



Study of Attribution Style among Pupil Teachers in the Colleges of Education in Jammu Region

* Dr. Shivali Bajaj

*

ABSTRACT

The aim of the present investigation was to explore the Attribution style amongst the pupil teachers studying in various B. Ed colleges in Jammu Division of State of Jammu & Kashmir. The sample comprised of 800 pupil teachers drawn out of 16 different B. Ed colleges within the Jammu Division. . The results indicated that there was significant differences in the Attribution style among the pupil teachers belonging to different levels of sex, locality and also under the joint influence of different variables viz., sex x marital status, locality x marital status.

Keywords : Attribution style, Pupil teachers, B.Ed Colleges.

Introduction

Many studies have acknowledged the importance of teacher beliefs (Fang, 1996; McCarty, Abbott-Shim, & Lambert, 2001; Nespor, 1987). Since the pupil teachers are expected to join the noble profession of teaching & render a yeoman's service to the nation by educating the leaders of tomorrow, it is indeed essential to know the constitution of their mental makeup i.e. the personality disposition so as to have a better understanding as what are the factors which may lead to a particular perception or a personality trait.

Accurate knowledge of others' current moods or feelings can be useful in many ways. We usually want to know more to understand others' lasting traits and to know causes behind their behavior. Social psychologists believe that our interest in such questions stems in large measure from our basic desire to understand the cause and effect relationship in the social world. Pitman, (1993) Van Overwalle, (1998). In other words, we don't simply want to know how others have acted, we want to understand why they have done so, too. The process through which we seek such information is known as attribution. More formally, attribution refers to our efforts to understand the causes behind others behavior, knowledge of their stable traits, disposition and on some occasions, the causes behind our behavior too. Social psychologists have studied attribution for several decades and their research has yielded many intriguing insights into this important process e.g. Graham and Folkes, (1990) , Read and Miller, (1998).

Attribution theories in the field of social psychology have examined the ways we draw inferences about other people's behaviors. They often find that we have biases and make errors when judging others. Attribution theory has a long history with in social psychology. Drawing on the seminal work of Heider (1958) and later contributions by Kelley (1965), derived an attributional theory of achievement motivation that continues to guide most studies of attributions in the achievement realm. The ASQ has been employed successfully with college students, Peterson, Semmel, Abramson, Metalsky and Seligman (1982), clinically depressed individuals and people undergoing various stressful events, O' Hara, Rehm and Campbell (1982), Mc Mohan, Bradley and Davidson (1982). Student levels of attributions and self-efficacy for academic success have been found to partially determine their study strategy. For example, Ferla, Valcke and Schyten (2007) found that students with a reproductive conception of their learning, i.e. a reproductive study strategy, attributed academic success to external causes. This raises the question whether students who use different strategies to influence their study situation attribute study results to different causes. The main purpose of the present study is to investigate if attributions

to positive events are differently related to personality disposition than are attributions to negative events. Bransford, Darling-Hammond, and Lepage (2005) offer a framework for conducting research on teacher preparation that points out a critical need for research on "how teachers learn to engage in practices that successfully support student development and learning".

Objectives

1. To find out differences in attribution style among pupil teachers under the main effects of sex, locality and occupation when studied separately and under the joint influence of sex x locality, sex x occupation, locality x occupation, sex x locality x occupation.
2. To find out differences in attribution style among pupil teachers under the main effects of sex, locality and qualification when studied separately and under the joint influence of sex x locality, sex x qualification, locality x qualification, sex x locality x qualification.
3. To find out differences in attribution style among pupil teachers under the main effects of sex, locality and marital status when studied separately and under the joint influence of sex x locality, sex x marital status, locality x marital status and sex x locality x marital status.

Methodology

Sample

The total sample consisted of 800 pupil-teachers studying in 16 different B. Ed Colleges in Jammu Division of J & K State. A list of the students studying in each college was prepared and 50 students were selected by systematic random sampling from each college.

Tool

The Attribution Style as constructed & standardized by Dr.Martin.E.P.Seligman was selected & used by the investigator for collection of reliable data for the present study.

Data Collection

The investigator personally visited the colleges and administered the tool with clear instructions on answering the questions.

1. Data regarding marked variables i.e. gender, locality, qualification, parental occupation, marital status were collected from pupil teachers of different B.Ed colleges.
2. Data regarding Attribution Style among pupil teachers were collected.

Statistical techniques

The data obtained was treated statistically by using appro-

prate statistical measures like Three Way Anova and t-test suiting to the requirements of data and objectives of the study.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Summary of results based on Attribution score in relation to different levels of sex, locality and occupation in 2x2x3 factorial design

Sources of Variance	SS	Df	MS	F
Variable A	512.53	1.00	512.53	4.90*
Variable B	108.30	1.00	108.30	1.03**
Variable C	409.62	2.00	204.81	1.96**
AxB	104.53	1.00	52.27	0.50**
AxC	15.82	2.00	15.82	0.15**
BxC	66.95	2.00	66.95	0.64**
AxBxC	273.82	2.00	136.91	1.31**
Within	11305.60	108.00	104.68	

*Significant

**Not Significant

The F-ratio for table no.1 revealed that attribution scores of variable viz., sex were found to be significant whereas the scores for other variables type of locality and occupation were found to be insignificant. F-ratio for interaction between sex and locality, sex and occupation and locality and occupation and sex, locality and occupation were found to be insignificant.

The t- test was applied to the data obtained and the mean scores so obtained are given in the table no.1.1

Table 1.1: Showing mean scores of Attribution for different pairs

S. No	Pairs	Means	t-ratio
1	A1	21.35	2.21
2	A2	25.48	

The F- ratio of sex in table no.1 was found to be 4.90. The F-ratio table against df 1 and 108 was found to be 3.94 and 6.90. On comparing its significance, the value of calculated F was found to be higher than the table value, hence, may be said to be significant at .05 level of significance. It means that the attribution scores of male and female pupil teacher differ from each other in level of attribution.

The investigator further desired to check the source for the cause of significance by male or female level of the variable A. It was done by comparing mean attribution scores of male and female pupil teachers by using t-test. The t-test as per table 1.1 was found to be 2.21. It means that the t-value was more than the level of significance at .05 level i.e. 1.96. It can be further said that the two means i.e. mean value of male was 21.35 and female was found to be 25.48. It can, therefore, be inferred that since the mean attribution score of female pupil teachers was higher than the mean attribution score of male teachers, the significance of difference between the two levels in attribution with respect of occupation scores may be because of female group of pupil teachers. Sex of the pupil teachers did determine the difference in the attribution style inter se both the sexes.

Table 2: Summary of results based on attribution scores in relation to different levels of sex, locality and qualification in 2x2x3 factorial design

Sources of Variance	SS	Df	MS	F
Variable A	425.63	1.00	425.63	4.70 *
Variable B	6.53	1.00	6.53	0.07**
Variable C	70.32	2.00	35.16	0.39**
AxB	80.03	1.00	40.02	0.44**
AxC	40.62	2.00	40.62	0.45**
BxC	217.12	2.00	217.12	2.40**
AxBxC	221.22	2.00	110.61	1.22 **
Within	9790.00	108.00	90.65	

*Significant

**Not Significant

The F-ratio for table no.2 revealed that attribution scores variable viz., sex were found to be significant whereas the scores for other variables type of locality and qualification were found to be insignificant.

F-ratio for interaction between sex and locality, sex and qualification and locality and qualification and sex, locality and qualification were found to be insignificant. The t- test was applied to the data obtained and the mean scores so obtained are given in the table no.2.1.

Table 2.1: Showing mean scores of Attribution for different pairs

S. No	Pairs	Means	t-ratio
1	A1	22.68	2.17
2	A2	26.45	

The F-ratio for sex in Table no.2 was found to be 4.70. The F-ratio table against df 1 and 108 was found to be 3.94 and 6.90. On comparing its significance, the value of calculated F for sex (male) was found to be higher than the table value, hence, may be said to be significant at .05 level of significance. It means the attribution scores vary under the influence of sex i.e (male) and (female). It can also be said that male and female pupil teachers differ from each other in level of attribution.

The investigator further desired to check the source for the cause of significance by male or female level of variable sex. It was done by comparing mean attribution scores of male and female pupil teachers by using t-test. The t-test as per table 2.1 was found to be 2.17. It means that the t- value was more than the level of significance at .05 level i.e. 1.96. It can be further said that the two means i.e. mean value of sex (male) was 22.68 and mean value of (female) was found to be 26.45. It can, therefore, be inferred that since the mean attribution score of female higher than the mean attribution score of male teachers, the significance of difference between the two levels of attribution scores may be because of female group of pupil teachers.

The above results mean that there were significant differences in attribution style of pupil teachers belonging to different levels of sex. Sex of the pupil teachers did determine the difference in the attribution style inter se both the sexes. It could be because of varied and very individual factors like education, socio-economic background, cultural environment etc. Therefore, the results of the study show that the pupil teachers belonging to different levels of sex had different attribution style. The difference in the attribution style could not have occurred by chance but could be attributed to the differences in the physiological, mental and emotional well being of the pupil teachers. The F- ratio for other variables locality, qualification, first order interaction between sex and locality, sex and qualification, locality and qualification and second order interaction sex x locality x qualification were found to be significant meaning thereby that the said variables did not have any effect on the level of attribution amongst the pupil teachers.

Table 3: Summary of results based on Attribution style scores in relation to different levels of sex, locality and marital status in 2x2x2 factorial design

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F
Variable A	5120	1.00	51.20	0.72**
Variable B	238.05	1.00	238.05	3.36 *
Variable C	80.00	1.00	80.00	1.13 **
AxB	6.05	1.00	6.05	0.09 **
AxC	352.80	1.00	352.80	4.99 *
BxC	396.05	1.00	396.05	5.60 *
AxBxC	266.45	1.00	266.45	3.77 *
Within	5093.60	72.00	70.74	

*Significant

**Not Significant

The F-ratio for table no. 3 revealed that attribution scores of variable viz., i.e. locality were found to be significant. The other F-ratio viz. sex and marital status were found to be insignificant.

The F-ratio for interaction between sex and marital status locality and marital status and sex, locality and marital status were found to be significant except which was found to be insignificant. The t- test was applied to the data obtained and the mean scores so obtained are given in the table no.3.1.

Table 3.1: Showing mean scores of Attribution style for different pairs

S. No	Pairs		Means		t-ratio
1	B1		20.43		1.83
2	B2		23.88		
3	A1C1 A1C2	A2C1 A2C2	18.25 24.45	24.05 21.85	31.58
4	B1C1 B1C2	B2C1 B2C2	21.65 19.20	20.65 27.10	33.46

The F-ratio of locality in table no.3 was found to be 3.36. The F-ratio table against df 1 and 72 was found to be 1.84 and 2.35. On comparing its significance, the value of calculated F was found to be higher than the table value, hence, may be said to be significant at .05 and .01 level of significance.

It means the attribution scores vary under the influence of local and non-local. It can also be said that local and non-local pupil-teachers differ from each other in the level of attribution.

The investigator further desired to check the source for the cause of significance between local or non-local level of the variable locality. It was done by comparing mean attribution scores of local and non-local pupil-teachers by using t-test. The t-test as per table no.3.1 was found to be 1.83. It means that the t-value was found to be less than the level of significance at .05 and .01 level. It can be further said that the two means i.e. mean value of local was 20.43 and mean value of i.e. non-local was 23.88. Karraker (1972) maintains that communication between the home and the school promotes good academic results. It can, therefore, be inferred that though the difference was insignificant but the mean attribution scores of the non local candidates was still higher than local candidates, so the significance of difference between in F-ratio between the two levels in attribution scores may be because of non-local group of pupil-teachers.

The F-ratio between sex and marital status was also found to be 4.99. The F-ratio table against df at 1 and 72 df was found to be 1.84 and 2.35. On comparing its significance, the value of calculated F was found to be higher than the table value hence may be said to be significant at .05 and .01 level of significance. It means the attribution scores were found to be different for different categories of sex and marital status.

In order to test the exact source of significance under joint influence of different levels of main effects i.e. sex and marital status, t-test was employed on different pair combinations. So, there were two levels of male and female and two levels of married and un-married pupil teachers. In post hoc comparisons, four combinations with different permutations were taken at one time and hence, t value was calculated as per table no. 3.1. The table further revealed that for different combinations viz. male and married pupil teacher, male and unmarried teachers, female and married teachers and female and unmarried teachers, t value was calculated for each pair and found to be significant as the value of t was found to be higher than 1.96 and 2.58. It means that sex x marital status was found to be significant due to male and married pupil teachers, male and unmarried pupil teachers, female and married pupil teachers, female and unmarried pupil teachers whereas the combinations of pair for F-ratio of sex and locality were found to be less than the F-ratio table, hence, were insignificant.

It can be further inferred that examining the mean value of significant pairs, the mean value of male and unmarried pupil teachers, female and married pupil teachers and female and unmarried pupil teachers was found to be 24.25, 24.05 and 21.85 which was higher than male and married pupil teachers i.e. 18.25, hence, may be the cause for its significance.

The F-ratio between locality and marital status was also found to be 5.60. The F-ratio table against df at 1 and 72 df was found to be 1.84 and 2.35. On comparing its significance, the value of calculated F was found to be higher than the table value, hence, may be said to be significant at .05 and .01 level of significance. It means the attribution scores were found to be different for different categories of locality and marital status.

In order to test the exact source of significance under joint influence of different levels of main effect i.e. locality and marital status; t-test was employed on different pair combinations. So, there were two levels of locality i.e. local and non-local and two levels of marital status i.e. married and un-married. In post hoc comparisons, four combinations with different permutations were taken at one time and hence, t value was calculated as per table no.3.1. The table further revealed that different combinations local and married pupil teachers, local and unmarried pupil teachers, non-local and married pupil teachers, non-local and unmarried pupil teachers for each t was found to be significant as their value of t was found to be higher than 1.96 and 2.58. It means that locality x marital status was found to be significant due to local and married pupil teachers, local and unmarried pupil teachers, non-local and married pupil teachers, non-local and unmarried pupil teachers.

It can be further inferred that examining the mean value of significant pairs, the mean value of local and married pupil teachers, non-local and married pupil teachers, non-local and unmarried pupil teachers. was found to be 21.65, 20.65 and 27.10 which was higher than local and unmarried pupil teachers i.e. 19.20, hence, the cause for its significance.

The above results indicate that different levels of locality categorized as local and non- local did have an impact on the attribution style of the pupil teachers. More so, pupil teachers came from different States and with different Urban and Rural background which in the opinion of the researcher might be the cause for the difference in the scores. The results also revealed that the pupil teachers belonging to different levels of sex with different levels of locality and different levels of marital status when studied under the joint influence of locality and marital status reflected different levels of attribution style leading to difference in attribution style scores. This means that the pupil teachers with different levels of marital status coming from different States of the country with varied levels of locality like urban and rural did reflect a difference in their attribution style. The F-ratio of sex x locality and sex x locality x marital status were found to be less than the F-ratio table, hence, were insignificant.

Conclusions

- There was difference in the attribution style of the pupil teachers belonging to different levels of sex. However, different levels of locality and occupation separately caused no difference. Even the joint influence of different levels of different variables viz., sex x locality, sex x occupation, locality x occupation and sex x locality x occupation revealed no difference in the attribution style of the pupil teachers.
- There was difference in the attribution style of the pupil teachers belonging to different levels of sex. However, different levels of locality and qualification separately caused no difference. Even the joint influence of different levels of different variables viz., sex x locality, sex x qualification, locality x qualification and sex x locality x qualification revealed no difference in the attribution style of the pupil teachers.

- There was difference in the attribution style of the pupil teachers belonging to different levels of locality. However, different levels of sex and marital status separately caused no difference. The joint influence of different levels of different variables viz., sex x locality revealed no difference in the attribution style of the pupil teachers. However, the joint influence of variables like sex x marital status, locality x marital status and sex x locality x marital status did report a difference in the attribution style of pupil teachers.

REFERENCES

1. Bransford, J., Darling-Hammond, L., & LePage, P. (2005). Introduction. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world*, (pp. 1-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
2. Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research*, 38, 47-65.
3. Ferla, J., Valcke, M., & Schyten, G. (2007). Relationships between student cognitions and their effects on study strategies. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 18, 271-278.
4. Graham, S., & V. Folkes, (eds.) (1990): *Attribution theory: Applications to achievement, mental health and interpersonal conflicts*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
5. Karraker, R.J. (1972). Increasing academic performance through home-managed contingency programmes. *Journal of School Psychology*, 10 (2), 173-178.
6. Kelley H.H., (1965): *Attribution theory in Social Psychology* in D. Levine (Ed.) *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Lincoln N.E. University of Nebraska, pp.192-241 as cited in *Attribution Style Questionnaire* (Eds) test Critiques, Tennen. H. Herberger, S. (1986), Vol-5, p.20.
7. Manly P. C., R.J. Mc. Carty, F., Abbott-Shim, M., & Lambert, R. (2001). The relationship between teacher beliefs and practices, and head start classroom quality. *Early Education and Development*, 12(2), 225-238.
8. Mc. Mohan, C.P. Bradley & P.D. Davidson, (1982): "Depressive Attributional Style and depression following child birth", *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, pp.91, 245.
9. Overwalle. F. Van, (1998): "Casual explanation as constraint satisfaction: A critique and a feed forward connectionist alternative", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74-312-328.
10. O'Hara M. W., L.P. Rehm, & S.B. Campbell, (1982): "Predicting depressive symptomatology: Cognitive-behavioral models and postpartum depression", *Journal of Abnormal psychology*, 91, 457-461 as cited in *Journal of Personality and social psychology*, 1986, vol-50, no-5, 974-991.
11. Peterson, C., A. Semmel, L.Y. Abramson, G.I. Metalsky, M.E.P. Seligman, (1982): "Attribution styles and life events in the classroom: vulnerability and invulnerability to depressive mood reactions", *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 43, 612-617.
12. Pitman, T.S. (1993): Control motivation and attitude change. In G. Weary, F. Gleicher, & K.L. Marsh (eds), *Control Motivation and Social Cognition*, New York: Springer - Verlag pp.157-175.
13. Read S. J., & L.C. Miller, (1998): Connectionist and PDP models of social reasoning and social behaviour, Mahwati, N. J. : Erlbaum as cited in David R. Shaffer, "Loc. Cit.", pp.94.
14. Seligman Martin. E. P., (1984): "Attribution style Questionnaire". In R.C. | Sweetland, Test Critiques, (Vol-5) Kansas City, MD test Corporation of America, | pp.20-32. |