

A SCALE TO MEASURE ATTITUDE OF GIRL STUDENTS TOWARDS AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

D. G. Kotadia¹ and A. O. Kher²

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural education is a professional education. It is also an instrument for bringing out desirable changes in rural structures, the economy and standard of living. The main objective of giving college education in the field of agriculture is to produce the better educated and technically sound youth for maximizing agricultural and allied production. Our country constitutes about 50 per cent of women population and they perform the majority of agricultural work. For the empowerment of gender there is need to strengthen the link between agricultural education and farm women by enrolling more girls in agricultural courses. The attitude of girl students towards agricultural education plays a vital role in agricultural development process.

The success or failure of any social reforms or development programs would mainly depend upon the peoples' attitude towards it. Thurstone (1946) defined that "attitude is the degree of positive or negative affect associated with psychological object like symbol, person, institution, idea or ideas towards which people can differ in varying degrees". Attitude is a mental and natural state of readiness to respond, organize through experience, expecting a directive or dynamic influence on behavior. Keeping this in view, an attempt has been made to develop a scale which can scientifically measure attitude of girl students towards agricultural education.

METHODOLOGY

Among the techniques available for

construction of scale, the methodology suggested by Likert (1932) and Edward (1957) was used in this study for scale construction and for ascertaining the response of the scale.

Item collection

At initial stage, a large number of statements covering the entire universe of the content were selected from the relevant literature. The list was further added and refined by consulting subject experts. These statements were then edited according to the fourteen criteria of Edward (1957). In all, 26 statements were selected as they were found to be non-ambiguous and non-factual.

Judges' rating on attitudinal statements

In order to judge the suitability of each statement on the five-point continuum, as many as 110 sets of statements were handed over to judges. The judges selected for the study comprised of extension experts, other professors and teachers of all the four colleges of agriculture of Gujarat Agricultural University. The responses of the 72 judges who replied were considered for analysis.

Determining "t" value

The response of judges was obtained on the five-points of rating scale. The statements most suitable, suitable, undecided, unsuitable, most unsuitable; responses were given weightage of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1, respectively. For a negative statement the scoring system was reversed. Based on the judgments, 25 per cent of the subject with highest score and 25 per cent of the subject with the lowest score were selected. The responses of high and low

1 Ph.D. Student, Department of Extension Education, College of Agriculture, GAU, Junagadh

2 Associate Director of Extension Education (Zone) (Retd.), GAU, Junagadh

APPENDIX - I

Sr.No.	Statements	Response				
		SA	A	UD	DA	SDA
1.	Agricultural Education is useful for girls (7.21)	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Agricultural Education provides effective utilization of students' time (2.26)	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Studying in Agriculture is totally waste of time (5.71)	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Students' counseling is farce in Agricultural Education (2.92)	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Agricultural Education covers all the related aspects in detail (5.66)	5	4	3	2	1
6.	I hate to be an Agriculture student (5.12)	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Studying in Agriculture is an accident for me (4.25)	1	2	3	4	5
8.	I get required co operation from teachers (2.37)	5	4	3	2	1
9.	Crammer is scholar in Agricultural Education (1.85)	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Examination schedule in Agricultural Education boring (5.37)	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Course content in Agricultural Education paces with present day needs (9.08)	5	4	3	2	1
12.	Semester system in Agricultural Education does not allow the students for extra curricular activities (3.35)	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I am satisfied with my hostel facility (3.56)	5	4	3	2	1
14.	Evaluation system in Agricultural Education is cumbersome (7.19)	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Educational system in Agriculture does not fit to the students' interest (5.10)	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I would suggest to select the study in Agricultural Education to any girl students (6.26)	5	4	3	2	1

SA: Strongly Agree A: Agree UD: Undecided DA: Disagree SDA: Strongly Disagree

group of each statement were analyzed by working out "t" values. The items having "t" value of less than 1.75 was rejected. Finally, 16 statements were constituted the attitude scale.

Reliability of the scale

The split half technique was used to measure the reliability of the scale. For this, the test was first divided in to equal halves and the correlation was worked out by the odd and even split method. From the reliability of the half test, the self-correlation of the whole test was estimated using Spearman Brown formula. The calculated value of reliability coefficient was 0.8.

Scoring system

The selected 16 statements for the final format of the attitude scale are randomly arranged to avoid response bias, which might contribute to low reliability and direction from the validity of the scale. Against each of the 16 statements, there are five columns

representing a five-point continuum of agreement and disagreement to the statements. The points on the continuum are strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree with weights of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1, respectively for positive statement and of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, respectively for negative statement. The final format of the scale is presented in Appendix-I.

References

Edward, A. L. 1957. Techniques of attitude scale construction. Appleton Century Crofts, Inc., New York
 Likert, R. A. 1932. A Technique for the measurement of attitude scales. Psychol, New York, No. 140
 Thurston, L. L. 1946. The measurement of attitude. American J. of Sociology, Chicago Univ., Chicago Press
