



A study of quality of life of primary school teachers of Kurukshetra and their adjustment level

¹ Dr. Sharmila Devi, ² Dr. Amisha Singh

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Distance Education, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab, India

² Associate Professor, University College of Education, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India

Abstract

Since long time education plays a pivotal role in improving the standards of living, quality of life and make an individual as an adjusted member of the social order. It is one of the best means for improving the quality of life. The concept quality of life may be described as the standard of living, scientific and civilized life, socio- economic condition of individual, educational standard, value oriented living pattern and the adjustment of the individual with changing society. The quality of life influences personal, social and professional adjustment of teachers at large. A well adjusted teacher is a boon to the society. In this paper the main focus is to study quality of life of primary school teachers and their adjustment.

Keywords: quality of life, primary school teacher, adjustment

Introduction

The package quality of life covers, balanced food, nutritious diet, health care, pure drinking water, sanitation of living standard and civilized way of clothing and dressing. It is not only the primary necessity of the life, but it also covers quality of educational opportunity, education for all, hygienic housing accommodation, transport communication, production of various energies for comfortable living.

Elements of quality of life

According to P.D Malgavkar the package of quality of life includes:

1. Education
2. Health care and medical facility
3. Food and drinking water
4. Housing facility
5. Transport and communication
6. Poverty and family size
7. Ecology

Objectives of the study

To study the relationship of quality of life, (in terms of seven elements) of primary school teachers with their level of adjustment.

1. To study the relationship of education and adjustment of primary school teachers.
2. To study the relationship of health care and medical facility with adjustment of primary school teachers.
3. To study the relationship of food and drinking water with adjustment of primary school teachers.
4. To study the relationship of housing facility and adjustment of primary school teachers.
5. To study the relationship of transport and communication with adjustment of primary school teachers.
6. To study the relationship of poverty and family size with adjustment of primary school teachers.

7. To study the relationship of ecology with the adjustment of primary school teachers.
8. To study the relationship of all elements of the quality of life with the adjustment of primary school teachers.

Hypothesis of the study

1. There is no significant relationship between education and adjustment of primary school teachers
2. There is no significant relationship between health care and medical facility with adjustment of primary school teachers.
3. There is no significant relationship between food and drinking water with adjustment of primary school teachers.
4. There is no significant relationship between housing facility and adjustment of primary school teachers.
5. There is no significant relationship between transport and communication with adjustment of primary school teachers.
6. There is no significant relationship between poverty and family size with adjustment of primary school teachers.
7. There is no significant relationship between ecology with the adjustment of primary school teachers.
8. There is no significant relationship between quality of life with the adjustment of primary school teachers.

Method Used: Survey method was used in the present study.

Sample: The sample consisted of 100 primary school teachers of Kurukshetra district.

Tools Used: Following tools were used:

1. Quality of life questionnaire prepared by investigators.
2. Teacher adjustment inventory by S.K. Mangal

Statistical techniques used: In the present study product

moment co efficient of correlation technique was used to find out the relationship between all the dimensions of quality of life of primary school teachers and their adjustment.

Result and Analysis of data: Each of the elements of the quality of life is correlated with adjustment

Table 1: Correlation between education of primary school teacher and their adjustment

N	Df	Coefficient of correlation	Level of Significance
100	98	.191	Significant

Degree of freedom = N-2
= 100-2=98

Table value

- .195 significant at .005 level
- .256 significant at .01 level

Interpretation

The co- efficient of correlation between education and adjustment was found to be .191 which is significant. There is significant relationship between educational standard and adjustment of primary school teachers. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 2: Correlation between health care and medical facility of primary school teacher and their adjustment

N	Df	Coefficient of correlation	Level of Significance
100	98	.16	Not significant

Degree of freedom = N-2
= 100-2=98

Table value

- .195 significant at .005 level
- .256 significant at .01 level

Interpretation

The co- efficient of correlation between health care and medical facility with adjustment was found to be .16 which was not significant. There is no significant relationship between health care and medical facility with adjustment of primary school teachers. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 3: Correlation between food and drinking water of primary school teacher and their adjustment

N	Df	Coefficient of correlation	Level of Significance
100	98	-.06	Not significant

Degree of freedom = N-2
= 100-2=98

Table value

- .195 significant at .005 level
- .256 significant at .01 level

Interpretation

The co- efficient of correlation between food and drinking

water with adjustment was found to be -.06 which was not significant. There is no significant relationship between food and drinking water with adjustment of primary school teachers. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 4: Correlation between housing facility of primary school teacher and their adjustment

N	Df	Coefficient of correlation	Level of Significance
100	98	.13	Not significant

Degree of freedom = N-2
= 100-2=98

Table value

- .195 significant at .005 level
- .256 significant at .01 level

Interpretation

The co- efficient of correlation between housing facility and adjustment was found to be .13 which was not significant. There is no significant relationship between housing facility and adjustment of primary school teachers. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 5: Correlation between transport and communication of primary school teacher and their adjustment

N	Df	Coefficient of correlation	Level of Significance
100	98	.12	Not significant

Degree of freedom = N-2
= 100-2=98

Table value

- .195 significant at .005 level
- .256 significant at .01 level

Interpretation

The co- efficient of correlation between transport and communication with adjustment was found to be .12 which was not significant. There is no significant relationship between transport and communication with adjustment of primary school teachers. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 6: Correlation between poverty and family size of primary school teacher and their adjustment

N	Df	Coefficient of correlation	Level of Significance
100	98	.19	Significant

Degree of freedom = N-2
= 100-2=98

Table value

- .195 significant at .005 level
- .256 significant at .01 level

Interpretation

The co- efficient of correlation between poverty and family size with adjustment was found to be .19 which was not significant. There is no significant relationship between poverty and family size with adjustment of primary school teachers. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 7: Correlation between ecology of primary school teacher and their adjustment

N	Df	Coefficient of correlation	Level of Significance
100	98	.05	Not significant

Degree of freedom = N-2
 = 100-2=98

Table value

- .195 significant at .005 level
- .256 significant at .01 level

Interpretation

The co- efficient of correlation between ecology and adjustment was found to be .05 which was not significant. There is no significant relationship between ecology and adjustment of primary school teachers. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 8: Correlation between quality of life of primary school teacher and their adjustment

N	Df	Coefficient of correlation	Level of Significance
100	98	.11	Not significant

Degree of freedom = N-2
 = 100-2=98

Table value

- .195 significant at .005 level
- .256 significant at .01 level

Interpretation

The co- efficient of correlation between quality of life and adjustment was found to be .11 which was not significant. There is no significant relationship between quality of life and adjustment of primary school teachers. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

Conclusion

As per the result of this study it is concluded that there is no significant relationship between quality of life and adjustment of primary school teachers. Their education has a significant relationship with adjustment. Food condition, nutritious diet, healthy hygienic living, availability of medical facility, eradication of poverty, control of birth rate, well transport facility all are related with quality and standard of living. The quality of life can be improved and modified through the quantity and quality of education.

References

1. Allardt E. Having, Loving, Being: An Alternative to the Swedish Model of Welfare Research, In Nussbaum and Sen eds., The Quality of Life, 1993, 88-94.
2. Banga US. Impact of Teacher Training Programme in Physical Education on the Physical Fitness Personality, Adjustment and Motivity, in 3rd Survey of Research in Education by M.B. Buch (1983-88), Baroda, 1983.
3. Blair GM, Janes RS, Simpson RH. Education Psychology Macmillian Company, New York, 1956.
4. Chadha DK. Self-Concept of Teachers and their Emotional Adjustment, in 4th Survey of Research in Education by M.B. Buch (1983-88)s, N.C.E.R.T, 1985.

5. Dutt NK. Psychological Foundations of Education, Doaba House, Delhi.
6. Donga NS. A Study of Adjustment of Trainees of Teachers’ Training College in Gujarat, in 4th Survey of Research in Education by M.B. Buch (1983-88), N.C.E.R.T, 1987.
7. Gates AS, Jersild AT. Education Psychology, Macmillan, New York, 1948.
8. Goyal JC. A Study of the Relationship Among Attitudes, Job Satisfaction and Adjustment and Professional Interests Teacher Educators in India, in 3rd Survey of Research in Education by M.B. Buch (1983-88), Baroda, 1980.
9. Mangal SK. Analysis of Common Factors in Teacher Adjustment, PhD. Thesis, Department of Education, K.U. Kurukshetra, 1979.
10. Marlgavkar PO. Quality of Life and Governance; Trends, Options, and Institutions, Konark Publishers, New Delhi, 1996.
11. Parker DH. Philosophy of Values, University of Michigem Press, Arn Arbor, P.B, 1957, 14.
12. Witmann CL. Comparison of teacher efficacy of graduates from an alternative teacher education program and traditional programs. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland College Park, 1992). Dissertation abstract International, 1992; 54-01A:151.
13. Woolfolk AE, Hoy WK. Prospective teachers’ sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1990; 82:81-91.