

Vol 4 Issue 9 June 2015

ISSN No : 2249-894X

---

*Monthly Multidisciplinary  
Research Journal*

*Review Of  
Research Journal*

---

Chief Editors

---

**Ashok Yakkaldevi**  
A R Burla College, India

**Flávio de São Pedro Filho**  
Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil

**Ecaterina Patrascu**  
Spiru Haret University, Bucharest

**Kamani Perera**  
Regional Centre For Strategic Studies,  
Sri Lanka

---

## Welcome to Review Of Research

**RNI MAHMUL/2011/38595**

**ISSN No.2249-894X**

Review Of Research Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double - blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial Board readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

### Advisory Board

Flávio de São Pedro Filho Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Delia Serbescu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest, Romania	Mabel Miao Center for China and Globalization, China
Kamani Perera Regional Centre For Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka	Xiaohua Yang University of San Francisco, San Francisco	Ruth Wolf University Walla, Israel
Ecaterina Patrascu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest	Karina Xavier Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), USA	Jie Hao University of Sydney, Australia
Fabricio Moraes de Almeida Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	May Hongmei Gao Kennesaw State University, USA	Pei-Shan Kao Andrea University of Essex, United Kingdom
Anna Maria Constantinovici AL. I. Cuza University, Romania	Marc Fetscherin Rollins College, USA	Loredana Bosca Spiru Haret University, Romania
Romona Mihaila Spiru Haret University, Romania	Liu Chen Beijing Foreign Studies University, China	Ilie Pinteau Spiru Haret University, Romania
Mahdi Moharrampour Islamic Azad University buinzahra Branch, Qazvin, Iran	Nimita Khanna Director, Isara Institute of Management, New Delhi	Govind P. Shinde Bharati Vidyapeeth School of Distance Education Center, Navi Mumbai
Titus Pop PhD, Partium Christian University, Oradea, Romania	Salve R. N. Department of Sociology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur	Sonal Singh Vikram University, Ujjain
J. K. VIJAYAKUMAR King Abdullah University of Science & Technology, Saudi Arabia.	P. Malyadri Government Degree College, Tandur, A.P.	Jayashree Patil-Dake MBA Department of Badruka College Commerce and Arts Post Graduate Centre (BCCAPGC), Kachiguda, Hyderabad
George - Calin SERITAN Postdoctoral Researcher Faculty of Philosophy and Socio-Political Sciences Al. I. Cuza University, Iasi	S. D. Sindkhedkar PSGVP Mandal's Arts, Science and Commerce College, Shahada [ M.S. ]	Maj. Dr. S. Bakhtiar Choudhary Director, Hyderabad AP India.
REZA KAFIPOUR Shiraz University of Medical Sciences Shiraz, Iran	Anurag Misra DBS College, Kanpur	AR. SARAVANAKUMARALAGAPPA UNIVERSITY, KARAIKUDI, TN
Rajendra Shendge Director, B.C.U.D. Solapur University, Solapur	C. D. Balaji Panimalar Engineering College, Chennai	V.MAHALAKSHMI Dean, Panimalar Engineering College
	Bhavana vivek patole PhD, Elphinstone college mumbai-32	S.KANNAN Ph.D , Annamalai University
	Awadhesh Kumar Shirotriya Secretary, Play India Play (Trust), Meerut (U.P.)	Kanwar Dinesh Singh Dept.English, Government Postgraduate College , solan

More.....

RELATEDNESS OF PHILOSOPHICAL ORIENTATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS: AN ANALYSIS



Vijay Kumar Grover

Associate Professor , DAV College of Education, Abohar, Punjab.

Short Profile

Vijay Kumar Grover is working as an Associate Professor at DAV College of Education, Abohar, Punjab. He Has Completed M.A., M.Sc., M. Ed. and Ph.D.



**ABSTRACT:**

The paper is an investigation of relatedness between philosophical orientations and attitudinal valences of secondary school teachers. Investigator developed and standardized the philosophical orientation measure adapted from scale developed by Thomas G Ryan, 2008. Other scale for attitudinal assessment was developed on the basis of Kerlinger's (1967) study. This scale was used used to classify teachers in to Person oriented and

Task oriented groups based on their attitudinal valences. Data obtained from philosophical orientation measure is analyzed in respect of two attitudinal polarities and across attribute variables-gender, nature of school and experience of the teachers. Data has been analyzed by utilizing one-way analysis of variance and student's t-test. It has been found that philosophical orientation of secondary school teachers are not influenced by their attitudinal valences. Both task oriented and person oriented teachers have almost equal preference for philosophical alliance in respect of 'Essentialism', 'Progressivism', 'Social Reconstructionism' and 'Behaviorism' . But at the same time they rejected philosophy of 'Essentialism' and 'Existentialism' for teaching. Also study revealed that both task oriented groups and person oriented groups don't differ in their philosophical orientations across attribute variables-gender, nature of school and experience. Finally study concludes that subject should be taken for extensive study which can help in curriculum planning improving methodology of teaching.

Article Indexed in :

DOAJ  
BASE

Google Scholar  
EBSCO

DRJI  
Open J-Gate

## KEYWORDS

*philosophical orientation, attitudinal valences, educational attitudes, task oriented attitudes, person oriented attitudes .*

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

Philosophy is the real guide which works behind the scene and becomes basis for our decisions in day to day life. We may be aware or not, but we consistently follow dominant philosophy in our decision making. It is true for professional decisions also, which leads to different kind of approaches to achieve a target. In fact, we are aware that the great philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Dr. Rajender Prasad, Rabinder Nath Tagore were also great educators. A teacher is not a true teacher, unless he/she is not able to discover the relationship between philosophy and education. Besides teaching the content teacher should also have the moralistic sense which comes from philosophy. The philosophy of the teacher is reflected in the child by his method of teaching. So the course of life of the child is definitely influenced by philosophy a teacher follows. Education is a laboratory where philosophic theories and speculations are tested and made concrete. Education may, therefore, be rightly called applied philosophy. Philosophy is wisdom; education transmits that wisdom from one generation to the other.

The most popular educational quote “teacher is a friend, philosopher and guide” also calls teacher to be a philosopher who has ability to create knowledge, besides simply transacting it. A person can only create knowledge if he knows method to create it and parameters of true knowledge. This is what philosophy tells us. To create knowledge one should know various possible school of philosophy and hence must have some alliance with a particular school of philosophy. There may be case that we may alliance with one or more philosophies, may not be clearly decisive, but one is very clear what he does not like or associate with. This kind of association or dissociation from a philosophy or philosophies we call it as philosophical orientations, which investigator became interested to assess for teachers.

Attitudes are components of mental life which usually described as consistent favorable or unfavorable response towards a social object. Educational attitudes are attitudes related to educational domains- cognitive, affective and conative. Kerlinger’s (1967) study revealed Progressivism and Traditionalism as first order factors and Person oriented and Task oriented as second order factors. In present investigation we have chosen second order factors as correlate of philosophical orientations. Task oriented teachers are concerned with academics as their first priority and are strict disciplinarian and do not care much about building relation with learners. On the other hand person oriented teachers based their teaching on relation building and consider academics as secondary to learner.

Although attitudes are acquired entity but it is believed that these strongly affect decision our making. It is also believed that philosophical orientations (synthesis of inherent and acquired entities) affect our decision making. Investigator became interested to study influence of attitudes alliance on philosophical orientations for teachers.

## 1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

The study has been undertaken to attain the following objectives

- Development of Educational Attitude Scale
- Standardization of Philosophy of Education Measure (adapted from Philosophy of Education, by Thomas G Ryan, 2008)
- Classification of participant teachers in to task oriented and person oriented persons
- Assessment of dominant philosophy in the two groups
- Analysis of dominant philosophical orientation in respect of some attribute variables

## 1.3 RESEARCH TOOLS

### 1.3.1 Philosophy of Education Measure (Adapted from Thomas G Ryan, 2008)

**Constructs:** the measure contains- 'Essentialism' (teach the common core, "the basics" of information and skills (cultural heritage) needed for citizenship i.e. curriculum evolves slowly), 'Perennialism', (teacher puts forward ideas that are eternal and aim to uncover enduring truths which are constant, unchanging, through grand literature, art, philosophy, religion), 'Progressivism' (ideas are to be tested by active experiments, learning is rooted in questions of learners via interaction with others and experiences are student centered), 'Existentialism' (reality is subjective within the individual and individual rather than external standards are parameters of learning), 'Social Reconstructionism (critical pedagogy via analysis of world events, controversial issues and diversity to provide vision for better world and social change), and 'Behaviorism' (Behavior shaped by design and determined by forces in milieu. Learning occurs as result of reinforcing responses to stimuli. Social learning is aided by observing and imitating others). Each construct contains eight items placed in cyclic order.

### Scoring of the measure

As participant himself/herself needs to fill the numeral corresponding to desired response i.e. strongly agree (5), Agree (4), No opinion (3), disagree (2) and disagree (1). As all the items are positive in nature scoring becomes pretty straight forward. Just add the numerals written against the items for respective sub measure.

### Reliability

As the measure is obtained from an open source which did not supply whole procedure of standardization, thus investigator standardized the instrument using sample of the study. Split-half method was utilized to calculate reliability of the measure, values are detailed in table 1.

Table 1: Reliability of the measure

Sr. No.	Abbreviation	Sub measures	Reliability	
			Half Length (r)	Full Length (R)
1.	P <sub>1</sub>	Essentialism	.73	.84
2.	P <sub>2</sub>	Perrenialism	.69	.81
3.	P <sub>3</sub>	Progressivism	.70	.82
4.	P <sub>4</sub>	Existentialism	.68	.80
5.	P <sub>5</sub>	Social Reconstructionism	.72	.83
6.	P <sub>6</sub>	Behaviorism	.79	.88
		Whole measure	.72	.83

**Validity:**

Mouley (1970) stated "At the most elementary level, it is necessary for all the questionnaires to have content validity. In questionnaire each question must be related to the topic under investigation. There must be an adequate coverage of the overall topic; the questionnaire must be clear and unambiguous". "A more adequate approach to validation consists of checking agreement between responses obtained by the questionnaire against criterion".

For adequate coverage of topic and content validity, the subject 'philosophical orientation' is covered under six heads– Behaviorism, Essentialism, Perrenialism, Progressivism, Existentialism, and Social Reconstructionism. Each head contains eight items, which adequately cover the area.

The testing of agreement against criterion is not easy when we are using questionnaire as somewhat like opinionnaire (as is the case in present study) reason being objective criterion is not available.

**The problem was solved by two measures.**

a) Ten subjects of the sample were randomly selected and were interviewed. Their verbal responses matched to their written responses in the response to instrument up to 83% which ensured validity of the questionnaire.

b) The average ranking of the areas by the subjects were correlated with their responses obtained in the questionnaire. High correlation (0.73) was found in the two patterns of responses which ensured the sufficient validity of the measure.

**1.3.2 Development of Educational Attitudes Scale (Based on Kerlinger's 1967 study)**

Following steps were undertaken for development of the scale

- Theoretical Constructs for the concept
- Framing of items
- Selection of items

- Organization of items
- Distribution of items
- Try out of the scale

### Reliability of the measure

Reliability was calculated by using split half method; values are detailed in table 2.

Table 2: Reliability of the measure

Sr. No.	Sub measure	Reliability	
		Half Length (r)	Full Length (R)
1.	Task oriented measure	.78	.88
2.	Person oriented measure	.69	.82
	Whole measure	.73	.84

### Validity:

a) Ten subjects of the sample were randomly selected and were interviewed. Their verbal responses matched to their questionnaire responses up to 79% which ensured validity of the questionnaire.

b) Contrast group method was used to assess the validity of the measure. The t-ratio for task oriented and person oriented groups when compared against opposite group has been found to be significant ( $t_{to} = 5.7$ ;  $t_{ro} = 4.9$ ), ensuring validity of the measure.

### Scoring of the measure

Scoring is very easy it is in the form of 5 (SA), 4(A), 3(NO), 2(DA), 1(SD) for positive items and in reverse order for negative items i.e. 1 (SA), 2(A), 3(NO), 4(DA), 5(SD). After scoring for each individual s/he needs to be placed in the category of Task Oriented or Person Oriented attitudinal valence. For this investigator decided that an individual should show a decided swing in one or other side. Investigator employed criterion of at least five score advantage to decide for placement in a category. For instance if a participant's responses when scored gave values as TO (55) and RO (50), will be placed in the category of task oriented. However an individual with score TO (55) and RO (52) is not placed in any of the group.

#### 1.4 Sample for the study

Study falls in the category of survey type, and sample is disproportionate stratified random one. One hundred secondary school teachers constituted the participants for the study. Sample varied across attribute variables Gender (male/female), nature of school (government/private) and experience (experienced/inexperienced).

#### 1.5 METHODOLOGY:

Investigator divided the participants into task oriented and person oriented groups on the basis of score obtained on attitudinal measure. This has been done by at least five points swing in one of the



category (task oriented or person oriented) for putting in the category. Data obtained on philosophical orientation measure has been used for data analysis. Data has been analyzed using one way ANOVA for comparing means in respect of preference for philosophical orientation for both task oriented and person oriented groups. Student's t-test has been used to compare means across variables.

### 1.6 TESTING NORMALITY OF THE SAMPLE

Sample was tested for normality by using K-S test and I.c.pe - c.pol max values have been found to be less than limit for a sample to be normal.

### 1.7 HYPOTHESES TESTING

H<sub>1</sub>: "There exists significant difference in dominant philosophical orientation across attitudinal orientation"

This hypothesis needed to be studied at three levels-

- "There exists significant difference among task oriented group in respect of preference of philosophical orientation"
- "There exists significant difference among person oriented group in respect of preference of philosophical orientation"
- "There exists significant difference in dominant philosophical orientation across attitudinal orientation"

For dealing the a) part calculations have been performed by using one-way analysis of variance. Summary of ANOVA has been reproduced in table 3.

Table 3: Summary of analysis of variance (Task oriented group)

Source of Variation	df	Sum of squares	Mean square variance	S D
Among means of conditions	5	1103.7215	220.7443	4.26
With in conditions	468	7474.5063	15.9712	
Total	473	8578.2278		
F ratio = $220.7443/15.9712 = 13.8214$				

F ratio has been found to be far greater than table values (F at 0.05 = 2.23; F at 0.01 = 3.05 at df1 = 5 and df2 = 468). This indicates that the difference is a real one and can't be attributed to chance factor. To further understand the facts we need to apply t-test on all the possible combinations for task oriented group. Table 4 presents results of t-ratio of task orientated group in respect of different philosophical orientation.



Table 4: summary of result of t-test applied across different possible combinations of philosophical orientation (Task oriented group)

	P <sub>1</sub>	P <sub>2</sub>	P <sub>3</sub>	P <sub>4</sub>	P <sub>5</sub>	P <sub>6</sub>
P <sub>1</sub>	0.0000	5.1710**	-0.5067	5.0039**	-0.0227	0.0460
P <sub>2</sub>			-4.9932**	0.0724	-4.9843**	-4.9746**
P <sub>3</sub>				4.8773**	0.4681**	0.5317**
P <sub>4</sub>					-4.8405**	-4.8277**
P <sub>5</sub>						0.0657
P <sub>6</sub>						0.0000

It is observed that task oriented group has preferences when compared on different possible philosophical orientations. The group has preference in the order of P<sub>3</sub> > P<sub>1</sub> = P<sub>5</sub> = P<sub>6</sub>. This means their main choice is 'Progressivism' followed by 'Essentialism', 'Social Reconstructionism and 'Behaviorism' to an equal extent. At the same time they reject out rightly philosophy of 'Perrenialism', as well as 'Existentialism'. This suggests that task oriented teachers are mainly follow progressivisms.

For dealing the b) part calculations have been performed by using one-way analysis of variance. Summary of ANOVA has been reproduced in table 5.3.

Table 5: Summary of analysis of variance (Person oriented group)

Source of Variation	df	Sum of squares	Mean square variance	S D
Among the means of conditions	5	623.8560	124.7712	4.1381
With in conditions	108	1311.1579	12.1404	
Total	113	8578.2278	1934.9964	
F ratio = 124.7712/12.1404 = 10.2774				

F ratio has been found to be far greater than table values (F at 0.05 = 2.30; F at 0.01 = 3.01 at df<sub>1</sub> = 5 and df<sub>2</sub> = 468). This indicates that the difference is a real one and can't be attributed to chance factor. To further understand the facts t-test has been applied on all the possible combinations for person oriented group. Table 6 presents results of t-ratio of person orientated group in respect of different philosophical orientations.

Table 6: summary of result of t-test applied across different possible combinations of philosophical orientation (Person oriented group)

	P <sub>1</sub>	P <sub>2</sub>	P <sub>3</sub>	P <sub>4</sub>	P <sub>5</sub>	P <sub>6</sub>
P <sub>1</sub>	0.0000	3.8794**	-1.8915	2.5885*	-1.5084	-0.2997
P <sub>2</sub>		0.0000	-4.9699**	-1.4326	-4.9754**	-3.9841**
P <sub>3</sub>			0.0000	3.9088	0.6229	1.5932
P <sub>4</sub>				0.0000	-3.8335**	-2.7364**
P <sub>5</sub>						1.1605
P <sub>6</sub>						0.0000

It is observed that person oriented group has equal preference for 'Essentialism', 'Progressivism', 'Social Reconstructionism' and 'Behaviorism'. Again this group also rejected philosophy of 'Essentialism' and 'Existentialism'.

When we compare the preferences for two groups, we find outcomes as described in table 7.

Table 7: Comparative view of two groups

Task Oriented Group		Person Oriented Group	
Preference in order	Rejection	Preference in order	Rejection
P3	P2 & P4	P1=P3=P5=P6	P2=P4
P1=P5=P6			

This reveals that both the groups have almost similar preferences as far as philosophical orientation is concerned. This means our main hypothesis H1: There exists significant difference in dominant philosophical orientations across attitudinal orientation could not be accepted. In other words null hypothesis is accepted. This implies that teachers have their philosophical preferences, but those preferences are not influenced by their educational attitudes. We cannot estimate philosophical orientation of a teacher just by knowing his/her educational attitudes.

H<sub>2</sub>: "There exists no significant difference in dominant philosophical orientation among task oriented teachers in respect of attribute variables"

Investigator has selected three attribute variables which he thought could be an influencing factor in deciding preference for philosophical orientation. These attribute variables are- gender (male/female), nature of school (govt./private) and level of experience (experienced/inexperienced). Thus further three hypotheses could be framed as follows.

H<sub>2a</sub>: "There exists no significant difference in dominant philosophical orientation among task oriented teachers in respect of gender variation". The summary of calculations has been presented in the table 8.

Table 8: Summary of results of t-tests in respect of gender variation across all philosophical orientation (Task Oriented Group)

Variable	Gender	N	M	S D	S. E <sub>a</sub>	t- ratio
P <sub>1</sub>	Male	54	30.7200	2.9794	0.7629	0.2398
	Female	25	30.5370	3.5005		
P <sub>2</sub>	Male	54	25.8800	4.6576	1.0673	2.1772*
	Female	25	28.2037	3.8283		
P <sub>3</sub>	Male	54	30.4800	4.4639	1.0797	0.5845
	Female	25	31.1111	4.4623		
P <sub>4</sub>	Male	54	26.6800	4.9221	1.1513	0.9375
	Female	25	27.7593	4.3867		
P <sub>5</sub>	Male	54	29.8000	3.9370	0.9221	1.2813
	Female	25	30.9815	3.5261		
P <sub>6</sub>	Male	54	30.4000	3.7081	0.8863	0.2800
	Female	25	30.6481	3.5669		

Female have significant greater preference for P2 (Perennialism) compare to their male counterpart. This may be due to their preference for traditionalism and belief in eternal sense of knowledge.

H<sub>2b</sub>: "There exists no significant difference in dominant philosophical orientation among task oriented teachers in respect of nature of school in which they serve". The summary of calculations has been

presented in the table 9.

**Table 9: Summary of results of t-tests in respect of nature of school variation across all philosophical orientation (Task Oriented Group)**

Variable	School	N	M	S D	S E <sub>a</sub>	t- ratio
P <sub>1</sub>	G ovt.	28	29.9643	2.9750	0.7791	1.2539
	Pvt.	51	30.9412	3.4837		
P <sub>2</sub>	G ovt.	28	27.1429	4.4946	0.9979	0.5053
	Pvt.	51	27.6471	4.0979		
P <sub>3</sub>	G ovt.	28	30.0714	4.8605	1.0421	1.2485
	Pvt.	51	31.3725	4.1759		
P <sub>4</sub>	G ovt.	28	27.4286	4.1849	1.0787	0.0156
	Pvt.	51	27.4118	4.7924		
P <sub>5</sub>	G ovt.	28	29.9286	3.2080	0.8617	1.2207
	Pvt.	51	30.9804	3.8910		
P <sub>6</sub>	G ovt.	28	29.7143	4.3958	0.8377	1.5817
	Pvt.	51	31.0392	3.0064		

None of the t-ratio has been found to be significant.

$H_{2c}$ : "There exists no significant difference in dominant philosophical orientation among task oriented teachers in respect of experience they have". The summary of calculations has been presented in the table 10.

**Table 10: Summary of results of t-tests in respect of amount of experience across all philosophical orientation (Task Oriented Group)**

Variable		N	M	S D	S E <sub>a</sub>	t- ratio
P <sub>1</sub>	Exp.	59	30.3333	3.5543	0.7026	1.3759
	Inexp.	20	31.3000	2.3642		
P <sub>2</sub>	Exp.	59	27.6500	4.0665	1.1624	0.6022
	Inexp.	20	26.9500	4.6280		
P <sub>3</sub>	Exp.	59	30.6500	4.7150	0.9800	1.2755
	Inexp.	20	31.9000	3.4167		
P <sub>4</sub>	Exp.	59	27.7500	4.7715	1.0254	1.2677
	Inexp.	20	26.4500	3.6487		
P <sub>5</sub>	Exp.	59	30.5333	3.8903	0.8362	0.1993
	Inexp.	20	30.7000	2.9753		
P <sub>6</sub>	Exp.	59	30.9000	3.2349	1.0640	1.2218
	Inexp.	20	29.6000	4.3698		

None of the t-ratio has been found to be significant.

$H_3$ : "There exists no significant difference in dominant philosophical orientation among person oriented teachers in respect of attribute variables". This hypothesis can further be split in to three hypotheses.

$H_{3a}$ : "There exists no significant difference in dominant philosophical orientation among task oriented

teachers in respect of gender variation" The summary of calculations has been presented in the table 11.

Table 11: Summary of results of t-tests in respect of gender variation across all philosophical orientation (Person Oriented Group)

Variable	Gender	N	M	S D	S E <sub>d</sub>	t- ratio
P <sub>1</sub>	Male	10	30.2000	3.1903	1.2473	1.1758
	Female	9	31.6667	2.0616		
P <sub>2</sub>	Male	10	27.5000	4.6248	1.9906	1.3117
	Female	9	24.8889	3.9826		
P <sub>3</sub>	Male	10	32.8000	3.0478	1.8216	0.1708
	Female	9	33.1111	4.7813		
P <sub>4</sub>	Male	10	27.3000	3.6833	1.6937	1.0693
	Female	9	29.1111	3.6893		
P <sub>5</sub>	Male	10	32.0000	3.5590	1.3361	0.4158
	Female	9	32.5556	1.9437		
P <sub>6</sub>	Male	10	30.9000	3.1073	1.4232	0.3825
	Female	9	31.4444	3.0867		

None of the t-ratio has been found to be significant.

H<sub>3b</sub>: "There exists no significant difference in dominant philosophical orientation among person oriented teachers in respect of nature of school in which they serve". The summary of calculations has been presented in the table 12.

Table 12: Summary of results of t-tests in respect of nature of school variation across all philosophical orientation (Person Oriented Group)

Variable	School	N	M	S D	S E <sub>d</sub>	t- ratio
P <sub>1</sub>	Govt.	8	30.1250	1.7728	1.1734	1.1330
	Pvt.	11	31.4545	2.8058		
P <sub>2</sub>	Govt.	8	25.8750	5.4423	2.3477	0.2856
	Pvt.	11	26.5455	3.8043		
P <sub>3</sub>	Govt.	8	31.6250	3.5322	1.8630	1.2260
	Pvt.	11	33.9091	3.9104		
P <sub>4</sub>	Govt.	8	28.1250	4.6547	1.9049	0.0298
	Pvt.	11	28.1818	2.7136		
P <sub>5</sub>	Govt.	8	30.500	2.2254	0.9634	3.1612**
	Pvt.	11	33.5455	1.5725		
P <sub>6</sub>	Govt.	8	31.1250	2.9681	1.4566	0.0390
	Pvt.	11	31.1818	2.8572		

Private school teachers have significant greater preference for Social Reconstructionism compare to their government counterparts. As we know Social Reconstructionism involves critical

pedagogy via analysis of world events, controversial issues as a methodology of teaching which government teacher avoid due to tendency to maintain unbiased and controversy free nature of the school.

$H_{3c}$ : "There exists no significant difference in dominant philosophical orientation among task oriented teachers in respect of experience they have". The summary of calculations has been presented in the table 13.

Table 13: Summary of results of t-tests in respect of amount of experience across all philosophical orientation (Person Oriented Group)

Variable		N	M	S D	S E <sub>d</sub>	t- ratio
P <sub>1</sub>	Exp.	11	30.1818	2.9264	1.1987	1.4125
	Inexp.	8	31.8750	2.2952		
P <sub>2</sub>	Exp.	11	26.9091	3.9863	2.1662	0.7082
	Inexp.	8	25.3750	5.0973		
P <sub>3</sub>	Exp.	11	33.0000	2.9665	1.9985	0.0625
	Inexp.	8	32.8750	5.0551		
P <sub>4</sub>	Exp.	11	27.9091	3.7803	1.7665	0.3345
	Inexp.	8	28.5000	3.8173		
P <sub>5</sub>	Exp.	11	31.8182	3.3412	1.2371	0.8542
	Inexp.	8	32.8750	2.0310		
P <sub>6</sub>	Exp.	11	31.0000	3.2249	1.4194	0.2642
	Inexp.	8	31.3750	2.9246		

None of the t-ratio has been found to be significant.

## 1.8 FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

- Attitude has no influence on preference of secondary school teachers for their preference towards philosophical orientations.
- Both task oriented and person oriented teachers have good alliance with 'Essentialism', 'Progressivism', 'Social Reconstructionism' and 'Behaviorism' to almost equal extent where as they reject philosophy of 'Essentialism' and 'Existentialism'. It is expected result as today in the world dominated by technology subjective reality is not acceptable as advocated by existentialism. Essentialism is rejected due to its notion of core curriculum as in present times allied and inter disciplinary curricula are extended significantly.
- Task oriented teachers show no preference for any of philosophy across variation in gender (except female prefer Perrenialism significantly greater than male counterparts), nature of school and experience. This confirms that probably philosophical is a compositional issue rather acquired one as in case of attitudes. That is why we found no relation between attitude and philosophical orientation of teachers.

• Person oriented teachers show no preference for any of philosophy across variation in gender, nature of school (except private school teachers have significant greater preference for Social Reconstructionism compare to their government counterparts) and experience.

## 1.9 EDUCATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

As study revealed that secondary school teachers have almost equal preference for 'Essentialism', 'Progressivism', 'Social Reconstructionism' and 'Behaviorism' irrespective of their educational attitudes, we recommend that content and methodology could be designed in alliance with these orientations. In case curricula planners differ with this they need to describe the philosophical basis they have chosen while framing curriculum, so that teachers can strive to adjust accordingly. Thus we conclude that this should become a subject of extensive study in educational circles.

## REFERENCES:

1. Adler, M. (1982). *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*. New York: Touchstone.
2. Adler, M. (1992). *A Second Look in the Rearview Mirror*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
3. Allport, G. W. (1935). Attitudes. In C. Murchison (Ed.), *A handbook of Social Psychology*, (pp798-844). Mass: Clark University Press.
4. Anastasi. (1961). *Psychological Testing*, New York: McMillan Co.
5. Bagley, W. (1938). An Essentialist's Platform for the Advancement of American Education, *Educational Administration and Super-vision*, 24, 241–256.
6. Bagley, W.C. (1941). The Case for Essentialism in Education. *NEA Journal*, 0(7), 201-202.
7. Bloom, A. (1987). *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster. ISBN 5-551-86868-0.
8. Campbell, D. T. (1963). Social Attitudes and Other Acquired Behavioural Dispositions. In S.Koch (Ed.). *Psychology: A study of Science: Investigation of Man as Socius: Their Place in psychology and social sciences*, (Vol.6), New York: McGraw Hill.
9. Counts, G.S. (1934). *The Social Foundations of Education*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
10. Crews, N, N., Glascott, K.P. (1998). A Teaching Philosophy: Rhetoric or Reality? *Childhood Education*, 74(4), 232-234.
11. Guilford, J.P. (1974). Attitude Definitions. Net source <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/attitude>. Accessed on March 6 2007.
12. Henniger, M.L. (2004). *The Teaching Experience: An Introduction to Effective Practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, Merrill Prentice Hall.
13. Hutchins, R.M. (1954). *Great Books: The Foundations of Liberal Education*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
14. Kartz, D. and Stotland, E. (1959) A Preliminary Statement to Theory of Attitude Structure and Change. In S.Koch (Ed.), *Psychology a Study of Science (Vol.3)*, New York: McGraw Hill.
15. Kerlinger, Fred. N. (1967). Attitudes and Perception of Desirable Traits and Behavior of Teachers, Final Report, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED-019742).
16. Kerlinger, Fred. N. (1967). Attitudes and perception of desirable traits and behavior of teachers,

Final Report, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED-019742).

17. McMullen, M. B. & Alat, K. (2002). Education Matters in the Nurturing of The Beliefs of Preschool Caregivers and Teachers. *Early Childhood Research and Practice*, 4(2).

18. Neill, A. S. (1960). *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing*. New York: Hart Publishing Company.

19. Nipissing University (2006-2007). *Practice Teaching Handbook*. North Bay, ON: Nipissing University.

20. Ozmon, H. A. & Craver, S. M. (2008). *Philosophical Foundations of Education*. (8th ed.) Columbus, OH: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

21. Petress, K. C. (2003). An Educational Philosophy Guides the Pedagogical Process. *College Student Journal*, 37(1), 128-135.

22. Ryan T. G. (2008). Philosophical Homogeneity in Pre-Service Education: A Longitudinal Survey. *Issues in Educational Research*, 18(1), 2008.

23. Ryan, T. G. (2008). Philosophical Homogeneity in Pre-service Education: A Longitudinal Survey, *Issues in Educational Research*, 18(1).

24. Skinner. B. F. (1968). *The Technology of Teaching*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

25. Theodore, B. (1955). *Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspectives*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

26. Theodore, B. (1971). *Patterns of Educational Philosophy: Divergence and Convergence in Culturological Perspective*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

27. Thurstone, L. L. (1946). The Measurement of Social Attitudes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 26, 249-269.

28. Triandis, H. C. (1971). *Attitude and Attitude Change*. New York: John Wiley.

## NET SOURCES

1. <http://www.jeffbloom.net/docs/PhilOrientations-Education.pdf>

<http://www.iier.org.au/iier18/ryan.pdf>

2. <http://www.preservearticles.com/2012030625277/relationship-between-education-and-philosophy-in-the-modern-world.html>

3. [oregonstate.edu/instruct/ed416/PP4.html](http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/ed416/PP4.html)

4. [www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RR414.doc](http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RR414.doc)

5. [www.enotes.com/.../five-modern-philosophical-orientation-teaching-how](http://www.enotes.com/.../five-modern-philosophical-orientation-teaching-how).

6. [www.jeffbloom.net/docs/PhilOrientations-Education.pdf](http://www.jeffbloom.net/docs/PhilOrientations-Education.pdf)

7. [www.jstor.org/stable/1083235](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1083235)

8. [www.jstor.org/stable/23758496](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23758496)

9. [www.wzb.eu/en/...and.../why-does-education-correlate-with-attitude](http://www.wzb.eu/en/...and.../why-does-education-correlate-with-attitude)



# Publish Research Article

## International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished Research Paper, Summary of Research Project, Theses, Books and Books Review for publication, you will be pleased to know that our journals are

### Associated and Indexed, India

- ★ Directory Of Research Journal Indexing
- ★ International Scientific Journal Consortium Scientific
- ★ OPEN J-GATE

### Associated and Indexed, USA

- DOAJ
- EBSCO
- Crossref DOI
- Index Copernicus
- Publication Index
- Academic Journal Database
- Contemporary Research Index
- Academic Paper Database
- Digital Journals Database
- Current Index to Scholarly Journals
- Elite Scientific Journal Archive
- Directory Of Academic Resources
- Scholar Journal Index
- Recent Science Index
- Scientific Resources Database

Review Of Research Journal  
258/34 Raviwar Peth Solapur-413005, Maharashtra  
Contact-9595359435  
E-Mail-ayisrj@yahoo.in/ayisrj2011@gmail.com  
Website : www.ror.isrj.org