response categories, namely, `strongly agree', `agree', `disagree', and `strongly disagree' with scores of 4, 3, 2 and 1 for positive items representing cosmopoliteness and liberalism. The scoring was reversed for the negative items representing localiteness and conservation. The draft scales were administered to 90 rural women in the pilot study. The respondents were classified equally into three categories based on land holding measured in standard acres: (a) families owning no land, (b) families owning land upto 5 acres, and (c) families owning more than 5 acres of land. Based on the total scores obtained on the scales, the respondent's scores were arranged in descending order separately for both the scales. The top 25 per cent (23 respondents) and the bottom 25 per cent (23 respondents) were selected as high and low groups respectively for item analysis. The middle groups were omitted from the analysis. Item analysis carried out for these scales was based on the mean difference between means of high and low groups as suggested by Murphy and Likert quoted by Edwards (1957).

Murphy and Likert found that the rank ordering of statements upon the basis of the magnitude of the difference between the means of high and low groups agreed very well with the ordering of the

same statement in terms of the magnitude of the correlation between the item response and total score. As a simple and convenient procedure, they found that the difference between the means of the high and low groups on the individual statements might be used as a basis for selecting items desired for the scale. The mean difference worked out between high and low groups for 11 items of localite-cosmopolite dimensions is given in Table 1.

Table 1 : Localite-cosmopolite value orientation scale-item selection

Sample = 90

Item No.	Mean of High group $(\overline{X}_H)$	Mean of low group $(\overline{X}_L)$	Difference $(\overline{X}_H - \overline{X}_L)$
1.	3.27	1.60	1.67*
2.	3.53	1.87	1.66*
3.	3.21	2.12	1.09
4.	3.47	1.40	2.07*
5.	4.00	2.60	1.40*
6.	3.32	2.56	0.76
7.	3.87	2.33	1.54*
8.	3.54	2.46	1.08
9.	3.40	1.67	1.73*
10.	3.67	2.53	1.14
11.	4.00	3.00	1.00

* Items selected for final scale. Items with mean difference 1.40 and above were selected (Murphy and Likert's Technique; Edwards (1957).

For consersatism-liberalism value dimension, item analysis was carried out by mean difference procedure with modification and items with mean difference $(\overline{X}_H - \overline{X}_L)$ more than grand mean difference $\left(\dfrac{\Sigma \overline{X}_H}{n} - \dfrac{\Sigma \overline{X}_L}{n} \right)$ The mean and grand mean differences worked out between high and low groups and item analysis carried out for 18 items of conservatism-liberalism orientation are given in Table.2

Table 2 : Conservatism-liberalism value orientation scale-item selection

Sample = 90

Item No.	Mean of High group $(\overline{X}_H)$	Mean of low group $(\overline{X}_L)$	Difference $(\overline{X}_H - \overline{X}_L)$
1.	3.87	2.67	1.20*
2.	2.40	1.40	1.00

Item No.	Mean of High group $(\overline{X}_H)$	Mean of low group $(\overline{X}_L)$	Difference $(\overline{X}_H - X_L)$
3.	3.53	2.40	1.13*
4.	3.67	2.20	1.47*
5.	2.36	1.42	0.94
6.	1.52	1.15	0.77
7.	3.60	2.07	1.53*
8.	3.73	3.20	0.53
9.	3.87	3.53	0.34
10.	1.87	1.27	0.60
11.	2.87	1.47	1.40*
12.	3.05	2.14	0.91
13.	2.93	1.98	0.95
14.	3.93	1.80	2.13*
15.	3.50	2.87	1.03
16.	3.62	2.74	0.88
17.	2.82	1.92	0.90
19.	3.90	2.87	1.03

$$E\overline{X}H = 57.84 \qquad E\overline{X}L = 39.10$$

Grand mean of high Group =

Grand mean of Low group =

grand mean difference   =

* Items selected for final scale
Items with mean difference more than the grand mean differeence (1.04) were selected.

Taking the magnitude of mean difference of 1.40 and above as a sufficient level for discriminating the items, six statements were selected to form a scale to measure localite-cosmopolite orientation. The grand mean difference worked out between high and low groups of localite-cosmopolite dimension was 1.38. Hence, 1.40 and above was considered as a sufficient level for discriminating the items. For conservatism-liberalism orientation, six items with mean difference more than grand mean difference were considered as valid for being included in the scale. The full scales covering both localite-cosmopolite and conservatism-liberalism dimensions are given in Table.3

The final scales consisted of six statements each in localite-cosmopolite and conservatism-liberalism dimensions. In each value dimension three were positive

126

FINAL FORMAT OF THE SCALE

Value orientation

Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each one of the following statements. Tick (√) in appropriate column against each statement.

Strongly Agree (SA)   Disgaree (DA)
Agree (A)   Strongly Disagree (SDA)

Statements	SA	A	DA	SDA
	1	2	3	4

A.   Localite-Cosmopolite Orientation

1.   One can learn many things about farm from the happenings and experience of her village only.

2.   Many things a person ought to know are happenings outside of her village and such happenings may be of great advantage to her. She, therefore, ought to know.

3.   One who has seen something worked in her village need not worry about taking any additional information from sources outside her village.

4.   In these days, when transport and other communication facilities are developing, one should know more about things happening outside her village.

5.   One can satisfy all her requirements out of the local resources available to her.

6.   To get more useful information about farm and home activities, one should have frequent contacts with different sources of interest outside her village.

B.   Conservation-Liberalism Orientation

7.   If one adopts improved farm practices more problems get involved, so there are more chances of loss.

Statements	SA	A	DA	SDA
	1	2	3	4

8. One should pay proper attention to arguments forwarded by the young, and if convinced, be ready to accept them.

9. Women should not confine to homes and they should go out and work in fields and factories.

10. Women should wear traditional not ultra-modern dress.

11. Marriages within one's own caste should not be strictly pursued, intercaste marriage should be favoured.

12. The legislation of abortion is nothing sort of sin.

and three were negative indicators. The sum of scores on all the items in each scale independently formed the scores of respondents on localite-cosmopolite and convervatism-liberalism orientation. The score range possible on each of these was maximum 24 and minimum 6.

3. Reliability of the Scales :

The scale items of localite-cosmopolite and convervatism-liberalism dimensions were administered twice to the same respondents of 30 rural farm women at 20 days interval. The two sets of attitude scores obtained for each of these respondents were correleted separately on these two dimensions. The correlation coefficients obtained were r = 0.86 for localite-cosmopolite orientation and r = 0.87 for conservatism-liberalism orientation which were highly significant indicating a high degree of dependability on the instrument for measuring value of rural women.

(4) Validity of the Scales :

The validity of the scales was taken as valid on their face value, since the items were collected from the standard scales, from the rural women themselves and also they were got passed by the experienced judges.Further, the mean differences between criterian groups used for item selection also indicated a reasonably good discriminations. Thus, validity was built in the process of preparation of the scales. Besides, some experts were used as judges for rating the statements for their relevance of the two value dimensions. The criterian for selection of item was the unanimity of the judges. This ensured the validity of items, in indicating the status of the individual on the value dimensions concerned. Hence, it was assumed that the scores obtained by administering the value orientation scales of this study measure what was intended to 'be measured.

REFERENCES

Chattopadhyay, S.N. and Udai Pareek 1963.   Value Orientation Scale. Measurement in Extension Research. Instruments developed at I.A.R.I. (1963-72). Unpublished compendium of the Division of Agricultural Extension, I.A.R.I., New Delhi.

Edward, Allen L.   1957.   "Techniques of attitude scale construction". New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Murthy, A.S.   1969.   Social and Psychological correlates in predicting communication behaviour of farmers. Ph.D. Thesis, I.A.R.I., New Delhi.

Nelson, L., Ramsey, C.F. and Vernon, C. 1955.   Community structure and Change. New York : The Mac Millan Co.

Parsons, T. and Shils, B.A.   1965.   Towards a general theory of action. Cambridge : Harward University Press.

Rogers, E.M., and Lynne Svenning 1969.   Modernisation among peasants : The impact of communication. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Udai Pareek and Venkateswara Rao, T. 1974.   Handbook of psychological and social instruments. New Delhi : Samashti

> **There is more to life than increasing its speed.**
>
> - Mohandas Gandhi.